71-17,009

WATROUS, Stephen Digby, 1939-
RUSSIA'S "LAND OF THE FUTURE": REGIONALISM AND THE AWAKENING OF SIBERIA, 1819-1894.

University of Washington, Ph.D., 1970
History, modern

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

RUSSIA'S "LAND OF THE FUTURE":

REGIONALISM AND THE AWAKENING OF SIBERIA

1819-1894

by

STEPHEN D. WATROUS

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

1970

Approved by Donald W Treadgold
(Chairman of Supervisory Committee)

Department History
(Departmental Faculty sponsoring candidate)

Date September 15, 1970

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Date: 1 October 1970

We have carefully read the dissertation entitled "Russia's 'Land of the Future': Regionalism and the Awakening of Siberia, 1819-94" submitted by Stephen Digby Watrous in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy and recommend its acceptance. In support of this recommendation we present the following joint statement of evaluation to be filed with the dissertation.

The USSR, and the Russian Empire before it, have been multi-national states as well as the largest political units in the world. The most numerous ethnic group has for centuries been the Great Russians. In recent years historians have begun to study the minorities intensively. Within the area in which Great Russians have long been the majority, there are vast sub-areas that also require individual study, most notably and clearly Siberia. Mr. Watrous has undertaken to examine the rise of a regional consciousness in Siberia during the nineteenth century, from the arrival of Michael Speransky, the first more or less enlightened governor-general, to the death of Nicholas Yadrintsev, the "leading Siberian regionalist." The latter date, 1894, also approximated the time of the building of the Trans-Siberian Railway and a new flood of migration into Siberia; these developments and others did much to transform the region. During the 75 years in question, exiles from Great Russia and Siberian-born Russians, as well as Poles and others, generated a series of ideas about Siberia's past, present, and future that were disseminated and became influential within certain Siberian groups.

Mr. Watrous has written a thorough scholarly account of the growth of Siberian regionalism and has provided a judicious evaluation of its various stages. He notes that it evinced hopes for Siberia that were not justified by events during the period or since; he tries to depict the regionalists as neither seers whose vision was thwarted nor as dolts who conjured up fantasies, but as men who loved their region (and often country as well) and did their best to serve its present needs as well as their image of its potentialities. He has been limited to printed materials available in this country, but he has exploited them fully and conscientiously.

We unreservedly recommend acceptance of the dissertation.

DISSERTATION READING COMMITTEE: Donald W Treadgold, Chairman

Peter Pozen

Norton Hoch

Doctoral Dissertation

In presenting this dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the doctoral degree at the University of Washington, I agree that the Library shall make its copies freely available for inspection. I further agree that extensive copying of this dissertation is allowable only for scholarly purposes. Requests for copying or reproduction of this dissertation may be referred to University Microfilms, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106, to whom the author has granted "the right to reproduce and sell (a) copies of the manuscript in microform and/or (b) printed copies of the manuscript made from microform."

Signature Stephen D. Watrous

Date October 30, 1970

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION iv

PART ONE: THE SETTING (1800-1860)

CHAPTER I: Old Siberia and the Impact of Speransky: The Early Nineteenth Century 2

Siberian Society at the Turn of the Eighteenth Century 2
Siberia as a Special Administrative Entity: The Pre-Speransky Period 13
Speransky's Contributions: Administrative, Cultural, and Social 26

CHAPTER II. Exiles and Siberian Society: Cultural and Intellectual Developments, 1825-1855 44

Slovtsov: The First Siberian Patriot 45
Decembrists in Siberia: Their Impact and Legacy 61
Contributions of Polish Exiles 86
Stirrings from within Siberian Society: 1825-50 99

CHAPTER III. Social Ferment in the Age of Muravyov: The Late Fifties and Early Sixties 115

The Significance of Muravyov and His Administration: 1847-61 117
Petrashevtsy and Siberian Society: 1855-60 134
Bakunin's Years of Siberian Exile: 1857-61 154
The End of an Era 164

CHAPTER IV. The Development of Federalist, Regionalist, and Separatist Theories 185

Decembrist Views on Federalism and Siberia before 1825 185
Early Views of Siberia among Petrashevtsy 196
Herzen, Ogaryov, Bakunin, and the Bell 200
The Ukrainian Contribution: The Cyril-Methodius Society and Kostomarov 222
Shchapov: The "Father of Siberian Regionalism" 236

PART TWO: THE EMERGENCE OF SIBERIAN REGIONALISM (1860-1881)

CHAPTER V. Regionalists in the Making: Potanin and Yadrintsev 255

The Early Years (to 1860) 258
Student Years in St. Petersburg (1860-63) 272
Initial Ideas and Program of the Regionalists 285
Regionalist Activity in Siberia (1863-65) 295

CHAPTER VI. The Siberian Independence Affair and Its Aftermath 324

The Affair (1865) 324
The Aftermath (1865-68) 338

CHAPTER VII. Regionalism in the Seventies 352

Regionalists in Exile (1868-74) 354
Vagin, Zagoskin, and the Newspaper Siberia (1875-81) 373
Yadrintsev in St. Petersburg and in Western Siberia (1874-81) 392
Siberians and the Russian Revolutionary Movement 408
Siberia, Regionalists, and the Great Reforms 421

PART THREE: REGIONALISM AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF SIBERIA (1881-1894)

CHAPTER VIII. Yadrintsev's Later Life and Works 434

Yadrintsev and Siberia's Tricentennial (1881) 436
The Major Works: Siberia as a Colony and Siberian Natives 443
The Newspaper Eastern Review (1882-94) 461
Yadrintsev at His Peak (1882-88) 483
The Last Years (1888-94) 494

CHAPTER IX. Regional Consciousness and the Development of Urban Society 514

The University Site, the Tricentennial, and Public Response 516
Tomsk and Irkutsk Come of Age 537
The Development of Smaller Siberian Towns 569
Regionalism and Centralism in Competition 600

CHAPTER X. Siberia on the Eve of a New Age 616

Government Attitudes and Administrative Changes 618
The University Question 634
The Trans-Siberian Railroad 659
The Migration Question 683
The Exile Question 698
The Native Question 712

EPILOGUE. Siberian Regionalism in Perspective: Its Nature and Significance 728

BIBLIOGRAPHY 752

INTRODUCTION

This study investigates the political, social, and intellectual awakening of Siberian society in the nineteenth century. In the early part of the century the immense region of Siberia was a remote, isolated, and stagnant backwater, by and large cut off from the main currents of Western and Russian culture and ruled by powerful, despotic officials. By the eve of the twentieth century Siberia had gradually been transformed into a more integral part of the Russian Empire and of the world at large — culturally, intellectually, economically, and politically. After much investigation I have come to the conclusion that in the 19th century the idea of Siberian regional consciousness did more to awaken Siberian society to the values and needs of the modern age than did any other single factor. Indeed, I feel that an understanding of Siberian regionalism is essential for a proper evaluation of the westernizing and modernizing processes and influences that so changed this large part of Asiatic Russia by the end of the nineteenth century.

In area Siberia constitutes the largest region of the largest state in the world; it occupies roughly 8% of the earth's land surface and, straddling nine time zones, takes up slightly less than half of the total area of the Soviet Union. Not only have few historical studies been written on this enormous, though relatively inactive and under-populated region, but the majority of these works has dealt with aspects of Russian expansion eastward: either colonization and settlement, or foreign policy

and diplomacy. Another large group of monographs has considered the Civil War experience in Siberia and the present-day conditions among Siberia's ethnic minorities. To date little has been written in any language on the overall subject of the cultural, social, and intellectual development of the Russian (or Sibiryak) population in the 19th century. It is this gap in historical scholarship that I hope to narrow.

While it is frequently recognized that the Russian Empire and the present Soviet Union have been made up of many nationalities, it is less often acknowledged that the Russian Empire and its predecessor, the Muscovite state, grew out of a number of distinct Russian regions, each with its own history, character, and traditions. Historical scholarship has naturally gravitated toward emphasizing developments of the Muscovite and Great Russian center — and often at the expense of the history of the outlying borderlands of the Russian state. This study offers a mild corrective to the more frequent and customary centralist approach to Russian history. A consideration of 19th-century Russian history from the Siberian point of view provides a different and valuable perspective not even afforded from, say, the Ukrainian or Polish vantage point. With increasing awareness in the West of the importance of non-Russian ethnic groups and their historical experiences within the Russian state, it is reasonable to assume that a study of Siberia and Siberian regionalism might complement this interest. Even the Great Russian people have not always been one solid "whole." Indeed, along with the spokesmen of national minorities in the 19th century (and occasional Russians), Siberian regionalists were the most vigorous and steadfast proponents of a genuinely federative Russian state, consisting of autonomous regions: both Russian and non-Russian. Just as some of the non-Russian nationalities underwent brief yet ill-fated flings at autonomy or independence after the Bolshevik Revolution, so too did

Siberians declare their autonomy in 1918, only to be submerged soon after by centralistic Whites, followed by Bolsheviks.

In this study I have also sought to provide for the first time in English partial biographies of two key Siberian regionalists, Grigory Nikolaevich Potanin (1835-1920) and Nikolai Mikhailovich Yadrintsev (1842-94), to the extent that their lives and works formed an integral part of the regionalist movement. These two men, more than any others, became the standard-bearers of Siberian regionalism. They pressed for the implementation of badly needed reforms and changes, and sought to rouse Siberian society at large to social action, to a sense of patriotic and civic duty, and to a greater consciousness of Siberia's best interests. However, as Siberians and as regionalists, standing somewhat apart from the mainstream of the Russian social movement, Potanin and Yadrintsev have generally been overlooked as significant social thinkers. Hopefully, a portrayal of these two distinguished and spirited Siberians will serve to increase a recognition of their distinctive role in both Siberian and Russian history. I have also briefly sketched the lives of several other important figures whose influence has loomed large in the history of Siberian regional consciousness — of men such as Slovtsov, Vagin, Zagoskin, Shashkov, and to some extent Shchapov.[1]

In undertaking what was eventually this monograph, I was initially intrigued by certain similarities between the Siberian and American historical experiences. These similarities boil down to the fact that both Russians and Americans conquered parts of two continents inhabited by native populations,

---

1 Shchapov has recently become a popular subject for Western Ph.D. dissertations. See, for example, J. Wachendorff, "Regionalismus, Raskol, und Volk als Hauptprobleme der russischen Geschichte bei A. P. Ščapov," (Cologne, 1964). Gary Hanson (University of Wisconsin) and Rochelle Goldberg (University of Rochester) are to my knowledge presently writing dissertations on Shchapov.

the former moving eastward to the Pacific and the latter westward to the same. Further interest in this area was stimulated by Frederick Jackson Turner's suggestion that "if, with our own methods of the occupation of the /American/ frontier, we should compare those of other countries which have dealt with similar problems — such as Russia, Germany, and the English colonies in Canada, Australia, and Africa — we should undoubtedly find most fruitful results." [2] I determined that before an entirely fruitful comparison could be made, first Siberian society and how Siberian thinkers regarded their homeland had to be examined, especially at the very time when the westward movement in North America was taking place. More specifically, I sought to discover just how a thinking element or intelligentsia arose in Siberia, capable of self-analysis and of comparing the Siberian historical experience with the American. Indeed, I soon learned that the leading Siberian thinkers (most of whom were regionalists) were not only well aware of the similarities in expansion and settlement, but also viewed Siberia as a Russian colony, in some ways similar to British Canada, Australia, and the original Thirteen Colonies. Moreover, the federal constitution of the United States also provided for Siberian regionalists an attractive example of how the Russian Empire might become a federation of regions.

Another objective of mine seeks to help dispel two popular misconceptions regarding Siberia. At one extreme, Siberia has often been viewed both in European Russia and in the West as little more than a giant ice-box and a desolate land of exile. At the other extreme, some optimistic observers, enthralled by Siberia's untapped and vast resource potential, have since the

---

2 Frederick Jackson Turner, The Significance of Sections in American History (New York: Henry Holt, 1932), pp. 18-19.

early 19th century looked on the region as a "land of the future," somewhat as Canada or Brazil have been viewed in the Americas. First of all, this study stresses that the emergence of a thinking element in Siberian society, which struggled to advance "progress" and "enlightenment," gave Siberia much more to show for itself than just "ice and exile." Moreover, both regionalist and Soviet leaders have in fact sought to turn Siberia, with its dismal, inglorious past, into a real "land of the future" in many ways — but without notable success. The fact that Siberia's population has hovered around 18 million for over a decade (since the 1959 census), with more emigrants leaving than immigrants entering, attests that the "land of the future" has been a "land of disappointment" to many, in the 20th century as well as the 19th. Nevertheless, the vision of Siberia as a land with a glowing future — once the bonds of its "colonial" status were removed — constituted a fundamental assumption and motive behind the regionalist idea in the 19th century.

The territorial dimensions of Siberia have not always been the most clear-cut. Siberia has commonly been regarded as the vast, sparsely-populated area between the Arctic Ocean in the north and the borders of present-day China and Outer Mongolia in the south. It consists of the expanse stretching as far as 3,500 miles from the Urals to the Pacific Ocean. Strictly speaking, Siberia excludes the Amur basin, annexed in 1858-60, and Kazakhstan, gradually incorporated into the Russian Empire by mid-19th century. For the most part this study focuses on developments occurring in Siberia proper — indeed, in roughly a half-dozen major towns lying along the southern periphery of the region at about 55° latitude. The Amur and Central Asian areas of Asiatic Russia come under discussion only tangentially in this work.

I have chosen to delineate my investigation by the dates 1819 and 189[illegible], which encompass a 75-year period. The first date marks the arrival in S[illegible]ia of the first progressive Russian administrator, Michael Speransky. It was his

public initiative and administrative reforms that first pushed Siberia along the difficult path toward more progressive institutions, relatively advanced western ideas, and a more open and enlightened society. The terminal date, 1894, witnessed the death of Yadrintsev, the leading Siberian regionalist, and the death of the "last autocrat," the Emperor Alexander III. The mid-1890's also mark the beginning of a new era for Siberia, characterized by the construction of the Trans-Siberian Railroad, the flood of Russian settlers into the country, the gradual emergence of a working class in towns and along the railroad, and the arrival of the first Marxist political exiles. By the time that these new developments suddenly began to transform Siberia economically and demographically, Siberian society itself had already awakened to a considerable extent. The impact of western ideas, institutions, and techniques, which through European Russia penetrated Siberia in the 19th century, had not only engendered the regionalist movement. But reinforced and transmitted in part by regionalists, these various western influences on their own had greatly changed Siberian social and urban life in general by the eve of the 20th century.

This study is divided into three major parts. The first attempts to portray Siberian society and thought up to roughly 1860. I have herein sought to assess the impact of progressive administrators, political exiles, and local intellectuals on Siberian society at large. Besides describing pre-regionalist Siberia, I have presented a summary of federalist thought in the Russian Empire before the advent of the regionalist movement in the 1860's. The second part concentrates chiefly on the emergence of the Siberian regionalists and the development of the movement during the reign of Alexander II (1855-1881). The focus here is largely biographical and

chronological. The third and final part, utilizing topical and geographical approaches, delves into the relatively widespread awakening of Siberia during the reign of Alexander III (1881-94). During this time the regionalist movement reached the height of its influence, and urban Siberia was roused to an unprecedented level of social initiative. This part treats the activities of the leading regionalist Yadrintsev, surveys the flowering of civic and cultural life, and touches on the chief problems that then beset Siberian society. An epilogue investigates the nature of regionalism, its characteristics, and its importance in Russian and Siberian history.

Transliterating the Cyrillic script into the Roman presents a perennial problem which I have chosen to resolve by means of a dual method. I have adopted the Library of Congress system (without diacritical marks) for transliterated source references in the footnotes and in the bibliography, and for technical terms used in the text. Elsewhere in the text and footnotes I have employed my own method of transliteration, which departs from the Library of Congress system in the following major instances. The letter я (LC: ia) becomes ya; the letter ю (LC: iu) becomes yu; the letter ё becomes yo; and the letters кс (LC: ks) become x. Proper names ending in -ii and -yi have been changed to -y, and neither hard nor soft signs have been transliterated.[3] I have kept to pre-reform spellings in citing works published before 1918. Most first names and all patronymics I have left in the Russian form (i.e. Grigory, Alexei, Mikhail), but the first names of individuals well known in the West have been Anglicized (i.e. Nicholas, Alexander, Peter). Non-Russian family names I have spelled in their original form. In an English

---

3 With few exceptions, my dual method follows Systems I and II, as outlined in J. Thomas Shaw, The Transliteration of Modern Russian for English-Language Publications (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1967), pp. 3-4, 8-9.

context geographical place-names have been spelled as Webster's Geographical Dictionary. On the few occasions where it matters, dates are cited in accordance with the Julian Calendar (Old Style), unless indicated otherwise.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation to the following individuals and institutions, without whose assistance this work would never have reached fruition in its present form. For having carefully read the various drafts and for having helped guide my progress from beginning to end Professors Donald Treadgold and Peter Sugar, of the University of Washington, deserve special thanks. Professor Imre Boba, of the same institution, rendered noteworthy assistance in obtaining valuable bibliographical sources. The libraries whose collections in Russian and Siberian history I have drawn upon for the most part are those of the University of Washington and of the University of California at Berkeley. My appreciation extends as well to the libraries of the University of Wisconsin at Madison, Stanford University, the Hoover Institution, Columbia University, and Harvard University, and to University Microfilms (of Ann Arbor, Michigan), the Library of Congress, and the British Museum, whose staffs have kindly provided me with reproductions or loans of scarce materials relatively or totally inaccessible to me. Along this line, I would also like

to thank my father, Professor James Watrous, of the University of Wisconsin. I owe, moreover, a special intellectual debt to two Russian historians, S. G. Svatikov and M. K. Lemke, without whose basic works relating to Siberian regionalism my own efforts would have met great difficulty in getting off ground. For technical facilities and equipment used in completing this dissertation I am indebted to the Social Science Division and the Interlibrary Loan Office of Sonoma State College, Rohnert Park, California.

SIBERIA IN THE 19th CENTURY
Sveaborg
St. Petersburg
Archangel
Shenkursk
Moscow
Nikolsk
Nizhny Novgorod
Kazan
VOLGA R.
KAMA R.
OB R.
Berezov
Turukhansk
YAKUTIA
Yakutsk
Okhotsk
Petropavlovsk
KAMCHATKA
Yekaterinburg
Tyumen
Tobolsk
Yalutorovsk
OB R.
YENISEI R.
LENA R.
Orenburg
CASPIAN SEA
Chelyabinsk
Kurgan
Ishim
Tara
Omsk
Yeniseisk
Nikolaevsk
SAKHALIN ISLAND
AMUR R.
ARAL SEA
Novo-Nikolaevsk
Tomsk
Krasnoyarsk
L. BAIKAL
Yamyshevskaya
Semipalatinsk
Barnaul
Minusinsk
Blago-veshchensk
TRANS-BAIKALIA
ALTAI
Irkutsk
Chita
Nerchinsk
Khabarovsk
IRTYSH R.
L. BALKHASH
L. ZAISAN
Kyakhta
USSURI R.
ILI R.
Petrovsky Zavod
Verny
Vladivostok

A brilliant future lay ahead

for our distant borderland

— N. M. Yadrintsev

Sibir' ved tozhe russkaia zemlia

(Siberia, after all, is Russian land too)

— A Russian Proverb

Who will awaken this slumbering realm?

— M. V. Zagoskin

PART ONE

THE SETTING

(1800-1860)

CHAPTER I

OLD SIBERIA AND THE IMPACT OF SPERANSKY: THE EARLY NINETEENTH CENTURY

Siberian Society at the Turn of the Eighteenth Century

After the conquest of the Tatar khanate of Sibir by the Russian Cossack Yermak Timofeevich and his followers in the years 1581-83, Russians began to call all the lands east of the Urals Siberia (Sibir'). The Russian occupants of this vast country came to create a rather different social milieu than was found in the older lands of European Russia. During the first century or so of Russian expansion to the Pacific and settlement within Siberia, society was extremely fluid. From European Russia came peasant agriculturalists, émigré Cossacks, runaway serfs, persecuted religious sectarians, exiles and convicts, and former townspeople. Most of these migrants took up agriculture, fishing, trapping, or trade for a living. At the top of this relatively amorphous mixture of Russian inhabitants and native Siberians ruled a

veneer of transient high officials known as voevodas. These administrators frequently amassed huge fortunes at the expense of those below them and exercised almost unlimited authority over society at large. Urban centers in the 1600's consisted mainly of frontier-style forts (ostrogi), inhabited at most by a population of several thousand.

From the early 1700's the population of Siberia increased from less than 300,000 Russians and natives to almost one million by the year 1800. With this population increase, a commercial class of urban-based merchants and traders emerged, spurred in part by the depletion of valuable sable in the hinterland. The wealthiest of these merchants profited greatly from the tea trade with China and from trade in furs, which by now came from easternmost Siberia and especially the new holdings in the North Pacific. By the end of the 18th century the rudimentary administrative centers and trading posts that served as urban concentrations had grown into major towns, in some cases with as many as 15,000 inhabitants.

The Russians in Siberia were in many respects freed of the weight of Russian history, tradition, and attitudes which still lay so heavily on their brethren in European Russia. Much of the cultural, institutional, and social heritage that had developed and evolved during the Kievan period, the Tatar Yoke, and Muscovite domination was either transplanted, altered, or abandoned entirely by Russian settlers in Siberia. For many of these migrants Siberia constituted a kind of frontier country, a land of relative freedom and of greater opportunities than existed in the more rigid society of European Russia. As Basargin, an exile who observed Siberia for the first time in the 1820's, remarked: "The common people seemed to me much more free, more clever, and even more educated than our Russian peasants, and especially more

so than the peasants of landlords. Here they have better understood human dignity and have valued man's rights more highly." Basargin also briefly compared what these Siberian "frontiersmen" had in common with their counterparts in North America regarding customs, manners, and way of life.[1]

Since the beginning of Russian settlement, Siberia's social structure was especially distinguished from European Russia's by the almost total absence of a class of gentry landowners and by the accompanying absence of serfdom. This circumstance was in large part responsible for the conditions which struck Basargin and other visitors to Siberia so favorably. Another important aspect of Siberian society was the proportionately large percentage of exiles in the population, which in some ways tended to compensate for the absence of the deleterious institution of serfdom. Almost all the lands of Siberia belonged to the state, and peasants who tilled state-owned lands were naturally in a better position to improve their lives than the privately-owned serfs so common in European Russia.

After the fall of Sibir in the early 1580's, Russian rulers never considered Siberia as a borderland strategic to Russia's defense. Hence, service gentry who fought in the armed forces were not rewarded with lands in the east, for such a policy would not serve state interests. Service gentry were remunerated instead with lands and peasants along Russia's western and southern frontiers — areas gained in wars against Swedes, Poles, Turks, and Tatars. Russia's eastern borderlands, however, were incorporated more by the efforts of explorers and adventurers from among the lower classes, who met with little resistance on the part of Siberian natives. The central government and the service gentry played very little role in Russia's eastward

---

1 N. V. Basargin, Zapiski N. V. Basargina (N. V. Basargin's Notes), (Petrograd, 1917), p. 94, 178.

expansion. Not only was the state in no position to dole out Siberian lands to deserving gentrymen (who never helped annex them), but the gentry as a class also was not interested in estates so remote from the alluring centers of court life in Moscow and St. Petersburg. After the collapse of the Tatar khanates along the Volga in the 1550's and of Sibir in the 1580's, the last dangerous threats to the Russian state from the east had been erased. Consequently, foreign and military policy was consistently directed toward the west and south for the next several centuries.

The absence of a gentry class undoubtedly hindered the intellectual development of Siberian society. The gentry, pampered by rulers since the time of Peter I in the area of education and culture, were responsible for most of the noteworthy intellectual and cultural achievements in modern Russia up to about mid-nineteenth century. For the century and a half after Peter Russian culture was definitely aristocratic. Without an educated aristocracy — traveling to Europe and back, reading, writing, and speaking foreign languages, keeping up with the latest ideas and attitudes of the West, and moulding a Russian literary and intellectual tradition — Siberia remained a stagnant cultural backwater. This bleak situation was in time overcome by two important developments: the forced transfer of a Russian intellectual elite to Siberia (beginning with the deportation of the critic, Alexander N. Radishchev, to Ilimsk in 1792), and the slow growth of intellectual and cultural consciousness among elements of Siberia's indigenous Russian population.

In the absence of a gentry class, the dominant social position in Siberia during the 18th and early 19th centuries was assumed by bureaucratic officialdom — in its upper echelons consisting of transient officials with

few if any local roots. Top administrators often stayed in Siberia just long enough to fleece the local population, amass considerable fortunes, and then return to Russia before getting caught. Though officials in the lower ranks were usually of local origin, their poverty and lack of education made them even less suited than were their superiors to assume leadership of whatever sparks of intellectual or social life flickered at the time. A vicious circle of corruption, bribery, and graft, from which few could easily escape, affected Siberian officialdom from top to bottom. Thus, one Soviet historian writes: "In the first decades of the 19th century the despotism of officialdom, on one hand, and the indiscriminate bribery and extortion, on the other, created a social atmosphere such that neither the self-consciousness of Siberian society nor its moral bases could develop normally." [2]

The only other class that was socially and economically influential was the Siberian merchants. Despite the wealth and power that some of them possessed, this class on the whole held conservative economic, social, and religious values — often those of old Muscovy or of the unreformed Old Belief. Though the merchant-dominated middle class occupied a more powerful and prestigious social position in Siberia than its counterpart did in Russia, even with the absence of a landed gentry its members generally did not assume a position of leadership in cultural or social affairs.

The deeper, less superficial values of West European culture that began to penetrate Russia by the late 18th century were extremely rare in Siberia well into the 19th. As late as the 1830's one Siberian could remark that "for those who are not well acquainted with the Siberian way of life, I will note that perhaps nowhere else, except in northern Russia, is old Rus as well

---

2 P. Kubalov, "Sibirskoe obshchestvo i dekabristy," (Siberian Society and the Decembrists), Katorga i Ssylka, (1925) no. 21, bk. 8, p. 168.

preserved as in Siberia." [3] Even such "millionaires" in the China trade as the Mylnikovs and the Sibiryakovs at the turn of the century remained true to the old Russian customs of their fathers and grandfathers. They "slept on trunks in which they hid their gold and with incredible, even ridiculous cheapness" ate simple meals, washed down with kvas or beer. [4] Well into the 19th century segregation of the sexes was strongly entrenched not only among merchant families, but among those of many officials too. A man might go for as long as thirty years without seeing the female relations of a long-standing friend or acquaintance. [5] On the other hand, it was not uncommon for wives of certain high administrators, in emulation of the styles and customs of St. Petersburg, to participate quite actively in public and social affairs. Pastimes common at all levels of urban Siberian society were hard-drinking, gambling, and card-playing.

Toward the end of the 18th century Siberian merchants, especially those of Irkutsk, who were wealthy from trade in Chinese tea, American furs, and from local domestic trade, began to challenge administrative authorities in various ways. By the first two decades of the 19th century much of the sordid political history of Eastern Siberia revolved around the intrigues of the powerful "merchant party," which sought to humble the capricious and despotic officials sent to Siberia by the central government. In this respect, however, the wealthy merchants of Irkutsk, entrenched politically in the Municipal Duma (established in 1787), provided the only possible check upon the autocratic policies of local officialdom. [6] In the struggle between these

---

3 K. P. (Ksenofont Polevoi), in the foreword to (E. A. Avdeeva) Zapiski i zamiechaniia o Sibiri (Notes and Observations on Siberia), (Moscow, 1837), p. 5.

4 F. F. Vigel', Zapiski Filipa Filipovicha Vigelia (Philip Wiegel's Notes), vol. 1, pt. 2 (Moscow, 1892), p. 165.

5 N. Bulatov's testimony, as cited in N. Jadrinzew, Sibirien. Geographische, ethnographische und historische Studien (Jena: H. Gostennoble, 1886), 393.

6 V. P. Sukachev, Irkutsk. Ego miesto i znachenie v istorii i kul'turnom razvitii Vostochnoi Sibiri (Irkutsk. Its Place and Significance in Eastern Siberia's History and Cultural Development), (Moscow, 1891), pp. 20-21.

two social elements there was little room for the rule of law; at times the only final arbitrator was the tsar himself, though he was usually kept in a shroud of ignorance as to the actual state of Siberian administrative and political affairs. All in all, the real losers were neither merchants nor officials, but the vast majority of common people, oppressed and exploited by these two powerful social groups.[7]

In Siberia the merchants and the officials were concentrated in relatively small towns, whereas in European Russia the pre-eminent social class, the gentry, often alternated between rural, country estates and the two large capitals — St. Petersburg and Moscow. In these circumstances provincial towns in Siberia had far greater potential for leadership in intellectual and cultural developments than did provincial towns in European Russia. One example of this (from as early as the 1780's) was the capital of Eastern Siberia, Irkutsk. A local historian, Sukachov, writes:

> Already called the Siberian St. Petersburg as a result of its extraordinary luxury, Irkutsk was also known for its hospitality; Governor-General Jakobi, Lieutenant Lamb, and the millionaire Medvedev held open table and gave in turn weekly dinners and balls. While sunk in material interests, Irkutsk was not hostile to literary activities either. Representing such were numerous private teachers for the most part — mainly Poles, Swedes, French, and Jesuits [sic], who gathered at the homes of the most prominent families.[8]

This view is confirmed by John Ledyard, an American who visited Irkutsk in 1787: "At this place I am in a circle as gay, rich, polite, and as scientific, as if at Petersburg. I drink my French and Spanish wines: and have

---

7 N. N. Firsov, Chteniia po istorii Sibiri (Readings in Siberian History), (Moscow, 1921), pt. 2, p. 14; and N. N. Koz'min, "M. V. Zagoskin i ego znachenie v istorii razvitii sibirskoi obshchestvennosti. (Iz istorii oblastnago dvizheniia)" (Zagoskin and His Significance in the History of the Development of Siberian Public Opinion: From the History of the Regionalist Movement), Ocherki proshlago i nastoiashchago Sibiri (St. Petersburg, 1910), pp. 163-64.

8 Sukachëv, Irkutsk, p. 16. The Society of Jesus (Jesuits), dissolved by the Papacy in 1773, found asylum in non-Catholic Prussia and Russia.

Majors, Colonels, and Brigadiers by Brigades, to wait on me in the town, and disciples of Linnaeus to accompany me in my philosophic walks." [9]

Nevertheless, the flashy, cosmopolitan atmosphere of Irkutsk in the 1780's appears to have been rather ephemeral. As Sukachov remarks,

> All this splendor of festivity, dinners, balls, and the coming and going of notable and scholarly foreigners formed only an illusory side of affairs, an external, rather superficial veneer, and a deceptive brilliance. The life of the town and of all the immense over which /Irkutsk's/ administrative and economic influence extended went right along its normal course . . . [10]

The glitter of Irkutsk high society had few ties or roots in the local environment. In part, it was short-lived because it depended upon the tastes and sympathies of one all-powerful official, Governor-General Jakobi. With his departure from the scene, life reverted back to normal and an equivalent high-point in the social and cultural life of Irkutsk did not recur until the arrival of Governor-General Speransky in 1819.

Indeed, soon after the turn of the century the civilian governor of Irkutsk, N. I. Treskin, complained that in Irkutsk society "there was an absolute wilderness, and almost no education at all." [11] However, Treskin's own actions during his long administration (1805-19) do not appear to have improved this lamentable situation very much. As for the overall intellectual level of urban society before Speransky's arrival, the Siberian historian Shchapov concludes that it was still too low to criticize the

> bourgeois aspirations of the merchant class, the despotic monopoly of the officials, or the dark ignorance and passive

---

9 Letter to Wm. Smith, dated August 20, 1787 at Irkutsk; quoted (with slight alterations in punctuation) in S. Watrous, ed., John Ledyard's Journey through Russia and Siberia, 1787-1788 (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1966), p. 129. The former student of Linnaeus was A. M. Karamyshev, then active in local literary circles.

10 Sukachëv, Irkutsk, p. 17.

11 Quoted in Shchapov, "Sibirskoe obshchestvo do Speranskago" (Siberian Society before Speransky), Sochineniia A. P. Shchapova, vol. 3 (St. Petersburg, 1908), p. 678; and in Jadrinzew, Sibirien, p. 393.

> servility of the masses. The only intellectual interests and ideas of the majority of Siberian society were inspired by bourgeois /i.e. materialistic/ motives or represented a chaotic mixture of pre-Petrine ideas with Chinese-Asiatic ones. [12]

This gloomy description is seconded by another Siberian historian, Yadrintsev, who goes so far as to say that "Siberia up to the beginning of our /nineteenth/ century, and even later, was a completely ignorant and barbaric land." [13]

Nevertheless, around this time a few faint glimmers of light did manifest themselves. Several progressive merchants emerged from such Irkutsk families as the Basnins, Polevoys, and Belogolovys. Wiegel relates that as of 1806 the head of one of these families, A. I. Polevoy,

> was much more concerned about European politics than about Asiatic trade. One could detect in him an inclination toward that which was then without a name, but which is now called liberalism, and he ordered all the papers that then were published in Russian. During my last stay in Irkutsk I learned from him of what had happened two months before in Germany. [14]

Indeed, Polevoy's young son, Nikolai Alexeevich (1796-1846), was to become perhaps the first Siberian intellectual to make good — as editor of the Moscow Telegraph and as a historian of the Russian people.

Despite the unfavorable atmosphere, educational and cultural institutions began to be established sporadically in Siberia throughout the 18th century. The first school in Siberia, founded in the early 1700's, was attached to the archbishop's residence in Tobolsk and served as a kind of

---

12 Shchapov, "Sibirskoe obshchestvo," pp. 712-13.

13 N. M. Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia v geograficheskom, etnograficheskom i istoricheskom otnoshenii (Siberia as a Colony in Its Geographical, Ethnographical, and Historical Aspects), (2d ed., St. Petersburg, 1892), pp. 549-50.

14 F. F. Vigel', Zapiski Vigelia, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 187.

seminary. This situation alone helps explain why illiteracy was so common among the Siberian clergy. In 1745 a church-directed grammar school was established in Tomsk, the first such institution in Siberia. Roughly about the same time, in the spirit of Peter I's educational innovations, schools specializing in geodesy were founded in Irkutsk, Tobolsk, and Tomsk; navigation schools were set up in Yakutsk, Okhotsk, Irkutsk, and Nerchinsk; and later, mining schools were established in Barnaul and Nerchinsk. On the whole, none of the above-mentioned institutions contributed very much to the spread of education in Siberia. As indicated earlier, tutors provided the bulk of the educational resources in Siberian towns.

The first general, non-specialized school in Irkutsk (and all Siberia) was established in 1781, and in 1789 the first public schools were opened in Tobolsk, Tomsk, and Irkutsk. [15] In 1790 a school of Oriental languages was founded in Irkutsk, but was forced to close four years later. By this time Siberia could now boast two ecclesiastical seminaries, in Tobolsk and in Irkutsk. In Yadrintsev's opinion, the instruction here was consistently distinguished by "scholasticism" and pedantry, bearing no relation at all to Siberian life. The first secondary schools (gimnazii) in Siberia were founded in 1806, in Irkutsk and in Tobolsk, but educated no more than 30 or 40 pupils apiece per year. [16]

---

15 Jadrinzew, Sibirien, p. 395; (Iadrintsev) "Istoriia prosvieshcheniia v Sibiri i universitetskii vopros" (The History of Education in Siberia and the University Question), Sibirskii Sbornik, (1886) bk. 3, pp. 129-30; I. V. Shcheglov, Khronologicheskii perechen' vazneishikh dannykh iz istorii Sibiri, 1032-1882 g.g. (A Chronological List of the Most Important Facts in Siberian History: 1032 to 1882), (Irkutsk, 1883), p. 320; and (Iadrintsev) "Pervyi sibirskii universitet" (The First Siberian University), Viestnik Evropy, (November 1879) bk. 11, pp. 60-61.

16 (Iadrintsev) "Istoriia prosvieshcheniia," p. 130; "Pervyi sibirskii universitet," pp. 59-60; and V. I. Vagin, Istoricheskie sviedeniia o dieiatel'nosti grafa M. M. Speranskago v Sibiri, s 1819 po 1822 god (Historical Information on Count Speransky's Activities in Siberia: 1819-1822), (St. Petersburg, 1872), II: 127 ff.

The Empress Catherine's edict of 1783, which permitted the establishment of private printing presses, had few reverberations in Siberia. The first printing press east of the Urals was brought to Tobolsk in 1789 by Vasily Korniliev, a local paper-factory owner. Perhaps the most important publication to come from this press was a literary journal, The Irtysh, Which Turns into the Hippocrene.[17] Though this pseudo-classical periodical, edited by an "untalented" exile, P. P. Sumarokov, continued for only a year and a half (1789-91), it did have the honor of being the second provincial periodical ever to be published in the Russian Empire. Of its quality, however, a contemporary observer, Slovtsov, remarked that "instead of providing interesting news about Siberia, the editors allowed themselves to ape miserable literature and poetry."[18] The practical activity of Korniliev's press ceased in 1795 with the departure from Tobolsk of the sympathetic governor-general, A. V. Alyabiev. The attitudes of a single all-powerful administrator would continue to influence the shaky course of cultural progress in Siberia for some time to come. Thus the decree of September 1796, issued by the new Emperor Paul I, which prohibited all private, non-official printing establishments in the empire, was for Korniliev's operation only the final coup de grâce to what had been already been settled locally by Alyabiev's successor.[19]

When Alexander I (1801-1825) restored Catherine's edict of 1783,

---

17 In Russian: Irtysh, prevrashchaiushchiisia v Ipokrenu. The Irtysh is a river in western Siberia, and the Hippocrene a fountain on Mount Helicon sacred to the muses — hence a symbol of poetic inspiration.

18 Quoted in Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia, p. 555, and in Sibirien, p. 396. See also Sibir' kak koloniia, pp. 664-66, and (Iadrintsev) "Nachalo pechati v Sibiri" (The Beginning of the Press in Siberia), Literaturnyi Sbornik (St. Petersburg, 1885), pp. 353-54, 366. The first provincial paper in the Russian Empire began publication in Yaroslavl in 1786.

19 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia, p. 667; "Nachalo pechati," p. 364.

Korniliev revived his printing activities briefly, from 1804 to 1807. By this time, however, the Tobolsk provincial government had set up its own press just for administrative purposes. Regarding the overall quality of these first Siberian publishing ventures, Yadrintsev writes:

> All of the books and journals issued at the end of the past [eighteenth] century in Tobolsk were bad, even for their time, and not very exacting on literary grounds. The journals were especially bad, filled chiefly with stories and articles of moral reading content, translated from foreign books and journals by Tobolsk translators. [20]

Whatever the drawbacks of these first printed publications, they did represent the first such undertakings in Siberian history. However, they hardly reflected any growing local demand for the printed word. A provincial press was not re-established in Siberia for another fifty years. Clearly, urban Siberian society in the early 1800's showed little interest in education and even less in regional or local publications.

* * *

Siberia as a Special Administrative Entity: The Pre-Speransky Period

Among the factors which specially affected Siberian society and its attitudes was the distinctive administrative position of Siberia within the Russian Empire. The great distance from the Russian central government alone tended to turn its voevodas and governors into despotic satraps and local "tsars" on the spot. As Alexander Herzen once remarked,

> The power of the governor generally grows in direct proportion to the distance from St. Petersburg, but it grows

---

20 (Iadrintsev) "Nachalo pechati," pp. 365-66.

> in a geometric progression in provinces where there is no gentry, such as Perm, Vyatka, and Siberia. [21]

To this the historian Pypin adds:

> The history of Siberian administration is filled, as it never was in the early and modern Russian state, with examples of unbridled arbitrariness and plundering, which descended by degree from the highest rulers to the lowest subordinates, and the whole country was completely defenseless in the face of this arbitrary rule. [22]

Further unique characteristics of the country were noted by Wiegel, who travelled through Siberia in 1805-06. Wiegel was struck not only by similarities with the former British colonies in North America, but also by differences. In his opinion, the British government had lavished all kinds of efforts on making the American colonies productive; in the end, however, the wealth, spirit, and education that emerged from these efforts caused the colonists to revolt and become Great Britain's chief commercial rival. On the other hand,

> Careless Russia has always looked upon Siberia as would a rich landowner's wife upon a distant estate inherited by accident, which she has never visited and whose administration is entrusted entirely to stewards, more or less honest and clever. The estate always pays a quitrent punctually in gold, silver, iron, and furs — its only requisite; she worries little about its moral and political condition.

Wiegel likened Siberia to a bear, sitting at the end of a leash. But as for breaking away, Siberia was "so large and so underpopulated, and the communications between inhabitants so difficult, that any attempt would be unsuccessful." Fortunately for Russia, Siberia did not possess the wealthy, educated, and independent-minded citizenry that the thirteen colonies did.

---

21 A. I. Gertsen (Herzen), Byloe i dumy (My Past and Thoughts), (Leningrad, 1946), p. 126.

22 A. N. Pypin, Istoriia russkoi etnografii (A History of Russian Ethnography), vol. 4 (Bielorussiia i Sibir'), (St. Petersburg, 1892), p. 433.

Moreover, Wiegel added, if in the future the Russian peasant masses should spill across the Urals to fill this sparsely populated area, "Russia" would expand (eastward), whereas "Siberia" would contract. [23]

Russians had begun to settle east of the Urals in the 1580's and by the 1640's had even reached the shores of the Pacific. Because Siberia had been conquered in relatively short time and with no major obstacles, this entire area was quite naturally regarded by many as one distinct unit. Economically, the Muscovite government in the 1600's regarded Siberia chiefly as a fur colony. Politically, the tsar handed over administration of the country to voevodas, military governors, who wielded almost absolute power over large areas of Siberia. In the face of the oppressive policies of these local despots the familiar peasant proverb, "God is high above, the tsar is far away," was only all too true. Since 1637 a "Siberian Office" (sibirskii prikaz), located in Moscow, exercised a kind of nominal co-ordination of the colony's affairs from the center. [24]

The reforms of Peter I (1689-1725), which affected European Russia so profoundly, barely scratched the surface of Siberia. Peter's chief concerns of state were military and technological, and Siberia in these respects was of little strategic value in his eyes. Nevertheless, on occasion Peter also strove to make Siberia's administration more efficient and centralized. In 1708 the various voevodas were placed under a single governor. And in 1710 Peter abolished the Siberian Office and the position of voevoda, and turned Siberia into one single province (guberniia), far larger and more remote

---

23 Vigel', Zapiski Vigelia, vol. 1, pt. 2, pp. 196-97. Wiegel also claimed that only Amur valley and Chinese problems would arouse Russian concern for the East.

24 The definitive work on this period in English is George Lantzeff, Siberia in the Seventeenth Century: A Study of the Colonial Administration (Berkeley and Los Angeles: The University of California Press, 1943).

than the half-dozen-odd provinces he was then creating in European Russia. The capital of the new Siberian province now became Tobolsk, and as Siberia's first governor Prince Matvei Gagarin was appointed. In 1719 Peter decided to sub-divide vast Siberia into smaller units called provintsii (i.e. sub-provinces) under the Siberian governor's jurisdiction. The embezzling activities of the new governor were indicative of Siberian officials both before and after, and for his misrule Peter sent him to the gallows. Interestingly enough, Gagarin was even suspected of wanting to detach Siberia from Russia.[25] The end result of Peter's Siberian policy in practice was that one despot ruled instead of several. Nevertheless, administrative unity under one governor tended to reinforce the idea of Siberia's overall oneness as a distinct region.

Peter's immediate successors undid some of his reforms not only in European Russia but in Siberia as well. After a lapse of twenty years, the old Siberian Office was restored in 1730, and in 1736 Siberia was divided into eastern and western halves, though both were subject to the Siberian Office.[26] Only with the accession of Catherine II (1762-1796) did the monarch and the St. Petersburg government become distinctly interested in Siberia's relationship to the Empire as a whole. Three differing viewpoints regarding this relationship emerged at the outset of Catherine's reign. First, there was the attitude of Catherine and certain officials that Siberia constituted a grandiose Russian colony, similar in some ways to those

---

25 S. G. Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir'. (K istorii sibirskogo oblastnichestva v XIX v.) (Russia and Siberia: On the History of Siberian Regionalism in the 19th Century), (Prague, 1930), p. 5. See also Marc Raeff, Siberia and the Reforms of 1822 (Seattle: The University of Washington Press, 1956), p. 4; and Vasili Klyuchevsky, Peter the Great, trans.: L. Archibald (New York: Vintage Books, 1961), p. 206, 206 n, and 224.

26 Firsov, Chteniia po istorii Sibiri, pt. 2, p. 6.

of Britain and Spain — hence the reference to Siberia as a Russian "India, Mexico, or Peru." Siberia was not viewed so much as a simple Russian colony or territory, but as a colonial empire of natives ruled by viceroys. [27]

Another approach tended to reflect the universalist and centralizing assumptions current in the Age of Enlightenment. Accordingly, in 1763 Catherine abolished the "antiquated" Siberian Office once and for all and transferred its duties to central departments of state. The third attitude regarded Siberia as a semi-autonomous part of Catherine's empire and reflected in part the first approach. In 1764 Catherine had Siberia officially designated as the "Siberian realm" (sibirskoe tsarstvo), over and above the provinces of Tobolsk and Irkutsk, which were reorganized that same year. Indeed, a year earlier (1763) Catherine had ordered the minting of a special Siberian coin; on it the coat of arms of the new "Siberian realm" were cast. Moreover, a special throne was set up in Tobolsk as a symbol of Catherine's sovereignty over the "Siberian realm." [28]

However Siberia might best be governed as a matter of policy, these alternatives point to a growing awareness in government circles that Siberia's unique characteristics did not easily place it alongside the provinces of European Russia into the overall conception of the Russian Empire. A separate "realm" with its own coinage, throne, and coat of arms, and conscious

---

27 Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 6; and Raeff, Siberia, p. 6.

28 Firsov, Chteniia po istorii Sibiri, pt. 2, p. 6; and Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 6. Raeff states that the "Siberian realm" implied an "independent territory joined to Russia not organically but by virtue of having a common sovereign" (Siberia, p. 6). In this respect Alexander I's Polish Kingdom (tsarstvo pol'skoe) of 1815-30 affords perhaps the closest comparison with what Catherine had in mind for Siberia. According to Treadgold, however, the "Siberian realm" was regarded more as a "colonial empire capable of supporting itself as well as of rendering tribute," i.e. like British India. See D. W. Treadgold, The Great Siberian Migration (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1957), p. 20.

comparisons with colonies elsewhere in the world, all of which were promoted by the central government, could not but encourage a tendency which in time caused Siberians themselves to differentiate their country from European Russia. In a sense Catherine's Siberian policies of the 1760's helped prepare the ground for what would later emerge as Siberian regionalism, just as her talk of emancipating serfs (and Alexander's later moves in the direction of a Russian constitution) encouraged the subsequent development of liberalism in Russia.

By the early 1780's, however, Catherine decided upon a different administrative course for Siberia. Like her successor Alexander III a century later, she now attempted to bring Siberian administrative institutions more into line with those in European Russia. The centralizing approach now became predominant, the concept of a "Siberian realm" was allowed to drop, and in 1781 the minting of Siberian coins was discontinued; coins with the imperial coat of arms now came into circulation. In 1782-83 three new "lieutenancies" (namestnichestva) were formed, which followed along the lines of the provincial reorganization of 1775 in European Russia. Thus the "unity" of the "Siberian realm" was replaced by the lieutenancies of Tobolsk, Kolyvan, and Irkutsk. As Raeff indicates, the tendencies in these areas for a governor to become a kind of all-powerful was quite natural; indeed this very term, with its colonial, imperial connotations, was applied to the Governor-General of Irkutsk and Kolyvan, I. V. Jakobi.[29] Thus did the tendency to regard Siberia as a "Russian India or Peru" with its own viceroy assert itself, despite Catherine's centralizing attempts. The absence of a

---

29 Raeff, Siberia, p. 7. Jakobi's unofficial title of "Viceroy" is frequently documented in Watrous, ed., John Ledyard's Journey, p. 136, 155, 161, and 168.

local gentry, so powerful in European Russia at this time, gave of necessity the local authorities and bureaucracy a correspondingly greater role in the provincial decision-making process.

Catherine's division of Siberia into three (or in practice — two) distinct and equal administrative units on the uppermost level was perhaps the first such sharp division of Siberia since the 17th century. Nevertheless, her lieutenancies, as with so many other of her works, were annulled by the Emperor Paul soon after his accession to the throne in 1796. The throne in Tobolsk was finally sent back to St. Petersburg, and the administrative division reverted back to the two provinces (gubernii) of Tobolsk and Irkutsk.[30]

Only during the subsequent reign of Alexander I did a single governor-general again rule Siberia at the top. This situation once again helped strengthen the idea of a unitary Siberian region within the Empire. Almost from the start Alexander and his closest advisers were dissatisfied with the type of administration present in Siberia. In 1801, even within his first "hundred days" of rule, Alexander entrusted the governor of Tobolsk, I. O. Selifontov, with the task of inspecting Siberia's internal organization, with the end in mind of creating a special statute suited to administering the region. According to the tsar's instructions, Siberia "requires a special statute both in its administrative division and in its very form of government."[31]

Despite no immediate success, the determination to draw up a special statute for Siberia did not wane. One of Alexander's closest advisers,

---

30 Firsov, Chteniia, pt. 2, p. 7; and Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 6.

31 Quoted in Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', pp. 6-7; and in Raeff, Siberia, p. 9. Their source is evidently Polnoe Sobranie Zakonov, 19, 910, pp. 693-94.

Count V. P. Kochubey, wrote to the tsar in 1803:

> Siberia's distance from the area of the Main Administration, its great expanses, the dispersion of the population, and many other local considerations which distinguish this country from all other provinces have for some time forced one to think that the composition of its judicial and police administration should be adapted to these essential differences in its condition.

And in 1809 Alexander himself stressed that Siberia was "decidedly different from other provinces and cannot be subordinated in any case to the general regulations." [32] The tsar was definitely moving away from centralism.

Meanwhile, changes were occurring in Siberia's day-to-day administration. As a result of Selifontov's inspection tour and recommendations, Alexander appointed him in 1803 to the newly created position of governor-general of a unified Siberia. With broader authority than ever before, this new position was designed to facilitate the task of reorganizing the administrative structure and preparing the proposed statute. Siberia's administrative unity under one governor-general would remain until 1822, when the completed statute finally went into effect. Selifontov himself lasted only three years on the job. During his tenure the province of Tobolsk was split into two provinces (in 1804): Tobolsk and Tomsk; and in 1805 the region (*oblast'*) of Yakutsk was carved out of the pre-existing Irkutsk province. These new divisions would remain intact until the collapse of the monarchy in 1917. At the same time, Selifontov's good intentions of writing a statute for Siberia fell by the wayside. He began increasingly to care about improving his own personal finances and entrusted the administration of Siberia to avaricious favorites. A second Siberian inspection tour undercut

---

32 *Zhurnaly Komiteta Ministerstv* (1802-1826), vol. 1, p. 76 and 271; quoted in Svatikov, *Rossiia i Sibir'*, p. 7.

his position, and in 1805 Tsar Alexander replaced him with Ivan Borisovich Pestel. [33]

This new governor-general ruled Siberia for fourteen years. Appointed in 1805, Pestel visited Irkutsk for one week in 1807, resided in Tobolsk for another year, and in 1809 returned to St. Petersburg, where he remained until he was relieved of office in 1819. [34] In view of Pestel's blatant absenteeism, Alexander Herzen later compared him to a Roman pro-consul (and a cruel one at that), who instead of governing his province on the spot spent most of his time in Rome. [35] In his absence, Pestel delegated real executive power in Siberian affairs to Nikolai Treskin, the civilian governor of Irkutsk. The Pestel-Treskin team worked smoothly and efficiently for the full fourteen years. Treskin made use of the broadened powers given earlier to Selifontov to rule Siberia ruthlessly and with an iron hand. According to one contemporary, Treskin viewed Irkutsk province as "his patrimony and himself as the plenipotentiary steward and administrator within it." Another commentator mentions the "stifling atmosphere of groveling and fear" which Treskin created. [36]

Treskin made a concerted effort to see that no complaints about his administration reached authorities in S. Petersburg. Spies in the bureaucracy and elsewhere informed on dissidents in Siberia, and censors carefully checked the mail crossing the Urals into European Russia. Merchants

---

33 Jadrinzew, Sibirien, pp. 353-54; "Zapiska o Sibiri Shteingeilia" (Steinheil's Memo on Siberia), in Sibir' i russkoe pravitel'stvo (2d ed.; Leipzig: E. L. Kasprowicz, n.d.), pp. 9-13; and Raeff, Siberia, 10-11.

34 For details on Pestel's "stay in Siberia" see Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 23.

35 A. Gertsen, Byloe i dumy, p. 135, 136.

36 Quotations from Firsov, Chteniia, p. 11, and Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 167, respectively. For the best discussion in English on Treskin's administration, see Raeff, Siberia, ch. 2.

especially were opposed to Treskin's high-handed measures concerning urban renewal in Irkutsk and the government monopoly of Siberian grain for export to Russia. In perhaps the most well-known scandal of this regime, Treskin and Pestel had several wealthy merchants of Irkutsk, including the mayor, M. K. Sibiryakov, exiled from town for their attempts to denounce the wily governor to the Minister of the Interior; indeed, all of them died in exile not long after. [37] Though Treskin's policies did much to arouse public antagonism and opinion, the Siberian public was unable to match him on local ground. It appears that at first Treskin had the support of the lower classes in his struggle against the powerful merchant oligarchy, but as years wore on complaints increased to the extent that "the whole population in all its strata was drawn into this movement; it was a unanimous protest." [38] Indeed, Svatikov sees in this struggle between the Pestel-Treskin administration and the merchants especially "not only a certain element of society's struggle for the right to self-government, but also an element of the colony's struggle against the mother country." [39]

Whatever the real dimensions of this "unanimous protest" and this "colonial struggle," in 1818 at long last, the Irkutsk merchant Salamatov furtively crossed the Siberian frontier undetected and successfully made his way to Alexander's palace at Tsarskoe Selo. Upon receiving S[illegible]amatov's petition, the tsar assured him that the matter would be inve[illegible]ed (the petitioner, fearing for his life if he should return to Siberia). [40] It was

---

37 "Zapiska Shteingeilia," p. 15; and Jadrinzew, Sibirien, pp. 359-60.
38 Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 164; and Jadrinzew, Sibirien, p. 365.
39 Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 8.
40 Gertsen, Byloe i dumy, pp. 135-36; Firsov, Chteniia, p. 15; and G. N. Potanin, "Goroda Sibiri" (Towns of Siberia), in I. S. Mel'nik, ed., Sibir': eia nuzhdy i eia sovremennoe sostoianie (St. Petersburg, 1908), pp. 239-40.

this act that led to Pestel's downfall. Salamatov's petition brought on the decision of the Committee of Ministers to order an inspection of Siberia and the removal of Pestel from his post.

Indeed, since 1812 the Committee of Ministers had been disturbed by Pestel's absence from Siberia, and in November 1813 the ministers set up a special "committee on Siberian affairs" in an attempt to limit the autocratic rule of the Siberian governor-general.[41] This committee not only filled the gap left by the earlier Siberian Office, but also served as the forerunner to the Siberian Committee (1821-38 and 1852-64), first established to supervise Speransky's institutional reforms. Later, in 1817 the Committee of Ministers proposed that a new governor-general replace Pestel, correct abuses, and renew the work of transforming Siberia's administrative system. This proposal, plus the impact of Salamatov's petition, was enough to oust from power the entrenched Pestel (a friend of the influential Arakcheev). In March 1819 Tsar Alexander, with the approval of the Committee of Ministers, appointed Michael M. Speransky as the new governor-general of Siberia.

It is worth noting that at just about this same time new government plans got underway for not only a reorganized Siberia, but a Russian Empire restructured along federative lines as well. In 1818 Alexander instructed Nikolai Novosiltsev, his high commissioner in Poland, to draft a federal constitution for the whole empire. According to Novosiltsev's plan, Siberia was to become more integrally part of the empire as one of twelve lieutenancies (though with its own regional assembly).[42] As with many of Alexander's projects, however, this whole idea never got beyond the planning

---

41 Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 9.
42 For details see chapter IV below, pp. 186-87.

stage. Moreover, this was hardly the only federative constitutional plan to consider Siberia drawn up in the later years of Alexander's reign.

Meanwhile, the committee on Siberian affairs decided to consider the proposal of the Minister of the Interior, O. P. Kozodavlev, regarding a radical reorganization of the Siberian administration alone. In 1818 Kozodavlev came out in favor of a system which he felt would better conform to local conditions. The power of local government authorities in Siberia should not be increased to eradicate injustices (as Selifontov had earlier recommended), but restricted. In essence, he proposed semi-representative institutions for Siberia.

> The establishment of a supreme government, council, or committee in the Siberian province, in part consisting of members from among officials appointed by the government, and in part of members elected from among the local inhabitants of the various classes, alone can limit the power of the governor, who as president of this organization would have a deciding voice only in case of a tie in voting.

Kozodavlev also supported wider authority for local magistrates and municipal governments vis-à-vis the governor. The positive effects of this he noted in the impetus that town magistrates in the Baltic provinces gave to local industry, trade, and education.[43]

Kozodavlev's recommendations for local self-government, though never fully realized in Siberia, touched on an issue important in the later regionalist movement: the campaign for zemstvos and municipal institutions already permitted in European Russia.[44] Upon learning of Speransky's

---

43 Quoted in Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 10 (he does not cite his source). See too Sukachëv, Irkutsk, p. 27; and Raeff, Siberia, pp. 46-47. As Raeff points out, Siberian merchants were "centuries behind those of Riga in education and civic consciousness."

44 See D. Zaitsev, "Zemstvo v Sibiri" (A Zemstvo in Siberia), Russkaia Mysl', (December 1904) no. 12, p. 61.

Siberian appointment, Kozodavlev sent a copy of his memorandum to the new governor-general. Though impressed with the idea of semi-representative institutions in Siberia, Speransky never really moved in this direction.[45] Moreover, Siberian society at this time did not encourage him to.

It was Kozodavlev too who called Siberia "our Mexico and Peru," perhaps a somewhat questionable (and pessimistic?) assertion in that the year 1819 witnessed the beginning of the Latin American independence movement away from Spain. Nevertheless, he also gave to Speransky for future reference a copy of Bishop de Pradt's work, On Colonies and on the Present American Revolution.[46] De Pradt argued that mother countries would be unable to keep their colonies unless they granted them more political representation and linked them more organically with themselves. Not only similar legal and social institutions would suffice, but favorable commercial and economic terms for colonies were necessary too. These views, of course, had influenced Kozodavlev's reform proposals for Siberia, as he and other high officials pondered Siberia's future in the light of colonial revolts in the Americas since 1776.

Moreover, it was Kozodavlev who reputedly at this time made the well-known statement: "The history of Siberia is divided into just two epochs: the first from Yermak to Speransky, and the second from Speransky to X."[47]

---

45 See Raeff, Siberia, pp. 73-74; Firsov, Chteniia, pt. 2, pp. 16-18; and Jadrinzew, Sibirien, pp. 380-81

46 Dominique Dufour de Pradt, Des colonies (et de la révolution actuelle de l'Amérique), 2 vols., (Paris and Warsaw, 1817). For more extensive discussions see Raeff, Siberia, pp. 45-46; Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia, pp. 493-94; and Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 10.

47 Iadrintsev and, following him, Svatikov give credit to Kozodavlev for this statement (Sibirien, p. 366, and Rossiia i Sibir', p. 10); Vagin, however, attributes it to Count S. S. Uvarov (Istoricheskie sviedeniia, I: 1).

Though "X" most likely signified some indeterminate point in the future, for purposes of this present study Siberia's "second epoch" extended from Speransky's arrival in late 1819 to roughly the year 1894.

* * *

Speransky's Contributions: Administrative, Cultural, and Social

The majority of the individuals who most influenced Siberian cultural and intellectual development in its embryonic stage were exiles of some sort. One of the first and most important of these exiles Michael Mikhailovich Speransky (1772-1839), governor-general and institutional reformer of Siberia from 1819 to 1822. In advancing and introducing western concepts into Siberia's backward institutional, social, and cultural milieu, Speransky exerted an impact upon nineteenth-century Siberia which can be likened perhaps most closely to the effect Peter I had upon eighteenth-century Russia. As with Tsar Peter a century earlier, Speransky was far (perhaps too far) ahead of his time and so far above his surrounding environment that most contemporaries were totally unable to appreciate, comprehend, or utilize his various contributions to Siberia. Only in time did Siberians begin to give Speransky his proper due.

As indicated above, Speransky on his arrival had to contend with a tradition of despotism among Siberian authorities that had been deeply ingrained for 200 years. Speransky well understood that in Siberia the establishment and rule of law was necessary before any permanent civilizing processes or genuine intellectual developments could hold their own. The stable, more traditional institutions of Western Europe that he so admired influenced his objective in Siberia. Hence he sought to enact a set of

administrative and legal reforms whereby Siberia's economic, social, and cultural level might ultimately rise to that of European Russia. However, reforms on paper alone could not curb the arbitrary power of local authorities. There also had to emerge the force of public opinion, which would not tolerate a tyrannical administrative regime. Public opinion depended on the spread of education, the rise of civic consciousness, and emergent feelings of human dignity. These ingredients, so undeveloped in early nineteenth-century Siberia, Speransky sought to foster and encourage.

Speransky, for instance, wrote to Count Kochubey from Siberia: "How can I govern without moral authority? They answer: by laws — as if laws exist in a Siberia which has always been administered by arbitrary rule, and as if laws can be executed without executors." [48] Though he wished to make Siberia a more integral part of the Russian Empire, in his opinion, it definitely required its own special statute or "constitution." He once claimed that "institutions without men are useless," and if neither were present, the easier task would be to provide the former from "above."

Speransky's "constitution" for Siberia, established in 1822, came at the tail-end of a reign devoted to implementing constitutional rule both within the Russian Empire and without. Alexander I had already granted special, or "unique" constitutions to Finland and Poland earlier, and in partial response to public opinion in European had promoted several constitutional plans (such as Novosiltsev's and Speransky's own) for Russia. [49] In Siberia, however, Speransky's reform statute was hardly a concession to public opinion, which barely existed; it was more an administrative convenience and an

---

48 Quoted in Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 11 (the source is not cited).

49 On the common denominators in Alexander's various constitutions, both Russian and foreign, see A. McConnell, "Alexander I's Hundred Days: The Politics of a Paternalist Reformer," Slavic Review, (September 1969) vol. 28, no. 4, p. 392.

attempt to promote local and regional self-development from above.

Michael Speransky was appointed Governor-General of Siberia by the Emperor in early 1819. Dismissed in 1812 from the civil service, where he had served as the tsar's secretary and close adviser, Speransky was sent into exile. Slowly rising to prominence again, he served as governor of Penza province from 1816 until his Siberian appointment. This new assignment both he and the government viewed as short-term. At first Speransky looked upon it rather bitterly, as just one more stage in his gradual rehabilitation, prolonging even more his route from exile to St. Petersburg. Yet complaints about the Pestel administration had increased to such an extent that Alexander decided it best to send Speransky to examine Siberian affairs and to prepare a thoroughgoing administrative reform. Thus, during his 20-month stay Speransky acted more as inspector-general than as governor-general. He observed local conditions in town and country from the Urals to the Pacific and attempted as best possible to eradicate administrative malpractices. For instance, Speransky had Treskin, numerous subordinate officials, and hundreds of other individuals suspended and brought to court for trials. In this respect Count Nesselrode compared his task to Hercules' cleansing of the Augean stables.[50] Speransky's most important job, however, was to recommend administrative improvements and changes for incorporation into a general reform statute (uchrezdenie) for Siberia.

To two of Speransky's contemporaries, the statesmen Kozodavlev and Uvarov, his brief administration and the ensuing reform statute marked a watershed in Siberian history. And in the same vein, the Siberian historian Yadrintsev later remarked that "Speransky separated Siberia of the 19th

---

50 Cited in Jadrinzew, Sibirien, p. 367; and Firsov, Chteniia, pt. 2, p. 19. Nesselrode was Foreign Minister from 1816 to 1856.

century from the 18th and 17th centuries." [51] Why then did his achievements rate such high praise? Speransky's recommendations, later embodied in the reform statutes, included first of all the division of Siberia into two governor-generalships, each containing two provinces. Consequently, Alexander's decree of January 26, 1822 divided Siberia into eastern and western halves, with their respective capitals in Irkutsk and Tobolsk (transferred in the 1830's to Omsk). As part of Western Siberia too, in addition to the provinces of Tobolsk and Tomsk established under Selifontov, the region of Omsk was created. In Eastern Siberia the province of Yenisei was set up, with its capital in Krasnoyarsk; this governor-generalship was now composed of Irkutsk and Yenisei provinces and the region of Yakutsk. Speransky's administrative division put an end to the frequent reshuffling that previously had taken place. The West Siberian governor-generalship and its subdivisions lasted until 1882, while the East Siberian units were preserved until 1917. To manage the affairs of Siberia as a whole and to insure that the more specific reforms were carried out on the local level a formal "Siberian Committee" was established in St. Petersburg in 1821. [52]

Moreover, Speransky helped establish what he called a "system of administration peculiar to the local conditions of this region." [53] The final "statute for the administration of the Siberian provinces," issued on July 22, 1822, included regulations on native affairs, on exiles, on Siberian Cossacks, and on means of communication. Regulations also touched on state obligations and taxes, supply of foodstuffs, and state trade monopolies.

---

51 N. M. Iadrintsev, "Speranskii i ego reformy v Sibiri" (Speransky and His Reforms in Siberia), Viestnik Evropy, (May 1876) III, p. 93. On Kozodavlev and Uvarov see above, p. 25 and 25 n.

52 Membership in the Siberian Committee comprised the chief ministers of state; between 1821 and 1838 this included Speransky, Kochubey, A. A. Arakcheev, and A. N. Golitsyn. See Raeff, Siberia, p. 48 and 164; and Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 12.

53 Quoted in Firsov, Chteniia, pt. 2, p. 18.

The general principles underlying the reforms sought to change the personal power of officials into power vested in institutions, to give local institutions more latitude in decision-making (i.e. decentralization), and to bring greater order into the relations between various administrative offices in Siberia. In some ways most innovative was the establishment of councils (or colleges), comprised of appointed officials, which would assist and temper the governor-general in important administrative decisions. In Raeff's opinion, Speransky's recognition of Siberia's distinctive characteristics in the reform statute helped contribute to the development of a more "regionalist" approach to local government. Moreover, through his reforms he widened the range of social and cultural activities, along with private economic initiative, thereby fostering a freer development of the population's own way of life. [54]

Speransky's influence on the development and quickening of Siberian life was not only in administrative affairs, but in the areas of society and culture as well. Here his effect was in some ways more direct. Anxious for permission to return to European Russia as soon as possible, Speransky aimed at completing his assignment thoroughly, but rapidly too. At first glance he was rather unimpressed with Siberia and its people. From Tobolsk he wrote his daughter: "Siberia is simply Siberia. One must have not just a fervid, but a wild imagination to see some sort of India here." He lamented the absence of "higher civic education" and wrote that there was "almost no intellectual conversation at all in society." [55] At

---

54 Raeff, Siberia, p. 132. Vagin also comments to this effect (Istoricheskie sviedeniia, II: 383-84).

55 Letter dated June 14, 1819 at Tobolsk, "Pis'ma M. M. Speranskago k ego docheri iz Sibiri" (Letters of Michael Speransky to His Daughter from Siberia), Russkii Arkhiv, (1868) no. 11, p. 1685.

first Siberia to him was just a country of "ignorant rabble and outcast criminals." [56] These were not the views of a blueblood Russian aristocrat, but of a village priest's son who had risen far in Russian society.

As he moved farther eastward into Siberia, Speransky soon recognized the potential significance of the vast region. On February 1, 1820, he wrote his daughter: "I have discovered Siberia in its true political relationship. Only Yermak can dispute with me for this honor." [57] The new governor-general did not want Siberia to remain a type of colony or a backyard appendage to Russia, but he envisaged the country as an organic part of the Empire. The more that institutions, laws, schools, printing, and ideas could be introduced, linking Siberia with Russia, then all the stronger would the awareness develop among Siberians of their own unique regional status.

To assist him in his work Speransky brought from Penza several able officials, though generally he tried to make use of local talent whenever possible. In this latter category was the engineer and future Decembrist, Gavriil S. Batenkov, whom Speransky brought from Tomsk to Irkutsk; Batenkov subsequently drafted important sections of the reform statutes. [58] Other local lights were the young Ivan T. Kalashnikov, whom he promoted and who later became Siberia's first littérateur in St. Petersburg; and Pyotr A. Slovtsov, subsequently Siberia's first modern historian, who at the time was director of Irkutsk schools and who co-operated in many of Speransky's

---

56 Quoted in (Iadrintsev) "Pervyi sibirskii universitet," p. 61.
57 "Pis'ma Speranskago," p. 1735.
58 Born in Tobolsk in 1793, Batenkov studied in St. Petersburg and abroad before entering the civil service in Tomsk in 1816. In Tomsk he was an active Freemason and founded the local lodge of the Eastern Star in 1818, the first such in Siberia.

educational endeavors. The fact that Batenkov and Kalashnikov subsequently made their way to St. Petersburg, where they remained (indeed, after 1826 Batenkov languished in prison there for 20 years), and that Slovtsov, an exile, longed to return to the capital, illustrates the problem of "intellectual absenteeism," which has plagued Siberia in both 19th and 20th centuries. Speransky too faced the problem of how to keep intelligent, able, and educated men in the Siberian provinces. He even tried to bind administrative officials to Siberia by allotting them land, thereby giving them some stake in the region's future. Though the lure of European Russia usually proved stronger, this idea points to Speransky's search for an elite which might engender public opinion.[59] A more direct, but short-term approach to the problem was to appoint able administrators to high and important posts; thus the appointment of Zeidler, Speransky's successor as governor-general of Eastern Siberia.

Besides tapping local talent for work in his administrative reform, Speransky undertook open and conscious attempts to advance the interests of Siberian society. His immediate contributions toward improving the educational level in Siberia were important in two areas: the founding of branches of the Russian Bible Society, and the promotion of schools and new educational concepts. An ardent champion of the evangelical and pietistic-oriented Bible Society while in Russia, Speransky had already founded branches in Penza province. No sooner had he arrived in Tobolsk in May 1819 than he visited the group established there two years earlier. In these activities, however, he always acted in an unofficial capacity as a

---

59 See Marc Raeff, Michael Speransky, Statesman of Imperial Russia, 1772-1839 (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1957), p. 270.

private person.

Soon after his arrival in Irkutsk he opened a local division of the Society and drew up the "rite" himself. A letter of December 31, 1819, to Prince A. N. Golitsyn, President of the Bible Society, reveals his intentions concerning the Siberian branches. After describing the achievements of the Irkutsk division, Speransky related:

> We are thinking of setting up associations in Yakutsk and Verkhneudinsk. Of the three Siberian provinces, there is now no Bible Society in Tomsk; but there is not one noteworthy ecclesiastic there . . . In time I will present to your Grace my thoughts on how some light could be admitted into this country, darkened by its coarse Schism /raskol: Old Belief/ and indifference. [60]

Though devoutly Orthodox, Speransky also shared to some extent the pietistic views held by his superiors, Golitsyn and Alexander I. He felt that the true enlightenment of Siberia would come about not only through education, but through moral regeneration and acquaintance with Holy Scripture as well.

Even though the Bible Society was beginning to decline in European Russia about this time, Speransky met marked success in his efforts to establish Siberian branches. In February 1820 he opened "associations" in Kyakhta and Nerchinsk, which soon numbered 360 and 51 members, respectively. By April the Irkutsk division counted 119 members, and the three branches together raised over 13,000 rubles, most of which was sent to the Society's central committee in St. Petersburg. [61] This was a rather remarkable display of public initiative, considering the time and place.

---

60 Letter to Golitsyn, dated December 31, 1819; quoted in Vagin, Istoricheskie sviedeniia, II: 119. Golitsyn was Minister of Spiritual Affairs and Public Education from 1817 to 1824.

61 Vagin, op. cit., p. 120.

According to Speransky's plans, libraries were to be established in each branch, supplied with moralizing books and Bibles. For some reason the branch proposed for Verkhneudinsk was never opened, but the one for Yakutsk, entrusted to the supervision of Archbishop Michael of Irkutsk, was in time set up.

Soon after Speransky's departure from Siberia in early 1821 the activities of the Siberian branches stopped completely; indeed, the Society itself was officially dissolved in 1826 (indicating the relative strength of "state" vis-à-vis "society"). Yet the Siberian organizations left some significant traces. In Irkutsk several prominent merchants had joined and undertaken to convey pertinent books from Russia to Irkutsk; and in Tobolsk members translated the Gospel into Ostyak and other native languages. According to Vagin, Speransky's Siberian biographer,

> The short-lived existence of the division and associations in Irkutsk province brought benefits with it; even in the 1840's one could find in Irkutsk and in Transbaikalia moralizing books published by the Bible Society. In view of the extreme poverty of our popular literature previously, these made quite useful reading for literate common people.[62]

In education Speransky's influence was both direct and indirect. A month after his arrival in Irkutsk he helped sponsor groups and a school based on the Lancaster method of mutual instruction, a book about which he had brought with him.[63] This method had first attracted the attention of Tsar Alexander on a trip to England in 1814. Though it was just beginning to be introduced in Russia, even in Siberia the director of Irkutsk

---

62 Ibid., p. 121.

63 "Pis'ma Speranskago," p. 1700. Joseph Lancaster, an Englishman, had initiated this method, whereby older pupils taught the younger and less experienced ones; it was especially popular with English Non-Conformists.

schools, Slovtsov, had already been considering putting the idea into practice. Through the efforts of both Speransky and Slovtsov the Lancaster method was successfully introduced into the Irkutsk military school.[64]

Speransky also devoted his attention to the town's secondary school (gimnaziia), which had sunk to such a low level during Treskin's administration. Besides visiting the school frequently, he attended the annual examinations and even administered the questions to the pupils himself. The public primary school in Irkutsk also fell under his scrutiny. In Vagin's opinion, through Speransky's efforts "Irkutsk in its public education moved to a level with the capitals and far ahead of other towns."[65] Working closely with Slovtsov, he also helped invigorate and found village schools in Irkutsk province.

Speransky's interest in schools was not limited to Eastern Siberia. In 1819 he inspected the Cossack cadet school (kadetskii korpus) in Omsk and remarked: "Surprising successes, especially in mathematics, drafting, and design. The whole institution is excellent."[66] Moreover, he supported efforts of progressive citizens in various places to set up schools. He encouraged, for example, the attempts of the mayor of Kyakhta, N. M. Igumnov, to introduce a vocational school to prepare children of the lower middle class for trades.[67] His concern for the development of public education among various social groups was reflected in the reforms of 1822, which stipulated that schools be established not only among Cossacks,

---

64 See the testimony of John D. Cochrane, Narrative of a Pedestrian Journey through Russia and Siberian Tartary (London, 1825), I: 212.
65 Vagin, Istoricheskie sviedeniia, II: 139-40.
66 Quoted in ibid., p. 128.
67 Ibid., p. 137; see too Jadrinzew, Sibirien, p. 398.

Buryats, and other native peoples, but also in the recently annexed southern Kazakh steppe. Moreover, native children were permitted to attend Russian schools, if they and their parents so desired.[68]

Among Speransky's educational concerns was his intention to re-establish in Irkutsk the formal study of Oriental languages (Chinese, Manchurian, Mongolian, Tibetan, and Japanese). The original school (founded in 1790) in which these languages had been taught and which trained translators had long since been closed. Speransky unearthed a collection of its left-over books in Oriental languages and arranged for additional books in Chinese and Manchurian to be purchased in Peking. With these acquisitions he had the language school reinstated, but the same problem as before plagued the institution: a dearth of pupils.[69] As for higher education, some commentators feel that he encouraged his successor in Western Siberia, Governor-General P. M. Kaptsevich, to work toward establishing a university in Siberia.[70]

During Speransky's governor-generalship a periodical devoted to Siberia, the Siberian Herald (Sibirskii Viestnik) was published in St. Petersburg. This rather scholarly publication, issued between the years 1818 and 1824, was edited by G. I. Spassky, a mining engineer by profession. This was the first journal to be published which concerned Siberian affairs (chiefly travel accounts and historical documents). Despite

---

68 For the harmful aspects of native children attending Russian schools see below, pp. 721-22.

69 (Iadrintsev) "Pervyi sibirskii universitet," p. 62; and Vagin, Istoricheskie sviedeniia, II: 140.

70 "Pervyi sibirskii universitet," pp. 62-63; Vagin, op. cit., II: 141; and Raeff, Siberia, p. 51. A university for Siberia had been officially projected in 1803.

assertions to the contrary, the available evidence indicates that Speransky gave little assistance, if any at all, to Spassky's publication, the only one of its kind before the late 1850's. [71]

Besides his activities promoting formal education, Speransky tried to establish closer intellectual and social contact between the administration and leading citizens. In this way he hoped to impress upon the latter the desirability of education and civic consciousness. He arranged social events at his residence, to which his younger and outgoing administrative assistants, such as Batenkov, contributed considerable success. According to one observer, during the winter of 1819,

> Irkutsk went on a fling; it seemed that no one did anything, and Speransky least of all: dinners, balls — Speransky was certainly present everywhere; . . . indeed, Speransky's entire house was often illuminated until long into the night.

His residence "concentrated within itself the whole life of Irkutsk." [72] Though the example set by Speransky and his subordinates was not forgotten in Irkutsk, these occasions were not always enjoyable for the governor-general. Generally a retiring person, who shunned social functions, Speransky found "the solitude of the mind better than empty and tasteless entertainment." [73] Nevertheless, he recognized the need in Irkutsk for such social occasions.

---

71 According to Raeff, Speransky "helped to establish a local paper, although it did not survive for long after his departure . . ."; he provides no further information (Siberia, p. 51). On Spassky's periodical see A. N. Pypin, Istoriia russkoi etnografii, IV: 351-54; Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia, p. 662; and "Nachalo pechati," p. 376, 405. In English see A. Mazour, Modern Russian Historiography (Princeton, N. J.: Van Nostrand, 1957), pp. 163-64.

72 E. I. Stogov-Mozhaiskii, "Ocherki, razskazy i vospominaniia. Speranskii i Treskin v Irkutskie, 1819 g." (Sketches, Stories, and Reminiscences: Speransky and Treskin in Irkutsk in 1819), Russkaia Starina, (November 1878), p. 524.

73 Letter of June 9, 1820; "Pis'ma Speranskago," p. 1760.

The arrival of a new governor-general in Siberia had often evoked messianic hopes on the part of the long-suffering population. In contrast to his predecessors (and successors), however, Speransky made a lasting favorable impression upon many Siberians. Compared to the haughtiness of former governors-general and to the fear and animosity that Treskin aroused, Speransky's manner (to use Raeff's expression) was "a revolution in itself." Cochrane reflects this in his first impressions:

> Of General Speranski I will only say, that I have never seen more true greatness of soul or goodness of heart. There is in him a certain condescension and affability, and at the same time a certain air of nobility, that strikes all who approach him with awe and respect. [74]

Another contemporary, N. N. Bulatov, wrote: "With Speransky's arrival life entered into our society; festivities and evening parties were arranged. In this manner a new element was introduced into our mode of life. With the overall submission to Speransky, this innovation was accepted without opposition." [75] Of Speransky's eleven months in Irkutsk, Kalashnikov wrote that it "was a true holiday for the people. . . . Everyone began to breathe more freely and to amuse himself without fear . . ." The governor-general's own reaction to this was also one of wonder: "The local inhabitants scarcely believe that they have some degree of freedom and can gather to dance or to do nothing — without permission." [76] Such was the nature of this "thaw by autocratic fiat" after the frozen regime of Pestel and Treskin.

---

74 Cochrane, Narrative of a Pedestrian Journey, I: 194.
75 Quoted in Jadrinzew, Sibirien, p. 394.
76 Quotations from I. T. Kalashnikov, "Zapiski irkutskago zhitelia" (Notes of an Irkutsk Resident), Russkaia Starina, (July 1905) vol. 123, pp. 249-50.

As subsequent commentators testified, Speransky's activities and reforms, directed from "above," gave the first positive impetus toward invigorating social life and cultural activity in Siberia. According to Vagin, "the talented Siberian youth of that time mastered not only the ideas but even the language of Speransky. The generation of educated public figures immediately after Speransky placed him as the ideal of an administrator."[77] Stogov-Mozhaisky, who returned to Irkutsk in 1830,

> saw an altered Siberia twelve years later. The fruits of Speransky's work were tangible . . . The abuses of the authorities had really decreased. In the moral life of the people I found an enormous change; in less than a generation it was impossible to recognize the people.[78]

Though this view of the Siberian public appears rather exaggerated, it is true that the arbitrariness of officials did tend to diminish after Speransky's departure, in comparison with the Pestel-Treskin era.

Siberia's cultural and intellectual development after Speransky's brief administration can hardly be viewed as ever-progressing onward and upward. For a long time after Speransky Siberia suffered setbacks in this respect. Village schools were shut down, Bible Society branches foundered, the absence of a local press continued, Speransky's philanthropic institutions collapsed, and administrative officials steeped in the old school resumed the traditional methods of bribery, graft, corruption, and arbitrary rule. As a contemporary phrased it: "During his administration things appeared to get better and somewhat quieter, but then everything went on again as before."[79] In the eyes of another, the new governor-general of

---

77 Vagin, Istoricheskie sviedeniia, II: 384.
78 Stogov-Mozhaiskii, "Ocherki, razskazy i vospominaniia," pp. 525-26.
79 Quoted in Vagin, op. cit., p. 395.

Western Siberia, Kaptsevich, exemplified this reversion: "from the very beginning of his administration he began to subvert the same governing principles which he was obligated to introduce and protect." [80] The statutes regarding natives, exiles, peasants, and Cossacks were often encroached upon by many of Speransky's administrative successors. As evidence of all this, the St. Petersburg government repeatedly had to arrange tours of inspection through Siberia from 1827 to 1851.

From the vantage point of northeastern Russia in the late 1830's Alexander Herzen offered his views on Speransky's impact:

> Speransky attempted to lighten the lot of the Siberian people. He introduced everywhere an administration by colleges, as if it were not all the same by whom theft was committed — by individuals or by gangs. He got rid of the old swindlers by hundreds but introduced hundreds of new ones. At first, he inspired the provincial police with such fears that the officials themselves paid money to the peasants, so as to prevent their addressing petitions to the governor. But a few years later, officials were making a fortune under a new form, no worse than the old one. [81]

One of Speransky's chief objectives, of course, had been to promote publicity, to arouse public opinion, and to convince Siberians that complaining against local authorities was not a crime. Nevertheless, two fleeting years hardly provided time enough to supplant attitudes that had permeated Siberian society for over two centuries. Ironically, Speransky's reforms, along with the failure to implement the semi-representative institutions advocated by Kozodavlev, did hasten the political decline of the merchant class. According to Yadrintsev, "after the terror of the Pestel epoch and after Speransky's reforms, the towns lost their strength and independence forever. The merchant class, which before Treskin's time had helped remove

---

80 Vagin, op. cit., p. 394.
81 Gertsen, Byloe i dumy, p. 135.

half-a-dozen Siberian governors, did not regain its former political leverage again."[82]

As time went on, the memory of Speransky dimmed and his "tradition" became weaker; the number of his contemporaries and sympathizers decreased, and increasingly he became a kind of myth. His influence remained most permanent, of course, in the organization of local and regional administrations. Many literate Siberians of the time read his reform statutes and recognized definite rules of governmental conduct which flew in the face of the arbitrary rule to which they were accustomed.[83] Even though the overall quality of administrators improved after Speransky's departure, especially in the upper echelons, no single administrator for the next quarter century stood out in the area of advancing Siberia's economic, social, or cultural development. Speransky's successors displayed little interest in public education or in public opinion, and thus progress in these areas was quite slow. Only in the 1850's did some of the schools operating in Speransky's time reopen and did a nascent public opinion emerge. In the next few decades only one new secondary school was founded — in Tomsk in the late 1830's. Even for the first girls' school, established in Irkutsk in 1838, the town was "indebted to Speransky for having appointed Zeidler as governor."[84]

Despite all the retrenchment, Speransky's endeavors were not totally premature. They served as seeds, which lying dormant for some time, began to sprout as Siberian society slowly awakened from its slumber. Kalashnikov exalted the reforms as "a true miracle" and as designed to make Siberia

---

82 Jadrinzew, Sibirien, p. 381.
83 Vagin, Istoricheskie sviedeniia, II: 383.
84 Ibid., p. 388. Zeidler was active in promoting girls' education in Irkutsk.

"a fully happy country." Still, they "could not quickly adjust to the Siberian soil after many years of despotic rule and servitude." With this Slovtsov agreed. In 1823 he wrote to Kalashnikov of Speransky's reform statutes: "The thick book compiled for Siberia is now completed, but Siberia will still present a melancholy picture to sensitive people for a long time." [85]

In Vagin's view,

> The direct and immediate influence of Speransky and his laws on Siberia was great and beneficial. It illuminated Siberia, awoke her from age-long stagnation and gave her a new life. But this influence gradually weakened, new elements burst into Siberian life, and those which were old and unsympathetic to Speransky's reform raised their heads.

Speransky's personality and activities had a "civilizing significance" and aroused in Siberians "a consciousness of their rights and relationship toward local authorities." Yet his influence was unable to "consolidate in people feelings of legality and independence from arbitrary rule; but this feeling was born and demanded nourishment for its further development." [86]

More recently, Raeff has concluded that "in a sense, though on a much smaller scale Speransky's role in forming a Siberian society can be compared to Peter the Great's a century earlier in European Russia." [87] Though the similarities in this comparison have been briefly noted above, it should be added that the somewhat reserved Speransky, who spent only eleven months in Irkutsk and whose favorite spare-time reading then was Thomas à Kempis, could hardly have exerted as profound an influence upon

---

85 Quotations from Kalashnikov, "Zapiski irkutskago zhitelia," (June 1905), p. 249 and 248.
86 Vagin, Istoricheskie sviedeniia, II: 398, 382-83.
87 Raeff, Michael Speransky, p. 259.

Siberian society as did Peter upon Russian society. He too sought to westernize laws, institutions, society, and culture in Siberia. His chief legacy lay in the administrative reforms of 1822. Yet his high moral and civic standards affected only a small number of Siberians (most of them educated). With his cultivated personality and with his vision of a society based on law and the power of public opinion, he bore little resemblance to Peter I.

As for Speransky's impact upon the future development of Siberian regionalism, Raeff offers an interesting interpretation. In his view, Speransky's activities and reforms helped contribute

> to the formation of a new kind of Siberian leader: a man interested in the fate and the history of the region and eager to obtain a good education in order to be of the greatest help to his people and province. This new Siberian leader was proud of his region, he vied with the elite of St. Petersburg in intellectual and cultural interests, he resented the fact that Siberia was still often considered merely an area of exploitation. He believed Siberia to be truly an organic part of Russia and in this belief he only expressed the change in attitude towards Siberia that had been in the making since the eighteenth century, had been formulated by Speransky, and had received its administrative sanction in the statutes of 1822. [88]

The more Europeanized and westernized Siberia would become, all the more consciously would her leading thinkers ponder her unique positive and negative features, trying to preserve the former and eradicate the latter. This attitude marked the awakening of Siberian society, slowly but surely, and the beginning of Siberian regional consciousness. It is now to the first of these new "conscious" Siberian leaders that we should direct our attention.

---

88 Raeff, Siberia, p. 53.

CHAPTER II

EXILES AND SIBERIAN SOCIETY: CULTURAL AND INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENTS, 1825-1855

In the first half of the nineteenth century, from around 1820 to 1860, much of the force that went into uplifting and awakening Siberia came from a small elite of educated exiles. Though the cultural and intellectual impact of these exiles from European parts of the Empire indeed continued throughout the entire 19th century, their contributions to Siberian society tended to predominate in the first half of the century over efforts of other social groups.

During the reigns of the Emperors Alexander I (1801-1825) and Nicholas I (1825-1855) the major contributions among exiles to Siberia's cultural and intellectual growth stemmed from three general types of exiles: exile-administrators, Russian political exiles, and Polish political exiles. In the first group Speransky and Slovtsov, who occupied positions of administrative authority, stand out. The second group consisted almost exclusively

of Decembrist aristocrats, exiled after the abortive rebellion of December 1825. The third element comprised patriotic and even separatistic Poles, deported after the unsuccessful uprising of 1830-31 and other subsequent "affairs."

The impact of Speransky on Siberian society has been discussed above. This chapter examines the contributions of Slovtsov, Decembrists, and Poles to individual Siberians and to society in general — primarily during the reign of Nicholas I. These exiles, however, were not the sole "culture-bearers" in Siberia at this time. Elements of culture and self-consciousness (samosoznanie) were beginning (and continuing) to stir even within a small educated elite of Siberian society itself, quite apart from the immediate influence of educated exiles.

* * *

Slovtsov: The First Siberian Patriot

If the work of Speransky in and for Siberia can be compared in some ways to that of Peter I's for Russia, perhaps then the cultural contributions of Pyotr Andreevich Slovtsov to Siberia can best be compared to those of Michael Lomonosov for Russia in the mid-18th century. Like Lomonosov, a man of many talents, Slovtsov distinguished himself as preacher, educator, administrator, publicist, historian, and patriot. Unlike both Lomonosov and Speransky, however, Slovtsov's work went almost totally unappreciated in his own day. Probably the most educated Siberian of his time, he ended up living his last and most productive years as a kind of scholarly recluse in Tobolsk.

The early lives of Slovtsov and Speransky display several interesting

parallels. Both were self-made men of humble background, born the sons of priests in provincial Russia, and contemporaries of each other. Speransky (1772-1839) was from Vladimir in northeastern Russia, whereas Slovtsov (1767-1843) hailed from Verkhoturie district (uezd) in western Siberia. Both came as students to St. Petersburg, where they became life-long friends. Moreover, both men, as high-ranking bureaucrats in Siberia, carried on important administrative and educational activities, while serving a kind of semi-official exile. Neither Speransky nor Slovtsov asked to be sent to Siberia, and while there they both strenuously sought permission to return to St. Petersburg as soon as possible. Whereas Speransky returned to Russia in two years, though, Slovtsov remained in Siberia for the rest of his life.

A native-born Siberian, Slovtsov spent roughly fifty-five of his total seventy-five years east of the Urals. After having received his early education from his father, a priest in Verkhoturie, he went in 1779 to study at the Tobolsk Ecclesiastical Seminary, then one of two such secondary schools in Siberia. After performing admirably, he was sent in 1788 at state expense to St. Petersburg to continue his studies at the more advanced Alexander Nevsky Seminary, a theological academy. It was here that he first met Speransky. Upon completing the five-year course here, he was obligated to return to Tobolsk. Thus did Slovtsov become professor of philosophy and rhetoric at the Tobolsk seminary in 1793.

He had not been back for long, however, before he delivered a sermon in the Tobolsk cathedral (in honor of the marriage of Grand Duke Alexander) which alluded critically to the activities of imperial and local authorities. This was to be his last sermon. The Tobolsk governor, present in

the congregation, subsequently complained to St. Petersburg, and Slovtsov, now suspected as a freethinker and a subversive, was summoned and taken to the capital for a trial. The upshot of this was his imprisonment at Valaam monastery on Lake Ladoga. Pardoned by the Emperor Paul in 1797, he was soon appointed professor of rhetoric at the Alexander Nevsky Seminary (where Speransky was then teaching). Later that year, however, he gave up his career as a cleric and entered the civil service. Although he rose rapidly in the ranks, in 1807 he was accused of extortion. The consequence of this was his banishment in 1808 from St. Petersburg back to Siberia. He was sent to Tobolsk to the staff of Governor-General Pestel and was forbidden not only return to St. Petersburg but entry into European Russia as well. Such were the consequences of a charge for which he never received a trial nor any opportunity to defend himself. [1] In such fashion Slovtsov began twenty years of exile in Siberia, from which he was finally pardoned in 1829 by the Emperor Nicholas at the advanced age of 62.

In Siberian exile Slovtsov performed minor duties in Tobolsk for several years because of illness, in his spare time taking up the study of mineralogy. In 1814, however, he was commissioned to survey and inspect administrative offices in Transbaikalia. On completing this assignment he was sent to survey offices in other districts to the north. During these travels Slovtsov came to know much of Siberia first-hand, a valuable preparation for his later activities in education and scholarship done on a

---

1 For details on Slovtsov's early life see K. Golodnikov, "K biografii P. A. Slovtsova" (Concerning a Biography of P. A. Slovtsov), Sbornik gazety "Sibir'", vol. 1 (St. Petersburg, 1876), pp. 423-28; K. M. "Petr Andreevich Slovtsov. 1767-1843 g.," in P. A. Slovtsov, Istoricheskoe obozrienie Sibiri, vol. 1 (2d ed., St. Petersburg, 1886), pp. 4-16; and Pypin, Istoriia russkoi etnografii, IV: 354-56.

regional basis. Treskin, the civilian governor of Irkutsk, was impressed with Slovtsov's reports, and in early 1815 raised his rank in the civil service. That June Pestel recommended him for the vacant directorship of schools in Irkutsk province. Permission was obtained from the Minister of Public Instruction, and from this point on, in Kalashnikov's words, "a new era for the Irkutsk schools" began. [2]

The ensuing fourteen years, during which Slovtsov served as Siberia's first prominent educator, can be divided into two periods. In the years 1815-20 he was director of schools in Irkutsk province, and for the years 1821-28 he held the post of supervisor of all schools in Siberia (including the provinces of Kazan, Perm, and Vyatka). According to Potanin, this was the only time in Siberian history that such a broad administrative position existed in the realm of education. [3] During the period 1815-20 Slovtsov was especially influential in improving the Irkutsk secondary school, promoting the idea of a Siberian university, and encouraging the intellectual development of such promising young Siberians as Nikolai Polevoy and Ivan Kalashnikov. In the later period his efforts were directed especially toward increasing the number of schools and pupils in the entire Siberian school system.

As his initial position in 1815 included the directorship of the Irkutsk secondary school (gimnaziia), his first task was to renovate this run-down institution by repairing the decrepit old building and by improving the quality of the teaching staff. In spite of obstacles, he obtained a

---

2 Kalashnikov, "Zapiski irkutskago zhitelia," (August 1905), p. 398.
3 G. N. Potanin, Oblastnicheskaia tendentsiia v Sibiri (The Regionalist Tendency in Siberia), (Tomsk, 1907), p. 2.

grant from Governor Treskin and was given some degree of support from local citizens. He cleaned up the building's exterior and interior, and was responsible for increasing the number of pupils from ten to forty. Among younger teachers recruited fresh from the St. Petersburg Pedagogical Institute was Semyon S. Shchukin, future director of the school. Just as concerned about his pupils' social activities as over their intellectual development, Slovtsov (like Speransky) encouraged dancing and introduced it into the school curriculum. All in all, in the words of one contemporary, "the gimnaziia quickly erased its former blemishes and was reborn out of ashes. The inhabitants of Irkutsk looked with pleasure upon its rebirth." [4] By 1819 Speransky could write of Slovtsov and his school: "His gimnaziia is perhaps the only one in Russia which proceeds quite regularly and successfully; he is in it every day." [5]

Slovtsov's efforts in founding schools in Irkutsk province were also impressive. On his initiative eighteen village and parish schools were opened in 1816 alone. Treskin, though initially approving these schools, later did almost everything possible to impede their development; according to Vagin, "the development of education among the people, and consequently of a certain degree of independence" did not set well with the Irkutsk governor. [6] Nevertheless, when Slovtsov left his Irkutsk post in 1820, the province had to show for itself one secondary school, seven district primary schools, six parish schools, and sixteen village schools; in the town of

---

4 Kalashnikov, "Zapiski irkutskago zhitelia," (September 1905), p. 620.

5 Letter to A. A. Stolypin, dated November 19, 1819; quoted in A. Sulotskii, "Petr Andreevich Slovtsov," Chteniia v imperatorskom obshchestvie istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri moskovskom universitetie, (1873) bk. 3, p. 140.

6 Vagin, Istoricheskie sviedeniia, II: 130; see too Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia, pp. 555-56.

Irkutsk there were reportedly more than 300 pupils and in the entire province around a thousand. [7]

Even though many of the village schools closed after Speransky and Slovtsov left the scene, similar schools for state peasants in European Russia hardly existed at all prior to the reforms of Count Kiselyov in the 1840's. These and other primary schools in Siberia did much to spread literacy, and in this much of the credit should go to Slovtsov. Despite setbacks, Kalashnikov even claimed that "from this time on the schools did not come to a stop but went forward. One can say in all fairness that the province of Irkutsk in regard to education is much indebted to the enlightened and indefatigable efforts of Slovtsov." [8]

Slovtsov was one of the first Siberians (and perhaps the first) to have promoted the idea of a Siberian university after its initial conception. Though first projected in 1803 by the central government (and supported then by the donations of the Siberian industrialist Demidov), only in the 1820's did the idea begin to pick up again. During Speransky's administration Slovtsov undertook more specific plans for establishing a university in Siberia. The excessive distance of most of Siberia from the nearest Russian university at Kazan served primarily to stimulate the idea. From what Kalashnikov indicates, Slovtsov put together a draft plan for a Siberian university at this time. But whether he even presented it to Speransky or not remains uncertain. [9]

Slovtsov also exerted some degree of influence upon the intellectual

---

7 Kalashnikov, "Zapiski irkutskago zhitelia," (September 1905), p. 624.
8 Ibid.
9 Ibid., p. 623.

development of a trio of young Siberians who subsequently attained a fair amount of fame. Of these the best known was Nikolai A. Polevoy (1796-1846), later a prominent Moscow journalist and author of the six-volume History of the Russian People (published in 1830-33). Son of a prominent Irkutsk merchant, the young Polevoy visited Slovtsov on occasion. During these visits Polevoy sought Slovtsov's "advice on what to read or do, asked a multitude of questions, /and/ loved to argue." [10] Polevoy later "repaid" Slovtsov by publishing his articles in his own newspaper, the Moscow Telegraph.

The relationship between Slovtsov and Ivan T. Kalashnikov (1797-1863) was closer and more enduring. An Irkutsk attorney's son and subsequent novelist in St. Petersburg, Kalashnikov first made Slovtsov's acquaintance in 1815. In 1823 he took his mentor's advice to go to the capital and stay there; from this point on a correspondence began between the two writers which lasted for twenty years. "Slovtsov," he relates,

> took a very fond interest in me, directed me in my studies, even gave me a course in philosophy, and corrected my compositions and translations. Continuing to look after me after I left Irkutsk, he sent me books, supported and guided me with advice, or consoled me in my misfortunes; in a word, he acted as a best friend and loving father. [11]

A third Siberian, Nikolai A. Abramov (1812-70), son of a Kurgan priest and teacher, and future local historian and educator, became well acquainted with Slovtsov in Tobolsk in the early 1830's. After leaving Tobolsk,

---

10 Sulotskii, "Slovtsov," p. 139 n. On Polevoy in English see Mazour, Modern Russian Historiography, pp. 74-77. On Polevoy's "liberal" father see above, p. 10.

11 Kalashnikov, "Zapiski irkutskago zhitelia," (September 1905), p. 634. For a biographical sketch of Kalashnikov, see B. Modzalevskii's introduction to the "Zapiski," (July 1905), pp. 187-88.

Abramov corresponded with him, giving advice on his historical investigations, and in turn being influenced by them himself. In contrast to Polevoy and Kalashnikov, however, Abramov never left the confines of western Siberia.[12] Slovtsov also served as a mentor for the brothers S. S. and N. S. Shchukin of Irkutsk. The former, whom in 1817 he engaged to teach in the Irkutsk secondary school, later became a noted botanist and director of the school from 1832 to 1842. The latter developed into a prominent ethnographer and local historian.[13]

During the second phase of his educational activity (1821-28), Slovtsov served as supervisor of Siberian schools. Despite advanced age and poor health, he visited most parts of Siberia, traveling more than 29,000 versts (about 20,000 miles) during this time. Abramov indicates that he tried "to bring Siberian schools into the most possible conformity with the contemporary state of knowledge and with local needs of the region . . ." According to the figures of Abramov and Golodnikov, between the years 1820 and 1826 the number of pupils in the three Siberian school districts increased from 600 to 2000.[14] On the other hand, Slovtsov's own report of 1826 showed only 620 pupils in the 13 schools of the Irkutsk district, and a grand total for Siberia of 31 schools with 1,588 pupils. Of these, only eighty-one attended the secondary schools in Irkutsk and Tobolsk.[15]

---

12 On Abramov, see S. A. Vengerov, Kritiko-bibliograficheskii slovar' (An Encyclopedia of Critics and Writers), vol. 1 (St. Petersburg, 1889), pp. 18-21; and Pypin, Istoriia russkoi etnografii, IV: 360-61.

13 Potanin, Oblastnicheskaia tendentsiia, p. 3; Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 175; and Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 196.

14 N. A. Abramov, "Petr Andreevich Slovtsov," Chteniia v imperatorskom obshchestvie istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri moskovskom universitetie, (October-December 1871) bk. 4, pt. 5, p. 92; and Golodnikov, "K biografii Slovtsova," p. 428.

15 P. A. Slovtsov, Pis'ma iz Sibiri, 1826 goda (Letters from Siberia: 1826), (Moscow, 1828), pp. 111-12; cited in Raeff, Siberia, p. 164. Cf. too Kalashnikov's figures given above, p. 50.

By imperial decree of February 8, 1828, the position of supervisor of Siberian schools was abolished, the schools now becoming subordinate to local civilian governors. Though deprived of his post, Slovtsov was fortunate enough to be granted an annual pension by the government in September 1829. This same year, through the mediation of two highly-placed senators, Slovtsov's exile was terminated. He was now pardoned and allowed to live wherever he chose. Thus, most of his educational activities and his term of exile ended almost simultaneously. Though prior to this Slovtsov (now 62 years old) had sought to return to European Russia, he retired instead to Tobolsk. Here he lived for the rest of his life, devoting his chief efforts to writing a history of Siberia. Just before his death in March 1842 Slovtsov bequeathed his large library to the Tobolsk secondary school, his mineralogical collection to the University of Kazan, and his historical, geographical, and statistical papers to Kalashnikov in St. Petersburg and to Abramov in Berezov. [16]

Slovtsov's efforts at writing history in his last years had been preceded by earlier literary endeavors. His first compositions of note were a series of sermons delivered in 1793 in Tobolsk. After one of these resulted in his incarceration in Valaam monastery, he took up poetry. Though his verses were not of high quality — in their imitation of Derzhavin's fashionable, classical style, his attachment to his Siberian homeland expressed itself in several poems (such as "To Siberia"). According to Yadrintsev, Slovtsov, the author of the first known written poetry about Siberia, was "the first Siberian in whom the first warm feeling toward the

---

16 K. M., "Slovtsov," pp. 19-20; and Golodnikov, "K biografii Slovtsova," pp. 430-31.

region broke through, who came to understand her destiny, and, moreover, who displayed an artistic impulse." [17] Thus, Slovtsov addressed such nostalgic and sentimental lines to his homeland:

> So richly endowed, O daughter of Asia!
> . . . . . .
> Friend of Slavs and mother of fierce hordes,
> Siberia, I love to think of thee. [18]

Several of Slovtsov's prose works are among the first descriptions of Siberia written by a native-born Sibiryak. Along with his later two-volume history, two shorter and earlier works, Letters from Siberia of 1826 and Walks around the Town of Tobolsk in 1830, reflect his growing interest in his homeland. [19] In several of the Letters Slovtsov advocated the economic interests of the Siberian population vis-à-vis Russian economic interests. In thus emphasizing the future economic and cultural development of the country for the sake of its own residents, Slovtsov has been identified as a precursor of what later became known as regionalism. [20] The second work, though written in his usual ponderous, 18th-century style, portrays the life, pastimes, and interests of the people of Tobolsk, as observed by the author on excursions in and around the town.

Slovtsov's literary interests in the twenties and thirties were not solely local; they included a work on the Scipii Africani of Rome, translations of Thomas à Kempis and Winckelmann's history of art into Russian, numerous articles on Siberian history and geography in Russian periodicals, and the dissemination of Pushkin's reputation and works in Siberia. All

---

17 Iadrintsev, "Sud'ba sibirskoi poezii i starinnye poety Sibiri" (The Fate of Siberian Poetry and Early Siberian Poets), Literaturnyi Sbornik (St. Petersburg, 1885), p. 411

18 Quoted from an unidentified poem in K. M., "Slovtsov," pp. 20-21.

19 Pis'ma iz Sibiri, 1826 goda (Moscow, 1828), and Progulki vokrug Tobol'ska v 1830 godu (Moscow, 1834). The Letters were first published in serial form in Polevoy's Moscow Telegraph (Moskovskii Telegraf).

20 See Potanin, Oblastnicheskaia tendentsiia, p. 1 ff; and B. Zherebtsov, ed., Staraia Sibir' v vospominaniiakh sovremennikov (Old Siberia in the Recollections of Contemporaries), (Irkutsk, 1939), pp. 25-26.

these activities were undertaken with little scholarly and literary encouragement from other Siberians, though a small circle of educated men did exist in Tobolsk at the time. Accustomed to thinking and contemplating alone, Slovtsov once wrote of his environment;:"Either conversation over cards or talk in the gloom of your own solitude, here are the conditions sine qua non!" [21]

Although Speransky shared these same sentiments during his brief stay in Siberia, he at least had Slovtsov's company in Irkutsk. To his daughter he wrote: "I have got accustomed to this solitude here; there is no one to say a word to. Slovtsov is the only intelligent and sometimes witty man here, but he is ailing and getting old. He is a dying ember, which only rarely blazes up." [22] Speransky in 1820 obviously underestimated the potential that Slovtsov still possessed. A whole decade later Slovtsov settled down to work for thirteen years on his most significant work, one which influenced Siberian intellectuals, regionalists, and historians more than any one other single publication for almost a half century.

With little scholarly intercourse, without decent libraries on hand, and with few competent predecessors in the field, Slovtsov labored from 1829 to 1842 on his two-volume Historical Survey of Siberia. Besides tapping his own comprehensive knowledge of Siberia, he relied upon such published and manuscript sources as the 18th-century studies of J. E. Fischer and G. I. Mueller, and the early 19th-century works of G. I. Spassky and N. Semivsky. He also made use of the documentary collections from archeological expeditions and local archives, the Complete Collection of Laws of

---

21 Quoted in Kalashnikov, "Zapiski irkutskago zhitelia," (September 1905), p. 642. Kalashnikov lists and discusses his prose works (p. 641), as does K. M., "Slovtsov," p. 21.

22 Letter dated June 9, 1820 at Irkutsk, "Pis'ma Speranskago," p. 1760.

the Russian Empire (first published in 1830), various Siberian chronicles (published by Spassky), and travelogues — both Russian and foreign. Just before his death Slovtsov justified writing his history to Kalashnikov: "I do not seek rewards for works; I only wish to be useful to the Siberian reading public." [23]

Of Slovtsov's undertaking, his former protégé and, indeed, part-time collaborator, Nikolai Abramov, wrote:

> It was not profit, but only the selfless feeling of duty toward the fatherland and love toward his homeland that roused Pyotr Andreevich to undertake such a difficult work at his advanced age. Born in Siberia, having spent many years there, and having traveled from the Urals to Kamchatka, he intimately knew many particulars about this country. He could penetrate more deeply and faithfully than others into many circumstances and could gather information for an exact geographical description of it. The seventy-year old author was a sight to behold, sitting bent over piles of books and manuscripts, and often at night by firelight. His exemplary diligence and patience was amazing. He put all his intelligence to work in his history of his native land and tried as much as possible to present a historical survey of it with a master's firm hand, for /writing/ a history of Siberia was a necessity for his soul. [24]

On occasion it took six months or longer just to obtain books from St. Petersburg. Understandably, Slovtsov often scolded himself for having undertaken such an immense task.

The first volume, over 500 pages in length, was published in Tobolsk in 1838, when Slovtsov was seventy-one years of age. It covered Siberian history from Yermak's conquest (1585) to 1742 and was dedicated to the historian Mueller. The second volume, published posthumously in St.

---

23 Letter of February 23, 1843; quoted in Kalashnikov, "Zapiski irkutskago zhitelia," (September 1905), p. 638.

24 Quoted in K. M., "Slovtsov," p. 22. Abramov became Slovtsov's most helpful assistant in compiling the work, providing, among other things, translations from Mongol and Tatar manuscripts (Golodnikov, "K biografii Slovtsova," p. 430 n.).

Petersburg in 1844, extended from 1742 to 1823 (through Speransky's reforms) and was dedicated to Speransky. Slovtsov's labors on this trail-blazing work were a tribute to his love of his homeland and his recognition of Siberia's unique past and present, as separate from Russia's. Of all the exiles in the 19th century who contemplated or discussed Siberia's future, Slovtsov probably regarded Siberia the most seriously and cared most sincerely about its destiny. Then again, he was the most prominent Siberian-born exile banished to Siberia in the 19th century.

In the preface to the first volume of his history Slovtsov stated his intention to "revive in the memory of Siberians" the institutions that "quickened or retarded the manifestations of vital forces, and most of all to represent private and social life." All of this he considered to be for him a "call heard out from under the ruins of 250 years."

> Answering this call and taking the joys and sorrows of my homeland to heart, I am perplexed by one thing alone: the history of a melancholy country, hibernating amidst motley customs and morals, with no dreams of glory nor manifestations of genius, without victories, politics and history, never viewing the Great of the world, except its great exiles, /and/ inheriting in place of ancient temples only burial mounds or illegible writing on rocks . . .

In view of all this Slovtsov asked if even the modest title of "Historical Survey" was justified. Answering affirmatively, he assured himself that the reader would find subjects worthy of consideration, especially if given the "opportunity to judge for himself just how and since when Siberia was destined to have such a slow growth." [25]

Indeed, thoughtful Siberians were to regard Slovtsov's history quite

---

25 P. A. Slovtsov, Istoricheskoe obozrienie Sibiri (A Historical Survey of Siberia), (2d ed., St. Petersburg, 1886), I: xxi.

worthy of consideration and significance. Appreciation of his pioneering efforts gradually increased as decades passed. One of the first known Siberians to express admiration for the work and recognize its significance for Siberia's future was a contemporary Siberian poet and writer, Alexandrov. [26] Kalashnikov considered Slovtsov's work "a precious gift to Siberia"; yet in the early 1860's he could still ask: "Has Siberia appreciated this gift, however? Have others valued it at its true worth? I have not had occasion to read a single detailed and substantial analysis, which this remarkable work truly deserves." Uncovering only superficial reviews in a few journals, Kalashnikov concluded that Slovtsov's work had hitherto gone almost entirely unnoticed. [27]

By the 1870's, however, due perhaps to the impact of the regional awakening among Siberians, Slovtsov's history began to affect more than just isolated individuals like Alexandrov and Kalashnikov. In 1875 Slovtsov's biographer, Golodnikov, could write: "The value of his chief work, A Historical Survey of Siberia, goes without saying; who among us Siberians has not read it?" [28] And in the 1880's Yadrintsev described the work as "an epoch in Siberian historical scholarship." Amidst Slovtsov's heavy prose Yadrintsev detected reflections of his own passionate patriotism. Hence, "Slovtsov was not a dry chronicler and historian of Siberia. From his mode of expression it is clear that here was a man with soul, a patriot to his homeland, and to a certain extent a poet and artist. . . . Pages of

---

26 Alexandrov's rather cryptic and symbolistic remarks are quoted in (Iadrintsev) "Nachalo pechati," p. 380.

27 Kalashnikov, "Zapiski irkutskago zhitelia," (September 1905), p. 623, 640.

28 Golodnikov, "K biografii Slovtsova," p. 430.

this history are full of lyrical passages, sad thoughts, and secret hopes." [29] Another regionalist critic, Potanin, on the other hand, felt that "though Slovtsov's work is not distinguished by a brilliant feeling of Siberian patriotism, this book nevertheless has aroused interest among Siberians toward their homeland." [30]

Along with the relative spate of works published on Siberia in the 1880's, a second edition of Slovtsov's history came out in 1886. Almost fifty years after the first volume had been issued, the prefatory commentator could remark:

> Owing to the mass of data conscientiously examined and to the abundance of historical, geographical, and ethnographical material included in this work, it will serve for a long time to come as a source from which information on former times can be drawn and for illuminating past periods in the life of Siberians as well as current events. [31]

In fact, even to the present day an equally comprehensive work on early Siberian history has yet to be written.

The impact that Slovtsov exerted on the cultural and intellectual awakening of Siberia was in some ways similar to Speransky's. Though both wielded considerable influence in their own time, few of their contemporaries in Siberia came close to understanding them. Though the influence of both men waned after their departure from the scene, Speransky and Slovtsov became more widely acclaimed and appreciated by the younger, more educated, and regionalistic generations of the sixties and seventies.

---

29 Iadrintsev, "Bibliografiia" (Bibliography), Literaturnyi Sbornik (St. Petersburg, 1885), p. 481; and "Sud'ba sibirskoi poezii," p. 411.

30 Potanin, Oblastnicheskaia tendentsiia, p. 2.

31 K. M., "Slovtsov," pp. 22-23. For a survey of Siberian historiography between the first and second editions of Slovtsov's work, see V. Semevskii, "Istoricheskoe obozrienie Sibiri P. A. Slovtsova," Sibirskii Sbornik, (1886) bk. 3, pp. 159-66.

While Speransky became a kind of administrative ideal whom Siberians could look back upon nostalgically, Slovtsov came to serve as a literary, scholarly, and patriotic model, and his history a standard reference work. Such leading regionalist historians as Yadrintsev and Vagin drew heavily from his work, while Potanin considered Slovtsov the "first Siberian patriot" and his history a "patriotic feat." [32]

In several concrete respects Slovtsov was a man ahead of his time. The idea of a Siberian university, which he advocated, began to gain acceptance with the Siberian public only in the mid-1860's, was officially approved in the 1870's, and was opened only in 1888. Siberia's secondary school system, which he strove to improve, did not experience any substantial increase in number of schools again until the late 1850's. In scholarship Slovtsov's history remained an isolated phenomenon until the solid regional studies of Shchapov, Vagin, Shashkov, and Yadrintsev began to appear in the 1870's and 1880's. As for his overall significance, Potanin wrote in 1876, "Slovtsov was the first alarm clock of intellectual life in Siberia." He left behind him a "group of pupils who more or less passed along the love" which he felt for Siberia. [33]

Thus, Slovtsov's contributions to Siberia's regional awakening began to bear fruit from the 1870's on (as far as can be determined). Nevertheless, his achievements constituted only the first of several new impulses stirring in Siberia during the reign of Nicholas I. During the 1830's, 40's, and 50's Slovtsov was followed by a much larger influx of educated

---

32 Potanin, Oblastnicheskaia tendentsiia, p. 1.
33 Avesov (i.e. Potanin), in Sibir', (1876) no. 5; quoted in Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 178.

exiles. Among the most influential of these exile groups were the Decembrists, who helped set new currents into motion that reinforced the previous impetus toward enlightenment in Siberia that Speransky and Slovtsov provided.

* * *

The Decembrists in Siberia: Their Impact and Legacy

On December 14, 1825 an uprising broke out in St. Petersburg among several of the guards regiments. They refused to pledge allegiance to the new Tsar Nicholas I. The insurrectionists, subsequently known as Decembrists, were for the most part well educated officers from the upper echelons of the gentry class. All of them sought a change toward some form of constitutional government for Russia. This army revolt, crushed immediately in the capital and later in the south of Russia, resulted in the trial of 121 Decembrists (at which Speransky was one of the judges). Five af the chief leaders were hanged in St. Petersburg, among them Pavel.II Pestel, son of the former governor-general of Siberia. One-hundred seven of the accused were sentenced to Siberian exile for life. Classified as "state criminals," many of these men of aristocratic and gentry origin were condemned to hard labor (katorga) and all of them at some time or another to compulsory penal settlement (poselenie) in Siberia. [34]

Thus the years following the abortive uprising of 1825 witnessed the forced implantation of an intellectual elite into Siberia. Prior to this,

---

34 For a full list of the Decembrist exiles to Siberia, their length of stay, and their initial year in "settlement," see Jeanne Haskett, "Decembrists in Siberian Exile," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1962), pp. 167-77.

very few of those in Russia's educated elite had lived beyond the Urals, and many educated Siberians had sought to go westward to the capitals and stay there. Now, with the arrival of Decembrists in Siberia from 1826 on, the flower of Russia's youth and intelligence was banished to the east for as long as thirty years. Indeed, only a handful of them (such as Steingel, Zavalishin, and Batenkov — who arrived only in 1846) had any previous, first-hand knowledge of the region which was to accommodate them for so long. For Siberians the presence of these highly-cultured Decembrists in their midst (at least those who survived and were active) had a profound impact on their country. In the words of a Soviet scholar, "the influence of Decembrists on Siberian society constituted an entire epoch in the life and education of Siberian society." [35] For the most part, this "epoch" formally terminated in 1856, when the newly crowned emperor, Alexander II issued an amnesty pardoning the Decembrists. Most of the thirty-four still alive in Siberia chose to return with their families to European Russia.

During their exile a considerable number of Decembrists kept their minds active, studied, wrote, discussed and argued among themselves, keeping abreast (when possible) of developments in Russia and Europe by correspondence (often, though not always censored) with friends or relatives back home. Such activities, however, only indirectly concerned the degree that Decembrists influenced their surrounding social milieu. Their contributions to agricultural, medical, and mechanical improvements in Siberia were indeed substantial. Nevertheless, it was in the realm of education, culture, and ideas that their impact was greatest. Decembrists helped

---

35 B. Kubalov, "Sibirskoe obshchestvo i dekabristy," p. 148.

rouse Siberian society by establishing schools, influencing local educators, and teaching a variety of subjects from basic reading and writing to advanced trigonometry and chemistry. Moreover, they helped orient, or reorient, the minds and attitudes of many Siberians, influencing their intellectual, moral, social, and even political values.

It is much more difficult to determine the extent of the cultural and intellectual influence of Decembrist exiles than merely to describe their activities. To this effect, Maximov, who visited Decembrists in Siberia, comments: "There is perhaps nothing more difficult than tracing in all spheres and presenting graphically the wholesome influence which the so-called Decembrists had upon Siberia; but that it existed and inevitably had to occur is beyond all question." [36] Moreover, it is safe to conclude that the Decembrists, through their talents, numbers, and the circumstances in which they found themselves, rendered a more effective service for Siberian society than any other group or type of exiles in the 19th century. They spoke the same language as Siberians, yet represented an educated Russian elite, arising from the gentry class and, as noblesse oblige, dedicated to helping their fellow man. By and large they were neither idealistic intellectuals who languished in captivity nor incorrigible activists thirsting to rebel, gain their freedom, or to move "history." Though much a part of the Romantic, post-Napoleonic era, they were also heirs of many ideals of the Enlightenment, with their emphasis on reason, moderation, and gradual progress through education. During their long stay in Siberia many of them grew more attached to their new "adopted" homeland than did most later

---

36 S. V. Maksimov, Sibir' i katorga (Siberia and Hard Labor), pt. 3 (Politicheskie i gosudarstvennye prestupniki), (4th ed., St. Petersburg, 1900?), p. 329. The first edition appeared in 1871.

exiles, who stayed for shorter periods of time, were generally more Russia-oriented, and whose influence on Siberia was usually more ephemeral. [37]

The Decembrists arrived in this vast, remote region largely unknown to them with no preconceived ideas in mind of promoting the enlightenment of the local population. Not only had they been sentenced to hard labor for ten years or more (at least the great majority of them), but most of them had little idea of what the inhabitants and the country were really like. Basargin, for instance, reflected a common initial reaction; "the farther we moved on in Siberia," he related, "the more it gained in my estimation." He was especially impressed by the qualities of the common people. [38] As most Decembrists knew they were coming as permanent residents (and resigned themselves somewhat to this fact), they often attempted to make themselves a part of Siberian society. In this way they participated in the country's development more as local inhabitants of just a different sort, rather than as Russian aristocrats or as alien or temporary exiles.

One Decembrist, Dmitry Zavalishin, later reminisced:

> We were the first to appear in Siberia as people of a higher class that was fully accessible and, in addition, had rules totally opposite to those which the people were used to seeing in their superiors; they saw sympathy and the performance of good, instead of coercion and extortion. For this reason no one ever hid a thing from us; and Russians, natives, old settlers, colonists, Cossacks, and Old Believers all revealed to us what they never would have revealed to the government. [39]

---

37 Apropos of this, see the comments of the former exile, I. I. Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe: Vospominaniia za 50 let (My Past Experiences: Fifty Years of Recollections), (Leningrad, 1924), II; 45.

38 N. V. Basargin, Zapiski Basargina (Basargin's Notes), (Moscow, 1872), p. 66. See Basargin's further remarks on pp. 3-4, above.

39 Quoted in M. Azadovskii et al., eds., Sibir' i dekabristy (Irkutsk, 1925), p. 96. The article is Azadovskii's, "Stranichki kraevedcheskoi deiatel'nosti dekabristov v Sibiri" (Pages from the Local Study and Activity of Decembrists in Siberia).

Moreover, the Decembrists arrived at a time when Speransky's and Slovtsov's activities were just beginning to rouse Siberia from its age-long slumber and low level of education, morals, and aspirations. That this overall situation was changing significantly by the time of the amnesty of 1856 can be attributed in part to Decembrist influence. They helped ignite sparks of cultural life and a thirst for schools, newspapers, books, theatres, and intelligent discussion that could not easily be extinguished. By the mid-fifties, moreover, various educated and dedicated Siberians began to fill the shoes left by some of the Decembrists, taking over from them the task of educating and awakening the local population.

Decembrist exiles engaged in three chief types of cultural activities that affected the local populace: simple tutoring — most frequently in Russian or foreign languages, but also in crafts or sciences; the establishment of schools attended by children, teenagers, and even adults; and the more elaborate and sophisticated social events involving Decembrists and their families in the larger Siberian towns, and especially Irkutsk. In contrast to "cultural" influences, "intellectual" influences took hold whenever Decembrists through teaching or through example inspired individual Siberians to the point of striving to attain a fair degree of intellectual achievement. With few exceptions, most of these cultural and intellectual activities occurred during the years 1840-56. Moreover, not more than perhaps a dozen Decembrists were pre-eminent in these activities.

While in exile most Decembrists experienced three different types of confinement, which can be roughly delineated chronologically. At first, the majority of Decembrists, who arrived in Siberia in 1826-27, was taken to Chita in Transbaikalia to engage in hard labor (katorga), often in

mines; here they had little or no contact with the local population. In 1830 they were transferred 200 miles to the east to Petrovsky Zavod (Petrov Factory), a hard-labor, prison camp built especially for them. It was here that the first Decembrist school was gradually established, which drew schoolboys from the surrounding area.

By 1839 the majority of Decembrists had completed their term of forced labor and were sent to a second type of confinement, called "settlement" (poselenie), which involved relocation in villages or small towns anywhere between Tobolsk in Western Siberia and Yakutsk in Eastern Siberia. The period of settlement, lasting from the 1830's to 1856 (for most Decembrists), witnessed the greatest interaction with the local population — both Sibiryak and native. During these fifteen to twenty years, a number of Decembrists began giving private lessons, building or maintaining schools, and influencing local authorities, both favorably and unfavorably, with their educational ideas. In this respect, the Decembrists who perhaps distinguished themselves most were Ivan Yakushkin, Alexandr Poggio, Dmitry Zavalishin, Alexei Yushnevsky, Pyotr Svistunov, and V. F. Raevsky. In settlement, Decembrists were expected to sustain themselves by farming, and many of those unable to eke out a living in this way alone turned to tutoring whenever possible.

A third type of confinement developed in the late 1840's when a small group of Decembrists and their families transferred residence to Irkutsk. Owing to the indulgence of the perspicacious governor-general of Eastern Siberia, Nikolai N. Muravyov, who arrived at his post in 1848, many Decembrists living in surrounding villages were permitted to move to town. Not only did Muravyov receive them well, but also a number of younger Siberians

proved especially receptive to the cultural endeavors and social ideas of these exiles. A fourth type of residence in Siberia followed after the amnesty of 1856 for the few Decembrists who chose to remain. Several of these Decembrists became prominent at this time in political and journalistic activities.

Just after the Decembrists had left for Siberia, the poet Alexander Pushkin wrote to them in 1827:

> Ir Siberia's deep, dark mines,
> Hold on to your proud patience,
> Your doleful toil shall not go wasted,
> Nor shall your high and striving thoughts. [40]

Indeed, even while in the mines of Transbaikalia, Decembrists began to carry out modest aspirations and ideas, and their "toil" began to bear small fruit. During the period of hard labor (roughly 1827 to 1839), Decembrists first began to exert a degree of cultural influence on Siberians in the Chita and Petrovsky Zavod areas. At the latter place a few Decembrists sought to engage in rudimentary teaching activities and ingeniously requested that a children's choir be formed to sing in the prison church. Pyotr N. Svistunov and N. A. Kryukov proposed to lead the choir. After the commandant granted this, it then became necessary to instruct the children in reading words to the music. In this way a reading class was initiated, taught by the brothers Alexandr and Nikolai Bestuzhev. From these modest beginnings a few Decembrists developed a school where the children from local families — of impoverished exiles to well-off officials — could get a decent education according to their needs. Before

---

40 The Russian text of this four-stanza "Epistle into Siberia," along with a rather literal translation into English, can be found in J. Fennell, ed., Pushkin (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1964), pp. 34-35.

long, subjects from simple, elementary reading to Greek and Latin, and such vocational skills as tailoring, joinery, metalworking, and bootmaking were taught.[41]

A subsequent blacksmith, who was taught reading and handicrafts at Petrovsky Zavod, wrote Zavalishin many years later, thanking him for the useful knowledge obtained which enabled him, in turn, to educate his own children. He added that the example set by Decembrists who refused to disdain "any craft or physical work affected people most of all, so as to ennoble in their eyes the work which they were used to viewing only as a heavy and dreary burden."[42] Another indication of the high level of the school was the fact that in the advanced schools of Russia prejudices existed then against pupils from Transbaikalia, mainly due to their insufficient preparation. However, when a pupil from the prison school for the first time appeared for advanced entrance examinations in St. Petersburg, "he so surprised the examiners by both the extent and clarity of his knowledge, that they were curious to learn where and by whom he could have been so prepared."[43]

When the Decembrists left Petrovsky Zavod in 1839, one of them, I. I. Gorbachevsky, stayed on to run the school. The others meanwhile settled in small towns or villages, many of which were inhabited largely by non-Russian natives. They were allowed 15 desiatiny of land apiece (about 40 acres), and most of them took up farming to survive. To help make ends

---

41 Maksimov, Sibir' i katorga, pt. 3, pp. 330-31; and Kubalov, "Sibirskoe obshchestvo," pp. 150-51.
42 Quoted in Maksimov, op. cit., pt. 3, p. 332.
43 Ibid., p. 331.

meet, however, many resorted to tutoring local children to read and write, which brought in supplementary earnings. Thus, Maximov writes that "in this way, state criminals brought to the region an unquestionable and immense service, raising the level of Siberian education significantly higher than that which existed in Russia."[44] Whatever his yardsticks for comparison, this generalization most likely holds water only with respect to education among the common people, and a minority of them at that.

During the period of settlement, the impact of Decembrists in villages was generally felt either through basic educational work or through introduction of advanced methods of agriculture. In the towns, where the cultural level was usually higher, Decembrist influence could often be correspondingly greater. When forced to reside in such larger towns as Tobolsk, Berezov, Yalutorovsk, Krasnoyarsk, and Chita, they even formed social "circles." Moreover, in both towns and villages they also exerted a kind of moral influence, often defending local inhabitants from abuses perpetrated by officials. Some of them gained influence even through positions that they obtained in the local administration.[45]

Generally speaking, the Decembrists most active in cultural activities were concentrated in two areas of Siberia: around Tobolsk and around Irkutsk. In contrasting their activities in these two parts of the country, Maximov concludes that

> Eastern Siberia in this and other respects was much more fortunate than Western Siberia through the accidental settlement there of more talented and capable

---

44 Ibid., p. 315. Cf. Vagin's remark regarding the high quality of education in Irkutsk at least on p. 35, above.

45 Anatole Mazour, The First Russian Revolution, 1825 (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1965), p. 247; Kubalov, "Sibirskoe obshchestvo," pp. 168-70; and Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 50.

> people. At a time when in Western Siberia the majority /of exiles/ were forced to resort to the assistance of merchants and to procure some means of living by becoming their agents and clerks, in Eastern Siberia the activity of Decembrists took on more diverse and practical forms. [46]

In addition, of course, the relaxation of restrictions and the favors of Governor-General Muravyov helped spur the greater influence of Decembrists in the east. Though a larger number of them were in fact relocated in the eastern half (with perhaps a correspondingly greater amount of talent), Western Siberia had the good fortune of receiving perhaps the most well-known and ingenious Decembrist educator, Ivan D. Yakushkin (1793-1857).

Yakushkin's activities in Yalutorovsk, not far south of Tobolsk, influenced not only local Siberian schoolchildren, teachers, and civil authorities, but also other Decembrists who established schools in the area. Employing the Lancaster method of mutual instruction, whereby both teacher and pupil learn from and teach each other, Yakushkin's first school (for boys), built in 1842, was so successful that in 1846 he opened a second school (for girls), which also made rapid progress. The girls' school was the first public, elementary school of its kind in Western Siberia. [47] By one account, between the years 1842-56, as many as 594 boys were accepted into the one school, with 531 completing the course of instruction; in the girls' school, 192 pupils out of 240 finished their studies between 1846 and 1856. [48] According to other figures, roughly 1600 boys attended school in fourteen years. [49]

---

46 Maksimov, Sibir' i katorga, pt. 3, pp. 315-16.

47 Firsov, Chteniia, pt. 2, p. 63 n. Girls' schools had been founded in Irkutsk in 1838 and 1845. For a general discussion in English on the two Yalutorovsk schools, see Haskett, "Decembrists in Siberia," pp. 124-33.

48 S. Ia. Shtraikh, ed., Zapiski, stat'i, pis'ma dekabrista I. D. Iakushkina (Notes, Articles, and Letters of the Decembrist Yakushkin), (Moscow, 1951), p. 664.

49 Maksimov, Sibir' i katorga, pt. 3, p. 315.

The first of Yakushkin's schools could not have been established without local help. Two dedicated Siberians, the young archpriest Stepan Znamensky and the merchant I. P. Medvedev, were instrumental in this. The former first suggested the idea of a school to Yakushkin and was able to get ecclesiastical permission to locate it on church grounds; the latter contributed funds for constructing the building. Indeed, Znamensky became Yakushkin's chief partner and, after the Decembrist's departure in 1856, became solely in charge of the school. Despite local support, Yakushkin ran into the opposition of local authorities and the supervisors of the Yalutorovsk school district, Lukin and Abramov (Slovtsov's friend). They disliked the idea of an experimental school run by a "state criminal" and at first tried to hamper Yakushkin's efforts. Other local educators, including the aged Slovtsov, praised the institution, and their influence eventually persuaded supervisors and officials to re-evaluate their views.

Yakushkin's boys' school became popular among the poorer townspeople, and even peasants in the surrounding area "gladly gave up their children" to the school. Here they could be taught, "along with handicrafts and primary education," some moral principles too. [50] As a result of the vocational instruction in various crafts, numerous articles made at the schools were sold, bringing needed income to both the school and the children's families. By 1848 local merchants and townspeople had decided to contribute for the school's use an annual sum of 200 silver rubles, out of which the older teachers received up to 70 rubles in pay per year. [51]

---

50 N. V. Basargin, "Neizdannaia rukopis'" (Unpublished Manuscript), in Shtraikh, ed., Zapiski Iakushkina, p. 484.

51 E. P. Obolenskii, "Vospominaniia o I. D. Iakushkine" (Recollections of Yakushkin), in Shtraikh, op. cit., p. 490.

Yakushkin's successful example influenced highly-placed local authorities elsewhere. In Tobolsk and Omsk, for example, girls' schools promoted by Svistunov and Znamensky were subsequently authorized.

Academic subjects taught in the Yalutorovsk schools were reading, writing, arithmetic, Russian and sacred history, geography, geometry, mechanics, and — to prepare boys for seminary — Greek and Latin. After pupils had studied at least three years at school they might be chosen to instruct the less advanced pupils. In this way Yakushkin and Znamensky kept expenses down and prepared not only a large group of literate and fairly knowledgeable graduates, but also a number of potential teachers, who on leaving the school could transmit their learning and training elsewhere. Yakushkin also retrained other teachers and advanced students. Probably the prominent subsequently among the pupils was Znamensky's own son, Mikhail Stepanovich (1833-92). Young Znamensky in time became a noted caricaturist in the Spark, a popular Petersburg journal of the early 60's. A later novel of his, published in 1872 as The Land of Exile and the People Who Disappeared, described by means of pseudonyms the life and activities of Yakushkin and other Decembrists in Yalutorovsk. [52]

The Decembrists in Western Siberia most influenced by Yakushkin and his schools were Ivan I. Pushchin and Pyotr N. Svistunov. Pushchin had formerly been a schoolmate of Alexander Pushkin and subsequently made a point of popularizing the poet's verses among Siberians at Chita and Petrovsky Zavod. During the years 1843-56 he lived in Yalutorovsk, where he

---

52 M. S. Znamenskii, Strana izgnaniia i ischeznuvshie liudi (St. Petersburg, 1872); also see Znamenskii's biographical sketch, "Ivan Dmitrievich Iakushkin," Sibirskii Sbornik, (1886) bk. 3, pp. 86-105. About the man himself see B. Zherebtsov, ed., Staraia Sibir', p. 57.

not only aided Yakushkin with his schools, but also taught local children in his home and petitioned for improvement of teaching conditions in various nearby localities. [53] Svistunov helped set up a girls' school in Tobolsk. Yakushkin himself, after a visit, described this school and its pupils with candor:

> They are generally instructed very well in handicrafts; in the reading class there is nothing special; the girls, having already entered somewhat literate, read tolerably well and even understand what they read; their handwriting in exercise books looks like calligraphy . . . The intended procedure is a pure jumble, but despite all this, I was gladdened by seeing before me more than a hundred poor girls, who still comprehend somehow and study something suitable for themselves. [54]

In Eastern Siberia one of the most prominent Decembrists in the realm of education was Dmitry I. Zavalishin (1804-92), settled at Chita. Here Zavalishin established a school where the children of officials, peasants, and natives were taught such subjects as geometry, trigonometry, mechanics, physics, chemistry, and foreign and ancient languages (at which Zavalishin excelled). His pupils often placed first in the Irkutsk military school and in the girls' institute. [55]

It was in Eastern Siberia where probably the most famous pupil of Decembrist exiles, Nikolai A. Belogolovy (1834-95), was educated. Subsequently a prominent doctor in St. Petersburg, Moscow, and Western Europe, Belogolovy became physician to the writers Nekrasov and Turgenev, friend of Herzen and Saltykov-Shchedrin, and close colleague of another well-known

---

53 I. I. Pushchin, Zapiski o Pushkine, pis'ma (Notes on Pushkin and Letters), ed. by S. Ia. Shtraikh, (Moscow, 1956), p. 33.

54 Letter of I. D. Iakushkin to S. Ia. Znamenskii, dated January 22, 1854, in Zapiski Iakushkina, p. 372.

55 Maksimov, Sibir' i katorga, pt. 3, p. 333.

physician, S. P. Botkin. Belogolovy was the son of an Irkutsk merchant — in fact, one who on business trips to Russia often carried letters of Decembrists, thereby evading the censors. In 1842 the elder Belogolovy entrusted his two sons, Nikolai and Andrei, to Alexei P. Yushnevsky for an education. Yushnevsky, settled in the village of Malaya Razvodnaya, three miles from Irkutsk, was for Belogolovy an excellent teacher — "far from ordinary," as he later put it. [56]

After Yushnevsky died of a sudden stroke in 1844, the education of the Belogolovy brothers was directed by Alexandr V. Poggio (1797-1873), a Decembrist of Italian origin and strongly influenced by Enlightenment ideals. In the tiny village of Ust Kuda, Poggio in two years' time left such a stamp of young Nikolai's mind that the boy became a lifelong devotee of his mentor, Poggio. [57] In 1846, however, Belogolovy was transferred to a secondary school in Moscow, and he went on to complete his medical schooling in European Russia. Nevertheless, he was one of the first well-educated Siberians to return home for any length of time, as he came back to Irkutsk in 1855, where he practiced medicine for several years. Here Belogolovy renewed his ties with Poggio, who had since moved to Irkutsk and stayed on after the amnesty.

For some time Poggio had been active in Irkutsk society. Of Poggio and a fellow exile in Irkutsk, P. A. Mukhanov, one contemporary remarked that "by their enlightened minds, their affability in manner, and their elaboration of views on conditions of Siberian life, they fascinated us

---

56 N. A. Bielogolovyi, "Iz vospominanii sibiriaka o dekabristakh" (From a Siberian's Recollections of the Decembrists), Vospominaniia i drugiia stat'i (4th ed., St. Petersburg, 1901), pp. 1-4, 19; and "Iushnevskii, A. P.," Russkii biograficheskii slovar', vol. 24, p. 365.

57 Franco Venturi, Il moto decabrista e i fratelli Poggio (Turin: Einaudi, 1956), p. 150; and Bielogolovyi, "Iz vospominanii," pp. 20-22. See too V. Krylov, "Pamiati N. A. Bielogolovago" (Memories of Belogolovy), Istoricheskii Viestnik, (1896) vol. 62, p. 574.

more than all the others with their conversations." [58] It was at such a point as this that Poggio and other Decembrists began to exert an intellectual influence on Siberian society.

In Western Siberia the social life of Decembrist exiles was not as intense as it came to be in Eastern Siberia, namely in Irkutsk. In such towns as Yalutorovsk and Tobolsk Decembrists soon constituted part of the best society and had some degree of influence on young men eager for knowledge and intellectual advancement. For instance, K. M. Golodnikov, then a young teacher and subsequently Slovtsov's biographer, recalled the mixing of Decembrists with local society in Yalutorovsk. Getting together frequently at the home of Matvei Muravyov-Apostol (former leader of the Decembrist revolt in the south),

> they dined and stayed all evening, occupied with cards, reading, and music. . . . Only rarely did the conversation here revolve around the events of December 14 . . . although perhaps this care was observed only in the presence of us young people. . . . I can say positively that from these honorable people we heard nothing that might be inclined toward a condemnation of the existing government, and they behaved irreproachably, doing good works in society around them . . .

Muravyov-Apostol, for example, taught Golodnikov to read French fluently in one year's time. [59]

In Tobolsk the Decembrists Svistunov, Annenkov, and Steingel were frequent visitors at the home of Mikhail Ya. Yadrintsev, father of the subsequently famous regionalist, Nikolai Mikhailovich Yadrintsev. During the years 1843-47 the Yadrintsev family lived in Tobolsk, and Baron Vladimir I.

---

58 B. V. Struve, "Vospominaniia o Sibiri" (Recollections of Siberia), Russkii Viestnik, (April 1888) IV: 170.

59 K. M. Golodnikov, "Gosudarstvennye i politicheskie prestupniki v Ialutorovskie i Kurganie (otryvok iz vospominanii)" (State and Political Criminals in Yalutorovsk and Kurgan: An Except from Memoirs), Istoricheskii Viestnik, (December 1888) 34: 757.

Steingel was then on especially close terms with the elder Yadrintsev. According to Nikolai Yadrintsev, "he continued to correspond with my father, and after my father's death many of Steingel's letters remained with me, in which I remember only the description of the baron's family affairs, his worries /etc./ . . ." [60] This was evidently the closest direct link between any single Decembrist and the most eminent regionalist of the late 19th century. Steingel himself had worked in Siberia before the 1825 uprising, knew the country well, and during exile wrote several articles on Siberia. [61]

In Irkutsk the pace-setters in local social affairs became the Volkonsky and Trubetskoy families. In 1844 Princess Maria Volkonskaya, living with her husband, the exiled Sergei Volkonsky, and two children in the village of Urik, requested permission to transfer residence to Irkutsk, so that her son Mikhail could study at the secondary school. Count Orlov, head of the Third Section (which was in charge of exiles), granted permission, and the princess settled in Irkutsk with her children. Though her husband often came to town, he remained more absorbed in his agrarian, village life at Urik in somewhat Tolstoyan fashion. With the arrival of the new governor-general, N. N. Muravyov, in 1848, other exiles living in the environs of Irkutsk also received permission to move into town. According to Princess Volkonskaya, Muravyov "received us just as blamelessly as did his worthy and good wife." [62] The arrival of both Muravyov and a

---

60 Quoted in M. K. Lemke, Nikolai Mikhailovich Iadrintsev (St. Petersburg, 1904), p. 5. Young Yadrintsev was not yet five years old when his family left Tobolsk.

61 Perhaps the best known of these works is Shteingel', "Sibirskie satrapy, 1765-1819" (Siberian Satraps, 1765-1819), Istoricheskii Vistnik, (August 1884) 17: 366-86.

62 Maria Volkonskaia, Zapiski Knigini M. N. Volkonskoi (Notes of Princess Volkonskaya), (Chita, 1960), p. 112.

number of Decembrists in Irkutsk about the same time contributed significantly to the town's emergence as the undisputed cultural center of Siberia in the 1850's.

Thus the Trubetskoy family, Poggio, Mukhanov, and other Decembrists followed Princess Volkonskaya and settled in Irkutsk. The Trubetskoys were interested in sending their daughters to the girls' secondary school just opened in 1845. Other Decembrists in the vicinity, such as V. F. Raevsky, who had established a school for native children at Olonki, 45 miles from Irkutsk, came into town when possible. Even those settled in Western Siberia, such as Pushchin (in 1849) and Yakushkin (in 1854), were allowed to travel as far east as Irkutsk to visit friends.

Governor-General Muravyov considerably relaxed the restrictions placed on Decembrists and often sought their company. After all, they alone in Irkutsk were by birth his social peers or even superiors. Moreover, he viewed their exile as only "correctional" and not for life, and by now he considered them to have been rehabilitated. He also eased the antagonism that local officials had built up toward these "state criminals," and they were now for the most part anxious to imitate the example set by their new superior.[63] As one Siberian official said of Muravyov:

> He let us look upon them as upon members enjoying equal rights in local society, in the midst of which they turned to us quite freely, on a level with other more enlightened townspeople. In the homes of the former princes and present exiles Sergei Grigorevich Volkonsky and Sergei Petrovich Trubetskoy, all the most enlightened society of this provincial capital gathered together.[64]

---

63 On Muravyov's relations with Decembrists, see Joseph Sullivan, "Count N. N. Muraviev-Amursky" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard, 1955), pp. 272-83.

64 Struve, "Vospominaniia o Sibiri," p. 169.

According to Volkonsky's grandson, Muravyov "promoted them at once, and if not in a civil sense, then in a social sense he placed them in a position which belonged to them by virtue of the high quality of their education and breeding. He not only received Decembrists at his home, but paid them visits." [65]

The home of Maria Volkonskaya thus became the "chief center of Irkutsk's social life" — intense, worldly, and relatively brilliant. [66] The princess, still in her early forties, was anxious to regain the aristocratic style of life she had been forced to give up in order to join her husband in exile. Belogolovy, well acquainted with the Volkonsky and Trubetskoy families, recalled their position and influence in Irkutsk society in his memoirs.

> During winter, life at the Volkonsky home was bustling and open, and everyone belonging to Irkutsk society considered it an honor to visit there . . . except for this home and the Trubetskoys', Irkutsk life was then unable to provide much in the way of entertaining worldly youths, and at Volkonskys' there were balls, masquerades, and all kinds of winter entertainments. . . . visiting this worldly, aristocratic home could not but influence us for the better, gradually polishing our morals and manners, which left much to be desired, owing to the backwoods conditions of provincial life at that time. [67]

Maria Volkonskaya in the winteroof 1845 organized a small private theatre, the first of its kind in Irkutsk. With her children and the Belogolovy boys as actors, productions were given to the public and served to develop

---

65 Sergei M. Volkonskii, O dekabristakh (po semeinym vospominaniiam) (The Decembrists, According to Family Reminiscences), (Petrograd, 1922), p. 85.

66 Bielogolovyi, "Iz vospominanii," p. 36.

67 Ibid., pp. 36-37. See too, H. I., ed., "Une élite en exil: les Décembristes: mémoires du docteur Belogolowy," La Revue de Paris, (June 1918), pt. 3, pp. 628-29.

a taste for drama and the need for a more permanent stage in town.

In Irkutsk the general political and social ideas of Decembrists were discussed, understood, and favorably received by a number of Siberians. These ideas included at least the concepts of a constitutional government, a federative, decentralized Russian state, and the abolition of serfdom. During the last few years of exile a chief topic of discussion among Decembrists and Siberians became the Crimean War. Even socialistic ideas, reflecting the influence (among other things) of Pestel's radical constitutional plan, "The Russian Truth," were popular among some exiles. Not only in Irkutsk, but also among the educated merchants of Kyakhta (where no Decembrist exiles were settled) did these exiles "arouse an interest in politics and social problems at a time when all of Russia was sunk in deep slumber." [68] If nothing else, this points to the impact of Decembrists on a town where they were not even living. All in all, however it was probably Decembrist ideas of a federative Russian state and their activities in Siberia after the amnesty of 1856 that contributed most tangibly to the growth of regional consciousness in Siberia.

Perhaps the most vigorous and uncompromising disseminator of revolutionary, anti-government ideas among Decembrists was Mikhail S. Lunin. His letters to his sister (the wife of Count S. S. Uvarov) were actually sharply-worded political pamphlets designed for propaganda purposes and attacking the autocracy and serfdom. His letters were copied and widely read by townspeople in both Russia and Siberia. Hence he could well write:

---

68 Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II: 40. Such Kyakhta merchants as Basnin, Botkin, and Igumnov were in frequent communication with the Decembrists Gorbachevsky, Zavalishin, Torson, and the Bestuzhev brothers, all settled nearby.

"The publicity which my letters enjoy through the numerous copies made of them is turning them into a political weapon, which I must use in the defense of freedom." [69] In his active, overt and unceasing opposition to the regime, Lunin more resembled many Polish exiles (he too was a staunch Roman Catholic) than his fellow Decembrists. For his militant efforts, he was arrested in 1841 and was transferred from the village of Urik to a desolate hamlet on the Chinese border where he died four years later.

Lunin, however, was the exception to the rule that Decembrist political activities and influence in Siberia before the amnesty were neither overt nor great. In the words of a Decembrist "pupil,"

> With inherent modesty and political maturity in all of them, they did not draw their pupils or interlocutors into political innovations, did not inflame passions, call for barricades, nor advocate insurrections and conspiracies. . . . They relied only on the fact that enlightenment would spread slowly but surely among the masses and that self-consciousness and civic maturity would emerge by themselves, and along with this would come a progressive movement. [70]

Without newspapers, printing presses, or rapid means of communication in Siberia at this time, public opinion could only be rather local and undeveloped, and Decembrist views consequently made their biggest impact by means of the small, separate social circles in the urban centers of the region.

Decembrists also gave an impetus to the study of Siberia, a later hallmark of the regionalist movement and a development already taken up by Spassky and Slovtsov. Some of the exiles undertook scholarly investi-

---

69 Quoted in Kubalov, "Sibirskoe obshchestvo," p. 166. On Lunin's activities also see Mazour, First Russian Revolution, p. 238; and Shtraikh, ed., Zapiski Iakushkina, pp. 651-53.

70 P. P. Pershin-Karaksarskii, "Vospominaniia o dekabristakh" (Recollections of Decembrists), Istoricheskii Viestnik, (1908) CXIV: 538.

gations concerning Siberian natives — their social life and customs, the administrative system and its history, the wildlife and natural resources, geological and climatic conditions, and aspects of Siberia's economy. Some assisted or even took part in the scientific expeditions of such visiting scholars as Erman, Humboldt, and Middendorff. The imprint of such scholarly activities and studies helped pave the way for similar work which Siberian regionalists and subsequent exiles later took up with such relative intensity in the last few decades of the century. [71]

After the amnesty of 1856 several Decembrists stayed on who became prominent in journalism and public affairs in Eastern Siberia. Dmitry Zavalishin, who was already influential in the Transbaikalia administration, was most noteworthy in this respect. In 1858-59 he opposed by means of searing editorials in Russian newspapers Governor-General Muravyov's policy of rapid acquisition and forcible colonization of the Amur basin. Instead he maintained the idea that Russia's North American possessions were of more vital importance (having spent time in Alaska and California in 1823 in the employ of the Russian-American Company). According to Svatikov, he "played a tremendous role in Siberia and in the history of Siberian regionalism . . . Zavalishin was one of the first to begin a struggle in the press against arbitrary rule in Siberia, by means of articles in the /Maritime/ Anthology and other organs of the press in the capital. The young Siberian regionalists of the 1860's valued his work highly." [72] Though unsuccessful in his attempt to restrain Muravyov's aggressive policies,

---

71 For brief summaries of these activities, see V. I. Nikolaev, "Sibirskaia politicheskaia ssylka i izuchenie mestnogo kraia" (Siberian Political Exile and the Study of Local Areas), Katorga i Ssylka, (1927) bk. 5, no. 34, p. 94, 95, 102, 105-06, 109; and Mazour, First Russian Revolution, p. 252, 255-56.

72 Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 27.

and forced in 1863 to leave Siberia for a "milder climate," Zavalishin openly expressed attitudes held by many in Siberia and thereby gave a considerable push in the development of public opinion. [73]

A second prominent Decembrist who stayed in Siberia after the amnesty was Mikhail Bestuzhev. He was active not only in local discussion circles, but also in the affairs of the official newspaper Kyakhta Leaflet, one of the first papers to be published in Siberia. Bestuzhev, Zavalishin, and others were unsuccessful, however, in trying to found a private newspaper with the proposed name of "Transbaikal Leaflet." [74]

Several Decembrists in their memoirs and letters prophesied a bright future for Siberia and noted similarities between this vast region and the United States; both of these factors were subsequently stressed by Siberian regionalists. For example, Baron Rosen, on leaving Siberia in 1857, gave his blessing to "a country which in time promises not to be a bugbear, nor a place and means of punishment, but a receptacle of welfare in the highest sense of the word."

> Perhaps Providence has appointed many of my fellow exiles and many Polish exiles to be founders or builders of a better future for Siberia, which besides gold, metal, stone, and material wealth will offer in time precious treasures for a properly-ordered civic life. With the acquisition of the necessary personal rights and positive laws, people will be able to preserve them with moral strength for their moral benefit. Perhaps Siberia will face in its own way the destiny of North America, where exiles also settled willy-nilly for their political and religious beliefs, and by prayer and works they have brought forth in the new world all those blessings which the old and experienced world has sought so long and vainly. Three circumstances now serve as a guarantee of

---

73 For further discussion of this, see below, pp. 171-74.

74 M. K. Azadovskii, ed., Vospominaniia Bestuzhevykh (Reminiscences of the Bestuzhevs), (Moscow-Leningrad, 1951), p. 794. The Russian titles are Kiakhtinskii Listok and "Zabaikal'skii Listok."

> Siberia's happy future: there are no privileged classes, no gentry landowners, and no serfs; and few officials are there. Moreover, the people manage well at village meetings, for the most part work on free land, and carefully fulfill all their duties to the state. [75]

These thoughts were not far removed from those of Nikolai Basargin:

> Though recently the very course of events has advanced Siberia a great deal in many branches of its public well-being and internal organization, it still remains at a low level of social life and still awaits measures and transformations that can supply what it lacks and thereby give it a chance to develop fully its own forces and internal capacities. There would then be no doubt that it would concede little to the United States of America in the rapid material and political achievements which are so amazing in this young republic . . . [76]

Another Decembrist, Ivan Pushchin, carried out the idea of Siberia's political imitation of the United States even further. As early as 1845, a time when rumors of Siberia's possible separation from Russia popped up here and there, Pushchin confided to a friend that Siberia's lack of serfs gave her one essential, radical advantage.

> This is a blessing for all Siberia, and a blessing which has an unusually beneficial influence on the region and will no doubt move her ahead of Russia. I look upon Siberia no differently than on the American States. She could separate from the mother country right now if it so required — and is rich in all the gifts of nature. [77]

Though certainly not all Decembrists looked upon Siberia and Siberian society with optimism, it is indicative that those who were optimistic saw distinct similarities with the North American example.

---

75 A. E. Rozen, Zapiski dekabrista (Notes of a Decembrist), (St. Petersburg, 1907), p. 213.

76 N. Basargin, Zapiski N. V. Basargina (Petrograd, 1917), p. 178.

77 Letter to E. A. Engel'gardt, dated February 26, 1845, in Pushchin, Zapiski o Pushkine i pis'ma (Moscow, 1927), pp. 153-54.

On the other hand, how did educated Siberians look upon Decembrist exiles and appraise their influence on society? Speaking for Siberians in general, Yefimov wrote in 1885,

> The presence of Decembrists in Siberia, as far as I know, left hardly any unpleasant recollections among us Siberians. On the contrary, they exerted a broad educational influence, which for many of us, including me, retain a sincere gratitude. We did not consider them as political figures, but as people who, in our eyes, bore for thirty years a heavy punishment calmly, with dignity, and with faith in Divine Providence.

As for the wives of Decembrists, "what concerns us Siberians is that a half-century later we remember them as living examples of all that is good, pure, and beautiful, and preserve deep and thankful memories toward these voluntary exiles." [78]

The reflections of Belogolovy, whose intellectual development was perhaps as strongly affected by Decembrist mentors as that of any other Siberian, are even more to the point.

> The Decembrists contributed to the flowering of an artistic sentiment in Siberia. The atmosphere of the Volkonsky home, at once both hospitable and glittering, created new ties in society, refining manners and stimulating a taste for culture and the spirit. In spite of the modest and discreet attitude which the exiles continued to hold during their stay in Siberia, the presence of this group of educated men among the local population did not take long in making itself felt.
>
> Their influence was exerted imperceptibly, infiltrating into the deep strata of society, without noisy fanfare coming to announce it to the world. They acted solely through their personal charm and through their fine example of integrity, enthusiasm and courage. Many souls, who dimly felt aspirations toward a higher and more noble ideal than petty daily preoccupations, welcomed the Decembrists as long-awaited leaders. . . .

---

78 I. V. Efimov, "Zametki na vospominaniia L. F. L'vova. (Dekabristy, ikh razselenie i zhizn' v Sibiri)" (Comments on L. F. Lvov's Memoirs: The Decembrists, Their Settlement, and Life in Siberia), Russkii Arkhiv, (March 1885) no. 12, p. 553, 564.

> The middle of the nineteenth century, which for the rest of Russia was heredarkest and most tyrannical epoch, experienced in Siberia a magnificent awakening of human intellect and consciousness. [79]

Along with an idealized description of Decembrists and a rather exaggerated appraisal of Siberia's awakening in mid-19th century (especially in contrast to the harsh regime of Nicholas west of the Urals), Belogolovy indeed reflects a deep and living appreciation of the Decembrist legacy — one shared by many of his contemporaries.

A modern scholar, Venturi, writes that "Siberia itself was entering a period of rapid development, of notable transformation, and of grand dreams of the future. Decembrists, with their cultural, economic, and social activities, constituted no insignificant element in the metamorphosis that was coming to pass." [80] Broadly speaking, they were following up and complementing the spade work undertaken by Speransky and Slovtsov. Their Polish contemporaries in exile also contributed to this metamorphosis.

More specifically, however, the Decembrist exiles have been called the "spiritual fathers of the future Siberian intelligentsia." [81] Thus, Decembrists helped educate and inspire a generation of Siberians who sought to know not only more of Russia and the West, but of Siberia too. These pupils in turn contributed to rousing and strengthening Siberian civic consciousness and public opinion. In this respect the well-known reply of the Decembrist poet-exile Alexandr Odoevsky to Pushkin's "Epistle" of 1827 can apply not only to Russia but to Siberia as well:

---

79 Quoted in H. I., ed., "Une élite en exil: mémoires du docteur Belogolowy," pp. 630-31.
80 F. Venturi, Il moto decabrista, p. 155.
81 N. Firsov, Chteniia, pt. 2, p. 63.

Our doleful toil shall not go wasted,
For from the spark will burst a flame,
And underneath a sacred sign
Our Russian people shall be saved;
From our chains we'll forge our swords,
And freedom's fire will burn again.

* * *

Contributions of Polish Exiles

Following the exiled Decembrists to Siberia came several other waves of political exiles that also helped spur Siberia's cultural and intellectual progress. Second only to the Decembrists in their impact on the local population during the reign of Nicholas I were Polish nationalist rebels, banished for their participation in various insurrectionary and conspiratorial activities. In comparison with the efforts (conscious and unconscious) made by Decembrists to raise the cultural and educational level of Siberian society, it is of interest and value to evaluate the approaches in this direction undertaken by exiled Poles. On the whole, a number of Poles distinguished themselves in the areas of education and culture, as did individual Decembrists. On occasion, they differed from the more moderate Decembrists in their plans or attempts to escape Siberia or to revolt. Indeed, in one well-known attempt to detach Siberia from Russia, they gave an impetus to the idea of Siberian separatism.

The presence of numerous Poles in Siberia was not a phenomenon peculiar to the 19th century alone. Polish exiles and captives had been deported there since the 1600's, and Siberia in many ways was considered an kind of "second fatherland of the Poles." [82] Large numbers of Poles were

---

82 Michał Janik, Dzieje polaków na Syberji (A History of Poles in Siberia), (Cracow, 1928), p. 29.

banished to Siberia as a result of the unsuccessful anti-Russian confederacy of Bar (in 1768), the futile Kościuszko insurrection of 1794, and Polish participation in Napoleon's ill-fated campaign of 1812. With the exception of the dramatic escape of Count Maurycy Beniowski from Kamchatka in 1771 and of a few exiled Poles and Jesuits from Poland who served as tutors for wealthy Siberian families, Poles in Siberia before 1830 were not especially known for rebelliousness, fierce nationalism, or cultural contributions to the region. Beniowski's example, however, in time came to serve as an inspiration to many a would-be fugitive or conspirator among later Polish exiles.[83]

The arrival of members of the "Patriotic Society," exiled to Siberia for having initiated the "November" Insurrection of 1830-31 against Russian rule, inaugurated what has been called the "second period of Polish exile."[84] The first of these new exiles entered Siberia in 1832, and before long an estimated 45,000 families had been deported to Siberia and the Caucasus region.[85] After the November Insurrection, subsequent conspiracies and secret societies were broken up in Russian Poland in the years 1833, 1838, 1840, 1843, 1846, and 1848. Following arrests in each of these incidents (sprawy), additional, though not large numbers of Poles were banished to Siberia, where they joined their previously exiled compatriots. Thus, by the mid-1850's there were an estimated 50,000 Poles in Siberia.[86]

---

83 Rufin Pietrowski (Piotrowski), Recollections of Siberia. The Story of a Siberian Exile (London: Longman, Green, Longman, 1863), p. 109.

84 S. V. Maksimov, Sibir' i katorga, pt. 3, p. 45. Janik calls this the "third period," his "second period" beginning in 1768 (p. 148).

85 R. F. Leslie, Polish Politics and the Revolution of November 1830 (London: Athlone Press, 1956), p. 267.

86 See Janik, Dzieje polaków, p. 212.

The exiles of this "second period," which extended roughly from 1832 to 1856, fell into four different categories. Those few in the first category were given considerable freedom, were allowed to keep their former property, and were usually permitted to return home after a few years. More of them were in the second category; though they could live in a village settlement, they could nourish little hope of returning home (excluding a general amnesty). Such exiles in Western Siberia were not allowed to travel more than six miles from their village, whereas in Eastern Siberia authorities permitted them to travel anywhere within the region. Exiles in the third category were designated to serve in military battalions stationed in forts along Siberia's southern borders. The fourth category consisted of forced labor — such as in the Nerchinsk mines — or military service for life. [87] To the last two categories the leaders of the November Insurrection, men of wealth and education, had been assigned; with little freedom or contact with the local population, they often spent their time dreaming of escape, plotting to revolt, or both.

About two-thirds of the Polish political exiles came from the gentry class (szlachta, about 8% of the Polish population), and of these the majority came either from cities, such as Warsaw and Vilna, or from the Russo-Polish borderlands. [88] The exiles were solely Roman Catholic in faith. Among them were a large group of educated and trained specialists: doctors, officers, priests, artists, teachers, and musicians. Nevertheless, these Poles, for all their knowledge, abilities, and numbers, gen-

---

87 Maksimov, Sibir' i katorga, pt. 3, pp. 51-53; and R. Piotrowski, Polacy na Syberji (n.p., n.d.), pp. 5-11. This unofficially titled book, lent to me by Dr. Imre Boba of the University of Washington, I have determined to be part of a later edition of Piotrowski's Pamiętniki z pobytu na Syberyi Rufina Piotrowskiego, 3 vols., (Poznań, 1860). See Janik, Dzieje polaków, p. 210 n.

88 Maksimov, Sibir' i katorga, pt. 3, p. 50.

erally did not and could not channel these resources as effectively as they might have in raising the level of Siberian life. The reasons for this were several. Their Roman Catholicism and their Polish speech and exclusiveness did not facilitate open and communicative relations between them and the local population, though Siberians in time came to look upon them more favorably. The early nineteenth century, especially, witnessed an intense Polish nationalism, and after the unsuccessful uprising of 1830-31 this patriotism combined with strong religious sentiments to produce a chauvinistic and even Messianic outlook among many (though far from all) Poles. Thus, Poles during the "second period" of Siberian exile by and large kept to themselves, apart from the local population; many even regarded marriages to Siberian girls as "treason to the fatherland."[89] On occasion they organized their own societies of mutual assistance, plotted to escape Siberia by extraordinary means and routes, and even planned uprisings to overthrow the local government and detach Siberia from Russia.

Polish exiles, however, were not without influence upon local society. Their greatest cultural contributions were in the realms of education and music, and they helped encourage a more distinct Siberian regional feeling through their overt anti-Russian, anti-government, and even separatistic views. Moreover, the vast majority of Poles in settlement contributed positively to Siberian life in a minor way by becoming tradesmen, shopkeepers, stationmasters, innkeepers, clerks, or agriculturalists. Compared to such business activities, though, Maximov states that

> Undoubtedly the influence of those Poles who devoted themselves to teaching children to read and write was

---

89 Ibid., p. 64. Cf. in much of this the Hebrews in Babylonian Captivity. For a discussion of Polish exclusiveness in Siberia, see Maksimov, pp. 74-75.

> more solid and fruitful, especially as a significant number of them took up this occupation, and in such distant places and remote backwaters that without these unexpected guests literacy would have stagnated under the old order of things. [90]

Thus, many Poles in settlement supplemented their yearly allowance of 75 rubles by giving lessons to local children. In the area of languages, which they quite frequently taught, they preferred French and other foreign languages to Russian, however. Occasionally a Pole was offered a position higher than that of tutor or private instructor; such was the good fortune of the former prior and professor Jan Sierociński, who, having become a Cossack, was given a teaching post at the Cossack cadet school in Omsk. Though many Polish exiles built up private libraries over the years, these generally had little or no influence on local inhabitants, who, if literate, usually read only Russian.

Probably the most distinctive cultural contribution of Polish exiles was to awaken and develop musical interests in Siberia. This is somewhat understandable in view of the fact that Russian secular music until mid-19th century (i.e. Glinka) was still a good ways behind western norms and achievements, and had hardly penetrated Siberia. As for raising the level of musical culture in Siberia, Janik claims that "ever since the time of the Bar Confederacy Poles established their fame in this respect." [91] After 1815 Poles, Czechs, and Germans formed an orchestra in Omsk which continued on into the reign of Nicholas I. In Transbaikalia a Pole (Kwiatkowski) set up a school for trumpeters which supplied Cossack regiments all over Siberia with trained trumpeters. After 1830 Konstanty Wolicki, a former Polish army officer educated at the Paris academy of music, was

---

90 Maksimov, Sibir' i katorga, pt. 3, p. 72.
91 Janik, Dzieje polaków, p. 293.

appointed conductor of the Omsk orchestra. Wolicki was also active as a music teacher and subsequently became director of the Tobolsk orchestra. By the late 1840's Poles comprised a good portion of the new theatre orchestra in Irkutsk, and here too "the most talented Polish musician in Siberia," Wolfgang Szczepkowski, gave lessons and violin recitals. [92] In Kyakhta Poles taught piano, directed the Cossack orchestra, and presented frequent recitals. In Yalutorovsk the Siberian memoirist Golodnikov wrote of "the quiet and relatively happy time" when Poles and Decembrists invigorated the town's cultural life: "We had our own chorus from among the pupils of the district school and our own musical orchestra from among exiled Poles, under the direction of the violinist Shevchenko." [93]

All in all, Siberia was indebted to many Poles for their role in teaching and spreading the appreciation of music. This influence was even valued by some of the higher officials. Muravyov's immediate predecessor, Governor-General Rupert, allowed cultured Poles to instruct both his own children and those of prominent Irkutsk citizens. Among such "privileged" Polish exiles were the pianist Kaszewski, the linguist Juljan Sabiński, and "the best draftsman and painter among the exiles" of the time, Leopold Niemirowski. [94] As a high-school student in Irkutsk, the young I. V. Fyodorov-Omulevsky (1837-83), a subsequent populist and regionalist writer, was influenced by ideas and activities of local Decembrists and Poles. From the latter he learned Polish, and his later translations of Mickiewicz's sonnets constituted his first published work. [95]

---

92 Ibid.; and Maksimov, Sibir' i katorga, pt. 3, p. 44.
93 Golodnikov, "Gosudarstvennye i politicheskie prestupniki," p. 753.
94 Janik, Dzieje polaków, pp. 290-92; V. Vagin, "Sorokovye goda v Irkutskie" (Irkutsk in the 1840's), Literaturnyi Sbornik (St. Petersburg, 1885), p. 257; and Sukachëv, Irkutsk, p. 49.
95 See T. A. Voitik's introduction to Omulevskii, Shag za shagom (Step after Step), (Moscow, 1957), pp. 3-4.

In the field of education no single Polish exile stood out as did the Decembrists Yakushkin, Poggio, and Zavalishin. Yet a number of Poles, more at home with the culture of Western Europe than many Decembrists, came well equipped and able to transmit knowledge and appreciation of western languages, music, and painting to a Siberia which knew next to nothing of these matters. Yet even among the talented minority, homesickness, aloofness, poverty, cultural alienation, or a predilection for drink and cards often reduced their potential contributions. The desperate and impoverished conditions in which many Poles found or regarded themselves often gave rise to insurrectionary and separatistic sentiments among some exiles, which willy-nilly affected the subsequent course of Siberian regionalism.

Such thoughts among Polish exiles are reflected in the remarks of Piotrowsky, who described the situation as late as the mid-fifties:

> There is no doubt that the elements of revolution and revolt are not wanting in Siberia . . . [and] those who know the country well are fully aware of this feature in it. Discontent is very general, although the causes and the degrees of it are sundry and manifold, and differ so widely as to be almost contradictory. It is only by the presence of the garrisons that the country is kept safe within the iron-bound circle of the empire. [96]

The first and most well-known attempt of Poles to stage an insurrection in Siberia occurred in Omsk in 1833. In that year Jan Sierociński, who as a teacher in the Omsk cadet school was allowed greater freedom than other Poles, became acquainted with the exiled doctor Franciszek Szokalski. The two men then began to plot a general revolt which would break off Siberia from Russia. To this end they would declare all convicts freed from

---

96 R. Pietrowski, Recollections of Siberia, p. 111.

hard labor, and Siberians, Russians, Poles, and Tatars, including officers, soldiers, peasants, and exiles in settlement, would be incited to join the rebellion. The hard-core insurrectionists, however, were to consist of the two thousand Poles in the vicinity of Omsk, who were to bring over the Omsk garrison to their side. According to the plan of Sierociński and Szokalski, weapons, supplies, and state funds would then be seized, the Russian authorities arrested, and Siberia proclaimed independent. In the event of failure, the rebels planned to flee across the steppe to Tashkent or Bukhara, and from there make their way to India. [97]

The night before the uprising was to take place, three Polish informers leaked word to the authorities, and the leaders were seized. [98] Any other suspects were also arrested: Russians, Poles, Siberians; settlers, peasants, Cossacks — about a thousand in all. Szokalski initially managed to escape but was later captured incognito in Orenburg province. Arrests dragged on for the following two years, and finally in March 1837 the affair was closed when Sierociński and five other leaders died after running the gauntlet. [99]

The after-effects of the "Omsk conspiracy" were unpleasant not only for those involved, but also for Poles in general, toward whom many in Siberia now became more suspicious. For instance, fires in Siberian towns, a rather common phenomenon, were now increasingly attributed to Polish arsonists. Despite failure, this conspiracy was the boldest and most direct

---

97 Piotrowski, Polacy na Syberji (Poles in Siberia), pp. 29-30; Maksimov, Sibir' i katorga, pt. 3, pp. 77-78; Janik, Dzieje polaków, p. 148 ff; Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', pp. 24-25; and Juri Semjonow, Die Eroberung Sibiriens (Berlin: Ullstein, 1937), pp. 311-12.

98 The most direct source cited by Janik, the memoirs of Franciszek Knoll, does not give the exact date of the proposed uprising (pp. 148-52).

99 Piotrowski, Polacy na Syberji, p. 34, and Recollections of Siberia, pp. 112-13; and Janik, Dzieje polaków, pp. 156-58.

step hitherto taken toward establishing a separate Siberia. It went beyond mere contemplation, talk, or rumor, and therefore sent a shudder of horror through much of officialdom. Lest, however, Sierociński and his collaborators receive too much credit for fostering any indigenous regionalist or separatist ideas, one should remember that they were only seeking to achieve in Siberia what they recently had failed to achieve in Poland in 1830-31: independence from Russia.

Whatever its real contributions to a sense of Siberian regionalism, the Omsk conspiracy definitely set off an unprecedented fear of Siberian separatism which reverberated through Siberian officialdom and manifested itself most openly three decades later in the so-called "Siberian Independence Affair." Indeed, S. B. Bronevsky, governor-general of Eastern Siberia from 1835 to 1837, recalled his own reactions to the affair as follows:

> Remembering the conspiracy of Poles in Omsk, which threatened to turn into an awful incident, I requested the addition of several battalions of armed forces, so as to have reliable support on hand, especially in Transbaikalia. In response to the Emperor's questions in 1833 on the disturbances in Siberia and on the criminals, I dared to state the essential truth that criminals from among the common people regard the powers that be with reverence, but those from the upper class should not have been exiled /to Siberia/, for little by little they spread their ideas and, misinterpreting the government, they can be harmful.

Bronevsky recommended for the safety of Siberia the "upper-class" criminals be exiled elsewhere and suggested that the Omsk conspiracy failed only because it was foiled at just the right time.[100]

---

100 Quoted in N. N. Kos'min, "Iz proshlago Sibiri (Byvshii General-Gubernator Vostochnoi Sibiri S. B. Bronevskii i ego memuary)" (From Siberia's Past: Former Governor-General of Eastern Siberia S. B. Bronevsky and His Memoirs), Ocherki proshlago i nastoishchago Sibiri (St. Petersburg, 1910), pp. 64-65.

Another insurrection was planned by Poles in Eastern Siberia in the late 1830's. Among the plotters was the cultivated Polish patriot, Juljan Sabiński. These conspirators, however, did not even get beyond the planning stage before they were arrested in Irkutsk in 1839. Sabiński's original sentence to twenty years' hard labor was commuted to such an extent that in 1843 he was transferred to penal settlement near Irkutsk. This close to town, he was able to sustain himself by tutoring children of officials and local citizens — a fate far different from Sierociński's.[101]

The thought of escaping Siberia and returning to Western Europe to serve the Polish cause more positively haunted the minds and absorbed the efforts of many a Pole at this time. Such sentiments and aspirations, of course, removed them from the world of most Russian exiles and of even some of their fellow Poles in exile, not to mention the Siberian population. In this way too, their potential cultural contributions to the country were somewhat diminished. According to Maximov, strong attacks of homesickness were

> especially dangerous to people with a higher education, who had shown such a great love for their homeland and had sacrificed their freedom for it. The search for this freedom and the quest to attain this condition . . . constitute one of the striking and substantial peculiarities in the exile of the second period . . .[102]

For would-be fugitives from Siberia there were five possible routes of escape: through Okhotsk to America, through Central Asia to Persia or India, across the Caspian Sea to Persia or Turkey, across the Black Sea or

---

101 M. V. Volkonskaia, Zapiski kniagini Volkonskoi, p. 146; and Janik, Dzieje polaków, p. 199, 203.

102 Maksimov, Sibir' i katorga, pt. 3, p. 75.

the Ukraine, and northwest through Archangel.[103] Needless to say, most attempts at flight were unsuccessful. Probably the best known and most publicized was Rufin Piotrowski's escape through Archangel, while perhaps the best known failure was that of Piotr Wysocki (1799-1875), a former lieutenant and one of the chief leaders of the November Insurrection. Wysocki in 1836 sought to flee from Irkutsk toward the Sayan mountains and then to China, but an overturned raft on the Angara River just beyond Irkutsk quashed this idea. After surviving a thousand lashes, he was sent to two years' hard labor. According to Piotrowski's testimony, Wysocki had other goals in mind too; besides escaping from Siberia, he even "had the wish to make Siberia itself rise in revolt against the rule of the Tzar."[104]

After Alexander II's general amnesty of 1856, Wysocki and most Poles exiled to Siberia since 1831 returned to their homeland. It is a tribute to the unflagging Polish spirit of the times that some of these very same exiles returned to Siberia in the aftermath of the unsuccessful "January" Insurrection of 1863. One important change after 1863 in the cultural relations between the new Polish arrivals and Siberians was that the former were now forbidden to engage in teaching activities. However, by this time Siberian cultural and intellectual growth had advanced to the point where it was more self-sustaining than during the earlier period. Thus, in many ways the overall contributions of Poles of the "third period" of exile were relatively smaller in scale than those of their immediate predecessors. In the long history of Polish exile in Siberia the Poles who arrived after 1830 and who departed in the late 1850's contributed more to Siberia's

---

103 Ibid.; and Piotrowski, Polacy na Syberji, pp. 48-49.

104 Pietrowski, Recollections of Siberia, p. 109. On Wysocki and his attempted flight, also see Janik, Dzieje polaków, p. 159; and Semjonow, Eroberung Sibiriens, pp. 313-14.

cultural and political awakening than did those who were banished before or after this period. Maximov, for instance, found "deep and conspicuous traces" left by these Polish exiles, who "aroused thought, raised self-consciousness, and directed spontaneous initiative" among Siberians. [105]

Despite the greater overall significance of "second period" Poles in the development of Siberian life and thought, Siberian regionalists recognized the contributions of individual Poles of the "third period" more distinctly. This is explained partially by the fact that after 1860 a comparatively greater number of Siberian writers were able to appreciate the work of their Polish contemporaries in exile (itself a reflection of increasing awareness in Siberian society). Moreover, Poles after the January Uprising tended to abandon the tendency toward romantic heroism and nationalism, and to settle for the down-to-earth, realistic business of "organic work." In this respect, Polish exiles of the 1860's resembled many Decembrist exiles more than did their predecessors after 1830. [106]

The Siberian writer Potanin, for example, viewed these later Polish exiles as worthy heirs of the recently departed Decembrists: "Ten years after their departure there came to Irkutsk a galaxy of educated and scholarly exiles no less brilliant, consisting of Polish insurrectionaries." Among these was the zoologist Benedykt Dybowski, who took soundings of Lake Baikal and studied its aquatic life. The well-known geologists Aleksander Czekanowski and Jan Czerski studied the geology of Lake Baikal and other areas of Eastern Siberia, and the archeologist N. I. Witkowski

---

105 Maksimov, Sibir' i katorga, pt. 3, p. 74.

106 According to official figures, from early 1863 to late 1866 over 18,600 Polish exiles (including women and children) arrived in Siberia, hence a substantially smaller number of exiles than in the previous period. See Maksimov, p. 97, and Peter Kropotkin, Memoirs of a Revolutionist (New York: Anchor/Doubleday, 1962), pp. 141-42.

became director of the Irkutsk museum.[107]

When the "third period" of Polish exile ended with the general amnesty of 1883, and the majority of Poles left for home, a regionalist press had develpped in Siberia which could assess the overall contributions of Polish exiles in general, and of the more recent ones in particular. Not only had they been instrumental in the development of trades, handicrafts, and food industries, but they had been the first to establish restaurants, coffee houses, and decent hotels in Siberian towns. In addition,

> Poles no doubt contributed to raising the intellectual level and development of the two lowest classes of society /peasants and urban poor?/. One cannot pass over in silence the work of such scholarly and knowledgeable naturalists and geologists among Polish exiles as Czekanowski, Dybowski, and Czerski. Moreover, many Polish doctors who gave their lives to the practice of medicine cannot be forgotten. . . . Siberia is aware of these services and is able to appreciate the contributions of Polish political exiles.[108]

Though exerting less tangible influence than did Decembrists on Siberian society, available evidence points to the conclusion that Polish exiles by mid-19th century constituted an important ingredient, "imported" from the West, in the social milieu from which a cultural, intellectual, and political awakening began to emerge in Siberia.

* * *

---

107 See G. N. Potanin, "Goroda Sibiri," p. 237.
108 "Poliaki v Sibiri" (Poles in Siberia), Sibir', (1883) no. 31; quoted in Janik, Dzieje polaków, p. 398.

Stirrings from within Siberian Society: 1825-1850

Political exiles were not alone in contributing to the all but imperceptible quickening and maturation of urban Siberian society in the 1830's and 1840's. A small number of scattered individuals, relatively advanced culturally, socially, and intellectually, were also beginning to try their wings and to make their presence felt somewhat. Such persons by and large were continuing the rather weak and spotty "tradition" of enlightenment and sophistication in Siberia set by such luminaries as Speransky and Slovtsov (and which even preceded them in some ways). This tradition can perhaps be traced back to the days of Jakobi in the late 18th century. On the one hand, it included an interest in literature, science, and contemporary affairs transcending the immediate locality that was found among some officials and leading merchants, and on the other, it included the desire to leave Siberia and go west to complete one's formal education in European Russia (as exemplified by Slovtsov, Nikolai Polevoy, and Kalashnikov).

Thus, by the 1830's and 1840's there was a distinct group of scattered teachers, officials, and merchants who dabbled in literature and who at some time or another had strong ties with the cultural life of the capitals (either through study there or through commercial or government contacts). Such "thinking" Siberians were on the whole just as little influenced or affected by Decembrists and Poles in Siberia as their even fewer "thinking" predecessors in Siberia had been by earlier exiles. Thus, whatever signs of life emerged in the "Siberian mind" during the 1830's and 1840's appear to have been relatively independent of exile influence and much more the result of contacts of other kinds with European Russia.

What then was the social setting in which such modest ripples of intellectual and cultural initiative began to emerge? And what kind of background did these tendencies provide for the subsequent emergence of public opinion and the regionalist movement of the 1860's? Despite the absence of much information, a rough description of social and intellectual life in Irkutsk, the leading Siberian town by the 1840's, and brief sketches of a few leading thinkers of the day can perhaps provide an attempt to answer these questions.

The major towns in Siberia during the reign of Nicholas I were not large even by standards of European Russia. In 1825, in comparison with St. Petersburg and Moscow (with populations of about 425,000 and 300,000, respectively), Siberia's two largest towns at that time were Tobolsk (with 16,994 inhabitants) and Irkutsk (with 14,411). Twenty-five years later the overall size of Siberian towns was not very different. The few following figures reflect either very slow growth or demographic stagnation in several of the largest Siberian towns:[109]

	1825	1851	Ave. % Change/Yr.	Overall % Change
Irkutsk	14,411	16,795	+ .7	+16.6
Tobolsk	16,994	15,359	- .4	- 9.7
Tomsk	10,867	13,511	+1.0	+24.3
Omsk	8,496	13,233	+2.2	+55.8
Tyumen	10,771	9,674	- .4	-11.2

Clearly these very gradual population changes (either up or down) did not enhance social, cultural, and intellectual ferment or innovation.

Between the administrations of Speransky (1819-21) and of Muravyov (1847-61), not one high Siberian official in either Eastern or Western Siberia stood out as a dynamic leader. In no way did they attempt to alter the low-keyed tenor of slumbering social life in Siberia. Most of them

---

109 I. V. Shcheglov, Perechen', pp. 465-66, 561-62.

lived within the confines of their own small, official circles, unconcerned with changing the status-quo in any way (for they — in contrast to Speransky — were not ordered to). It was thus quite fitting that a Siberian official of the 1870's should remark of these administrators:

> After Speransky, who stirred up Eastern Siberia, a complete immobility reigned there right up to Count Muravyov-Amursky. The Governors-General Bronevsky, Lavinsky, and Rupert left only their names in Irkutsk, and even these have been half-forgotten.[110]

Though such administrators did very little to encourage spontaneous initiative in local society (as had Speransky), at least they were not the despotic, capricious satraps of the sort that preceded Speransky's watershed administration. As an example, the governor-general of Eastern Siberia from 1837 to 1847, W. J. Rupert, was a friend to both Decembrist and Polish political exiles. Rupert and his family occupied the center of a relatively small social elite in Irkutsk at this time. Around this "center" were the chief local officials, the governor-general's small personal suite, mining engineers, and a few merchants and teachers.[111] Despite the fact that most of this group were officials of some sort, and rather rootless, some of these very men formed the nucleus of what constituted the thinking, educated avant-garde in local Siberian society.

Siberian merchants, of course, had much stronger ties and roots in the country than did the transient higher officialdom. Merchants in Irkutsk and Kyakhta profited especially from trade in tea and furs, and during the gold boom of the 1830's many merchants in Tomsk, Yeniseisk, and Krasnoyarsk grew wealthy. Nevertheless, the influence of this mining boom on Tomsk and

---

110 P. P. Suvorov, "Zapiski o proshlom" (Notes on the Past), Russkoe Obozrienie, (1893) no. 12, p. 93.

111 V. I. Vagin, "Sorokovye goda," p. 261.

other towns was largely ephemeral. Much of the profits went to Russian capitalists, and the "easy-come, easy-go" mentality encouraged fortunes to be squandered abroad. According to Potanin, all that these millionnaires left to Tomsk (with one exception) was a street named "Millionnaire."[112]

The nature of Irkutsk's wealth was more solid and conducive to social and personal improvement. Irkutsk merchants went to Russian fairs in person to exchange the teas and furs for manufactured goods.

> Thus, Irkutsk merchants had a chance each year to travel a thousand versts farther to the west than the merchants of West Siberian towns and to become intimately acquainted with the capitals of the land, especially Moscow. Irkutsk retailers of Siberian products were in a more advantageous situation than residents of West Siberian towns in the matter of assimilating external culture at least, if not intellectual culture.

So, concludes Potanin, the merchant class of Irkutsk became more advanced culturally than its counterpart in any other Siberian town (except perhaps Kyakhta). In fact, in the 1830's members of several Irkutsk merchant families made impressive donations to public institutions..[113] The names Sibiryakov, Trapeznikov, Basnin, Medvednikov, Belogolovy, and Kuznetsov were closely associated with progressive views and deeds in Irkutsk of the 1840's.

The cultural elite in Siberian towns of the thirties and forties, and especially in Irkutsk, consisting, as it did, of scattered high officials, teachers, and well-educated merchants, was far from united. The major bonds were a common circle of acquaintances, dinners at one another's home, the exchange of "pretentious visits," and card playing (the greatest pastime

---

112 G. N. Potanin, "Goroda Sibiri," p. 244. The exception was the generous donation of the Tomsk merchant Popov in 1836 to a public bank and girls' school.

113 Ibid., p. 238. For examples of donations, see below, pp. 104-05.

of all). This "elite" by no means possessed the solidarity of the later intelligentsia (with its general agreement on basic political and social issues). Moreover, women played little if any role in this budding Siberian cultural elite, and most of them still led the secluded and separate life which Speransky had tried to break down.[114] Nevertheless, social differentiation was taking place even at this upper level. According to Vagin, in the early 1840's,

> A separation into circles already existed, but it was not as strong and as sharp as it is today /1884/; society was small and local people all knew each other and were often related; there were few new arrivals, and those that there were tried to join local society.
>
> Social life was very monotonous, or rather, there was none at all. An official dinner at Rupert's, evenings at his home in winter, or gatherings at /Governor/ Pyatnitsky's, and in summer promenades through the town park, parades, and drills were the only manifestations of this life and were all that there was to local entertainment at that time.[115]

Other attractions popular with the public were watching soldiers being run through the gauntlet and seeing criminals lashed with the knout on the scaffold. Such spectacles until the mid-forties served as almost the only substitute for plays and theatrical entertainments. Indeed, this could hardly be otherwise, when there was not a single dancemaster or a musical instructor to be found in all Irkutsk during the thirties.[116]

Drinking was, of course, another typical pastime among all social strata, though drunkenness in the 1840's was less frequent in higher society than in lower. Vagin observed that prominent merchants then behaved quite soberly and that excessive drinking was alien to official circles. "But

---

114 Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 167; and Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 45.
115 Vagin, "Sorokovye goda," p. 261.
116 (E. A. Avdeeva) Zapiski i zamiechaniia, p. 54; Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 44; and Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 168.

amidst the petty bourgeoisie and townspeople such circles did not exist and drunkenness was almost universal." [117] Despite the heavy drinking, most people were off the streets by nightfall, and well into the 1840's Irkutsk was known for its "tomblike silence" from dusk till dawn, interrupted only by the barking of watchdogs and the passing of an occasional drozhky. [118]

Family life in most cases was still quite patriarchal and subject to strict decorum. The uniformity of family life was broken up chiefly by name-day celebrations, baptisms, betrothal festivities, and weddings. "But Siberian society was unconscious of this boredom," writes Kozmin. "No living word, no daring or free movement disturbed this enchanting silence, and nothing forced any dissatisfaction to be felt. It is hard to detect the rudiments of movement even in the appearance of a reading public." [119] And Yadrintsev confesses that at this time "there were no signs of higher spiritual interests, of the recognition of civil rights, and of honesty — as manifestations of social aspirations and self-consciousness." [120]

During the thirties and forties, however, a few positive steps were made in the realm of education. Tomsk saw the opening of its first secondary school (gimnaziia), and Siberia's third, in 1837. And Irkutsk witnessed the founding of the first girls' schools in Siberia in 1838 and 1845. These two institutions were realized largely by generous donations

---

117 Vagin, "Sorokovye goda," pp. 266-67.
118 Koz'min, "Zagoskin," pp. 167-68. Also see Sukachev, Irkutsk, pp. 39-40.
119 Koz'min, "Iz proshlago Sibiri," pp. 44-45.
120 (Iadrintsev) "Nachalo pechati," p. 376.

by members of the Medvednikov and Kuznetsov families.[121] Despite these steps forward and those made by Decembrist educators, general progress in education was quite slow in the period between Speransky and the 1850's. With a population of 2,680,000 in 1851, Siberia had at this time in the area of secondary education only three gimnazii for boys, one institute for girls, two seminaries, and one Cossack cadet school. No wonder Yadrintsev could write that this was a "very dark period in the life of Siberian society."[122]

Along with a slowly awakening awareness of the need for educational facilities and teachers, a recognition of the need for public libraries also began to emerge. As early as 1832 Semyon S. Shchukin, protégé of Slovtsov and well-known botanist, made an effort to create a public lending library in Irkutsk, but had little success.[123] More successful in this respect was the Irkutsk merchant, A. M. Boldakov, who established in 1839 the first private library open to the public to last a while. Nevertheless, no more than fifty subscribers could be found from amidst the local public during its entire existence. Despite difficulties, Boldakov's library survived over ten years and was instrumental in introducing some of the most influential Russian periodicals of the day to the Irkutsk reading public. Vagin relates how during the 1840's the journal Reading Library was superseded by Notes of the Fatherland as the most popular periodical in Irkutsk; the latter after 1847 was in turn eclipsed in popularity by the Contemporary.[124]

---

121 Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 43.

122 (Iadrintsev) "Pervyi sibirskii universitet," p. 64, and "Istoriia prosvieshcheniia," p. 136.

123 Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 192. On Shchukin, see above p. 49 and 52.

124 Vagin, "Sorokovye goda," p. 264; see too Sukachev, Irkutsk, pp. 45-46. The Russian titles are Biblioteka dlia Chteniia, Otechestvennye Zapiski, and Sovremennik, respectively.

During these years a small number of educated Siberians began to break through the silence of torpid Siberian society in the area of literature and journalistic commentary. Some of them even began to show patriotic tendencies in their writings. Just as was the case with Slovtsov from the mid-1820's on, these few Siberian writers also began to take a sympathetic and concerned interest in their homeland. In this respect they too can be viewed as precursors of Siberian regionalism. In contrast to Slovtsov, however, these early Siberian writers concerned themselves not with history but with poetry, short stories and articles, and semi-autobiographical accounts.

In view of all this, Potanin writes the following:

> In the 1830's the first Siberian writers emerge; tales of Siberian life appear at this time, some of them even written by Sibiryaks. These first Siberian stories are of almost no social or artistic significance, and thus they are of no interest for the historian of Russian literature. However, they should be mentioned in the history of the development of self-consciousness in Siberia, as they represent the first beginnings of Siberian thought. The time between the 1830's and 1860's was a period of Siberia's literary awakening, but the amount of the literary works in this 30-year period was insignificant and was proof that Siberia ranked very low on the book market at this time. [125]

Certainly the best known (and most quickly forgotten) of these early Siberian writers was Pyotr Pavlovich Yershov (1815-69), author of the famous folk poem "The Little Humpbacked Horse" (Konëk gorbunok). Yershov was the first Siberian writer of any stature after Slovtsov; indeed, publication of his well-known tale preceded Slovtsov's history by several years. Born in a remote village in Tobolsk province, young Pyotr was sent to the Tobolsk

---

125 G. N. Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri" (Siberia's Needs), in I. S. Mel'nik, ed., Sibir': eia sovremennoe sostoianie i eia nuzhdy (St. Petersburg, 1908), p. 268.

gimnaziia at age 11 (in 1826). Upon finishing his secondary education with distinction, he went to the University of St. Petersburg in 1831. In 1834, the year in which he received a degree, he saw the first installment of his poem, "The Humpbacked Horse," published in a St. Petersburg periodical. The background of this work lay more in the popular stories he had heard as a child in Siberia than in his own creative imagination alone. [126]

During his university years and upon graduation, Yershov became the first known Siberian student in European Russia disillusioned with big-city life to look nostalgically at his distant, provincial homeland. At this time in St. Petersburg he wrote several poems on Siberian subjects and associated closely with the Siberian writers, Kalashnikov and N. S. Shchukin. Upon graduation he and another Siberian, Konstantin I. Timkovsky, conceived a plan of traveling through Siberia and of studying the country. Thus, he wrote to Timkovsky in 1835: [127]

> The Law of Heaven appoints us to a glorious task,
> And at dawn in a land so dark
> This goal is shown to us.
> A goal to lighten steppes and wilderness
> With rays of civility,
> To break the chains which bind the mind,
> And create a new humanity.

Young Yershov took this mission quite seriously, and with Timkovsky he took a solemn vow to carry it out. [128] With the tremendously favorable reception given to his "Humpbacked Horse" almost overnight, it was no wonder that this 19-year-old dreamer felt called upon (as a kind of Siberian

---

126 K. Dubrovskii, "Tvorets bezsmertnoi skazki (P. P. Ershov)" (P. P. Yershov: Creator of an Immortal Tale), Rozhdennye v stranie izgnaniia (Petrograd, 1916), p. 60; and M. Azadovskii in the introduction to P. P. Ershov: Konek-gorbunok, stikhotvoreniia (Leningrad, 1961), p. 7.

127 "Timkovskomu" (To Timkovsky), in P. P. Ershov, p. 145. Timkovsky's grandfather was the merchant-explorer of the North Pacific, G. I. Shelikhov. On Timkovsky's later activities in the Petrashevsky circle, see below, p. 196.

128 Azadovskii in P. P. Ershov, pp. 11-12; Dubrovskii, "Tvorets," p. 61; and (Iadrintsev) "Sud'ba sibirskoi poezii," pp. 411-12.

Pushkin) to awaken Siberian society by means of grandiose literary activity.

However, such patriotic, idealistic plans of going to the homeland to enlighten it (which later regionalists actually began to do) he never even put down on paper. He went only so far as to divulge these "literary dreams" many years later to a former schoolmate and subsequent biographer (Yaroslavtsev). Indeed, Yershov's vision for Siberia has been compared to Gogol's unfulfilled literary plans for the Ukraine. [129] Yershov's literary fame and influence both began and ended with the "Humpbacked Horse."

This literary patriot did return to Siberia in 1836, but he got no farther than Tobolsk, where he became a high-school teacher. Here, in an "atmosphere heavy for both head and heart," his romantic idealism and illusions became totally deflated. After his return to Tobolsk a few poems of Siberian content became the major extent of his literary efforts, and even these were not published in his lifetime. Though he still dreamed of writing a "Siberian novel" that reflected "all Siberian life," the most that came of this was several genre stories and tales. Such a romantic found himself somewhat out of place in the practical-minded, down-to-earth society of Tobolsk at that time, and he found himself drawn deeper and deeper into "mediocrity and prose." In contrast to subsequent regionalist leaders, he had (in Potanin's view) "neither the temperament nor the genius to become the center of a Siberian renaissance and to discern correctly the themes that could unite Siberia from Tobolsk to Nerchinsk." [130] Indeed, his "uncontrollable dreaminess" set him apart from almost all subsequent Siberian writers and publicists, who possessed more realistic and pragmatic

---

129 Potanin, Oblastnicheskaia tendentsiia, p. 5.
130 Ibid., p. 6.

attitudes. As a teacher in Tobolsk, Yershov's educational contributions included encouraging two subsequently famous pupils: Dmitry Ivanovich Mendeleev (1834-1907) — as reknown chemist and scientist, and Ivan A. Khudyakov — as revolutionary and ethnographer.

Patriotic tendencies were present in other Siberian writers of the thirties and forties too. Among these was Alexandr Alexandrovich Mordvinov, a teacher and subsequent official, who published articles on Siberia in both Notes of the Fatherland and Contemporary. In his articles Mordvinov strongly defended Siberia and insisted that the country had just as much right to the government's protection and concern as any other part of the empire. According to Potanin, "this was the first instance in which a Siberian heart declared itself capable of feeling resentment." As was the case with Slovtsov and Yershov, Mordvinov exemplified the development of a still rather formless regional patriotism, though he tended to emphasize mainly the economic aspects of the problem: that Siberia's natural resources belonged to the local population, not to Russian exploiters.[131]

An even more obscure Siberian writer of the 1840's, Gersevanov, looked at Siberia's future with extreme pessimism. No doubt influenced by the gold boom of the 1830's, which was exploited to a great extent by Russian capitalists and entrepreneurs and which left little for Siberia and Siberians, Gersevanov considered Siberia "doomed to remain a desert" and a "source of extraction" for the benefit of the mouther country.[132] Under such conditions it was clear to this writer that hopes for a more flourishing cultural life and for economic prosperity in Siberia were in vain.

---

131 Ibid., p. 4, 38-39; and Vagin, "Sorokovye goda," p. 263. I have been unable to track down these articles more specifically.

132 Gersevanov expressed these views in the article "Zamiechaniia o torgovykh otnosheniiakh Sibiri k Rossii" (Remarks on Siberia's Commercial Relations with Russia), in Otechestvennye Zapiski, at some time in the 1840's; see Koz'min, "Zagoskin," pp. 172-73, and Potanin, Oblastnicheskaia tendentsiia, p. 4.

Still another interesting commentator of the period was M. Alexandrov, a naval officer who came to Siberia in 1824 and who resided in Irkutsk for much of his later life. Alexandrov's literary pieces were never published during his lifetime, though several of his manuscript stories did circulate in Eastern Siberia. This shadowy writer distinguished himself by the first known use of social satire in Siberian literature. In such works as the "Light-weight Tarantass" (Vozdushnyi tarantas) and "Taiga Carnival" (Taëzhnyi karnaval) he singled out for ridicule and censure wealthy gold entrepreneurs, mining inspectors, petty shopkeepers, and coarse peasants, all characterized generally by greed, lust for profits, and a tendency toward slandering. Yet Alexandrov also sang of the glories of Siberian nature: of Kamchatka, Lake Baikal, and the great rivers flowing north. [133]

Alexandrov was also the first known Siberian to attempt to found a newspaper in Irkutsk. At some time in the thirties or forties he drew up a lengthy program for a newspaper, to be called the "Angara Herald." Not only would this paper serve as an outlet for literary works of his own and of others', but it would also carry official news and general information. For unknown reasons, however, the project never got off the ground. [134] Alexandrov also appears to have been one of the first Siberians (if not the first) to write of similarities between North America and Siberia. Indeed, viewing America as a kind of "sister" of Siberia, he even looked for a Siberian George Washington to lead the country to a more promising future. [135]

---

133 (Iadrintsev) "Sud'ba sibirskoi poezii," pp. 418-19; and Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 170. Aleksandrov's work, "Vozdushnyi tarantas i vospominaniia o poiezdkakh po Vostochnoi Sibiri" (written in 1827) was published posthumously in B. A. Miliutin, ed., Sbornik istoriko-statisticheskikh sviedenii o Sibiri (St. Petersburg, 1875-76), pt. 1.

134 (Iadrintsev) "Nachalo pechati," p. 377, 381. In this respect Kyakhta fared better; here an official named Orlov put out a manuscript newspaper in the 1840's (Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II: 30).

135 (Iadrintsev) "Nachalo pechati," pp. 378-79.

Alexandrov was not alone in looking toward America. The prominent Irkutsk merchant, S. Dudorovsky, not only contemplated the advantages of a commercial rapprochement between Siberia and the United States (with a free port on Kamchatka), predating Muravyov in this respect. But he also sought to develop Siberia's own natural resources for the benefit of the local population instead of Russian investors and entrepreneurs. The chief beneficiaries of such a reorientation would be, of course, Siberian merchants, such as Dudorovsky. Nevertheless, for holding such views Dudorovsky has been called "one of the first pioneers of the regionalist movement." [136] Perhaps most important was the fact that Dudorovsky's home in the 1830's became a center where the best minds of Irkutsk congregated and where he openly expressed his opinions.

With the option of either sending written works to European Russia for publication or circulating them locally in manuscript form, it is obvious that literary and journalistic tastes did not reach a very high level of development at this time. Indeed, the reading public consisted mainly of higher officials and a few educated merchants and clergy in the chief Siberian towns. According to Vagin, Gogol in the early forties did not enjoy much of a reputation in Irkutsk, Lermontov went unread for the most part, and Belinsky was even made fun of. "Toward the late 1840's, however, the views of the public, especially under the influence of Belinsky's criticism, began to change." The emergence of the "Natural School" of social commentary "broadened our intellectual horizon and taught us to seek not only amusement in leisure hours, but also a better portrayal of life with

---

136 B. Zherebtsov, Staraia Sibir', p. 27. Alexandrov, incidentally, spoke highly of Dudorovsky in his story, "Light-weight Tarantass." On Dudorovsky also see Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 114; and Potanin, "Goroda Sibiri," p. 240.

all its troubles and problems." [137]

The slow and subtle process of social awakening in Irkutsk during the late 1840's was reflected in more than just literary tastes, however, Again to quote Vagin:

> In the second half of the decade still another change occurred in the intellectual mood of our society. This change was also partly a consequence of the influence of literature, but other causes were also active. Advanced minds understood these causes, but the masses only felt them and yielded instinctively to their effect. Society was already dissatisfied with the former condition of apathy, and people no longer "peacefully enjoyed themselves" . . . It is true, this dissatisfaction did not yet have a definite object or a clear expression for us. It was reflected only in trifles and appeared in complaints about local procedures and individual personalities; but its roots were concealed even more deeply. Only ten years later, with the beginning of the new reign /of Alexander II/ did it become clear what had afflicted our souls at that time and what had failed to reach us: air and light. [138]

Thus, a new critical approach toward society was beginning to stir among certain Siberians by the late forties. This was not just limited to local affairs and problems but extended to governmental and national matters as well. As indicated above, the idea was beginning to take hold that Siberia's natural resources were exploited by Russians and should instead exist for the benefit of Siberians. Moreover, at this time some observers began to see the rise of separatistic ideas among a small group of "disaffected" Siberians. If this was actually the case (for there exists no evidence provided by avowed or crypto-separatists at this time), then perhaps the longing for a Siberian "George Washington" was really a

---

137 Vagin, "Sorokovye goda," p. 265. Belinsky's influence reached Siberia chiefly by means of the literary journals which he edited — Notes of the Fatherland and, from 1846 to 1848, the Contemporary.

138 Vagin, "Sorokovye goda," pp. 265-66.

submerged desire for a Siberia detached and apart from Russia.

An important testimony regarding the presence of separatistic ideas in Siberia during the 1840's comes from Prince P. D. Gorchakov, governor-general of Western Siberia from 1836 to 1851. In a report of 1849 to the central government he declared that though the vast majority of Siberians were loyal to the crown, factors and circumstances were present in Siberia which might encourage the idea of rebellion. A rebellion, however, could be much more easily conceived than successfully carried out.

> There is no doubt that Siberians are proud of their country, to which most of the population here is quite attached. They value its abundance and comforts excessively. Moreover, a class is emerging which does not look at all indifferently on the benefits which the empire derives from Siberian trade, from local products, and especially from gold and treasures, which constitute, as it were, Siberia's private property. And touching this string one can quickly find an echo in the heart of a Siberian, and perhaps arouse the wish to set up an independent country; but this tendency of only a young segment does not yet represent any essential danger. [139]

Though Gorchakov perhaps had people like Alexandrov and Dudorovsky or even their younger contemporaries in mind, he identified no one by name.

However general and imprecise his report, Gorchakov from his "official" viewpoint did attest to new developments arising within the relatively quiescent Siberian society of the 1840's. The period between Speransky and Muravyov was not entirely dormant. Only in view of the few stirrings in thought and criticism among scattered Siberians, for the most part in Irkutsk, can the relatively sudden emergence of public opinion in the late

---

139 Quoted in V. Semevskii, "Iz istorii obshchestvennykh idei v Rossii v kontsie 40-kh godov" (From the History of Social Ideas in Russia during the Late 1840's), in Na slavnom postu (1860-1900). Literaturnyi sbornik posviashchennyi N. K. Mikhailovskomu (St. Petersburg, 1900), pt. 2, p. 142. Cf. the views of the Decembrist Pushchin on Siberia's separation, expressed in 1845, on p. 83 above.

1850's be understood.

The contributions of political exiles together with the more autochthonous social awakening of an educated elite in Siberia during the 1830's and 1840's helped prepare the ground for the various advances made during the administration of Governor-General Muravyov in Eastern Siberia (1847-61). In the late 1850's there first occurred a confluence of social, political, and cultural action between both political exiles and the Siberian "thinking" elite — at least for the first time on a broad scale and on farily equal terms. This coming together of educated exiles and Siberians, combined with the new reign of Alexander II and the dynamic leadership of Muravyov, all helped produce a heightened sense of awareness in urban Siberian society, a sense that was only barely perceptible during the thirties and forties.

CHAPTER III

SOCIAL FERMENT IN THE AGE OF MURAVYOV: THE LATE FIFTIES AND EARLY SIXTIES

The decade of the 1850's marks an important period of transition in the history of Siberia's social, political, and intellectual development. First and foremost, this was the age of Nikolai Muravyov (as of 1858, Count Muravyov-Amursky), Siberia's greatest administrator since Speransky. Muravyov's vigorous initiative was not only responsible for the annexation and settlement of the Amur basin, which alone tended to stir up society in Eastern Siberia. But as governor-general of Eastern Siberia from 1847 to 1861, he also sought, somewhat like Speransky, to stamp out administrative abuses and to encourage greater public participation and action (within limits) concerning the affairs of state and society.

With such encouragement from "above," it was no wonder that some political exiles and some of the more thoughtful and progressive Siberians should coalesce and join forces, the result being the emergence of public opinion. This phenomenon, however, occurred only in a few major Siberian

towns, and especially in Irkutsk, the seat of Muravyov's governor-generalship. Contributing to the rise of public opinion was also an altogether new factor: the appearance of the first printed and regular Siberian newspapers, both official and private (at least the first since the rather halting efforts of Korniliev in Tobolsk at the turn of the century). Moreover, in Irkutsk a rudimentary "intelligentsia" also began to form, a discussion group consisting of both political exiles and local intellects (both Siberian and Russian-born), knit together by relatively similar social and political convictions. The late fifties also witnessed the first overt manifestations of public dissatisfaction, in both word and deed, against the policies of the official authorities. Indeed, these were directed against an administration which itself had fostered relative freedom of speech and of the press and had sought to eradicate corrupt practices and abuses. In fact, the course of Muravyov's administration, with its "liberal" reforms and innovations from above and subsequent social polarization and discontent, resembled in some ways the reign of Tsar Alexander II (1855-81), in which similar tendencies also occurred.

Thus, the political and intellectual ferment in parts of Siberia during the late 1850's formed a bridge between the muffled and isolated voices of individual Siberians here and there during the 1840's and the emergence of a relatively cohesive and articulate regionalist movement in the early 1860's. The relatively greater amount of liberties and opportunities in the Muravyov period, the founding of newspapers and scholarly institutions, the emergence of political criticism on the part of the public, the embryonic development of a Siberian intelligentsia, and the increasing contact with advanced or new ideas from Western Europe and Russia all helped create in the fifties a milieu which could give rise to a regionalist movement.

The Significance of Muravyov and His Administration: 1847-61

In September 1847 Tsar Nicholas unexpectedly appointed Nikolai Nikolaevich Muravyov (1809-81), then serving as governor of Tula province, to replace W. J. Rupert as governor-general of Eastern Siberia. Thus began the well-known Muravyov administration, the longest in Eastern Siberia since the Pestel regime. The young, new governor-general reached Irkutsk in March 1848 and the very morning after his arrival held a general reception. Vagin, who witnessed the event, relates that "in his youthfulness and briskness he presented a complete contrast to the personality of Rupert," and he "looked more like some fledgling ensign than a governor-general." With the additional arrival of his many new officials and subordinates, a "new order" came to replace the "Rupert era." [1] So, in its own way the year 1848 marked a turning point in Siberian history, just as it did in the history of much of Western and Central Europe.

Opinions of Muravyov's character, ambitions, and ideological outlook differed widely not only in his own time but long after his controversial administration as well. Probably one of the most flattering contemporary descriptions of Muravyov (in its own unique way) comes from the pen of the exiled revolutionary and Pan-Slav, Michael Bakunin. As one of Muravyov's staunchest non-official supporters in Eastern Siberia, Bakunin wrote to Herzen of his superior:

> There is indeed one man in Russia, the only one so highly placed in the whole official world of Russia, who has made a great name for himself by great patriotic deeds and not by trifles or base actions. He loves Russia passionately and is just as devoted to

---

1 V. I. Vagin, "Sorokovye goda," pp. 279-80.

> it as Peter the Great was. At the same time he is neither a kvas patriot /i.e. jingoist/ nor a bearded Slavophile with lenten oil. He is to the highest degree an up-to-date and enlightened man. He wants Russia's grandeur and glory to be couched in freedom.

Indeed, Bakunin considered Muravyov "absolutely a democrat" like himself and Herzen, both by instinct and by conviction." [2]

Bakunin's impassioned description is both confirmed and contradicted by a more impartial account — that of another subsequently famous Russian anarchist, Peter Kropotkin. Though young Kropotkin (1842-1921) arrived in Irkutsk as a Cossack officer in 1862 (a year after Muravyov's departure), he was well acquainted with the milieu on which the noted governor-general had made his stamp. According to Kropotkin's memoirs, Muravyov was

> very intelligent, very active, extremely amiable, and desirous to work for the good of the country. Like all men of the governmental school, he was a despot at the bottom of his heart; but he held advanced opinions, and a democratic republic would not have quite satisfied him. He had succeeded to a great extent in getting rid of the old staff of civil service officials, who considered Siberia a camp to be plundered, and he had gathered around him a number of young officials, quite honest, and many of them animated by the same excellent intentions as himself. [3]

Despite all this, Kropotkin recorded in his diary after Muravyov's departure that "you rarely meet anyone now who speaks of him sympathetically." [4]

Siberian regionalists, however, tended to take a more critical attitude toward Muravyov than did Kropotkin and, especially, Bakunin. Vagin considered the governor-general to have been a "very capable and energetic man,

---

2 Letter to A. I. Gertsen (Herzen), dated November 7, 1860, at Irkutsk, in Iu. M. Steklov, ed., M. A. Bakunin. Sobranie sochinenii i pisem, 1828-1876 (M. A. Bakunin: A Collection of Works and Letters, 1828-76), vol. IV (V tiur'makh i ssylke, 1849-1861), (Moscow, 1936), pp. 304-05.

3 P. Kropotkin, Memoirs of a Revolutionist, pp. 133-34. This work was written and first published in English in 1899.

4 P. Kropotkin, Dnevnik P. A. Kropotkina (P. A. Kropotkin's Diary), (Moscow and Petrograd, 1923), p. 92.

but reckless and easily carried away." [5] Yadrintsev at one time described Muravyov as little more than a "son of the system and of the milieu," who possessed more or less "all the generative traits of Siberian administrators." With his "face of Janus" and passion for intrigue he was hardly a cut above the average run-of-the-mill administrator in Siberia. [6] Potanin, however, tended to put Muravyov on a plane equal to Speransky. In comparing the two, he wrote,

> Muravyov-Amursky yielded to Speransky in the area of charm exerted upon Siberian society. In his views on reform Speransky was guided more by the interests of society, and Muravyov by the interests of the state. In Muravyov's opinion, Speransky made an unpardonable omission during his administration of Siberia by failing to raise the question of annexing the Amur to Russia, and he equated this omission with political treason. Like Speransky, Muravyov also did not shrink from utilizing local Siberian talent. Inclined to give more preference to the needs of state over those of society, however, he left some of the more prominent Siberians in the background and advanced those who by their own abilities and through their loyalty could render him service in the narrow sphere of the administration. [7]

Thus, where Speransky in a much briefer administration had encouraged or utilized such subsequently prominent Siberians as Slovtsov, Batenkov, and Kalashnikov on their own merits, the only Siberian subsequently prominent to be advanced by Muravyov was M. V. Zagoskin — to serve as editor of the official newspaper.

---

5 Vagin's diary, line 561; quoted in L. Ia. Podol'skaia, "Dnevnik V. I. Vagina kak istoricheskii istochnik" (V. I. Vagin's Diary as an Historical Source), in Akademiia nauk SSSR, Sibirskoe otdelenie, Obshchestvenno-politicheskoe dvizhenie v Sibiri v 1861-1917 gg. (Novosibirsk, 1967), p. 125.

6 Letter to D. I. Zavalishin, dated April 18, 1883, in Sbornik starinnykh bumag, khraniashchikhsia v muzeie P. I. Shchukina (Collection of Old Papers Preserved in the P. I. Shchukin Museum), pt. 10 (Moscow, 1902), p. 273.

7 Potanin, "Goroda Sibiri," p. 236.

The crowning achievement (and obsession perhaps) of Muravyov was the annexation of the left and right banks of the Amur River from China. With this, Eastern Siberia was provided an easy outlet to the Pacific. It was this accomplishment which more than anything else opened the eyes of some observers — both Russian, Siberian, and foreign — to the prospects of a great and glorious future for Siberia. According to this view, Siberia and its new, easternmost appendage, the Russian Far East, was now destined to play an important commercial and civilizing role in the Orient and in the North Pacific. Some optimists (and pessimists) believed, moreover, that Siberia would be affected by "liberalizing" influences from the United States, through commercial contacts in the Amur and North Pacific areas. In this manner the exploration, occupation, and annexation of the Amur basin stimulated a reappraisal of Siberia's political, economic, and cultural significance and place in the world — both for the present and especially for the future. The increased consciousness and awareness of a special destiny reserved for Siberia, hitherto a backward and isolated part of the world, fed directly into the regionalist movement.[8]

Since the Treaty of Nerchinsk, signed between Russia and China in 1689, Russians had agreed to stay out of the lower Amur valley and China had held this area, inhabited by various non-Chinese peoples, in tribute. In the 1780's the question of Russian occupation of the Amur valley had been raised once again; however, too many supplies and armed forces were considered necessary to make the undertaking worth the risk.[9]

Then, in early 1848 Governor-General Muravyov left St. Petersburg for

---

8 The similarity between this outlook and incipient nationalisms of the 19th century is rather obvious.

9 For details see Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 64; and Yuri N. Semyonov, Siberia: Its Conquest and Development (Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1963), pp. 252-53.

Eastern Siberia with the specific mission of initiating a campaign which would counteract British and French influence and activity in the Far East. China, of course, would be directly and adversely affected in this struggle between great powers. Muravyov's greatest sympathies were for the United States; these were to some extent the result of his antipathy toward Great Britain. In 1853, for instance, he stated that the best way to begin to diminish British commercial interests in the Orient was to forge a close alliance with the United States and to gain control of the Amur estuary and Sakhalin.[10] In this respect, however, Muravyov ran up against the opposition of those who disliked any expansion in the Pacific area, on one hand, and against Zavalishin, who urged that Russia's American holdings be strengthened and expanded, on the other (Muravyov favored ceding them to the United States).

The first step in the direction of Russian control of the Amur basin was taken in St. Petersburg with the formation of the "Amur Committee" in January 1849. This committee recommended what actions should be undertaken regarding exploration along the Amur and establishments at its mouth. At this time, for instance, it was not known that the mouth of the Amur was in fact navigable. Uncertainties such as this were cleared up by the naval expedition of Captain G. I. Nevelskoy, who in mid-1849 discovered that the Amur was indeed navigable all the way to the sea and that Sakhalin was actually an island separated from the mainland by a narrow strait. In 1850 the Nevelskoy expedition founded the fort of Nikolaevsk, not far from the

---

10 See I. P. Barsukov, Graf Nikolai Nikolaevich Murav'ëv-Amurskii po ego offitsial'nym dokumentam, razskazam sovremennikov i pechatnym istochnikam (Count Nikolai Nikolaevich Muravyov-Amursky: His Letters, Official Documents, Accounts of Contemporaries, and Printed Sources), (Moscow, 1891), I: 321-23.

river's mouth. This became Russia's first Pacific port south of Okhotsk on the mainland and of Petropavlovsk on Kamchatka. Indeed, one of Muravyov's associates predicted that Nikolaevsk would in time became another San Francisco. [11]

The discovery that Sakhalin was an island forced Muravyov, as he put it, "to undertake the occupation of the Amur without any further delay, as otherwise we must expect others to come at any time and occupy it from the south." [12] As could be expected, however, opposition to Muravyov's plans began to mount, both within the Amur Committee (now renamed the Gilyak Committee) and without. Within the Committee Count Nesselrode, fearing the antagonism of China and Britain, opposed the establishment of Nikolaevsk and any further moves in the Amur region. Moreover, Muravyov's counterpart in Western Siberia, Prince Gorchakov, opposed occupation or annexation of the area on different grounds. In a secret report written to Prince A. I. Chernyshev (on the Committee and President of the State Council) Gorchakov stressed that

> the Amur was unnecessary for Russia, that the measureless wilds between Yakutsk and Kamchatka and the Okhotsk coastline constituted a natural frontier which required no protection, and that all the more importantly it kept Siberians from immediate contact with foreigners, which could easily bring pernicious propaganda and substantial assistance to any disorder. [13]

Thus, Gorchakov agreed with those in the opposite camp (such as Herzen and Bakunin) in recognizing that the influence of Englishmen or Americans

---

11 Cited in J. Sullivan, "Count Muraviev-Amursky," p. 254.

12 Quoted in Barsukov, Graf Murav'ev-Amurskii, II: 50. For an easily accessible account of Muravyov's operations in the Amur valley, see Y. Semyonov, Siberia: Its Conquest and Development, pp. 246-49, 255-78.

13 P. V. Shumakher, "K istorii priobrieteniia Amura. Snosheniia s Kitaem s 1848 po 1860 god" (On the History of the Amur Acquisition: Relations with China, 1848-60), Russkii Arkhiv, (1878) bk. 3, p. 262.

might alter the status quo in Siberia to some extent. Indeed, Prince Chernyshev feared that American influence might cause Siberians to turn on Russia just as Americans had earlier done to Britain. Though Chernyshev urged Tsar Nicholas to form a committee to discuss the possibility of Siberia's secession from Russia, both the tsar and Muravyov vetoed the idea.[14] In fact, the tsar upheld the establishment of Nikolaevsk on the grounds that "where once the Russian flag has flown, it must not be lowered again."

By January 1854 Tsar Nicholas had consented to Muravyov's request to occupy the Amur territory between Transbaikalia and Nikolaevsk, an area still technically under Chinese suzerainty. On this occasion he instructed Muravyov to "sail down the Amur," but to leave "no smell of gunpowder."[15] Later that year Muravyov, accompanied by a large flotilla, sailed down the Amur on a tour of inspection. On reaching the mouth, Muravyov demanded that China cededto Russia all the land on the left bank of the Amur. Muravyov's pretext was that this would help protect China against British infiltration.

Though talks began between Russians and Chinese in 1855, it was not until 1858 (during the turmoil in China due to British and French advances from without and to the Taiping rebellion from within) that a settlement was reached. Muravyov personally took part in the negotiations held at Aigun, on the Manchurian side of the river. The treaty, signed in May 1858 by Muravyov and Yi-shan (governor of Heilungkiang province), formalized the Amur River as the boundary between Russia and China. Thus, for

---

14 Ibid.
15 See Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 65.

the first time since 1689 Russia' Far Eastern boundary was revised. Moreover, both countries were now to exercise joint control over the area between the Ussuri River and the sea.

Because the Peking government refused to honor the Aigun Treaty, signed by a mere provincial official, the issue of ceding the Amur basin was again put before the Chinese government in 1860 by the Russian envoy, N. P. Ignatiev. During the capture and pillaging of Peking by western powers and the flight of the Hsien-feng Emperor and his court to Jehol in Manchuria, Ignatiev used his influence to secure for Russia the right bank of the Amur as well, including the Ussuri region to the Korean border. The transfer of these lands was officially approved in the Treaty of Peking, signed in November 1860 by Ignatiev and Prince Kung (the highest Manchu official left in the capital).[16] Meanwhile, several months earlier, a new Russian port on the Pacific had been founded — Vladivostok, the "Ruler of the East." Muravyov's ambitious goals in the Far East, toward which he had almost single-mindedly striven for over a decade, culminated in the Treaty of Peking, which was signed only shortly before his resignation as governor-general.

In the Amur basin, an area of roughly 400,000 square miles (as large as California and Texas together), Russian settlement had begun in the early 1850's. By 1860 the Russian population reached an approximate total of 12,000, compared with about 7,000 natives.[17] By this time Cossack troops had founded 61 posts, including the major centers of Nikolaevsk

---

16 For details see Masataka Banno, China and the West, 1858-1861: The Origins of the Tsungli Yamen (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964), ch. 3-5; Sullivan, "Count Muraviev-Amursky," ch. 6; and Hugh Seton-Watson, The Russian Empire, 1801-1917 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967), pp. 439-40.

17 Sullivan, op. cit., p. 261; and P. Collins, Siberian Journey: Down the Amur to the Pacific, 1856-57, ed. by C. Vevier (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1962), p. 319.

(1850), Blagoveshchensk (1856), Khabarovsk (1858), and Vladivostok (1860). Besides Cossacks, many of the settlers in the area at this time were criminal exiles who had been released from hard labor and sent to the Amur under duress. To provide many of these men with wives, so as to encourage population growth, officials rounded up large numbers of prostitutes in Siberian towns and arranged hasty marriages with the convicts. Needless to say, these compulsory policies did not help boost the economic potential of the new region overnight. Agricultural productivity was low, the population often demoralized, and corruption probably more widespread than in Siberia itself.[18] Muravyov's settlement policy was clearly bound to attract criticism on numerous grounds, and in this respect the Decembrist Dmitry Zavalishin became the sharpest local critic in public.[19]

Also somewhat less than successful was the Amur Company, incorporated by the central government in January 1858. The company was given timber and coal concessions in the Amur basin, along with the right to open stores in all the new posts established in the area. Its chief purpose, however, was to open up and stimulate the trade that Muravyov had so earnestly hoped would flourish. Its monopolistic practices throughout the region aroused a certain degree of antagonism among the public in Irkutsk and elsewhere, which helped lead to its demise not long after its birth.[20]

Connected in part with Muravyov's Amur projects, though in a more scientific way, was the first scholarly institution east of the Urals: the

---

18 See David J. Dallin, The Rise of Russia in Asia (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949), pp. 23-25. In contrast to the combined figures of Sullivan and Collins, Dallin claims the population of the entire area in 1860 did not exceed 15,000 (p. 23).

19 For more details, see above, pp. 81-82, and below, pp. 171-73.

20 Sullivan, "Count Muraviev-Amursky," pp. 242-43. Also see E. G. Ravenstein, Russians on the Amur (London, 1861), pp. 146-47.

Siberian Section of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society. Founded in Irkutsk in 1851, this was perhaps the most durable and valuable cultural achievement of the Muravyov administration. For well over a half-century this institution was to advance in a variety of ways the scientific and geographical study and exploration of Siberia. Its establishment in the early 1850's was one more indication of the rising cultural level of the region and of an increased interest in Siberia, not only on the part of local officialdom and scholars (both Russian and foreign) but also on the part of educated Siberians.

The Imperial Russian Geographical Society had been founded in St. Petersburg only several years before, in 1845. Muravyov, while governor of Tula province, had been one of its earliest members. The first move toward founding a Siberian branch was taken by M. N. Muravyov, vice-president of the Society and relative of the governor-general. The two Muravyovs discussed the matter in late 1850, and the governor-general fully approved of the idea. A Siberian branch appealed to him not only in its scholarly aspects, but also in its "Russian" and "patriotic" dimensions. [21] By mid-1851 the Ministry of Interior had approved the proposal and the tsar had given his final assent to the matter. The Siberian Section was to be patterned after the regional Transcaucasian branch already established and would receive an annual subsidy of 2000 rubles. [22]

Muravyov officially opened the Siberian Section in a room of his Irkutsk residence in November 1851. The civilian governor of Irkutsk, K. K.

---

21 Barsukov, Graf Murav'ev-Amurskii, I: 290.

22 P. P. Semënov, ed., Istoriia poluviekovoi dieiatel'nosti Imperatorskago Russkago Geograficheskago Obshchestva: 1845-1895 (A History of a Half-Century's Activities of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society, 1845-1895), (St. Petersburg, 1896), II: 65-66.

Wenzel, was appointed as the Section's first chairman. The first Manager of Affairs to serve for any length of time (1855-61) was a Siberian official, I. S. Selsky.[23] The Section proved to be one of the first important instances of the Muravyov administration's active promotion of the cultural and intellectual development of the region; in fact, Irkutsk society viewed its establishment as the most important local event of the year 1851. From the very outset the Section provided an institutional base, the first of its kind, for a small group of thinking, progressive individuals to meet and work together in common for the sake of both science and scholarship and the region as a whole. Sukachov writes that "the motive for establishing this Section was the awareness of the need to concentrate local scientific efforts into one institution and to direct them to permanent and regular activity on the spot, which expeditions alone could not achieve."[24]

In the beginning the Section had only ten members or so, but in a year's time as many as one hundred had joined. Efforts toward building up a museum and a library for the Section had in fact antedated its official establishment. As early as 1850 Muravyov chose a local Irkutyanin, V. I. Sedakov, to serve as curator for the museum-to-be. By the time the Section was officially opened, Sedakov had collected more than 650 objects for the museum. The Section's library was donated in large part by the noted local botanist, Semyon Shchukin, who (after his "public" library failed) had built up a considerable private collection over a period of two decades.[25]

---

23 Ilarion Sergeevich Selsky (1802-61) was of Russian birth, though he lived in Eastern Siberia from 1834 until his death.

24 Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 187.

25 Ibid., p. 186; Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 192; and I. A. Iakushev, "Sem'desiat piat' let nauchnoi raboty. (K iubileiu V.-Sib. otdela russkago geografich. obshchestva). (1851-1926)" (Seventy-five Years of Scholarly Work: In Commemoration of the Jubilee of the East Siberian Section of the Russian Geographical Society, 1851-1926), Vol'naia Sibir', (1927) no. 2, p. 161.

The Section soon became closely involved in the exploration and study of the Amur basin and Eastern Siberia. In 1853-54 it sponsored an exploratory expedition to the Vilyui River in the Siberian Northeast, led by R. K. Maack. This marked the beginning of the long tradition of valuable expeditions into the Siberian hinterland sponsored by the Section. In 1855-56 Maack explored the Amur basin, and in 1859-60 he led a third expedition into the Ussuri area, investigating the possibilities of trade. In the meantime other expeditions into parts of Eastern Siberia had been undertaken since 1854. Many local merchants and officials, displaying public spiritedness and an interest in the characteristics and resources of their homeland, donated substantial sums to support these expeditions.[26] The year 1856 witnessed the publication in St. Petersburg of the first issue of the Proceedings of the Siberian Section of the Geographical Society.[27] This scholarly journal, edited by Selsky, provided detailed accounts of the various expeditions and investigations connected with the Section. The Proceedings, whose publication was soon transferred to Irkutsk, became the chief source of scientific, geographical, and ethnological information about Siberia for the next twenty-five years.

Muravyov also wrought social changes which affected the course of cultural and intellectual developments in Eastern Siberia. First of all, this dynamic administrator created a kind of myth of a Siberia as a land of opportunity, as a kind of "new frontier" (in its eastern half and in the Amur area, at least). Like Speransky and a few other of his predecessors,

---

26 Semenov, ed., Istoriia Geograficheskago Obshchestva, II: 66; Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 89; and Iakushev, "Sem'desiat piat' let," p. 163.

27 In Russian: Zapiski Sibirskago Otdiela Imperatorskago Russkago Geograficheskago Obshchestva.

Muravyov made a concerted effort to eradicate age-old abuses and to replace corrupt officials with new and, hopefully, more honest ones from Russia. The latter he sought to attract by the lure of "making good" and cashing in on the new opportunities opening up in the east. His policy, however, was less one of "careers open to talent" than of careers open to personal loyalty to himself. Through loyal officials, both new and old, he struggled not only against corrupt officialdom but against the abuses of private businessmen, especially gold entrepreneurs, too. This struggle against abuses, embezzlement, and extortion, along with the attempts to streamline his Main Administration (Glavnoe Upravlenie) in efficiency, has been described as Muravyov's "domestic policy."[28] Indeed, the rationale behind permitting the establishment of two newspapers was based on the need to allow open and public exposure of malpractices wherever and whenever they occurred.

Muravyov's attempts to attract and introduce new men into the administration who stood apart from the entrenched system and held "different principles" led to an influx of many young aristocrats, who had just finished their schooling, into the civil service. Barsukov describes (with perhaps some exaggeration) the aura surrounding Muravyov, the Amur, and Eastern Siberia that was so alluring in the late fifties:

> The Amur developments were on everyone's lips: Muravyov's personality was somewhat legendary, and from this time on Siberia attracted everyone, and especially educated young people. Many of them, still in student attire, would come to Muravyov in St. Petersburg

---

28 Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 193.

> several months before graduating and ask to be accepted into the civil service in Eastern Siberia. He would put them through a long test before satsifying their wishes. [29]

Service in the eastern borderlands attracted not only opportunists but idealists. Peter Kropotkin, himself of good aristocratic background, was an example of the latter. Young Kropotkin, just out of school in 1862, told Tsar Alexander that he wanted to work in Siberia "to apply the great reforms which are going to be made." [30]

The infusion of this small, but highly-placed segment of aristocrats into the world of Siberian officialdom was not an unmixed blessing. This new group tended to give local Siberian society an increased sense of their own identity, which openly appeared during the celebrated Neklyudov affair of 1859 with its strong anti-administration sentiments. Sukachëv concludes apropos of this,

> The distinctive energy of youth perhaps hastened this course of affairs, but along with this, the fervor, tactlessness, ignorance of local conditions, and self-importance of these administrators provided much trouble and unpleasantness for Muravyov and for local society too, whose respect and esteem they were unable to merit. [31]

Muravyov introduced new tendencies not only in official society, but also (as discussed earlier) in the area of relations between the administration and local political exiles. In part it was his "advanced opinions" that explain his interest in associating more closely with exiles of various ideological hues: liberal, socialist, radical, and Pan-Slav. Though his predecessor, Rupert, had shown favors to individual Decembrists and

---

29 Barsukov, Graf Murav'ev-Amurskii, I: 545.

30 Kropotkin, Memoirs, p. 132.

31 Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 68. For a contemporary critique of these so-called "dung" (navoznye) officials, see "Ubiistvo Nekliudova v Irkutskie" (The Murder of Neklyudov in Irkutsk), Sibir' i russkoe pravitel'stvo (Leipzig: E. L. Kasprowicz, 1879?), pp. 139-40.

Poles, Muravyov went several steps further. He tended to regard the well-born Decembrists on an equal social plane, and for other political exiles he even went so far as to provide employment. Known in the mid-1840's for his advanced views on the emancipation of serfs in European Russia, he applied his relatively liberal and progressive outlook to certain aspects of the chief social problem in Siberia — the exile system.

So suddenly did Muravyov act in erasing the numerous restrictions placed upon the Decembrists settled in villages surrounding Irkutsk and in permitting them to reside in town, that Pyatnitsky, the governor of Irkutsk province, felt obligated to denounce officially Muravyov's actions to the Ministry of Interior. He denounced "in dark colors" how reprehensibly Muravyov and some of his associates had behaved by exonerating the Decembrists and by mixing with them socially. Nevertheless, the upshot of this affair was Pyatnitsky's dismissal, not Muravyov's. In fact, Tsar Nicholas commented on Muravyov's actions: "I have finally found a man who understands me." [32]

Muravyov also treated local Polish exiles generously and fairly. Bakunin relates that "before his arrival in Siberia they suffered all kinds of repression and insult." But during his administration "they became inviolable." In fact, the well-known Piotr Wysocki told Bakunin that "Muravyov has reconciled us with Russians and with the name of Muravyov." [33]

---

32 Quoted in a letter of Bakunin to Herzen, dated October 8, 1865 (N.S.) at Naples, in M. Dragomanow, ed., Mikhail Bakunins sozial-politischer Briefwechsel mit Alexander Iw. Herzen und Ogarjow (Stuttgart, 1895), p. 109; and in B. V. Struve, "Nieskol'ko slov o grafie Murav'evie-Amurskom" (A Few Words on Count Muravyov-Amursky), Russkii Viestnik, (1884) v. 172, p. 361.

33 Bakunin in "Otvet Kolokolu" (Reply to the Bell), dated December 1, 1860, in Bakunin. Sobranie sochinenii, IV: 350. This was written before Poles had real reason to detest the name Muravyov, as Count M. N. Muravyov in 1863 brutally repressed the January Insurrection.

Though relations with Polish and Decembrist exiles remained good until the amnesty of 1856, the attitude of mutual respect between Muravyov and political exiles began to deteriorate toward the end of his administration. At this time articulate exiles among the Petrashevtsy raised the issue of the limits of freedom of speech and of the press, rousing public opinion in their opposition to administration policies. The upshot of this was an unprecedented rupture in relations between Muravyov and the leading Petrashevtsy and their deportation from Irkutsk back to village "settlement."

Muravyov also displayed liberal hospitality and relaxed social relations toward foreigners in Eastern Siberia, and especially toward the few Americans traveling there at the time. In view of his grand vision of a commercial and political rapprochement between Russia and the United States, it is not surprising that one of the first Americans to visit Eastern Siberia in the 19th century, Perry McDonough Collins, was well received in Irkutsk. In January 1857 an official dinner was put on for Collins, a California businessman, and his American companion, Peyton. In a brief, unprepared speech in English before the governor-general and his highest officials (some of whom knew English), Collins expressed his views on Siberia, Muravyov's recent accomplishments, and the prospects for closer relations across the North Pacific.

> What strikes a stranger particularly with amazement, is the vast extent and wonderful resources of this country, and one is equally amazed that they should have lain so long comparatively dormant and scarcely recognized by the world at large. But we are at the same time reminded that it was reserved for a Mouravieff to develop the resources and the knowledge of Siberia and the country of the Amoor. The Russian nation will owe, the world will owe, to the man whose genius has achieved this, true and lasting honor, because it must mark an epoch in history. Russia descending from the heights of the Altai /sic/ to the

> great Eastern Ocean by way of this mighty river, and the United States descending to its opposite shores from the heights of the Sierra Nevada, will shake the friendly hand in commercial intercourse upon that mighty sea, and these two great nations will only vie with each other in developing the resources of their respective countries. [34]

Individual Russians and Siberians for several decades previous to this had been comparing Siberia and its destiny with North America and its course of development. Collins, however, presented the first known and informed remarks and comparisons made by an American regarding Siberia and its future. Moreover, he and his traveling companion were the first Americans to penetrate Eastern Siberia (from the west) since the scare of "pernicious" and "seditious" American influences had been raised. Collins' speech and his travels represented the type of intercourse so welcomed by Muravyovs and Herzens, yet so dreaded by Gorchakovs and Chernyshevs. [35]

It is difficult to take issue with Svatikov's assertion that "the occupation of the Amur and General N. N. Muravyov's governor-generalship in Eastern Siberia played an enormous role in the history of Siberian self-consciousness." [36] Yadrintsev himself, as one of the chief representatives of this awakening self-consciousness, agreed with many others that "Muravyov's arrival in Eastern Siberia and his administration constituted an epoch" (his personal dislike of the governor-general notwithstanding). In Yadrintsev's words:

> This was a lively time, which uplifted social life. The annexation of the Amur caused a sensation not only in Siberia. The incorporation of new territory

---

34 P. M. Collins, Siberian Journey, p. 90. This very year, 1857, the administration ordered English to be taught for the first time in the Irkutsk gimnaziia, but no teachers turned out to be available (Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 583).

35 For the controversy that Collins stirred up regarding his proposal to build a railraad in Eastern Siberia, see below, pp. 663-64.

36 Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 20.

> naturally aroused thoughts on Siberia's political significance once again, and it also gave an impulse toward intellectual stimulation during the Muravyov period.[37]

The intellectual awakening that arose in the late 1850's, in both western and eastern parts of Siberia, was, however, only partially a consequence of Muravyov's "domestic" policies and of his occupation and settlement of the Amur. As shown previously, Siberian society was beginning to mature on its own, and new currents of inquiry, dissatisfaction, and criticism were developing within it. The advent of a new reign in 1855 (after thirty years of Nicholas I's rule) and an expectation of reforms also gave a new impetus to Siberian thought. Moreover, the influx of a new generation of political exiles — activist-minded men of the 1840's — provided still another element of change in the ferment of the late fifties.

* * *

Petrashevtsy and Siberian Society: 1855-60

In the wake of the revolutionary upheavals of 1848 in Europe, a small group of young Russians, which met regularly at the home of Mikhail V. Butashevich-Petrashevsky in St. Petersburg, was arrested in early 1849 for having undertaken a "conspiracy of ideas." Actually, this group had done little more than discuss, argue, and speculate about problems of the day, which included the future of Russia and theories of utopian socialism. Ultimately, fifteen members of the Petrashevsky circle were deported to Siberia as political criminals. In comparison with the Decembrists and Poles

---

37 (Iadrintsev) "Nachalo pechati," p. 381. See also Barsukov's similar comments in Graf Murav'ev-Amurskii, I: 545-46.

who preceded them, these "Petrashevtsy" (i.e. Petrashevskites), as they were subsequently called, were relatively few in number, initially utopian socialist in orientation, and lacking much solidarity or cohesiveness as a group in exile. Only two of them (Speshnyov and Chernosvitov) had ever engaged in military action, only one of them (Speshnyov) had traveled abroad for long, and none of them had ever taken part in open revolutionary activity. In contrast to the predominantly gentry composition of Decembrists and Poles, the Petrashevtsy were for the most part of non-gentry origin. They were largely professional men, students, or lower officials who struggled to make ends meet. Besides their mixed social origins and occupations, they also in time adopted rather diverse ideologies and loyalties.

For these reasons the activities of Petrashevtsy in Siberia can best be considered person by person, in contrast to Decembrist or Polish activity, which operated in a more group-oriented framework. It is of special interest to observe how these men, who, (in contrast to Decembrists and Poles), never once attempted to put their ideas into practice (excluding Petrashevsky's disastrous phalanstery, modeled on Fourier's plan), acted and reacted in exile. In contrast to the Decembrists, who often viewed their life in exile with stoic resignation and the apex of their lives forever past, the Petrashevtsy, whose "great moment" had never arrived, were more frequently unresigned to their fate. Though their restlessness did not express itself in plots to rebel or flee Siberia (as it did with some Poles), Petrashevtsy often pressed for imperial pardon or sought ways to express themselves openly in public as spokesmen for progress and change. In this last respect, the most significant of these exiles in the history of Siberia's social awakening were Petrashevsky, Speshnyov, Lvov, Durov,

and Toll. Another member of the group, who had little influence on Siberia, but on whom Siberian exile left a great impact, was Fyodor Dostoevsky.

Before their arrest in 1849, only three members of the Petrashevsky group were known to have been in Siberia. Konstantin Timkovsky, former friend of Yershov, had by now become an avid socialist and follower of Fourier's theories.[38] Nikolai Speshnyov had traveled briefly in Siberia, and Rafael A. Chernosvitov had served as a district police officer in Western Siberia from 1838 to 1842. Later he became a shareholder in several Siberian gold companies, and had apparently met Muravyov once for a few minutes. When introduced to Petrashevsky's circle in November 1848 by P. Latkin (a student and son of a Yeniseisk gold entrepreneur), he played up his "connections" with the popular "liberal" governor-general for all they were worth, thereby making a great impression upon the Petrashevtsy.[39] However, Chernosvitov, Timkovsky, and Petrashevsky alone in the circle expressed any real interest in Siberia before the arrests of 1849.[40] Chernosvitov's association with the group lasted only two months, though, and consequently after the arrests he was detained only briefly and was not exiled to Siberia.

There was a great difference in the nature of the impact and in the activities of Petrashevtsy exiled to Western Siberia and of those banished to the eastern half of the country. This difference is reflected in part by the sympathetic regard of Governor-General Muravyov toward the Petrashevtsy in Eastern Siberia and by the higher cultural and intellectual level of

---

38 M. Azadovskii in P. P. Ershov, p. 10; and Franco Venturi, Roots of Revolution, trans.: Francis Haskell (New York: Universal Library/Grosset & Dunlap, 1960), p. 89.

39 V. I. Semevskii, M. V. Butashevich-Petrashevskii i Petrashevtsy (Moscow, 1922), pt. 1, pp. 187-88. For discussions in English on the backgrounds of Chernosvitov and Speshnyov, see Venturi, Roots, pp. 86-88, and John L. Evans, "Petrashevskii and the Petrashevtsy," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1968), pp. 84-86.

Irkutsk society. Moreover, the most significant Petrashevtsy in Western Siberia were exiled for shorter overall terms and thus spent relatively more time at hard labor and less amidst the civilian population. Of the exiles inaand around Western Siberia, Dostoevsky, Pleshcheev, Toll, and Durov were probably of most importance culturally and/or socially. Only Durov, however, appears to have exerted much positive influence on surrounding Siberian society, and indeed he made a pronounced impact on the young Grigory Potanin, the future explorer, ethnographer, and regionalist spokesman and writer.

The most subsequently famous member of the circle exiled to Western Siberia was Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky (1821-81). The years 1850-54 he spent in a convict prison in Omsk, and during the period 1854-59 he was stationed in Semipalatinsk as a common soldier. Dostoevsky contributed little to Siberian cultural and intellectual development for several reasons. First, he was sentenced to a convict prison, where (in his view) the common people looked upon him as a "noble," and therefore automatically suspect. In turn, he viewed Omsk as a "hateful hole, . . . dirty, almost exclusively inhabited by the military, and dissolute to the last degree."[40] His own moody personality kept him from giving lessons or holding forth at social gatherings, as did many of his fellow Petrashevtsy (in fact, those he disliked most).

After his release from prison in 1854, he soon fell in love with Mme. Maria Isaeva in Semipalatinsk, and this infatuation, by his own admission, drained most of his time and energy (he finally succeeded in marrying her in 1859 after her husband died). Furthermore, Dostoevsky's creative

---

40 Letter to Mikhail M. Dostoevskii, dated February 22, 1854, at Omsk; quoted in Letters of Fyodor Dostoevsky to His Family and Friends, trans.: E. C. Mayne (New York; McGraw-Hill, 1964), p. 63.

interests were not directed toward immediate social causes, but almost entirely toward literature, while his spiritual concerns moved toward a faith in the Russian people and in Russian Orthodox Christianity. As Carr puts it, "but for Siberia, Dostoevsky would never have developed his idealisation of the Russian people; . . . the form of the cult bears the clear impress of these prison years." [41] In Siberia itself, however, Dostoevsky had little faith. As he bluntly expressed it, "Siberia can have no future, since all its rivers run into the Arctic Ocean, and there is no other outlet to a sea." [42] Not only did he abandon whatever beliefs he had had in the secular, utopian socialist, and radical ideas of the Petrashevsky circle, but he became far too preoccupied with his own convictions and problems to worry and immediately improving or changing the world around him.

Nevertheless, Dostoevsky was not entirely inactive. He first began to think of writing a "great novel," started work on the "House of the Dead" in 1855, and finished two smaller stories, "The Village of Stepanchikovo" and "Uncle's Dream," both published in 1859. Of course, none of this had any effect at all on Siberia at the time, though prison life in Omsk did form the subject matter of the "House of the Dead" and material for the two above-mentioned stories was drawn from experiences in Semipalatinsk. Dostoevsky rarely gave lessons; in prison he taught a Circassian to speak and read Russian, and in Semipalatinsk he tutored a Polish girl (who promptly fell in love with him). He helped the son of his future wife, Pavel Isaev, gain acceptance into the Omsk cadet school, and he brought the boy back to Peters-

---

41 E. H. Carr, Dostoevsky, 1821-1881 (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1931), p. 67.

42 Baron A. E. Vrangel', Vospominaniia o Th. M. Dostoevskom v Sibiri 1854-56 g.g. (Reminiscences of F. M. Dostoevsky in Siberia, 1854-56), (St. Petersburg, 1912), p. 33. Wrangel adds that at this time no one in Semipalatinsk knew of Muravyov's recent exploits along the Amur River.

burg with him in early 1860. But it was hardly worth the effort, as young Isaev became a rake and idler in the capital. All in all, Dostoevsky's meager educational endeavors in Siberia brought forth little fruit.

The fault was not all his, however. Semipalatinsk at the time was a town of 5,000 inhabitants, with an extremely low level of culture and political sophistication. According to Dostoevsky's friend, Baron Wrangel:

> There were no schools except a district one. Even the pharmacy was state-run. There were no stores, except for a haberdasher's shop . . . there was no bookstore at all, for there was no one that read. I think that in the whole town only ten to fifteen people subscribed to newspapers, nor was that any wonder, since people in Siberia then were interested only in cards, drinking-bouts, scandals, and business affairs. They even took little interest in the Crimean War: it was too far away and was not their own "Siberian" affair. Sibiryaks kept to themselves and would say: "he is from Russia." [43]

Here Wrangel interestingly associates "regional" particularism with ignorance and apathy, and hardly with an intellectual and political awakening.

It is curious that both Dostoevsky and Bakunin, the two exiles in Siberia at this time to become most famous subsequently, exerted very little positive influence upon local society. And with few exceptions, Siberians preserved no special attachment or esteem for either one. The soil for the great missions which obsessed these two visionaries lay elsewhere than in Siberia.

The activities of two other exiled Petrashevtsy, the poet Alexei Nikolaevich Pleshcheev (1825-93) and the writer and educator Felix Gustavovich Toll (1823-67), can be summarized briefly. Pleshcheev's reception in Orenburg, a large provincial town on the Ural River, affords an interesting

---

43 Ibid., pp. 20-21.

comparison with that which other Petrashevtsy met in towns of Siberia proper. Exiled to military service in Orenburg from 1850 to 1856, Pleshcheev returned to Russia in 1859 after having entered the civil service. According to one account, Pleshcheev had hardly a single friend in Orenburg: "'Cultured' local society looked on him with special enmity," and the fact that he "wrote" was for all concerned "already enough to avoid him and view him as an outcast." [44] Orenburg society was clearly less advanced in its literary and cultural interests (and tolerance) than most of the larger Siberian towns (including Omsk); in such an atmosphere a cultured Russian exile could hardly be expected to contribute much. Toll, on the other hand, lived "quite tranquilly" in Tomsk, where he earned a living by giving lessons. In Bakunin's words, Toll "was an excellent teacher, and the children worshipped him"; moreover, his wife, one of Toll's pupils, preserved "fondest memories of him." [45] At the same time, however, Toll submerged himself in drink and bad company until Bakunin "rescued" him shortly before his return to European Russia in 1857.

From what the evidence indicates, the most influential Petrashevets in Western Siberia was the politically-minded poet, Sergei Fyodorovich Durov (1816-69). Along with Dostoevsky, Durov had spent four years in convict prison in Omsk. The two disliked each other and reportedly did not even speak to one another during their prison years. The account that they "hated one another with all the force of their beings" may well be close to the

---

44 P. Iu. Iudin, "A. N. Pleshcheev v ssylkie" (A. N. Pleshcheev in Exile), Istoricheskii Viestnik, (May 1897), pp. 403-04.

45 Letter to A. I. Gertsen, dated November 7, 1860, at Irkutsk, in Bakunin. Sobranie sochinenii, IV: 342. Toll, incidentally, was the only known Petrashevets with whom Bakunin got along quite well (Speshnyov he tolerated). Potanin also acknowledged Toll's contributions to Tomsk society ("Goroda Sibiri," p. 244).

truth. After settling in Omsk in 1854 Durov became well-liked by many, and he "talked, and even argued, freely upon all sorts of subjects, and often succeeded in carrying his audience with him." [46] In Omsk he became a favorite guest at the home of the Kapustins, a "pure Siberian family," and here the "best of Omsk youth gathered." At other Omsk homes, however, Durov was evidently "shunned as a dangerous man." [47]

Durov's chief contribution to Siberian intellectual development was his catalytic influence upon the young Cossack Grigory Potanin (1835-1920), who became a founder of the regionalist movement. Potanin had previously finished the Omsk cadet school and, after having served several years in the Altai region, returned to Omsk in 1857. Here, in the "intellectual center of Western Siberia" (as he viewed it — in contrast to Dostoevsky's "hole"), an old classmate introduced him to Durov. With this encounter, Potanin felt he "was coming into an altogether new sphere."

> For the first time I saw before me a man made ecstatic by humane ideas. . . . With the spiritual upsurge, which is beginning to envelop Russia, said Durov, a thirst for knowledge has begun to appear in areas and remote places where previously it could hardly have been expected. Durov said that these sprouts of new strength, issuing forth from Russian land and replacing lost generations, gladden him and strengthen his faith in the Russian people, though he feared for the solidity of this movement and asked if this revival in Russian society was only temporary. . . .
>
> Toward mid-evening I was already enchanted by Durov's conversation. I was very pleased that he sympathized with everything with which I sympathized . . . [48]

---

46 "From the Memoranda of P. K. Martyanov, at the House of the Dead, 1850-1854," Letters of Dostoevsky, p. 286.

47 G. N. Potanin, "Vstriecha s S. Th. Durovym" (An Encounter with S. F. Durov), in Na slavnom postu (St. Petersburg, 1900), pp. 260-61.

48 Ibid., pp. 261-62.

The conversation then turned to the Siberian administrative authorities, a subject in which Potanin was keenly interested.

> I was already quite charged with antipathy toward the administration of Western Siberia of that time, or rather toward the clique around /Governor-General/ Hasford, and I was pleased to hear Durov unceremoniously recount its sins and crimes in no uncertain terms. I also liked the fact that Durov advanced the rights of youth.[49]

In the struggle against administrative abuses Potanin had already begun to show a regionalist bent by advocating the need for a Siberian Gogol to step forth. Durov, however, on hearing this, rejected the idea on grounds that "laughter was a weak and ineffective means which reconciled itself to evil." What was needed instead was a "direct indictment of evil."

By the end of the evening Durov had made a "convert." As Potanin related it,

> I easily went over to the other faith, because between my old sympathy and its denial stood an apostle of progress, to whom I now felt a cordial attraction. A revolution took place inside me. . . . Actually, it was not a revolution, for my ideological basis was already being formulated along this approximate line . . .[50]

Durov left for European Russia soon thereafter, and Potanin never saw him again; but he could never shake loose from his mind the halo surrounding Durov. Indeed, the ideological stimulus Durov gave to young Potanin was soon to be supplemented by the more practical assistance of another prominent exile in Western Siberia — Michael Bakunin.

In Eastern Siberia the most important among exiled Petrashevtsy were

---

49 Ibid., p. 262. Gustav Kh. Hasford (Gasford) was governor-general of Western Siberia from 1851 to 1861.

50 Ibid., pp. 263-64. Potanin's "other faith" prior to this may be characterized in part by the fact that he had admired Tsar Nicholas I and had wept upon hearing the news of his death in 1855;(see V. A. Obruchev, Grigorii Nikolaevich Potanin. Zhizn' i deiatel'nost' (Grigory N. Potanin: His Life and Activities), (Moscow-Leningrad, 1947), p. 38.

Nikolai Alexandrovich Speshnyov (1821-82), Fyodor Nikolaevich Lvov (1823-85), and Mikhail Vasilievich Petrashevsky himself (1821-66). After an initial period of hard labor this trio was released from it by the general amnesty of 1856. Eventually, Governor-General Muravyov permitted them to "settle" in Irkutsk, and here they filled in part the vacuum recently left by many of the amnestied Decembrists. Thus, in 1857 Speshnyov, Lvov, and Petrashevsky took a room in Irkutsk and soon became closely connected with Muravyov's Main Administration. Paradoxically, they were on the whole both more intimately linked with Muravyov's administration and more opposed to it than any of their Decembrist predecessors (with the exception of Zavalishin).

The contributions of these three Petrashevtsy to the development of social thought and public opinion in Eastern Siberia took two major avenues of approach: a direct and immediate personal influence upon local youth and society, and the circulation of political commentary and criticism through newspapers. As for the latter approach, it was Muravyov himself who in 1857 selected the personable Speshnyov as editor of the Irkutsk Provincial Gazette, the first printed newspaper in the history of Eastern Siberia.[51] Other chief contributors were Lvov and Petrashevsky, of course, along with articulate writers from Irkutsk itself.

The first issue of the Irkutsk Provincial Gazette, published on May 16, 1857, was indeed a landmark in the history of Siberian journalism. The merits of this official newspaper Sukachov described in retrospect as follows:

> Looking back now over this Gazette, printed in a hackneyed, coarse type on gray, almost dirty paper, one is struck by the full contrast in the contents of its

51 In Russian: Irkutskiia Gubernskiia Viedomosti. As with all government-sponsored newspapers then, it had both official and unofficial sections.

> unofficial part with the contents this type of publication usually presents. The Irkutsk Gazette, with its lively, animated, and interesting articles, for several years successfully took the place of a private periodical publication. Whoever wants to know how people lived and what they did and thought in Irkutsk . . . in the late 1850's and the early 1860's should look through the Irkutsk Gazette of that time, and he will be convinced that a circle of people lived in Irkutsk . . . who led the same kind of life that the best part of educated Russian society then led. [52]

Yadrintsev presents another view of the Irkutsk Gazette, stressing its "accusatory character." In fact, the paper became so outspoken and vigorous that "in this respect it could hardly be compared with any other publication of the time in Russia." Soon after it began, an editorial announced that the paper was "authorized" to print any kind of article of benefit to Siberia or any accusation of abuses. Over the objections of the Ministry of Interior, Muravyov continued to permit the printing of accusations, which came from all over Eastern Siberia and even Western Siberia. In this way the Gazette served much of Siberia by becoming "the terror of all bribers, embezzlers, and usurers." [53] The role this official newspaper played is hard to exaggerate. Publication of exposés helped nurture public opinion by drawing society into a more active interest in political affairs and in giving it a greater influence over them. [54]

The first editor of this newspaper, Speshnyov, was of gentry origin (he had once owned 500 serfs), had resided in Western Europe for five years, and had at one time considered himself a "communist." [55] His previous radicalism

---

52 V. P, Sukachev, Irkutsk, pp. 75-76.
53 (Iadrintsev) "Nachalo pechati," p. 372.
54 Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 195.
55 The recent literary critic Mochulsky sees in Speshnyov a prototype of Dostoevsky's enigmatic character, Nikolai Stavrogin, in the Possessed. See K. Mochul'skii, Dostoevskii: Zhizn' i tvorchestvo (Dostoevsky: His Life and Creative Work), (Paris: YMCA Press, 1949), p. 109; and J. Evans, "Petrashevskii," p. 80 n.

notwithstanding, he ingratiated himself easily with Muravyov, and the governor-general more than once petitioned the tsar for his pardon. Speshnyov served as editor of the Gazette until March 1859, when Muravyov took him along on a journey to inspect the settlement of the newly acquired Amur region. In contrast to Petrashevsky and Lvov, Speshnyov retained the respect and support of Muravyov by keeping out of the tumultuous Neklyudov affair, which began in the spring of 1859. After returning from the Amur trip, he soon went back to European Russia, having been reinstated to gentry status with civil rights.

As editor of the Gazette, Speshnyov encouraged local talent too. In this respect he helped provide an outlet for the first literary efforts of young Serafim S. Shashkov (1841-82), born the son of an Irkutsk priest and a subsequent regionalist, historian, and publicist of note. Shashkov began his literary career in 1858 with three articles in the Gazette on the Buryats and their customs.[56] Succeeding Speshnyov as editor of the paper was Mikhail V. Zagoskin (1830-94), former professor at the Irkutsk Ecclesiastical Seminary and subsequently prominent regionalist writer and newspaperman. Zagoskin's opinion that of all the Petrashevtsy "Speshnyov was generally the most developed, knowledgeable, and self-possessed" seems to have been shared by many others at the time.[57]

Fyodor Nikolaevich Lvov, formerly trained as an engineer, was another important contributor to the Gazette, especially with his scientific

---

56 S. S. Shashkov, "Buriati Irkutskoi gubernii, ikh nravy, obychai, vierovaniia i piesni" (The Buryats of Irkutsk Province: Their Morals, Customs, Beliefs, and Songs), Irkutskiia Gubernskiia Viedomosti, (1858) no. 11, 12, 18.

57 Quoted in V. Araf'ev, "M. V. Butashevich-Petrashevskii v Sibiri," Russkaia Starina, (January 1902) v. 109, p. 182.

articles. In contrast to Speshnyov, however, Lvov became more involved politically in the main issues of the day, a tendency which he shared with Petrashevsky and the Decembrist Zavalishin. His chief earnings came from a minor position that he was given in Muravyov's administration, though he also tutored and gave public lectures on scientific and technological subjects. It was as Petrashevsky's closest friend and moral supporter, however, that Lvov contributed most to the emergence of public opinion and criticism in Irkutsk.

In contrast to both Speshnyov and Lvov, Petrashevsky never held an official position. Though he boasted of his intimacy with Muravyov, from the very outset of his stay in Irkutsk the governor-general treated him somewhat coolly. Though frequently invited to Muravyov's residence, this did not mean that the strong-willed, rough-and-ready governor-general had any great liking for an intellectual that "loved mankind more than man." To earn a living in Irkutsk, Petrashevsky at first set himself up as an attorney; as business was rather poor, however, he was often reduced to dire poverty. [58]

Though he wrote articles for the Gazette, he was not a major contributor and his writings only slightly reflected the "accusatory character" that the paper took on. In an article of July 1857, entitled "Some Thoughts on Siberia," Petrashevsky discussed Russia's civilizing role in Asia and appealed for a greater Europeanization of Siberia. A year later he contributed a somewhat more pointed article that warned of a potential trade monopoly in the Amur region by the newly formed Amur Company. [59] Touchy articles such

---

58 V. I. Semevskii, "M. V. Butashevich-Petrashevskii v Sibiri," Golos Minuvshago, (March 1915) no. 3, p. 20, 22.

59 Ibid., pp. 24-27.

this in the paper's unofficial section tended to irritate many merchants and administrative officials unused to such criticism, and "not only the people /directly/ offended in it, but also people in general with old and set bureaucratic views hated and feared" the Gazette.[60] Thus, the administration's censorship slowly became more restrictive, though the paper continued to publish.

Consequently, toward the end of 1858 Petrashevsky, Zagoskin, Selsky, and a few others connected with the Gazette began to consider publishing a private weekly newspaper.[61] Petrashevsky proposed this to Muravyov, who, sympathetic to the idea, was able to gain permission from the Siberian Committee (re-established in 1852) in St. Petersburg. In accordance with Muravyov's wish, the name of this first private, printed newspaper in Eastern Siberia was to be the "Amur." Instead of Petrashevsky, however, Muravyov chose Zagoskin to be editor and set himself up as censor. Meanwhile, Petrashevsky became active in procuring funds to support the new publication. Arrangements were made with the local military press to print the new paper.

The prospective editorial staff of the Amur was drawn up accordingly: Petrashevsky took the "local review"; M. P. Shestunov, a local accountant, was given "general domestic news" and publishing responsibilities; and P. A. Gorbunov, former tutor in the Decembrist Trubetskoy family, was placed in charge of "foreign" affairs. Several other important local contributors and financial supporters in the venture were three young men with "advanced" ideas, all sons of Irkutsk merchants: Stepan S. Popov (subsequently involved in the Siberian Independence Affair), Ivan I. Pilenkov, and Andrei A.

---

60 (Iadrintsev) "Nachalo pechati," p. 372.
61 Araf'ev, "Petrashevskii v Sibiri," p. 178.

Belogolovy, former pupil of the Decembrist Poggio. Vsevolod I. Vagin (1823-1900) began a lifetime association with Zagoskin at this time, sending off articles from Kainsk to the Amur.[62] Other contributors among Petrashevtsy were Lvov, Speshnyov, and Chernosvitov (corresponding from Krasnoyarsk).

Despite the seemingly heterogeneous composition of the staff and leading contributors, Yadrintsev considered the Amur to have been "an organ not of one person, but of a whole group of persons with identical views and aspirations."[63] As former editor of the Irkutsk Gazette for a brief period, Zagoskin had both the experience and connections to attract good writers and correspondents and to keep the paper going through its brief, though tempestuous existence. From the very start the Amur proved more attractive than the Gazette to many Siberian writers, who preferred a private paper to an official, government one, and from 1860 on the unofficial section of the Gazette began in fact to deteriorate in quality. The editorial staff of the Amur sought to make the new paper a regional voice and announced it would be devoted "to the interests of Siberia."[64]

The first issue of the Amur came out on January 1, 1860, the very day of Muravyov's return to Irkutsk from the Amur valley. Petrashevsky's inaugural article in part pleased Muravyov, who, having been away, was unable to censor it. Nevertheless, in emphasizing civil rights and liberties, "its general principles and especially its indication of the harm of administrative interference in the activity of judicial institutions" hardly pleased the governor-general.[65] Petrashevsky's subsequent articles, though perhaps

---

62 See Vagin's testimony in Iadrintsev, "Nachalo pechati," p. 382.
63 "Nachalo pechati," p. 382.
64 Ibid., p. 382, 373.
65 Semevskii, "Petrashevskii v Sibiri," p. 41.

less colorful than the first, still touched on such controversial questions as the settlement of the Amur, the benefits of local self-government, and open public discussion of private enterprise in the region. Of these articles Zagoskin commented that Petrashevsky wrote "against the censor, trying to offend people close to the governor-general." [66] All in all, his participation in the Amur was extremely brief. By the ninth issue (of March 1, 1860) an announcement appeared, stating that "there is no local review in this number for reasons not dependent upon the editor." [67] Indeed, Petrashevsky had been deported from Irkutsk several days earlier.

To understand the reasons behind this banishment, ordered by Muravyov's assistant, M. S. Korsakov, but approved by the governor-general, Petrashevsky's non-journalistic activities need to be described. In 1858 Mikhail Prokopievich Shestunov (1825-83) assumed ownership of a private "public" library previously established in Irkutsk, and with no more than 300 rubles he immediately began to broaden the scope of its activities. [68] According to Shashkov, in Shestunov's library a

> cultured circle met where all kinds of social questions were discussed and raised against the local authorities, who were irritated by the library and called it a Jacobin club. I was a subscriber and often while reading papers in the library I overheard conversations of interest to me going on. [69]

According to another source, the members "demanded more of life than cards, drunkenness, and debauch," and needed to "unburden their souls." More

---

66 Quoted in Araf'ev, "Petrashevskii v Sibiri," p. 181. Semevskii briefly lists and describes Petrashevsky's articles in his article, "Petrashevskii v Sibiri," pp. 41-42.

67 Quoted in Semevskii, "Petrashevskii v Sibiri," p. 42.

68 Sukachev claims Shestunov's library belonged previously to Boldakov, thus having existed for over twenty years (Irkutsk, p. 77); Semevskii and Koz'min state that the previous owner was one Protopopov ("Petrashevskii v Sibiri," p. 30; and "Zagoskin," p. 192).

69 S. Shashkov, "Avtobiografiia" (Autobiography), Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1882) no. 32, p. 12; quoted in Semevskii, "Petrashevskii v Sibiri," 30.

specifically, they were "collaborators in both Irkutsk papers, several local teachers, the more developed segment of merchant-class youth, and several young university people who had arrived in Eastern Siberia, to whom Muravyov, disliking students in general, did not give positions corresponding to their education." [70] As might be expected, however, "among those present in the club, Petrashevsky, a born agitator, was, of course, first and foremost." [71] In short, such a group of local intelligentsia was precisely what Petrashevsky wanted and needed (representing, in a way, a continuation of his earlier circle in Petersburg). He not only visited Shestunov's library frequently, trying to sway whomever was there with fiery speeches, but he also became the most vocal opponent of Muravyov, his administration, and its policies in Irkutsk.

This opposition became crystallized in April 1859 by an unusual event: the first known duel in Siberia. [72] Two minor officials, Beklemishev and Neklyudov, had challenged each other and met on the outskirts of Irkutsk. Neklyudov was wounded fatally. A number of factors pointed toward premeditated murder, with the connivance of certain higher officials. Beklemishev was a "partisan" and favorite of Muravyov, and both his own second and Neklyudov's were his close friends. Moreover, the nature of the wound, the administration's foreknowledge of the duel and its failure to forestall the event ahead of time, the delay in bringing the participants and the case to

---

70 Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 77.

71 B. A. Miliutin, "General-gubernatorstvo N. N. Murav'eva v Sibiri. (Otryvok iz vospominanii)" (N.N. Muravyov's Governor-Generalship in Siberia: An Excerpt from Memoirs), Istoricheskii Viestnik (Dec. 1888) [illegible], p. 616.

72 The influx of aristocratic youths and mores into Muravyov's administration in a Siberia without gentry (and not the "frontier spirit" in Eastern Siberia) help explain why this first known duel occurred when it did.

court, not to mention the subsequent overruling of a district court decision by provincial court judges in Beklemishev's favor, all made the affair and the administrations's part in it even more suspect in the eyes of the local public. To complicate matters, Muravyov was absent from Irkutsk both at the time of the duel and for the rest of the year. [73]

Public indignance was soon aroused in Irkutsk. Archbishop Eusebius of Irkutsk spoke out sharply and disapprovingly against the turn for the worse that the affair was taking. Beklemishev, the seconds, and the police chief were subjected to insults in the street, and a raft of manuscript poems and pamphlets directed against them began to circulate. [74] Petrashevsky soon stepped into the fray. He went to local authorities and requested that invitations to Neklyudov's funeral be printed. According to Milyutin, when the invitations appeared, plastered all over town with official permission to print stamped on them,

> Even the neutral part of the population thought this was an official appeal. . . . The whole town followed his coffin. . . . And at the grave a speech was given by the same Petrashevsky, and for the first time the words "treacherous murder" were uttered in public. [75]

Thus occurred the first recorded public street demonstration in Irkutsk. All in all, writes Sukachov, the Neklyudov affair "occupies a rather substantial place in the history of Irkutsk society in that it caused the first clearly defined manifestation of public opinion in Irkutsk." Moreover, the affair pointed to a further "awakening of conscious life in Irkutsk society." [76]

---

73 The intracacies of this duel and the after-effects were written up (presumably by Nikolai Belogolovy) in Herzen's émigré paper Pod Sud! (On Trial!), (1859) no. 2, and later reprinted in Sibir' i russkoe pravitel'stvo with the title "Ubiistvo Nekliudova v Irkutskie," pp. 138-39.

74 Sukachev, Irkutsk, pp. 71-72.

75 Miliutin, op. cit., p. 617.

76 Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 75.

After Muravyov returned to Irkutsk (in January 1860), he broke off relations with Petrashevsky, and on February 27, 1860, Petrashevsky was deported to the village of Shushenskoe (subsequently Lenin's place of exile in 1897-1900) near Minusinsk. And Lvov, for an article in the Gazette implicating Muravyov's "favorites," was dismissed from his post in the Main Administration and exiled to the village of Olonki, not far from Irkutsk. [77] In view of all this, Shestunov could only conclude that "such contempt for the law, for public opinion and even for decency, and such arbitrariness and despotism have never in the course of thirteen years been displayed so nakedly, clearly, and publicly as in the last year." [78]

Thus, Petrashevsky and Lvov, like a few of the more rebellious Poles in Siberia, suffered a kind of "exile within exile" for their activities openly opposing the administrative and political status-quo. Zagoskin and the "student-officials" who came to the library circle received little more than sharp reprimands from Muravyov, though Shestunov was deported to Kirensk for two months. The library, temporarily closed down, reopened later and survived until 1866. [79] The Amur continued to publish for two more years.

Petrashevsky's positive achievements in rousing the Irkutsk public were several: he took the initiative in establishing the Amur, Eastern Siberia's first private newspaper; he advanced controversial ideas both in

---

77 Araf'ev, "Petrashevskii v Sibiri," p. 179. Lvov later received permission to reside in St. Petersburg, and here in 1870 he became secretary of the Russian Technical Society.

78 Letter to D. I. Zavalishin, dated April 5, 1860; quoted in Semevskii, "Petrashevskii v Sibiri," p. 37.

79 Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 78; Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 525; Araf'ev, "Petrashevskii v Sibiri," p. 179; and "Shestunov," Russkii biograficheskii slovar', XXIII: 245.

the "Jacobin club" among a small but inquisitive elite and in the columns of the Amur, read by the public at large; and in certain ways he led Irkutsk society in its widespread opposition to the administration's position in the Neklyudov affair. With the exception of Zavalishin's earlier opposition in the Russian press, this was the most open and articulate expression of public opinion against local authorities to date — both in the streets and in the press. And Petrashevsky was at its forefront. This growing opposition may have contributed in part to Muravyov's decision to retire as governor-general as of January 1861, though it appears that the successful conclusion of the Treaty of Peking in November 1860 was much more influential in this respect.[80] On the other hand, it also seems that much of Petrashevsky's influence was only superficial and ephemeral (in contrast to the Decembrists'). Whatever influence he exerted was due in part to his highly placed connections. One contemporary noted that many in Irkutsk did not accept Petrashevsky because of his "lack of restraint"; however, "one strong argument in favor of gaining his acquaintance was that the governor-general received him."[81] Thus, in some ways Petrashevsky's personal following was really no more substantial in Irkutsk than that of another "agitator-exile" at that time — Michael Bakunin.

Only in a relatively advanced social milieu such as Irkutsk's could Petrashevsky even begin to flourish. He subsequently withered away during his last six years in Shushenskoe, Krasnoyarsk, and Belskoe. In this

---

80 See Sullivan, "Count Muraviev-Amursky," p.1162.

81 V. P. Bykova's testimony as quoted by Semevskii, "Petrashevskii v Sibiri," p. 22.

last village, according to one account, "everyone was afraid of him and thought he associated with the devil. They came to this conclusion from the fact that he did not go to church, disliked priests, and led an altogether unsociable life." [82] Nevertheless, he did help peasants by writing petitions and complaints to government authorities. In 1866 Petrashevsky died here in Belskoe, the last remaining member of his circle in Siberia and the most prominent among his peers in the social, political, and journalistic awakening that openly surfaced in Siberian society in the late 1850's.

* * *

Bakunin's Years of Siberian Exile: 1857-61

In contrast to the Petrashevtsy, the revolutionary Pan-Slav, Michael Alexandrovich Bakunin (1814-76) was sent to Siberia for a great deal more than a mere "conspiracy of ideas." First, for his connection with Wilhelm Weitling's communist societies in Switzerland, Tsar Nicholas in 1844 deprived him in absentia of his noble rank and sentenced him to hard labor in Siberia. Henceforth Bakunin's fate would be sealed whenever he should step within the borders of the Russian Empire. Then, he was arrested in 1849 by Saxon officials for his participation in the Dresden insurrection, and was subsequently detained by Austrian authorities for his links with the Prague disturbances of 1848. The upshot of all this was Bakunin's deportation to Russia in 1851 into the hands of Nicholas I. His immediate lot was six years' imprisonment in the Peter-and-Paul

---

82 Araf'ev, "Petrashevskii v Sibiri," p. 183.

fortress and in Schluesselburg prison near Petersburg. In February 1857, the newly crowned Alexander II offered him the choice of staying in Schluesselburg or of perpetual banishment to Siberia. Reduced by now to a complete physical and mental wreck, Bakunin naturally chose the second alternative as his only hope for recovery. [83]

When compared to the Petrashevtsy in exile, Bakunin's activities during his four-year stay in Siberia come closest to resembling those of Petrashevsky and Durov: giving lessons now and then, writing a few articles, trying to influence young Siberians, and attempting to mould or sway public opinion. In spite of Bakunin's strong antipathy toward Petrashevsky, many Siberians who knew them both tended to lump the two together as outside agitators and disliked them about equally. Bakunin and Petrashevsky found themselves on opposite sides of the fence on almost every issue that shook Irkutsk society in the years 1859-60.

Bakunin was first permitted to reside in Tomsk, where he stayed for two years, 1857-59. After having struck up a friendship with the Petrashevets Toll, he took over two of his pupils when Toll left for Russia. Thus, Bakunin embarked upon teaching French to the two daughters of a local Pole, Ksawery Kwiatkowski, and before long he married the elder sister, Antonia. Though he tried to influence her way of thinking and even boasted that she shared all his aspirations and was a "Slavic patriot," according to a more detached observer, she "took rather less interest in social ideas than in last year's fashions." [84]

---

83 For details consult E. H. Carr, Michael Bakunin (New York: Vintage Books, 1961), pp. 129-30, 208-35.

84 Letter to A. I. Gertsen, dated December 8, 1860 at Irkutsk, in Bakunin. Sobranie sochinenii, IV: 368; the unidentified observer is quoted in Carr, Bakunin, p. 239. Antonia remained a devoted wife, for richer, for poorer, for better, for worse, until his death.

Much more significant for the history of Siberian self-consciousness, however, was Bakunin's association in Tomsk with Grigory Potanin. In this respect Bakunin later claimed: "I have not only known Potanin personally, but I was, I may well say, his creator, or more correctly stated, his discoverer. I freed him from the Cossack yoke and sent him to Petersburg." [85] Despite the previous impact of Durov on the young Cossack in Omsk, Bakunin could justifiably call himself Potanin's "discoverer" (an honor he shared perhaps with P. P. Semyonov). Whereas Durov had failed to recognize Potanin's potential, or at least to nurture it consciously, Bakunin lent Potanin books from his library (recently purchased from the Decembrist Batenkov), and in 1859 he helped the penniless youth reach St. Petersburg by arranging his passage on a gold and silver caravan. Moreover, Bakunin gave to this "Siberian Lomonosov," as he called him, two letters of introduction to deliver in the capital: one to Mikhail N. Katkov, editor of the Moscow Gazette, and the other to his cousins. [86] Not only did he urge Katkov to aid the prospective student financially, but he suggested that the information Potanin had collected about Siberia might "serve as material for newspaper articles." [87]

In March 1859 Bakunin and his young wife arrived in Irkutsk. Governor-General Muravyov, Bakunin's second cousin on his mother's side, had met his exiled relative in Tomsk briefly the year before and agreed to

---

85 Letter to Herzen, dated October 8, 1865 (N. S.) at Naples, in Bakunins Briefwechsel, p. 110.

86 Letter to M. N. Katkov, dated January 21, 1859 at Tomsk, and letter to E. M. and P. M. Bakunina, dated January 1859 at Tomsk, in Bakunin. Sobranie sochinenii, IV: 296, 298. Reminded of Lomonosov's earlier example, Potanin had contemplated walking to Petersburg to continue his education.

87 Letter to Katkov, dated January 21, 1859, op. cit., IV: 297.

permit his transfer to Irkutsk. Here Bakunin was given a post in the newly formed Amur Company that paid 2000 rubles a year (for once enough money for his needs), and the following summer he traveled widely through Eastern Siberia and the Amur region on company business. After his return to Irkutsk in November 1859, he remained there until June 1861. Soon thereafter he made his dramatic, but rather unplanned escape from Siberia, which took him from the Amur mouth to Japan and San Francisco, and via Panama to New York and London, where he arrived in late December 1861.

To understand Bakunin's activities in Eastern Siberia, it is necessary to recount briefly his attitudes toward Muravyov. Bakunin worshipped the governor-general. Related to him by family, Muravyov had permitted the revolutionary exile to come to Irkutsk, allowed him to find employment, and accepted him socially (along with other political exiles). But most of all it was Muravyov's headstrong propensity for action over talk, together with his belief in the greatness of Russia and Slavdom that drew this Pan-Slav radical and future anarchist to the despotic, yet "liberal-democrat" administrator (to use Bakunin's own label).

Protests against Muravyov's "tyranny" which appeared in Alexander Herzen's émigré paper, the Bell, provoked Bakunin to write several lengthy rebuttals, denouncing these attacks and praising Muravyov, his policies, and his "program" to extremes. Bakunin's flattering opinion of the governor-general is illustrated by several passages in a letter of his to Herzen: "how could you fail to notice or recognize the one patriot and statesman in our fatherland whom we can absolutely call our own, and from whom Russia can now expect a real service, and perhaps salvation . . ."[88]

---

88 Letter to Gertsen, dated November 7, 1860, at Irkutsk, in Bakunin. Sobranie sochinenii, IV: 305.

Bakunin went on to outline Muravyov's "liberal" and "democratic" program, which included complete emancipation of serfs "with land," open judicial procedures with everyone subject to the law, unlimited freedom of the press, abolition of classes, popular self-government, and broad public education. Even more congenial to Bakunin's outlook, Muravyov represented "an inveterate foe of bureaucracy and a friend of life and action"; after the abolition of government ministries he would support

> no constitution nor garrulous parliament of nobles, but a provisional iron dictatorship under any name, and to attain this goal /he sought/ the complete destruction of the servility of Nicholas' regime, and most likely that of Alexander II's too. [89]

Without doubt, Bakunin's vivid imagination carried this description well beyond reality, but it does convey at least an impression of what Bakunin thought Muravyov believed and of the intense loyalty that Bakunin held toward his superior.

Oddly enough, the only other man in Irkutsk that greatly impressed Bakunin was another official, the young Nikolai P. Ignatiev (1832-1908), who as envoy to China advantageously negotiated the Treaty of Peking in 1860. In Bakunin's opinion, Ignatiev was committed to "democratic reforms and a Slav policy abroad — in a word, with slight differences, the same as Muravyov demands." [90] Clearly, only "Pan-Slav democrats" who achieved great things for Russia met with Bakunin's complete approval at the time. With the exception of Speshnyov, the political exiles in

---

89 Ibid. Another rebuttal of the "Tyranny of the Siberian Muravyov" was Bakunin's "Otvet Kolokolu" (Reply to the Bell); see pp. 347-58.

90 Letter to A. I. Gertsen, dated December 8, 1860, at Irkutsk, in Bakunin. Sobranie sochinenii, IV: 365. Ignatiev impressed his Pan-Slav objectives upon Turkey at the abortive Treaty of San Stefano in 1877, and as Minister of Interior in 1882 advocated the "democratic reform" of a Slavophile-style zemskii sobor (representative national assembly).

Irkutsk he viewed condescendingly as big talkers but "small fry" liberals who accomplished little. [91]

Bakunin faced a dilemma as soon as he arrived in Irkutsk in March 1859. While passionately devoted to Muravyov, he also "wanted to become the authority for local society." [92] The Neklyudov affair, which burst one month after his arrival, made the dilemma insoluble. Having to choose sides, he staunchly came out for Muravyov and the integrity of his administration, while he castigated and vilified Petrashevsky, who already exerted a strong influence on "progressive" youth and who spoke for the public against the administration's role in the affair. As one observer pointed out, Bakunin soon after his arrival "found that in certain circles which he himself might influence especially strongly Petrashevsky enjoyed great authority." So, seeking to belittle Petrashevsky, Bakunin spoke contemptuously and maliciously of those who admired Petrashevsky's "political grandeur," among which were "some untalented dilettante-teachers, some petty officials . . . and even some townspeople — comrades at billiards." [93] Nevertheless, even this bickering and in-fighting between prominent exiles gave an impetus to critical thought and a greater diversity to public opinion, which in itself was a constructive development.

During the Neklyudov affair Bakunin strongly supported Beklemishev and the administration. At a musical soirée, well attended by local residents, he began "to draw out the opinions of youth" on the affair,

---

91 Speshnyov, like Bakunin, had been a follower of the "communist" Wilhelm Weitling while in Switzerland in 1843; he had also fought then in the Sonderbund War.

92 V. P. Bykova, Zapiski starci smolianki (Notes of a Former Smolny Student), (St. Petersburg, 1899), II: 47; quoted in Semevskii "Petrashevskii v Sibiri," p. 46. The second, Siberian volume of Bykova's memoirs has been unavailable to the writer.

93 Bykova's testimony, as quoted in Semevskii, "Petrashevskii v Sibiri," p. 47.

openly urging that "society should stand up for Beklemishev," as otherwise the safety of citizens might be threatened.[94] Stirring up the public in such fashion, Bakunin was able to win over "about fifteen people." Yet it was not until after Petrashevsky's deportation (several months after Bakunin's return to Irkutsk) that his influence began to increase somewhat. Milyutin states that

> When it came to politics he behaved very modestly, and though several youths followed after him, as after a teacher, I suspect that in the case of some of them their intention was different: to secure a career by taking advantage of Bakunin's proximity both to Count Muravyov and to Izvolsky . . .[95]

Just as with Petrashevsky, a degree of intimacy with higher authorities enhanced the following of a would-be popular leader in Irkutsk.

As far as Bakunin's revolutionary, Pan-Slavic mission was concerned, he wrote to Herzen that his activity in Siberia was limited to propaganda among Poles (in distinct contrast to most Petrashevtsy, who generally kept aloof from Poles). He felt he successfully convinced many of them of the futility of separating Poland from Russia. On the other hand, he also felt he had convinced Muravyov of the "need to decentralize the empire and of the reasonableness and salutariness of a Slavic federative policy."[96] In view of the friendly relations between Bakunin (aided by his Polish wife) and Poles in Siberia and of Muravyov's inclination to "empire-build" on his own in Eastern Siberia, Bakunin's estimation of his

---

94 Bykova, Zapiski staroi smolianki, II: 47; cited in Semevskii, "Petrashevskii v Sibiri," p. 46.

95 B. Miliutin, "General-gubernatorstvo Murav'eva," p. 630. P. A. Izvolsky was civilian governor of Irkutsk in 1860 and 1861.

96 Letter to Gertsen, dated December 8, 1860, at Irkutsk, in Bakunin. Sobranie sochinenii, IV: 369. For details on Bakunin's federalism, see below, pp. 212-14.

limited accomplishments in Irkutsk may not have been too far off base. Whatever its actual value, however, this is the only known admission of what this incessant activist felt he really achieved in Eastern Siberia.

Evidence points to the fact that Bakunin did not make a very positive impression on Siberians during his stay in Irkutsk. Milyutin, who visited the Bakunins' apartment, was at first little impressed — in the presence of speeches that "poured in streams from the lips of the eloquent host." In his opinion, however, Bakunin "propagandized little," preferring to tell of his exploits in earlier days. But by the time of Bakunin's departure from Irkutsk Milyutin had become imbued with "the fullest repugnance toward him." [97] Nikolai Belogolovy adds that in general Bakunin "did not leave sympathetic and warm recollections behind him." [98]

Local commentators did not single out Bakunin alone for censure, however. Shestunov called both Bakunin and Speshnyov "renegades" for their support of Muravyov in the Neklyudov affair. [99] And to the sharp-tongued Mme. Bykova, head of the girls' institute, Bakunin was just as bad as Petrashevsky and some of the Decembrists. To her (and to others) they were all alien, "so-called reformers," and she even found it "repulsive to speak of them." [100]

Bakunin appears to have shied away from participation in the Amur

---

97 Miliutin, "General-gubernatorstvo Murav'eva," p. 630.
98 N. A. Bielogolovyi, Vospominaniia i drugiia stat'i, p. 103.
99 Letter of M. P. Shestunov to D. I. Zavalishin, dated April 5, 1860; quoted in Semevskii, "Petrashevskii v Sibiri," p. 37.
100 Quoted in Semevskii, "Petrashevskii v Sibiri," p. 46. Sullivan also mentions the "disagreeable impression" that Bakunin made on Irkutsk society ("Count Muraviev-Amursky," pp. 295-96).

and wrote no known articles for this private paper.[101] His literary efforts in Siberia seem to have been dissipated into lengthy and involved missives to Herzen in London (which Herzen never published). Katkov rightly concluded that during Siberian exile Bakunin "did not enrich Russian literature with a single work."[102] All this fits in somewhat with his strong, "anti-intellectual" distaste for the "writers' opposition" in Irkutsk (chiefly Petrashevsky and Zavalishin) and with his reverential loyalty to Muravyov. With this "coterie" in mind, he wrote to Herzen from Irkutsk:

> the writers are a delicate and especially vainglorious people; yesterday they trembled, and today they boast of their strength and consider their chatter as something serious. They are the monopolists of the meager Russian enlightenment, monopolists of intellect in dress coats, who love to bow and scrape. Muravyov despises them and will not come to terms with them. They are liberals, but he is a simple democrat, and there is nothing in common between them. Thus, it is natural that all this privileged, chattering and domineering public does not tolerate Muravyov . . .[103]

Despite the antagonism that Bakunin engendered toward himself among much of local society and many political exiles, he did make several positive contributions during his four-year stay in Siberia. First, he encouraged and assisted young Potanin in his attempts to reach Petersburg and the university. Secondly, with his pro-administration stand, he contributed to a broader forum of public debate in Irkutsk. His tales of exploits in

---

101 This is Steklov's conclusion in his edition of Bakunin. Sobranie sochinenii, IV: 587. Zagoskin, however, claims that he wrote two or three articles in the Amur (Araf'ev, "Petrashevskii v Sibiri," p. 182).

102 M. N. Katkov, in Moskovskiia Viedomosti, (1870) no. 4; quoted by Dragomanow in Bakunins Briefwechsel, p. lxv.

103 Letter to Gertsen, dated November 7, 1860, at Irkutsk, in Bakunin. Sobranie sochinenii, IV: 309-10. Though Bakunin applied the term "liberal" to Muravyov elsewhere, he uses it here pejoratively, as something Muravyov was not.

Western Europe to interested young people no doubt brought the immediacy of the revolutionary events of 1848, that "springtime of peoples," closer to Siberia. Moreover, Bakunin disseminated ideas of federation and decentralization in Eastern Siberia, ideas incorporated by regionalists in the 1860's. According to Peter Kropotkin, who arrived in Irkutsk just after Bakunin's departure, he left a reputation of having discussed rather far-fetched ideas of Siberian federalism and separatism. Thus, Kropotkin wrote (forty years later) of Bakunin's conversations with Muravyov and several of his younger associates of "the chances of creating the United States of Siberia, federated across the Pacific Ocean with the United States of America." [104] Whatever the accuracy of this well-known but belated, second-hand statement, it does point to the continuity of strong pro-American sentiments in Irkutsk, which had existed since the days of Alexandrov and Dudorovsky.

Furthermore, Bakunin encouraged the circulation of Herzen's bimonthly newspaper, the Bell, in Eastern Siberia. Soon after his successful escape he wrote to Herzen from San Francisco:

> Since I know with what avidity the Bell and the Polar Star are read in Siberia, and with what kind of difficulties they are obtained there, I agreed with three merchants, a German in Shanghai, an American in Japan, and one in Nikolaevsk at the mouth of the Amur, that they take everything in commission that we send them from London and sell it to naval officers and Kyakhta merchants, whose numbers on the Amur and Pacific Ocean will increase yearly. In such fashion we will be able to sell from 100 to 300 copies, a number not large commercially speaking, but politically speaking, very important. [105]

---

105 P. Kropotkin, Memoirs, p. 134.

106 Letter to Herzen, dated October 15/3, 1861, at San Francisco, in Bakunins Briefwechsel, p. 41. Herzen published the Polar Star (Poliarnaia Zviezda) between the years 1855-60.

Whatever results the arrangements with the above-mentioned merchants may have had, this represented Bakunin's last effort in attempting to influence Siberian opinion. Abandoning all interest in Siberia from this point on, he soon plunged into the melee of European and Russian émigré politics with gusto. Meanwhile people in Siberia (including officials — and Muravyov himself) had not only been reading the Bell, but a few of them were even contributing to its pages. Through Bakunin and through the Bell, by the turn of the 1850's Siberian contacts were increasing not only with the world of European Russia, but with the world of Western Europe as well.

* * *

The End of an Era

The invigoration of social and cultural life in Irkutsk during the Muravyov administration was, of course, not totally unique in Siberia during the late fifties and early sixties. Important steps toward improving public life were taken in various other Siberian towns at this time, and in Irkutsk itself the overall impact of Muravyov's relatively liberal administration lingered on for several years after his departure.

Though the causes of this revitalization of life in Siberian centers can be attributed to social, administrative, economic, and cultural factors, it is interesting to note how urban population growth during the 1850's also contributed in its own way to the social malaise and readjustment of the times. As indicated earlier, there was relatively little increase, and even decrease, in the population of Siberia's largest towns in the period 1825-51. In contrast to this rather static quarter century, the brief time span between the years 1851 and 1858 was comparatively

dynamic in demographic increase. This is reflected in the following figures for Siberia's four largest urban centers:[107]

	1851	1858	Ave. % Incr./Yr.	Overall % Increase
Tomsk	13,511	20,234	7.1	49.7
Irkutsk	16,795	18,808	1.7	11.9
Omsk	13,233	18,676	5.9	41.1
Tobolsk	15,359	16,270	.8	5.9

Whatever the causes of this relatively sudden spurt, they definitely helped break down to some extent the apathy and stagnation that long characterized Siberian towns.

Tobolsk, with the smallest population growth among the large towns, was by mid-century tending to become a provincial backwater in comparison with resurgent Tomsk and Irkutsk. Nevertheless, it too experienced a kind of revival beginning in the mid-fifties. This town had been the home of a number of noted individuals in the 1840's and 1850's. Slovtsov lived in Tobolsk until his death in 1843. Such prominent Decembrist and Polish exiles as the writer Steingel, the educator Svistunov, and the musician Wolicki were settled there. Tobolsk was also the home of the cultured Mendeleev family and of the poet-educator Yershov (to his death in 1869).

This West Siberian provincial capital was fortunate in having two capable and enlightened governors from the mid-fifties to the mid-sixties: V. A. Artsimovich and A. I. Despot-Zenovich. Artsimovich, appointed to his post in the mid-fifties, was in part responsible for the establishment of the first local newspaper in Tobolsk in a half-century, the Tobolsk Provincial Gazette. Founded in 1857, as was its counterpart in Irkutsk, this official newspaper served as the only periodical published in Tobolsk

---

107 From Shcheglov, Perechen', pp. 561-62, 589. For corresponding figures for the period 1825-51, see above, p. 100.

until the mid-1880's.

Among the best of the early contributors to the Tobolsk Gazette were the local historians Nikolai Abramov and the archpriest Alexandr Sulotsky (former teacher of Potanin's in Omsk). Though Yershov was urged by Governor Artsimovich to write for the paper, he never did — perhaps owing in part to his appointment that same year as director of Tobolsk schools. Despite the absence of the most talented local writer, the Gazette flourished quite well during the years 1858-59 (according to Yadrintsev). After a decline for a few years, with the coming of Despot-Zenovich as governor in 1863 the content of the paper improved considerably. On the whole, however, compared to the first years of the Irkutsk Gazette, the local educated elite in Tobolsk did not rush to contribute to a paper that was still rather limited in scope. Consequently, the Tobolsk Gazette reflected only weakly whatever intellectual and cultural life transpired in Tobolsk.[108]

The administration of Governor Despot-Zenovich (1863-67) marked what was perhaps the last high point in Tobolsk history until the revival of the 1880's (which spread throughout Siberia). Of Polish origin himself, Despot-Zenovich was well disposed toward exiles — both Russian and Polish, most of whom had to pass through Tobolsk on their way eastward into the depths of Siberia. According to reports of both Russians and Poles, Despot-Zenovich knew how to unite the functions of an administrator with a regard for human beings, whose dignity he never offended. Moreover, his campaigns against official abuses, drunkenness, gambling, bribery, fawning before superiors, and exploitation of subordinates (reminiscent of Muravyov's

---

108 (Iadrintsev) "Nachalo pechati," pp. 368-69; and Azadovskii in P. P. Ershov, pp. 43-44. Cf. Sukachov's comments on the Irkutsk Gazette on p. 144, above.

policies) won for him a good reputation throughout the empire.[109] Indeed, twenty years after his departure the local peasantry confessed that they "had never since had a governor such as Despot-Zenovich."[110]

Despite the reforming efforts of two progressive administrators and a relatively enlightened element in Tobolsk society, this West Siberian town had neither the strong economic base nor the favorable geographical situation for rapid social and cultural development. The ripples that occurred on the surface of Tobolsk life at the turn of the 1850's could hardly be compared with the waves that washed through Irkutsk.

In contrast to Tobolsk, Tomsk — 600 miles to the east — had lower-quality administrators and a more rapid population growth at this time. Beyond this, however, the level of cultural life in the two towns was not overly different. Tomsk too had its prominent exiles (Batenkov, Toll, and Bakunin) and its own "educated circles," in which, for instance, the young Yadrintsev was maturing. All in all, Bakunin's remark that "Irkutsk is closer to Europe than Tomsk" held true for Tobolsk as well.

Tomsk also witnessed the establishment of an official provincial newspaper in 1857, the same year its counterparts were founded in Irkutsk, Tobolsk, and Krasnoyarsk. This was the result of a government decision of December 1856 which affected all four Siberian provinces simultaneously.[111] The Tomsk Provincial Gazette at first, however, had even fewer intellectual resources to draw upon than did either the Tobolsk or the Irkutsk Gazettes.

---

109 Wacław Jewsiewicki, Na syberyskim zesłaniu (In Siberian Exile), (Warsaw, 1959), pp. 80-81.

110 Quoted in L. F. Panteleev, Vospominaniia (Memoirs), (Moscow, 1958), p. 430.

111 For details see (Iadrintsev) "Nachalo pechati," p. 371, and Sibir' kak koloniia, p. 696; and Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 75. The Yeniseisk Provincial Gazette also began to publish in Krasnoyarsk in 1857, but was of minor social and literary significance.

Nevertheless, with the establishment of an unofficial section in the paper in 1858 such subsequent literary lights as Vagin and Potanin had articles published. Yadrintsev, in his study of the Siberian press, felt that during the years 1858-65 the Tomsk Gazette was rather noteworthy in its publication of valuable regional historical and ethnographical studies. Perhaps the greatest significance of this paper in its early period, however, was that during the years 1864-65 it served to spread, in some of its "unofficial" articles, the ideas of the young Siberian regionalists.[112]

Despite their rather rough-hewn quality, the overall contributions and significance of the Provincial Gazettes in their first few years were relatively great, especially in view of the total absence of Siberian newspapers before this time (and in view of the comparative mediocrity of the contemporary provincial press elsewhere in the empire). The content of the unofficial sections of these papers was the best indication of their real public and social value. Yet after the mid-sixties these sections deteriorated to the point of consisting chiefly of private announcements to the public. Looking back from the 1880's, Shcheglov could write,

> in the earlier years of their existence the Siberian provincial gazettes unquestionably stood on a higher level than many of those in Russia, and they maintained in their pages a multiplicity of intriguing material on local history, ethnography, statistics, linguistics, meteorology, and so forth.[113]

Except for the brief interlude of the Amur and its successor, the Provincial Gazettes constituted the only real local outlet (or "refuge," to use Yadrintsev's term) for Siberian writers. Though metropolitan periodicals

---

112 (Iadrintsev) "Nachalo pechati," pp. 369-70.
113 Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 580 n.

had long been utilized, the Provincial Gazettes for over fifteen years almost alone provided an outlet for writers on subjects of regional or local interest, not to mention a Siberian audience.[114]

During the late fifties and early sixties an upsurge of political expression and interest emerged in two towns of Transbaikalia: Kyakhta and Chita. In both instances, Decembrists who had stayed on this area after the amnesty of 1856 were prominent — Mikhail A. Bestuzhev and Dmitry I. Zavalishin. Through their journalistic activities and participation in local discussion circles they exerted a fair degree of influence. In the case of Kyakhta, a commercial center located on the Mongolian border, there was a level of culture and sophistication that perhaps equaled that of Irkutsk. Kyakhta's leading citizens engaged in the international tea and fur trades, made frequent business to Petersburg and Moscow, and were consequently relatively open-minded. Popov (exiled there in the 1880's) relates that during the fifties "Kyakhta merchants were all liberal and were very well read."[115]

Before Despot-Zenovich had gone to Tobolsk, Muravyov had appointed him to serve as municipal governor of Kyakhta. In 1860 he petitioned for permission to publish an official newspaper. Upon approval from St. Petersburg, the newspaper was given the name Kyakhta Leaflet. This paper, published in the years 1862-63, owed its existence primarily to the efforts of the governor, though Bestuzhev and other local writers helped out. Despot-Zenovich acted as the paper's censor (as had Muravyov in Irkutsk) and even contributed unsigned articles to its pages; as editor he chose

---

114 The one other exception during these years was the somewhat irregularly published Proceedings of the Siberian Section of the Geographical Society.

115 I. I. Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II: 40.

P. A. Andrutsky.[116] The Leaflet, however, lasted only as long in Kyakhta as Despot-Zenovich did. Before leaving in 1863, Despot-Zenovich had encouraged the local population to read periodicals in general and had instigated wealthy local merchants to found several schools. In sum, he "tried to invigorate society and 'emancipate' it in the spirit of the time."[117]

One of the leading figures in Kyakhta society was V. N. Sabashnikov, whose discussion and reading sessions influenced Andrei Belogolovy to undertake the same in Irkutsk. Bestuzhev (who lived 60 miles from Kyakhta) once attended Sabashnikov's "quasi-literary" circle and claimed to have "heard bold opinions and heated discussions for the first time."[118] Bestuzhev also frequented a younger group in Kyakhta, which he jokingly called "the United States," in view of the enthusiasm its members expressed for the American political system.[119] The interest in politics and social problems among Kyakhtans was further stimulated by regular access to Herzen's émigré publications, the Polar Star and the Bell, since the mid-1850's. After the Treaty of Peking, which accorded Russia commercial privileges in China, access to Herzen's writings was facilitated by the new mail route via Tientsin.[120]

Northeast of Kyakhta lay Chita, the capital of Transbaikalia. Until 1863 Chita was the residence not only of a liberal governor, B. K. Kukiel, but also of Muravyov's most formidable political antagonist, Dmitry Zavali-

---

116 Ibid., pp. 41-42; P. Pershin-Karaksarskii, "Vospominaniia," p. 545; and Ia. P—v, "Spisok periodicheskikh izdanii (na russkom iazykie) poiavivshikhsia s 1856 po 1880 god" (List of Periodicals in Russian Published between 1856 and 1880), Istoricheskii Viestnik, (April 1880), p. 898.

117 Pershin-Karaksarskii, "Vospominaniia," p. 544. See too Potanin, "Goroda Sibiri," p. 258.

118 Quoted in Kubalov, "Sibirskoe obshchestvo i dekabristy," p. 164. Also see Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II; 44.

119 Pershin-Karaksarskii, "Vospominaniia," p. 545.

120 Ibid., p. 539; and Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II: 40.

shin. Prominent in the administrative development and organization of Chita since the early 1850's, Zavalishin also had long been an expert on foreign and Oriental affairs, and in fact regarded himself as the authority on the subject in Eastern Siberia. His conception of Russia's role in the East and in the North Pacific clashed head on with Muravyov's, and each of them was convinced of the correctness of his own views.

As indicated above, Zavalishin by the mid-1850's had split publicly with Muravyov on several counts (though earlier, like other Decembrists, he had been on good terms with the governor-general). Zavalishin opposed Muravyov's view that Russian possessions in North America should be sacrificed to the need to consolidate Russian power in the Far East, specifically the Amur region. Moreover, he felt that overemphasizing the development of the Amur basin would adversely affect the needs of his own Transbaikalia. And last, but certainly not least, he broadcast to the world some of the worst and seamiest sides of Muravyov's colonization policy along the Amur. [121]

Peter Kropotkin, who visited Zavalishin in Chita in late 1862, described him as an "extraordinary personality, with much initiative and not at all stupid." Kropotkin characterized his recent polemics, "which recklessly criticized the whole Muravyov administration," as "very remarkable," adding however, that along with many true assertions, some false ones were mixed in. [122] Another visitor in Chita was the Muravyov-loyalist, Bakunin, who met Zavalishin in June 1859. To Herzen he wrote of him: "Imagine a

---

121 See A. Mazour, First Russian Revolution, pp. 250-51; and also above, p. 81.

122 P. A. Kropotkin, Dnevnik, p. 61.

thin little old man, turning black, but unusually ascetic and well-preserved, who is still endowed with a rare and all-embracing memory and with remarkable eloquence." In view of his recent clashes with Muravyov, however, Bakunin considered him "an abscess" and the "one black sheep" among Decembrists.[123]

Zavalishin's chief merit in the years just after his amnesty was his effectiveness in rousing public opinion one way or another not only in Siberia, but in Russia too. For his trenchant articles in the Russian press against Muravyov's policies he received numerous congratulations. Indeed, the periodicals in which his critiques appeared were sold out immediately.[124] Sukachov writes of the sensational impact he made upon a public wrapped up in the swing of enthusiasm for the seemingly successful Amur undertakings. Like Kropotkin, Sukachov (thirty years later) viewed Zavalishin's articles as only pamphlets, lacking serious research, prejudiced, and filled with one-sided conclusions — though generally containing facts for the most part true.

> Composed skillfully and with great fervor, [Zavalishin's] communications . . . planted disillusionment with the new borderland in many and presented the administration of Muravyov and the activities of persons closest to him in a most unfavorable light . . . These articles produced an even greater impression in Irkutsk. Here the matter did not involve Muravyov alone, but a whole network of more complex and entangled feelings and motives. The Amur question occupied such a central place in Muravyov's administration that whoever served in the area, from great to small, was in some way or another touched by it, directly or indirectly. In general, it involved and affected everyone who then lived and worked in Irkutsk, Transbaikalia, and the new regions. Among the

---

123 Letter to A. I. Gertsen, dated November 7, 1860, at Irkutsk, in Bakunin. Sobranie sochinenii, IV: 330, 331.

124 See Mazour, First Russian Revolution, p. 251. Zavalishin's articles appeared in Naval Anthology (Morskoi Sbornik), (1858) XI, and (1859) V, VI, VII; and in Herald of Industry (Viestnik Promyshlennosti), (1859) XII.

> many excesses and personal attacks in Zavalishin's articles, which did not pass Muravyov's censorship, one could find much valuable and worthwhile information, but such which could never have appeared in the pages of the local press, subject as it was to Muravyov. [125]

Zavalishin's testimony, both printed and manuscript, was in fact closely scrutinized by various administrators and departments in Petersburg, and it actually served to hinder Muravyov in some of his requests regarding the administration of the Amur region. There is little doubt that Zavalishin's exposés, coupled with the criticisms arising from the Neklyudov affair, made Muravyov's position as governor-general increasingly uncomfortable and perhaps even untenable. [126]

On the other hand, Zavalishin's articles served to undermine his own position too. In the eyes of many officials this David who took on Goliaths was after all only a "former state criminal." In the end, Muravyov's successor as governor-general, M. S. Korsakov, was able to get Zavalishin ousted from Chita and transferred to Russia. Through Korsakov's efforts Zavalishin was ordered by imperial decree in February 1863 to leave "for a milder climate." After protests and delays he finally complied and left Chita the following summer for Moscow. Though fighting a lost cause personally, Zavalishin's influence in Eastern Siberia must have been widespread, considering that two governors-general had since 1855 sought to move this activist out of Eastern Siberia. [127] His departure by no means ended his interest in Siberia. As late as 1882 the aging Decembrist wrote articles on the region, one of which drew an informed comparison and

---

125 V. P. Sukachëv, Irkutsk, pp. 78-79.
126 Ibid., pp. 81-82.
127 Ibid., p. 80; and J. Haskett, "Decembrists in Siberian Exile," p. 103 n.

contrast of Siberia and Canada as colonies.[128] Recollections of Zavalishin's courageous struggle against arbitrary decision-making were still strong twenty years after his departure from Siberia. Yadrintsev, for example, wrote to him in 1883 on behalf of himself and his fellow Siberians:

> We /too/ are struggling against governors-general. We are writing against new Amur fantasies. . . . For this reason we need the support of such witnesses and testifiers as you. It goes without saying that we value your articles on colonies and on Siberia as an agricultural and civil colony.

Yadrintsev considered Zavalishin as one of the very few Russians who "knew the life of the region" and who understood the "colonial question" in its full dimensions.[129]

In Irkutsk itself cultural and civic developments were unfolding by the 1860's rather independently of either the Main Administration or the influence of local exiles. Even in the mid-fifties Irkutsk had already changed considerably over a decade's time. From the stifling, somnolent atmosphere of the mid-1840's, a tendency toward cultural diversions and self-improvement was beginning to emerge. One commentator even went so far as to suggest in the Irkutsk Gazette (in 1857) that "Siberia is definitely becoming a land of music lovers."[130] In the fifties Irkutsk could even boast a poet with something of a public following — Pyotr V. Schumacher.[131] And resuming the example set by the "Jacobin club," broken up by the administration, a subsequent group of local intellectuals (more moderate in outlook, however) formed in the early 1860's. At regularly organized

---

128 D. I. Zavalishin in Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1882) no. 34; for a resumé see Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia, p. 699, 715-16.

129 Letters of Iadrintsev to Zavalishin, dated April 18, 1883, and February 18, 1883, in Sbornik starinnykh bumag, X: 276, 272.

130 Quoted in Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 192.

131 Barsukov, Graf Murav'ev-Amurskii, I: 546; and Suvorov, "Zapiski," p. 94.

meetings the discussions centered on politics, literature, and social problems. The president was a local official, Yuriev, and Zagoskin, as secretary, kept minutes of the group's activities. According to Potanin, this circle could only function in a kind of underground capacity.[132]

On the more professional side of municipal life, institutionalized associations began to form. In 1858 some Irkutsk doctors set up an evening discussion group on a regular basis, where they could pool their medical knowledge and problems. On the initiative of Dr. Nikolai Belogolovy, this group five years later became officially chartered as the Society of East Siberian Doctors. A similar development occurred with respect to technical knowledge. The writer-official, B. A. Milyutin, was especially instrumental in establishing in Irkutsk the East Siberian Division of the Imperial Russian Technical Society in 1868 (a kind of counterpart to the Geographical Society's branch). In one year's time this organization was already putting on public exhibitions, holding lectures, and printing its own proceedings, with a membership of well over one hundred. In the early 1860's a local juridical society formed in Irkutsk, composed chiefly of young jurists and lawyers spurred by the expected introduction of judicial reforms in Siberia.[133] In the area of new educational institutions, however, the progress made in Irkutsk at this time was more in line with advances made in other Siberian towns. In general, urban Siberia witnessed a relatively widespread increase in the founding of public schools at various levels,

---

132 Potanin, "Goroda Sibiri," p. 240; and Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 90.
133 Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 90, 204-08; Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 609, 636; and Krylov, "Pamiati Bielogolovago," p. 574.

beginning in the late 1850's. These included schools for boys, girls, native children, cadets, and adults.[134]

By the early 1860's several libraries were operating in Irkutsk. The two most prominent "public" libraries were the "state" library, run by the administration, and the private library reconstituted by Shestunov after his return from exile (in the wake of the Neklyudov affair). As of 1862 the "state" library subscribed to roughly fifty journals and newspapers in various languages, with everything provided cost-free. In 1862 Shestunov's library was reopened, though by now Vagin was assisting the founder in maintaining it. Now, just as in the days of Petrashevsky, this library resumed its role as a "clubhouse" for alienated intellectuals. As Mme. Bykova told Kropotkin, "here is the very best evidence for you that the government's policies cannot be proceeding well, for there are always people in the public library (of Vagin and Shestunov), but in the 'imperial' (or state) library there is almost no one."[135]

Upon investigation Kropotkin became quite impressed with Shestunov and his library. Though it had seen better days, it had not lost its earlier vitality. Before its break-up in 1860 as many as 120 people came in to read in a day, and it had the distinction of being the one place in Irkutsk where Zavalishin's anti-administration articles could be read. In 1862 the number of visitors per day fluctuated between 20 to 30 (but never over 50), and the total number of subscribers did not exceed eighty. From what Shestunov told Kropotkin, his general reading public preferred "only the jour-

---

134 For instances of new schools opening in Siberian towns in the late 1850's and early 1860's, see Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 583, 587-88, 595, 602, 606, 609.

135 Quoted in Kropotkin, Dnevnik, p. 44.

nals, other belles lettres, and a few historical books; now, however, . . . they are beginning to demand some serious books, chiefly in the area of the popularized branches of natural sciences."[136] Shestunov's library, which first opened under his management in 1858 and which finally closed in 1866, was more or less coterminous with, and indeed helped nurture, the social and political ferment in Irkutsk during the last years of Muravyov's administration and the first years of Korsakov's.

As discussed earlier, Zagoskin's newspaper, the Amur, was also part and parcel of the awakening in Irkutsk. In contrast to Shestunov's library, which closed in the aftermath of the Neklyudov affair, the Amur continued, though on a rather precarious basis. Muravyov asked only that Zagoskin "not tarnish the Amur" (i.e. his Amur policies) — as Zavalishin had been doing. Thus, from mid-1860 on, until his departure from Irkutsk in January 1861, Muravyov remained favorably inclined toward the paper.[137]

With Korsakov as the new governor-general, however, the newspaper's affairs began to deteriorate steadily. According to Zagoskin, "it so happened that whole issues had to be printed over again. Moreover, the editors had to print what, in their eyes, was opposed to their own views." For example, Korsakov ordered one of his assistants to write an article refuting Zavalishin's assertions. The refutations ran over several printed pages in length and was forwarded to the Amur staff with the order to "print it" in the upcoming issue. Zagoskin regarded this as clear interference in the internal affairs of a private paper. It was "an attempt to influence its

---

136 Quoted in ibid., p. 46. It is tempting to presume that these popularized science books were translations of Buechner's Stoff und Kraft (1855) and Moleschott's Kreislauf des Lebens (1852), both highly popular in Russia then (as evidenced in Turgenev's Fathers and Sons).

137 Araf'ev, "Petrashevskii v Sibiri," p. 179.

direction, overriding the opinions of the editorial staff, which sided more with Zavalishin's views than with those of the author of the refutation." Insulted by this meddling, the staff decided to discontinue the paper altogether.[138]

Korsakov, however, strongly insisted that the Amur continue to publish. In fact he promised to subsidize the paper so as to insure its existence. Evidently local public opinion was strong enough that Korsakov wished to avoid responsibility for shutting down the paper. Moreover, he prided himself (as a good disciple of the Muravyov school) on allowing a liberal newspaper to publish within his jurisdiction. Thus, the Amur's editor agreed to a subsidy of 800 rubles per year. Despite this official assistance, the paper continued to express its own independent views, as it had previously.

Nevertheless, after this incident the Amur was unable to regain its earlier circulation. From a previous high of 600 subscribers, it now decreased markedly both in circulation and in size of format (from two large sheets to one small one). Moreover, many staff members quit about this time, leaving most of the work to Zagoskin. This situation was relieved somewhat when Boris Milyutin in mid-1861 joined Zagoskin in a joint editorship. However, differences arose between the two, Zagoskin quit, and in April 1862 the Amur, unable to pay its bills, closed down altogether. Besides being a newcomer in Siberia, Milyutin was unable to give the paper its former vitality and could not cope with its pressing financial difficulties.[139]

---

138 Ibid., pp. 180-81. Iadrintsev, less convincingly, attributes this account to Vagin, not Zagoskin ("Nachalo pechati," p. 381, 383).

139 Araf'ev, "Petrashevskii v Sibiri," p. 181; (Iadrintsev) "Nachalo pechati," p. 384; and Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 87.

In praise of the short-lived Amur, Yadrintsev wrote that to the very end it stayed true to "principles of science and morality." Indeed, as a result of its muckraking activities twenty-eight officials were removed for their malpractices. [140] As a private provincial paper, and serious in content, it was something of a rarity in Russia and attracted the attention of the metropolitan press. But during its brief 2½-year existence (1860-62) it did not make itself very well known among the general public beyond the confines of Eastern Siberia. Yadrintsev concluded that on Siberia in general the "Amur had scarcely any more influence than did the Irkutsk Provincial Gazette in its early days. It was too serious for the majority of readers, and for this reason its demise passed almost unnoticed." [141] Zagoskin's predicament reflected Shestunov's regret over the lack of serious interests among his library readers.

Despite his failure to keep the Amur from going under, Milyutin in 1864 established a similar private newspaper in Irkutsk called the Siberian Herald. About all that can be said for this publication is that it quietly managed to survive until 1867, and that after its collapse Irkutsk was without a private newspaper worthy of the name until 1875. This gap was filled only partially by the official Irkutsk Gazette and by the new ecclesiastical newspaper, the Irkutsk Diocesan Gazette, founded in 1863 and edited by the capable Fr. Prokopy Gromov. This paper was noteworthy in that it was the first ecclesiastical paper to be published in Siberia and was the only one of its kind for two decades. In its first few years the Diocesan Gazette even tangled with the official Provincial Gazette on

---

140 I. I. Popov, "Mikhail Vasil'evich Zagoskin," Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1898); cited in Araf'ev, "Petrashevskii v Sibiri," p. 181.

141 (Iadrintsev) "Nachalo pechati," pp. 384-85.

issues affecting the local clergy.[142]

The decline of the ferment in Irkutsk society was due not only to the departure of activist exiles and to the collapse of private libraries and newspapers, but also to the gradual passing of "official" liberalism. The relatively open atmosphere fostered by Muravyov slowly became more and more closed as mediocrity, petty despotism, and corruption gradually crept back, just as they had after Speransky's departure some forty years earlier. This process was not sudden, however. One year after Muravyov had left, Kropotkin could still comment (albeit in retrospect):

> In 1862 the upper administration of Siberia was far more enlightened and far better all round than that of any province of Russia proper. . . .
> When I came to Irkutsk, . . . the wave of reaction which I saw rising at St. Petersburg had not yet reached these distant dominions. I was very well received by the young governor-general, Korsakov, who had just succeeded Muraviov, and he told me that he was delighted to have about him men of liberal opinions.[143]

Despite Korsakov's open expressions of sympathy for liberal opinions and for Herzen, the new governor-general was just as vigilant as Muravyov in defending the administration's Amur policies. As just indicated, Korsakov harassed the Amur and arranged for Zavalishin's expulsion from Siberia on this account. Regarding the Amur question, Sukachov calls his ten-year administration "essentially an epilogue" to the Muravyov era — both a continuation and a conclusion.[144]

---

142 The Russian titles of these two papers are Sibirskii Viestnik and Irkutskiia Eparkhial'nyia Viedomosti. For details, see Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 88; Ia. P—v, "Spisok izdanii," p. 899; Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 606, 609; and Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 203. Shcheglov claims that according to one source the Siberian Herald was founded in 1862.

143 Kropotkin, Memoirs, p. 133, 134. Mikhail Semyonovich Korsakov was Governor-General of Eastern Siberia from 1861 to 1870.

144 Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 87; see too Kropotkin, Dnevnik, p. 40.

Kropotkin was equally impressed with another administrator in Eastern Siberia, Bolesław Kukiel, the young governor of Transbaikalia (from 1862 to 1863) and the owner of a complete, up-to-date collection of Herzen's "London revolutionary editions." Indeed, Kropotkin became Kukiel's personal aide-de-camp at Chita, and the two got along together famously. Kukiel, however, did not last long as governor, for Bakunin (who had met him earlier in Irkutsk) in 1863 sent to this official of Polish ancestry an indiscreet letter, urging him to aid the cause of the January Insurrection. Bakunin's letter fell into the hands of gendarmes, and Tsar Alexander consequently suspended Kukiel from his position.[145]

Kropotkin gave his own impressions of this affair:

> The wave of reaction soon reached our remote province. One day in March [1863] a paper was brought by a special messenger from Irkutsk. It intimated to General Kukel that he was at once to leave the post of governor of Transbaikalia and go to Irkutsk, waiting there for further orders, and that he was not to reassume the post of commander of the general staff. . . .
>
> Our parting with Kukel and his charming family was like a funeral. . . . I not only lost in him a dear personal friend, but I felt also that this parting was the burial of a whole epoch, full of long-cherished hopes,— "full of illusions," as it became the fashion to say.[146]

Thus, the year 1863, which saw governmental reaction in Poland — the empire's westermost borderland, also witnessed shake-ups in the empire's easternmost borderland. Not only were Kukiel and Zavalishin forced to leave Chita, but also the "enlightened" Despot-Zenovich was transferred away from

---

145 Kropotkin, Dnevnik, p. 41 n.; and Bakunin. Sobranie sochinenii, IV: 603-04. Though later cleared of the charges, Kukiel did not return to his post in Chita; he died in 1869 at age forty.

146 Kropotkin, Memoirs, p. 142, 143.

his relatively progressive surroundings in Kyakhta.

Korsakov's governor-generalship was also an "epilogue" to Muravyov's in terms of its increasingly anti-liberal orientation. By the mid-1860's, much of the vitality and life that had emerged in Irkutsk, Chita, and Kyakhta during the previous decade had either disappeared or subsided. Just as in European Russia at this time, the earlier hopes and expectations of many thinking individuals in Siberia were deflated. Once again, Kropotkin, summing up this change of scene, is to the point: "A new governor came, — a good-natured 'leave-me-in-peace' man." The Siberian administration was only a "branch of the tree which had its root at St. Petersburg, and that was quite sufficient to paralyze all its excellent intentions, and to make it interfere with all beginnings of local spontaneous life and progress."[146] Nevertheless, it should be noted that repressive measures against the exercise of free speech had been applied by the Muravyov administration as early as the late 1850's.

With or without enlightened administrators, a trend toward spontaneity, openness, and critical thought in social and public affairs had noticeably developed in a number of Siberian towns in the late fifties and early sixties. Perceptive Siberians were quite aware of this change, which gave birth to a rudimentary public opinion and to aspirations for a better life and social progress. As early as 1857 Shestunov described this new tendency:

> At present one cannot but notice a striking phenomenon in Russian society; namely, it is as though everyone fully recognized the groundlessness of life in

---

146 Kropotkin, Memoirs, p. 143, 145-46.

> former days and of the apathy, so to speak, to which people hitherto surrendered themselves. Lethargy has passed, and society, having shaken loose its fetters, has naturally sensed the need to change the principles that lay at the basis of its former life. Now people have stopped believing others at their words they doubt authority, and, animated by a desire to know themselves, and gaining confidence in their own powers, they have moved forward onto the path of self-improvement and self-consciousness. [147]

Seventy-odd years later, another Siberian, the journalist-historian Yakushev, looked on the 1850's in similar fashion — as on a period when Siberian society, and Irkutsk society in particular, began to rise out of the general swamp of mediocrity:

> These years were transitional for Irkutsk society; among petty, average, and money-grubbing concerns there began to appear aspirations toward intellectual inquiries and needs. . . . The former stifling and stuffy atmosphere of philistine existence — with fist fights on the edge of town, with military parades and executions, with noisy feasts put on by gold entrepreneurs and eminent merchants, against a background of official caprice and petty tyranny by administrators — was thinned out by new and fresh streams coming from people with intense intellectual interests, who sincerely desired to work for the general good. [148]

These new, fresh currents were indeed emerging. Yet this spontaneity and initiative, this quest for knowledge and self-knowledge, at this point still lacked concise ideological underpinnings. Only in European Russia, and especially in St. Petersburg, did young Siberian students of this new breed become increasingly aware of the relationship of themselves and their homeland to Russia and the rest of the world. With this came the formula-

---

147 M. P. Shestunov, "Mysli ob ustroistvie v Irkutskie publichnoi biblioteki" (Thoughts on Founding a Public Library in Irkutsk), Irkutskiia Gubernskiia Viedomosti, (1857) no. 29; quoted in Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 195.

148 I. A. Iakushev, "Sem'desiat piat' let," p. 161.

tion of an ideology and a program of action, which gave them a definite sense of direction.

Hitherto independently of Siberian social and intellectual development, ideologists and theorists in other parts of the Russian Empire had been working out ideas and schemes for a Russian state restructured on federal or regional foundations. The ferment in this transitional period of the fifties led in part to an acceptance of these ideological concepts. The confluence of this new, self-confident social awakening in Siberia with the discovery and adaptation of federalist and regionalist theories by a few young Siberians to fit their own needs gave birth to the Siberian regionalist movement in the early 1860's.

CHAPTER IV

THE DEVELOPMENT OF FEDERALIST, REGIONALIST, AND SEPARATIST THEORIES

Decembrist Views on Federalism and Siberia before 1825

Federalism in Russian political thought began to emerge around 1820 in both official and unofficial constitutional projects drawn up by a number of theorists. Federalism, as an idea expressing a federation of autonomous states, provinces, or regions in a Russian state with a limited central government, automatically signified a rejection of the absolute, centralized government of autocratic Imperial Russia. Though Peter I and Catherine II had divided and redivided Russia into various numbers of provinces, they had tried to decentralize only administratively, militarily, and bureaucratically within the overall framework of the autocratic structure. Though the inspiration for federal principles came to Russia in large part from the example set by America's thirteen liberated colonies and by their subsequent federal union, Russian federalism had before itself an almost completely opposite task. Instead of following the course symbolized by the

motto, E pluribus unum, Russian federalistic thinkers sought ways whereby a unitary, centralized state could be broken down into component autonomous areas, loosely united in a federal union (in the sense of ex uno plures). Whether this union be a republic or a constitutional monarchy, the component states or regions would have certain autonomous rights and local powers, just as the center would have its own federal powers. Though these theorists concerned themselves primarily with the Russian Empire as a whole, some of them did single out Siberia, its non-Russian peoples, and Russia's "eastern colonies" for special, though limited consideration. Both the federalist approach to Russia's problems and the view of Siberia as a unique region helped lay a theoretical groundwork to which later Siberian regionalists could refer.

It is characteristic of the milieu around 1820 that not only did Decembrists come up with unofficial theories on how best to reorganize Russia, but that Tsar Alexander I himself should in 1818 instruct Count Nikolai N. Novosiltsov, his high commissioner in Poland, to prepare a monarchical constitution for Russia embodying the federal principle. Novosiltsov's draft constitution, finished in 1821 and influenced somewhat by Polish and American constitutional structures, was, needless to say, never implemented. Indeed, it was not even published until 1831, when Polish insurgents found a copy in Warsaw and made public its contents. In the limited constitutional monarchy that Novosiltsov projected the Russian Empire was divided into twelve lieutenancies (namestnichestva), among which Siberia was to constitute the lieutenancy of Tomsk. This area was in turn subdivided into three provinces (gubernii): Tobolsk, Tomsk, and Irkutsk (including Kamchatka). Each lieutenancy would have an assembly (seim), with its upper

chamber serving as a department of the Russian Senate — with members appointed by the Emperor, and its lower chamber a House of elected Deputies. Each lieutenant, as top administrator, was to be appointed by the Emperor. Above the twelve regional assemblies a State Assembly would be established, which would possess only consultative powers. [1]

Seton-Watson has pointed out the probable influences on Novosiltsov's federalistic constitution, along with its limitations:

> it is most likely that Alexander was influenced at this time by the example of the Constitution of the United States. He had had talks with John Quincy Adams when he was in St. Petersburg in 1809-13, and he had corresponded with Jefferson. At the same time it must be stressed that, even if the lieutenancies bear some superficial resemblance to the states of North America, the constitution completely fails to incorporate the federal principle. The essence of federal government is that the central and regional authorities each have powers of their own, that they are co-ordinate with each other, that the latter are not subordinate to the former. Of this there is not a trace in Novosiltsov's draft. It stresses the unity of government and the supremacy if the emperor. [2]

Despite the gap between federative form and centralistic content, the latter-day regionalist, Yakushev, has pointed out its symbolic value.

> The constitutional draft plan of 1818-20, the Statutory State Charter of the Russian Empire, was perhaps the first attempt to solve the problem of correlating the center with the borderlands by means of a federation, with an original (by the ideas of that time) combination of the principles of monarchical power. [3]

Following Novosiltsov's draft constitution in point of time were the

---

1 Sbornik imperatorskago russkago istoricheskago obshchestva (Anthology of the Imperial Russian Historical Society), XC: 212-13. Also G. Vernadskii, Gosudarstvennaia Ustavnaia Gramota (Prague, 1925), pp. 35-36; as paraphrased in H. Seton-Watson, Russian Empire, p. 158, 158 n.; and in Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 10. And V. Bazilevich, "Oblastnoe delenie Sibiri v proekhtakh dekabristov" (The Regional Division of Siberia in Decembrist Draft Plans), Sibir' i dekabristy, p. 43.

2 H. Seton-Watson, Russian Empire, p. 159.

3 Iakushev, "Ot redaktsii," Vol'naia Sibir', (1927) no. 1, p. 7.

constitutional draft plans worked out by various Decembrists in the early 1820's, without official sanction. Though not all of their plans were federalist in content, the various federative schemes that were drawn up went further than Novosiltsov's draft in many ways. Indeed, George Guins, in his study of Siberian regionalism, feels that "the idea of Siberia's self-government was perhaps first expressed in one of the projects worked out by Decembrists. Among them this idea was born from an abstract principle — the preference for decentralization." [4]

Nevertheless, of the various plans among Decembrist groups for a constitutional change, only two — those of Nikita M. Muravyov and of the Society of United Slavs — really took the idea of decentralization seriously. Though Muravyov was republican in outlook, he chose to draw up a plan for a Russian constitutional monarchy in accordance with the majority view of the "Northern Society," which he helped direct. Muravyov's "northern" constitution, begun in 1821 and still unfinished by December 1825, was designed as follows. Russia would be divided into thirteen states (derzhavy) and two regions (oblasti). Each state would be subdivided into districts (uezdy), and each of these into townships (volosti). Muravyov's states by and large had ethnic or regional bases, many of them taking the names of local rivers or seas. Siberia, however, was treated in this plan as two separate states, reflecting official administrative practices in both the 18th century and in the immediate post-Speransky period. Thus, the Ob State, corresponding to Western Siberia, had Tobolsk as its capital, and to the Lena State, replacing Eastern Siberia, Irkutsk was assigned as capital. [5]

---

4 G. K. Gins, "Sibirskoe oblastnichestvo" (Siberian Regionalism), Vozrozhdenie (Paris), (September-October 1950) bk. 11, p. 147.

5 H. Seton-Watson, Russian Empire, p. 188 n.

For Russia as a whole Muravyov projected a National Assembly (narodnoe veche) with legislative power — as opposed to Novosiltsov's purely consultative assembly. The Supreme Council (duma), acting as an upper house and modeled on the American Senate, would consist of three members from each state or region. Thus, Siberia would send six representatives, each elected to a six-year term. From a total of 42 delegates this representation would greatly favor the Siberian states at the expense of the others. A lower house (or representatives) was to be based on the principle of one representative per 50,000 male inhabitants. This, according to Muravyov's calculations, would give the Ob State (with over 500,000 males) ten delegates, and the Lena State five delegates (with over 250,000 males). Among the autonomous privileges accorded to the states and regions were bicameral assemblies, and to the districts and townships unicameral assemblies. The state bicameral assemblies would then elect deputies to the National Assembly, and in return the National Assembly would every three years elect "state executives" to head each of the thirteen states.[6] Though a hereditary emperor would hold executive control as "Supreme Official of the Russian Government," his powers would be circumscribed in many ways, similar to the powers of the United States president.

Thus, Muravyov's constitution was not only democratic, but it also showed much outward resemblance to the United States Constitution. Muravyov viewed sympathetically both the executive and legislative branches of the American government, along with its federal and "regional" principles.[7]

---

6 See Mazour, First Russian Revolution, p. 91; Seton-Watson, Russian Empire, p. 189; and Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 16.

7 Vosstanie dekabristov. Materialy (Materials on the Decembrist Uprising), ed. by M. N. Pokrovskii (Moscow-Leningrad, 1925), I: 175, 178; and P. I. Svistunov, "Nieskol'ko zamiechanii po povodu novieishikh knig i statei o sobytii 14 dekabriia i o dekabristakh," Russkii Arkhiv, (1870), 1639-40.

It moreover seems likely that his thirteen Russian states reflected the American model too. In the preamble to his draft constitution he wrote:

> Vast territories and a large army prevent certain /nations/ from being free; and those which do not have such inconveniences suffer from their own weakness. Only a Federal Government or Union has solved this problem, satisfied all conditions and combined the greatness of a nation with liberty for its citizens.[8]

Muravyov's federalism was opposed by Pavel Pestel, leader of the "Southern Society" and son of the former Siberian Governor-General Ivan Pestel (1806-19). Pestel felt that the federal principle was dangerous for Russia in that it would weaken the state and make Russia an easy prey to foreign aggression. His own draft constitution, entitled "Russian Truth" (Russkaia Pravda), was not only more radical socially and politically than Muravyov's, but also much more centralistic in approach. Only Poland, a nation of Roman Catholics, did Pestel consider "capable" of independence. Even then, he was willing to let Poland break loose from the Russian Empire only on condition that it adopt a republican government similar to the republic he proposed for Russia and that it conclude a permanent military alliance with Russia. As for the remaining nationalities, they should "completely fuse their nationality with the nationality of the dominant people." In his Russian Truth Pestel wrote specifically:

> Finland, Estonia, Livonia, Kurland, Byelorussia, Little Russia, New Russia, Bessarabia, the Crimea, Georgia, all the Caucasus, the lands of the Kirghiz, all the Siberian peoples and various other races living within

---

8 Vosstanie dekabristov, I: 109. Bazilevich writes that Muravyov was also influenced by the French Constitution of 1791, the "federalism" of the Girondins, and the Spanish Constitution of 1812 ("Oblastnoe delenie," p. 44).

> the state never have enjoyed and never can enjoy independence on their own . . . [9]

For these areas and peoples Pestel prescribed Russification and assimilation. Evidently he concerned himself with only the non-Russian peoples of Siberia and not the Sibiryaks, as he singled out for assimilation the Tatars, Kirghiz (i.e. Kazakhs), Cossacks, and "east Siberian peoples." This process was to be accomplished through the dessemination of Christianity, education, and civilization. [10]

Pestel also felt Russia should annex such neighboring territories as Moldavia, the rest of the Caucasus, the Kirghiz steppes, and part of eastern Mongolia ("the upper Amur basin") "for the firm establishment of state security." For Mongolia, under nominal Chinese suzerainty, Pestel visualized a Russian civilizing mission there not totally removed from what Yadrintsev subsequently envisaged. According to Pestel, the Mongolian lands, inhabited by nomads, were "useless for China; moreover, they would provide Russia with greater advantages and benefits for her trade and also for constructing a fleet in the Eastern Ocean /sic/." [11]

Pestel's "Russian Truth" further stated that "Russia is a unified and indivisible state." For administrative purposes, however, Russia would be divided into ten regions (oblasti), which in turn were to be split into 50 areas (okrugi). Though opposed to regional autonomy, federalism, and decentralization — in contrast to Muravyov, Pestel did recognize Siberia as a single entity and organized it as a unitary region. Thus, he divided

---

9 P. I. Pestel', Russkaia Pravda. Nakaz Vremennomu Verkhovnomu Pravleniiu (Russian Truth: Instructions to the Supreme Provisional Government), ed. by P. E. Shchegolëv (St. Petersburg, 1906), p. 15. For a partial translation of the Russian Truth in English, see M. Raeff, The Decembrist Movement (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1966), pp. 124-56.

10 Pestel', Russkaia Pravda, p. 40, 55. Also see Mazour, First Russian Revolution, p. 104; Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 18, 19; and Seton-Watson, Russian Empire, p. 191.

11 Pestel', Russkaia Pravda, pp. 16-17.

this region into five okrugi: Tobolsk (including parts of Perm and Ufa provinces), Tomsk, Irkutsk (where the regional capital was located), Yakutsk, and Kamchatka.[12] The centralistic and mathematically exact character of the administrative divisions and subdivisions of this Russian "Jacobin" in fact bear some resemblance to the départements created in Revolutionary France of the 1790's.

Pestel regarded as Russia's only colony not Siberia, but the holdings in North America. Regarding these colonies, however, Pestel established a "general rule," which would have pleased subsequent regionalists. Accordingly, colonies "should be administered in such a way that they could be given independence if they became strong enough to enjoy this, and therefore they should be administered more under the guise of patronage than as a full possession."[13]

Besides the "Northern" and "Southern" Societies, the Society of United Slavs was also important in the Decembrist movement. Though the leaders of this group (such as Andrei and Pyotr Borisov) did not draw up a constitutional plan — as did the leaders of the "Northern" and "Southern" Societies, they did formulate around 1824 a program espousing a federation of Slavic peoples. This republican and democratic federation was to consist of eight Slavic peoples: Russians, Poles, Serbs, Dalmatians, Croats, Bohemians, Moravians, and Hungarians (sic).[14] According to the Decembrist Gorbachevsky,

> A chief goal of the Society was the liberation of all Slavic nations from autocracy, the destruction of

---

12 Pestel', Russkaia Pravda, pp. 21-22, 24, 30.
13 Ibid., p. 41. See too Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 18.
14 Vosstanie dekabristov (1927) V: 207. Also see Mazour, First Russian Revolution, p. 146.

> existing national hatred between some of them, and the unification of all the lands they inhabit through a federative union. It was proposed to determine the boundaries of each state with exactness, to introduce among all peoples a form of democratic government, and to hold a congress to manage affairs of the Union and, if necessary, to change the general fundamental laws, letting each state engage in its own internal organization and be independent in composing its own particular statutes. [15]

The historian Semevsky feels that this group and its "attempts to spread federalistic ideas could have influenced the /later/ development of aspirations toward local and regional autonomy." [16] Nevertheless, whatever concrete influence these ideas may have had upon Siberian regionalists or anyone else, it is just as difficult to substantiate this impact as it is with the ideas of Pestel and Nikita Muravyov. They do, however, reflect an increasing awareness of a need for federative government and decentralization.

Though the plan of the United Slavs was probably the most federalistic in content of any of the Decembrist plans, it was based solely on criteria of nationality, not of region. And in this respect Siberia was to be included wholly within the autonomous Russian state. The United Slavs did not appear to extend the federal principle below that of the major nationality units, and their interest in the "Slavic question" was more general or "Pan-Slavic" than particularistic or regional. One member of the Society of United Slavs, however, M. M. Spiridov, did get down to regional specifics. He proposed to

---

15 (I. I. Gorbachevskii) "Zapiski neizviestnago. Iz Obshchestva Soedieennykh Slavian" (Notes of an Unknown Writers: From the Society of United Slavs), Russkii Arkhiv, (1882) bk. 1, pp. 443-444. Also see Raeff, The Decembrist Movement, pp. 157-61.

16 V. I. Semevskii, "Nieskol'ko slov v pamiat' Nikolaia Mikhailovicha Iadrintseva" (A Few Words in Honor of Nikolai Mikhailovich Yadrintsev), Russkaia Mysl', (1895) I: 29.

> put together a Russian State out of Russian Provinces alone and to leave Siberia and other /provinces/ whose inhabitants are of non-Russian origin in full dependency, depriving them of the right of representation among the Citizens of Russia but granting them this within their own Provinces, or regions; /and/ to enact laws /in these areas/ that are uniform with Russian laws . . . [17]

Spiridov's plan, alone among those of the Decembrists, put Siberia on a separate and in some ways lower political and civil plane than European Russia.

Another Decembrist constitutional plan which touched on Siberia was one drawn up in the late 1810's by two of the earliest members of what later became the Decembrist movement, Count M. A. Dmitriev-Mamonov and General M. F. Orlov. In their "Brief Experiment" (Kratkii Opyt) a two-chamber popular assembly (narodnoe veche) was drawn up. Russia was to be divided into nine "realms" — one of which was Siberia, five "grand duchies," and four other areas. The Siberian "realm," a name earlier employed by Catherine II, was to consist of three provinces (gubernii): Tobolsk, Tomsk, and Irkutsk. It would send ten hereditary and landed nobles (i.e. deputies) to the upper House of Lords (out of a total of 221 deputies). To the lower House of Commons Siberian towns were to send an undetermined number of elected delegates. Whether the authors of this plan realized it or not, Siberia did not possess the land, hereditary class of nobles or gentry necessary for such representation. [18]

---

17 Vosstanie dekabristov, V: 126-27.

18 A. K. Borozdin, Iz pisem i pokazanii dekabristov. Kritika sovremennago sostoianiia Rossii i plany budushchago ustroistva (From the Letters and Testimonies of Decembrists: Criticism of the Contemporary Status of Russia and Plans for Its Future Organization), (St. Petersburg, 1906), p. 148, 150-52, 156. Also see Bazilevich, "Oblastnoe delenie," p. 42.

Like Pestel, Orlov and Dmitriev-Mamonov recognized the value of the Amur basin for Russia. They projected the construction of a harbor at the Amur mouth and the founding of a trading company linking Japan, China, and Siberia. In this respect they were theoretical forerunners of Count Muravyov-Amursky, recognizing that without a decent outlet on the Pacific Ocean, Siberia would have little future. [19]

Thus, a small number of Decembrist theorists recognized Siberia's unique territorial, historical, and ethnic characteristics, though perhaps not as distinctly as some observers in the pre-Speransky era did. The centralist Pestel reconstructed a single Siberian region (reflecting his father's unitary jurisdiction?), just as the aristocratic federalists Orlov and Dmitriev-Mamonov did in reviving the idea of a "Siberian realm." On the other hand, the "decentralist" Muravyov went farther by splitting Siberia into two federal states (predating the approach of the later regionalist, Ivan Popov). None of these Decembrists, however, came out for an integrated Siberia — on a par with Russia, yet autonomous and largely self-governing — which most regionalists later advocated. Nevertheless, the majority of Decembrists seem to have agreed in their preference for some kind of federalized Russia. In this respect they are important as the founders of the federalist idea in the Russian Empire. Though their constitutions and programs for a reconstructed Russia were noten not published for some time (Pestel's Russian Truth cameout only in 1906), their ideas also spread by word of mouth and reinforced autonomist and regionalist tendencies and outlooks already present in the empire. This was true both in

---

19 Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 15; and Bazilevich, "Oblastnoe delenie," p. 43.

the Ukraine and in Siberia, and in the latter the force of their political ideas was strengthened by their immediate presence in exile.

* * *

Early Views of Siberia among Petrashevtsy

Before the arrest of the Petrashevsky discussion circle in St. Petersburg in 1849 only three participants in the group — Konstantin Timkovsky (a born-Siberian), Rafael Chernosvitov, and Nikolai Speshnyov — are known to have lived in Siberia previously. While Timkovsky had discarded his former Siberian patriotism in favor of extreme socialism by now, the latter two, along with Petrashevsky himself, are known to have expressed distinct views concerning the region. Chernosvitov, who boasted of his "unlimited influence" on Governor-General Muravyov, viewed Siberia in two rather different perspectives. First, he saw the region as a separate entity, constituting an empire (or at least part of one) distinct and apart from Russia. Secondly, he looked on Siberia as a possible base for revolution, which would spread from there to European Russia. Having helped put down a serious peasant revolt in 1842 in Perm province (then administratively part of Western Siberia), he had since become more convinced of this region's revolutionary potential.

Chernosvitov elaborated his views on Siberia's uniqueness in a bit more detail than he did his views on its revolutionary potential. At one of Petrashevsky's soirées, Chernosvitov asserted that Siberia was "a country completely separate from Russia, rich and beautiful, and . . . surely somehow fated to be a separate empire." In fact he went so far as often

to call Siberia "an America, California, Eldorado, and a Russian Mexico," and sometimes, carried away by thoughts of its future, he called it a "Great Empire." [20] Chernosvitov apparently so loved Siberia as a homeland that he "could in his enthusiasm invite everyone to go there." [21]

He also developed a rather fantastic plan whereby a revolution would start in Eastern Siberia, and from there an armed corps would be sent to the Urals. When it arrived, 400,000 factory workers would accordingly rise up and carry the revolution to the provinces of European Russia. Chernosvitov later admitted that "the idea of an uprising in the Urals and of a revolt in Siberia, and especially the latter, could not be realized and could be no more than a dream of youthful imagination." [22] Nevertheless, this 38-year-old's "youthful" dreams of a separate Siberian empire qualify him as one of the earliest known separatist thinkers, and his idea of Siberia as the initial center for a Russian revolution preceded similar ideas held by certain Russian radicals in the 1860's. Moreover, this idea, linked with his appreciation of the revolutionary capabilities of the peasantry, makes Chernosvitov askind of early "populist" in Russian political thought.

Speshnyov, who had visited the Kurgan district of Western Siberia in 1841, agreed with Chernosvitov as to Siberia's revolutionary potential. He in fact once remarked that "here is where the revolutionary Russia of the future should begin." [23] According to a government spy who had infil-

---

20 Quoted in V. I. Semevskii, M. V. Petrashevskii i Petrashevtsy, pt. 1, p. 189, 189 n. Also see Semevskii, "M. V. Butashevich-Petrashevskii," Golos Minuvshago, (1913) no. 8, p. 72.

21 P. Shchegolev, ed., Petrashevtsy v vospominaniiakh sovremennikov (The Petrashevtsy in the Recollections of Contemporaries), (Moscow-Leningrad, 1928), III: 244; quoted in Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 28. Also see, Semevskii, "M. V. Petrashevskii," p. 73.

22 Petrashevtsy v vospominaniiakh, III: 29, 252; quoted in Svatikov, pp. 28-29. Also see A. Yarmolinsky, Road to Revolution (New York: Collier Books, 1962), p. 79.

23 Petrashevtsy v vospominaniiakh, III: 245-46; quoted in Svatikov, p. 28.

trated the circle, members spoke of the need to "agitate not only among separate strata of society, but also in the separate lands of the state, for example, preparing an uprising in the Caucasus, in Poland, /and/ in Siberia . . . " [24]

Petrashevsky himself at one time had had rather far-fetched hopes that Siberia would serve as a catalyst in the future transformation of Russia. Of Siberia he wrote in 1841 (at age 20): "I think that Siberia will replace /sic/ present-day Russia and that there the Russian people will emerge untainted and a republican government will prevail." [25] Petrashevsky also developed an interest in federalism, though he does not appear to have linked Siberia in any specific federative reorganization, as some of the Decembrists did. However, he did recommend that others in his circle read up on such topics as the United States, federalism, and federation. In the long run he hoped for a gradual transformation of the Russian Empire into a federated republic somewhat like the United States. [26]

One other member of the circle is known to have expressed views on Siberia — Alexandr P. Balasoglo. This visionary realized a degree of antagonism existed in the borderlands toward Great Russians. He predicted in 1845 that in some future "catastrophe" Poland, the Ukraine, the Caucasus, and the tribes of Central Asia would break away, and that "Siberia will rise up and cause trouble with China." In some ways predicting events

---

24 Semevskii, M. V. Petrashevskii i Petrashevtsy, pt. 1, p. 133.
25 Ibid., p. 41; and Semevskii, "Petrashevskii v Sibiri," p. 26.
26 See Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 29; Semevskii, M. V. Petrashevskii i Petrashevtsy, pt. 1, p. 133; and Yarmolinsky, Road to Revolution, p. 78.

set into motion during the Crimean War and the Russian Civil War, Balasoglo foresaw the British seizure of Russia's American colonies, Kamchatka, and the lower Amur basin.[27] All in all, however, grandiose visions such as these were rather typical of the 1840's, not only among the Russian intellectual elite, but in the western world too.

The ideas of certain Petrashevtsy regarding Siberia that were tossed around in the late forties seem to have exerted little influence on the circle as a whole and almost none at all outside of it. Chernosvitov visited the group for only two months, and Speshnyov and Timkovsky were more revolution-oriented than most of the members. Conceivably, some of the group in Siberian exile (such as Lvov, Durov, Speshnyov, and Petrashevsky) could have passed on these visions of a future Siberia to local intellectuals, but the evidence (as seen above) points to the contrary. These early revolutionary and separatistic ideas regarding Siberia among Petrashevtsy are indicative of their ignorance of the real conditions in Siberia and of the pedestal on which they placed it (and Chernosvitov, who had lived there) in their somewhat romantic conceptions of the country. Nevertheless, their ideas also reflected the rumors circulating in Siberia in the 1840's of Siberia's possible separation from Russia. Perhaps more importantly their ideas (and especially Chernosvitov's) gave added weight to the growing bugbear of Siberian separatism.[28] The view of Siberia as a base for revolution was probably original with the Petrashevtsy and was

---

27 Petrashevtsy v vospominaniiakh, III: 252-53; quoted in Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 29.

28 These ideas were brought out at the trial of the Petrashevtsy. See V. I. Semevskii, "Iz istorii obshchestvennykh idei," pp. 141-42.

later contemplated by such revolutionaries as N. A. Serno-Solovyovich and Pyotr N. Tkachov.[29] With respect to federalism, the Petrashevtsy barely scratched the surface of this problem, in comparison with the Decembrists. Though their theoretical contributions to federalism and regionalism were minimal, some of their ideas on Siberia's unique character and its conceivable separation from Russia (an ultimate extension of regionalism in one respect) stand out in the theoretical development of the problem of Siberia's relationship with Russia in the early 19th century.

* * *

Herzen, Ogaryov, Bakunin, and the Bell

Prominent among Great Russian intellectuals who gave thought to Siberia's distinctiveness as a region and to her possible place in a federative restructuring of the Russian Empire were Alexander Ivanovich Herzen (1812-70) and his close companion Nikolai Platonovich Ogaryov (1813-77). These two thinkers not only presented some rather original ideas regarding Siberia and her destiny, but they also allowed ample space in their bimonthly newspaper, the Bell (published from 1857 to 1867 in London and Geneva), for articles about developments and events in Siberia. In this respect the pages of the Bell provided for the first time ever a completely open forum for public discussion and criticism of Siberian affairs and issues.

---

29 On Serno-Solovyovich see, for instance, Venturi, Roots, p. 267; and Panteleev, Vospominaniia, pp. 567-68. On Tkachov see I. S. Dzabadari, "Protsess 50-ti. (Vserossiiskaia Sotsial'no-Revoliutsionnaia Organizatsiia 1874-1877 g.)" (The Trial of the Fifty: The All-Russian Social-Revolutionary Organization, 1874-77), Byloe, (September 1907) no. 9/21, p. 184.

Though the Bell was extremely popular in Eastern Siberia (when obtainable) in the late 1850's and early 1860's, it is difficult to determine exactly how and how much the statements of Herzen and Ogaryov on Siberia and on federalism actually affected young Siberians of the time. Indeed, the late fifties and early sixties were a period when not only in Russia, but all across Europe federative plans and policies were popular — in Italy, Germany, the Habsburg Empire, Moldavia-Wallachia, and even in Scandinavia and the South-Slavic Balkans.[30] Grandiose projects and visions for large-scale reorganization of the European map were commonly voiced abroad. This environment helps explain in part why Herzen and Ogaryov, then stationed in London, could be so taken up with similar ideas for Russia and the Russian Far East. Within the Russian Empire itself, Alexander II by the spring of 1861 had taken steps toward granting political autonomy in Poland and Finland. Though these measures were soon revoked in the Polish case, a Finnish national Diet was in fact re-established in 1863.[31] These developments, coupled with Great Reforms in Russia proper and the recent annexation of the Amur region, evoked promise and expectation in the minds of many Russians and Siberians of a totally new future ahead.

Despite all these developments of the late fifties and early sixties, Alexander Herzen had been struck by the vision of a special destiny for Siberia long before this time. While serving a rather comfortable term of exile in Vyatka, in northeastern Russia, he wrote in 1835 (at age 23)

---

30 See especially Robert C. Binkley, Realism and Nationalism, 1852-1871 (New York: Harper & Row, 1935), pp. 181-84. Binkley calls the period 1857-63 the "Era of Federative Experiments."

31 For details see Werner E. Mosse, Alexander II and the Modernization of Russia (New York: Collier Books, 1962), p. 93, 100-03.

apropos of this to two friends. He was not writing from personal experience in Siberia, however, but from what he had heard about the nearby region from others.

> Do you know that Siberia is a completely new country, a kind of America, namely because it is a land without an aristocratic origin, the daughter of a Cossack brigand who has forgotten his kinship, a country where reborn people live, who have closed their eyes to all past life, which for them represents a black prison, chains, a long journey, and often even the knout. Here everyone is an exile and everyone is equal. . . . /In society/ no one disdains exiles because they disdain neither themselves nor their fathers. . . . People are happy here, enlightenment is here, and, most of all, freshness and novelty. Everything that has recently been settled has a progressive base — like Prussia. [32]

Though this imaginative depiction of Siberia in the 1830's is a bit exaggerated regarding happiness, enlightenment, and equality, it does reflect how others who had been there presented the country to Herzen. Once again, Siberia was compared favorably with the United States, and compared to Russia it was viewed as a land of much greater social equality, progress, and innovation. Herzen's early characterizations of Siberia were both near and far from the mark. That Siberia was progressive and enlightened was a claim that any later regionalist would immediately deny, though the parallel with America they frequently drew. These same remarks of Herzen can also be viewed in a wider context. Thus, Malia, a recent biographer of Herzen, writes:

> Here is the first recorded appearance in Herzen's thought of the twin concepts of the "broad nature"

---

32 Letter to N. Kh. Ketcher and M. I. Sazonov, dated July 18, 1835, in A. I. Gertsen, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, ed. by M. Lemke (Petrograd, 1919), I: 190-91.

> of the Russians and of the advantages conferred upon them by historical youth and freshness — concepts which after 1848 were to be main components in his theory of Russian socialism. [33]

Herzen later recalled his experiences in Vyatka, along with his reflections on Siberia, in his autobiographical work, My Past and Thoughts, written in the early 1850's. Here again he stressed the democratic aspects of Siberian society — as opposed to the authoritarian administration, noting the similarities the region had (or could have) with the United States. Moreover, he also emphasized the various differences between Russia and Siberia and their respective inhabitants. Having left Vyatka in 1837 and Russia altogether in 1847, he now attempted to sum up his conclusions in London. Though farther away from Siberia than ever, his faith in its social and economic potentialities was just as glowing as it had been almost twenty years earlier. Thus, of Siberia's future and of both past and present administrations there he wrote:

> It is a pity that Siberia has been administered so badly. The selection of governors-general has been especially unfortunate. I don't know how Muravyov has been, — he is noted for his intelligence and capabilities, but the rest were worthless. Siberia has a great future; people look on her as a reservoir which has much gold, furs, and other goods, but which is cold, covered with snow, poor in means of life, and neither developed by roads nor settled. This is untrue.
>
> The Russian government, which kills everything and does everything by force and with the stick, does not understand how to render that vital impulse which would carry Siberia forward with American rapidity. We shall see what will happen when the mouth of the Amur is opened for navigation and America meets Siberia right next to China.

---

33 Martin Malia, Alexander Herzen and the Birth of Russian Socialism, 1812-1855 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1961), p. 144.

> I said long ago that the Pacific Ocean would be the Mediterranean Sea of the future. In this future the role of Siberia, a country between the /Pacific/ Ocean, southern Asia and Russia, is extremely important. It is understood that Siberia should extend down to the Chinese border. Indeed, we need not freeze and shiver in Berezov and Yakutsk, when there are Krasnoyarsk, Minusinsk, etc.

And of the Siberian "character" he added:

> Even the Russian population in Siberia has in its character a certain basis which hints at a different kind of development. In general the Siberian people are healthy, stalwart, clever, and extremely sedate. As children of settlers, the Sibiryaks know nothing at all of landlord authority. There is no gentry in Siberia, and at the same time there is no aristocracy in the towns; the officials and the military officers, as representatives of authority, are rather more like a hostile garrison set up by conquerors than an aristocracy. The enormous distances save the peasants from frequent relations with them, while money saves the merchants, who in Siberia despise the officials and, outwardly yielding to them, accept them for what they are: their clerks in civil matters.
>
> The habit of using weapons, necessary for the Sibiryak, is universal; being accustomed to danger and prompt action has made the Siberian peasant more militant, resourceful, and ready to resist than the Great Russian. The distance from churches has left his mind freer than in Russia; he is cold toward religion and is in large part an Old Believer /sic/. Remote villages exist where a priest comes perhaps three times a year and in one lump baptizes, buries, marries, and hears confessions for all time. [34]

A year or two later, in January 1854 (at the outset of the Crimean War), Herzen optimistically described Russia, including specifically its Pacific borderland, as a land of the future, and a socialist one at that. Moreover, he predicted "new societies" of the future would emerge primarily in Russia and the United States, touching each other on the Pacific

---

34 A. I. Gertsen, Byloe i dumy, pp. 136-37; from ch. XV, entitled "Tiur'ma i ssylka, 1834-38" (Prison and Exile). A contemporary English translation is in the inappropriately entitled work of Herzen, My Exile in Siberia (London: Hurst and Blackett, 1855), I; 218-21.

Ocean. Thus, he wrote to an Englishman,

> Look, for example, at these two huge flatlands, meeting back to back and surrounding Europe. Why are they so vast, what are they preparing themselves for, and what does their devouring passion for activity and expansion signify? These two worlds, placed opposite each other, and between which there is a unique kind of resemblance, are the North American United States and Russia.

Along the shores of the North Pacific the two youthful giants of the world, Russia and the United States, uncontaminated by the decadence of the old world, would shift the center of world history and accomplish this by establishing their own unique types of socialism. These thoughts were to form part of a later work appropriately called The Old World and Russia.[35]

Herzen continued these themes, with new variations, in an article of 1858 in the Bell. Though the title, "America and Siberia," somewhat misrepresents the contents (which barely mention Siberia), Herzen further expanded his ideas on the Pacific link between Russia and America and on the similarities between the two countries. Appearing in the Bell, this work was no doubt more widely read than any of his earlier writings concerning Siberia. He first quoted from an article in the Philadelphia Daily Evening Bulletin entitled "Our Western Neighbor," which hailed Muravyov's treaty annexing the left bank of the Amur.

> "When a railroad to the Pacific is finished, and Russia on her side has an open shore on it, then Russians and Americans, peacefully turning their backs on Europe, will extend a hand to each other across it

---

35 "Pis'ma Iskandera k redaktoru 'The English Republic,' V. Lintonu (1854 g.)" (Letters of Iskander to V. Linton, Editor of the English Republic in 1854), in Staryi mir i Rossiia (London: Trübner and Co., 1858), p. 4. For Herzen's intellectual debt to Tocqueville in this respect, see Malia, Alexander Herzen, pp. 191-92. It should also be noted that Herzen was especially disillusioned with Western Europe (the Old World) after the failures of 1848.

> and let the ocean's very name (Pacific) be a good sign of a future alliance!
>
> . . . "Our age is an age of events accomplished rapidly; new states arise on the shores of unknown seas, scarcely marketable plans are not only contemplated but put into operation; and Russia and America are far from letting other states execute them by themselves. If the administration of the Russian colony on the Amur in ten years still proceeds at the same quick pace of development as in the past year, then we will move a half-century ahead. The treaty concluded by Muravyov will in time have world-wide significance."

The Bulletin article concluded that for these reasons Americans "will have as many reasons to rejoice as the inhabitants of Irkutsk and all Siberia."[36]

Herzen, on his own, went on to write eloquently of similarities in character and historical development in Russia (and by extension Siberia) and America. However, in declaring his admiration for the American federal form of government, he pointed to the great contrast with Russia in this respect.

> Both countries have a surplus of energies and flexibility, and a spirit of organization and persistence that knows no obstacles; both are poor in past history and begin fully in a break with tradition; both expand across endless valleys, seeking their frontiers; both reach from different sides across terrible expanses, marking their route everywhere by towns, villages, and colonies right up to the shores of the Pacific, this "Mediterranean Sea of the future" . . .
>
> The contrast of the Petersburg military dictatorship, annihilating everyone in the person of the autocrat, with the American autocracy of every man is enormous. . . .
>
> If we turn our attention to the distinctiveness of American thought . . . , then two things will strike you: first, that federal democracy with the self-legality of each small town and each constituency is

---

36 Iskander (Herzen), "Amerika i Sibir'," Kolokol, (December 1, 1858) no. 29; reprinted in Kolokol (Moscow, 1962), pt. 1, p. 233. The Daily Evening Bulletin of October 8, 1858, was unavailable to me. The last sentence cited, incidentally, contains the only direct reference to Siberia in Herzen's entire article.

> a form of civic life, completely suitable to the transatlantic colonist of the United Kingdom . . . The second thing is the freshness and simplicity which the American mind brings into the scholastic rubbish of political questions. . . . This simple, vital, healthy relationship of the American mind to political and economic questions completely corresponds to the concept of a democratic republic.
>
> Can one in conscience also say that an all-absorbing dictatorship in Russia is the final form of its civic structure, fully corresponding to its genius? Isn't this dictatorship only a tutelage which will end with the coming of age? [37]

Here Herzen seems to hint at what was later known as the frontier theory of democracy, a kind of historical determinism resulting from the frontier environment. In the American case this environment had aided the formation of a federal democracy, and Herzen hoped that the Russian experience in Siberia (so poor in past history) and in European Russia would ultimately engender a similar form of government, superceding the "tutelage" of autocracy.

Herzen concluded with a commendation of Muravyov, Count Putyatin, and others instrumental in acquiring the left bank of the Amur: for their having

> driven in the pile for a long bridge . . . across a whole ocean. While gloomy European funerals take place, each mourning over something or other, they on one side and the Americans on the other have put together a cradle! [38]

Soon after this, Herzen began to speak more specifically on the subject of federalism. In early 1859, he accused "centralization" (of a Nicholas I or of a Bonaparte) of "sacrificing the originality of the various parts, aspiring to a police-like, monotonous front, and murdering everything that is individual, distinctive, and local . . ." [39] Moreover, he spoke

---

37 Ibid., p. 234.
38 Ibid., p. 235.
39 Kolokol, (January 15, 1859) no. 32; reprinted in Kolokol (Moscow, 1962), pt. 2, p. 275.

more frequently of a federation between Russia and Poland, and soon extended this idea to include the Ukraine as well.[40] By 1862, addressing himself to the problems coming to a head in Russian Poland, he declared the need for self-determination of nations or nationalities and advocated a federal union of peoples within the empire (subject to their approval, of course). If not, a given nationality should then have the right to separate from the federation, if it so desired. Herzen applied the right to separate even to Siberians, though he hardly considered them a "nationality" or a "nation."

Thus, in an article of 1862, "To the Russian Officers in Poland," Herzen first endorsed the idea of Siberian separatism. Moreover, he coined the striking regionalist slogan: "Land to the Peasants, Autonomy to the Regions" (Poland included). He ended on the following note:

> We recognize neither material force as a right, nor historical right as a force. Not only do we recognize the right to autonomous development for each nationality which has stood out from others and which has had its own natural boundaries, but also a geographical location for each. If Siberia should separate from Russia tomorrow, we would be the first to welcome its new life. That a state keeps intact does not necessarily coincide with popular welfare within it.[41]

As to the possible impact of this statement on Siberians, Svatikov has gone so far as to say that "without a doubt these words of Herzen reached Siberia and evoked a sympathetic response there, both among patriots of Siberia and among radicals from Russia (political exiles, liberal officials of Muravyov's group, etc.)."[42] In actuality, these stirring words on the

---

40 See Venturi, Roots, pp. 121-22

41 (Editors of the Bell) "Russkim ofitseram v Pol'shie," Kolokol, (October 15, 1862) no. 147; reprint: (1962) pt. 5, p. 1214.

42 Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 42.

Bell may indeed have encouraged or delighted young Siberians at home or in St. Petersburg, but, unfortunately, there exists no specific evidence of their response.

Much more regionalistic (in the broad sense of the term) than Herzen was his close associate on the editorial staff of the Bell, Nikolai Ogaryov. Though Ogaryov considered himself a socialist first and foremost, he also contributed significantly to Russian federalist and regionalist thought. In an article that greeted the new year 1861, he wrote: "The Russian Empire is naturally broken up into regions, in part by geographical and economic conditions, and in part by ethnic groups." He then singled out the following such regions: the areas around the White and Baltic Seas, Byelorussia, Lithuania, the Central region of Great Russia, the Ural, Caspian, and Transcaucasian areas, and in the south — New Russia, the Ukraine, and the lands of the Don Cossacks. Poland he divided into several regions and vaguely did the same for Siberia, which, as he put it, "is amassed into its regions in the direction of the Pacific Ocean." [43]

Perhaps influenced by the ideas of the historian Shchapov, Ogaryov tried to show how a regional division of Russia was nothing artificial, but was deeply rooted in Russia's past experience. In the above-mentioned article Ogaryov spoke out against those who disparaged the idea of a federative union between Russian regions.

> But they tell us that this division into regions will bring us into the world of the appanage or pre-appanage period of our history. [44] Perhaps! Even quite

---

43 N. Ogarëv, "Na novyi god" (On New Year's Day), Kolokol, (January 1, 1861) no. 89; reprint: (1962) pt. 4, p. 748.

44 The "period of portions" or of separate principalities under the Mongols, from roughly the 13th to 15th centuries; and the pre-Mongol era.

> probably. Moreover, we say this is quite just and natural. The appanage world was formed when tribes wandered and occupied lands /sic/. They occupied lands and were joined into principalities by naturally ethnic and geographical conditions. [45]

Continuing, Ogaryov presented a framework for effecting a federative constitutional structure for Russia.

> These conditions have remained even now; only, having settled down from wandering and in one place, there is now no need for us to enter into appangge discords; there is no desire to fight anyone; and after having organized regional self-governments, everyone will see the need to give one another a hand in general interests and to unite into a federation, into a general union of Slavic-Russian regions in which each region would be administered by itself on principles of elective self-government, with the allotment of land to each and everyone, and with its own regional bank; and for general affairs of the union each region would send its delegates to agree on organization of communication routes and general expenditures, and finally to put together a general bank of the union, administered by delegates from all the regional banks. [46]

As part of a detailed 21-point plan for the federative reconstruction of Russia, elective self-government would be institutionalized in Regional Legislative Dumas, one per region, with a Federal State Duma at the top. Ogaryov then called on the Russian emperors to present the regions with the gift of freedom, autonomy, and self-government. [47]

Another contemporary plan for the reconstruction of Russia on a regional basis was that of Mikhail S. Beideman (1840-87), a former officer who had served as a typesetter for the Bell in London for a year. Returning to Russia in 1861, Beideman drew up a fake imperial manifesto to stir

---

45 Ogarev, "Na novyi god," p. 748.
46 Ibid., pp. 748-49.
47 Ibid., pp. 750-51.

up the peasantry to revolt in the name of "Emperor Constantine the First" (supposed son of Grand Duke Constantine, elder brother of Nicholas I). Beideman's manifesto reflected Ogaryov's regionalist ideas, as described above. First, "Emperor Constantine" appealed to the inhabitants of various specifically named regions of European Russia to overthrow the "tsar-usurper," Alexander II.[48] Then, the manifesto went on to appeal to the "inhabitants of Siberia, Finland, Georgia, and Transcaucasia." In contrast to Ogaryov, Beideman differentiated more precisely between Russian regions and non-Russian borderland regions, among which he included Siberia (as one single region, not several). Moreover, one of the points embodied in Beideman's manifesto was that the "general administration of the Russian Empire would be concentrated in regional congresses and in a General National Assembly /zemskii sobor/."

Needless to say, this early regionalist and would-be populist revolutionary did not get far. He was arrested later in 1861, the scraps of his manifesto found in the bottom of a box and subsequently pieced together by the Third Section. For his efforts Beideman was kept in prison for twenty years and later died in an insane asylum.[49]

In close contact with Herzen and Ogaryov during his student years in the 1830's, during his Siberian exile (by mail), and in Western Europe after 1861 was the socialist, revolutionary, and future anarchist Michael

---

48 Beideman's regional division of Russia was similar to, though a bit more specific than Ogaryov's. Among the regions named were the White Sea, Baltic, Byelorussian, Lithuanian, Transdnieper, New Russian, Kursk, Moscow, Ryazan, Ural, and Astrakhan areas. See P. E. Shchegolëv, "Tainstvennyi uznik. Glava iz knigi ob Aleksieevskom ravelinie" (A Secret Captive: A Chapter from the Book on the Alexeev Ravelin), Byloe, (1919) no. 14, p. 156.

49 Ibid., pp. 156-57. See also Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 45; and Yarmolinsky, Road to Revolution, p. 165 n.

Bakunin. At several stages of his ideological development Bakunin conceived ideas of a revolutionary Pan-Slavic federation and visions of a special destiny for Siberia. Many of the latter he communicated directly to Herzen from Siberia.

While in Europe in the mid-1840's Bakunin was already mulling over ideas and plans for a Russian revolution and a subsequent republican federation of free Slavic peoples. He hoped that the revolutionary events of 1846, set off by Poles in Cracow and Austrian Galicia, would lead to this. Despite setbacks here, a much greater opportunity presented itself in the revolutionary year, 1848. First, in March 1848 Bakunin expanded his idea of a Slavic federation, predicting that "the revolutionary movement will stop only when Europe, the whole of Europe, including Russia, is converted into a democratic, federal republic." [50]

However, at the Slav Congress, which met in Prague in June 1848, he returned to his earlier idea of a purely Slavic federation (becoming disillusioned, like Herzen, with Western Europe). Only a Slav federation extending "from the shores of the Adriatic to the borders of the White Sea and Siberia" could guarantee freedom for all Slavs. In his article written at the Congress, "The Foundations of Slavic Federation," the proposed federation would create a "Slav Council" as a supreme organ, with full authority in foreign affairs and empowered to maintain freedom in and good relations between the federated nations. [51] Yet the Poles and various

---

50 M. A. Bakunin in La Réforme (Paris), March 13, 1848; in Bakunin. Sobranie sochinenii, vol. III (Period pervogo prebyvaniia za granitsei, 1840-1849), p. 296. See also Carr, Bakunin, p. 149, 157; and Venturi, Roots, p. 53.

51 "Osnovy novoi slavianskoi politiki" and "Osnovy slavianskoi federatsii," in Bakunin. Sobranie sochinenii, III: 302-05; and in Bakunin, Izbrannye Sochineniia (Selected Works), (Moscow-Petrograd, 1920), III: 64-67.

Slavs from Habsburg lands and the Ottoman Empire, immersed in their own immediate needs and problems, took little interest in Bakunin's grand designs. Bakunin did, however, manage to form a short-lived secret society of "Slav Friends," composed of a few like-minded Slovak, Croat, and Serb revolutionaries. Like the Decembrist Society of United Slavs before him, Bakunin at this time espoused a federalism (whether European or Slavic in scope) that involved Slavic nations, and not Russian regions. [52]

Such ideas would have found little response in Siberia, even had Bakunin chose to spread them while in exile. Though he did not abandon his earlier hopes of Slavic federation, in Siberia he began to stress the decentralization of Russia. Thus, as seen above, he claimed he limited his political activity in Siberia to successfully persuading Poles "that they must reconcile themselves with Russia" and to "convincing Muravyov of the need to decentralize the empire and of the reasonableness and the salutariness of a Slavic federative policy." [53]

Moreover, Bakunin felt that Muravyov, whom he considered a kind of savior for Russia, favored "the liberation of Slavs and the establishment not of an indivisible Pan-Slav monarchy, but of a free, though strongly united Slavic federation." According to Bakunin, Muravyov's domestic program advocated "popular self-government with the abolition of bureaucracy and a possible decentralization of Russia." [54] To what extent Muravyov agreed with these characterizations is unknown, but they still reflect the

---

52 At the Prague Congress Bakunin also advocated the independence of the Ukraine and the Baltic nations.

53 Letter to Gertsen, dated December 8, 1860, at Irkutsk, in Bakunin. Sobranie sochinenii, IV: 368-69.

54 Letters to Gertsen, dated November 7, 1860, and December 8, 1860, in Bakunin. Sobranie sochinenii, IV: 306, 360.

direction of Bakunin's own thought at the time.

Concerning Siberia itself, Bakunin developed other new ideas, which he communicated to Herzen and others. These revolved around the possible separation of Siberia from Russia and perhaps even some kind of federation with the United States. According to Arnold Ruge, Bakunin at one time told him that "Siberia would become more and more independent of Russia and in the distant future would without doubt become master of her own fate." [55] To Bakunin the annexation of the Amur region had a liberating influence on Siberia:

> Whether there be Americans or Russians on the Amur, Siberia is now adjoining the ocean and has ceased being a hopeless, deserted Siberia. We are already feeling this influence: in Irkutsk, for example, we are closer to Europe than in Tomsk, and Siberia for the first time is given significance by the Amur. . . . There is no doubt that in time the Amur will drag Siberia away from Russia and give independence and self-sufficiency to her. This is greatly feared in Petersburg, yet others even seriously fear that Muravyov will not proclaim the independence of Siberia. But is independence — impossible now, but necessary perhaps in the near future — really such a misfortune? Can Russia really remain an abnormally clumsy monarchy, united by force, any longer, and should not monarchical centralization disappear in a Slavic federation? [56]

Ideally, Siberian independence would thus help lead to Slavic federation.

In almost the same breath, however, Bakunin went on to speculate that the annexation of the Amur would bring Russia as a whole closer to the United States. The Amur, he wrote to Herzen,

> is a new Siberia, but abundant, enlightened, and maritime. Thanks to the Amur, the Slavic Russian

---

55 Quoted by M. Dragomanow in Bakunins Briefwechsel, p. lxvii.
56 Letter to Gertsen, dated November 7, 1860, at Irkutsk, Bakunin. Sobranie sochinenii, IV: 314.

> empire has gained a firm foothold on the Pacific; and an alliance with the United States, [considered to be] platonic until now, has henceforth become real, as has been clearly expressed in the present relations and negotiations with China. [57]

It was probably extrapolation from this kind of thinking that led Peter Kropotkin (who arrived in Irkutsk a year after Bakunin had left) to remark in his memoirs that Bakunin had discussed with young officers in Muravyov's own study "the chances of creating the United States of Siberia, federated across the Pacific Ocean with the United States of America." [58]

In his known writings, however, Bakunin never came close to advocating a "United States of Siberia." Nevertheless, his thoughts in Siberia and after did concern a decentralized Russia and a federation of regions. The idea of a regionally federated Russia he spelled out in some detail on at least one known occasion. A Russian who met Bakunin in Florence in 1864, V. I. Modestov, subsequently recalled that

> Bakunin demonstrated the necessity of breaking up Russia into I don't know how many parts, but in any case a dissolution such that not only Finland, the Baltic provinces, the Polish Kingdom, Bessarabia, and the Caucasus would completely separate from Russia, but also Little Russia, Siberia, and, it seems, even the Novgorod region would constitute independent units according to his plan, all linked together, however, by federative ties. [59]

Bakunin's ideas on a Slavic federation, on decentralization of the

---

57 Ibid., p. 316. Because of the context, I have translated the word soiuz as "alliance," instead of "union," which would imply federation with the United States (thereby supporting Kropotkin's remark above).

58 Kropotkin, Memoirs, p. 134. Apropos of this assertion, Steklov declares that "both Muravyov and Bakunin never dreamed of the separation of Siberia; Bakunin never and nowhere expressed even similar thoughts." Cf. this (Bakunin. Sobranie, IV: 584) with p. 214 above (IV: 314).

59 V. I. Modestov, "Zagranichnyia vospominaniia" (Recollections from Abroad), Istoricheskii Viestnik, (April 1883) 12: 122.

Russian state, and on a special destiny for Siberia did not appear in the Bell. However, he claimed his propagandizing was limited only to Poles and and to Muravyov. Nevertheless, if Kropotkin's testimony can be trusted, the influence or effect of his theories and visions lingered on in Siberia and helped keep alive the specter of Siberian separatism.

As for the Bell, this newspaper certainly did more for Siberia and Siberian regionalism than just provide a seedbed for the expression of federalist and regionalist ideas for Russia as a whole. As mentioned above, its columns afforded a forum for the expression of public opinion, controversy, and criticism on issues affecting European Russia, and Asiatic Russia as well. All this was in keeping with Herzen's aim of promoting the development of independent thought and "publicity" throughout the empire. As Venturi puts it, Herzen preferred "publicity" even to "liberty" and for this reason demanded

> the opportunity to make public the evils of the state more than political organs which liberty could have permanently guaranteed. His program at this time sought to bring down or limit censorship rather than to demand constitutional guarantees.
> . . . Whoever felt injured by tyranny or sought to assert his own rights against the arbitrary power of the state found in London the public accuser which was lacking in Moscow or St. Petersburg.[60]

Thus, letters and denunciations flowed to the editors of the Bell from all parts of the empire, Siberia included. The heated debate over Neklyudov's death in Irkutsk lasted in the Bell from 1859 to 1861 and also reached the pages of Herzen's newly founded supplementary periodical, On Trial!. This issue gave several writers a chance to castigate Muravyov's

---

60 Franco Venturi, Il populismo russo (Turin: Einaudi, 1952), I: 176-77.

administration, when few opportunities to do so existed in the domestic press. One correspondent (presumably Nikolai Belogolovy) wrote to Herzen:

> This question, among other things, is especially important in that it shows the extent to which our Bell has become omniscient, and that even a rumor of such a crime, the scene of which was distant Siberia, has not died down in this huge expanse of over 7,000 versts, but has reached your sensitive ear anyway, and here the alarm has been struck. [61]

This article accused Muravyov's administration of partiality toward Beklemishev and of covering up the fact that Neklyudov had been murdered in cold blood; moreover, it protested against the transfer elsewhere of the district judges who had ruled the verdict as murder. As noted earlier, the lines in this dispute and over Muravyov were blurred somewhat by the correspondence of Bakunin and others which openly praised the governor-general and his deeds. [62]

Also significant about this time were two unsigned articles in the Bell which not only criticized past and present administrations in Siberia, but also spoke out for reforms and more "publicity" in Siberia. They also hinted at Siberia's future separation from Russia. According to Svatikov, the anonymous author of these articles was Mikhail I. Venyukov (1832-1901),

---

61 "Ubiistvo Nekliudova v Irkutskie," Pod Sud!, (1859) no. 2; reprinted in Sibir' i russkoe pravitel'stvo, p. 138.

62 Anti-administration articles on the Neklyudov affair included "Ubiistvo Nekliudova"; "Duel Nekliudova s Beklemishevym" (Neklyudov's Duel with Beklemishev), Kolokol, (August 1, 1859) no. 49; pro-administration was "G. Izvol'skii, upravliaiushchii irkutskoi guberniei (popravka)" (Mr. Izvolsky, Administrator of Irkutsk Province: A Correction), Kolokol,(June 15, 1859); and neutral: Kolokol, (April 1, 1860) no. 67; and "Opiat' ob irkutskoi dueli" (More on the Irkutsk Duel), Kolokol, (June 15, 1861) no. 101. Anti-Muravyov in particular was "Tiranstvo Sibirskago Murav'eva" (The Tyranny of the Siberian Muravyov), Kolokol, (October 1, 1860) no. 82; while pro-Muravyov were "Imperatorskii kabinet i Murav'ev-Amurskii" (The Imperial Cabinet and Muravyov-Amursky), (December 15, 1860) no. 87-88; and "Po dielu irkutskoi dueli" (On the Affair of the Irkutsk Duel), Kolokol, (June 15, 1860) no. 73-74; and Bakunin's unpublished "Otviet Kolokolu" of December 1, 1860.

a Russian who had come to Siberia in 1857 and subsequently served in the Muravyov administration. By 1860 Venyukov had evidently become well acquainted with the recent administrative history of Western Siberia too, for an article of his appeared in the Bell then which bitterly indicted the regimes of Gorchakov (1836-51) and Hasford (1851-61).[63] This exposé certainly reinforced the newspaper's overall goal of fighting the arbitrary power of the Russian state and revealing its corruption.

Venyukov characterized the two governors-general and their almost unlimited authority as follows:

> For ten years /sic/ General Gorchakov administered Western Siberia, a malicious, arrogant, and proud man. He surrounded himself with idlers who scourged the countryside with denunciations and espionage. . . . Gorchakov hoped by means of them to learn of all the abuses in the country and thereby created a greater evil, which he could not see.

And of his successor in Western Siberia, Governor-General Hasford, he wrote:

> This externally good creature was, after Gorchakov, the same as /the feeble-minded Tsar/ Fyodor after Ivan the Terrible. This respectable German has already ruled for ten years. Generally the authority of the Emperor is not felt in Siberia and is recognized only upon the replacement of one pasha by another.

Venyukov berated Hasford for envying Muravyov's achievements and his title "Amursky"; in turn, Hasford had tried in vain to obtain the title: Count of the Trans-Ili — Zailiinsky.[64]

---

63 "K kharakhteristikie Sibiri" (On Characterizing Siberia), Kolokol, (June 1, 1860) no. 72; reprints: Sibir' i russkoe pravitel'stvo, pp. 35-43; and Kolokol (Moscow, 1962), pt. 3, pp. 604-06.

64 "K kharakhteristikie Sibiri," in Sibir' i russkoe pravitel'stvo, p. 35, 37, 39. The area south of the Ili River was occupied by Russians in 1854 and the fort of Vernyi (Alma Ata) built at that time.

Such frank opinions could hardly have passed censorship in the local Siberianspapers, official or unofficial, and this situation left the Bell as the chief outlet for such expression. As Venyukov had written,

> In this rempte region publicity is needed even more than in the closer provinces. The Siberian Committee has prohibited the editors of local papers from describing "hard times"in Siberia" and does not miss similar articles on Siberia in the metropolitan journals. [65]

Thus, by implication Siberia had the unique but dubious distinction of being the region in the Russian Empire where public opinion vis-à-vis the authorities was least developed, and hence most needed. On an absolute standard, however, public opinion (in Irkutsk at least) had by now probably become as developed and articulate as anywhere else in provincial Russia, if not more so.

Two years later, in 1862, in another unsigned letter to the Bell Venyukov renewed his outspoken opinions on Siberia. Not only was a strict government inspection tour needed, but so were institutional reforms and territorial reorganization. To overcome the "root of the evil" in Siberia he demanded

> elected authorities throughout all judicial and economic institutions, elected not from among the gentry (of which there is none in Siberia), but from the mass of taxpaying but free classes that live there. This alone can save Siberia from "Russian" officials, who come here to make fortunes and careers by hook or by crook. This will be an excellent means for developing the principles of self-government so needed in the country both now and in the future, especially when the feeling of independent action among Siberians reaches greater maturity, and they will wish to take leave of the tutelage of Petersburg. [66]

---

65 Ibid., p. 41.

66 "Iz Sibiri (Otryvki iz pisem k izdateliiu)" (From Siberia: Excerpts from Letters to the Editors), Kolokol, (May 1, 1862) no. 131; reprint: Sibir' i russkoe pravitel'stvo, p. 34.

Whether this last thought implied the separation of Siberia from Russia or some less drastic step toward local autonomy is not clear, however, especially as Venyukov went on to propose the division of Siberia into three governor-generalships (to replace the two existing ones).[67]

Nevertheless, toward the end of the article, Venyukov suggested a possibly separate Siberia much more explicitly, along with a kind of liberating influence that would emerge from the Far East (reminiscent of Chernosvitov and Bakunin). Moreover, he publicized two subjects barely mentioned in the contemporary press which later became controversial for several decades: a university and a railroad in Siberia. Referring first to the demand for elective institutions, he wrote:

> We know that to our government these pia desideria will appear to be utopian and perhaps even a revolutionary scheme, . . . But we sincerely advise our government not to be excited in vain and to its own detriment. It has already written in the history of Siberia two shameful pages, having rejected the establishment of a university in Siberia and having refused the Americans permission to build a railroad from Chita to [Lake] Baikal; and let it beware of writing a third. . . . let it remember too that a light breeze of civil liberty hostile to it will penetrate quickly up the Amur and into all Siberia, and then it will have to part with its possessions beyond the Urals even more certainly than it is now parting with Poland.[68]

Thus, Venyukov's strongly worded message predicted not just separation alone, but one apparently stemming from new contacts with Americans in the Amur basin. The libertarian, revolutionary spirit engendered here would sweep westward, though apparently stop at the Urals (in contrast to Chernosvitov's similar vision).

---

67 Ibid., pp. 34-35.

68 Ibid., p. 35. The railroad from Chita to Lake Baikal had been proposed to Muravyov by the American, P. M. Collins, in March 1857. For documents, see Collins, Siberian Journey, pp. 130-34; also see below, p. 663.

Summing up, it is not easy to assess the concrete influence of Herzen, Ogaryov, and their newspapers on the development of Siberian regionalism and public opinion beyond the Urals. Though the Bell at its peak in the early 1860's had a circulation of 2,500 copies, the clandestine paper usually passed from hand to hand within Russia, thereby reaching a much greater number of readers. The Bell was especially sought after since it was the only Russian periodical that dealt with so many subjects forbidden to the press within Russia. The impact of the Bell and of Herzen's works in general in Siberia was varied, of course. In one instance, Potanin could write: "In the sixties Herzen's works could already be found in the drawing rooms of Barnaul, but Herzen's influence on the minds of the Barnaul engineers was just as superficial as Voltaire's influence was on the courtiers of Catherine II." [69] In Irkutsk, Kyakhta, and Chita, however, Bakunin, Kropotkin, and others have testified to the avidity with which the Bell was read. [70] Some Siberians, such as Andrei Belogolovy, even subscribed regularly to the paper by way of Tientsin and Kyakhta.

By means of the Bell and other publications Herzen and Ogaryov contributed to the small, frail body of federalist political thought and stressed the role of all the regions in a reconstructed Russia. Herzen especially viewed Siberia as a kind of land of the future, but so was Russia too, he felt. Herzen, Bakunin, and Venyukov gave added impulses to the separatist idea that was then emerging. The Bell provided space to various correspondents from Siberia, among them the Belogolovy brothers and Venyukov. These emphasized the uniqueness of developments in the eastern borderlands,

---

69 G. N. Potanin, "Goroda Sibiri," p. 255.
70 See above, p. 163, 170, and 181.

hazarded to suggest Siberia's possible separation, joined in lively debates, and criticisms concerning local authorities, and demanded reforms for Siberia.[71]

Moreover, it was Herzen and Ogaryov, who in the Bell in late 1861 and early 1862, after the University of St. Petersburg was closed, exhorted students to "go to the people." Herzen wrote,

> Where should you go, youth from whom science has been shut off? . . . Listen — from all parts of our vast fatherland: from the Don and Urals, from the Volga and Dnieper, the groan is increasing, the murmur is rising — it is the initial roar of an ocean wave, . . . Into the people, to the people. There is your destination, ye banished men of science.[72]

Among these "men of science" were a number who "went to the Siberian people" and who later became leading Siberian regionalists for the next few decades.

* * *

The Ukrainian Contribution: The Cyril-Methodius Society and Kostomarov

Another important stimulant to Siberian regionalism came from the federalist and regionalist ideas developed by Ukrainian and Ukrainophile thinkers. Most important in this respect was Nikolai Ivanovich Kostomarov (1817-85), founder of the Society (or Brotherhood) of Saints Cyril and Methodius in Kiev in 1846 and professor of Russian history at the University of St. Petersburg from 1859 to 1862. The brotherhood, founded in Kiev by Kostomarov and a few other intellectuals, was named in honor of St. Cyril and St. Methodius, ninth-century Byzantine apostles who brought Christianity

---

71 A recent Soviet work on Herzen and Siberian public opinion, to date inaccessible to this writer, is B. G. Kubalov, A. I. Gertsen i obshchestvennost' Sibiri (Irkutsk, 1958).

72 "Ispolin prosypaetsia" (The Giant Is Waking Up), Kolokol, (November 1, 1861) no. 110; reprint: (1962) pt. 4, p. 918.

northward to various Slavic peoples. Thus, the name of the society served to indicate an interest in Slavic interdependence and unity, not under one dominant Slavic ethnic group, but in a Pan-Slavic federative union. Moreover, in keeping with its name, the society also stressed a devotion to an evangelical Christianity that would unite the Slavic peoples, and hence advocated a kind of Christian federalism.[73] Thirdly, and most important in the long run, the Brotherhood constituted the first political circle in the Ukrainian nationalist movement.

With respect to its federalist, Pan-Slavic tendencies, the Brotherhood formed part of a definite ideological and geographically-based tradition. In the post-Napoleonic period when Freemasonry spread so rapidly throughout European Russia, a lodge was established in Kiev bearing the name of "The United Slavs." In 1822, however, Alexander I decreed all Masonic lodges forbidden, and in the ensuing vacuum the secret Decembrist "Society of United Slavs" (noted above for its federalistic, Pan-Slav ideas) was formed in 1823 by low-ranking army officers. The center of this group became the small town of Leshchin, not far from Kiev. It was, in fact, in remembrance of the suppression of the Decembrist movement in the south in January 1826 that the Brotherhood was founded on its anniversary twenty years later.

In the 1840's Pan-Slav ideas, emanating from Slav thinkers in the Austrian Empire, and more especially from the Slovak ethnographer P. J. Šafařik

---

73 See A. Markevich, "Kostomarov," Russkii biograficheskii slovar', (St. Petersburg, 1903) IX: 308; and J. Sydoruk, "Ideology of Cyrillo-Methodians and Its Origin," Slavistica, (1954) no. 19, pp. 7-60. For a brief discussion of the Ukrainian Christian messianism in the society's program, see Omeljan Pritsak and John S. Reshetar, Jr., "The Ukraine and the Dialectics of Nation-Building," Slavic Review, (June 1963) vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 250-51.

(1795-1861), began to penetrate the Russian Empire. According to Kostomarov, the idea of Pan-Slavism in Moscow at this time became one of Slavic unity under tsarist autocracy, while "in the Ukraine this idea was immediately clothed in the clear form of a federative union of Slavs, where each nationality would preserve its own peculiarities along with personal and social liberty . . ." [74]

The ground for the eventual establishment of a secret society such as the Brotherhood of SS. Cyril and Methodius was also prepared in another more immediate way. In 1839 the University of Kiev (established six years earlier) petitioned to the Ministry of Education for permission to set up a chair of the literature and history of Slavic dialects — Ukrainian (or Little Russian) included. With the government's rejection of this petition, an organized legal outlet for the interests and aspirations of local writers, students, and intellectuals sympathetic to Slavic affairs in general, and to Ukrainian studies in particular, was closed. The alternative left was underground activity. [75]

At this juncture Kostomarov stepped onto the scene. The son of a Great Russian squire and a Ukrainian peasant woman, Kostomarov (in Ukrainian — Mykola Kostomariv) had attended the universities of Moscow and Kharkov. During his stay at the latter he gradually became taken up with not only rudimentary "Pan-Slavic" sentiments, but also Ukrainophile ideas (to use the contemporary expression). His subsequent passion and interest in Ukrainian history, folklore, and language was incited in large part by

---

74 "Ukraina," Kolokol, (January 15, 1861) no. 61; reprint (1962) pt. 3, p. 501. On the influence of Šafařik and other West Slavs see Markevich, "Kostomarov," p. 308.

75 V. I. Semevskii, "Nikolai Ivanovich Kostomarov, 1817-1885," Russkaia Starina, (January 1886), p. 187.

Gogol's stories in Russian, Taras Bulba and Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka. Kostomarov's first attempt at a master's thesis at the University of Kharkov, written in 1841-42 on the Uniate Church, was deemed unacceptable, for he had described, among other things, the Cossacks as responsible for the regeneration of Little Russia and as saviors of Orthodoxy and the Ukrainian people (a prelude to his later Ukrainian messianism). After writing a second thesis dealing largely with Ukrainian poetry, Kostomarov became a high-school teacher in Kiev. In June 1846 he was selected to become assistant professor of history at the University of Kiev.

Shortly before this, in December 1845, Kostomarov, along with V. M. Belozersky and N. I. Gulak, formed a small discussion group, which the following January took the name of the Brotherhood of SS. Cyril and Methodius. Among those subsequently connected with the society were the linguist-historian P. A. Kulish (1818-97) and, from mid-1846 on, the famous Ukrainian poet-artist Taras G. Shevchenko (1814-61).[76] Upon founding the secret society, Kostomarov set forth its ultimate goals as "the dissemination of ideas of Slavic reciprocity and of a future federation of Slavic peoples on the basis of full liberty and autonomy of nationalities." According to Kostomarov,

> the plan of this society, which was later worked out further, was approximately the following: to recruit

---

76 The significant members of the group came to number about a dozen (Semevskii, "Kostomarov," pp. 187-88. See too the report of Count A. Th. Orlov to the tsar, dated May 26, 1847, "Ob ukraino-slavianskom obshchestvie" (On the Ukrainian-Slavic Society), Russkii Arkhiv, (1892) no. 7, pp. 335-37; and Dennis Papazian, "Nicholas Ivanovich Kostomarov: Russian Historian, Ukrainian Nationalist, Slavic Federalist" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1966), p. 110.

> the largest number of members among all Slavs and all classes of people, /but/ chiefly professors, students, and writers, since they could influence youth most of all and prepare them for future activity.

Among reforms proposed were the abolition of serfdom, autocracy, and gentry privileges, and the establishment of religious equality and universal education. Nevertheless, a basic rule of the society, according to Kostomarov, was to avoid all violence in attempting to achieve these ends and, "when the time should come, to oppose violence with the force of thought and of a united people." [77]

The Brotherhodd proposed that Slavic peoples outside the existing Russian state link themselves to a Russia composed of definite regions to form a comprehensive federative republic. Within the boundaries of Russia itself the following scheme was suggested:

> Russia should be broken up into units or states: one each in the north, the northeast, and the southeast, with two along the Volga (an upper and a lower), two Little Russian ones, one in Central Russia, two in the south, two in Siberia, and a Caucasian one; Byelorussia would constitute a separate state, as would Poland, Bohemia with Moravia, Serbia, and Bulgaria; part of Galicia would be annexed to Poland and the rest to the western Little Russian state, etc. Such a division would not be recognized as final and could be reconstructed in accordance with economic and other needs. [78]

By this proposal Russia would not function as a whole in a Pan-Slavic federation, and its constituent region-states would be equal to the states of the West and South Slavs. As in other similar constitutional projects,

---

77 Quotations from Semevskii, "Kostomarov," p. 187, and also Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 41-42. Also see N. Kostomarov, "Avtobiografiia Nikolaia Ivanovicha Kostomarova" (Autobiography of N. I. Kostomarov), Russkaia Mysl', (1885) no. 5, p. 210.

78 Quoted in Semevskii, "Kostomarov," pp. 187-88. In the above-cited scheme Byelorussia appears to be linked more with the West Slavic states than with the remaining thirteen Russian ones.

Siberia, because of its vast size, would be broken into two autonomous parts. Kiev would function as a kind of federal or central capital, as the seat of the general assembly or congress (sejm) of the Slavic union, apart from the constituent states. A small federal army would exist, but the militias of each state would provide the bulk of the armed forces.[79]

This plan shows interesting similarities with the United States Constitution not only in its federal structure, but more specifically in its election of a president, its bicameral congress (of senators and deputies), its federal district for the capital, and the division of the Russian part of the confederation into thirteen states (like Nikita Muravyov's).[80] As for propagandizing all these ideas, one member of the society, N. I. Savich, left for the Slavic lands to the west. With respect to efforts undertaken in Kiev, Kostomarov wrote:

> In January 1846 I began to give lectures on Russian history at the University of Kiev, and by nature, easily carried away and forgetful of the golden mean, I devoted myself to them with all my soul. . . . The ideas of the society which I founded absorbed me to the point of fanaticism. I spread them wherever I could: from the lectern among students, in private conversations among university professors, and even in the ecclesiastical academy. The ideas of the society quickly set in motion. One of the most active disseminators was Pilshchikov, who had a strong influence on youth both by his ability to get along and by his honest personality.[81]

However, propaganda efforts both outside the Ukraine and in Kiev did not

---

79 Semevskii, "Kostomarov," p. 188. Pritsak and Reshetar discuss Kostomarov's provsions for an independent Ukrainian republic if this plan should fail. They state that "clearly, the failure to achieve complete national equality would imply a solution outside a Slavic union." For details, see "Ukraine and the Dialectics," p. 251

80 Semevskii, "Kostomarov," p. 188; Seton-Watson, Russian Empire, p. 272; and, for the influenceoof ancient Greek city-state federations, Papazian, "Kostomarov," p. 88, 167, and 276.

81 "Avtobiografiia Kostomarova," pp. 210-11.

get far, and the cause was doomed to sudden defeat.

In March and April 1847 members of the Cyril-Methodius Society were arrested without warning by agents of the Third Section, their activities and discussions having been noted diligently several months before by a hidden informer. In the same manner as were the Petrashevtsy, the members were viewed as having fomented a kind of "conspiracy of ideas." Kostomarov's home was searched, and on his table was found a report of the Investigatory Commission of May 30, 1826. In this was information on the organization and ideas of the Decembrist Society of United Slavs, which indicated the apparent ideological influence of this group on Kostomarov, and through him on the Brotherhood.[82] In contrast, however, to the leaders of the Petrashevsky circle (arrested two years later — after the events of 1848), Kostomarov and Kulish, who had advocated peaceful tactics, received light sentences. Shevchenko, who in his intensely nationalistic poetry had favored action more revolutionary, was banished to Siberia as a soldier and was forbidden to write or draw. There is no evidence, though, that Shevchenko, the one member exiled to Siberia (in its extreme southwestern part), ever spread federalistic ideas, or was even in a position to do so during his ten-year term. The impact of the Brotherhood's ideas on the Siberian regionalists of the 1860's came via two routes: personal contact with Kostomarov and his ideas, and a general but vague awareness of the activities and ideology of the Ukrainian secret society. Of this latter influence

---

82 Semevskii, "Nieskol'ko slov v pamiat' Iadrintseva," p. 30 n. It should be noted that the federative union of the United Slavs allowed only for the individual Slavic nationalities, whereas Kostomarov's federalism went beyond this in embracing the Russian regions too.

Lemke has remarked that "all of this, though only along very general lines, was known to Siberian students." [83]

Kostomarov, after a brief stay at Peter-and-Paul fortress in St. Petersburg, was permitted to reside as an exile in Saratov, where he remained until the accession of Alexander II. In Saratov he again took up investigations of Ukrainian history and folklore, and in this provincial setting he became more acquainted with the Great Russian people. All in all, his time and efforts were well spent in preparation for what was to become a highly successful return to the academic world in St. Petersburg. [84]

At the beginning of the new reign Kostomarov was given in 1855 the right to go to St. Petersburg, and one year later all limitations upon him were dropped except the prohibition to teach in an educational institution. Having made his way to Petersburg, he busily continued his research on aspects of the life of the Russian people. Results of this work appeared in articles published in the late 1850's on the Cossack and peasant heroes of the 17th century, Bogdan Khmelnitsky and Stenka Razin. In 1859 he was chosen to take the vacant chair of Russian history at the University of St. Petersburg. Despite his former activities in the Brotherhood, his present academic restrictions as a former exile, and his somewhat controversial work on Razin, Alexander II confirmed the selection, forbidding him to teach only in Kiev. [85]

Kostomarov's lectures in Russian history began in late 1859 and lasted

---

83 M. Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 42.

84 For his activities in Saratov, see Semevskii, "Kostomarov," p. 192; and A. Mazour, Modern Russian Historiography, p. 154.

85 Markevich, "Kostomarov," p. 310; and Semevskii, "Kostomarov," pp. 192-94.

until mid-1862, a time when a substantial contingent of patriotic Siberian students first began to attend the University of St. Petersburg. The inaugural lecture of this former "conspirator," recent exile, and populist-minded historian, delivered on November 22, 1859, drew a packed audience. The reception given to his basic views of Russian history was so enthusiastic that students carried him out of the lecture hall on their shoulders. In a period of such intellectual and emotional excitement, engendered by exalted expectations of a coming regeneration of Russia, Kostomarov became overnight probably the most popular lecturer in Petersburg. The enthusiasm toward him was felt not only by Great Russian students, but also by those from the borderlands, especially the Ukraine and Siberia.

What then did his lectures emphasize? Kostomarov felt that Russian history did not consist only of deeds and doctrines of the state — political events, diplomacy, wars, legislative acts, and court life. Equally as important, if not more so, was the history of the people, the masses — their lives, customs, traditions, folklore, and aspirations. Kostomarov (along with Shchapov) thereby took a new departure in the interpretation of Russian history, parting company with those who stressed the role of the state (such as Karamzin, Pogodin, and Solovyov). Moreover, he continued to express some of the views developed in the Cyril-Methodius Society: mutual interdependence among Slavic peoples, close links between Slavs to oppose external enemies, and regional and ethnic autonomy, with free self-governing institutions.[86]

---

86 Semevskii, "Kostomarov," p. 200, 202-03; and Papazian, "Kostomarov," pp. 276-77. In his published lectures he made only passing references to Siberia (such as the origin of the name or Novgorod's contacts there); see Kostomarov, Sobranie sochinenii. Istoricheskiia monografii i izsliedovaniia (Collection of Works: Historical Monographs and Investigations), bk. 3, vol. VII (St. Petersburg, 1904), p. 23, 227.

Kostomarov emphasized the role of national minorities and regional differences in Russian history, maintaining (as did Shchapov and Ogaryov) that from earliest times the development of Russia was based on the principle of federalism. In one of his courses, "The History of Early Russian Regions," he gave special attention to the northern democracies of pre-Muscovite Russia — Novgorod, Pskov, and Vyatka, stressing their autonomous internal life and distinctive political structures. He felt that Russia was well on the way to finding a federative political solution before the Tatars forced the principalities into one centralized unit. [87] Along with his lectures he published several relevant historical works on Russian federalism and specific regions. Among these were the book, North Russian Democracies (1868), and the articles, "The Federative Structure of Ancient Russia" (1861) and "Thoughts on the Federative Principle in Ancient Russia" (1861). [88] This last article, writes Lemke, "could not but speak to the heart of a Siberian." [89]

Kostomarov also stressed the ethnic element in regional history, especially as the Ukraine was considered one of the most important Russian regions. He felt that ethnography should constitute contemporary history (i.e. the study of popular mores and customs), whereas history should consist of past ethnography. All of this pointed to a more important role of not only the Great Russian people in their history, but also borderland peoples, with their distinct regional peculiarities, in their own past and present.

---

87 See Papazian's synopsis, "Kostomarov," pp. 314-15.

88 N. I. Kostomarov, Istoriia Novgoroda, Pskova, i Viatki, vo vremia udiel'no-viechevago uklada (Sievernorusskiia narodopravstva), (St. Petersburg, 1868); "O federativnom stroie drevnei Rossii," Osnova, (1861); and "Mysli o federativnom nachalie v drevnei Rusi," Osnova, (1861) bk. 1, pp. 121-58. The last article is reprinted in Sobranie sochinenii, I: 1-30.

89 Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 41.

As a Ukrainophile, Kostomarov, of course, stressed ethnic differences in his regionalist outlook over geographical and economic factors. Of his contribution to Russian historiography in general, Semevsky has written that the "vital rapprochement" with the life of the people, and the "entry of the popular element into history, which he insisted upon, constituted an enormous step forward." [90]

Concerning the Ukraine as a distinct Russian region and its relationship to Russia as a whole, Kostomarov published during his professorship an important article entitled "Two Russian Peoples." [91] In this he differentiated between the Great Russians, dominated by a communal spirit, and the Little Russians (Ukrainians), permeated by a spirit of personal liberty. He also strongly supported the first Ukrainian periodical published in St. Petersburg — Foundations (Osnova). This publication was founded in 1861 by a former member of the Brotherhood, V. M. Belozersky. Though it ceased to publish in 1862, it may have spurred Siberians to consider putting out a similar publication of their own. Kostomarov contributed to its pages some of his most important works on federalism and regional history. Yet for all his strong Ukrainian sympathies, he considered himself a moderate and hardly the "separatist" that Katkov and other conservatives labeled him, especially after the Polish Insurrection in 1863. [92]

---

90 Semevskii, "Kostomarov," p. 204.

91 Kostomarov, "Dvie russkiia narodnosti," Osnova, (1861) bk. 3, pp. 33-80; this was later translated into French as Deux nationalités russes (Lausanne, 1916).

92 L. F. Panteleev relates in his memoirs that in the early 1860's "Kostomarov loved his native people fervently, grieved for their past, and was not satisfied with their present; but he was not a separatist at all in the sense with which they attached this word in certain circles." Panteleev, Vospominaniia, p. 193.

Kostomarov's position against separatism and his continuing support of federalism were well illustrated in his anonymous article of 1861, "The Ukraine," published in the Bell.

> We are not about to demand and wish for ourselves anything independent of general desires in common with all Russia. None of us thinks of tearing Southern Russia away from the bonds of the rest of Russia. On the contrary, we would prefer that all other Slavs would join us in one union, even under scepter of the Russian sovereign, if this sovereign would become one of free peoples, and not an omnivorous Tatar-German Muscovy. In a future Slav union, in which we believe and for which we hope, our Southern Russia should constitute a separate, civil entity wherever people speak the south Russian language, and should preserve a unity, based not on pernicious, deadly centralization, but on a clear consciousness of equal rights . . . [93]

Kostomarov's lectures and articles brought him considerable fame and renown in the early 1860's. Despite a tendency among higher authorities to look askance at his activities from mid-1861 on (due to an especially controversial lecture), other circumstances were more influential in snuffing out his meteoric teaching career. Because of student disorders, the University of St. Petersburg was closed in the fall of 1861, and by the time it reopened Kostomarov had decided to leave the profession altogether. Not only did teaching interfere with his research, but as a "moderate" he was becoming increasingly unpopular with activist students, who, previously hanging on his every word, were now increasingly becoming radicalized. Moreover, the troubles in Russian Poland during the early 1860's roused suspicions of Kostomarov's "separatism" among Russian nationalist circles, which adamantly opposed his continuing as professor. At a "free universi-

---

93 "Ukraina," Kolokol, (January 15, 1861) no. 61; reprint: (1962), pt. 3, pp. 502-03.

ty," organized after the university was closed, Kostomarov presented in public the lectures he had prepared for the academic year 1861-62, and in March 1862 he retired to pure scholarly research. This he continued until his death in 1885.[94]

In connection with the propagation and influence of federalist (or "separatist") ideas in Russian society, the retrospective comments of the Ukrainian federalist and autonomist, M. P. Dragomanov (1841-95), are of interest. Writing in 1881 from abroad, he noted:

> It is interesting that the most fervent representatives of decentralization in Russian literature in the first years of the reign of Alexander II were not all publicists and political figures, but historians, ethnographers, and archeologists. The doctrine of decentralization was taught not so much in journals and political treatises as from chairs at universities.

As examples he pointed to such history professors as Platon V. Pavlov in Kiev, Kostomarov in St. Petersburg, and Shchapov in Kazan.[95]

That an academic milieu should generate these ideas had drawbacks, however. According to Dragomanov,

> Already this one circumstance prevented the dissemination in public of ideas of decentralization in a federative form. Propagating such ideas of decentralization only from chairs of history, chiefly with respect to antiquity, gave them an archeological character. . . . In contrast to federalists who advocated their ideas only under the cover of medieval facts, their opponents could always point to the unfitness of archaic relationships for a more recent

---

94 Semevskii, "Kostomarov," p. 198. For the latter part of his life, see Semevskii, "Nikolai Ivanovich Kostomarov (okonchanie)," Russkaia Starina, (February 1886), pp. 323-60; and Mazour, Modern Russian Historiography, pp. 155-58.

95 M. Dragomanov, Istoricheskaia Pol'sha i velikorusskaia demokratiia (Historical Poland and Great Russian Democracy), (Geneva, 1881), pp. 156-57. All three of these federalist historians were subjected to exile, a relatively rare phenomenon among academics in 19th-century Russia.

> age . . . All the renunciations of separatism by Kostomarov and other Ukrainian autonomists were accepted only as hypocrisy and as a fear of openly declaring their secret thoughts.

Dragomanov thought it remarkable that even Great Russians sympathetic to autonomy, such as Herzen and Bakunin, spoke of the "inevitableness or the possibility that Poland, the Ukraine, Byelorussia, etc. might 'separate'." Though such Great Russians did not fear separatism, they identified the aspirations of non-Russians with it and greatly overestimated the actual chances of provinces separating and of Russia collapsing.[96]

The failure of federalism to take root among Great Russians Dragomanov attributed in part to a lack of proper publicity. "The federative idea, however, was not explained to the public in Russia, and therefore this public, even in the sixties, understood in fact only two political forms: centralization and separatism . . ."[97] The intricacies of federalism, local autonomy, and regionalism were lost, and continued to remain so, on most Great Russians, inured to centuries of centralistic, autocratic traditions.

The best available testimony of the influence of Kostomarov and, indirectly, of the Cyril-Methodius Society on the development of Siberian regionalism comes from the subsequent regionalist Yadrintsev, a student in Petersburg in the early 1860's. Years later he wrote to a friend, "I remembered Kostomarov's lectures, Shevchenko's circle [on his return from Siberian exile], his poetry, and Shchapov's lectures on regionalism; all of this material formed a groundwork."[98] A more specific appraisal of Kostomarov's lectures has been given by the Russian radical, Longin Panteleev

---

96 Ibid., pp. 163-65.
97 Ibid., pp. 166-67.
98 Letter to V. I. Semidalov, dated October 1, 1892; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 41. Shevchenko lived in St. Petersburg from 1858 to his death in 1861.

(a long-time friend of some of the Siberian regionalists). He wrote in his memoirs,

> For the first time in Kostomarov's works and in his lectures . . . the voice of the living people was heard. And the people stepped forth not in a role of only subordinated material, but as a factor attempting independently to direct the historical process . . . [99]

In this way Kostomarov's scholarly and academic influence complemented all the more the call of Herzen and Ogaryov in the Bell for students to go to the people, to study them, and to learn from them. Kostomarov beckoned students not just to know the people in general, but to know the specific peoples of the different borderlands and regions of Russia in particular.

* * *

Shchapov: The "Father of Siberian Regionalism"

Surpassing Kostomarov as an influence on incipient Siberian regionalism was the regionalist, populist historian Afanasy Prokofievich Shchapov (1830-76). In contrast to Kostomarov, Shchapov was of pure peasant stock and a Siberian by birth. Furthermore, the theoretical and systematic contributions of the latter regarding the importance of regionalism as a continuous and democratic factor in Russian history had greater impact on Siberian students and intellectuals than did the broader, less systematized, ethnic regionalism of Kostomarov. Moreover, in some of Shchapov's lectures and articles he pointed to the need to waken regional consciousness by study and action, not only in the borderlands in general, but in Siberia in particular. Because of his historical and sociological contributions,

---

99 L. F. Panteleev, Vospominaniia, p. 193.

Shchapov can be viewed as a kind of father of Siberian regionalism, laying a theoretical and scholarly groundwork to what would soon take on cultural, journalistic, and semi-political characteristics.[100]

A strong point in Shchapov's subsequent popularity among students and intellectuals was not only his geographical background, but his social and ethnic origins as well. As Venturi points out, Shchapov "came from the people itself, from its traditions, from its closed and separate life, and from its religion and political forms . . ."[101] He was born in 1830 in the village of Anga, roughly 150 miles north of Irkutsk. His father was a deacon, descended from peasant settlers that had come to Eastern Siberia in 1693, fleeing as persecuted Old Believers. His mother was of native Buryat origin. Young Afanasy at the age of ten was sent to study at the Irkutsk bursa, a tuition-free ecclesiastical school for sons of clerics. After a harrowing six years spent at this backward institution, he passed on to the Irkutsk seminary, from which he was graduated at age 22. According to Shashkov, "he took away little knowledge from the seminary; of Russian history, for example, he knew only Karamzin, and he had almost no conception of foreign literature."[102] Despite inadequacies, Shchapov was considered one of the best students and was selected to be sent to the Ecclesiastical

---

100 K. Dubrovskii gives the title "The Father of Regionalism (A. P. Shchapov)" to a chapter in his book Rozhdennye v stranie izgnaniia (Sons of the Land of Exile), (Petrograd, 1916), pp. 93-105. For a brief comparison of Kostomarov and Shchapov as historians, see N. N. Koz'min, "Athanasii Prokof'evich Shchapov," Ocherki proshlago i nastoiashchago Sibiri (St. Petersburg, 1910), pp. 105-06.

101 F. Venturi, Il populismo russo, I: 327.

102 S. S. Shashkov, in Novoe Vremia, (1876) no. 198; quoted in Koz'min, "Shchapov," p. 110. Shashkov attended the Irkutsk seminary in the mid-1850's and went on to become a student of Shchapov's at the Kazan Ecclesiastical Academy.

Academy of Kazan on a state scholarship. The Academy and the University in Kazan had traditionally served as the chief destination of Siberian seminarists and students seeking higher education.

In comparison to previous institutions Shchapov had attended, the Kazan Academy set high academic standards. According to a contemporary account, the Academy during the mid-1850's was "distinguished by a lively mood, it pursued scientific questions, and the level of education among its students was certainly higher than university education in certain areas of scholarship." Here among the students Hegel and Belinsky were much in vogue, and the best of foreign literature was avidly read. Evidently the Crimean War and the new reign had brought a kind of liberating atmosphere into the Academy, for on Shchapov's arrival in 1852 Guizot's works had officially been considered "horrifying" and the one German translation of Gibbon was kept in a secret section of the library.[103]

To the Kazan Academy students (as sons of priests) came from many parts of the Russian Empire, including a contingent from Eastern Siberia, which spent much time together. A former student there in the early 1850's, Ya. G. Rozhdestvensky, characterized the Siberians as follows:

> All the Siberian students, as much as I knew them, were very talented people, distinguished by a direct and bold character; this probably stemmed from the fact that the Siberian clergy did not know the disparagement that the Great Russian clergy experienced from landowners, and that they were more prosperous. The Siberian students right up to our time half-jokingly and half-seriously called their Siberia a Russian America, and they said that sooner or later

---

103 The unidentified quotation is given in Dubrovskii, "Otets oblastnichestva," Rozhdennye v stranie izgnaniia, p. 96. See also Venturi, Roots, pp. 196-97.

> it would separate from Russia. These thoughts were expressed in passing, of course, and were not developed, but perhaps they gave Shchapov cause to dream of federation, though consequently quite a bit was said about this in Russian literature, especially by N. I. Kostomarov. [104]

Thus, as was the case so frequently with young Siberians studying far from home in European Russia, Shchapov in the midst of his countrymen developed a kind of Siberian patriotism once west of the Urals.

During the Crimean War the manuscript archives from Solovetsk monastery, a former stronghold of Old Believers in the 17th century and now besieged by the British fleet in the White Sea, were transferred to the Kazan Academy. It was at this point that Shchapov was entrusted to help undertake an inventory of these materials. This was to become a turning-point in his academic career, leading to his extensive studies of the 17th-century Schism in the Russian Church and its social effects and causes. Indeed, after graduation in 1857 he stayed on to complete his master's thesis: "The Russian Schism of the Old Ritualists, Considered in Connection with the Internal Structure of the Russian Church and Civic Life in the 17th and the First Half of the 18th Centuries." [105] Upon graduating he was also chosen to become lecturer in Russian history at the academy, a post which he held until 1860.

In his thesis research Shchapov, as a true "son of the Russian people,"

---

104 Quoted in Koz'min, "Shchapov," pp. 112-113; and partially in Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 47. G. A. Luchinskii states simply that "Siberian students were already thinking of the desirability of Siberia's separation from Russia." Luchinskii, "A. P. Shchapov, biograficheskii ocherk" (A. P. Shchapov: A Biographical Sketch), in Shchapov, Sobranie sochinenii, III: xvii.

105 Shchapov's thesis was published as Russkii raskol staroobriadchestva, razsmatrivaemyi v sviazi s vnutrennym sostoianiem russkoi tserkvi i grazhdanstvennosti v XVII-m i v pervoi polovinie XVIII-go vieka (Kazan, 1859).

sympathized with the struggles of the Russian masses vis-à-vis the Russian state during the religious, social, and political controversies of the Schism. Moreover, this study had personal meaning for him; he read every book and manuscript that might help explain his own personality as the product of a village in the Baikal country.[106] Shchapov was especially impressed by the development of regional self-governing communities among the schismatic Old Believers, and he was in time to attribute the formation of these in the White Sea region, the Don, Kazan, and Starodub areas, and in Siberia to part of a much older Russian tradition.[107] He also began to realize the significance of local and regional geographical factors on religious life and popular saints. From this he began to recognize the importance of settlement and colonization, which he later developed as a basic factor in Russian history.[108]

During the years 1858-60, as lecturer at the Kazan Ecclesiastical Academy, Shchapov elaborated these views of Russian history more distinctly. His friend and biographer, Aristov, points to the influence of the Slavophiles on the young historian, one which stressed the role of the people and of the commune in Russian history, and which opposed the centralistic reforms of Peter I.[109] Moreover, S. V. Yeshevsky, a young historian in Kazan, who had initially pointed to the importance of the Solovetsk manuscripts, also stimulated Shchapov through his studies of the problem of regionalism

---

106 Venturi, Roots, p. 197.

107 Koz'min, "Shchapov," p. 131; and N. Ia. Aristov, "Zhizn' Athanasiia Prokof'evicha Shchapova" (The Life of Afanasy Prokofievich Shchapov), Istoricheskii Viestnik, (1882) bk. 10, p. 304.

108 Aristov, "Zhizn'," p. 303. In this respect Shchapov was a forerunner of the well-known historian V. O. Klyuchevsky, who stressed the role of colonization as the prime factor of Russian history.

109 Aristov, "Zhizn'," p. 296; and Koz'min, "Shchapov," p. 104.

and colonization in both Russia and the Roman Empire.[110] It is of interest that Shchapov's emphasis on the role of the people was, broadly speaking, similar to that of the earlier Siberian historian-journalist, Nikolai Polevoy, author of the six-volume History of the Russian People.[111]

As opposed to the centralist, Great Russian school of interpretation, Shchapov developed the theories of colonization and federation in Russian history. With free land in abundance, Russian settlers moved in to occupy it and then developed their own local and regional institutions, customs, dialects, and so forth. Previous tribal and ethnic differences accentuated those which subsequently developed. The fundamental framework of Russian society began not so much from the top down, but from the bottom up — the village commune, the township, the district, and the region (zemlia) all forming distinct communities. Shchapov felt there had existed two kinds of regionalism in past Russian history. First, a particularist regional period during colonization and before the spread of Muscovite rule was manifested by a kind of federative interdependence between the various regions or principalities. Then came the unified regional period, during and after the gathering of the Russian lands by Muscovite princes and tsars. Regional interests now were expressed through popular rebellions and through the zemskii sobor (land assembly), composed, ideally, of representatives from the various Russian regions.[112]

During his last year at the Kazan Academy Shchapov delivered lectures

---

110 Aristov, "Zhizn'," p. 296; and Venturi, Roots, p. 199.

111 N. A. Polevoi, Istoriia russkago naroda, 6 vols. (Moscow, 1830-33). In part this was written in critical response to Nikolai Karamzin's History of the Russian State (1816-29).

112 Koz'min, "Shchapov," pp. 128-29; and Aristov, "Zhizn'," p. 303.

on the appanage or "regional" period, which witnessed the formation of autonomous principalities, and on the role of the Great Russian regions during the Time of Troubles (1598-1613). According to Aristov, Shchapov also discussed what he considered the meaning of early Russian history, showing how ancient Rus "sought federation" and how federation was the only "natural, fruitful form of the life of the people." [113]

In September 1860 Shchapov was invited to accept the vacant chair of Russian history at the University of Kazan. He took the position and began preparing for his inaugural lecture, scheduled for November 11, 1860. On the appointed day the crowd of listeners was so great that the lecture had to be moved to the largest auditorium in the university. Many came not out of admiration but out of skepticism toward the "seminarian scholastic." Nevertheless, the talented young professor soon enraptured those who had come to scorn, and the lecture was a resounding success. Entitled "A General View of the History of the Great Russian People," the lecture set forth the basic historical theories and outlook of this regionalist and populist historian.

Apropos of his new appointment Shchapov began as follows:

> I will state in advance that I am bringing to the chair of Russian history at this university not the idea of the State system nor that of centralization, but the idea of nationality /narodnost'/ and of regionalism /oblastnost'/. It seems that now the view has been affirmed that the chief factor in history is the people themselves, a spirit of the people that creates history, and that the essence and content of history is the life of the people. . . . But there is

---

113 Aristov, "Zhizn'," p. 306; see also V. Semevskii, "Nieskol'ko slov v pamiat' Iadrintseva," p. 31.

> another principle that is still not clearly recognized in our scholarship: the principle of regionalism — if you will allow me to express it so. [114]

Shchapov went on to state that until recently all Russian history, even that of the provinces and regions, had been interpreted predominantly in the light of Muscovite centralization. Regions and provinces had been treated only with generalizations, and the study of local self-government and of the internal life of regions had been shunted aside in favor of the development of the Muscovite state, the autocracy, and the process of centralization.

He then summarized the regionalist view of history:

> Russian history at base is primarily the history of various regional masses of people, the history of territory-building, of diverse ethnic organization, of interaction, struggle, and unification, and of diverse political situations among regions before and after centralization. Only in Russian history do you encounter such a peculiar territorial and ethnographical formation of regions by means of colonization. The various regional chronicles will tell you of the age-long, original, special, and distinct life and mutual struggle between regions. Then the Moscow chronicle begins to speak of the development of the geographical centralization of the enormous Muscovite state; but in the regional chronicles an energetic protest rings out, the cry of regional inhabitants against Muscovite violence, centralization, and the gathering of the Russian lands.

Shchapov went on to link the regional characteristics of ancient Russia with those of the not so distant past.

> Thus, the regional element was the most vital and prevalent principle, and the main cause of historical movement prior to centralization; it sustained an energetic, age-old struggle with the connecting, centralizing force of the State; it expressed itself

---

114 Quoted in Shchapov, Sochineniia (Works), III: xxxi; Koz'min, "Shchapov," pp. 134-35; Dubrovskii, "Otets oblastnichestva," pp. 98-99; and Semevskii, "Nieskol'ko slov v pamiat' Iadrintseva," p. 30. An English translation is in Venturi, Roots, p. 199. The original source, unavailable to me, is O. L., "Iz vospominanii kazanskago studenta" (From the Recollections of a Kazan Student), Pervyi Shag (Kazan, 1876), pp. 407-12.

> quite significantly in the Time of Troubles, during this great struggle of regional communities; it was manifested in the zemskie sobory of the 17th century and in various regional insurrections, both democratic and indigenous; it caused quite a few petitions to the government during the entire 18th century and at the beginning of the 19th during this long process of establishing provinces; in the famous period of secret societies it aroused in liberal minds various plans and projects regarding the constitutional structure of regions, etc.

Reflecting the influence of the contemporary English historian, Henry Buckle, Shchapov stressed the need to look at all aspects of the past and to view Russian society in terms of natural science.

> And we who study Russian history have given this regional element, so enigmatic and perhaps just as basic and fruitful for our future civilization, almost no attention at all! Russian history, when based on the idea of centralization and excluding the idea of regionalism, denies the essential, vital significance of regions, as different organs in the structure and development of the entire political organism — of all the Russian people. . . . Without knowing the organization and function of the various separate organs of the body, the life and function of the whole organism cannot be understood. So too, without knowledge of the different historical and ethnicsorganizaticns, characteristics, concepts, views, faiths, sympathies, and antipathies of the regional masses of people, one cannot obtain a full and distinctly clear understanding of Russian history. [115]

As can be gleaned from the above, Shchapov did not find the likelihood of regional tendencies re-emerging to be totally improbable in his own time. Certain statesmen, he claimed, had recognized the necessity of attending to the specific needs and problems of the various regions. Moreover, he went

---

115 The above excerpts of Shchapov's inaugural lecture are taken from Aristov, "Zhizn'," pp. 309-10; and also Koz'min, "Shchapov," pp. 135-36; and En-Pe, "Proshloe Sibiri (Potrebnost' v izuchenii ego)" (Siberia's Past and the Need to Study It), Russkaia Starina, (June 1912), pp. 547-548.

on,

> In the provinces themselves the need for self-consciousness has recently begun to awaken. At least one gratifying phenomenon, emerging little by little in our literature, is the appearance of published regional anthologies, of historical and statistical descriptions of provinces, and of publications of regional papers and documents.

Pointing the way toward a further development of regionalism in the future, he added that

> The publication of regional anthologies can serve not only as a guide for our regional self-knowledge, but also as organs to arouse in the provincial masses the ideas of political self-consciousness and self-development within the context of the political union as a whole.

Shchapov then concluded his lecture by stating his intentions for the coming academic year: "Thus, with the idea of regionalism and of nationality in mind, I have chosen for my lectures the history of the Great Russian people or of the Great Russian regional communities, in connection with Siberia."[116]

Not only did Shchapov's themes and words fit in well with educated society's increasing interest in the Russian people on the eve of the emancipation of serfs, but his regional note also struck a responsive chord in Kazan, an educational and cultural center for much of the Volga basin, Eastern Russia, and even Siberia — all outlying regions of Russia. His proposed lecture series offered too a new departure from the more standard, traditional views of Russian history. Moreover, his inaugural lecture seemed to contain veiled, subtle criticisms of the autocracy and of the present system inherited from the Muscovite gatherers of the Russian lands.

---

116 Quoted in Koz'min, "Shchapov," p. 137; En-Pe, "Proshloe Sibiri," pp. 548-49; and Dragomanov, Istoricheskaia Pol'sha, p. 162.

Shchapov also seemed to suggest that a democratic Russia could not result from a centralized Russia under any guise, but only from one with true regional autonomy and federative form. Last but not least indicated a kind of program for the further development of regional consciousness and action. Implicitly this was applicable to Siberia, especially when in the next breath he pointed to the important role of this region in the formation of the Russian state.[117]

Shchapov's inaugural lecture had a remarkable effect upon students in Kazan. From this point on he became an "idol of the student masses." As one witness related,

> Shchapov's entry into the university was an entire event in the annals of the university's internal life. In the short period that Shchapov occupied our chair of Russian history, one can say that he reigned in the university; each of his appearances on the rostrum was a kind of triumph. For a long time, at the hours when Shchapov's lectures were held, all the other professors cancelled their lectures; the clinic and the anatomical theatre were deserted; and at the university entrance carriages gathered, as the public began to arrive from town to listen to him.[118]

Despite much sincere enthusiasm, many of those present, according to Aristov, "were carried away by their own fantasies" more than by the desire to study and learn Russian history, as viewed by Shchapov or anyone else.[119]

Among Siberian students in Kazan his popularity was especially great. Those who visited Petersburg or transferred their studies there from Kazan were quick to tell their compatriots in the capital of this rising new star

---

117 Svatikov wrote in 1929 of this lecture: "Even now, seventy years later, it is hard to read Shchapov's inaugural lecture without emotion . . ." Rossiia i Sibir', p. 47.

118 O. L., "Iz vospominanii kazanskago studenta," as quoted by A. Pypin, Istoriia russkoi etnografii, IV: 436-37.

119 Aristov, "Zhizn'," p. 311.

and proponent of regionalism. Among these, the most well-known subsequently was S. S. Shashkov, a student of Shchapov's in Kazan; Shashkov continued his studies in Petersburg, became an important regionalist spokesman in the mid-1860's, and in his later years developed into a noted historian.

Shchapov's days as professor of Russian history, however, were even more numbered than were Kostomarov's. In the extremely fluid whirl of events following the Manifesto of February 1861, proclaiming the emancipation of serfs, Shchapov became increasingly involved in contemporary issues. In contrast to Kostomarov, though, he became more radical and political in outlook, in part pressed by some of his students. This tendency led to his famous funeral speech at the village of Bezdna (near Kazan) in April 1861. This he delivered at a requiem mass organized by Kazan students for the peasants shot and killed in an uprising against the inadequacies of the emancipation manifesto. Keenly aware of his own peasant background, he claimed that the blood of these victims would arouse the people as a whole to insurrection and freedom. He ended his oration by declaring "long live a democratic constitution!" [120]

For this Shchapov was arrested on personal orders of Alexander II. Taken to St. Petersburg, he underwent investigations by the Third Section, which resulted in his removal from the chair of Russian history at Kazan. However, the Minister of Interior, P. A. Valuev, anxious that Shchapov continue his historical studies, had him appointed as an official in a department concerned with Old-Believer affairs. This position gave him a modest

---

120 "Rech' A. P. Shchapova posle panikhidy po ubitym v s. Bezdne krest'ianam" (A. P. Shchapov's Speech after the Requiem for the Peasants Slain in the Village of Bezdna), Krasnyi Arkhiv, (1923) IV: 409-10.

salary and plenty of free time for research in the Ministry's archives. As a result of his investigations Shchapov was able to write and publish a good number of articles in many of the leading literary journals of the day. Among these was the newly founded, but short-lived Century (edited by the Siberian-born G. Z. Yeliseev), to which Shchapov became a frequent contributor.

Probably the most influential of his articles regarding regionalism was "Great Russian Regions and the Time of Troubles (1606-1613)," which in 1861 put into print more specifically many of the ideas expounded in his inaugural lectures at Kazan a year earlier.[121] Another work along this line was his unpublished "Regional Land Assemblies and Councils." This, however, dealt with present problems, recommending how the Great Reforms might best be implemented.[122] He was also pondering the idea of writing a "full history" of the culture of Russian regions.[123] Relating to Siberia in particular he began in 1862 to publish memoirs of his school days in Irkutsk.[124]

In 1861 Shchapov wrote a personal letter to Alexander II with a plan for reform of the empire. This included the division of Russia into a number of regions, with a regional council for each region.[125] In this he was following the broad decentralizing constitutional approach, favored by Nikita Muravyov, Ogaryov, Kostomarov, and a few others before him. With Si-

---

121 "Velikorusskiia oblasti i smutnoe vremia (1606-1613)," Otechestvennye Zapiski, (1861) vols. 138-139: no. 10, pp. 579-616; and no. 11, pp. 79-118.

122 See Aristov, "Zhizn'," p. 604; and Koz'min, "Shchapov," p. 147.

123 Aristov, "Zhizn'," p. 578.

124 Shchapov, "Iz bursatskago byta (Vospominaniia Shchapova o svoem vospitanii v Irkutskoi dukhovnoi shkolie)" (Shchapov's Memoirs of His Education in the Irkutsk Ecclesiastical School), Iskra, (1862).

125 See V. Vegman, "Episod iz zhizni A. Shchapova" (An Episode from the Life of Shchapov), Sibirskie Ogni, (1926) no. 1-2, p. 141.

beria in mind Shchapov described to the tsar the

> enormous expanse of the Russian Empire, in which, with the geographical and ethnic diversity and the remoteness of many provinces, news of unfortunate events and of the sufferings, needs, and wishes of the people in the provinces does not quickly reach, and sometimes does not reach at all

the ears of His Majesty.

Shchapov mentioned the plan drawn up by Kozodavlev in 1818 whereby semi-representative institutions in Siberia would limit the power of capricious governors-general. He recommended this so that "a new governor-general would not dream of taking power[126] in Eastern Siberia as Count Muravyov-Amursky had done . . ." He thereby alluded to the potential (and imagined) danger of "separatist-minded" administrators in Eastern Siberia. A further recommendation to the tsar stemmed from Shchapov's personal knowledge of the difficulties Siberians had to face to obtain a decent higher education. He stressed that

> Some provinces have long been openly expressing their need for a university. For example, Eastern Siberia needs a university in Irkutsk extremely much, owing both to its distance from Russian universities and to the strong quest for education, not only among children of officials, merchants, and small businessmen, but also among Buryats — a very clever race.[127]

As for the tsar's immediate response to all this, no evidence exists.

By 1863 Shchapov appears to have modified his views on centralization and decentralization to some extent. He summarized the problem as follows:

> Our /educated/ minority is still divided into centralists and federalists. Centralization has created an

---

126 I have translated the verb votsarit'sia as "taking power," though literally it means "to ascend the throne," i.e. to become tsar.

127 "Pis'mo A. P. Shchapova Aleksandru II v 1861 g." (Letter of A. P. Shchapov to Alexander II in 1861), Krasnyi Arkhiv, (1926) XIX: 158-59.

> overall external order, but federation, without destroying unity, can promote the internal self-development of the popular masses more naturally and regularly. The idea of federation is inherent in the spirit of the Russian people, just as the empire has a historical basis too. Each of these political ideas — centralization and federation — contains its own share of truth. It is a pity that they are separate to the point of being intolerable . . . [128]

Among the educated minority, Shchapov's articles were read with great interest, and even in distant England. Alexander Herzen wrote to Shchapov in 1861, expressing his satisfaction with what he had seen of his "serious historical works." Herzen asked him to continue this high level of scholarship, adding, "Your fresh voice, strong and clear, is almost unique now; it rings out comfortingly among the jaded and hoarse voices of contemporary Russian writers and makes a deep imprint upon one's mind." [129] Though Herzen did not specifically single out Shchapov's regionalist and federalist views, from what we have seen of Herzen's (and Ogaryov's) ideas along this line, he must have looked on Shchapov's with favor.

While in St. Petersburg Shchapov came into little direct contact with the younger generation of Siberians attending the university and other schools. Shashkov he had known previously in Kazan, and the two roomed together briefly in Petersburg. But Yadrintsev, Potanin, and others knew Shchapov only indirectly, through reputation, mutual acquaintances, and through his articles. [130] In general, Shchapov did little socializing,

---

128 Shchapov, "Novaia era. Na rubezh dvukh tysiachelietii" (A New Era: Between Two Millenia), Sovremennoe Slovo, (1863) supplement to no. 5; paraphrased by Aristov, "Zhizn'," p. 595.

129 Quoted in Dubrovskii, "Otets oblastnichestva," p. 102; and in Aristov, "Zhizn'," p. 328. Neither writer indicates his source.

130 Shchapov's own testimony (of 1865) concerning his relationship to Shashkov, and to Potanin and Yadrintsev (whom he did not know) is printed in Vegman, "Episod iz zhizni Shchapova," p. 141.

though he did get along well with Kostomarov, Yeliseev, and V. S. Kurochkin (the editors of Century and Spark, respectively). Yeliseev, a former professor at the Kazan Ecclesiastical Academy, was probably his closest acquaintance in St. Petersburg.

It is not easy to assess the direct influence of the "father of Siberian regionalism," and to document exactly how his regionalist theories of Russian history, his Siberian patriotism, and his program for action in the regions affected younger regionalist activists. Nevertheless, some indications are available. Yadrintsev, as noted above, mentioned the influence of Shchapov's lectures (with those of Kostomarov) as providing a kind of groundwork or canvas upon which later regionalist activity was based.[131] Potanin, who was also studying in Petersburg at the time, briefly described these same influences at a later date:

> Certain incidents and influences in the capital were not without significance for Siberians. Two Russian historians then in the capital adhered to the idea of federalism: one, Kostomarov, in lectures and in writing, and the other, Shchapov, just in writing. The minds of young Siberians served as soil on which the seeds of this idea were to take root well.[132]

Shchapov did have some feelings of sympathy toward the Siberian colony in St. Petersburg. It was to his countrymen that he sent a patriotic, though somewhat "civic" poem dedicated to Siberia, written during his detainment by the Third Section in 1861. This poem became quite popular among Siberian students then in Petersburg. Yadrintsev later summed up whatever contents of it he could recollect as follows: "At a time when Russia is

---

131 See above, p. 235. Yadrintsev, who never studied in Kazan, could have been influenced by Shchapov's lectures only through second-hand accounts or through Shchapov's articles based on them.

132 G. N. Potanin, Oblastnicheskaia tendentsiia, pp. 15-16.

awakening everywhere, and when Finland, Little Russia, and the Western regions have already responded to the call of life, why are you, my distant Siberia, alone so quiet?" [133] Yet it was the following version of this poem that Shchapov later admitted corresponded most closely with his original of 1861: [134]

> Will you listen, native land,
> Land of involuntary exile,
> My golden, native Siberia,
> Will you hear a prisoner's call?
>
> It's time for provinces to rise,
> To throw off fetters, age-old
> Chains, and central rule,
> And for regional councils to convene.
>
> See how Poland's long been ready,
> Look how insurrection seethes,
> Foundations now awakes the Ukraine!
> Behind whom will this cause stand?

Shchapov's residence in Petersburg lasted only three years, however. Quite unexpectedly, he was denounced to government authorities on several grounds. His cordial relationship with the self-exiled Herzen was revealed. Moreover, his studies on the Schism and the Old Believers played into the hands of those suspicious that "London propagandists" (Herzen, V. I. Kelsiev, and others) were preparing a revolt in Russia, linking the revolutionary group around the Bell with dissident Old Believers. [135] Because he was already under limitations for his revolutionary speech at Bezdna, he was exiled in 1864 first to his native village in Eastern Siberia and

---

133 N. M. Iadrintsev, "Zhizn' i trudy A. P. Shchapova" (Life and Works of A. P. Shchapov), Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1883) no. 31; quoted in Semevskii, "Nieskol'ko slov," p. 31 n.; amd in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 63 n. Potanin sent a version of this poem to the young N. S. Shchukin in Irkutsk,where it appeared in the "Liberalist," a manuscript journal. See Vegman, "Episod iz zhizni Shchapova," pp. 142-43; and S. F. Koval', "Kharakter obshchestvennogo dvizheniia 60-kh godov XIX v. v Sibiri" (The Character of the Social Movement in Siberia of the 1860's), Obshchestvenno-politicheskoe dvizhenie, p. 38.

134 Cited in Vegman, "Episod iz zhizni Shchapova," p. 141.

135 Aristov, "Zhizn'," p. 589; and Venturi, Roots, pp. 201-02, 116-17.

soon thereafter to Irkutsk.

Shchapov's return to Siberia from European Russia was unlike that of the other important regionalists, who returned to their homeland voluntarily. However, like the others, Shchapov seems to have welcomed the opportunity to return to his native land, despite banishment. During his last days in Petersburg he had looked on Siberia "as a country of high education and excellent life compared to European Russia." According to Aristov's account,

> He was very happy to go to Siberia, where there was uncontaminated soil, freedom, and elbow-room. But since he knew Siberia, Little Russia, and Great Russia largely from books, these dreams shattered immediately on his contact with reality; his home town of Irkutsk seemed to him a hellish prison, without educated people and with an unbearable population, coarse and ignorant. [136]

Shchapov was to spend the last twelve years of his life in Irkutsk until his death at age forty-five in 1876. Though he devoted much time and energy to research and writings concerning Siberia during this period, his chief contributions to the budding Siberian regionalist movement, in theory and in inspiration, had already been made before his arrival in Irkutsk in 1864. Though he later produced significant studies on Siberia's past and present, by now he had presented his basic regionalist views of Russian history, his proposals to the tsar for a federative Russia and regional self-government, and his exhortations to students and to society for an awakening in the Russian provinces, especially Siberia. Just at the time that the well-known Shchapov was sent into exile, a group of younger Siberians stepped forth to take over the further development of regionalism.

---

136 Aristov, "Zhizn'," p. 330.

PART TWO

THE EMERGENCE OF SIBERIAN REGIONALISM

(1860-1881)

CHAPTER V

REGIONALISTS IN THE MAKING: POTANIN AND YADRINTSEV

Siberian regionalism as a movement was born in the year 1860. Its birth did not take place in Siberia, but in European Russia. In Kazan Shchapov's inaugural lecture of November 1860 provided regionalism with its immediate theoretical underpinnings. In St. Petersburg a cohesive group of Siberian students formed in 1860, which provided a vehicle for pragmatic implementation of the goals of the movement. From about 1860 on, the two leading exponents of Siberian regionalism in practice became Grigory Nikolaevich Potanin (1835-1920) and Nikolai Mikhailovich Yadrintsev (1842-94).

In their subsequent formulation of a regionalist "program" and of the activities needed to carry it out, Potanin and Yadrintsev had been influenced by a number of factors. Among these were the intellectual and cultural influence of educated exiles (and returned students) in Siberia, the slow spread of schools and of higher Russian culture, the gradual awakening of certain segments of Siberian society, the increasing penetration of

"advanced" and "enlightened" reform ideas, and by theories advocating the reorganization of the Russian Empire into a more decentralized, federative state. Most of all, the leaven of the heady environment of St. Petersburg in the early 1860's determined the initial course of Siberian regionalism and in fact produced its two major champions for the rest of the century: Potanin and Yadrintsev.

The genesis of Siberian regionalism in European Russia in 1860 can be explained by several factors. First, much of Russian society, and students in particular, was then in restless ferment and in high hopes of Russia's regeneration through long-anticipated reforms, now about to be implemented. Secondly, a benevolent interest in the Russian people, mainly the peasantry, was becoming more widespread among the intelligentsia and the educated elite. This populist tendency, along with the expectations of reforms, the belief in social progress (so characteristic of the second half of the century), and the galvanizing effect of defeat in the Crimean War all helped contribute to a kind of patriotic resurgence. Out of this a faith in a special mission and future for Russia became more widespread. Examples of this we have already seen in Bakunin, Herzen, Dostoevsky, and even Muravyov-Amursky. This more general Russian patriotism fed into and evoked more specific feelings of Siberian patriotism, which both complemented and reacted against the former. This Siberian patriotism in itself was nothing new, for it had been gathering strength over the last few decades among Siberian thinkers; but from the 1860's on, it tended to affect Siberians both more deeply and in greater numbers.

Prior to 1860 the number of Siberian youths who went westward to European Russia for a university or academic education was quite small. Furthermore, of those who went, many were loath to return to their native land,

where so few opportunities to put their education to good use existed. Outstanding examples of Siberians who stayed in Russia rather than return in these years are the historian Nikolai Polevoy (1796-1846), the publicist G. Z. Yeliseev (1821-91), and the chemist Dmitry Mendeleev (1834-1907). Around 1860, however, the Siberian student colony in St. Petersburg increased greatly in size — to between twenty and thirty. It was augmented not only by new arrivals from beyond the Urals, but also by students who had left Kazan (such as Shashkov) after the closing of one of its academic institutions. With greater numbers in the Petersburg colony, sentiments and solidarity toward Siberia grew. These feelings were further nourished by the historians Kostomarov and Shchapov, both of whom in lectures and articles argued that the principles of decentralization, autonomy, and federation had been constants in Russian history. Many young Siberians in Petersburg seized upon these ideas as justifying Siberia's own cultural, economic, and even political self-determination, oneone hand, and equal rights and reforms in Siberia, on the other.

During the two decades between 1860 and 1881 the regionalist movement constituted the most active and vital force in awakening and advancing Siberian society. For Siberia this period was one relatively devoid of enlightened administrators, or progressive exiles, and of ferment within local society at large. Most of the progress in and for Siberian society during these years can be credited to a select few public leaders, most of whom generally accepted the objectives of the regionalist cause. Among these men, Yadrintsev, Potanin, Shashkov, Vagin, Zagoskin, and to some extent Shchapov stood out. These regionalist crusaders, despite numerous and heavy setbacks, kept alive the vital impulse for a better Siberia during this

relatively dark period. They formed a kind of bridge that linked the earlier ferment of the late fifties and early sixties in a few Siberian towns with the more widespread awakening that permeated much of urban Siberian society in the 1880's.

* * *

The Early Years (to 1860)

Grigory Nikolaevich Potanin was born in southwestern Siberia in 1853 at Yamyshevskaya station on the Irtysh River. After the death of his mother in 1840, his father, a Cossack officer, moved to Presnovsk and in 1843 placed young Grigory in the home of Brigadier Commander Ellisen to receive some education. Here Potanin later claimed to have picked up a love for science and literature from Ellisen's wife. When this family left Presnovsk in 1846, however, Grigory's father took him to Omsk, where he enrolled him in the Cossack cadet school (kadetskii korpus).[1] After six years of study at the cadet school, he was graduated in 1852. Of these school years he summed up the following impressions a half-century later:

> We left the school with a great interest in social affairs. Even on the school bench we thought of how we would serve progress. Our love of homeland included a love of progress. Zhdan-Pushkin [the inspector of classes] wanted love of homeland to be the guiding idea in our future lives and a love of Russia really to become the religion of our hearts.
>
> Of progress in general we could think only that we would push Russia onto the path of progress. We saw ourselves as future fighters, and we would greet reforms only with applause. We even sympathized with revolutions wherever society could not continue by peaceful means along a path toward progressive institutions; we worshipped Peter the Great, but toward contemporary Russia we were unmoved. . . .

---

1 For details on his early life see V. A. Obruchev's popularized biography, Grigorii Nikolaevich Potanin: Zhizn' i deiatel'nost', pp. 9-25.

> The tasks before us seemed to us much easier than they were in fact; we were not acquainted with the real negative sides of Russian life, and desired ends were not placed before us. Publicity, freedom of speech, the jury, and self-government were all terms that did not exist at all in our vocabulary . . . [2]

While at the Omsk cadet school, young Potanin got to know the son of a Kazakh sultan, Chokan Valikhanov. Under Chokan's influence Grigory for the first time became interested in the culture and history of the peoples of Central and Inner Asia, an interest that remained with him his entire life. Chokan liked to relate folk tales and legends of his ancestors and spurred Grigory's enthusiasm for popular poetry and folklore. Several years later Chokan played an important role too in the development of young Potanin's social and political awareness.

Upon completion of military school in 1852, Potanin, as a graduated Cossack, was appointed to serve at various Cossack posts. In the next few years he served duty along the Central Asian frontier, along the Irtysh, in the Altai area, and in the newly acquired Trans-Ili region. In 1855 in the Altai he undertook the first of his many exploratory expeditions, and in the Trans-Ili region at Vernyi (present-day Alma Ata) he happened to meet P. P. Semyonov (1827-1914), then a member of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society and its future vice-president. Semyonov, then on his way to explore the Tien-Shan range, became for Potanin a second acquaintance valuable to him in his later life.

Because of a quarrel with a regiment commander in the Trans-Ili area, Potanin in 1857 was summoned back to Omsk to serve in the Cossack military

---

2 G. N. Potanin, "Vstriecha s S. Th. Durovym," Na slavnom postu (1900), pp. 257-58.

administration. Here in Omsk, Potanin ran into his old friend Chokan Valikhanov. As he later reminisced,

> While I lived in the remote Altai, the Sevastopol campaign was finishing, the clutches of censorship weakened, and new trends and dreams appeared; Chokan gradually adopted new ideas brought in by books, and when I returned to Omsk he was a changed man, but I still held the views with which I left the cadet school.

Nevertheless, Potanin had no difficulty adapting to the new mood. As he put it, Chokan "often visited me in the evening and we argued a great deal about current trends in journalism; on many points our views did not agree, and we became impassioned and angry, and parted very put out with one another." [3]

According to Popov, it was in Omsk that Potanin's regionalist worldview began to take shape. Here Potanin read the works of Slovtsov and the letters of Yershov. Moreover, he began to read metropolitan journals, and especially pertinent articles on exile and colonies in Notes of the Fatherland, the Contemporary, and the Russian Herald. [4]

An even stronger influence on the young Cossack's intellectual development in Omsk was the discussion circle of Katerina I. Kapustina, wife of the writer-official Semyon Ya. Kapustin and sister of the Siberian-born scientist, Dmitry I. Mendeleev. Of the Kapustins Potanin later wrote: "This was a pure Siberian family, and this fact made it all the more precious." [5] To the Kapustin home would gravitate whatever existed of a local

---

3 Potanin, "Vstriecha s Durovym," pp. 255-56.
4 I. I. Popov, "Vospominaniia G. N. Potanina" (G. N. Potanin's Reminiscenses), Golos Minuvshago, (1913) no. 9, p. 275.
5 Potanin, "Vstriecha s Durovym," p. 261.

intelligentsia, political exiles, and explorers and scholars passing through town. It was here that Chokan Valikhanov introduced Potanin to Sergei F. Durov, the exiled Petrashevets. As discussed above, Durov had a considerable impact on Potanin's developing intellectual views. In short, however, Potanin summed up his conversion as follows:

> In Omsk I experienced two spiritual turning points. First, after meeting the Petrashevets Durov, to whom Chokan introduced me, I changed my political convictions; until this encounter I revered the Emperor Nicholas, in whom I saw a second Peter the Great and a champion of progress and of European ideas of political liberty; after meeting Durov, I became a Petrashevets. [6]

Potanin's second turning point — in the area of his future plans — occurred in 1858.

> I considered my leaving the Cossack class as hopeless; I reconciled myself to the idea of always remaining a Cossack officer, but the arrival of P. P. Semyonov gave me hope in the possibility of entering the university. [7]

Semyonov had earlier recognized Potanin's potential, and now, seeing his interest in science and social questions, he encouraged him to leave the military service. This explorer, with this assistance of the Cossack ataman, General Krinsky, who happened to approve of Potanin's university plans, helped the young Cossack get a doctor's certificate to leave the service. As Potanin recalled,

> With the blessing of the general, the army doctor Voitkevich invented a hernia for me — on which

---

6 Quoted in Popov, "Vospominaniia Potanina," p. 275. Popov's excerpts are from Potanin's memoirs, which appeared in serial form from 1912 to 1914 in Sibirskaia Zhizn', a Tomsk newspaper unavailable to me.

7 Quoted in Popov, "Vospominaniia Potanina," p. 275. Also see D. Klements, "G. N. Potanin," Russkoe Bogatstvo, (1905) no. 9, p. 184. Pyotr Petrovich Semyonov, for his exploration of the Tien-Shan mountains, was subsequently awarded the surname Semyonov-Tian-Shansky.

> side I no longer remember — which, as it were, bothered my riding on horseback. The doctor, handing me the certificate, repeated several times: "Look, don't forget on which side you've got the hernia." [8]

The governor-general of Western Siberia, Hasford, consented to Potanin's resignation from the service, but only on condition that he never reenter the state service. After promising this, Potanin, in the spring of 1859, was discharged. Though now free to do as he pleased, he had lost his Cossack salary and had to find an inexpensive means of reaching St. Petersburg. Remembering that he had a "relative" in Tomsk, Baron Gilsen, married to the widow of his uncle, he quickly set out for that destination.

In Tomsk the Baron proposed to Potanin that he live at his home until autumn, when having to return to Estonia, he would take the prospective student with him to Petersburg. Though the anticipated trip to Estonia failed to materialize, the Baron instead gave Potanin an introductory letter to present to an acquaintance of his, then living in Tomsk, the exiled Michael Bakunin. Gilsen requested that Bakunin try to help Potanin reach Petersburg. Unable to aid Potanin financially, Bakunin did provide the would-be student with books from his library (which he had just purchased from the Decembrist Batenkov). Bakunin later recalled in his impressions of Potanin that "in spite of his dull appearance, he is an unusually smart, honorable, and energetic young man, untiringly active and free of vanity and phrases." [9] Bakunin, who even then credited himself with having "discovered" Potanin and having "freed him from the Cossack yoke," was able to

---

8 Quoted in Popov, "Vospominaniia," p. 275.

9 Letter to Herzen, dated October 8, 1865 (N.S.) at Naples, in Bakunins Briefwechsel, p. 110.

arrange his passage to Petersburg on a gold caravan. In this way Potanin reached the capital in the fall of 1859. Here he entered the university in the natural science division of the faculty of physics and mathematics.

At this point it appears that Potanin was torn between two fields of endeavor: science and exploration, and social action. Much later he described this duality in his early years as follows:

> At an early time in my life my plans diverged; when I read books on natural history, I wanted to become a naturalist very much, but when I read novels of Dickens I dreamed of becoming a novelist. Later in my capacity as officer, this question of the future took a more definite shape; I began to dream of trips into the depths of Central Asia or of social work in Siberia. [10]

Several factors, therefore, can be seen as major influences on Potanin's intellectual development: a relatively good education at the Omsk cadet school, with at least a few inspiring teachers and classmates; entrance into the most "advanced" circle in Omsk society; the assistance and and encouragement of Semyonov and Bakunin; and the strong ideological influence of Valikhanov and, especially, Durov (and perhaps Bakunin), who stressed relatively democratic, libertarian, and anti-autocratic views.

Nevertheless, these factors alone did not predetermine Potanin's emergence as a Siberian regionalist. Other Siberians of his generation were subject to roughly the same influences and did not become active regionalists (such as the Belogolovy brothers and Fyodorov-Omulevsky). In Potanin's case, a strong Russian patriotism was instilled in him at school and as a Cossack officer. When his faith in Nicholas was crushed, he had to seize upon a more immediate loyalty in its place. Having traveled widely through

---

10 Quoted in I. I. Popov, "K 80-ti lietiiu G. N. Potanina" (On the Occasion of G. N. Potanin's 80th Birthday), Golos Minuvshago, (1915) no. 1, p. 290.

much of southwestern Siberia before leaving for the capital, he probably grew to love and appreciate his own homeland. Both Obruchev and Popov write of Potanin's "Cossack patriotism" cooling down, and the latter feels this was replaced by a Siberian patriotism, especially after he saw the iniquities of Governor-General Hasford's administration on his return to Omsk.[11] Yet the real turning point in his patriotic views still lay in the near future. A man may never realize a strong, latent attachment to his homeland until he has left it for a sufficient length of time.

Nikolai Mikhailovich Yadrintsev was born in 1842 in Omsk amidst circumstances more favorable to rising in the intellectual and literary world than were Potanin's. Nikolai's father was a modestly well-off merchants from Perm, just west of the Urals. In Siberia he engaged in several jobs, among them wine retailing and managing the domestic affairs of a gold entrepreneur. Though lacking a formal education, Mikhail Yakovlevich Yadrintsev possessed a strong curiosity, read a great deal, befriended several Decembrist exiles, and built up a considerable personal library. According to his son, he knew Derzhavin, Karamzin, Pushkin, and Gogol through their writings — no mean accomplishment in the Siberian society of those days. Nikolai said of him that "he tried to give us /children/ an education and carefully followed my achievements. He determined that I should go to the university." Of his mother, Nikolai claimed that her "dream was to give me a secular education in a Siberian town. Very early I was taught dancing and French in two pensions; I studied piano, but never learned it, and at

---

11 Obruchev, Potanin, p. 41; and Popov, "Vospominaniia Potanina," p. 275. For Potanin's views on the Hasford administration, see p. 142 above.

age 14 I gave it up . . . At ten I already resembled a little gentleman." When young Nikolai began to write diaries and verses at age twelve, his mother called him her "Pushkin." [12] Clearly, there was a world of difference between Yadrintsev's more cosmopolitan upbringing and Potanin's life as a young Cossack lad, even in the relatively cultured Ellisen household.

Yadrintsev described himself as "weak and sickly at birth" and his physical constitution as "weak all his life." [13] His childhood was rather mobile, as his family moved from Omsk, to Tobolsk, to Tyumen, and, when Nikolai was nine, to Tomsk, where he lived until age seventeen, in 1860. Seven years Potanin's junior, Yadrintsev did not experience a similar intellectual from political exiles. Nevertheless, while in Tobolsk, his father's home was frequented the best society, which then included the Decembrist exiles Annenkov, Svistunov, and Steingel. As noted above, the friendship of the latter his father valued highly, but this relationship seems to have had little impact on Nikolai.

After his family moved to Tomsk, young Yadrintsev spent several miserable years in two French pensions. On entering the Tomsk secondary school (gimnaziia) in the fall of 1854, he felt that "the transition to high school was a true blessing." By strange coincidence he was seated next to the young Nikolai I. Naumov (1838-1901), later a noted populist writer. In some ways Naumov's role in Yadrintsev's intellectual development can be compared to that of Valikhanov in Potanin's. A second class-

---

12 Iadrintsev, "Avtobiografiia N. M. Iadrintseva. Dietstvo" (Nikolai Yadrintsev's Autobiography: Childhood), Sibirskii Sbornik, (1895) III; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 3, 4.

13 N. M. Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii" (Additions to My Autobiography), Russkaia Mysl', (1904) VI: 153.

mate of Yadrintsev's, D. I. Ponikarevsky, recounted how Naumov, Yadrintsev, and others came to his house and

> conversed, joked, quarreled, told anecdotes, and also related what we had read. N. I. Naumov distinguished himself especially by his eloquence and wit; as I recollect there were constant arguments between him and N. M. /Yadrintsev/, and N. I. Naumov with his wit always defeated Nikolai Mikhailovich, whose jokes were mostly gentle and amusing, and aroused animated laughter . . . [14]

Of the Tomsk high-school teachers, Naumov later recollected: "In other circumstances . . . we would have been brilliant pupils, but we didn't study because there was nothing to learn from our teachers — to whom it was hardly possible to apply the word 'teacher'." [15] Yadrintsev described his teachers a bit more negatively:

> Some of them had been distinguished scholars in their day, but they did not know how to make this knowledge the property of either pupils or society. On the contrary, they gradually lost their knowledge, forgot, grew lazy, and either adopted the life and customs of their ignorant surroundings, sunk to a petty-bourgeois life, became drunks, or degenerated and lost their minds.

Still, his schooling was not without a few redeeming, humane teachers. More importantly, however, "in the life around us something else was blowing, and Belinsky somehow penetrated into the upper grades of the high schools" [16] Belinsky's name (as the Slavophile Ivan Aksakov ruefully admitted in 1856) was known by every thoughtful young man in provincial Russia. And in Tomsk Yadrintsev and his close friends knew Belinsky (1811-47)

---

14 D. P., "Vospominaniia o N. M. Iadrintsevie" (Recollections of N. M. Yadrintsev), Sibirskii Sbornik, (1896) II; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 12.

15 N. I. Naumov, in Sibirskii Sbornik, (1895) IV: 3; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 13.

16 Iadrintsev, "Vospominaniia o tomskoi gimnazii" (Recollections of High School in Tomsk), Sibirskii Sbornik, (1888) I; quoted in Lemke, p. 15, 18.

and his literary and social criticism better than did their teacher of literature.[17] Indeed, they devoured every copy they could of Contemporary and Notes of the Fatherland, which Belinsky formerly had edited.

Besides informal discussion sessions with friends, probably the most significant influence on Yadrintsev during his Tomsk years was his growing attachment to the great expanse of Siberian nature.

> Freed from class, we were free to do as we pleased at school or at home. . . . We developed our strength, capabilities, sensitiveness, and a power to observe. A beautiful world of observations and delights was opened before us. Torn away from classes and stuffy rooms, we gamboled about like young deer.[18]

Young Yadrintsev devoted as much time as possible to hiking and hunting. The latter he often engaged in with Ponikarevsky, in imitation of the carefree sportsman in Turgenev's Notes of a Hunter, about which both of them were ecstatic. These excursions familiarized Yadrintsev with the general tenor and immediacy of rural Siberian life. Even while in high school, he planned an expedition to the Altai. In such ways the perceptive and romantic Yadrintsev grew more acquainted with and attached to his homeland.

In 1858 Naumov, Ponikarevsky, and Yadrintsev arranged a literary circle, and for each evening session each of them prepared something original. On the first occasion Ponikarevsky and Naumov read short stories, while Yadrintsev recited a poem. Naumov's story was eventually published, a step which helped determine the whole course of his later life. Yadrintsev's also had some significance for the future, for Naumov criticized it

---

17 Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 21.

18 Iadrintsev, "Vospominaniia,"; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 18. Aksakov's remark is cited in M. T. Florinsky, Russia: A History and an Interpretation (New York: Macmillan, 1960), II: 810.

so "maliciously" that relations between the proud and high-strung Yadrintsev and the incisive Naumov were broken. Though the latter soon left for Petersburg without bidding Yadrintsev, the breach was repaired in time.

Entering the seventh, and last, grade of secondary school, Nikolai began to think more seriously of the university, imagining for himself the "free" existence of a university student. At this time, after the Crimean defeat and the initial decision to emancipate serfs, he was still rather unaware of the importance of the times for Russia. However, he was not alone in this. As he later wrote, in Siberia then

> there was no telegraph and people rarely read newspapers and journals, /for/ the public was still unaccustomed to reading; news was learned only suddenly and by accident. . . . It is true that even in Siberian society there were sensitive observers and commentators on the new trends, but these . . . were persons who conversed and envisaged events in their study rooms and in intimate circles. Society, however, was devoid of foreknowledge. [19]

In 1859 there suddenly arrived in Tomsk a Siberian student back from the university in Petersburg, Nikolai Semyonovich Shchukin (1838-70), son of the Irkutsk educator, S. S. Shchukin. This young man more than anyone else determined Yadrintsev's resolve to enter the university. The impact of Shchukin on Yadrintsev and his future career, in opening up a new world of ideas in all their immediacy, was somewhat analogous to Durov's effect on Potanin. Shchukin, who was involved in opening a private school in Tomsk, rented by chance a room in the Yadrintsev apartment. The impressions that Shchukin and his "revelations" made on Yadrintsev he later described, though perhaps with some exaggeration, as follows:

---

19 Iadrintsev, "Studencheskiia i literaturnyia vospominaniia sibiriaka" (Memoirs of a Siberian Student and Writer), Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1884) no. 33; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 27.

> Many remember his agile figure, energetic discourse, fiery preaching, his sharp condemnations of everything obsolescent, and the storehouse of new ideas, common to all mankind, which he brought from the university circle of that time, and of hopes with which he familiarized us, and with which all of Russia was then living, awaiting its regeneration and the liberation of serfs. . . . /He/ fell on us right from the sky. From him we learned for the first time what Russia was going through. A whole stremm of life dawned upon our consciousness, forced our blood to agitate and hearts to beat in trembling. . . . here was light and the influx of a whole mass of European ideas of which we had never heard. For the first time we learned of progress, of human brotherhood, of man's finest aspirations. We were children in a distant family of Russian society, in its remote corner, unaware of the whole world. Everything gushed out upon us all at once: European life, history, and ideas which had agitated Europe for half a century. Rousseau and Voltaire, Diderot and D'Alembert, Condorcet — all of them were new to us . . . The material for thought was enormous and was enough to shake up and create a whole world-view. [20]

On another, more down-to-earth plane, Yadrintsev described Shchukin's presence and influence: "We found and followed what was written on the emancipation of peasants. . . . We spent whole nights in conversation and absorbed the new literature." Shchukin quickly attracted a rather heterogeneous following and got to know many young men and women, including the "European celebrity," Michael Bakunin, still living in Tomsk then. Yadrintsev never mentioned having met either Bakunin or Potanin in 1859, when all three of them were in Tomsk.

As for the effect of all this on Yadrintsev's university aspirations, he commented that he found his "friends reinvigorated; Naumov's gloomy, Byronic view of life disappeared, /and/. . . All of us impatiently awaited our departure for the university." For his friends and for Nikolai,

---

20 Iadrintsev, "Vospominaniia o tomskoi gimnazii," Sibirskii Sbornik, (1888) I; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 28.

especially,

> a faith in the future, an endless, ardent love toward humanity and toward everything unfortunate and disregarded, and a belief in the people's happiness warmed our hearts as the foundation of a future religion, as a voice of life. [21]

Yadrintsev did not even take his final high-school examinations before he left Tomsk in mid-1860 for St. Petersburg with his mother. His intentions were to enter the university as an "unattached student" (a non-tuitional auditor: vol'noslushatel').

Of the "sudden" ideological conversions which affected Potanin and Yadrintsev, both men compared the effects of modern, secular West European ideas on them to a new religion. Certainly both Potanin and Yadrintsev had previously been aware of these ideas through reading contemporary progressive periodicals. Perhaps this second-hand acquaintance only prepared them for their decisive encounters with men who, in their own eyes, embodied the most advanced European ideas. Yadrintsev's stronger reaction to these ideas may have stemmed from his more turbulent personality and from the fact that he was only an impressionable seventeen years of age when he met Shchukin; the more placid Potanin was in his early twenties when he met Durov.

The seemingly overwhelming impact of European and "progressive" ideas on young Siberians like Potanin, Yadrintsev, and others bears resemblances to the passionate reception given to many of the same ideas by young Russians several decades earlier, and indeed, still in the sixties. The impact of western ideas on the forthcoming Siberian "men of the sixties" has been evidenced in broadly similar fashion on first-generation "intelligen-

---

21 Ibid., p. 29, 30.

tsia" elsewhere in the non-western world (such as China, Japan, Turkey, and earlier, in parts of Eastern Europe). Whereas the response elsewhere to this impact often turned into a burst of passionate nationalism, in the Siberian case the reaction resulted in a similar patriotic impulse, but only regional in its dimensions.

Despite marked differences in the family and social circumstances of Potanin and Yadrintsev in their childhood and youth, certain similarities occurred in the early lives of both. Each attended high school and yearned to go to Petersburg, and each had intellectually stimulating friends and were to some extent influenced by progressive journals of the day. In this last respect, Belinsky's influence on Yadrintsev brings to mind some curious parallels. The lives of both men had similar characteristics: relatively humble social origin; publicistic activity; editorship of the most important periodicals in their respective "movements"; an often belated idolization by their followers; a restless, nervous, polemical way of life; and the devotion of their lives to a progressive, social ideal. In fact, Belinsky's nickname "furioso" could easily have been applied to Yadrintsev.

While Potanin both needed and received more means of assistance and encouragement to reach the university (e.g. Semyonov, the Kapustin circle, Durov, and Bakunin, among others), Yadrintsev's main immediate inspiration was provided by Shchukin and, to a certain extent, by his fellow class mates. But underlying this were his father's educational wishes for his son and the financial resources of his relatively well-to-do mother. With these advantages, young Yadrintsev at age seventeen arrived in St. Petersburg in mid-1860, about a half-year after Potanin.

* * *

Student Years in St. Petersburg (1860-63)

St. Petersburg society in 1860 was permeated by an atmosphere of great hopes and high expectations. Many anxiously awaited the expected manifesto emancipating the serfs, along with other projected reforms, and looked forward to the dawn of a new era for Russia. Optimistic, humanitarian, and altruistic ideals were especially prevalent among university students, who by this time were of rather mixed social ofigins and no longer predominantly of gentry background. Moreover in the early sixties, Russian universities suddenly prominence in intellectual and educational life that they had never before known, offering for many an opportune means to rise in the world. To the heterogeneous assortment of students in St. Petersburg Siberia for the first time now contributed a fair share. With the exception of Kazan, Siberian students had never before constituted a distinct and compact element in a university town in European Russia.

Since Siberia had neither gentry nor serfs, none of the students from there came from these classes. On the other hand, the Petersburg students from Siberia in the early sixties were of Cossack, merchant, official, clerical, native, and all but peasant families.[22] All of the Siberian students "abroad" in St. Petersburg drank in the heady brew of high hopes, ideals, and expectations which surrounded them. Their optimism was in part quite justified, for, after all, most of them had lifted themselves upwards and westwards to St. Petersburg largely by their own bootstraps, and for the first time in such numbers.

---

22 The absence of landed gentry in Siberia made the acquisition of a higher education (not to mention primary or secondary education) an almost exclusively urban phenomenon.

As indicated in the cases of Kostomarov and Shchapov, students looked on themselves and their favorite professors as heroes of the day. Writers too were included in this select group. According to Yadrintsev, "literature was also a favorite of the public. Periodicals and periodical articles played an enormous role and were bought up immediately. Every day the reader swallowed newspapers avidly like a cup of coffee after exercise."[23] At the summit of the Petersburg literary world at this time presided the editors of the Contemporary, Nikolai G. Chernyshevsky and Nikolai A. Dobrolyubov, and of the Russian Word, Dmitry I. Pisarev.[24] Siberians in Petersburg, however, did not generally become involved at this time in the activities of these relatively radical Russian activists and their publications. At most, Potanin and Yadrintsev gave passing thought to the two dominant wings of the Russian intelligentsia in Petersburg. Hence, Potanin's only comments in writing were: "Yadrintsev and I were opponents of 'Pisarevshchina' /Pisarev's nihilism/. The direction of the Contemporary appeared more healthy to us . . ." — with its concern for social justice and welfare.[25]

It was no mere coincidence that the Russian revolutionary movement, broadly speaking, was born in St. Petersburg at the same time as was Siberian regionalism. The two movements both involved social, cultural, and journalistic action, though the former sought radical political and social changes at the center, while the latter demanded more self-determination and civil rights chiefly for one borderland. The class composition of both movements was similar, however, and a major objective of both was to rouse

---

23 Iadrintsev, "Studencheskiia i literaturnyia vospominaniia," Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1884) no. 26; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 32.

24 The Russian titles are Sovremennik and Russkoe Slovo, respectively.

25 Potanin, "Vospominaniia," Sibirskaia Zhizn', (1913) no. 114; quoted in Koval', "Kharakhter obshchestvennogo dvizheniia," p. 38.

the "people" to action. A bitter disappointment in the procedure and terms of the emancipation of serfs initially touched off the Russian revolutionary movement; on the other hand, the Siberian regionalist movement began rather undramatically with the formation of a Siberian compatriotic group (zemliachestvo) in St. Petersburg.

Potanin has left an account of the origins of this "Siberian circle," as it was first called:

> In 1859 there already existed in Petersburg the small circle of Shchukin, at whose home it met once a week. About six or seven persons came, among whom only four were Siberians. With Shchukin's departure, the circle broke up and was revived after Yadrintsev's arrival. . . . These /meetings/ were the usual, politically innocent student jours fixes, at which students gathered to drink beer and sing student songs. Attempts were made to unite all the Siberians from all the institutions of higher learning at these jours fixes; and in all not quite thirty came. [26]

By calling this compatriotic group the "Yadrintsev circle," Potanin seems to have disavowed his own important role in the formation of the circle. Indeed, Potanin and Yadrintsev were both regarded equally as founders of the group. According to Svatikov, their group was initially formed on the model of many similar organizations and, with a brief interruption in 1865-1866, a Siberian zemliachestvo existed in Petersburg until 1917. [27]

Though it is difficult to reconstruct precisely how the Siberian circle came to be formed, it seems that shortly after Yadrintsev's arrival in mid-1860 he sought out Potanin, of whom he had already heard much praise, and brought him a letter of introduction from Shchukin. At the time Potanin was living a somewhat hermitic existence. What money he received from

---

26 G. N. Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," p. 272.
27 S. G. Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 49.

a few literary pieces, he spent for of all on books; whatever was left he spent on food, sometimes only bread and kvas (a lightly fermented rye drink). This half-starved existence, however, did not prevent him from hearing lectures at the university and continuing to write.

Yadrintsev's first encounter with Potanin he described accordingly:

> I found Potanin in an apartment on Vasilievsky Island. I remember him almost constantly pacing around the room with a book in hand, enthused by natural science, but likewise reading much on contemporary literature and already familiar with social questions. From the very first conversation, I remember, we spoke of Siberians in Petersburg and of the needeto get acquainted.
> . . . Potanin advocated getting together as a purely Platonic need — so that Siberian countrymen could see each other, remember their homeland, and contemplate how they could be useful to it. The idea of conscious service to the region, at a moment when social consciousness was also awakening in European Russia, . . . lay at the basis of our coming together. [28]

Yadrintsev appears to have been influenced by the ideas of Potanin (seven years his senior) even more strongly than he had been by Shchukin's previously. From the more specifically western concepts of Shchukin, he moved to Potanin's patriotic ideas. From the broader, cosmopolitan ideas of the Enlightenment (that Shchukin seems to have presented), Yadrintsev, several thousand miles from home, began to ask the questions: "Who amI, where do I belong, and where does my homeland fit in?" In short, he moved toward samosoznanie, roughly translated as self-consciousness or realization of self — both regarding himself and his homeland, Siberia. Though both Potanin and Yadrintsev fervently fastened on to such ideals as progress, freedom, brotherhood, and humanity (commonly associated with the late 18th century), they added to these a concern for the particular, the

---

28 Iadrintsev, "Sibirskie literaturnyia vospominaniia" (Siberian Literary Reminiscences), Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1884) no. 6; quoted in Iakushev, "Grigorii Nikolaevich Potanin," Vol'naia Sibir' (Prague), (1927) I: 21-22; and in Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 34-35.

unique, and the popular, which historically has often led to a romantic, culturalinationalism, but in their case engendered a regionalism, somewhat romantic and optimistic, and definitely more cultural than political in its early stages.

Along this vein, the Belgian sociologist, de Laveleye, has written:

> In provinces where half-animal men are living, let us establish schools, let us construct a railway, and tolerate a printing press. Twenty years later national feeling will be born. After two generations it will explode, if you try to suppress it. In this manner the national question is born out of the very nature of civilization. [29]

Siberians were, of course, not a nationality, but a regional variant of the Great Russian people. Yet the same civilizing and modernizing processes that helped engender nationalism elsewhere, tended to encourage the birth of regionalism in Siberia. However, Siberian regional feeling was born perhaps as early as the 1830's and 1840's; it "exploded" in the 1860's — almost twenty years before the first private newspapers were firmly established, and a generation before a university and a railway came to Siberia.

Yadrintsev described the "explosion" of his own regional feelings:

> In talks with Potanin I not only agreed, but was enthused by his mind,and his plans, and for me he became a first mentor and teacher; he even determined my vocation.
>
> I fanatically followed his patriotic idea, and we began to develop the thought among comrades of the need to group together. Everyone avidly shared this idea — some consciously, and others instinctively. The idea of uniting Siberians in Petersburg and of getting to know each other was attractive by its novelty and originality. [30]

---

29 Émile de Laveleye, The Balkan Peninsula (London, 1886); quoted in Oscar Jaszi, The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929), p. 251.

30 Iadrintsev, "Sibirskie vospominaniia"; quoted in Iakushev, "Potanin," p. 21; and in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 35.

As for arranging the first intentional meeting of Siberians in Petersburg, "Potanin, for all his impracticality and unworldliness, possessed a visible talent not only in bringing together his compatriots, but also in guessing their character and abilities . . ." [31] Siberians came not just from the university, but from the academy of arts and other schools of higher learning as well. Moreover, added to the growing influx of Siberians in St. Petersburg was the arrival of Siberian transfer-students from the University of Kazan, the cameral (kameral'nyi) college of which was recently closed because of student disorders. Though the Siberian Kazantsy were fresh from the experience of protest and demonstrations, it appears doubtful that they rendered much "revolutionary consciousness" to the Siberian circle in Petersburg. "The Kazantsy were fine fellows," wrote Yadrintsev, "but not very developed people." They spoke chiefly of carousals, athletes, fights, and of "clashes with the police; but in the end they usually drank beer and sang Kazan student songs . . . They also brought with them to Petersburg an inclination to gamble at cards, which, I recollect, terribly shocked the Siberians in Petersburg." [32]

As a result of the increasing number of Siberian students in Petersburg and of Potanin's organizational ability, the first meeting of the Siberian zemliachestvo was held in late 1860 in the apartment of a university student. According to Yadrintsev's account, it "was loud and boisterous, as student gatherings always are; already it was hard not to notice compatriotic sympathies, though all of this was extremely chaotic . . ."

---

31 Iadrintsev, "Sibirskie vospominaniia," quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, 35.
32 Ibid., p. 37. For an opposing view of the Kazantsy, see Koval', "Kharakhter obshchestvennogo dvizheniia," p. 37.

About twenty students showed up, among them the Buryat Ippolit Piroshkov, who had known Potanin in Omsk and who was now studying Hegel; the future populist writer Innokenty V. Fyodorov-Omulevsky; the law student N. M. Pavlinov; and a group of Kazantsy. Some of Potanin's non-Siberian friends were also present.

> At this evening party there were no questions artificially prepared ahead of time, no organized speeches or wars of words; everything had a comradely, family-like character. At the end, after the first acquaintances and noisy compatriotic effusions were made, the question arose of keeping up relations between fellow countrymen and of regularly continuing the meetings; such a thought was, of course, unanimously accepted. [33]

Second and third meetings followed not long afterwards, ending up with student songs. As to how potentially revolutionary Yadrintsev felt the meetings were, he noted thirty years later that "the first association, with all of its ardor and awakening of patriotism, did not represent anything serious. This circle did not possess the solidarity of the Little Russians, the Poles, etc." — a reference to the much more politically awakened national groups in Petersburg. [34] Potanin evaluated these gatherings a bit differently: "True, everyone was inclined toward revolution, but this mood had only a transient, lyrical character. Two or three people tried to interest this happy company in social tasks, but these tasks were not illegal . . ." [35]

As time went on, the Siberian circle became replenished by more new arrivals. For instance, S. S. Shashkov, the subsequent historian, arrived

---

33 Iadrintsev, "Sibirskie vospominaniia"; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 37, 38.

34 Letter to V. I. Semidalov, dated October 1, 1892; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 37.

35 Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," p. 272; see also below, pp. 408-10.

in 1861 from Kazan, following to Petersburg his "major professor," Shchapov, recently banned from teaching at the University of Kazan for his requiem declaration at Bezdna. Chokan Valikhanov and Naumov also joined the circle, as did Ivan A. Khudyakov (a former pupil of Yershov) and Fyodor N. Usov. The latter later became prominent in the Siberian independence "affair" of 1865, and Khudyakov in the Karakozov affair of 1866. Moreover, Nikolai Shchukin returned briefly to Petersburg and became active in the circle.

The Siberian circle in Petersburg exerted a degree of influence elsewhere in European Russia, for similar, though smaller, compatriotic groups formed along the same line in Moscow and in Kazan. Strictly speaking, the activity of the Petersburg zemliachestvo during the early sixties can be divided into two periods. The first lasted from late 1860 to late 1861, when in the wake of student disturbances over the inadequate peasant reforms the group broke up. A second zemliachestvo, formed in 1862, survived until its break-up in May 1865 owing to the unfortunate "affair of Siberian independence." [36]

Reinforcing the "cohesiveness" and patriotic tendencies of Siberian students in St. Petersburg were, of course, the ideas espoused by Kostomarov and Shchapov. Of Yadrintsev's reaction to the former, something is known. "I remember," he wrote, "the lectures of N. I. Kostomarov and of other favorite professors were almost public. The university auditorium shook from the rapture of the audience . . ." Kostomarov lectured before crowds as big as 2,500, and after his public debates with the centralist

---

36 Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 50.

historian of the "official" school, M. P. Pogodin, he was carried out of the hall on the arms of students. "Solidarity between professors and students was complete," wrote Yadrintsev. He spoke with Professors Kostomarov and Kavelin on the future of Siberia and found that "both were true friends of a regional renaissance, understanding by this the rise of the spiritual and civic forces of all the people." [37] As noted above, Yadrintsev considered Kostomarov's lectures as having helped lay a groundwork for his later views.

With the Siberian Shchapov, however, Yadrintsev was not as closely acquainted.

> I saw him a few times from a distance and knew about him through friends; among students many spoke of his intelligence, enormous talent, and unusual originality. We knew that he was our Siberian, was brought from Kazan, and had suffered. Young people clung to him. Shashkov was his pupil and loved him, but knew all his weaknesses and treated him quite soberly and even austerely. [38]

Yadrintsev felt that Shchapov was then living through a crisis, however, and moving away from his earlier, more original views on regionalism toward "westernizing" views of Russian history then current in Petersburg. Shchapov was not involved in the Siberian circle, though "he sent regards," wrote Yadrintsev, "to Siberia and to Siberians on his arrival by way of a poem, but this, it seems, was his last breath on Siberia." [39] This poem was the only known "work" of Shchapov imbued with a strong patriotic sentiment toward Siberia, unless we include his letter to Alexander II of that same year. As noted earlier, Yadrintsev also recognized the importance of Shchapov's lectures in the formation of the regionalist idea.

---

37 Iadrintsev, "Studencheskiia vospominaniia," Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1884) no. 26; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 32, 33, 34. K. D. Kavelin (1818-1885) was a noted jurist and historian.

38 Iadrintsev, "Studencheskiia vospominaniia," Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1884) no. 34; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 48.

39 Ibid., p. 48. Two "versions" of this poem are cited above on pp. 251-52.

Potanin, who was studying natural sciences, was evidently less affected by the lectures and scholarly articles of federal and regional-oriented historians. For him the discussions in the Russian Geographical Soceety stood out in importance. Potanin had developed an early connection with the Society through his acquaintance with Semyonov, and in 1862 he attended a public debate by the Society's political-economic committee on the Amur question. In a discussion on colonial policy, one speaker, Baron E. K. Meyendorff, warned that "if the population of Siberia grows and obtains education, then it would share the general fate of agrarian colonies of other states, that is, it would fall away from Russia and proclaim the country independent." However, Academician K. M. Baer objected to this, stating that

> separation of a colony from the mother country has been a fully natural act, which should not trouble statesmen, that in this separation the mother country would not be harmed, that history has known many similar cases of colonies falling away, and that mother countries not only have not lost from this, but have flourished better than ever.

Grand Duke Constantine Nikolaevich, however, rejected both these views, insisting that Siberia was not a colony at all.[40] Thus was the problem posed for the young regionalists: was Siberia a true colony or just a unique province? Was it destined to political separatism, to closer integration with Russia, or to cultural and administrative autonomy?

Also of significance for the future development of Siberian regionalism was the journalistic activity of Potanin, Yadrintsev, and Shashkov in St. Petersburg. Very soon after he arrived in the capital, Potanin began

---

40 Quotations from Popov's article, "Vospominaniia Potanina," pp. 276-77.

writing in various journals (including Pisarev's Russian Word), some of his articles touching on Siberia.[41] In 1862 Yadrintsev got his first article published in the Spark, an exposé of some sort.[42] From this point on, Yadrintsev made rapid progress. According to Potanin,

> In our little company Yadrintsev was a born journalist. I felt that he would go to the head of the Siberian movement, which was already blowing in the air, and that I was faced with becoming only his assistant.
>
> At first Yadrintsev and I went along evenly, at the same tempo; perhaps I, as more experienced, and older in years, was even somewhat ahead; in his memoirs he called me his teacher, but life separated us quickly. I began to travel, and all the burden of Siberian publicistic activity lay solely on his shoulders.[43]

However, by Yadrintsev's own admission, he did not turn to literary activity until after the university was shut down on December 20, 1861, due to student disorders.[44] While lectures were discontinued, he turned his attention more specifically to literature and built up a good personal library. From this step, it was not long before the influence of budding Siberian writers around him pushed him into writing. Naumov and Fyodorov-Omulevsky, both in the initial stages of their literary careers; Potanin, who had already published articles both in Siberia and in Petersburg; and the more solitary, self-sufficient Shashkov, who had already written for the Irkutsk Provincial Gazette, all spurred Yadrintsev along in his journalistic development.

His first piece, printed in the Spark in 1862, was an exposé rather

---

41 Potanin is not known to have published any articles in Katkov's Moscow Gazette, as Bakunin had suggested in Tomsk in 1859. See above, p. 156.

42 Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 48. Lemke does not cite this in his bibliographical index to Yadrintsev's works (see p. 203).

43 Quoted in Popov, "Vospominaniia Potanina," p. 276.

44 For participating in these disturbances Potanin was confined in the Peter-and-Paul fortress for three months.

typical of the times, but it did cause V. S. Kurochkin, the editor of Spark's literary section, to acknowledge Yadrintsev's talent openly. Yadrintsev recalled, "I modestly celebrated my first literary debut with friends. My mentor, G. N. Potanin, was quite satisfied that I was entering the literary arena." Yadrintsev next made arrangements with Mikhail Dostoevsky, co-editor of the Times with his brother Fyodor, to edit a work on Siberia by Ippolit Zavalishin (brother of Dmitry). After putting much effort into it, the arrangement fell through, his "literary ardor cooled somewhat," and his next attempts to write were begun only after his return to Siberia.[45]

Besides Potanin and Yadrintsev, Shashkov was also prominent in the regionalist movement in the early 1860's. Serafim Serafimovich Shashkov (1841-82), born in Irkutsk the son of a priest, was educated first at home, then in the Irkutsk bursa, and next in the Irkutsk seminary, where he found a few good teachers. While still in seminary he published articles, written on the local Buryats, in 1858 in the Irkutsk Provincial Gazette.[46] In 1860 young Shashkov was sent to the Kazan Ecclesiastical Academy, which at this time was undergoing a return to a more monastic discipline and academic "scholasticism." However, during Shashkov's stay in Kazan the chair of Russian history at the University went to Shchapov, who began his regional-oriented lectures in November 1860. A year later Shashkov left the Academy and went to St. Petersburg, where Shchapov had been sent earlier that year. In the capital Shashkov initially intended to attend university

---

45 Iadrintsev, "Studencheskiia vospominaniia"; quotations taken from Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 49. The titles of Spark and the Times in Russian are Iskra and Vremia, respectively.

46 For further details see above, p. 145.

lectures and to work on the journal Secular Trends (which he never did). However, he did contribute to other periodicals and published several articles relating to Siberia.[47]

Yadrintsev wrote of Shashkov at this time:

> When we became acquainted in Petersburg, he had already succeeded in placing something in the journal Century. . . . To this period dates his monograph on shamanism in Siberia, printed in the Notes of the Imperial Geographical Society; we found S. S. /Shashkov/ to be serious and a very industrious young man.[48]

He already knew German, had a basic knowledge of history, and was now interested in scientific literature. "After Potanin," added Yadrintsev, "he was the most educated of my countrymen of that time." Though Shashkov roomed briefly with Shchapov, and then with Yadrintsev, he rarely took part in conversations and never caroused. Still, he had a "lively humor and mind, which he often manifested in a most brilliant way."[49] An impoverished existence and unfavorable working conditions finally forced him, as with many others, to leave Petersburg for Siberia. He departed in the fall of 1863.

As seen above, Potanin also labored under miserable financial and dietary conditions in St. Petersburg. Of the prominent members of the

---

47 See P. Shchegolev, "Shashkov," Entsiklopedicheskii slovar' (St. Petersburg: Brokgaus-Efron, 1903), v. 39, pt. 1, p. 236. Secular Trends in Russian is Mirskoi Tolk. Among the articles of Siberian content were "Amurskii vopros v 1861 g." (The Amur Question in 1861), Viek, (1862) nos. 1-6; and "Ocherki Sibiri v istoricheskom i ekonomicheskom otnoshenii" (Essays on the History and Economy of Siberia), Biblioteka dlia Chteniia, (1862) bks. 10 and 12.

48 Iadrintsev, "Studencheskiia vospominaniia," Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1884) no. 34; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 46. The article he cites was Shashkov, "Shamanstvo v Sibiri" (Shamanism in Siberia), Zapiski imperatorskago russkago geograficheskago Obshchestva, (1864) bk. 2.

49 Iadrintsev, "Studencheskiia vospominaniia," Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1884) no. 34; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 47.

Siberian circle, he was the first to leave Petersburg. In 1862 he joined up with the K. V. Struve expedition to Lake Zaisan in Central Asia, sponsored by the Geographical Society. Yadrintsev was well enough provided for during his first two winters in the capital and was able to help out some of his less fortunate compatriots financially. But during the winter of 1862-63 his funds, originally supplied by his mother, became exhausted, and he too was forced to lead a "purely student existence." At this time he roomed in an apartment with Naumov, and for neighbors had the Siberians Usov, Kuklin, and Khudyakov. Thus was part of the Petersburg Siberian colony concentrated during a winter when they all lived on potatoes and butter. [50] Despite the hardships of these student years, however, Potanin reminisced fifty years later: "It was a happy time and was the springtime of Russian life . . . That bygone spring is recollected with more pleasant feelings than the most recent one /of 1905/; the fact was that the spring of the sixties was one fanned by hopes." [51]

* * *

Initial Ideas and Program of the Regionalists (1860-63)

When Yadrintsev, Potanin and others left Petersburg for Siberia, they carried with them rough guidelines for action at home which they had developed ever since the formation of the first Siberian circle in 1860. One chief goal at this time was to awaken and arouse among Siberians a sense of

---

50 Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 36.
51 Quoted in Popov, "Vospominaniia Potanina," p. 277.

their past, present, and potential future, so as to make them more aware of where their better interests lay. In short, they hoped to begin spreading to society as a whole the "self-consciousness" which they felt they themselves had gained. Their program consisted of the steps necessary in the realization of a more educated, moral, and prosperous society in Siberia. This program (for which Yadrintsev became the chief spokesman until his death), however, evolved considerably from its inception in the early sixties until its demise in the early twentieth century. As certain objectives were gained, or partially obtained, new ones or the remainder of old ones came to the fore. The main impulses generally remained the same, however: greater self-determination for Siberians in all respects — administratively, institutionally, economically, and culturally — and equal rights and privileges within the framework of the Russian Empire.

The very first ideas connected with serving the homeland were conceived at the first meeting of the Siberian zemliachestvo, which, according to Yadrintsev, "left its imprint on the souls of many." As could be expected, though, all did not go smoothly within the group during the first few years. Not only did the first circle break up after the disorders of late 1861 (Potanin was jailed for three months), but discord set in, and a rival faction, led by N. P. Pavlinov, arose to counter the idea of the "Potanin party" that Siberia's development did not need the constant aid and support of European Russia. [52] Probably the greatest setback to the Potanin-Yadrintsev group, however, was the fact that (according to Yadrintsev)

---

52 See Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 44. Relying solely on Lemke's information, I have assumed that N. P. Pavlinov was not the same as the law student (and subsequent friend of Yadrintsev) N. M. Pavlinov, mentioned above on p. 278.

> the absence of practical causes and a solely theoretical nature expressed in hopes and conversations could not give it /the zemliachestvo/ nourishment and life. . . . The earlier ardor and impressions of this intimacy disappeared, and a prosaic life of the circle set in, which turned it into the usual student corporation. Nevertheless, we more than once met to see off our fellow countrymen, sending them off to the homeland. 53

The more specific aims, objectives, and hopes of the Siberians that formed the circle and soon left for Siberia have been recorded by Yadrintsev:

> Among the Siberians were sensible people, and they began to think of the fate of their homeland, of its interests, and of future activity in the country. Of course, it was hard to come up with definite tasks in our young student family and to imagine practical deeds, still sitting in Petersburg on the school bench. I remember, though, that at these meetings the question of the significance of a university in the region and of the necessity of one for Siberia was heard for the first time. . . . Here in friendly conversations also developed the idea of the need to prepare for future activity in Siberia, of the need to study the country and to read works about it, and the idea of compiling a bibliography of Siberian books arose, whereupon Potanin took it on himself to direct this matter . . . Potanin also suggested putting out a calendar or notebook and recommended me as editor, to which I expressed a fervent readiness. We spoke of a future journal, of a newspaper — in short, questions increased. In the end, everyone was united in the conviction and faith that for our distant borderland a brilliant future lay ahead. 54

Despite its rather glowing, patriotic colors, the beginning of several distinct trends can be observed in this description: the demand for a regional university, the need study and know Siberia's past and present conditions,

---

53 Iadrintsev, "Studencheskiia vospominaniia," Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1884) no. 26; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 40.

54 Ibid., pp. 38-39.

and the concern for establishing a regional press. Attempts to realize and then improve upon all three of these needs became more or less constant features of the regionalist program throughout the years. Other constants were the insistence upon action toward fulfilling these objectives and an optimistic, fervent faith in Siberia's "golden age" ahead, which helped sustain the movement.

Under the influence of Kostomarov's and Shchapov's ideas, the initially buoyant spirit of the Siberian circle, and the general atmosphere of expectancy engendered by the coming Great Reforms, Yadrintsev recollected,

> We could not but be imbued with a more conscious relationship to the fate of our homeland. When everything was alive with social questions of Russian life and of the Russian people, . . . could we not think of our own forgotten land, to which we were tied by birth, by kinship, and by all our sympathies?! Here at this very time in our youthful compatriotic circle emerged the idea of serving our homeland and of returning home. Hitherto, the majority of those graduated from universities had not thought of returning and had chosen advantageous positions outside the homeland. Nothing drew them there, and they remembered with a shudder the ignorance of society and the absence of intellectual life. . . . We then understood what absenteeism was.
>
> Ardently and fervently we took oaths to return to the homeland, to serve it selflessly, and having graduated or not, we went back home not by accident, but fully consciously.

As for their vision of Siberia's future, Yadrintsev related that

> hearing passionate speeches on the people and on the duty of citizens' service, we could not but be carried away by thoughts of our homeland and become pensive about its future. In the present we imagined it as empty and poor, and in the future as rich and well-ordered, as going from ignorant to educated and strewn with schools; and instead unhappy and hearing only the clank of chains and the curses of exiles, we pictured it for ourselves

> as populated, free, cheerful, and jubilant; we called this country the "land of the future" . . . We dreamed of the happy future of a new virgin land, like America and Australia, and we enumerated its inexhaustible riches and pictured it in the future as a prominent world market, as the empress of Asia. Broad historical perspectives opened up to our mind's eye. [55]

Thus, Yadrintsev well portrayed the optimistic, ebullient, and imaginative mood and visions which enveloped him and, trusting his account, which circulated among members of the Siberian circle. It was as though this forgotten, backward, and slumbering half-continent would in time partake of or even surpass the glorious destiny that the German philosopher Herder had first predicted for the Slavs of Eastern Europe. [56] Siberians would cease being a "people without a history" (as Slovtsov had first recognized) and would rise to give world civilization their "inexhaustible riches," their homeland becoming happy, free, and the "empress of Asia."

Still, Yadrintsev did not end his recollections of this period on an entirely optimistic note. "This faith, this proud feeling of self-consciousness and conviction that we were members of a social group and children of a land with a history and a future, lifted up our spirit and often filled us with youthful rapture." Yet despite these dreams and hopes, some Siberians "simply forgot them, and others did not even wait for the realization of the most insignificant part of their youthful wishes." [57]

Potanin too expressed some of the plans of the Siberian circle,

---

55 Iadrintsev, "Studencheskiia vospominaniia," Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1884) no. 33; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 43-44.

56 Johann Gottfried Herder's proclamations of a great future for the rural and backward Slavs were expressed in Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte (1784), bk. 16, ch. 4. See Hans Kohn, Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology (2d ed.; New York: Vintage Books, 1960), pp. ix-x.

57 Iadrintsev, Sbornik izbrannykh statei (A Collection of Selected Articles); quoted in Iakushev, "Potanin," p. 22. Of this source, Iakushev indicates only that it was put out by the journal Sibirskie Zapiski.

though somewhat more soberly and broadly than in Yadrintsev's more effusive and detailed descriptions. Referring possibly to himself, Yadrintsev, and Shashkov, he wrote a half-century later:

> Two or three men tried to interest this happy company in a social task . . . they established as a duty that each one return to his homeland and dedicate his life to studying its needs, spreading progressive ideas in Siberia, and creating in it new conditions of life, as formulated by western science. Indeed, all this was done only in the area of conversations. The only attempt to cross over from conversations to deeds was in the plan to publish — as the start of publishing activity for Siberia — a special Siberian calendar, not an underground one, but a legal, politically loyal calendar. [58]

It is interesting to note here that for all his regional patriotism and his opposition to the "Pavlinov party," Potanin comes forth as an unqualified "westernizer" of Siberia, perhaps reflecting his earlier admiration for Peter the Great. As Yakushev correctly points out, Potanin's patriotism was the kind that "had nothing in common with the so-called 'kvas' patriotism of our 'hurrah-nationalists'." [59]

In his memoirs Potanin recalled more specifically other lines of thinking among the Siberians in Petersburg. First of all, they tended to regard Siberia as a colony of Russia, instead of just another Russian pro-

---

58 Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," pp. 272-73. The recent Soviet writer, Koval', portrays a more serious, intent mood: "Meetings of the circle . . . became regular. In them were discussed news of the day, books and journal articles, the most important events of university life, student agitations, and the progress of reform preparations. Practical measures were proposed: publication of a paper or journal. Perspectives in the development of Siberia were discussed." Underlying this description is the interpretation that not all Siberian regionalism was reactionary, but that the regionalists of the 1860's were part and parcel of the general revolutionary movement against the autocracy. See "Kharakhter obshchestvennogo dvizheniia," p. 35, 36.

59 I. A. Iakushev, "Potanin," p. 33.

vince.

> We then understood that the interests of Siberia were opposed to the interests of Moscow, but since we were socialists, we never arrived at the idea of customs line between Siberia and European Russia . . .[60]
>
> By the time of our departure from Petersburg, the main local Siberian questions had already been outlined: i.e. 1) exile to Siberia, 2) the economic yoke of Moscow on Siberia, and 3) the outflow of student youths from Siberia to the capital. We realized that three evils weighed upon Siberia: demoralization of its population — both among the upper and lower strata — which the exiled social dregs of European Russia brought into the country; subordination of Siberian economic interests to the interests of the Moscow manufacturing region; and the absence of a local intelligentsia capable of rising to the defense of the interests of its unfortunate homeland.[61]

The first objective, abolition of the exile system, was spurred especially by the abolition of serfdom in European Russia. Regionalists came to look upon exile as Siberia's own type of serfdom, in view of its destructive effects upon society. Just as the emancipation of serfs in February 1861 was the first in a series of "Great Reforms" in Russia, so the demand for the abolition of the exile system in Siberia became, if Potanin's testimony is correct, one of the first points raised by Siberian reformers. Hence, their initial reaction to the emancipation of serfs, a reform that barely affected Siberia at all then, was a strengthened desire to see an equivalent reform implemented in Siberia. Thus, the abolition of exile and the founding of a Siberian university were the two "equal treatment" demands that the regionalists consciously carried back to Siberia from St. Petersburg.

---

60 This is the only instance (fifty years ex post facto) I have come across in which regionalists were explicitly referred to as socialists (and by one of their own, no less).

61 Quoted in Popov, "Vospominaniia Potanina," p. 277.

The second problem, that of Siberia's economic subordination to the "Moscow manufacturing region," related especially to the extraction of valuable raw materials from Siberia, such as gold, silver, and copper. Not only private entrepreneurs and capitalists were active in this, as witnessed in the gold "rush" of the 1830's, but the state itself ran many of the mines and factories, such as those at Nerchinsk, Barnaul, and Kolyvan. Though Russian manufacturing was indeed more heavily concentrated in the Moscow area in the early 1860's, it was also substantial in Petersburg, the Urals, and scattered places elsewhere. Since Potanin did not explain the "interests of Moscow" in more detail, one may suspect that this was perhaps a generic term for the economic interests of European Russia or the "mother country" in general.[62] With the abolition of serfdom and the annexation of the Amur area, it was natural for Russian entrepreneurs wherever they be to eye Siberia with greater interest.[63]

The third issue raised, that of an absentee intelligentsia which rarely returned to Siberia, was also of great concern to Yadrintsev. It was then felt that the establishment of a university in Siberia would be the major step toward solving this problem. A university would at least serve to help keep students and an educated class within Siberia. Employment opportunities constituted a second step; schools, hospitals, law courts, and more open administrative positions would also help retain or attract back educated

---

62 Cf. the rather derogatory term used by Poles to describe Russians: "Moskali."

63 Writing of the late sixties and of the seventies, Koz'min notes that the "attention of entrepreneurs was turned on it /Siberia/ as on a country of inexhaustible natural riches and a supplier of various natural products and raw materials. Smart dealers who valued Siberia's significance as a raw material market began to petition energetically, first of all, for the creation of access to these natural riches and for the construction of routes for their export. From this arose the many plans for a Siberian railroad." "Zagoskin," pp. 218-19.

Siberians.

As Yakushev points out, Potanin and Yadrintsev both gave practical application to Shchapov's federalist and regionalist theories explaining the historical development of Russia. With this ideological base, the two formed a program of action which boiled down to serving Siberia's many-sided needs and interests — "spiritual and scientific, and social and material." According to Yakushev, Potanin and Yadrintsev

> looked upon the region as a detached unit, with its own distinctive physical, geographical, historical, ethnic, economic, juridical, and customary peculiarities in its development, which determined not only local material conditions of the region, but provided an energetic opposition to the centralist principle, that sought to bring the region to an auxiliary and subordinate position. [64]

Though Kostomarov and Shchapov admittedly influenced strongly the ideas and activities of the young regionalists, it also is apparent that their initial "program" was more spontaneous and open-ended in character than it was a definite plan of action, laboriously worked out point by point. Not only was their "going to the Siberian people" originally spurred by benevolent cultural and patriotic motives, but by financial ones as well. The fact was that many of the Siberian students, after several years in Petersburg, could no longer make ends meet. Moreover, the closure of the university also pushed many Siberians in a homeward direction. [65]

Because the memoirs of Yadrintsev and Potanin were written at least several decades after their student years in Petersburg and lacked the accuracy in detail and chronology that, say, a diary might possess, it is hard

---

64 Iakushev, "Potanin," p. 32.
65 Koz'min, "Zagoskin," pp. 205-06.

to determine precisely which goals and objectives the young Siberians, just setting out for their homeland, actually desired at that time and which ones were still to emerge in the future. It is fairly clear, however, that first and foremost in their minds was the idea of drumming up support for a Siberian university. Secondly, the available sources agree on the desire to establish a regional press devoted to Siberia. These two objectives were quite natural, as literary activity and a university education were among the primary concerns of these students. A third goal, the careful study of Siberia in all different aspects, was also advocated by both Potanin and Yadrintsev. Moreover, Potanin and Shashkov, at least, had begun to put this into practice both before and after their arrival in Petersburg by means of their publication of articles on Siberia.

While the demand for the abolition of exile began to stir the minds of Siberians in the early sixties, as Potanin and Yadrintsev indicate in their memoirs, it was not until the late sixties and the seventies, when many regionalist leaders experienced confinement and exile themselves, that they really brought this question to the fore. As for the economic subordination of Siberia to European Russia, this question does not seem to have been formulated much more precisely in the 1860's than it had been in the 1830's and 1840's, when the issue was first raised by thinking Siberians.

In many ways, however, the body of specific aims conceived in Petersburg was less important than the underlying intention and motivation to serve Siberia's best interests. The young regionalists, going into the field, met and tackled the problems and tasks as they presented themselves. What determined their success, and their eventual undoing, was not the

absence or presence of a particular objective, but the tireless, pragmatic energy that some of them devoted to awakening Siberia and the feelings of regional patriotism and concern that they sought to arouse. In their own view Siberian patriotism was not an anti-Russian particularism or separatism, but for the most part a regional patriotism quite compatible with a broader Russian patriotism. Their Siberian circle in Petersburg had been no more than an innocent, fully legal group, and their mission in Siberia was aimed at benefiting not only their regional homeland, but through this all of Russia in the long run. Initially, however, they tended to overlook the fact that the ideas they set in motion might be taken to extremes by some of their sympathizers. Moreover, in their optimism, they were unaware that others, especially in the Siberian administration, might lump all their regional, patriotic sentiments and activities together as a definite threat that undermined the integrity of the established Russian state.

* * *

Regionalist Activity in Siberia (1863-65)

Because of student disorders, the University of St. Petersburg was closed on December 20, 1861, and most of its departments were not reopened until mid-1863. Meanwhile in London, Herzen and Ogaryov saw that in the wake of unsuccessful attempts to organize student strikes and demonstrations the need was now for students to "go to the people." On January 15, 1862, in an article in the Bell, entitled "The Universities Are Closing," Ogaryov proclaimed:

> Let them close. . . . this will not make genuine and free learning perish.
> University youths will scatter throughout the pro-

> vinces. Anyone worth anything will carry learning with him wherever he goes. . . .
>
> We need traveling teachers. The apostles of learning, like apostles of religion, cannot stay put, shutting themselves up in chapels built expressly for them. Their cause is called preaching, and their place is everywhere. . . .
>
> Don't go to the universities, let them close. University youths spread throughout Russia will act as a unifying bridge between social classes. . . . to be free you must go to the people. [66]

Ogaryov's admonition was to serve as an initial call of the populist movement, a summons to students and intellectuals who subsequently sought to spread their radical, and usually socialist, ideas to the people and to cement a bond with them against the established order. Though the movement did not reach its zenith until the early 1870's in European Russia, attempts to reach the people were also made, on a smaller scale, among various Russian revolutionary groups of the early 1860's (such as "Land and Liberty" and "Young Russia").

The spirit of Ogaryov's appeal was shared by Siberian regionalists in the early sixties. But they did not especially owe to Ogaryov the idea of spreading "enlightenment" and learning among the people from whose midst they had come. Indeed, in their known writings the regionalists acknowledged neither Ogaryov's call or that of any other Russian as instigating their return home to Siberia after the University of St. Petersburg was closed. The guiding idea for them, of course, was largely that of "service to the homeland," which at base was more specifically regionalist and patriotic than populist — in the sense of reaching the peasant masses. As

---

66 N. Ogarëv, "Universitety zakryvaiutsia," Kolokol, (January 15, 1862); reprint: (1962) pt. 4, p. 1002.

Yadrintsev pointed out, the regionalists directed themselves more toward the larger provincial towns than the peasant villages in the countryside.

> The Russian intelligentsia, aiming toward the people, understood by provincial activity only activity in the countryside for the peasant. This made the activity and the very idea of a regional movement too narrow. We meant to crystallize and arouse intellectual life in the provinces. In the capital and in its press there was a very unfavorable soil for raising the question of the provinces. . . . No one had thought of grouping and rallying the provincial intelligentsia. The course of "populism" in its general, diffuse, and vague form was dominated by a current from the capital. But what was populism without the participation of higher spiritual and civic life in the provinces? [67]

Though Siberian regionalism was shaped in many ways by ideological currents in Petersburg during the early sixties, it was engendered (as was populism) by a feeling of alienation from provincial or regional life, but rather by a feeling of strong attachment to and belonging to a specific region. Thus, Russian populism was directed from an urban, central base toward the scattered peasant masses in the countryside, while regionalism arose from the borderlands via the capital and was primarily, though not exclusively, directed toward the urban provincial intelligentsia. Hence, it was natural that the regionalists returning from the university — Potanin, Yadrintsev, Shchukin, and others — initiated their activities in the larger Siberian towns.

Yadrintsev, speaking for himself and his comrades who returned home from Petersburg, later summed up the prevalent mood and sentiment among them at the time. Indeed, his description bears resemblances to Ogaryov's appeal to the "apostles of learning."

---

67 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," pp. 165-66.

> We all came to Siberia in a sort of rapturous condition as exalted proselytes of a new idea which drove us on. We could talk ardently and fervently about Siberia, its renewal, and future tasks for whole hours. There was no end to arguments, dreams, and elaboration of details. A vivid imagination carried us over into the distant future. We imagined everything in a rose color. We crowned and adorned our homeland as a bride, with all the finery and all the flowers of our souls. When we appeared in Siberian society, we found a need to express ourselves, to transmit and to bring our ideas to life, and to arouse and force this society to live. Moreover, we sought to make it tremble and blaze up by the same fire that seethed in us. Everywhere we tirelessly propagandized the renovation of Siberia, and, not satisfied with discussion circles, we sought occasions to speak publicly, to give lectures, and to kindle hearts. [68]

Nikolai S. Shchukin can probably be regarded as the first influential man of his generation to return from the university to promote the cultural and educational awakening of Siberian society. Coming to Tomsk in 1859, he established a school and organized a literary circle for the younger generation (for the most part, only a few years his junior). As seen above, he greatly affected the decisions of Yadrintsev and Naumov to go to the university; there is also reason to believe that he exerted some influence on the young N. N. Dolgushin, a subsequent Siberian revolutionary, then living in Tomsk. [69] Shchukin later moved to Irkutsk, where he took up work along the same lines until his arrest in 1865 in connection with the Siberian independence affair.

In Irkutsk Shchukin also made an unsuccessful effort to establish a new journal, to be called "Sibiryak," as he noted that public interest in

---

68 From Iadrintsev's manuscript biographical sketch of Shashkov; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 50; and in Dubrovskii, "Slavnyi syn Sibiri (N. M. Iadrintsev)" (Siberia's Famous Son: N. M. Yadrintsev), Rozhdennye v stranie izgnaniia, p. 111.

69 See Koval', "Kharakhter obshchestvennogo dvizheniia," p. 40. For more details on Dolgushin, see below, pp. 414-15.

the Irkutsk Provincial Gazette and the Amur was beginning to flag.[70] It appears that Shchukin wanted to make the "Sibiryak" a purely literary organ, for Potanin wrote him in 1862 from Petersburg, refusing to contribute to such a journal. Potanin asked, "Why do you leave 'politics,' the administration of the region, polemics, scandals, and exposés to the metropolitan journals?" Instead, he recommended "striking for local interests . . . , the interests of the people and not the interests of literature"; he added, "now is the time for proclamations, and you dream of some sort of novels."[71] Shchukin, however, did manage to put into print at this time an anthology entitled Siberian Stories, which included works of his own, of Fyodorov-Omulevsky, and of the Polish exile, Ordyński.

After Shchukin's departure from Petersburg in 1859, Potanin was the next of the important activists (and the first avowed regionalist) to leave for Siberia, setting out for Omsk in the summer of 1862. Potanin's primary motivation, though, was somewhat different from promoting a cultural and social awakening, which Yadrintsev tended to attribute to the returning students. As Potanin put it,

> In the course of university life I wavered between becoming a naturalist and a publicist, but I left Petersburg for Siberia as a naturalist and traveler.

After reading Baron von Humboldt's writings on Central Asia, Potanin became infused with a passion to explore two specific phenomena: a mountain that was possibly a volcano in the Tien Shan range, and Lake Kuku-Nor, in north-

---

70 Ibid., p. 39, 47; and Kropotkin, Dnevnik, pp. 46-47. Kropotkin thought Shchukin to be an "empty man" and a general "laughingstock" in Irkutsk.

71 Undated correspondence of Potanin to N. S. Shchukin, in the State Archives of Omsk Okrug; quoted in Koval', "Kharakhter obshchestvennogo dvizheniia," pp. 39-40. Potanin appears to have learned his lesson well from Durov; see above, p. 142.

west China.

> My political friends, among them L. F. Panteleev, distracted me from my passion for Central Asia. Having this mountain in mind, Panteleev laughingly said to me, "What would some bump in Central Asia give you? Leave it in peace." But circumstances favored Asia and not my friends. I was compelled to leave the capital and go to Siberia; but I did not have the means to depart. I do not know hom I would have gotten out of the capital if P. P. Semyonov had not suggested my taking part in K. V. Struve's expedition. I accepted this proposal. [72]

Thus, Potanin arrived in Omsk in the fall of 1862, where he joined up with the Struve expedition. As it was not scheduled to leave for the Altai mountains until the following spring, though, Potanin in the meantime engaged in political activity among local Cossacks, helping organize the elections of Cossack deputies to their assembly, which was to discuss a new statute proposed for the Cossack army. The statute had been drawn up by a committee appointed by Governor-General in Omsk, and it was opposed by many of the more democratic-minded Cossack activists, among them Potanin, Fyodor Usov (stationed in St. Petersburg), and A. P. Nesterov. Those who favored altering the proposal gained the sympathy of the Cossack Chief-of-Staff, Gulkevich, and a revised, more democratic statute, drawn up by a committee of forty elected Cossacks, was accepted and sent off to Petersburg. Potanin gained much popularity among the rank-and-file Cossacks in this chief contribution of his toward "serving the homeland" during the winter of 1862-63. [73]

In 1863 and 1864, as part of the Struve expedition, Potanin made two trips to Lake Zaisan, and after the second he helped defend the fishing

---

72 From Potanin's memoirs, as quoted in Dubrovskii, "Veteran sibirskoi obshchestvennosti"(G. N. Potanin)" (The Veteran of Siberian Public Opinion: G. N. Potanin), Rozhdennye v stranie izgnaniia, pp. 247-48.

73 Obruchev, Potanin, p. 53.

rights there of the local Koktebinsk Cossacks against encroachments permitted by the Cossack high command. On his way back to Omsk, Potanin gave a speech in Semipalatinsk in June 1864, entitled "On a University," and received a surprisingly good response. By this time Potanin the publicist and social activist was gaining predominance over Potanin the explorer and natural scientist. Soon after returning to Omsk, he left for Tomsk, which offered much greater opportunity for writing than did Omsk. Omsk not only had no newspaper then, but was also still "more like a military camp than a town at that time." [74]

In Tomsk Potanin found himself a job as secretary of the Tomsk provincial statistical committee. Here he became involved in the procedures for emancipating the peasants attached to the Altai factories and in various proposals put forth for improving the life of native peoples in the area. From this work Potanin was able to write up several articles on the geographical distribution of indigenous peoples in Tomsk province, which he sent to the Geographical Society in Petersburg. Potanin also renewed his interest and connections with the Tomsk Provincial Gazette, to which he had contributed in 1858. During the winter of 1864-65 a vacancy teaching position in natural history in the two local high schools became open. After an offer, Potanin accepted the job and subsequently kept busy with preparations and classroom teaching.

Soon after his arrival in Tomsk, Potanin came to occupy a prominent position in the local circle of young people. Generally receptive to ideas of Siberian patriotism, this group on occasion discussed the idea of Siberia's separation from Russia. This circle also contemplated founding a

---

74 Ibid., p. 71.

journal dedicated to cultivating a love of Siberia. Obviously practical considerations made these ideas rather impossible to realize, and the most down-to-earth activity to result from all this was the group's collecting money to aid Siberian students in Petersburg and Moscow. Even here they ran into problems, for Siberian students in the capitals asked if money should be given to all students from Siberia or only to those who promised to return to Siberia and work for its betterment. The Petersburg Siberian colony, in fact, split over this issue, and those who wished to return home became called "separatists!"[75] Some of the members in this Tomsk circle were avid followers of Herzen and were receptive to such underground Russian pamphlets as "To the Young Generation" (put out in 1861). Discussions of Siberia's possible separation, a Siberian journal and a regional university, the emancipation of serfs, and Siberia's overall relationship to Russia did not help soothe suspicions among many local residents and officials.[76]

As just indicated, members of the Tomsk circle kept in touch with their compatriots in St. Petersburg. Potanin himself corresponded frequently at this time with A. D. Shaitanov, a cornet in the Cossack army, who in early 1864 went to the University of St. Petersburg. Shaitanov, it appears, helped obtain books requested by Potanin and his friends, sending them to Tomsk via returning students. Potanin also kept in contact with returned students elsewhere in Siberia. For example, to Nikolai Shchukin, a kind of cultural activist, Potanin wrote in 1864: "We have a common cause, so let us exploit one another for its sake; I need to know in what condition it is, how it is propagandized, and how popular it is in Irkutsk; I think it

---

75 Obruchev, Potanin, pp. 74-75. For further discussion of the Petersburg "separatists," see below, p. 339.

76 Koval', "Kharakhter obshchestvennogo dvizheniia," p. 46. On Yadrintsev's brief ecnounters with this circle in 1863, see below, p. 304.

is of interest to you to know how it is progressing in Western Siberia." [77]

Though the Tomsk Provincial Gazette since its inception in 1857 had printed valuable literary and scholarly articles on occasion, it was still in many respects viewed as the mouthpiece of local administrative authorities. Potanin was anxious to steer it toward becoming a significant outlet for local public opinion. By taking over the unofficial part of the newspaper, which until then was chiefly literary in content, Potanin sought to arouse local society to a greater awareness of Siberia's needs and better interests. Soon after attaching himself to the paper, he invited Yadrintsev, then in Omsk, to join him in his journalistic activities in Tomsk.

Yadrintsev had since left St. Petersburg in the fall of 1863 for Tomsk, where his sister then lived. The situation in his hometown had evidently changed much in three years, for he wrote Potanin (then on an expedition) that a public library had been opened, public lectures were now given, and a reinvigorated social life was emerging. This trend he attributed to high-school teachers, and among them, especially, D. L. Kuznetsov, a graduate of the Kazan Ecclesiastical Academy. Besides teaching, Kuznetsov opened Tomsk's first public library, and in 1864 became editor of the Tomsk Provincial Gazette.

While visiting Kuznetsov's library, Yadrintsev by chance encountered A. P. Pichugin, a long-time resident of Tomsk, who had given up business and now devoted himself to study. His contributions to local intellectual life were perhaps as beneficial as Kuznetsov's. Of Pichugin Yadrintsev later recalled:

---

77 Letter of Potanin to N. S. Shchukin, dated June 30, 1864, at Semipalatinsk, in State Archives of Omsk Okrug; quoted in Koval', "Kharakhter obshchestvennogo dvizheniia," p. 47.

> Many were brought up under his influence and preserved a moral purity till death. When I got to know him, those who loved to go through those same questions, who sought to know, think, and learn, all clustered around him. Young people at thist time were longing to go to the university. I agreed with Pichugin to help them acquire knowledge by every means. [78]

Pichugin's circle of seminarists and high-school students was later joined by Potanin, when he arrived in Tomsk in 1864. Though Yadrintsev did not stay long in Tomsk, he managed to visit Pichugin's circle several times and actually did help direct some of the youths to the university. [79]

Later in 1863 Yadrintsev proceeded to Omsk, where Potanin had then returned after his first trip to Lake Zaisan. In Omsk Yadrintsev roomed and boarded at the home of the gendarme colonel Rykachov, whose son he tutored for about a year. In December 1863 at a "literary" gathering in the "Omsk Club," arranged on behalf of benifiting a school for Cossack children, he delivered a rousing speech in which he advocated a Siberian university. This oration characterizes rather well the form and content of Yadrintsev's thought and expectations at age 21. In recalling the past three-hundred years of Siberian history, he declared:

> We stand on the border of a new period, and our new young social and civic life, just beginning to form, raises many demands, among which one of the most important is the need for a more complete education of the people and the development of their spiritual capabilities. This need is apparent in the idea of creating a Siberian university.
>
> It is well known that a Siberian university has long been the most cherished dream and the most beloved ideal of Siberian patriots. . . . Despite this, . . . until now it has remained only a thought,

---

78 Iadrintsev, in Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1887) no. 17; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 51.

79 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," p. 153.

> without any serious attempts toward bringing it to fulfillment. Till now it has been considered a proposal for the future, and a very distant future . . .

Yadrintsev went on to discuss the need for Siberian youths to go to European Russia, despite the miserable existence they might face while gaining a higher education. And he stressed their frequent disillusionment on returning home. He then inveighed against the evils of intellectual absenteeism. Mentioning Shchapov, Mendeleev, and others then in Russia by name, Yadrintsev lamented that in Siberia

> our society, singling out talented personalities, gets nothing from them that benefits our country. Educated in various universities and detaching themselves, they are not impregnated with a general spirit of love for their homeland, do not form any original ideas in the interest of their country, and remain cosmopolitans, foreign to their land and alien to their own people. [80]

In the eyes of this young patriot this was tantamount to betrayal of their country. But in his mind they personally were not so much at fault as was the absence of a Siberian university.

Intellectual absenteeism was not the only problem at hand. Society itself had to be revitalized.

> The minority, which one by one returns to us, has in its small numbers not brought new elements into society up to now, but has merged into the old routine of the masses and has decayed fruitlessly in the same milieu of apathy and quietism. With all this, it is not strange that we have lacked spiritual life and intellectual interests. Siberia cannot be satisfied with transient educated people from Russia. . . . we need not only educated officials, but educated people as well . . .

He then turned to Siberia's potential and untapped resources:

---

80 Iadrintsev, "Po povodu sibirskago universiteta" (Apropos of a Siberian University), Tomskiia Gubernskiia Viedomosti, (1864) no. 5; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 52-53.

> Any reform is unthinkable in the region if there are no educated men there promoting it. . . . All the treasures of our land bring us no benefit, because either we are not aware of them or we cannot exploit them. Who knows how many riches we shall find in our land? We need agricultural economists for creating a more rational agriculture now, we need mineralogists and geologists to discover mineral riches, we need technologists to create a proper factory industry, and we need geographers, statisticians, zoologists, and botanists. . . . Without intellectual development neither political nor economic prosperity will be accessible for a country, especially a young one like Siberia, because knowledge has been the greatest force in all human history. . . . All this proves that we need a university; it is necessary as soon as possible and is necessary now, right this minute . . .

Thus for young Yadrintsev, a university at best was a panacea for the future development of an historically "young" country like Siberia. He asked what had held back the idea of a university and answered that the main reason had been "the lack of means and of capital. But the means are in the hands of society itself. Its duty is to looke after the means and to create them . . ." He then proposed the formation of an organization to facilitate collecting funds, a "Society for the Establishment of a Siberian University." His strong pitch for support of a university was tied in with his grand view of Siberia's destiny, toward which society would at the same time contributing. Yadrintsev declared that "Siberia is fated to a role of creating a civilization which will serve as a last link, connecting the educated peoples of the temperate belt of the northern hemisphere. A Siberian university will be the embryo of this civilization." Here, reminiscent of Herzen's vision of a new civilization centered around the North Pacific, Yadrintsev linked Siberia's ultimate future with North American civilization.[81]

---

81 Ibid., pp. 53-55.

Apropos of all this, Potanin once remarked that this was "the first public speech on the need to open a Siberian university, and the speech, given the composition of Omsk society at the time, resounded like dissonance." [82] Yadrintsev's talk, however, made some impact, for donations for the university cause began to come in, especially after the speech was printed in the Tomsk Provincial Gazette in early 1864.

In his autobiography Yadrintsev does not say much of his activity in Omsk in 1864. He relates only the following:

> In 1864 I arranged a literary soirée, where I gave a talk "On the Social Life of Siberian Towns," pointing to the apathy and immobility of life, etc. Back from Petersburg, I lived in Omsk in feverish activity, founded a circle and influenced youth. Many from the cadet school and from among Cossack officers then went on to the university. [83]

Yadrintsev's talk on urban social life, delivered on November 11, 1864, contained much content similar to his earlier speech. He appealed to society to help students obtain an education, and he defended students from their detractors. Moreover, he denounced social evils perpetrated by rapacious merchants and officials. He concluded by entrusting the fate of Siberia to "this young educated generation," giving it his blessing. According to one source, the immediate response of the audience was enthusiastic: "Twenty cadets present at the soirée went into a terrible ecstasy, the public poured out applause, and about thirty Poles demonstrated like true Siberians." [84] However, reaction soon set in, for Yadrintsev wrote to Potanin

---

82 Potanin, "Goroda Sibiri," p. 251.
83 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," p. 153.
84 From an unnamed document in the State Archives of Omsk Okrug; quoted in Koval', "Kharakhter obshchestvennogo dvizheniia," p. 48. This speech was later printed as "Obshchestvennaia zhizn' v Sibiri," Tomskiia Gubernskiia Viedomosti, (1865) no. 5.

two weeks later, "one half of Omsk stigmatizes me to death, while the other fights for me at every street corner." [85]

It was about this time that Potanin called on Yadrintsev to join the staff of the Tomsk Provincial Gazette permanently, feeling that in this way the latter would have a better chance to express himself in print. Yadrintsev recalled,

> At first I reacted with prejudice toward this proposal; it seemed to me that in an official paper there would hardly be a place for expressing our wishes. I had always imagined the unofficial part of the Gazette as the governor's antechamber, where obsequious officials wrote literature. But my hopeless situation finally forced me to agree to Potanin's proposal, and upon arrival in Tomsk I began a number of articles. [86]

Penniless on his return to Tomsk, Yadrintsev roomed at his sister's house and took on several tutoring jobs. He soon devoted much of his spare time to the interests of the provincial paper. From now on he began the "second phase" of his service to Siberia: his strictly journalistic endeavors. Indeed, these were soon to have wide repercussions. However, before his important articles of 1865 were printed, other returned students elsewhere in Siberia had been active, some promoting regionalist causes, others engaged in more personal activities.

Of the remaining returned students, Shashkov made by far the greatest contributions to the regionalist movement in Siberia, chiefly by means of his brilliant lectures in Krasnoyarsk and in Tomsk. Shashkov had left St. Petersburg in autumn of 1863 and headed for Krasnoyarsk, where he opened a

---

85 Letter to G. N. Potanin, dated November 23, 1864, at Omsk, in the State Archives of Omsk Okrug; quoted in Koval', "Kharakhter obshchestvennogo dvizheniia," p. 48.

86 From Iadrintsev's unpublished manuscript autobiography; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 56-57.

private school, which lasted about a year. During this time he corresponded frequently with Yadrintsev in Omsk. A subsequent biographical sketch of Shashkov, written by Yadrintsev, reveals both his intentions and his abilities at this time.

> We created a plan of publishing anthologies, calendars, and newspapers at this time. And indeed, Shashkov in Krasnoyarsk began to edit a notebook and was busy compiling lectures on general history. I saw these lectures, which were never published, but which showed the author's remarkable erudition and the tendency of Buckle's /positivist/ school. At the same time he took part in literary soirées, where he read extracts from Shchedrin's best satires. Skilfully grouping Shchedrin's satirical types — despite his attempts to collect in them all the comic traits of Zamyatin, the Krasnoyarsk governor then, and his concentrating all the bile of accusations here — the public was delighted, ovations were given to Shashkov, and they were so great and the burst of general animation and approval so strong that even the accused was carried along into the torrent, not understanding that it was all about him, and he warmly thanked the lecturer. Thereafter, Shashkov read a number of lectures on the history of Siberia. [87]

Besides preparing lectures and speaking at public soirées, Shashkov had several articles on Siberia published in Petersburg periodicals in 1863 and 1864. [88] He was also quite involved in teaching too. Not only did he open the above-mentioned private school (later closed by local authorities on grounds of being a hotbed of suspicious ideas), but he also taught in one of the local girls' schools for a while. After his own school was discontinued, Shashkov devoted his time primarily to his lectures on Siberian history, which he presented to the Krasnoyarsk public in late 1864. The

---

87 From Iadrintsev's unpublished manuscript biography of Shashkov; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 55-56; and in Dubrovskii, "Istorik i drug zhenshchiny (S. S. Shashkov)" (A Historian and Friend of Women: S. S. Shashkov), Rozhdennye v stranie izgnaniia, p. 160. The early works of M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin (1826-89) were primarily humorous satires of pre-reform provincial officials.

88 For details, see D. D. Iazykov, "Russkie pisateli, umershie v 1882 godu" (Russian Writers Who Died in 1882), Istoricheskii Viestnik, (1882) 22: 54

public reception to these lectures and the circumstances involved in Shashkov's willingness to present them in Tomsk have been described by Potanin in his memoirs:

> I learned from the Yeniseisk Provincial Gazette that Shashkov had given some public lectures in Krasnoyarsk on the history of Siberia which excited the Krasnoyarsk public. One old Krasnoyarsk official had burst out with an article against Shashkov, and the latter had answered him with his sharp pen.
>
> Having read this squabble, Yadrintsev and I decided to invite Shashkov to come to Tomsk to present the same lectures here. I wrote a letter to Shashkov and received his agreement, along with a request to get permission for the lectures from the Tomsk governor. Permission was obtained, and in a little while Shashkov arrived in Tomsk and stayed with me. He gave five lectures in the hall of the notables' assembly. The lectures were a great success; it seems the first lecture made such an impression that the whole town began to talk about the lecturer. Setting off for the lecture, there was no need to tell the cabman what street and building to go to. They simply said: "Cabby, to the lecture!" When the lecturer mounted the platform, the public greeted each of his entrances with applause. The lecture in which Shashkov described the morals of old Siberian officialdom, its arbitrariness, bribery, embezzlement, and mockery of the law agitated the officials in Tomsk. The officials said that this was libel and fiction, and if it was, then it was impossible to permit this to be told and written about. It seemed to the officials that this was a call to revolt; they became aroused and arranged to put an end to the scandal. The protesting officials took refuge in the home of Artashev, a gold entrepreneur.
>
> They decided to bring their indignation toward the lectures to the governor's attention and to ask him to discontinue them. We greatly feared that the governor would not permit the last lecture, but it was permitted. [89]

Yadrintsev also recollected Shashkov's lecture series in Tomsk, though he tended to emphasize its content and effect on the general public.

---

89 Potanin's memoirs, as quoted by Dubrovskii, "Veteran sibirskoi obshchestvennosti," pp. 161-62.

> We rented a hall for him in the Tomsk public assembly; the tickets quickly sold out. The hall was filled with youths and seminarists, thirsting to hear Shashkov. The lectures were exdellent. After historical sketches, he turned to the status of society and its needs: he spoke of the emancipation of the people, whose servitude had determined a bitter fate in past history, mentioning the life of the ignorant country and its lack of conscious life; then he passed on to proofs of the need for a university and spoke of Siberia's future. At this time he was full of animation and turned into an impassioned orator. His lectures made a tremendous impression and were interrupted by bursts of applause; the public lived with the lecturer. The end of the lectures was drowned by a full thunder of approval. We, of course, were also under the speel of these lectures and rejoiced as comrades, but since he was a like-minded person and represented our ideas, this was also our triumph, and a very happy one. [90]

Indeed, Yadrintsev wrote "fervent letters about these lectures" to his friends in Omsk and Irkutsk. [91]

Potanin, Yadrintsev, and Yevgeny Kolosov, a Cossack officer who had a private school in Tomsk, decided to turn Shashkov's last lecture into a demonstration in support of a Siberian university. According to Popov, these three men gathered a group of seminarists together before the last lecture. Together they prearranged a demonstration to take place after Shashkov's uttering the words: "We Siberians need a university." When, in fact, Shashkov said this, Potanin and Kolosov stepped forth and repeated loudly, "We need a university." Thentthe seminarists, scattered throughout the auditorium, picked up the cry, and after them the whole hall began to resound with shouts of "We need a university." [92] Shashkov's last lecture finally ended with a reference to Shchapov's remarks on the Novgorod

---

90 From Iadrintsev's manuscript biography of Shashkov; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 61.
91 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," p. 154.
92 I. I. Popov, "K 80-ti lietiiu," pp. 292-93.

veche (public assembly), which was then applied to the contemporary situation: a veche and a zemskii sobor (national assembly) were now needed in Siberia and in all Russia, respectively.[93]

The demonstration had succeeded well, Tomsk society was "shaken" as never before, and Shashkov left for Krasnoyarsk as a kind of hero. No efforts were made at this time on the part of local authorities to investigate the demonstrations. Yet the strong emotions aroused — both for and against the new and critical ideas which Shashkov expounded — did not augur well for the future, especially when slogans and ideas much less innocent than that of a mere Siberian university came to be circulated.

Among returned students, not only Shchukin, Potanin, Yadrintsev, and Shashkov were active, though these four were the most involved in cultural, educational, and journalistic endeavors — and the last three most active with respect to the "burning questions" of the day. Among the others, Yadrintsev's former schoolmate, Nikolai I. Naumov, forinstance, returned to Siberia from Petersburg in 1864 to take a position of land assessor in Tobolsk province. Though he did not engage in the same "regionalistic" type of activity as Potanin, Yadrintsev, and Shashkov did, his stay in Western Siberia was not without important results. During nine years of service in the Tobolsk and Omsk areas Naumov came into close contact with the peasantry, and his varied observations on the life of the Siberian peasants were well reflected in his "populist" stories of the 1870's and 1880's. Another returned student, N. V. Usharov, also concerned himself with the peasantry, though in the Irkutsk area, and in 1864 he published his findings on their living conditions in the Proceedings of the Geographical Society's Siberian

---

93 Obruchev, Potanin, p. 73.

Section.[94]

Potanin's friend, Fyodor N. Usov, a Cossack officer who had audited lectures at the Petersburg military academy, became quite active in Omsk on his return homeiin 1863. Here he continued the work of attempting to reform the Cossack army. Usov appears to have been Potanin's main contact in Omsk, while the latter was off on expeditions. In June 1863 Usov wrote Potanin of the progress that a new library in Omsk was making; over one hundred rubles had already been collected from Cossack soldiers and sent to St. Petersburg to purchase books. The group which had initially promoted was now working to spread education among Cossack soldiers and had opened a private schooll Usov was also instrumental in opening Sunday adult schools in Ust-Kamenogorsk, Vernyi, and other Cossack posts.[95] He was also able to acquire a lithograph press, but had little time to do much with it before the events of May 1865.

The poet-novelist Innokenty V. Fyodorov-Omulevsky had returned to Irkutsk in 1862 at the insistence of his father, then living there.[96] Here his most significant activities seem to have been literary. In 1862 he had published in the Amur a story concerning his travel impressions and several short articles. One of his more well-known tales, "The Siberian Girl," appeared in Shchukin's anthology, Siberian Stories. Omulevsky (his pen name) remained in Irkutsk until 1865, at which time the St. Petersburg literary world beckoned and lured him back. Needless to say, Omulevsky had not returned to Irkutsk entirely of his own volition or with the specific idea of

---

94 N. V. Usharov, "Iz putevykh zapisok po vostochnoi Sibiri" (From a Travelogue through Eastern Siberia), Zapiski sibirskago otdiela russkago imperatorskago obshchestva, (1864) bk. 8, pp. 207-44.

95 Letter to G. N. Potanin, dated June 25, 1863, at Omsk, in State Archives of Omsk Okrug; quoted in Koval', "Kharakhter obshchestvennogo dvizheniia," pp. 44-45.

96 For a very brief discussion of his earlier life, see above, p. 91.

serving Siberia; at best, his ties with the more patriotic regionalists had been and would remain somewhat tenuous. Nevertheless, many of the impressions from his return home served him well as material for his famous novel about Siberia, Step after Step, published in 1870.

Also returning to Irkutsk about this time was Afanasy Shchapov, though his return home was completely involuntary. In 1864 he was banished from Petersburg and sent to Irkutsk on several counts. He had been "denounced" for his relationship to Alexander Herzen, who had favored the Polish Insurrection of 1863 and was suspected of subversive ties with Russian Old Believers. Moreover, Shchapov's frank and forthright opinions on vital questions of the day and a scathing article of his indicting the Russian gentry (which failed to pass censorship) induced authorities to declare him a persona non grata in St. Petersburg. Sent directly to his home village of Anga, he was soon able to move to Irkutsk, where for the most part he resided until his death in 1876. Shchapov's years of Siberian exile had a pronounced negative effect on his work and life. Though he produced some significant scholarly works, he turned increasingly to alcohol. Though drawn into the Siberian independence affair with the other regionalists, he had few, if any, connections with Shchukin's circle in Irkutsk and was completely removed from any conscious service to the homeland. Indeed, he had the dubious distinction of being the only regionalist exiled to his home region.

Of the members of the Siberian circle in St. Petersburg in the early 1860's, at least a good number of them returned to Siberia between 1862 and 1864. Of the more prominent figures, almost all returned during this time (with the exception of Ivan Khudyakov). The reasons for their return,

Yadrintsev's testimony notwithstanding, were often other than patriotic; motives were financial, parental, academic, or simply due to local attachment or connections. Patriotic and humanitarian feelings of a duty to uplift and awaken Siberian society influenced Yadrintsev and Shashkov most of all, Potanin in part, and Usov, Shchukin, and D. L. Kuznetsov to an extent rather difficult to determine. For the writers Naumov and Omulevsky, return home was a necessity, yet their works, both then and subsequently, were affected by local and regional color. Among Siberian natives studying in Petersburg, the Kazakh Valikhanov returned to Omsk and the Buryat Pirozhkov went back to Irkutsk. Valikhanov was preoccupied with anthropological research and writing until his death in 1866.

The returned students did not always come back to their home towns. Tomsk, Irkutsk, Omsk, and Krasnoyarsk were the chief beneficiaries of what these students had to offer in the period 1863-65. It became apparent, moreover, that Irkutsk, which had been the cultural and intellectual pacesetter during the Muravyov era, no longer had the field to itself. The older generation of Siberian intellectual leaders that were active during the Muravyov administration (Vagin, Zagoskin, Shestunov, and the transplanted Milyutin) continued to work in Irkutsk, though less successfully under Governor-General Korsakov. By the mid-1860's it was in Tomsk that the new directions of Siberian self-awareness, patriotism, and regionalism were spread most intensively (though briefly). The forthright declarations of Siberia's unique problems, immediate needs, and best interests were well enunciated in Yadrintsev's speeches in Omsk and in Shashkov's in Krasnoyarsk and Tomsk. But with the publication of these ideas in the Tomsk Provincial Gazette, Potanin and Yadrintsev went on to establish, if not their own regionalist journal, at least a section of a newspaper devoted to spreading

their ideas and developing them within limits.

Yadrintsev has briefly indicated how the unofficial section of the Tomsk Gazette came to be a mouthpiece for demands and a sounding board for discussion among Siberian regionalists.

> We dreamed of publishing a newspaper, an anthology, and notebooks. We wanted to propagandize the need to establish a university. Potanin accepted my participation for the time being in the Provincial Gazette in Tomsk. . . . /For my first article/ I took from Herzen the motto "Vive la mort, let us build the future." We worked in the unofficial part of the Tomsk Provincial Gazette about a half year and tried to make this part literary. These were the first steps toward clarifying local problems; my publicistic essays, "Siberia under the Judgment of Russian Literature" . . . , "The Native Question," etc., date back to this time. [97]

Judging by the nature of Yadrintsev's articles, one can suppose that by trying to make the unofficial section of the Gazette "literary," Yadrintsev intended to attract serious literature on contemporary issues and problems, instead of literature written by "obsequious officials." This intention was also in keeping with Potanin's earlier injunctives against the purely literary journal that Shchukin had proposed.

The editor of the Tomsk Provincial Gazette since 1864 was D. L. Kuznetsov, a returned student from Kazan. Under his editorship articles were printed on such socially relevant subjects as the new statute on gold mines, public libraries, zemstvo institutions, girls' high schools, the education of natives, and Zavalishin's criticisms. [98] Also printed were two of Yadrintsev's speeches given in Omsk (on a Siberian university and on Siberian social life). Though Kuznetsov, Potanin, Usov, Shchukin, Kolosov, and

---

97 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," pp. 153-54.
98 Koval', "Kharakhter obshchestvennogo dvizheniia," p. 48.

others contributed articles to the unofficial section, Yadrintsev's were the ones to make the greatest impression on local society. Some of them were in fact used as evidence against him in the later trial of the "separatists" in the Siberian independence affair. However, the newspaper could not print just anything. For instance, because of the strong reactions to Shashkov's public lectures, both for and against, not a word could be mentioned about them in the Tomsk paper. Kuznetsov wisely guided the paper, giving it as much latitude as possible under existing conditions.

Yadrintsev's first article written as a regular contributor to the Gazette appeared in the first issue of 1865 under the title "Siberia on the First of January, 1865." Opening with Herzen's epigraph "Vive la mort, let us build the future," he claimed that although European Russia had just experienced social reinvigoration, despite the ensuing reaction, in Siberia slumber still reigned as ever.

> Our society is not a compact mass, aspiring to maintain the interests of its country; it is not an initiator and entrepreneur in public matters, but lives disunited, as if nothing tied it together, and as if it had no public interests and were even deprived of love toward its homeland. . . .
>
> See if there has been just one undertaking which has concentrated all the efforts of Siberia. Has there been one enterprise that uniquely interested all Siberians? No, there has not. Siberia's provinces are in no way linked, and towns are alien to one another, just as villages are. Moreover, our young country needs much that should have been done by the common efforts of the entire Siberian population, that should have been considered by the collective mind of all Siberia for the interests of the whole country on an equal basis. [99]

---

99 Iadrintsev, "Sibir' v 1-e ianvaria 1865 goda," Tomskiia Gubernskiia Viedomosti, (1865) no. 1; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 57-58. According to Svatikov, "in the words 'collective mind' of Siberia one cannot but see the idea of a Siberian Regional Duma, an idea clothed in the censored form of the times then." Rossiia i Sibir', p. 56. For the 1860's this extrapolation seems a bit far-fetched.

Yadrintsev then went so far as to conclude that Siberia lay "in desolation, like a corpse," with thousands of square miles of "voiceless deserts."

He sought to compare Siberia's economic past and present with countries elsewhere, and in Siberia itself saw a common identity of interest in the economic dependence of all parts of the country on European Russia.

> Did we put together societies for the settlement of the country like the American trading companies and Brazilian societies of capitalists? Did Siberians think of the necessity of colonization and of its advantages for Siberia? No, our society did not . . . Siberia enjoys everything imported, we have no manufacturing, and our factories are insignificant; we drink, eat, and dress with foreign products, and we are not an economically self-sufficient people, but exploited masses, simple toilers, swindled by various speculators, like the Moscow manufacturers. Has our society thought of becoming economically self-sufficient, of creating its own manufactures to secure itself from fraud, . . . and of obtaining good products for consumption, and not the cheap, rotten Muscovite goods?

Though deploring the country's cultural situation, he defended Siberia from the accusations of others.

> Our towns rarely have public libraries, and these are meagerly supported, which proves our society's dislike for reading. In all Siberia there is not one private printing press, and there are not even book stores; as if intellectual life were alien to Siberia and its townspeople needed wine shops more than Gutenberg's great invention. In the past, society never expressed its interests, and in fact it never had its own literary organ to do this. . . . Called a tundra and incapable of any culture, Siberia was viewed as a place of exiles, and all hope for the spontaneous development of popular energies was taken away from it; a Laplandian future was predicted for it, and its people were reproached for stagnating on the tundra like Eskimos. In a word, the future was taken away from the Siberia people, its general right to civilization was questioned, and the most sacred hope for a rational and humane existence was killed!

To make up for its inglorious past, however, a shining future was in store for Siberia. Thus, let the past die now: "Vive la mort, and letuus build the future."

> The time is coming when Siberia should think of its own interests and its own future. The time will come when it must raise its own claims to civilization, which falls to the lot of all humanity without climatic differences and restrictions. Let Siberian society unite from the Urals to the Eastern Ocean in order to create a new life for Siberia, to begin to live with intellectual life, and to look after its own all-round development.
>
> . . . In the interests of our country we summon Siberian young people who are beigg educated in Russian universities to return to the homeland to serve it. The cultivation and investigation of our virgin land belongs to them, as does the upbringing and education of their countrymen and the creation of this cherished future into which our country will begin a better life. We hope that educated Siberian youths will begin their sacred work toward their homeland's welfare with ardent patriotic love and with civic self-sacrifice. With these wishes we begin the new year . . . [100]

Yadrintsev's appeal was thus not only "Siberia for the Siberians," but Siberia's right to join the universal, historical process by which other societies and peoples had become developed and had achieved dignity, prosperity, and fame. But before this could occur, localist and particularist tendencies in Siberian society had to be broken down, and the educated and dedicated few had to embark upon a process of social unification and "region-building." This was to become the true test of the success or failure of regionalism. Could the people of this huge sub-continent, divided by ethnic, social, geographical, educational, and even linguistic factors, be welded into a cohesive unit, recognizing their common and mutual interests?

---

100 Iadrintsev, "Sibir' v 1-e ianvaria 1865 goda," quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 58-59.

This was actually the task that Yadrintsev, almost alone, was to take on himself in the years ahead. Though progress had certainly been made in the years before this time, Yadrintsev at this point preferred (perhaps for propaganda purposes) to see Siberian society as a slumbering giant, which had yet to awaken.

A second article of Yadrintsev's charatteristic of his ideas then, was entitled "Siberia under the Judgment of Russian Literature." The motive behind this work was to reproach the Russian radical, N. V. Shelgunov, for his unwillingness to recognize Siberia's important significance and great future. Shelgunov had visited Siberia in 1862-63 and had expressed his views on the country in a series of articles in the Russian Word called "Siberia along the Great Road." Yadrintsev bridled at Shelgunov's minimizing the accomplishments of Siberians (only a Sibiryak like Yadrintsev could get away with speaking of "slumbering Siberian society"), and he replied:

> A very energetic and enterprising part of the Russian people did not come to Siberia in vain; these people did not make conquests and discoveries, and did not labor in forests and wastes of a new land for almost three centuries in vain. Mr. Shelgunov states that the Sibiryak resigned himself to nature and did nothing to overcome it. [101]

After listing a number of explorers and heroes in refutation, Yadrintsev, reflecting Shchapov's ideas on the Russian people, continued:

> No! All that the Russian people could do in Siberia they did with unusual energy, and the result of their work in its immensity is worthy of surprise. Show me another people in the history of the world which crossed an expanse greater than that of all Europe in

---

101 Iadrintsev, "Sibir' pod sudom russkoi literatury," Tomskiia Gubernskiia Viedomosti, (1865) no. 9; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 59. Shelgunov's article was printed as "Sibir' po bol'shoi dorogie," Russkoe Slovo, (1863) nos. 1-3.

> a half century and has maintained itself in it?
> Now is not the time to detract from its /Siberia's/ significance and to criticize its future. Here is why we consider it a duty to oppose Russian publicists who belittle Siberia.
> Four million people await a better life. Four million await their happiness. . . . We believe in the efforts of these people, and we are convinced they can create a better future and can become as civilized a people as any other in the world.

More in keeping with the title of his article, Yadrintsev launched into a discussion of what was to become his major effort in later life — the establishment and maintenance of a regional newspaper. "To whom," he asked, "should belong the role of indicating Siberia's future and of leading its people out onto the path of civilization and historical progress?"

> This role should belong to local literature, which our poor Siberia has not possessed till now. The publication of a Siberian journal now could have an enormous significance and influence upon the country's development. The creation of a local literature will be an embryo of intelligent life and a beginning of the intellectual development of the masses. Local journalism will investigate our country, elaborate on its problems, declare its interests, and point to the future, which will consist not of conquests, as eulogists maintain, but of the creation of civilization for its people, which together with trade, will exert an influence on all Asia and the Orient.[102]

Thus, Yadrintsev affirmed his belief that, spearheaded by a responsible press, Siberians would join other peoples at long last in the amenities of civilization and economic prosperity. Furthermore, the young patriot at age 23 valiantly stepped forth on this occasion to defend Siberia against external "attack," not against the Russian government or economic exploiters, but against a radical publicist. He had total faith that his mission and

---

102 Iadrintsev, "Sibir' pod sudom russkoi literatury," quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 59-60.

Siberia's were one and the same.[103] Now that Siberia's interests had public defenders such as Yadrintsev, to stir up society, excoriate detractors, and to help push the country toward progress and civilization, Siberia's future had to be better than its past or present.

Not only did Yadrintsev have faith in himself and in his cause, but he also believed in the latent creative energies of the popular masses. In this he was more at one with the populists' optimistic faith in the people, along with a faith in enlightenment, freedom and progress. Once momentum was established and set in motion by the representatives of enlightenment, freedom, and progress, the spread of these forces among the masses would be irresistible and inevitable. This faith was what made Yadrintsev a "man of the sixties" (shest'desiatnik) his whole life through. Though he may have had a few second thoughts about the bases of his beliefs in later life, never once did he appear to waver in his devotion to them.

By the time that a third article of Yadrintsev's was published in the Tomsk Provincial Gazette, the author was sitting in the Omsk fortress, waiting out time for his alleged role in attempting to separate Siberia from Russia.[104] With this "affair," the journalistic, educational, and literary activity of the returned students came to an abrupt halt in one fell swoop. The impetus of the regionalist movement was broken, as was the development of public opinion, and relative stagnation in the intellectual awakening of Siberia ensued for about ten years. Not only were regionalists

---

103 Speaking of himself and Siberia, Yadrintsev once said, "I permit no one to come between me and my country." T. Farafontova, in Obrazovanie, (1905) no. 10, p. 293; quoted in Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 58.

104 Iadrintsev's article was "Ekonomicheskiia osobennosti sibirskago naseleniia" (The Economic Peculiarities of the Siberian Population), Tomskiia Gubernskiia Viedomosti, (1865) nos. 15, 17-18.

and their friends linked with the dissemination of openly separatistic proclamations, but their writings and activities of 1864-65 were now scrutinized and viewed by authorities as "separatist" in intent.

As Potanin summed it up fifty years later,

> We revealed our ill-intentions only in the newspaper — ill-intentions as they were regarded in that distant day. From today's point of view, what we then wrote was completely innocent. But it was a different matter then; we knew this and thus did not consider ourselves guiltless. It was, for example, a crime to use in print the expression "our Siberia," it was forbidden to write "we Siberians," and it was criminal to detach oneself from the general fatherland; it was impossible to love Siberia, for one could only love all of Russia. They told us, "If you are allowed to love Siberia, then, perhaps, you will love it more than Russia." And, after all, we had been dreaming of establishing a journal with the express purpose of developing a love for Siberia. [105]

All these were expressions and sentiments which could easily be interpreted as "separatist": if not in the narrow, specific sense of a political separation of Siberia from Russia and the establishment of an independent state or republic, than at least in a broader sense. In the latter sense, regionalists sought to make themselves more culturally, economically, and patriotically distinct, with their own regional press and university, with greater economic autarky, and with regional feelings of solidarity within the broader Russian context.

---

105 Potanin's memoirs, as quoted in Popov, "K 80-ti lietiiu," p. 293. For use of the expressions "We Siberians" and "our Siberia," see Shashkov's lecture and Yadrintsev's article, respectively (p. 311 and p. 321 above).

CHAPTER VI

THE SIBERIAN INDEPENDENCE AFFAIR AND ITS AFTERMATH

The Affair (1865)

The "Siberian Independence Affair," also known as the "Affair of the Siberian Separatists" and by several other longer, official designations, began in May 1865 and was dragged out in the courts until 1868. The immediate cause of the affair was the discovery of a manuscript proclamation advocating an independent Siberia. All persons known to have had connections with this appeal or with the people involved in its discovery, either directly or remotely, were drawn into the affair.

The various accounts concerning the origin of the affair are generally in agreement both factually and chronologically. The most important sources are the official account of 1865, and the memoirs of Potanin and Yadrintsev, the only participants who later published their impressions. As for the initial course of events, Yadrintsev recalled how Gavriil N. Usov,

a cadet at the Omsk military school,

> rummaging about in a desk, where the papers of his brother /Fyodor Usov/, a Cossack officer, lay, accidentally took out a sheet among the school notebooks, on which views of Siberia's miserable condition and history were set forth. This work was written with zeal, it is true, in the taste of the sheets spread about in the capitals during the 1860's. The cadet showed this writing in school to a comrade /Arseny Samsonov/, who took it and began to threaten that he would show it to the authorities, if he /Usov/ did not give him cigarettes. Finally, this cadet was caught with cigarettes by the supervisor, and keeping the cigarettes, he gave him, instead of tobacco, the forbidden sheet, which he /Samsonov/ himself had not read. The supervisor was amazed, of course, and presented the sheet to the authorities. Then a search was made of Usov's older brother, a staff-officer, his correspondence was taken, and telegrams and dispatches flew off to various parts of the country. [1]

Potanin's accounts of the earliest stage of the affair, written even later than Yadrintsev's, convey the following information. In 1865,

> the government discovered the existence of separatists in Omsk, Tomsk, Krasnoyarsk, and Irkutsk. Two manuscript proclamations were found in which the separation of Siberia from Russia was spoken of and in which Siberian society was even invited to an armed uprising. One was found in Omsk, the other in Irkutsk. The Omsk one was discovered first, and with it came the spark that set the forest on fire. [2]

According to Potanin, when the sheet fell into Samsonov's hands, he made use of it to "wheedle cigarettes out of Usov. An officer on duty, going around the rooms, noticed a tobacco smell and began to feel in the cadets' pockets, hoping to find tobacco or cigarettes in them, but instead of the forbidden tobacco he found the scandalous proclamation." [3] The sheet was then "handed over to the gendarmes. An investigation was prescribed and a

---

1 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," p. 155; written in early 1894.
2 Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," p. 270; published in 1908.
3 Potanin's memoirs, written ca. 1912-14; quoted in Popov, "K 80-ti lietiiu," pp. 294-95.

number of searches followed, first in the apartment of the Cossack officer, /Fyodor/ Usov, and secondly, among his friends in Tomsk . . ." [4]

It was Colonel Rykachov of the gendarmes (whose son Yadrintsev had once tutored in Omsk) who conducted the search of Usov's apartment. Upon finding his letters, which included correspondence from Potanin and Yadrintsev, Rykachov immediately thought he had stumbled upon a group of suspect people (in Yadrintsev's case he may have suspected such ever since his Omsk speeches). He then turned to Panov, the acting governor-general of Western Siberia. Though Panov did not find cause enough to have Potanin, Yadrintsev, and Kolcsov arrested, Rykachov was convinced that the author of the proclamation was among this small group. [5] Thus began the government's involvement in the matter, and the beginning of the affair itself.

The search of the rooms of the elder Usov brothers, Fyodor and Grigory, disclosed not only correspondence that could be construed as suspect, but also a number of works considered as outright radical or revolutionary by the authorities. According to a report of the Third Section, as a result of this search, "two lithograph presses were found, works which they themselves copied on revolution and on the socialism of Proudhon and Herzen, Robespierre's On the Rights of Man," along with letters of Potanin, Yadrintsev, and Alexandr Shaitanov, who was then auditing lectures at the University of Moscow. [6]

Yadrintsev recounted the circumstances in which he and two friends were drawn into the affair after the seizure of Usov's correspondence:

---

4 Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," p. 270.
5 Popov, "K 80-ti lietiiu," p. 295.
6 From "Nravstvenno-politicheskoe obozrienie vazhneishikh sobitii i iavlenii gosudarstvennoi i obshchestvennoi zhizni Rossii za 1865 g." (A Moral and Political Survey of the Most Important Events and Occurrences in Russia's Political and Social Life in the Year 1865), Arkhiv III-go Otd. Sob. E. I. V. Kantseliarii; quoted in Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', pp. 58-59.

> The spring of 1865 came, we were in a very joyful mood, and our patriotic plans continued to grow. How suddenly the thunder burst upon us in May 1865. I was with Potanin and Ye. Ya. Kolosov (a retired lieutenant of the artillery, who ran a private school in Tomsk) at Pichugin's summer cottage on a natural-history excursion, when we were summoned to town and put under house arrest. Our papers were seized. At first we did not know why, but gloomy premonitions gripped us. In three days they sent us to Omsk with gendarmes, and here new ordeals and bitter experiences began. In Omsk they presented us to the acting governor-general and then sent us to the fort. Such was the sensation during the first minutes of captivity . . . [7]

At this point Potanin takes over the further sequence of events. Referring especially to himself and Yadrintsev (though not by name), he wrote that not only in Tomsk

> were a number of persons arrested whose names were found in the correspondence seized, but in Krasnoyarsk and Irkutsk too. From a search of one apartment in Irkutsk a second proclamation was discovered. More than ten young people were arrested and taken to Omsk, where an investigating commission was formed. News of the affair, which was exaggeratedly entitled "The Affair of evil thinkers, who formed the intention of separating Siberia from Russia and of founding a republic in it on the model of the North American States," was spread through Siberian towns with much fanfare. [8]

What then was actually considered so seditious in the two proclamations? According to the official report given by the Third Section later that year, the following at least can be gleaned from the Omsk sheet:

> On May 21, 1865, a manuscript proclamation, "To the Patriots of Siberia," was found on Arseny Samsonov, a pupil of the Siberian Cadet School, which with an expression of hatred toward the government and the Sovereign Power stated that Siberia had been conquered by people who fled from the tsars for freedom, but

---

7 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," p. 154.
8 Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," pp. 270-71.

> were then caught by the tsars; the lands and the full riches of nature were taken away from the people; the Cossacks were deprived of their independence and the country was filled with criminals, who corrupted the inhabitants; that now, instead of corporal punishment, torture and capital punishment had come, exile was intensified into forced labor, and the weight of authority fell especially on Siberia, whose needs were not known to the government, and thus they demand for her a republican government on the example of America, for which it is necessary to take up arms; and that with this goal a society has already been formed with the name "Independence of Siberia," whose agents are to collect money, organize a printing press, and prepare youth for an uprising. [9]

Concerning the sheet found in Irkutsk, the report indicated,

> At Shchukin's there turned up a proclamation, "To Siberian Patriots," on the necessity of uniting with the Central Russian Popular Committee, of entering into a union with America, after having handed over to her the possessions of the Russian-American Company, and then, upon destruction of the authorities and after drawing in Cossacks, Old Believers, and mine workers, of staging an uprising with a declaration of the "Siberian United States." [10]

Exactly what the Central Russian Popular Committee could have been, and what its relationship to Siberia's separation and union with America was, is not easy to surmise. [11] Indeed, this proclamation, with its proposed transfer of Russian America and its "Siberian United States," has an especially fantastic quality to it. Though this proclamation to date has not been reprinted in its entirety, a Soviet source states that the document mentioned "the names of Chicherin, Pestel — the father, Treskin, Gorchakov, Ozersky, Muravyov-Amursky, and the fool Korsakov, so as to understand

---

9 From "Nravstvenno-politicheskoe obozrienie"; quoted in Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 58. A similar, though longer rendition of the proclamation, drawn up by the investigatory commission, is in Vegman, "Episod iz zhizni Shchapova," p. 138.

10 "Nravstvenno-politicheskoe obozrienie"; quoted in Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 59. See also G. Gins, "Sibirskoe oblastnichestvo," pp. 145-46.

11 Svatikov feels the Committee refers to the party center of Land and Liberty (p. 62), though Koval' makes no mention of this possibility.

what scoundrels the government entrusts power over an unhappy country to and of what scoundrels it itself is made up." This is perhaps an example of the "coarse" language of the proclamation to which Potanin later referred. The sheet also appealed to a general uprising "for the liberation of all our Russian Empire. We Siberians fraternally give our hand to Russian patriots for a joint struggle with our enemy. Upon completing this, Siberia will have to call its own popular assembly and determine its own future relations to Russia. This is its inalienable right." The appeal ended: "long live free Siberia . . . from the Ural Mountains to the shores of the Eastern Ocean." [12] A major difference between the Omsk and the Irkutsk proclamations was the former's clearly stated appeal for Siberian independence and the impreciseness of the latter regarding Siberia's future relations with both America and Russia.

Who the authors of these manifestos were was never established officially. Potanin, however, has given some indication of the author of the Irkutsk sheet.

> Regarding the Irkutsk proclamation, Shashkov said that he brought it from Petersburg. Subsequently, in the circle of separatists /i.e. regionalists/ the legend arose that this proclamation, written in strong, coarse expressions, was composed by Stepan Popov, an Irkutsk merchant, who in his youth had been a liberal and a share-holder with Andrei Belogolovy in the publication of the first private paper in Siberia, the Amur, issued in Irkutsk, and he finished his career as a bigot and collaborator in the Diocesan Gazette. Of the Omsk proclamation, perhaps Yadrintsev, who knew F. N. Usov and often visited him in Omsk, knew something, but I never spoke with him about it. [13]

---

12 The Irkutsk proclamation is in the State Archives of Omsk Okrug; citations are from Koval', "Kharakhter obshchestvennogo dvizheniia," p. 50, 51; and from Gins, "Sibirskoe oblastnichestvo," p. 145.

13 Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," p. 271. On Popov's connections with the Amur, see above, p. 147.

Concerning the Omsk proclamation, Yadrintsev added, "This appeal was written in Petersburg; the late Shashkov and I edited it; the real author was not taken and was hidden in obscurity — indeed, he was not a prominent person. Under investigation he would have played a silly role." [14] Evidently, Yadrintsev had known the author, but had probably never seen him since, and perhaps had even forgotten his name. The question still remains, however, to what extent editors Shashkov and Yadrintsev believed in the contents of the Omsk proclamation.

Of this manifesto Svatikov has written that "its author and indeed its editors were not so much regional-federalists as they were pure-water separatists. They did not aim at a federation through a union of regions, but at independence through autonomy." [15] Potanin himself wrote in retrospect:

> Even the proclamations themselves were obviously written solely to produce a sensation in Siberian society. The separatists thought: let Siberian society immediately reject the idea of Siberia's separation, but a noisy affair will arise and turn the public's attention on the idea, and it will think about the humiliated position of its region; this is the main things. [16]

Though Yadrintsev, at least, was never a "pure-water separatist" who demanded immediate secession, he never rejected the idea of Siberia's separation in the distant future. He certainly gave more thought to this than he did to a reconstructed Russian state of federated regions.

At any rate, the affair continued to broaden in scope. According to the report of the Third Section,

---

14 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," p. 158.
15 Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 63.
16 Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," pp. 271-72.

> The culprits were arrested and delivered to Omsk, where a special investigating commission was established, with the participation in it of the local staff-officer of the corps of gendarmes /Rykachov/, and despite stubborn denial at first, they were led to recognize their criminal designs and to point out their cohorts. [17]

The investigating commission consisted of five members: Rykachov, two auditors, an attorney, and Pilino, a councillor in the Main Administration of Western Siberia.

Actually, the arrests began in late May and continued through July 1865. On May 23, Gavriil Usov, Samsonov, and N. Kiryanov, all cadets in Omsk, were arrested and placed in the local guardhouse. In June more cadets were arrested, some of them as young as twelve and fourteen, along with a few Cossack officers, such as Grigory and Fyodor Usov; they were also confined in prison. The editor of the Tomsk Gazette, Kuznetsov, was also detained for a while. From Irkutsk was sent the twelve-year-old Andrei Zimin, accused of bringing the Irkutsk proclamation to Shchukin, who was also brought to Omsk for questioning. The returned student Usharov was implicated too, as was Shchapov, because of testimony given by Shchukin and because of his poem "to Siberia," written in 1861. Shashkov was also arrested and dispatched to Omsk. [18] Arrests were even made in Petersburg and Moscow of Siberian students implicated through their correspondence with Usov and others which the gendarmes seized. In Uralsk, a teacher in the Cossack army, Yevdoky Gankin, who had corresponded with Potanin, was arrested too. Even N. M. Pavlinov, a friend of Yadrintsev's in Petersburg who had been

---

17 "Nravstvenno-politicheskoe obozrienie"; quoted in Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 59.

18 According to Dubrovskii, Shashkov was arrested in Irkutsk, on his way to Kyakhta to deliver lectures ("Istorik i drug zhenshchiny," p. 162); Potanin, however, implies he may still have been in Krasnoyarsk (see above, p. 327).

active in the Siberian circle, was afrested, despite his official position in Irkutsk province. Governor-General Korsakov felt forced to send him to the Omsk commission because of his former participation in the Petersburg Siberian circle. Pavlinov and Korsakov both agreed it was incomprehensible that such meetings were now considered criminal. Korsakov, however, remarked to Pavlinov, "really, the affair is possible only in our contemporary Siberian system. Stay in Irkutsk. I need you in my service. We will write the president of the commission that you are needed, and then all the denunciations will be taken away from you on the spot." [19] Such was the nonchalant attitude toward the affair in the East Siberian administration, where idle talk of separation was nothing new; such too was the "protection" Korsakov could offer his subordinates.

Summarizing the degree of involvement of the participants, the Third Section report noted,

> Of the forty persons involved in this affair, sixteen of the most guilty are held under arrest in Omsk, ten were released on bail with police supervision established over them, three have not been found, and twelve men, mainly students at the Universities of Moscow and St. Petersburg and also at the Medical-Chirurgical Academy who were mentioned by Potanin and Yadrintsev, but who did not confess to having associated with them, were not convicted, and were set free. [20]

Among the most "guilty," of course, were Yadrintsev and Shashkov. Of their interrogations before the commission, Yadrintsev related the following:

> We were accused of propaganda, of composing proclamations, and of the fact that we wrote separatistic

---

19 From a conversation between Pavlinov and Lemke; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 66.

20 "Nravstvenno-politicheskoe obozrienie"; quoted in Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 60.

> articles in the Tomsk Provincial Gazette . . . on the need of a university for Siberia, among other things. "Who asked you about this?," the Omsk officers asked. The idea of a university ten years after our affair was still considered a cause of the separatists, and such opinions were expressed even after the founding of a university [in 1877], though the desire for a higher educational institution could hardly relate to the idea of separatism. Shashkov was questioned during the interrogations about his lectures . . . and when they asked us questions as to what we wanted for our country and what roused us to opposition, Shashkov gave very ironic answers. These questions evidently were raised by order from Petersburg and not on the initiative of the investigating committee. How could we answer them? The sincere wish for the welfare of our forgotten homeland was in our hearts; our dream was its enlightenment and civic prosperity. In our youthful dreams and wishes many local problems were still vague and received a certain shape and life only later. We answered that for Siberia we wanted a new public court system, zemstvo institutions, greater publicity, encouragement of industry, and more equal rights for natives. What was criminal here? Was it criminal to love one's own homeland ardently? But here patriotism was taken as separatism. Of what concern were dreams and parallels that Siberia should some day be like the American United States, and that these thoughts were expressed in connection with reading the history of colonies and their separation, in view of the injustices of the mother country. This, it was said, was a fact of the distant future. At that given moment there could be no danger from children and youths, who were in mutual contact but not in conspiracy. [21]

Although Yadrintsev did not advocate the separation of Siberia from Russia immediately (as did both proclamations) or even in the near future, he never dismissed the thought from his mind that the laws of history, so to speak, foreordained the colony's eventual separation from the mother country. This had been demonstrated in both North and South America. When and if Siberia's

---

21 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," p. 156.

separation should come about, then it would begin to resemble the United States politically.

Potanin's experiences under interrogation were somewhat different than those of Yadrintsev and Shashkov. Of him the government report stated:

> No one among the persons mentioned confessed to having composed these proclamations, though some explained, however, that they had copied and spread them. The chief figure of the society, Potanin, stated that he had picked up the idea of the separation of Siberia during his stay at the Siberian cadet school in 1846, and upon arrival in St. Petersburg in 1858 /sic/ developed it at meetings in the university, summoning all his countrymen to service in Siberia upon graduation, where many of them set out, and that upon his return to the homeland he printed in the Tomsk Provincial Gazette two articles which he wrote in the spirit of Siberian independence and attempted to inspire such a tendency among the younger generation, so that presently this idea is known to almost all the young Cossack officers. [22]

Testimonies had to be taken of all those brought before the investigators, but those of Potanin, Yadrintsev, Shashkov, Shchukin, Fyodor Usov, and Shaitanov were deemed the most important. Potanin, in fact, was viewed as the ringleader of the "conspiracy." He was held in confinement for a week before he had any inkling of why he had been arrested. Then his letters written to friends elsewhere in Siberia were shown to him, and he was informed of their arrests too. Then he was shown the two manuscript proclamations and given a chance to read them.

Following this, Potanin was interrogated about the persons mentioned in his correspondence: what each one was doing, what the nature of their conversations had been, and so forth. Even an article of his on Cossacks

---

22 "Nravstvenno-politicheskoe obozrienie"; quoted in Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', pp. 59-60.

in the Kirghiz steppe published long before was now considered suspicious by the commission, for it had portrayed their living conditions in less than the best light. [23] In the end, Potanin was condemned, "first, for spreading separatistic ideas in Siberia, and secondly, for founding a secret society in Petersburg called the "Siberian circle." . . . By secret society the commission meant the soirées os Siberian students, which were arranged weekly." Regarding his dissemination of "separatistic" ideas, Potanin later wrote:

> indeed if they had been criminal, then I would not have taken up any serious measures toward spreading them. I did not speak on this theme in public speeches, and did not spread in society underground sheets written on this theme. . . . even the president of the commission, Pilino, told me that the commission was fully convinced of my non-participation regarding the proclamations. All my guilt was limited to the fact that I expressed my seditious ideas on occasion in my private study, in private conversation, in the company of one, two, or at most three people. Now, fifty years later, recollecting this time, I find that the severe confirmation which condemned me was based solely on my "frank confession." I declared that I had spread separatistic ideas, that I had persuaded my comrades to share my thoughts, and that all those involved in this idea had been enticed by me. And this confession was the only basis for singling me out from among my comrades, and for imposing on me a punishment significantly heavier. If I had not made a "frank confession," then, perhaps, I would have suffered least of all. [24]

Indeed, it is difficult to see what the commission could have done without the "evidence" of Potanin's "frank confession," as the whole affair had been fabricated almost out of nothing. Colonel Rykachov's vivid imagination and perhaps his ambition definitely contributed to the affair's

---

23 See Obruchev, Potanin, p. 76.

24 From Potanin's memoirs, as quoted by Dubrovskii, "Veteran sibirskoi obshchestvennosti," pp. 249-50.

being carried out to such proportions. The authors of the two proclamations were never discovered, and the involvement of many in the affair, and even of those in some way connected with the proclamations, was most tenuous. It seems that Potanin's "confession" not only saved face for the administration of Western Siberia and the commission, but also lessened or abrogated the punishments given to many of those involved.

Potanin, wrote, "When I gave my first answers to the commission, I did not restrain myself in the confession, so as not to draw people into the affair who were not implicated in it . . . Thus, without protest I accepted the proposal to make a frank confession, but this confession gave the commission nothing new." He then admitted to the commission that the main agitator "in our company was I." [25] Moreover, Potanin claimed that Shchapov's patriotic poem of 1861 was actually one which he himself had composed. [26] Thus, in his memoirs he concluded,

> Except for this confession, there was no stronger evidence against me; in the letters there was not one word about the dissemination of separatism. In the testimonies of my comrades during the affair no one called me his teacher, and it could have ended such that my friends, Yadrintsev, Shashkov, and the rest, would have suffered more than I; but meanwhile I considered myself the ringleader. [27]

According to Yadrintsev, the "accomplishments" of the commission were that it

> tried to establish the accusation of persons connected in any way possible, and often quite unknown to each other, attaching the appearance of conspiracy to a comradely acquaintance. Finally, the investigation united several separate events and facts,

---

25 Potanin's memoirs, as quoted in Popov, "K 80-ti lietiiu," p. 296.
26 Ibid. For versions of this poem, see above, pp. 251-52.
27 Ibid., p. 298.

> independent and related to various times, into one. First, it was shown that the circle of officers and cadets in Omsk, which were in touch with me and Potanin, conducted, as it were, the propaganda of separatism. Many of this circle had left for institutions of higher learning, and were arrested on the road or in the capital. Secondly, it was shown that like-minded Siberians lived in other towns: Tomsk, Irkutsk (Shchukin), and Krasnoyarsk (Shashkov). Thirdly, among the Siberian separatists an appeal or proclamation had been discovered, which was found in Omsk and in Irkutsk. Fourthly, it was shown from correspondence that a Siberian circle already existed in Petersburg among Siberian students. In the enormous correspondence, dissatisfaction against the government was expressed, and it often included insulting references about persons in ruling circles. Thus, from all this a net was woven together, and much was evidently confirmed by "open-hearted confessions," as the auditors expressed it. . . .
>
> But it was enough to point to the cause and the principle of the affair to see how much of it was accidental and exaggerated. [28]

Though the commission decided upon the main charges against the "conspirators," it still could not decide upon a title which properly described the seditious "affair." In connection with this Potanin related that

> during a visit to the commission the folder cover of this affair caught my eye. The affair was entitled as follows: "The Affair of Malefactors who have aimed at separating Siberia from Russia and at establishing a republic there on the model of the North American United States." I smiled and, turning to Pilino, the president of the commission, said: "How grandiose a title you give us." Pilino became embarrassed and answered, "No, this is a temporary name; it was given when the affair was not yet cleared up." I really don't know under what title the dossier of the affair left for Petersburg. [29]

---

28 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," p. 155.

29 Potanin's memoirs, as quoted in Popov, "K 80-ti lietiiu," p. 296. The title of this document, now in the Central State Historical Archives in Leningrad, is: "The affair concerning the ill-intentioned activities of certain young people who strove to overthrow the existing system of government in Siberia and to separate it from the empire." See Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 62 n., and for a slightly different title, Koval', "Kharakhter obshchestvennogo dvizheniia," p. 53.

The Aftermath of the Affair (1865-68)

One reason administrative authorities so feared the spread of Siberian regionalistic activities and ideas, from their viewpoint potentially or actually separatistic, was the fact that only two years earlier the Polish Insurrection of 1863 had attempted to sever Poland from the Russian Empire and to set up an independent Poland. As a result of this, thousands of Polish rebels and their families were deported to Siberia. Though none of them were directly involved in the Siberian independence affair, many of them had revived the idea of Siberia's separation from Russia, which their predecessors in Siberia had promoted. [30] This automatically set some local officials on edge.

At the same time, in European Russia public opinion by and large turned against the Poles and their attempted secession, and Russian nationalist sentiment became much stronger in Russian society and official circles than it was prior to the insurrection. One of the chief spokesmen for this nationalistic, anti-Polish sentiment was the editor of the Moscow Gazette, Mikhail N. Katkov (1818-87), Bakunin's erstwhile friend. Katkov's paper at this time had a circulation of about 12,000 subscribers and exerted much influence on Russia's small reading public.

Katkov feared not only the separatism of the Poles, but also the demands for autonomy expressed by Finns, Baltic Germans, Georgians, Armenians, and Ukrainians at this time. As a Great Russian centralist, he viewed

---

30 V. V. Bervi (Flerovskii), Tri politicheskiia sistemy: Nikolai I-yi, Aleksandr II-oi, i Aleksandr III-ii. Vospominaniia N. Flerovskago (Three Political Systems: Nicholas I, Alexander II, and Alexander III. N. Flerovsky's Memoirs), London (1897), pp. 223-24. The author in 1865 was living not far from Tomsk.

these tendencies as ultimately separatistic. Though he did not mention Siberia by name at this time, it was in the early 1860's that Siberians in Petersburg latched on to the word "separatism" and began to call those among themselves who with patriotic feelings and motives wished to return home to serve Siberia. According to Potanin's biographer, these patriots, without investigating the provocative connotation of Katkov's word "separatism," began to call themselves separatists with much fervor. [31] Of course, only a few of these patriots, as witnessed in the affair itself, actually agitated for an immediate separation of Siberia from Russia. The most that could be said of these "separatists" is that they were working for or expecting separation in the distant future (such as Yadrintsev). As Potanin later reminisced:

> The young friends of Siberia of the 1860's did not know how to separate cultural from political separatism, nor did they want to listen to the voice of reason in civic affairs, from feelings of squeamishness; they did not want to sort out the legal from the illegal in their thoughts on Siberia's future. [32]

As for official reaction to the Siberian independence affair, it was not as if separatism had been ignored by Siberian officials before this time. Muravyov-Amursky had been known for his "empire-building" designs and had even been viewed by some as a "separatist." As early as 1849, the governor-general of Western Siberia, Prince Gorchakov, had not denied the possibility of a "small segment" of Siberian society sympathizing with the idea of tearing Siberia away from Russia, though he felt this "still did not represent an essential danger." [33]

---

31 Obruchev, Potanin, p. 75.
32 Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," p. 270.
33 Quoted in Semevskii, "Nieskol'ko slov v pamiat' Iadrintseva," p. 31.

As seen above, the initial reaction of Governor-General Korsakov to the independence affair, from his East Siberian vantage point, was not one of utmost concern or seriousness. The governor of Tobolsk province at the time, Despot-Zenovich, was also somewhat nonchalant toward the affair, though he well understood the reactions among many officials. In 1876 he wrote of the affair to the governor-general of Western Siberia, Kaznakov:

> if national importance was attached to the momentary utopian dreams of the young men who had formed the Siberian circle in Petersburg, then this explains the anxious situation in which the government authorities found themselves in view of the Polish insurrection, the sharp, accusatory direction of the press of the time, and many abnormal phenomena in society itself, summoned to a new life after an age-old sleep. [34]

The governor-general of Western Siberia, A. O. Duhamel, was in St. Petersburg when the initial arrests took place in Omsk in mid-May 1865. After receiving a dispatch concerning the affair, he reacted (according to his memoirs) as follows:

> On the eve of my departure from Petersburg (May 29), I received from general Panov, who had temporarily replaced me in Siberia, a dispatch whose contents extremely surprised me. Thanks to mere chance, traces of a conspiracy were discovered in Omsk, in which some of the Cossack officers of the Siberian /cadet/ school were strongly implicated. These young madmen planned to separate Siberia from the Empire and to form out of it a federative republic on the model of the North American United States. . . . Though I saw no serious danger in the secret intrigues of a few dozen young people who had no root within the country, this nevertheless served as an indication of the disposition of minds and of the harmful tendencies which were drawn by these base conspirators in universities and schools and which once more gave evidence of how unsatisfactory our system of public education has been. [35]

---

34 Letter to N. G. Kaznakov, dated April 21, 1876; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 64 n.

35 A. O. Diugamel', "Avtobiografiia A. O. Diugamelia" (A. O. Duhamel's Autobiography), Russkii Arkhiv, (1885) no. 10, pp. 178-79.

Though the governor-general was not as upset about the affair as were some of his subordinates, he obviously failed to recognize that those involved were not all "rootless madmen," but were generally people with both rational plans and patriotic attachment to Siberia.

Of the general public reaction to the independence affair, Yadrintseg claimed that

> Katkov wrote about this affair, and it was printed up even in the London Times. One might think that it was something grandiose. Many asked me about this affair, and these questions were often accompanied by ironic smiles: "How would you have separated Siberia?" Of course, in this respect there was much cause to mock with the palm of one's hand the Siberian youths who put on airs with such unrealizable plans. To separate Siberia — in the opinion of many, a wilderness and a land of exile — and to dream of waging war with an enormous state — these could only be madmen or children. [36]

On the whole, public opinion in European Russia was not very interested in the Siberian independence affair. It was certainly no great scandal in the metropolitan papers or journals, nor was it talked about in salons or open houses. Little, if any, sympathy toward the "separatists" in remote Siberia was expressed in the progressive journals of the day, and if the conservative, nationalist Katkov really did write an article on the affair it must not have been much. What general opinion there was was one of initial surprise and disbelief. Moreover, most of those involved in the affair had few connections with the Russian intelligentsia or with émigrés abroad. In Siberia, public opinion was stunned, but as many of those involved were leading spokesmen for public opinion itself, there was little recorded reaction, especially in print at the time, on the part of the rest of Siberian

---

36 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," p. 154. Lemke, after searching through all Katkov's writings from 1865 through 1868, could find nothing on the affair (Iadrintsev, p. 63 n.).

society. Most people wished to keep their distance from the affair (and the authorities) and maintained an attitude of indifference to or total detachment from the "separatists" as the safest course of conduct.

Abroad, the immediate response was, similarly, not especially perturbed. On September 15, 1865, the émigré socialist Alexander Herzen, then in Geneva, carried a brief note on the affair in the Bell: "From Siberia comes important news; arrests have taken place in Tomsk and Irkutsk; they say a secret society has been discovered, all those who were seized have been taken to Omsk, and among those arrested Potanin's name was mentioned." Herzen did not reveal his source, which evidently divulged no more information, for in the following issue (of October 1, 1865) he stated: "We would also like to have details on the recent arrests in Irkutsk and on the investigation which is being held in Omsk." [37] If Herzen later obtained more news on the affair, it was probably not reliable or detailed enough to print,ifor no further mention of it appeared in the Bell.

Another émigré living in Geneva, the old Decembrist Alexandr Poggio, expressed his reaction to news of the affair in a letter (of November 8, 1865) to his friend and former pupil, Nikolai Belogolovy. From Poggio's description it appears his information came from a source other than (or in addition to) the Bell. He wrote:

> What is going on in our Siberia? The news of the discovery there of those who seek not gold but separatism has both pained and amused me; what nonsense! Separatists in Siberia! You know it as well as I do, and you know if there is something like such

---

37 See Kolokol, (September 15, 1865) no. 204, and (October 1, 1865) no. 205; reprints: (1963) pt. 8, p. 1676 and 1684. Bakunin, then in Italy, knew even less, for in a letter of October 8, 1865, he asked Herzen for details on Potanin and the "Siberian conspiracy." Bakunins Briefwechsel, p. 110.

> pretensions there. Probably the influx of Poles promoted the propagation of the wildest ideas, and probably some youths unconsciously picked up the idea of separating Siberia and just talked about it a little. All this is simply ridiculous, and I chuckle with the conviction, though, that the affair will end up as nothing and there will be no victims; there was no need to raise this question and to begin a tactless persecution.

To this premature evaluation of the affair Belogolovy could only add in retrospect: "Poggio in his complacency was mistaken, imagining that it would end as a trifle. This affair, really ridiculous in essence, was to cost many a pretty penny — the price of a few years of calamities and deprivations. . . ."[38]

Roughly three years of calamity and deprivation had already elapsed before a final verdict was given on the fate of the participants in the affair. After the Omsk investigating committee considered the matter, it was taken up by another committee in St. Petersburg, established by the tsar. From here it went to the Senate in Moscow, which pronounced a verdict, and it finally ended up in the State Council, which reconsidered the Senate's decision. The State Council's final verdict was confirmed by imperial order on February 20, 1868.

During this time the participants in the affair had to wait for the final decision in confinement or under supervision. The three chief regionalists, Potanin, Yadrintsev, and Shashkov, were held during these three years either in the Omsk guardhouse or in the fort, which served as a prison. It is not known exactly how or how long many of the others were detained. As far as can be determined, however, the three men mentioned above

---

38 N. A. Bielogolovyi, "A. V. Podzhio, 1859-1873 gg. Iz zapisok N. A. Bielogolovago" (A. V. Poggio in the Years 1859-1873: From the Notes of Nikolai Belogolovy), Viestnik Evropy, (1896) no. 12, pp. 645-46.

were the only ones in confinement who made productive use of their detention period, in fact doing some sort of servide for Siberia. Potanin and Yadrintsev occupied themselves chiefly with historical, ethnological, and sociological investigations relating to Siberia's past and present. For Shashkov this period was a turning point in his scholarly interests. Though undertaking a few regional investigations, he ultimately became a disillusioned patriot, so to speak, and at this time turned away from Siberian matters. Except for several articles in later life, he never again directed his historical research to Siberia.

In accounting for the transformation of a talented, budding young regionalist into a historian interested in broader and more universal themes, Potanin provides the following sketch of Shashkov during confinement in Omsk:

> In our company Shashkov was the most educated of all; he knew German and French well, and in the seminary he acquired a knowledge of Latin and even Greek. He took up English while sitting in the Omsk guardhouse. Seminary life had disciplined him and made him a practical worker. Having gone to prison, Shashkov quickly oriented himself and considered what was possible to do in the new situation and how to make use of his prison time, so that it would not be all for nothing. He decided to learn English in prison. All of his time in prison was spent in studies. If he wasn't reading and writing, then he was repeating vocabularies. The wall around his bunk was all covered with lists of English words. As a result he left prison with a knowledge of five languages instead of four. With copies from archives, mine and his own, he availed himself to write a large article for a Petersburg journal; having received payment for this, he very wisely disposed of it: he ordered Rotteck's juridical encyclopedia in German . . . In Rotteck's encyclopedia he found an article on the question of women's rights and another, in connection with it, on infanticide. From the

> bibliographical indications of the encyclopedia he filled his library with the necessary books and began to compose article after article on the position and rights of women and on infanticide. Under the first of the articles in this category he declared in a footnote that from this moment on he was leaving his studies of Siberian history and Siberian questions and was turning to publicistic activity in general. . . . Having written two or three articles of Siberian content in prison, Shashkov found himself at a dead end.
>
> It was a pity that we were forced to reconcile ourselves with the withdrawal of such a significant person; he exceeded all of us in his knowledge, his erudition, and in his outstanding abilities. [39]

Three articles of Shashkov, attributed to this period, touched on Siberia: "Essays on Russian Morals in Old Siberia" (1867), "Siberian Natives in the 19th Century" (1867), and "Slavery in Siberia" (1869). [40] Even these articles indicate the trend toward social history that Shashkov was developing during his confinement in Omsk.

Potanin's first half-year after his arrest was spent in solitary confinement; he was next transferred to the Omsk prison where he could mingle with his fellow "malefactors." During his three years of so-called "preliminary" confinement, Potanin kept himself busy by investigating regional archives. After obtaining the proper permission, he delved into materials on Siberia in the 17th and 18th centuries. His research was written up into a collection of documents entitled "Materials on the History of Siberia," published while still in confinement in 1866 and 1867. [41] His studies on

---

39 Potanin's memoirs, as quoted in Dubrovskii, "Istorik i drug zhenshchiny," pp. 163-64. Karl von Rotteck (1775-1840) edited the Staatslexikon (to which Potanin was probably referring), a liberal encyclopedia quite influential in the 1830's.

40 For full bibliographical citations of these and his other articles of the time, see D. Iazykov, "Pisateli, umershie v 1882 g.," p. 54.

41 Potanin, "Materialy dlia istorii Sibiri," Chteniia v Imperatorskom Obshchestvie . . ., (1866) bk. 4, pp. 1-128; (1867) bk. 1, pp. 129-230; and bk. 2, pp. 231-324.

Siberian history he had actually begun in the Omsk archives as a Cossack in 1856. Potanin also pursued his other line of interest — natural science and exploration; he studied the Tatar language, took up paleontology, and worked up a number of geographical studies. Life in prison was not completely unfavorable for scholarly work, for besides his articles Potanin put together "a whole paleontological museum in his room." [42] According to Semevsky, Potanin and Yadrintsev asked to be transferred from the Omsk military prison to the guardhouse so as to be able to observe the life and morals and to hear the stories of inmates there (peasants, exiles, vagrants, Kazakhs, etc.). [43]

Yadrintsev's chief contribution to come from his stay in the Omsk prison and guardhouse was a book published in 1872 on Russian prison life: The Russian Commune in Prison and in Exile. [44] His three-year confinement gave him ample observations and reflections to use in writing this work, which he completed later in exile. Of his other activities he wrote: "In prison and in the guardhouse we shortened our days of imprisonment with studies. Potanin obtained the right to investigate regional archives, and he, Shashkov, and I worked on them. Shashkov drew rich materials from them for his historical monographs." [45] While in the guardhouse Yadrintsev wrote an article (perhaps under Shashkov's influence) on the history of Siberian women in the 17th and 18th centuries, published in 1867, and an obituary article on Chokan Valikhanov for Milyutin's Siberian Herald (1866). Other articles on

---

42 Popov, "K 80-ti lietiiu," pp. 296-97.
43 Semevskii, "Nieskol'ko slov v pamiat' Iadrintseva," p. 32; see also Obruchev, Potanin, p. 77.
44 Iadrintsev, Russkaia obshchina v tiur'mie i ssylkie (St. Petersburg, 1872). For more details see below, pp. 357-58.
45 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," p. 158.

Siberia were printed in the Petersburg journals Cause and Spark.[46]

While Potanin and Yadrintsev remained basically unchanged throughout their confinement, and Shashkov reoriented his scholarly interests away from Siberia, Nikolai Shchukin underwent a basic alteration in character and mind. Of his life in confinement, Yadrintsev briefly recounted: "There were victims in prison. The unfortunate Shchukin, formerly a great agitator and propagandist, went mad; a mystical delirium came over him, and he finally repudiated the past."[47] As for Shchapov, suffering already from the effects of his exile to Eastern Siberia in 1864, his detention in Omsk was relatively brief. Potanin's "confession" that he himself had written the controversial poem "To Siberia," instead of Shchapov, caused the latter's early release. Shchapov consequently left for Irkutsk in August 1865.[48]

Confinement in Omsk suddenly came to an end for [illegible] of the "conspirators" in early 1868. Of the verdict and the last moments of confinement Potanin wrote:

> After three years of our sitting in prison, a judicial sentence finally came. Our affair had already been examined in the Moscow branch of the Senate. The Moscow senators discussed our deeds and determined the extent of our crime; but we never saw our judges with our own eyes, and we did not exchange one word with them. A guard officer brought me the news as he was making the rounds of the rooms. . . . He came up to me and said, "You are condemned to five years of hard labor."[49]

---

46 In Russian: Dielo and Iskra, respectively. For full bibliographical citations of Yadrintsev's works of this period, see Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 203-04.

47 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," p. 158. Shchukin may well have been going downhill for some time before this; see above, p. 299 n.

48 On Shchapov's confinement see Vegman, "Epizod iz zhizni Shchapova," Bassim; Koval', "Kharakter obshchestvennogo dvizheniia," p. 33; and Popov, "K 80-ti lietiiu," p. 297.

49 Potanin's memoirs; quoted in Popov, "K 80-ti lietiiu," p. 297. Cf. this with Yadrintsev's account of the verdict's announcement (below, p. 349.

As the "ringleader," Potanin had originally been sentenced by the Senate to fifteen years of hard labor, but the State Council had found extenuating circumstances, and his term was shortened to a five-year sentence of hard labor, to be followed by exile in "settlement" in European Russia. Yadrintsev had originally been sentenced to twelve years of hard labor, but this verdict was commuted to exile in northern Russia. After a ceremony in which the condemned were deprived of all civil rights, those considered the worst offenders (seven in all) were sent off to hard labor or exile. Potanin was ordered to be sent to the Finnish fortress of Sveaborg (in Helsinki harbor) to report for hard labor. In the "second category," Yadrintsev and Shashkov were exiled to Shenkursk in Archangel province, and Shchukin, Shaitanov, and Usov were exiled to villages in Olonets province. The sixth in this category, Usharov, was exiled to another village in Archangel province. As Potanin put it, "since our crime consisted of propagating separatistic ideas in Siberia, Governor-General Duhamel . . . , referring the investigatory matter to Petersburg, requested that all of us be turned out of Siberia." [50]

Yadrintsev summed up the three-year ordeal as follows:

> The judgment on us was severe: at first they sentenced Potanin, Shashkov, and me to twelve years of hard labor, but later they mitigated the punishment in view of our youth and the long detention while under investigation. We spent three years in Omsk . . . at first in the guardhouse, and then in the fort, for it was crowded in the guardhouse. We were housed about four or five men per room and began to get ill. We lived half-starving, sometimes living on tea and kalatch bread. Our youth

---

50 Potanin's memoirs; quoted in Popov, "K 80-ti lietiiu," p. 297.

> saved us. Years dragged by, and in Russia events and reforms were accomplished, as zemstvos and a new court system came; the Karakozov affair burst forth. . . .
>
> After three years of difficult confinement a confirmation arrived. They announced the sentence to Potanin on the scaffold, put him in irons, and took him to Sveaborg. [51]

In the "third category" belonged those sentenced to three months' confinement (after three years of preliminary confinement already!), to be followed by three years of police supervision. Into this group fell the teachers Yevdoky Gankin and Yevgeny Kolosov, and others. In the "fourth category" were two men exiled from Siberia without loss of civil rights: Grigory Usov and Andrei Zimin, who had originally handed Shchukin the Irkutsk proclamation, as a twelve-year-old. In the "fifth category," those who "remained under strongest suspicion," were Dmitry Kuznetsov, former editor of the Tomsk Gazette and several others. [52]

The members of the "sixth category" were "freed from responsibility." In this group were Nikolai Naumov, Andrei Nesterov, Afanasy Shchapov, Nikolai Pavlinov, the cadets Gavriil Usov and Arseny Samsonov, and others. This group included many of the members of the "first" and "second" compatriotic circles in St. Petersburg, along with some Siberian students at the Medical-Chirurgical Academy and at the University of Moscow. [53]

Of the exile of the seven "separatists" to northern Russia, Yadrintsev

---

51 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," p. 158. The sequence in types of confinement in Omsk, as described by Yadrintsev, appears to conflict somewhat with the sequence described by Semevsky and Obruchev (see p. 346 above). Part of the unclarity lies with the imprecise use of the words fort (ostrog), prison (tiur'ma), and guardhouse (gauptvakht).

52 See Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 61.

53 Ibid., pp. 61-62.

later reflected: "It was a reverse exile from Siberia — seemingly the only time that Siberia was acknowledged as some sort of fatherland and that one had to be expelled from it. Most exiles, of course, would have liked being expelled this way." [54] Potanin later put it:

> Thus paid the Siberian separatists for their enthusiasm in serving Siberia and for their aspiration to study Siberia's needs and how to satisfy them. Before their exile the Siberian separatists were almost completely uninformed on local Siberiansaffairs; the literature on Siberia had only raised questions regarding Siberia's needs, and working out all of these could be expected only in the future. [55]

Reflecting back over forty years, Potanin certainly did not overestimate the knowledge and wisdom of experience shown by himself and his fellow regionalists in the sixties. The immensity of their task became more apparent only with time and much effort.

Despite the confinement and subsequent exile of many of the leading members of Siberia's young, patriotic intelligentsia for almost a decade, their regionalist cause did not lie entirely dormant during these years. On the other hand, it did not fully blossom. Of the years immediately following the unfortunate Siberian independence affair Yadrintsev could only remark:

> The affair did not involve separatism, but the destruction of undesirable patriotic aspirations in Siberia. After the first compatriotic circle in the sixties in St. Petersburg and after the Siberian affair of 1865, the tendency of patriotism, considered as illicit, died down for a while. But it could not disappear, and it emerged in a few years. It had to

---

54 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," p. 158.
55 Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," p. 273.

> emerge as local society became more conscious and as the region's needs came to be clarified. The questions of a university and of the exile system were raised. A local patriotic press appeared. Even the government wished to satisfy certain local needs and demands and gave reforms. [56]

Nevertheless, these gradual tendencies and changes, on the part of both the government and Siberian society, made little headway in the 1870's before Yadrintsev himself had returned from exile.

---

56 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," p. 157.

CHAPTER VII

REGIONALISM IN THE SEVENTIES

The 1860's witnessed among the young Siberian regionalists the stirring up of patriotic regional sentiment, the formulation of Siberia's present needs and future objectives into a rough "program," and the exposition of these ideas and aspirations in newspapers and lectures. During the 1870's, however, regionalists made more concrete efforts to realize some of goals enunciated earlier in the Petersburg Siberian circle and during the few years of open activity in Siberia. In this they were joined by several older-generation Siberians who more or less took up the regionalist cause. Briefly, the achievements of regionalists during the seventies fall into the following areas: assistance and promotion of prison and exile reform; support and participation in a provincial Russian paper that espoused regional revival in general; establishment of a private regional press in Siberia; increased study of Siberia's history and peoples; attainment of imperial approval of a Siberian university; and the gradual broadening of public

initiative and civic spiritedness in Siberian society. During this decade the political dangerous ideas of Siberian autonomy and separation receded out of the picture entirely, as far as regionalist thought and action were concerned.

Also in contrast to the 1860's, the leadership in the regionalist movement shifted to a certain extent in the seventies. Whereas Potanin, Yadrintsev, and Shashkov (and Shchapov to a degree) had by and large been the most active proponents of regional sentiments and interests in the previous decade, in the 1870's Yadrintsev, Vagin, and Zagoskin became the most prominent spokesmen in voicing the need for regional reform and progress. Moreover, they acted positively in both word and deed, The earlier dreaming, theorizing, llanning, and propagandizing began to be replaced by practical action toward realizing the most attainable demands and goals of regionalism.

The achievements of Siberian regionalists in the seventies could hardly be called complete victories. In many cases what success they accomplished was fraught with difficulties, even after attainment, and in some instances was only partially realized. More specifically, inertia or hostility, on the part of both the administration and the public, prevented a thoroughgoing prison or exile reform during the seventies, a completely free private press, and the immediate construction and opening of a university.

After 1865 Siberian regionalism went into a kind of hibernation. Its chief advocates had been arrested, imprisoned, and then banished to northern Russia. Thus, the decade of the 1870's began rather inauspiciously, with the acknowledged leaders and initiators of regionalism as a movement in exile, and with local, somewhat more moderate representatives of the "older generation" in Irkutsk assuming the mantle of leadership in the movement almost by default. In this group were such Siberians as Vagin, Zagoskin,

Nesterov, and, to a certain extent, Shchapov. By the end of the 1870's Siberian regionalists of various backgrounds had not only made a significant impact within Siberian society, but they had also sought to evaluate their relationship and Siberia's to the two most notable developments of the sixties and seventies in the empire as a whole: the Russian revolutionary movement and the Great Reforms of Alexander II.

* * *

Regionalists in Exile (1868-74)

After a confinement of almost three years in Omsk in the wake of the Siberian independence affair, Potanin was sentenced to hard labor at Sveaborg fortress in Finland, while Yadrintsev, Shashkov, and four of their comrades were deported to Archangel and Olonets provinces in northern Russia. These condemned "separatists" remained unpardoned until late 1873 or 1874, when they were allowed to leave northern Russia for Petersburg or elsewhere. Two of them, Shchukin and Usharov, died in exile in 1870 and 1873, respectively.

During the years of exile through 1871, one can say that regional questions and activities for the cause were not uppermost in the minds and deeds of Potanin and Yadrintsev. Potanin, spending three years at hard labor, had hardly the time or energy to devote to regional interests. Yadrintsev in the first three years of exile put his greatest efforts into compiling a work reflecting his experiences and observations in prison and exile. His articles that concerned Siberia, written at this time, revolved mainly around this same subject. Finished in late 1871, Yadrintsev's first major work, the fruit of his past six years and over 700 pages in length, was <u>The</u>

Russian Commune in Prison and Exile. The year 1872 witnessed not only the publication of this work, but also Potanin's release from hard labor and his exile to "settlement" in Nikolsk, a small north Russian town (Vologda province). From 1872 to 1874 both Potanin and Yadrintsev worked diligently on behalf of both Siberian regionalism and regionalism in general by means of the Kama-Volga Gazette, a regionalist weekly, published in Kazan.

Exile began for Yadrintsev in 1868 when he left Omsk in the company of Shaitanov and Usharov. After a difficult journey, performed in part by barge and by foot, the three reached Archangel. Arriving in bad health, Yadrintsev recuperated in a hospital for several weeks, but could not remain without "business, books, and studies" for long. Soon he was able to obtain his indispensable books and paper. Moreover, a local official asked him to prepare a memorandum on the condition of Russian prisons, in view of government preparations underway for prison reform. The governor of Archangel province, Gagarin, agreed to take this memorandum to the Ministry of Interior on his next trip to Petersburg. After two weeks of work, Yadrintsev finished the report, and his superiors were quite satisfied with it. In fact, they permitted him to choose whatever district town in the province he wished to reside in. Thus, Yadrintsev chose Shenkursk, where Shashkov was then staying. Gagarin actually presented Yadrintsev's unsigned memo to the Ministry, where it evidently made little impact, though was not discarded. [1]

In Shenkursk Yadrintsev had the company of Usharov and Shashkov, who had both been too ill to proceed to Archangel first. In this town lived

---

1 Regarding his days in Archangel, see Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," pp. 159-61.

several Russian and Polish exiles too, though the Siberians "lived as a separate circle." [2] Shenkursk, according to Potanin, was a "real university" for Yadrintsev. Here, surrounded by such educated exiles as Shashkov and the Russians Prugavin, Khristoforov, and Natanson, Yadrintsev spent much time reading, discussing, and working up articles for publication in Petersburg periodicals. [3] In letters to Potanin he mentioned having read such writers as Marx, Lassalle, Malthus, and Schultze-Delitsch. Moreover, his analyses and critiques of their works and of various articles on the peasant and native questions were so extensive that Potanin jokingly called these letters "little volumes." [4]

Of his first years in Shenkursk Yadrintsev gave the following account:

> In exile I began a number of journal articles in Cause on Siberian prison and exile. In connection with this I began to get interested in the criminal question and ordered many foreign books. But the main purpose was to disclose the unsoundness of the Siberian exile system. . . . I investigated it in this respect from all sides. At the same time I studied the history of colonies, learned English, and took up the problem of centralization and decentralization in various European states. This question seemed important to me for studying the regional question in Russia. Thus, all during my exile I prepared myself for publicistic activity, studying European history and the history of colonies.

Moreover, conversations and discussions with his fellow exiles gave him "opportunity to clarify these questions." [5]

In 1871 Yadrintsev gathered together all his essays and notes written

---

2 Ibid., p. 161.

3 A. Kh. Khristoforov was a former student in Kazan and future émigré publicist; A. S. Prugavin was a northern regionalist of sorts; and Mark A. Natanson (1850-1919) was a populist and future Socialist-Revolutionary of note.

4 Quoted by T. Farafontova, "Cherty iz zhizni sibirskago patriota. K 80-lietnemu iubileiu G. N. Potanina" (Features from the Life of a Siberian Patriot: On G. N. Potanin's 80th Jubilee), Russkaia Mysl', (1915) no. 9, p. 153.

5 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," p. 161.

since 1868 on prison and exile, some of which had been printed as articles. By reworking them and by writing a few new chapters, Yadrintsev was able to compile the book published a year later as The Russian Commune in Prison and Exile. Having experienced prison life firsthand and having studied it closely, Yadrintsev stepped forth in this work as an ardent champion of prison reform and, by implication, exile reform. He worked on the assumption that no one is incorrectable and that the prisoner, though a criminal, is still human. Moreover, a system of solitary confinement, which he had personally experienced, could not improve a man. On the contrary, he felt that the uniquely Russian commune, spontaneously formed, even in prison and exile, exerted the best correctional influences upon a criminal.

Yadrintsev's work had an effect on the Russian reading public somewhat similar to two recently published works on the same general subject: Dostoevsky's House of the Dead (1862), which also described prison life in Omsk, and Maximov's Hard Labor and Siberia (1871), a wide-ranging work of travel impressions, interviews, and scholarly research. Yadrintsev's study was especially well received by Count V. A. Sollogub and his commission on prison reform, in view of its abundant factual information. Indeed, Yadrintsev was later invited to participate personally in the commission's deliberations. Thus, his work and his views had some impact too on the dignitaries that ultimately controlled the fate of many thousands of Russian prisoners and exiles. As one of his biographers summed it up, "The difficult days of Yadrintsev's confinement in a pre-reform prison rendered a great service for Russian society." [6]

---

6 B. B. Glinskii, "Nikolai Mikhailovich Iadrintsev. (Biograficheskii ocherk)" (N. M. Yadrintseg: A Biographical Sketch), Istoricheskii Viestnik, (August 1894), p. 429. As I was unable to gain access to Yadrintsev's Russian Commune, my summary of the work is taken chiefly from Glinsky and Lemke.

The book was divided into two parts. In the first half, Yadrintsev gave personal observations and impressions in the form of literary essays, much of which was autobiographical. In the second half, he presented a historical sketch of the exile system, a comparison of various systems of punishment in Russia and in Western Europe, and the bases for a new, more rational system of correction in accordance with the most recent scientific views on the subject and with the experience of the Russian prison commune. Yadrintsev tried to indicate external conditions whereby a prisoner could be prepared successfully for re-entry into civilian life. The means for this rehabilitation in prison, Yadrintsev believed, perhaps too idealistically, was the commune (obshchina), which should be more strongly developed and encouraged.

> The correction of criminals should be based on the healthy elements of the commune and should offer a better means than the foreign exile systems and ours. . . . The prison commune did not devour itself in internal dissensions, but created its own laws for itself; in place of enmity and crimes it introduced a fraternal union of all the oppressed, the outcast, and the suffering . . . [7]

Yadrintsev's portrayal of regeneration through the commune tended to suffer, however, from his inductive method of investigation, which did not always provide enough evidence to prove the working existence of the commune. In keeping with the populists' idealization of the uniquely Russian village commune, Yadrintsev put somewhat the same great faith in the efficacy of the prison commune upon its members.

After completion of this work, Yadrintsev's investigations in this direction subsequently went more toward proving the harm of the exile system

---

7 Iadrintsev, Russkaia obshchina v tiur'mie i ssylkie; quoted in Glinskii, "Iadrintsev," p. 431.

for Siberia than toward promoting prison reform per se. In 1874 alone he published nine articles devoted to the subject of exile.[8]

Meanwhile, in 1872 Potanin's term of hard labor in Sveaborg fortress had ended. He was now given exile status and was transferred to Nikolsk. A vigorous correspondence was struck up between Potanin and Yadrintsev, despite an intermediary in the form of a curious but good-natured district police officer. Besides reporting the latest literary news to each other, they discussed such ideological problems as nationalism and local patriotism. Potanin, who saved these letters of Yadrintsev until late in life, claimed that they revealed Yadrintsev's thought at its freshest and most interesting stage. As an example, Yadrintsev attached the following requisites to patriotism in one of Potanin's favorite passages: "patriotism, like 'young wine,' should . . . fizz and gush like a fountain, like a sign of youth, fresh energies, and young, proud hopes."[9]

Among Potanin's projects in Nikolsk was the compilation of a survey for the Russian Geographical Society on the diffusion of Turkic and Finnic peoples in Tomsk province in the 18th and early 19th centuries. For this work he had brought with him all the way to Nikolsk extracts he had copied from the Tomsk archives. For a local study he had just completed on the ethnography of the Nikolsk area he was awarded in 1873 a silver medal by the Geographical Society. Thus, his interests were not entirely taken up with Siberian or regional issues during his stay in northern Russia.

About this time there came to Nikolsk a young, regionalist exile from

---

8 See Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 205-06.

9 Letter to Potanin, dated October 22, 1872, at Shenkursk; Potanin is quoted by Farafontova, "Cherty iz zhizni sibirskago patriota," p. 154.

from Kazan, K. V. Lavrsky. Lavrsky had been the editor of the newly established Kama-Volga Gazette and now kept close ties with the paper's acting editor, N. Ya. Agafonov. The exiled Lavrsky informed Yadrintsev, by way of Potanin, that the editorial staff of the provincial paper would be greatly interested in printing articles dealing with Siberian life. Thereupon Yadrintsev quickly wrote to Agafonov:

> being closely interested in the fate of provincial journalism, with which I have always sympathized deeply, I am ready to serve it — I don't know how suitable my works can be for your paper. I am chiefly a Siberian writer, and if I can be useful, then it will be namely by articles on the East. . . . Knowing the conditions of provincial publishing, I will not ask for any recompense, if funds are lacking, but will ask instead, if my assistance becomes permanent, that you send out your paper to the East, to Siberia, to three or four main towns — Tyumen, Tomsk, Irkutsk, and Omsk, since it probably is not overly popular there. [10]

Agafonov accepted Yadrintsev's offer, and during the year 1873 the latter immersed himself in publicistic activity on behalf of the Kazan paper in particular and the regionalist cause in general. According to Yadrintsev's account, Potanin,

> in view of the poverty of the Gazette, offered to attach himself to it and to invite Siberians to contribute. Writing articles on Siberia, I undertook at the same time a number of articles on the regional question. The initial point was this: each Russian region could have its own interests, and a provincial's views were distinct from those of a metropolitan or centralizer. On this Potanin, Lavrsky, and I were agreed. The articles in the Kama-Volga Gazette were full of originality. We had the courage to attack the metropolitan press, and at the same time I

---

10 "N. M. Iadrintsev v Kamsko-Volzhskoi Gazetie (1873)" (N. M. Yadrintsev and the Kama-Volga Gazette in 1873), Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1899) nos. 170 and 172; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 79-80. The Kama-Volga Gazette (Kamsko-Volzhskaia Gazeta) began publication in January 1872 in Kazan.

> subjected provincial organs to analysis. We began to follow a decentralistic direction and to hold the idea of a regional provincial renaissance. The paper quickly moved ahead, the attention of the metropolitan press was drawn to it, and both Shelgunov and Mordovtsev gave it first place in their provincial review sections. We wrote with ardor, freely, and unhampered by the editorial staff. This was an organ in which we had equal rights with the editorial staff. My most passionate, ardent, and inspired articles on both Siberian and regional questions date from this period. Even my friend Potanin, a serious scholar, became a publicist at this time. [11]

From his study of regionalism abroad, Yadrintsev wrote an interesting article for the Gazette entitled "The Fate of the Province and the Provincial Question in France." Castigating French centralism, he stated that "all the constitutions of France, composed under the influence of Parisian parties, had very little support from public opinion in the provinces. The Legislative Assembly never valued them and was never closely connected with local interests. In this way the instability of all the constitutions of France is explained." [12] This rather simplified view of French history reflects the influence of the tumultuous events of 1870-71 on Yadrintsev's staunch decentralistic thought.

Yadrintsev also came to the defense of native peoples in general, and in Siberia in particular, in the pages of the Kazan paper.

> We cannot apathetically regard the fate of natives and the native question in Russia and Siberia. The position of these people, living side by side with the prosperity of one race, cannot be allowed to deteriorate; it is of no advantage to have amidst a

---

11 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," p. 162. In 1873 Yadrintsev wrote approximately one article per week for the Gazette; with one small exception this paper was the sole outlet for his writings in that year (see Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 204-05).

12 Iadrintsev, "Sud'ba provintsii i provintsial'noi vopros vo Frantsii," Kamsko-Volzhskaia Gazeta, (1873); quoted in "Ot redaktsii," Vol'naia Sibir', (1927) no. 1, pp. 10-11.

> developing culture, in a country touched by this culture, a wilderness of savages doomed to a miserable existence; it is unjust to educate one part of the population and to exclude the other. Finally, any kind of oppression, slavery, and exploitation of the human personality, in a region where civilization and enlightenment are being assimilated, cannot be permitted. [13]

In this respect, (with the exception of Speransky perhaps) Yadrintsev was the first outspoken champion of native rights in Siberia in the 19th century.

An article of Potanin's in the Kazan paper was perhaps the first one written by a regionalist to touch upon the issue of a railroad through Siberia. As far as Potanin was concerned, however: "To build a railroad into Siberia means beginning the matter from the tail end." In other words, the question should first be considered from the viewpoint of the local population's own economic interests, instead of the commercial and manufacturing interests of Russian entrepreneurs. [14] Besides the exiled Yadrintsev and Potanin, the Kama-Volga Gazette attracted Siberian writers in Siberia to contribute articles; among these were the regionalist-oriented Vsevolod Vagin and Andrei Nesterov, then living in Irkutsk. Not only did the regionalist ideas of Yadrintsev and Potanin help promote the emergence of a Volga regionalism, as witnessed in the Gazette itself, and a meaningful dialogue between the metropolitan and provincial press, but they also served to inspire the rising Ukrainian federalist, M. V. Dragomanov (1841-95). [15]

Yadrintsev was also concerned about regional interests all over Russia.

---

13 From an unidentified article in Kamsko-Volzhskaia Gazeta, quoted in Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 68.

14 Potanin, "Syr'evaia doroga" (A Road for Raw Materials), Kamsko-Volzhskaia Gazeta, quoted in Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 219. Unfortunately, Potanin's memoirs extend only up to his participation in the Kama-Volga Gazette; thus information about him at this time is relatively scarce.

15 Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 67, 68-69.

In a letter to A. S. Prugavin, a native of Archangel and a former fellow-exile of his in Shenkursk, he told how he had received from the editors of the Kama-Volga Gazette

> a mass of provincial papers, among them the Don. I will prepare a review of provincial papers. It must be shown that our provincial press doesn't even know what to concern itself with, and that it has not determined the popular interests in the areas where it is published. The provincial paper is still occupied with street lights, bridges, and waterpipes, and further theatrical scandals are not necessary.
>
> Each locality within certain geographical limits, with its own topographical and ethnographical features and special economic interests unique to it, should devote itself to working out its own local interests.[16]

As an example, Yadrintsev pointed to the Russian North, which both he and Prugavin knew firsthand, with its individual economic and communications problems. "Its history is tragic. Centralization has killed the life in it and has taken from it the most advantageous communications by rivers from Siberia and the East; the rivers of the North are atrophied, as though they were not even there." And he asked, who, if anyone, represented the interests of the Russian North. "Where is the intelligentsia in the North, and where is a permanent local intelligentsia in the provinces in general?"

> They say that provincial questions are too petty. Yes, of course, as they are now understood. But connect them with the life of the people and with the peasantry and they will not be petty. . . .
>
> I say that each group in Russia has its own interests, life, and needs according to locality. The revival of this local group is tied up with the development and revival of the whole people. Popular life abroad has revived only where each part of a state is alive and has representatives of its interests and its own local figures. But in Russia

---

16 Letter to A. S. Prugavin, dated June 27, 1873, at Shenkursk; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 81.

> not only small localities, but whole regional groups lie as though dead. This is how the provincial question, which provincial papers and writers do not recognize, is so significant.

Yadrintsev concluded his letter by urging Prugavin to action:

> I will now speak of the provincial's literary activities. You can send accusations and ridicule of the provinces to the Petersburg papers, but you never write sincerely about the provinces; this is not accepted. On the other hand, the provincial press affords room and opportunity to quarrel and speak from your soul. . . . If you agree with my opinion, write an ardent, fiery article called "The Forgotten North." [17]

Yadrintsev felt the provincial press should not only acquaint the local intelligentsia and society with local problems and needs, and encourage development and growth. It should, furthermore, act as a mediator between higher literature and the provincial reader, so as to give him the best in print from the metropolitan periodicals.

On this theme he wrote to Potanin:

> The provincial newspaper should understand that it cannot compete with the capital . . . and it has other tasks. . . . Thus, as the metropolitan press has a section on world politics, the provincial press should have foreign politics, depicting the life of provinces in the West, their autonomy, etc. Where the state is discussed in the metropolitan press, the provincial paper should discuss the region.

As though pointing to his own future position as regionalist editor, Yadrintsev stated that "a provincial editor must have whole-hearted convictions, that is, before beginning a paper, he must know what he wants; it is not enough to say, 'we want to publish!'; first, it is necessary to 'explain the aim of publishing' and to give a clear account of the tasks of a pro-

---

17 Ibid., pp. 82-83.

vincial organ." He felt that others should do for their own regions what he and his friends had already done for Siberia: "Each province should clearly realize all its needs and compile a program of action for satisfying them." Considering himself at the vanguard of a new movement or awakening in Russian political and social development, he closed his letter to Potanin with the optimistic exclamation: "The province is the future." [18]

As Lemke points out, these convictions were of some significance in Yadrintsev's future activities as a regionalist writer and newspaper editor. First, he had little inclination toward "centralistic" Petersburg or toward students, intellectuals, or artists who temporarily went into the provinces to exhibit or spread their ideas. Secondly, he saw concrete, practical tasks to be performed in the provinces. Serious, conscientious journalism in the provinces offered the best means of arousing both state and society to implement these tasks. Moreover, he showed himself to be a permanent, unvacillating friend of the people. The editorial staff and contributors of the Kama-Volga Gazette more or less shared these convictions, and the exchange of ideas and polemics between this paper and various Petersburg journalists indicated that the "provincial" or "regional" question had more or less come of age in Russian public opinion. [19]

Yadrintsev in his letters also developed at this time his views on regionalism abroad. Amplifying the ideas expressed in his article on France, he wrote to Potanin in 1873,

> What a horrible example France has presented with its centralized provinces, and how peacefully a state reposes with provincial self-government or with a

---

18 T. Farafontova, ed., "Iz bumag sibirskago patriota" (From the Papers of a Siberian Patriot), Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1902) no. 188; this undated letter of 1873 to Potanin is quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 84-86.

19 Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 86.

> federal principle. This is the lesson of the latest historical events.[20] One can only say that European parties in some countries unsuccessfully apply this principle of federalism, and still too many centralistic prejudices are in them, as in France; they believe that any party with the help of usurpation can realize the doctrine of federalism from above, among a people untrained in self-government; but the latest French experiment and the example of the historical development of truly federal states like Switzerland and the United States show the opposite. Federalism has developed from below — from the commune, from the parish, and from the township, gradually organizing into states and their unions. This has been an organic historical growth, and the root lay in the ideas of the people, in the masses, who found expression for their instincts and wishes, and not in the external form of inculcated doctrines of the centralizing parties. 21

This is certainly one of Yadrintsev's strongest statements in favor of federalism and a federated state system. He now viewed the United States as not only a model for Siberia in its colonial experience and separation from the moterh country, but also as a model for all Russia in its internal federal structure. If separation was not to be realized, then autonomy within a federated Russia was Siberia's best hope for the future.

Besides his elaboration of regional or provincial questions in general, Yadrintsev also developed new ideas and hammered home old ones relating to Siberia in particular. Thus, in 1873, in the Petersburg paper, Week, he discussed a proposed administrative redivision of Siberia.

> The replacement or abandonment of governor-generalships alone will not help, if they are left alone without the help of institutions. . . . Open trial, justices of the peace, a zemstvo, and a new municipal self-government can now serve as such institutions, /all of/ which

---

20 The establishment of the Third Republic in 1871.

21 Undated letter of 1873 to Potanin; quoted in "Ot redaktsii," Vol'naia Sibir', p. 11.

> would be a better support for the authorities in the fight against abuses and better organs for managing local affairs. . . . Together with these reforms and for their successful action, it is also necessary to raise and strengthen the educational resources of the region, since without educated and capable people, institutions alone will be impotent. [22]

Here he presuasively argued that administrative authority in Siberia would actually be bolstered and made more effective with the aid of better men and institutions together, both of which were sorely needed.

Turning to Siberian economic and political problems at this time, Yadrintsev argued that Siberia should no longer serve as a colonial, mercantilist source of raw materials, but should acquire greater self-determination and "laissez-faire" in economic matters. His preference for a regional autarky, bolstered by uninhibited industrial capitalism, is evident.

> Protectionism is not possible for our East; it is impossible to think of organizing a customs at the Urals; [23] in return, the East can enjoy other powerful means for encouraging its industry . . . For promoting and encouraging local industry the development of technical education in the country is needed; supplying the region with working forces and a large population by means of free colonization, and encouraging local products and handicrafts, and furnishing credit to artisan associations, with the help of a zemstvo are also needed; finally sending for exports, furnishing the country with machines, and a rapid circulation of the population are necessary. Only a railroad can serve as a means of successfully achieving the majority of these goals. . . . So that a railroad may benefit the country and not separate classes, it should be directed to the centers of industrial life, Tyumen and Tomsk, and not to the land of savages, who will be in no condition to defend themselves from commercial exploitation and to

---

22 Iadrintsev, "Administratsiia v Sibiri" (The Administration in Siberia), Nedielia, (1873) no. 15; quoted in Glinskii, "Iadrintsev," p. 432.

23 A customs at the Urals had been abolished in 1868.

> enjoy all the blessings of civilization. . . . Our East, supplied with rich natural products and vast steppes, with a population which has not known the yoke of serfdom, with the Russian commune as an economic basis, and in the vicinity of various peoples more capable than the Negroes and Indians of America, can win for itself a happy future. What alone is needed is that the best sides of European civilization be imparted to us and that the development of a manufacturing and factory economy accompany the security of the working class and increase its wages. [24]

Indeed, Yadrintsev's peculiar mixture of a populist faith in the Russian commune, alongside the institutions and technology of Western civilization, and his espousal of a capitalist, industrial future for Siberia already in the early 1870's put him in a rather unique position in Russian economic and social thought. [25] Obviously, if Siberia should ever throw off the colonial yoke, it would have a future in some ways even greater than America's (for the United States lacked the commune and superior non-white peoples). Yet Yadrintsev was unable to foresee that Siberia's relationship to Russia, whether colonial-mercantilist or laissez-faire-capitalist in nature, would continuously leave Siberia dependent on European Russia, as long as the "center" existed. The Russian investors and manufacuurers were in many ways to link Siberia much more closely to Russia in the 1890's than ever before.

Yadrintsev also expressed his hopes for a Siberian zemstvo more explicitly at this time.

> Along with a railroad, another means of defending the region from exploitation and of encouraging local industry should also be advanced. The character of such measures can be discussed only by a

---

24 Iadrintsev, "Sud'by Sibiri" (Siberia's Fate), Nedielia, (1873) no. 5; quoted in Glinskii, "Iadrintsev," pp. 432-33; and in Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', pp. 67-68.

25 He was one of the first Russians to read Marx's Das Kapital, translated into Russian in 1872. See A. Terent'ev, "N. M. Iadrintsev (K sorokaletiiu so dnia smerti)," Sibirskie Ogni, (1934) no. 6, p. 133 ff.

> local institution — a zemstvo, without which the country will be flung into economic anarchy and subjected to all possible fortuities. Thus, we should desire that the first ceremonial train into Asia be met by a zemstvo. [26]

In retrospect, one can see that his views concerning the effect of a zemstvo's absence or presence in Siberia were painted in rather black or white colors.

In another, quite different way the period 1872-74 was important for both Yadrintsev and Potanin. The former, while working for the Kama-Volga Gazette, began to correspond with another contributor to the paper, the daughter of a Yeniseisk gold entrepreneur, Adelaida Fyodorovna Barkova. The exchange of letters continued, and in July 1874, six months after Yadrintsev had been released from exile, the two were married in Nizhni Novgorod, where Adelaida had been working. Potanin, through his acquaintance with Lavrsky, got to know his sister, Alexandra Viktorovna, when she came to Nikolsk to visit her exiled brother. After she had left for Nizhni Novgorod, where she taught school, Potanin wrote to her, requesting that she send him an instrument needed for meteorological observations. From this beginning, the correspondence grew more and more intimate. Ultimately, Alexandra agreed to marry Potanin, and she came to Nikolsk, where they were wed in 1874. Thus, Yadrintsev and Potanin, like so many exiles in Siberia, found that the circumstances of exile could be rather conducive to marriage.

In 1873 and 1874, Yadrintsev and Potanin, respectively, received amnesties and permission to go to St. Petersburg. The steps taken by Yadrintsev to achieve this long-awaited event he described briefly in his autobiography. In 1873,

---

26 Iadrintsev, "Sud'by Sibiri," quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 139 n.

> After Usharov's death, my solitude in Shenkursk became even more painful. For half a year I had begun corresponding with Petersburg, and I turned to the former governor of Tobolsk province and member of the Council of Ministers, Despot-Zenovich, and also to Count Sollogub, . . . asking them to petition for my liberation. Thanks to the petition of these persons and to the petition given in the name of Count Shuvalov, I was pardoned and sent to Petersburg. [27]

On December 1, 1873, an imperial pardon for Yadrintsev was issued, and by the end of the month he had received the news. He quickly set out for the capital, sending off several remaining articles to the Kama-Volga Gazette. In St. Petersburg he learned that the request of editor Agafonov to transfer the Kazan paper to Moscow had been rejected, and the paper was forced to close in early 1874. It was never revived. Soon after his arrival in the capital he appeared before Count Sollogub's commission to testify on prison and exile reform.

Potanin's permission to leave Nikolsk came in 1874, when a manifesto was issued that gave him the right to leave his place of exile for any town in Russia but Petersburg and Moscow. Hence he bade farewell to Nikolsk and went with his wife to Nizhni Novgorod, where her mother lived. Here he soon received word that at the request of P. P. Semyonov, now vice-president of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society, the chief of the gendarmes had submitted a petition for Potanin's full pardon. When this received imperial approval, Potanin left for Petersburg. Here he soon became involved in various project of the Geographical Society. Among these were several scientific excursions in European Russia, the writing of an up-to-

---

27 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," p. 163. Count P. A. Shuvalov (1827-89) was then the head of the Third Section.

date supplement to Ritter's geographical work on Asia, and the preparations for an expedition to Mongolia.[28] From this time on, and for the rest of the century, Potanin devoted most of his energies to science and exploration. Only on occasion during these years would he engage in public or journalistic activity that fell under the rubric of regionalism. From this time on, till his death in 1894, Yadrintsev became the chief standard-bearer of the Siberian regionalist movement.

As noted above, a champion of Siberian regionalism in its formative period, Shashkov, abandoned his interest in investigating his homeland's past and speaking for its present and future. Shashkov was also exiled to Shenkursk, where he stayed from 1868 to 1873. Here he contracted an incurable sickness, which eventually led to his death in 1882. Though one article of his on slavery in Siberia was published during these years (in 1869), his articles on Russian social thought and on the history of women (published in 1871) better illustrate the new-found interests of this ex-regionalist.

Another Siberian ex-regionalist (though of a much different kind than Shashkov) in exile in the late sixties and early seventies was Shchapov. Though the application of his talents had begun to wane considerably since his deportation to Eastern Siberia in 1864, Shchapov still made a number of valuable contributions to the study of Siberian ethnography and history. Aside from his earlier theoretical contributions to regionalism in general, these investigations made in exile can be considered as a kind of "involuntary" service to Siberia. Though Shchapov had returned to Siberia rela-

---

28 The second edition of Karl Ritter's geographical compendium, Erdkunde (Berlin, 1822-58), included various sections on the countries of Asia, but was still incomplete by the author's death in 1859.

tively optimistic, the lack of educated company, of libraries, and his status as an exile depressed him more and more. Vagin wrote of him in Irkutsk: "The company of /Shchapov's/ Olga Ivanovna was much more pleasant than that of her husband. Her conversation was serious and logical, but without pedantry; . . . Shchapov, on the contrary, could not speak of anything but of what occupied him at the moment, and much of this was of no general interest." [29]

After Shchapov had been cleared of charges in the Siberian independence affair of 1865 and was allowed to return to Irkutsk from Omsk, he eagerly took part in an expedition of the Geographical Society's Siberian Section to the lower Yenisei valley in 1866. On this so-called Turukhansk expedition Shchapov investigated the physical development and characteristics of the Russian and native populations, their economies and ways of life, and the colonization in the area. While working up his findings in Krasnoyarsk after returning from the north, Shchapov dug up much interesting archival material on Siberian history. This he was able to include in his most important historical work on Siberia, "Siberian Society before Speransky." [30] In the summer of 1874 he undertook his last ethnographical excursion, to investigate the diverse ethnic characteristics among residents of the Bratsk steppe. Most of Shchapov's ethnographical and geographical research was printed in various issues of the Proceedings of the Siberian Section. His writings on Siberia that were not published before his death in 1876 were destroyed by the great Irkutsk fire of 1879. [31]

---

29 Sibirskii Sbornik, (1889) no. 2, p. 69; quoted in Koz'min, "Shchapov," p. 153.

30 Shchapov, "Sibirskoe obshchestvo do Speranskago," Sochineniia A. P. Shchapova, vol. 3 (St. Petersburg, 1908), pp. 643-717.

31 On this period of his life (1864-76), see N. Aristov, "Zhizn'," pp. 605-16.

Vagin, Zagoskin, and the Newspaper Siberia (1875-81)

In 1875 Siberia's first private regional newspaper to last for more than a few years was established in Irkutsk. For twelve years it served as one of Siberia's most important voices of public opinion. Its chief founders, Vsevolod Ivanovich Vagin and Mikhail Vasilievich Zagoskin, gave it the name Siberia. The establishment of this paper was the fruit of efforts of regionalist thinkers in both Petersburg and Irkutsk to set up a private newspaper devoted to Siberia on a firm footing.

In 1874 several Siberian writers in St. Petersburg, among them Potanin and Yadrintsev, who had just arrived in town, put forth the idea of just such a publication. One result of this was the publication in 1875-76 in Petersburg of a collection of works on Siberia edited by Boris Milyutin, former editor of the Amur and the Siberian Herald. This publication, given the full title of A Collection of Historical and Statistical Data on Siberia and Contiguous Countries, was short-lived however, as only four issues came out before it folded in 1876. [32]

Attempts were also made in Petersburg to gain permission to publish a regular newspaper in the capital on Siberia. Thus, Yadrintsev discussed the idea in late 1874 with P. A. Rovinsky, a noted explorer and Siberiophile:

> We spoke much of the fact that the time had come for a Siberian press and that anthologies should be published. Rovinsky suggested that I get to know B. A. Milyutin, who had served in Eastern Siberia and had even published a paper there. He /Milyutin/ had the idea of publishing a newspaper

---

32 B. A. Miliutin, ed., Sbornik istoriko-statiskicheskikh sviedenii o Sibiri i sopriedel'nykh s neiu stranakh, 2 vols. (four issues in all), (St. Petersburg, 1875-76).

> called "The East" in Petersburg. He had petitioned, but it was not permitted, because . . . it was a time in which an increase in newspapers was not especially looked upon with favor.
>
> We discussed it all winter long. I attended meetings at Milyutin's, but the matter did not come off. [33]

The attempt to set up a paper in Irkutsk was more successful. Though official permission to publish a private paper could not be obtained in Irkutsk either, another opportunity soon presented itself. In 1873 a newspaper called Siberia had in fact gotten off the ground in Irkutsk and was edited by a military engineer named Klinder. Klinder's paper had no overall plan or direction, was unskilfully edited and without editorial assistants, and dragged out a rather wretched existence. In 1874 it had a grand total of nine subscribers, and though supposedly a weekly, it did not publish more than 20 issues a year. [34] Several people, including Vagin, Zagoskin, and A. P. Nesterov (a former Cossack officer), who sympathized with the idea of a good local newspaper, began negotiating with Klinder in an attempt to get him to cede them publishing rights. After successful negotiations, the group acquired Siberia from Klinder, who still remained legal owner, however. Though the particulars of this exchange are not fully known, Yadrintsev has supplied some of the details.

> Our friend A. P. Nesterov in Irkutsk acquired the newspaper Siberia from Klinder, a paper falling into decay in untalented hands. At first they telegraphed us that we should take this paper to Petersburg, and I adtually wanted to give it to Milyutin, going in

---

33 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," p. 169. Boris Alexeevich Milyutin (1831-86) was younger brother of the famous statesmen Dmitry and Nikolai Milyutin. For his journalistic activities in Irkutsk, see above, p. 178, 179.

34 G. N. Potanin, "Iz istorii provintsial'noi pressy" (From the History of the Provincial Press), Otechestvennyia Zapiski, (March 1881) no. 3, p. 31; and V. P. Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 107.

> with my own editorial staff (Naumov, Potanin, and I were on hand in Petersburg). But this combination did not succeed, in view of the difference of our opinions and those of Milyutin's circle. The paper was destined to stay in Irkutsk; Nesterov, Vagin, and Zagoskin took part in it, and the paper continued to exist for many years. We supported it the whole time with active assistance. [35]

Both Vagin and Zagoskin, the two chief initiators and supporters of Siberia, were not without previous journalistic and public experience. Vsevolod Ivanovich Vagin was born in Irkutsk in 1823, the son of a minor official. Soon after his birth, his family moved to Omsk, and from age five on young Volodya began to get a somewhat haphazard education in various towns in the Omsk area. In 1837, his father's death, the family moved to Troitskosavsk in Transbaikalia. After a more systematic education here, Vagin was appointed to teach in a parish school in 1840. Later that year, however, he entered the civil service of the Main Administration of Eastern Siberia in Irkutsk. In his ample spare time, he continued to educated himself, especially by making use of Boldakov's private library, where he read all he could. In time, however, he fell from the good graces of Muravyov, and he consequently moved to Tomsk and then to Kainsk. In the latter town Vagin began to submit articles to the Irkutsk Provincial Gazette in the late 1850's. In 1861, after Muravyov's departure, Vagin resigned from official duties altogether and returned to Irkutsk. Here he assisted Shestunov with his library for several years and practiced law for fifteen years. During this time Vagin also became active in the affairs of the Siberian Section of the Geographical Society, and with the establishment of the Irkutsk

---

35 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," p. 169.

Municipal Duma in 1872, he was elected a member. From 1872 to 1880 he was especially active in municipal affairs. As one biographer commented, "All the societies of Irkutsk are connected with Vagin's name." [36]

Vagin's efforts at serious writing began in 1847 in the St. Petersburg Gazette, and he continued the same in the Northern Bee in 1850. His literary output became more profuse in the late 1850's when he wrote articles on Siberia in the Tomsk and Irkutsk Gazettes and in the St. Petersburg Gazette. In the 1860's he became the permanent Irkutsk correspondent of the latter paper. He also played an active rôle in the Amur and for a short time edited Milyutin's Siberian Herald.

Besides these activities as journalist and publicist, Vagin can also be considered an historian in his own right. He was, in fact, the first since Slovtsov to put out a major historical work on Siberia. In 1871, after several years of labor, he completed his study of Speransky in Siberia, and a year later he made his first trip to European Russia to arrange its publication. Thus, in 1872 his two-volume compilation was published in St. Petersburg as Historical Data on the Activities of Count M. M. Speransky in Siberia from 1819 to 1822. [37] This extensive work is divided into thirty-two chapters, each of which deals with a different aspect or area of Speransky's activity, interest, and influence in Siberia. In the years between this work and his death in 1900, Vagin wrote several lesser, but important studies on Siberian history. Indeed, most of the 200-odd articles that he wrote altogether dealt with Siberia in some way.

---

36 I. Popov, "Vagin," Entsiklopedicheskii slovar' (St. Petersburg: Granat, n.d.), VII: 452. Vagin's autobiographical sketch appears in S. A. Vengerov, "Vagin, Vsevolod Ivanovich," Kritiko-bibliograficheskii slovar' (St. Petersburg, 1895), vol. 4, section 2, pp. 4-7.

37 Vagin, Istoricheskiia sviedeniia o dieiatel'nosti grafa M. M. Speranskago v Sibiri s 1819 po 1822 god, 2 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1872). Much of the material used for this study perished in the Irkutsk fire of 1879.

From 1875 to 1887 he was always closely involved in the fortunes of the paper Siberia, and from 1888 until his death he was active in the affairs of the "successor" to Siberia in Irkutsk, the Eastern Review. Though Vagin was never an avowed regionalist champion, as were Yadrintsev and Potanin, his deeds in public affairs, journalism, and historiography, and his concern for Siberia as a whole quality him as an important contributor to the regionalist cause. Belonging to a generation earlier than that of the "sixties," Vagin has been dubbed one of "the old Siberian regionalists." [38]

A second regionalist of the older generation was Mikhail Vasilievich Zagoskin, born (as was Shchapov) in 1830 the son of a cleric, in an East Siberian village. At the age of ten young Zagoskin was sent to the Irkutsk bursa or seminary school. Sketches of his childhood in his home village and in Irkutsk are reflected in his semi-autobiographical novel, "The Master," written in the early 1860's.[39] From the bursa Zagoskin went on to the Irkutsk ecclesiastical seminary. Finishing the seminary course as the best pupil, he was sent to study at the Kazan Ecclesiastical Academy. Here the same atmosphere that helped produce such Siberian scholars and publicists as Shchapov, Shashkov, and Grigory Yeliseev also had its effect upon young Zagoskin.

In the mid-1850's he returned to Irkutsk and became professor of history at the Irkutsk ecclesiastical seminary. In the opinion of Shashkov, then studying there, Zagoskin was one of the two best teachers.[40] He soon

---

38 Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 67. Svatikov refers to Zagoskin as a "regionalist of the older generation" (p. 70).

39 (Zagoskin) "Magistr," Sbornik gazety "Sibir'" (St. Petersburg, 1876), pp. 1-188. Only the first part of the novel was ever published.

40 Shashkov, "Avtobiografiia," Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1884); quoted in Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 189.

gave up teaching, however, for journalism. After editing the Irkutsk Gazette and the Amur during the years 1859-60, he became inspector of the Irkutsk military pro-gymnasium and the technical school. In the 1870's he became active in the Irkutsk Duma and in 1875 helped found the "Society for Rendering Aid to Students," established on public initiative. When in 1879 he went into semi-retirement from public life, he opened at Granovshchina, not far from Irkutsk, a free school for village children.

In 1857 Zagoskin wrote his first serious work, an article for the newly established Irkutsk Provincial Gazette on the conditions of life among Siberian peasants and natives in the Irkutsk area. Soon after this, Muravyov (with whom he got along well) appointed him editor of the Gazette, succeeding Speshnyov. Here he developed the "unofficial section" of the paper, to which many exiles and local writers then contributed. In 1860, Zagoskin helped establish the Amur, which existed precariously under his editorship for about two years as Siberia's first private paper of note.

Despite the earlier disagreements with Milyutin over the Amur, in 1864 Zagoskin helped him establish his Siberian Herald, which lasted for three years. During the sixties and seventies Zagoskin was active in the Siberian Section of the Geographical Society, an institution which attracted the assistance of most of the public-minded men in the Siberian East. In 1875, in fact, Zagoskin became the Section's Manager of Affairs, a post which he held for about ten years. During this time he was also in charge of publishing the Proceedings of the Section.[41]

---

41 P. P. Semenov, ed., Istoriia Geograficheskago Obshchestva, II: 491. There is no very satisfactory biography of Zagoskin. Perhaps the best is Koz'min's study of Zagoskin and his times, "Zagoskin," pp. 181-228; also see I. Popov's cursory sketch, "Zagoskin," Entsiklopedicheskii slovar' (St. Petersburg: Granat, n.d.), XX: 399-400.

Zagoskin recognized, as did Yadrintsev, that to realize any program of reforms for Siberia, public opinion had to be mobilized, and for this a newspaper was the best vehicle. Exactly why Zagoskin, Vagin, and their friends began a newspaper only as late as 1875 is not clear, for Irkutsk had been without a private or semi-private paper of worth since 1867. The lack of official permission was probably the chief handicap. Only by purchasing and obtaining publishing rights to Klinder's licit, but miserable organ, which had continually licked the boots of local officialdom, could they get around this obstacle.

Thus, the name Siberia was retained both for continuity's sake and to symbolize the regional outlook the paper was to take on. Its initial development under new management began somewhat as follows. After successful negotiations with Klinder, various local writers "proposed that the oldest of the Siberian writers, Vs. Iv. Vagin, be editor-publisher, and they asked M. V. Zagoskin, well known for his experience, also to take part in editing the paper." [42] It thus appears that in June 1875 Vagin began to publish and edit the paper, with Zagoskin serving as an integral assistant, and that in 1878 the publishing rights passed into the hands of Andrei Nesterov. [43]

Vagin himself related the following: "I succeeded in uniting many Siberian writers in this paper, and I gave it life and a certain significance. I published the paper until 1877 and then handed it over to M. V. Zagoskin, remaining, however, an active contributor to it." Vagin also stated that Zagoskin "became a co-publisher and its editor. The paper remained under

---

42 (Iadrintsev) "Nachalo pechati," p. 387; see too Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 207.

43 Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 209; and Potanin, "Iz istorii provintsial'noi pressy," p. 31.

his guidance until it was discontinued in 1887." [44] All of this implies that Zagoskin, after 1877, shared the position of publisher with someone else, presumably Nesterov.

Siberia and its promoters ran into difficulties soon after its establishment as a private, regionally oriented newspaper. At first, it was printed on credit in the local printing press, and on donated paper. Soon, however, problems of a more serious nature arose. According to Yadrintsev,

> With its publication under a new editorial staff, however, a curious thing happened.
> In Irkutsk the police chief . . . made a search of the homes of the editor and publishers on the grounds that the editorial staff had relations with the separatists Potanin and Yadrintsev, though we had been free persons for some time. This unwarranted act did not receive the approval of the authorities in Irkutsk, and the paper began to be published. [45]

Another, differing account of Siberia's difficulties was printed in Peter Lavrov's socialist paper, Forward!, published in London. The editors received in September 1875 a report from Irkutsk describing events earlier that year. In the absence of Governor-General Friedrichs, it seems, the police chief, Chebykin, had taken it into his head to make political searches at the homes of Vagin, Zagoskin, and a number of other prominent persons.

> Of course, they found nothing. The public is lost in conjecture about the reasons for this outrage, and the big-wigs affected so coarsely are awaiting the return of the baron /Friedrichs/ with impatience, so as to appeal against this unparalleled trick of the police chief. There is much reason to think that all these unexpected searches were made so as to discover the author of the correspondence from Irkutsk printed in the paper, Forward!. [46]

---

44 Vagin's autobiography, as quoted by Vengerov, "Vagin," IV: 7; and VI: 243.
45 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," p. 169.
46 "Iz Irkutska" (From Irkutsk), Vpered!, (October 15, 1875) no. 19, p. 598.

Thus, this anonymous writer not only identifies himself as the indirect cause of Vagin's and Zagoskin's misfortunes (as did Yadrintsev in his account), but he also puts them at the top of the list of local "big-wigs."

Whatever the reasons behind the searches of 1875, the sources show that segments of society and officialdom were hostile and intolerant toward the staff of Siberia and linked them with "untrustworthy" outsiders. In another hostile episode, a private individual named Hackel wrote the editors, declaring his intention to bring them to trial. To this threat the newspaper replied:

> From the last words of Mr. Hackel we should conclude that he intends to prosecute us through court. We will be very satisfied by this. A judicial decision can interpret best of all the obscure rights of the press for many. And besides, to seek justice by lawful means is a thousand times more sensible and honorable than, under the pretext of personal explanations, bursting into not even the editorial office, but into the private apartment of the editor . . . [47]

By the end of 1875, despite the unpleasant events of the year, Siberia already had 600 subscribers.[48] Klinder, who originally had ceded only publishing rights to the paper and was still the owner, now announced he intended to sell the paper for 3000 rubles, though he offered Vagin and his friends the first chance to buy. Thus, they ended up paying Klinder 2000 rubles to gain full ownership of the paper.[49]

In 1878 a new series of turnovers affected Siberia. N. G. Tyumentsev became the new editor-in-chief, though in fact Zagoskin remained in charge of the staff. Moreover, Nesterov became the owner of the newspaper. Then, in June 1879 the terrible Irkutsk fire occurred, and rumors were even

---

47 Sibir', (1875) no. 5; quoted in Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 208.
48 Potanin, "Iz istorii provintsial'noi pressy," p. 31.
49 Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 209.

spread that Vagin and Zagoskin had burned the town.[50] As all of his own property had burned, Zagoskin decided to leave Irkutsk temporarily. He moved to a village about ten miles from town, where he built a small cottage and lived for much of his remaining life (he died in 1904).

Soon after the fire, in August 1879, a new series of arrests and searches set in which involved Zagoskin (in Granovshchina), Vagin, and others associated with Siberia. As usual, accusations were levied against them, and a "political affair" was stirred up, but after some time instructions came from Count Loris-Melikov, the Minister of Interior, which "set all of them free, for lack of any facts whatsoever to support the accusation."[51]

After the disastrous fire of 1879, intensive efforts were made to save money to buy a new printing press. A local merchant, A. M. Sibiryakov, offered to provide 17,000 rubles on credit toward the purchase. With this in the offing, an old press in Petersburg was bought and moved to Irkutsk in early 1880. However, various financial complications ensued, which were compounded by a second fire in March 1880, which destroyed the newly acquired printing press. As Potanin put it, "all the hopes of the editorial staff blew away with the smoke into the air." For his alleged complicity in this fire, Nesterov was arrested and jailed as an "instigator," and all the papers and correspondence of the newspaper were confiscated. Putting together the accounts of Lemke and Kozmin, it appears that the paper was suspended in early 1880 for printing articles that displeased not only local authorities but some local merchants too. Moreover, Siberia subsequently

---

50 Vagin's manuscript diary, line 16; in the State Archievs of Irkutsk Oblast; quoted in L. Podol'skaia, "Dnevnik Vagina," p. 122.

51 Quoted in Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 209; see also Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 104 n; and Podol'skaia, "Dnevnik Vagina," p. 122.

had given the full story of these sad events to a Petersburg paper, which had promptly published it. After the usual searches of apartments, the editor Tyumentsev was forced to resign, and the paper was not issued again until January 1, 1881. At this time Zagoskin was reinstated as editor. [52]

All these misfortunes and calamities go to show how extremely difficult it was not only for a private newspaper to survive and to propound the views of its staff and contributors, but also for the very men themselves to lead their own private lives amidst frequent harassment from private citizens and officials. Little distinction was made between their public and private affairs. Arrests were made arbitrarily, and the mishaps of Siberia often evoked great joy in some quarters. In contrast to the Amur in the early 1860's, Siberia had absolutely no ties with the local administration. In many ways the social and administrative atmosphere of the late 1870's was more intimidating and repressive than it had been twenty years earlier. As Koz'min notes, "Muravyov's plans could often coincide with the plans of local public figures. But in the 1870's the latter kept themselves completely aloof and consciously removed themselves from any kind of agreements and compromises." [53] Yet the determination of men like Vagin, Zagoskin, Nesterov, and Tyumentsev to create an independent voice of public opinion in the face of so many official and social obstacles was definitely a healthy development in an unhealthy environment. Though Yadrintsev once wrote that the existence of Siberia "coincides with the greatest awakening of intellectual life in Siberian society," this was much more true of its

---

52 On these events see Koz'min, "Zagoskin," pp. 210-14; Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 104 n.; and Podol'skaia, "Dnevnik Vagina," p. 122.

53 Koz'min, "Zagoskin," pp. 215-16.

last six years than of its first six.[54]

Consideration should be given to a few of the most significant and indicative articles printed in Siberia. In June 1875, in the very first issue the editorial staff formulated their program:

> The general progress of the country consists of a regular and rapid development of all sides of its life. Of these sides the most important of all is the intellectual, economic, and political status of the country; all other conditions adjoin this and depend on it . . . Politics is not our affair; that is why we are concerning ourselves with other sides of the country's development, and chiefly the economic, on which even intellectual achievements to a great extent depend.
>
> What is necessary for the successful development of the country's economic prosperity? First of all, it is necessary that the person and property of each are secure enough; and for this a good, properly ordered administration and a good, upright court system are needed.[55]

Nevertheless, the Irkutsk paper, though professing to be non-political, would find politics, in the form of the local administration, difficult to avoid in charting a course to improve Siberia in other respects. Still, regional economic questions indeed became the paper's main concern.

A few issues later the editorial staff determined what the role and significance of Siberia should be for the region.

> A local Siberian organ cannct compete with those of the capital, and indeed this is not its task. It should prefer local problems to general ones . . . We have too many problems on the line of the simple and the ordinary to pursue the brilliant ones. Our language is rough, our speech is awkward, but we will have our say. . . . We endeavor to let the region itself and its inhabitants express their needs and

---

54 (Iadrintsev) "Nachalo pechati," p. 400. On Irkutsk in the 1870's, see Sukachev, Irkutsk, pp. 106-07.

55 "Voprosy dnia" (Questions of the Day), Sibir', (1875) no. 1; quoted in Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 217; and in "Nachalo pechati," p. 388.

> wishes. We value most of all the preservation of the only living organ [of the press] for our homeland, and we will give its improvement and future to the sum of opinions expressed, to the accumulation of literary efforts in the region, and to the sense and efforts of society itself. [56]

Thus, the paper's declared raison d'être was in many respects similar to Yadrintsev's credo, expressed only a few years earlier, on the chief tasks of a regional newspaper. Moreover, Yadrintsev later wrote of Siberia:

> It seems that there was not one corner in the Siberian expanse from which a voice would not resound, appealing to the press for local needs, and for which Siberia would not fight. Disclosing before the reading world a discomforting picture of rapaciousness, of pursuit after personal profit, of lawlessness and the trampling of the human personality, this organ . . . consoled society that it was on the verge of something better and it pointed toward what this would be. [57]

Although economic issues received considerable attention in the paper, other questions of a regional nature were, of course, raised in Siberia. For example, Shchapov, before his death in early 1876, wrote five articles for the paper, which mainly concerned a Siberian university, the natives of Siberia, and the Siberian working class. The ex-professor argued with much conviction that a future Siberian university should have four normal "faculties" and, to adapt to local conditions, chairs of agronomy and oriental languages should be added. [58] Yadrintsev wrote fifteen articles in Siberia between 1876 and 1880, most of them concerning either exile or Siberian social life; only one of them touched on a question specifically economic:

---

56 Sibir', (1875) no. 4; quoted in (Iadrintsev) "Nachalo pechati," p. 389; and in Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 218.

57 "Nachalo pechati," p. 389. For Yadrintsev's views in exile on the proper orientation of a provincial press, see above, pp. 363-64.

58 A. P. Shchapov, "Kakie fakul'tety neobkhodimy v sibirskom universitetie" (Which Faculties Are Needed in a Siberian University), Sibir', (1875) no. 3; quoted in Koz'min, "Shchapov," p. 159.

a Siberian railroad.[59] Zagoskin, who probably contributed more articles to Siberia in its first few years than anyone else, also wrote much on a Siberian university, and he welcomed its final confirmation in 1878 with much optimism.[60] Moreover, the paper contained a special section devoted to municipal and duma affairs, and local cultural events received much publicity in its pages.[61] As for lighter literature, the paper featured genre sketches, fiction, and satire by local writers.

Among economic issues discussed was the problem of communication routes in Siberia. In 1876, for instance, the following appeared in an unsigned article:

> The interior trade routes and their facilitation should always be preferred to exterior ones, since they promote the development of local industry, just as reinforcing the region's production and consumption should be preferable to export, and especially that of raw materials. Siberia must now be concerned with increasing its own industry, and not only with markets. . . . if you want its routes to pay for themselves, then encourage local manufacturing, develop trade and agriculture, and facilitate interior routes.[62]

The writer, presumably Zagoskin, favored (as did Yadrintsev) the development of Siberian industry, regional autarky in commercial matters, and the welfare of the local population placed first.

In 1877, Siberia amplified its earlier stance.

> We are far from thinking that we should close up and not conduct external relations and trade. We do not

---

59 See Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 206-08.

60 Zagoskin, "Pervye kamni dlia universiteta" (The First Stones for a University), Sibir', (1878) no. 22.

61 See Iu. S. Postnov, "Gazeta Sibir' i irkutskii teatr 70-kh godov XIX v." (The Newspaper Siberia and the Irkutsk Theatre in the 1870's), Obshchestvenno-politicheskoe dvizhenie v Sibiri, pp. 116-20

62 "Kakie puti nuzhniee dlia Sibiri" (What Routes Does Siberia Need Most), Sibir', (1876) no. 13; quoted in "Nachalo pechati," pp. 390-91; and in Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 219.

> want Siberians to be admirers of a Chinese-style seclusion. We are ready to greet the opening of routes and intercourse with the world, where civilization reigns, but together with this we must also be concerned with our own all-round development and firmly remember how to find a real means for this development. To step forth onto the international market and into competition, we ourselves must be strong and certain that we do not create commercial slavery instead of emancipation.[63]

Siberia's potential future of economic strength and self-sufficiency is now foretold with caution: the proper conditions must first be met.

In matters regarding agriculture and the peasantry Siberia also expressed interesting views and devoted much serious concern. Reflecting a populistic faith in the peasant commune, the editors held the opinion that "peasant" Siberia, in contrast to Russia, was alone in possessing solely communal agricultural practices. This was to guarantee the region a great future. In connection with rumors that large-scale agriculture geared to capitalism and a market economy was to be introduced by local administrators into Siberia, an article commented,

> Communal land-ownership in Siberia is a living and universal phenomenon and not an outdated form that is compulsory only by tradition or law [as in European Russia] . . . We have always thought that the absence of private land in Siberia, especially of large property, is one of the guarantees of its great future, through the possibility of an even distribution of prosperity and of the development of the chief industry — agriculture. Many countries have felt the influence of large land-ownership; Russia also has felt it; it acts as a precedent to many social ills and disorders, and it places difficult tasks on the future which are hard

---

63 "Mysli po povodu nashikh mezhdunarodnykh snoshenii" (Thoughts Regarding Our International Relations), Sibir', (1877) no. 47; quoted in "Nachalo pechati," p. 391; and in Koz'min, "Zagoskin," pp. 219-20. This article, if not written by Zagoskin, definitely reflects his views.

> to solve. It would be a great mistake to create such problems artificially in a country which has fortunately avoided such institutions. [64]

Thus, echoing Yadrintsev, the writer felt that Siberia's future economic prosperity lay in a somehow fortuitous mixture of local industry and small-scale communal agriculture, the one operating in a capitalist, free-market economy, and the other in a more socialistic, natural economy.

In view of the importance given to communal agriculture (which occupied almost 90% of Siberia's inhabitants, including settled natives), it is natural that Siberia gave much space to discussing peasant problems. Himself well versed in peasant conditions, Zagoskin wrote numerous articles advocating reforms in peasant affairs. In an article of 1881, he stated bluntly that

> among the causes impeding the peasants' development, and their overall welfare, popular ignorance naturally occupies first place. . . . the peasant pays dearly for his ignorance. He pays sorcerers and sorceresses, he pays clerks and petition writers, he miscalculates in sales and purchases, etc.

Zagoskin was not one to idealize peasant life and the commune. He suggested improving peasant educational instruction by implementing greater autonomy in local school affairs. "It is better to let peasants themselves teach their own children, as they know how, than to set up schools with teachers from whom they run away." [65] As he had set up a school in the village of Granovshchina just before this time, he had learned much from his own experience.

---

64 "Obshchinnoe zemlevladienie v Sibiri" (Communal Land-Ownership in Siberia), Sibir', (1877) nos. 20-21; quoted in "Nachalo pechati," p. 391, 392; and in Koz'min, "Zagoskin," pp. 220-21.

65 Zagoskin, "Sibirskie krest'iane" (Siberian Peasants), Sibir', (1881) no. 8; quoted in "Nachalo pechati," p. 392-93; and in Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 197.

Broader reforms were needed too. In Zagoskin's opinion, Siberia

> still needs to catch up with its mother country and petition for institutions long since introduced and established there. If we are soon given zemstvo institutions and new courts, and if we petition to increase the number of schools at least tenfold and then . . . distribute existing obligations more evenly and inoffensively, then the Siberian peasant will be able to live if not in clover then at least not in poverty. [66]

Moderate egalitarian that he was, Zagoskin looked askance at the increasing differentiation in income between wealthier and poorer peasants in just the past few decades. He feared the inroads into Siberia of a "slavery to capitalism worse than serfdom," but did not, and could not under local conditions, propose any radical solution to this growing trend. [67]

In 1876 the editorial staff of Siberia undertook a unique project in the publication of a special one-volume collection of "Siberiana" called An Anthology of the Newspaper "Siberia". The motive behind this was explained in the anthology's preface:

> The editorial staff of Siberia, in the course of the last half year, has accumulated a significant quantity of material that could not fit within the limits of the paper. Not wishing to conceal this material, the editors decided to publish it in the form of a special collection. If subsequent volumes come out after this "first" one, it depends on how readers accept the present experiment. [68]

Among the stories, poems, and accounts presented in the larger, literary section of the anthology were Zagoskin's semi-autobiographical novel, "The

---

66 Zagoskin, "Sibirskie krest'iane"; quoted in Koz'min, "Zagoskin," pp. 197-98.

67 "Chumazyi v Sibiri" (A Smudge in Siberia), Sibir', (1881); see Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 223.

68 Preface to Sbornik gazety "Sibir'", vol. 1 (St. Petersburg, 1876).

Master," and Yadrintsev's essay on Speransky's sentiments toward Siberia. The section devoted to Siberian history included, among other things, primary source material on the life of Slovtsov. Though a second volume was never published, due probably to either lack of material, insufficient public response to the first volume, or the general difficulties of the paper, this Siberian anthology did set a precedent. Along with Milyutin's anthology, published at this same time, Siberia's collection of works represents the fulfillment of a regionalist goal voiced in the early 1860's by Shchapov, Yadrintsev, and the Petersburg Siberian circle. In the 1880's similar "collections" were published under the aegis of another, more influential regionalist newspaper, the Eastern Review.

Despite services rendered by Siberia in trying to arouse social consciousness, Zagoskin in 1878 poetically pointed out the difficulties of this task. He thus asked Siberians:

> Who will awaken this sleeping realm? Whence will the peal and thunder resound capable of interrupting this age-long sleep? . . . There in the West, in Russia and Europe, a light flickers which promises warmth and life to people. Here we do not even see a faint glimmer. Will this light reach us, and will our lamps be ready to be lit by this light? Do we understand the sense of that song, long known to other peoples . . . : "quiet light, light of science and knowledge, of truth and humanity, and of freedom and self-consciousness, come and dwell within us." [69]

Although hardships and obstacles remained in the years ahead, through the efforts of Siberia and other progressive forces, "light" and renewal gradually penetrated Siberian society, rousing it from its slumber.

---

69 Zagoskin in Sibir', (1878) no. 1; quoted in En-Pe, "Proshloe Sibiri," p. 549.

In the face of attacks, Siberia doggedly continued along its course, holding firmly to the general direction taken since its inception in 1875. When Siberia was permitted to publish again, after the long shut-down in 1880, an editorial appeared in the New Year's issue of 1881 that reaffirmed the purpose of the Irkutsk newspaper.

> It was almost exactly a year ago when we, by the will of fate, were forced to discontinue our conversations with the reader. . . . Guided, as before, by the recognition that the printed word, however "modest" it be, still has its importance in the process of public self-consciousness, we are again resuming our interrupted conversations with the reader. [70]

Siberia was to survive for another six years before it was closed down permanently in 1887. Just two years before its final end, Yadrintsev wrote of its special significance as an independent voice in Siberian society:

> It has been hard, it seems to hope for longevity in an organ without funds, without special patronage, with the voluntary contributions of poor men, and in a region where society and the population have not been accustomed to an interest in literature. With all this, the local publication has not only struggled with circumstances, and not only strengthened, acquired vitality, and won its own existence, but it has been one of the prominent local organs. In this case it has been an example and clear proof of regional self-vitality and of an internal need for spiritual life, even in a remote country and distant borderland; it serves as a testimony of the birth of regional forces in Russia. [71]

Vagin and Zagoskin, especially through their newspaper Siberia, contributed considerably to the slow awakening of Siberian society in the late 1870's (or, in view of the ferment of the late fifties, a kind of reawakening). As the first private newspaper to survive for a substantial length of

---

70 Sibir', (1881) no. 1; quoted in Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 226.

71 (Iadrintsev) "Nachalo pechati," pp. 387-88. Siberia was resuscitated in the late 1890's under different management.

time in the region, Siberia, as its name indicated, spoke not only for Irkutsk and Eastern Siberia, but also for the region as a whole. It fulfilled an increasing need among educated and concerned Siberians, and they sought news and opinions in it relevant to their own lives, along with attempts to answer the numerous questions of the day. Many turned to the paper with complaints or for guidance and in this way began to feel a sense of solidarity with it. Thus, by 1881 it had come to serve as the first enduring mouthpiece and rallying point of public opinion — with no ties of any kind with the administration — in Siberian history. Compared with the short-lived, officially supported Amur in the early 1860's, Siberia and its chief promoters, Vagin and Zagoskin, had made a great step forward.

* * *

Yadrintsev in St. Petersburg and in Western Siberia (1874-81)

While Siberia was actively promoting regional interests in Irkutsk, Yadrintsev was at work in St. Petersburg and in Omsk undertaking much the same. In early 1874 he arrived in the capital, "exhausted by exile, tired, and nervous." His first and immediate concern was to find employment. As noted above, his advice on exile conditions had already been heard and appreciated by Count V. A. Sollogub and his reform commission. Soon after his visit with Sollogub, Yadrintsev in fact got a job as the Count's domestic secretary. Of his new "employer," Yadrintsev later reminisced:

> Count Sollogub was an old crank . . . /but he/ stood directly opposed to exile as a punishment, and he cited all of my book in his draft plan. In this respect I considered it a duty to support him. The Count sometimes jokingly said to me, "Siberia will have to erect a monument to me!" . . . For his

> struggle against exile and the clear understanding of its harm to the country which he has ascertained, one cannot but render him gratitude and fond memories.

Through Sollogub, Yadrintsev got to know other experts on prisons and on the exile system, including Professor I. Ya. Foinitsky.

> These acquaintances gave me a chance to know the views of various administrators and scholars on the exile question. At the same time I learned to be a representative of Siberian interests and a solicitor for Siberia. Consequently, my ties in administrative circles broadened. But despite these relations with higher administrative figures, my personal position did not improve, and, working for Count Sollogub, I had no security. [72]

Presenting reports and memoranda on the exile question to the Juridical Society, Yadrintsev could justly remark that "the criminal question became my specialty, and I was considered an expert on prisons, which indeed I was not." [73]

Along with his work in official circles, Yadrintsev submerged himself in literary activity. As a principled regionalist, however, he was loath to assist or contribute articles to newspapers and journals unsympathetic to his cause. Thus, after the Kama-Volga Gazette was closed down in early 1874 (for articles on the Samara famine that displeased the censor), Yadrintsev began working for an agreement on a new regional newspaper with Milyutin in the winter of 1874-75, and he readily co-operated with the new editors of Siberia, from his Petersburg base, from mid-1875 on.

His efforts toward founding a regionalist publication in European Russia

---

72 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," pp. 163-64.
73 Ibid., p. 167.

bore fruit when in 1876 he and other ex-contributors to the Kama-Volga Gazette (such as Lavrsky) put out a collection of miscellaneous works, called the First Step.[74] This volume was considered as a "first step" toward clarifying the relationships between regionalism, centralism, and populism.[75] Here Yadrintsev contributed no major study, however, as only two short stories and a poem of his were printed. This "first step" also proved to be the last one, for the censor did not permit a second volume to be issued by the Kazan-based editors. Thus, this concerted effort of regionalists in European Russia was just as short-lived as the similar anthology put out by the Irkutsk writers connected with Siberia that same year.

All in all, Yadrintsev's written contributions to the First Step and to Siberia's Anthology, two regionalist publications, were considerably fewer than his articles in "acceptable" Petersburg periodicals, especially Week and Voice. His articles of the period 1874-76, many of them written under pseudonyms, concerned such topics as Siberian administrative reform, the gold industry, a Siberian railroad, the needs of Siberian workers, a Siberian university, and the exile system. In 1876 he wrote his first two articles for the Irkutsk paper Siberia.[76] With the earnings from writing and from Sollogub's position, he managed to support his wife and new-born son.

Soon after his arrival in the capital Yadrintsev found that though his recent book on prison and exile had made some impact on administrative

---

74 Pervyi Shag. Provintsial'nyi literaturnyi sbornik (The First Step: A Provincial Literary Anthology), (Kazan, 1876). This work has remained inaccessible to me.

75 Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 97.

76 For a full listing of Yadrintsev's works of this period, see ibid., pp. 205-07.

circles and society, it was far from universally known. He was somewhat dejected to learn firsthand that Nekrasov, editor-in-chief of the Notes of the Fatherland, was not even aware of it. Moreover, a fellow Siberian and editor on the staff of the same journal, Grigory Yeliseev, also knew nothing of his book on Siberia. [77]

Also somewhat disappointing was the overall response that this avid regionalist met with in Petersburg. Among journalists, even such "defenders of the provinces" as N. V. Shelgunov and the Ukrainian D. L. Mordovtsev appeared as centralizers to him.

> Convinced that the Russian provinces had no representatives in the capital, that they had not rallied together, had not matured, and had not worked out a program, I again turned to our Siberian affairs. Consequently, I became convinced of how weakly developed a regional idea in general and a regional unity really were in European Russia. Only in the borderlands was it expressed with animation. [78]

Though depressing, the Petersburg atmosphere also tended to exert an invigorating effect upon Yadrintsev.

> Seeing the lack of understanding toward local feelings, inclinations, aspirations, and needs, the regionalist or borderlander will step aside from centralist intellectuals and shrink into himself, or continue his work in the provinces. I also noticed how a provincial or a regionalist in the capital gradually turned into a centralist. . . . /However,/ I remained true to my homeland and began all the more forcefully to bring Siberian questions into the metropolitan press. I began to write separate articles and topical satire in newspapers and even to introduce reports with a certain direction. . . . I wrote a whole number of articles on the question of exile, protesting against it, and even began polemical articles . . . [79]

---

77 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," p. 164.
78 Ibid., p. 166
79 Ibid., pp. 166-67.

Against a writer, who, for instance, stated that Siberia was indebted to the settlement of exiles, Yadrintsev wrote a "heated retort." As for some of his other articles at this time, he noted,

> The provincial question continued to occupy me, and in Week I presented essays showing the importance of a provincial and a regional renaissance. . . . Week provided space for my views, but they were so hard to understand in the capital that the editor . . . restricted me for a long time. The provincial question got all tangled up with the new tendency of "to the village" . . . [80]

Of this populistic concern for only the peasant and his commune in the provinces, Yadrintsev concluded,

> In any event, the life of the provinces was touched upon in provincial reviews and in metropolitan journals, but the provincial question waw never raised in all its width and depth, and the tone of the provincial defense never was raised as it was with us in the regional press, in the Kama-Volga Gazette, and in the First Step. [81]

After his initial contacts with Sollogub, Yadrintsev's most significant involvement with officialdom at this time developed out of his new acquaintance with Adjutant-General Nikolai Gennadievich Kaznakov (1824-85), who was appointed in January 1875 to be governor-general of Western Siberia. Of this turn of events Yadrintsev related:

> It turned out that he was interested in literature on Siberia and was gathering information on the question of a Siberian university. I asked /a mutual friend, M. K./ Sidorov to acquaint me with him, and he presented me to General Kaznakov. He completely charmed me. He indicated that he had read Naumov's book and my book, The Russian Commune, and was generally quite interested in Siberian questions. "Tell me," he asked, "what can I do for Siberia?" Having told him in words the needs of our borderland, I asked permission to present memoranda and draft plans

---

80 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," p. 165.
81 Ibid., p. 166.

> to him on the main problems, including exile, along with a program of information necessary to collect on the present conditions of the exile system, the history of a Siberian university, and the urgent need for it. [82]

Yadrintsev was, of course, delighted at finding an administrator so interested in Siberian problems, and especially the university question. With his wife's help he finished the memoranda in a few weeks. "I brought the notes to N. G. Kaznakov," he wrote, "and each time our talks grew longer. He well realized the harm of exile and the pressing need for a university." It was at this point that Kaznakov presented his views to the tsar on Siberia's need for a university. As Yadrintsev then recounted,

> When I gave him the last memoranda, I found N. G. Kaznakov in a full dress coat, returning from the palace. He gave me the glad tidings that through his report the emperor had agreed to founding a university in Siberia and had entrusted him with working out a draft plan. N. G. Kaznakov congratulated me like a Siberian and embraced me. . . . A new dawn had begun for Siberia. [83]

His immediate response was ecstatic. Exuberantly running home,

> Streets and houses did not existedor me. The thought carried me away into the distant past, when as youths we had dreamed of what was fated to be done in many years. Beaming and cheerful on arriving home, I kissed my family over and over. . . . My sensations were all the stronger in that I knew that others did not yet know, and it fell on me to transmit the good news to the homeland. [84]

Thus, in April 1875, by imperial decree Alexander II approved of writing up a draft plan for a Siberian university. The long-sought institution had been accepted by the autocrat almost overnight, in part due to favorable

---

82 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," pp. 167-68. Naumov's book on the Siberian peasantry was Sila solomu lomit (Force Crushes Straw), (St. Petersburg, 1874).

83 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," p. 168.

84 Iadrintsev, "Svietlyia minuty (iz vospominanii proshlago ko dniu otkrytiia universiteta" (Bright Moments: Past Recollections in Commemoration of the Opening of the University), Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1888) no. 29; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 102 n.

circumstances. Among them was the emperor's appointment of a sympathetic governor-general of Western Siberia. That this administrator had met and was impressed by Yadrintsev and his ideas, while still in Petersburg, added to the fortunate coincidence of events. However, the initial hopes and expectations soon plunged, for confirmation of the draft plan and the ultimate opening of the university were dragged out over many years.

When Kaznakov left St. Petersburg to take up his new post in Western Siberia, Yadrintsev and other Siberians saw him off. According to Yadrintsev,

> Before his departure he told me that he would try to justify our expectations. Actually, the news quickly reached our ears of the impression his entry made in Siberia. . . . The officials who met him he assaulted with unexpected questions on Siberian affairs and on the exile system, and everyone wondered where the new governor-general had learned all this. In Siberia they were used to seeing governors-general unfamiliar with local affairs . . . [85]

In early 1876 Kaznakov returned to the capital on business, and after contacting Yadrintsev, he invited him to serve in the Omsk administration.

> The proposal was tempting: to see the homeland again. The general said: "Yadrintsev, come with me, you love your Siberia, you have studied its needs and problems so, let's work together." This was the invitation of a noble administrator and a challenge to a patriot. . . . But I had no rights for entry into the service, and I lived by a passport taken from Archangel province. When I spoke of the governor-general's offer to my wife and relatives, and asked if they agreed to it, . . . they blessed me and gave their consent. We sold all our property, left our cozy apartment in Petersburg, where we had lived so quietly, and I took my wife, boy, and wet-nurse and went to Siberia. I went on my own account, since there was no permission to enter the service; after going through the Committee of Ministers, it arrived in Omsk a half-year later.[86]

---

85 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," pp. 168-69.

86 Ibid., p. 170. A. I. Despot-Zenovich's strong recommendation of Yadrintsev reinforced Kaznakov's wish to invite Yadrintsev into the service.

Yadrintsev and his immediate family arrived in Omsk in July 1876. His first six months were difficult, for the question of his "rights" to enter the civil service had been raised. As he wrote to Potanin, he had to live a half-year "without a position and without means in an Omsk extremely antipathetic to me." [87] Permission to enter the service finally arrived in December 1876, and the following January he was appointed secretary of the Akmolinsk regional prison committee. Yadrintsev was quite discontented with this position, his financial situation, and officialdom in general. From February 1877 to August 1878 he served as member of a committee to discuss the increase in the extent of Russian settlements and the amount of land needed for Kirghiz (i.e. Kazakh) settlements. In his words, the committee "conducted the affair so badly that I left with my own opinions, broke up its work, and it finished up with nothing." He also presented a memorandum and draft of his research on free colonization. In the end he became convinced that these "protector committees" were of no service at all to the interests of the people. [88]

Wishing to familiarize himself with the conditions of the Siberian peasantry, Yadrintsev began collecting information on land-ownership. He found much evidence of the sale of state land into private ownership. "Taking away the best lands from the peasants and selling them to officials and merchants presents facts that force one's hair to stand on end," he wrote. [89] His memorandum on this subject, however, had some results perhaps,

---

87 Letter to Potanin, dated September 5, 1877; in Farafontova, ed., "Iz bumag sibirskago patriota," Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1902) no. 172; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 106.

88 Letter to Potanin, in Farafontova, "N. M. Iadrintsev," Iubileinyi Sbornik Zapadno-Sibirskago otdiela I. R. G. Obshchestva (Omsk, 1902), p. 4; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 108.

89 Ibid., p. 108.

for in 1881 by order of the Minister of State Domains the sale of such lands was discontinued.

During the first few years of working in Kaznakov's administration, Yadrintsev was unable to tear himself away from Omsk. In early 1878 he wrote,

> Only the mass of living material which I have begun to dig up reconciles me with life here, along with the hope of traveling through Siberia. K/āzna/kov does not favor these trips, and they must be made independently. . . . I will probably break away this summer, though on vacation and on my own account. . . . I have spent two years in Siberia, and they don't let me see the life of the people; I don't know what the future will bring, but I will take a vacation and go on foot — this is decided.

Yet just as Yadrintsev the patriot yearned to get out into his native land, so Yadrintsev the writer felt that "the sooner I get into fresh air and into my native element — literature, the more I will preserve my energies." [90]

In both St. Petersburg and Omsk Yadrintsev strongly promoted the formation of a West Siberian Section of the Russian Geographical Society. Just as in the promotion of a Siberian university, he also helped convince Kaznakov of the need for a Section in Omsk. Kaznakov had earlier petitioned the president of the Geographical Society concerning the establishment of a "West Siberian" section in Omsk. In March 1876 the proposal was in turn reported to the State Council. In his petition Kaznakov had pointed out that the Siberian Section in Irkutsk limited its activity to Eastern Siberia. Moreover, he added that the many unique phenomena found in Western Siberia,

---

90 Letter to Potanin, in T. Farafontova, "N. M. Iadrintsev," p. 4; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 108-09.

besides their general interest, were important with respect to local administrative decisions on many issues.

> The modest and insufficient information we have at present . . . cannot give a true and comprehensive idea either of the nature of the country and its natural riches, or of the life of its inhabitants, their economy, industries, and trade, whereas detailed and scholarly research of all this is extremely important, for it can serve as a basis in all undertakings that aim toward some kind of improvement in the area. [91]

With Alexander II's approval, the State Council on May 10, 1877, gave the Russian Geographical Society permission to open a new West Siberian Section in Omsk, with an annual subsidy of 2000 rubles from the State Treasury. The Section was officially opened in Omsk on July 31, 1877, a chairman and a manager of affairs were elected, and a statute was drawn up modeled on that of the now renamed East Siberian Section in Irkutsk. [92] Thus, Western Siberia obtained a branch of the Geographical Society twenty-six years after a branch was established in Eastern Siberia.

The hopes of Kaznakov, Yadrintsev, and others for the new Section were not exactly fulfilled overnight. Writing to Potanin in September 1877, Yadrintsev told of the self-seeking and skeptical views of the Omsk public on how useful the Section would be. As for its early accomplishments, he stated:

> Our Section assembles chiefly on the occasion of scholars passing through. I fear it will receive only the lectures of traveling scholars and will bear the name of "Section of Foreign Communications." Local members, as usual, are quiet at the meetings. I am even beginning to be ashamed of my lectures alone.

---

91 From a paraphrase of Kaznakov's petition in Semenov, ed., Istoriia Geograficheskago Obshchestva, II: 490.

92 V. I. Sreznevskii, ed., Otchet Imperatorskago Russkago Geograficheskago Obshchestva za 1877 god (Report of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society for the Year 1877), (St. Petersburg, 1878), p. 115.

> After W's talk at the past meeting, the tired members jumped up and disappeared so quickly that I wasn't able to report on the Kostrov manuscripts; no problems or plans are developed. [93]

Yadrintsev was especially concerned that the activities of the newly established Section consist not only of paperwork and reports, but of field work too. On May 1, 1878, he himself left Omsk on a two-month vacation, going under the auspices of the Section into the Altai area (southeast of Omsk), but without Kaznakov's knowledge. This and another simultaneous expedition were the first to be sponsored by the West Siberian Section. Yadrintsev's expedition was also the first of many scientific expeditions which he undertook on occasion for the next decade and a half; on this one he sought to study the colonizing movement and the economic and ethnographical characteristics of the local population.. [94] The results of his Altai trip were printed up in the very first volumes of the Proceedings of the West Siberian Section in 1879 and 1880; Yadrintsev was also awarded a gold medal by the Geographical Society for his excellent research. [95] Moreover, this expedition, along with a second one, undertaken in 1880, provided Yadrintsev with much material for articles in Siberia and in Petersburg newspapers and journals at this time.

Despite promotions in rank and in pay in late 1878, Yadrintsev was dissatisfied in Western Siberia, and especially with the prevailing administrative atmosphere. He wrote to Potanin, then in Irkutsk (in the interval

---

93 Letter to Potanin, dated November 2, 1877, at Omsk, in Farafontova, "N. M. Iadrintsev," quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 109.

94 For details see Semenov, ed., Istoriia Geograficheskago Obshchestva, II: 661-62.

95 Iadrintsev, "Sviedeniia o marałovodstvie v Altaie" (Information on Stag-Hunting in the Altai), Zapiski Zapadno-Sibirskago Otdiela I. R. G. Obshchestva, (1879) bk. 1; and "Poiezdka po Zapadnoi Sibiri i v gornyi Altaiiskii okrug" (A Trip through Western Siberia and the Altai Mountain Area), Zapiski Zapadno-Sibirskago Otdiela . . ., (1880), bk. 2.

between his Mongolian expeditions of 1876-77 and of 1879-80), that there was little to obtain or expect from it. To Potanin's invitation that he come to Irkutsk Yadrintsev replied he could not effect such a move financially, nor would the service permit it; moreover, the same troubles would press on him there. "I regret that I cannot travel through Siberia: these years might not have been lost for literature or for society; I fear that these two-and-a-half years of life are not bringing many contributions to the public treasury." [96] Of the activities of the West Siberian Section he wrote,

> our geographical affairs are bad, and they don't want to make lectures accessible to the public; I don't understand this bureaucratic system of reticence. My Altai botanical collection lies in a storeroom unexamined, the same with samples of mineral waters, rocks, etc. In our Section everything will turn out to be useless. [97]

Though the draft plan of the Siberian university had been approved by the tsar in 1875, while Yadrintsev was still in Petersburg, not much progress had been made since. In Omsk Yadrintsev pressed Kaznakov to act energetically on the matter. In 1876 Kaznakov, in fact, brought a report to the Ministry of Interior urging the establishment of a university with four faculties, a view which the Ministry of Education shared. [98] Finally, in May 1878 an imperial order was issued to open the Imperial Siberian University in Tomsk, with four faculties: history-philology, physics-mathematics, jurisprudence, and medicine. As construction of university buildings would

---

96 Letter to Potanin, in Farafontova, ed., "Iz bumag sibirskago patriota," Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1902) no. 172; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, 113.

97 Quoted by Farafontova, "N. M. Iadrintsev," pp. 4-5; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 113-14.

98 I. Shcheglov, Perechen', pp. 680-81.

have to be financed in part by the public, the donations collected so far for the university, Yadrintsev learned, were far from enough. Renewing the fund-raising activities he had begun in 1864, he wrote to various contacts in Western Siberia urging donations for the now approved university. "Everyone says," he was informed, "that if the governor-general insisted on it, they would give quite a few /donations/. Such is Siberia." [99]

In April 1879 Yadrintsev was appointed member of a committee to review draft plans of statutes on military duties for natives in Western Siberia. In itself the work was of little general interest, but it did permit him to delve into facts and figures pertaining to the native question, which had interested him for some time. The end result of this research was a short but detailed brochure called A Program for Describing Siberian Natives, published in Omsk in 1880. [100] This marked the real beginning of an intensive study of Siberian natives by a man who had previously devoted most of his scholarly and literary activity to other Siberian problems. Indeed, Yadrintsev became perhaps the best known Russian writer and scholar in the 19th century on Siberia's indigenous peoples. Of this new-found interest he wrote at the time:

> The study of the native question and an initial acquaintance with the literature on the life of natives in Western Siberia aroused in me a desire to make a thorough investigation of them and also to compile a good map of the distribution of natives. I would gladly make an expedition to /study/ natives, but the question of my expeditions must be put off until next summer, however much I'd again like to go to the Altai. [101]

---

99 Letter to I. A. Dmitriev-Mamonovu dated February 27, 1879, "Pis'mo N. M. Iadrintseva iz ssylkie" (A Letter of Yadrintsev on Exile), Stepnoi Krai, (1894) no. 84; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 116.

100 Programma dlia opisaniia sibirskikh inorodtsev (Omsk, 1880).

101 Letter to I. A. Dmitriev-Mamonov, dated July 1879, in Farafontova, "N. M. Iadrintsev," p. 9; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 116-17.

Another important facet of Yadrintsev's activities in Western Siberia was his study of the Siberian peasant commune. This was initiated by the West Siberian Section in 1879, which, taking the cue from the studies of the Geographical Society on the commune in Russia, invited a number of people to help investigate and collect local information on the subject. Yadrintsev was entrusted with putting these local investigations together and with compiling a broader "program" on overall Siberian conditions. The result of this was a small work entitled "A Program for Investigating the Village Commune in Siberia." This was the first detailed study of the Siberian commune and was modeled on previous studies done in European Russia. Prior to this, little had been known publicly about the Siberian village economy and communal structure, tax system, and land organization among state peasants. Nine hundred copies of the "Program" were printed and sent out by the Section as a kind of questionnaire to various persons and places in Siberia. This, in turn, spurred further local investigations of peasant life and land organization in Western Siberia. In less than a year's time 250 sheets were returned to the Section in answer to Yadrintsev's "Program." Indeed, several very solid studies were made as part of the response. All this "raw material" returned to the Section was given to Yadrintsev, who made partial use of it, among others, in his later studies on the peasant and village economy in Siberia.[102]

In May 1880 Kaznakov gave Yadrintsev a new, relatively satisfying job: collecting information on the conditions of natives in Tomsk province and their social organization. For this task the Section granted him 1,500

---

102 Semenov, ed., Istoriia Geograficheskago Obshchestva, II: 671-72. The "program" was published as Iadrintsev, "Programma dlia izsliedovaniia sel'skoi obshchiny v Sibiri," Zapiski Zapadno-Sibirskago Otdiela, (1881) bk. 3.

rubles for a research expedition. This trip, taken in the summer of 1880, led Yadrintsev through Tomsk province, past Lake Telets, and into the Altai mountains, where he collected information on nomads. During his trip two questions formed in his mind which were to loom large in his later studies on Siberian natives: why were some natives growing impoverished or dying out, and what was needed to combat such tendencies? [103]

Regarding Yadrintsev's studies on Siberian natives in the period 1879-1881, Glinsky has commented:

> One can indeed be amazed at the scholar's capacity to embrace a subject quickly and in sufficient fulness and to illumine it from the viewpoint of the needs of the time and of science. . . . The scholar approaches the matter not simply stating reality, but he shows the means of developing and improving the subject under investigation. [104]

Yadrintsev was the first to take positive steps regarding Siberian natives almost since the days of Speransky. As Potanin put it, "Yadrintsev found a notorious state of affairs concerning the improvement of the natives' way of life, one that had dragged on without results for forty years . . ." [105] Glinsky concluded more specifically, "he was the first and only one up to that time to present serious and thorough material for studying the fate of natives in Western Siberia." [106]

Yadrintsev not only broadened considerably his knowledge of Siberian peasants and natives during his years in Western Siberia, but he also de-

---

103 His account of this trip was published as Iadrintsev, "Otchet o poiezdkie v gornyi Altai, k teletskomu ozeru i v vershiny Katuni" (Account of a Journey to the Altai Mountains, Lake Telets, and to Katun Glacier), Zapiski Zapadno-Sibirskago Otdiela, (1882) bk. 4.

104 Glinskii, "Iadrintsev," p. 437.

105 G. Potanin, "Nikolai Mikhailovich Iadrintsev. (Nekrolog)," Etnograficheskoe Obozrienie, (1894) IV: 172.

106 Glinskii, "Iadrintsev," p. 439.

veloped an interest in Siberia's pre-history during these years. On his expeditions he made archeological observations of stone images, cemeteries, and graves of ancient Siberian tribes. This was first real acquaintance with an area of scholarship in which he was later to gain world-wide renown. Of his pre-historical findings at this time, he wrote, "I intend to prepare a collection of archeological objects for the Siberian university. We once had a cultured people living in Siberia, and we must investigate them by their relics. I found traces of agriculture in many places." [107]

Yadrintsev's days in Western Siberia as a minor official employed in the Main Administration soon drew to a close — in many ways, much to his relief. In late 1880 his patron, Governor-General Kaznakov, grew ill and left for Petersburg, not to return to Omsk. He was relieved of his position in February 1881. In January 1881 Yadrintsev took a two-month vacation and went to St. Petersburg with his family. Here, among other things, he gave a few lectures for the Geographical Society and the Juridical Society, relating his recent work on Siberian natives in general and on Altai Tatar tribes in particular. Having requested his dismissal from the civil service, he was officially relieved of his duties on March 30. Meanwhile the Emperor Alexander II had been assassinated on March 1, 1881, and was succeeded by his son, Alexander III. Yadrintsev, released from the service, but without a salary, was now to make St. Petersburg his base of operations for the following seven years. The year 1881 brought not only a turning

---

107 Letter to Guliaev, dated September 2, 1880, at Salair, in G. Baitov, "Iz pisem N. M. Iadrintseva ob Altaie" (From N. M. Yadrintsev's Letters concerning the Altai), Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1903) no. 128; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 121.

point in Russian history, but also in Yadrintsev's career and in the fortunes of Siberian regionalism in general.

* * *

Regionalism and the Russian Revolutionary Movement

During the birth and growth of a regionalist movement among Siberians at home and in European Russia during the 1860's and 1870's, two important developments were simultaneously taking place in European Russia: the emergence of the Russian revolutionary movement and the implementation of the Great Reforms. With respect to Siberia and the regionalists, both of these developments can be viewed from two perspectives. What kind of relationship did Siberians, and regionalists in particular, have with Russian radicals, and how did Siberia and regionalism fit into the plans of various radical groups and individuals after 1860? Likewise, how did Siberian regionalists look upon the Great Reforms (as introduced chiefly in Russia), and how did Siberia figure in the reform plans of the government?

The ties of Siberians and of regionalists with the revolutionary movement in Russia are not always easy to determine. There were definitely closer connections in the 1860's than in the 1870's, by which time both the regional and radical movements in their various aspects were more developed and defined, and less united by the vague feelings and moods of the early sixties. It has, for instance, been asserted that Potanin was a member of the first "Land and Liberty" group (1862-64), a loose organization promoting propagandadtoward a future popular revolution; according to these accounts, Potanin did undercover propaganda work in the Urals and in Western Siberia

while "posing" as a botanist or an explorer.[108] The only known source for this assertion comes from Potanin's friend, Longin Panteleev, a member of Land and Liberty, in a comment made over fifty years later. As far as can be determined, Potanin himself never mentioned any personal connection with the Land and Liberty group in his memoirs or any other published material. Even if he had been a member, his participation in it would have been at best lukewarm, and would have trailed behind his scientific and regionalist activities and interests.

We have seen above that Potanin's "political friends," among them Panteleev, tried to dissuade him from his interest in exploration.[109] According to the conversation reconstructed by Panteleev in his memoirs, the closest Potanin came to working for Land and Liberty was Panteleev's recommending him to A. A. Sleptsov, a founder of the radical group. Sleptsov asked Panteleev:

> "Can't you recommend someone for a trip to the Ural Cossack region? We need to establish a section of our organization there."
> I had just the person, completely suited for this, Gr/ī/gory/ Nik/ō/laevich/ Potanin (a Siberian).
> "I can," I answered, not without a certain feeling of satisfaction, and I gave his family name, having supplemented it with a proper character sketch.
> "There can be nothing better," said the gentleman . . .

At this point, according to the account, Sleptsov and Panteleev began to discuss other matters.[110] From what Potanin's only biographer indicates,

---

108 See Venturi, Roots, p. 270; and S. F. Koval', "Kharakhter obshchestvennogo dvizheniia," p. 40. Venturi's source is Panteleev, "Iz lichnykh vospominanii o G. N. Potaninie" (Personal Recollections of G. N. Potanin), Birzhevye Viedomosti, (September 21, 1915), which was unavailable to me. Koval seeks to prove that the entire "Siberian circle" in Omsk, arrested in 1865, was a branch of the Land and Liberty organization (p. 42, 53).

109 See above, p. 300.

110 Panteleev, Vospominaniia, p. 296.

Potanin had no connections with Land and Liberty at any time, and he passed through the Urals on his way to Omsk in the summer of 1862 only to join the Struve expedition. [111] If Potanin was not involved in Land and Liberty, then it does appear that another Siberian, Semyon Kapustin, whose family circle Potanin had frequented in Omsk in the late 1850's, was, however. Kapustin (1828-91), who worked for the Main Administration in Omsk until 1864, was reportedly a member of the third group of "fives" in the Land and Liberty organization. [112] Perhaps the closest that Potanin came to the radicals was his admission that in the early sixties the regionalists "were socialists." [113]

A possible link between Siberian regionalists and Russian radicals is revealed in the Irkutsk proclamation in connection with the Siberian independence affair of 1865. This proclamation, in contrast to the Omsk manifesto, urged an overall rebellion in Siberia which would link up with a "Central Russian Popular Committee." Despite Svatikov's assertion that the Committee was the party center of Land and Liberty, there are no known ties between the author, Stepan S. Popov, and the Land and Liberty Organization. [114] Moreover, by 1865 the existence of Land and Liberty was largely a myth. [115]

Interestingly enough, a recent Soviet interpretation agrees with the government authorities of the 1860's in trying to detect links between

---

111 V. Obruchev, Potanin (1947), pp. 48-53.

112 This account comes from A. Sleptsov's daughter, M. Sleptsova, in "Shturmany griadushchei buri" (Helmsmen of the Approaching Storm), Zvenia, (Moscow, 1933), II: 435, 437. In this same "five" was V. V. Chuiko, a pupil in the Omsk cadet school; conceivably he was somehow linked to the Omsk proclamation (though Koval' fails to mention any ties).

113 See Potanin's reference on p. 291, above.

114 Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 62.

115 Venturi, Roots, p. 275.

Siberian regionalists and the Russian and Polish revolutionary movements. Moreover, they both have assumed the internal structure of the regionalist groups of 1863-65 to have been a tightly-knit conspiratorial organization. Thus, the Soviet historian Koval speaks of the "destruction of the Siberian organization of Land and Liberty in 1865." And in connection with the Siberian independence affair he writes,

> The Omsk investigating commission was interested in ascertaining persons involved in a conspiracy to liberate Chernyshevsky and in schemes of a general Russo-Polish uprising in Siberia. The casemates of Siberian prisons were filled with prisoners from among the Polish exiles. About 100 Poles were arrested.[116]

An unbalanced emphasis on either the "separatistic" tendencies of the regionalists or their connections with radicals and radical organizations in European Russia is not only erroneous, but also tends to minimize the strongly indigenous and patriotic character of the regionalist movement. Potanin, Yadrintsev, Shashkov, and others Siberians (though not necessarily all) were little interested in a social revolution or political changes that would merely replace one centralistic government by another, as were Russian radicals at this time. In a Siberia much more socially homogeneous than Russia, they sought chiefly self-determination, equal rights, and only at the very most, independence in the distant future.

The Polish Insurrection of 1863, with the subsequent inundation of almost 20,000 exiles into Siberia by 1866, probably caused greater fear among some officials of a Polish uprising in Siberia (similar to the Omsk conspiracy of 1834) than of a Siberian "separatist" conspiracy. The Russian

---

116 S. F. Koval', "Kharakhter obshchestvennogo dvizheniia," p. 53. Nikolai G. Chernyshevsky (1828-89), perhaps the most important and influential of the Russian radicals of the 1860's, was exiled to Eastern Siberia in 1864, where he remained until 1883.

radical, V. V. Bervi-Flerovsky, exiled to Siberia in the mid-1860's, claimed that "the great influx of exiled Poles revived the propaganda of the idea of separating Siberia." [117] Yet Svatikov tends to discount this influence. He writes,

> It is possible that Polish influence played a certain role in thes /separatistic/ propaganda, but it was insignificant. We know the history of the idea of liberating Siberia was purely Russian, we know the history of this idea in Eastern Siberia /especially during Muravyov's administration/, and we know the absence of its broad dissemination, but we also know its stubbornness and constancy. [118]

To date no concrete evidence has been found of any important Siberian regionalist involved in the independence affair of 1865 having specific organizational or ideological connections with either Land and Liberty or any Polish exile group in Siberia. [119] Moreover, the fact that extracts from Feuerbach, Louis Blanc, Proudhon, Herzen, Ogaryov, Shevchenko, and Dobrolyubov were found in the letters of some of those arrested in 1865 does not automatically place them in some overall revolutionary movement. It proves only that some Siberians were then reading what since has been accepted as "proper revolutionary literature." [120]

During the late 1860's several Siberians became prominent in revolutionary organizations, yet only after they lost much of their regionalistic complexion. Ivan A. Khudyakov, involved in Ishutin's "Organization," which

---

117 N. Flerovskii (V. V. Bervi), Tri politicheskie sistemy, pp. 223-24.
118 Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 63.
119 See Koval', "Kharakhter obshchestvennogo dvizheniia," p. 40, 49, 54. He writes that "the Siberian socio-political movement of this period is often viewed in isolation from the general Russian movement . . . Until recently, the ties of the Siberian movement with the Polish-Russian revolutionaries with the plans and designs in Siberia in the 1860's have nto been taken in account." (p. 36) Though Koval commendably takes this into account, he unearths no satisfactory evidence of ties between Siberians and other "revolutionaries."
120 Koval', "Kharakhter obshchestvennogo dvizheniia," p. 45.

directed an attempt on the life of Alexander II in 1866, came from Tobolsk. A former pupil of Yershov's before coming to Petersburg, he joined the Siberian compatriotic circle in the early 1860's and even roomed next door to Yadrintsev one winter. Khudyakov, however, did not return to Siberia and appears to have abandoned whatever Siberian patriotism he may have had. Around 1865 he formed with N. A. Ishutin and D. V. Karakozov a "troika" at the head of the most significant populistic (and terroristic) group to follow Land and Liberty. Siberia concerned this group to the extent that Ishutin spread rumors among members of his "Organization" that "Siberia wants to separate from Russia, and the United States has promised to take it under its protection only if the Siberians massacre the garrisons along the Urals." [121] Thus was the frequent duality of separation and federation with the United States maintained even here.

After the "Karakozov affair" had burst in 1866 with the unsuccessful assassination attempt, Khudyakov testified at the trial that "a number of constant conspiracies (in Poland, Petersburg, Moscow, Kazan, and Siberia) for the last four years indicates that the need for political freedom has penetrated everywhere." [122] His concern for the independence affair of 1865, in which many of his former friends and compatriots were involved, was not overly great. In 1867 Khudyakov was exiled to Yakutsk, the authorities evidently regarding him as reliable enought not to stir up patriotic or "separatistic" Siberian sentiments. Here in the north he became much

---

121 A. A. Shilov, Karakozov i pokushenie 4-go aprielia 1866 g. (Karakozov and the Assassination Attempt of April 4, 1866), (1920), p. 31; quoted in Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 63.

122 Khudiakov, "Iz vospominanii shestidesiatnika. (Avtobiografiia I. A. Khudiakova)" (From the Recollections of a Man of the Sixties: Ivan Khudyakov's Autobiography), Istoricheskii Viestnik, (December 1906) v. 106, p. 791.

more interested in studying Yakut folklore and customs and making meteorological observations than in any of the major objectives of the regionalists.

The next important political "event" of the sixties, the "Nechaev affair" of 1869, also turned out to have its share of Siberians involved. The trial of the Nechaev group disclosed that in St. Petersburg a Siberian compatriotic circle existed in which some Siberians expressed dissatisfaction with just mutual aid and friendly gatherings and dreamed of separating Siberia from Russia. By 1869, this Siberian circle consisted of thirteen persons at most. Its leaders were the dissidents Alexandr Vasilievich Dolgushin (1848-85) and Pyotr Mikhailovich Koshkin. As one member told it, the circle was formed with the intention of

> making a student benefit fund and a library with books pertaining to the specialty of each member. Besides this goal, the circle was also to help each poor person arriving from Siberia enter any higher academic institution . . . Koshkin and Dolgushin proposed also to buy books on Siberia found at cheap prices, in view of the fact that it would not be bad, among other things, to get acquainted with Siberia. We brought in money for the books on the spot.[123]

At the first meeting there was also a discussion of forming a "commune" to cheapen the costs of living in the capital.

However, disagreements concerning the objectives of the circle soon set in. About two weeks after the first meeting, the group met again and here Dolgushin read aloud a statute, which he had composed for the circle. By

---

123 From the testimony of one Krokhalev, Pravitel'stvennyi Viestnik (The Government Herald), (1871) no. 265; quoted in A. Kunkl', Dolgushintsy (The Dolgushin Circle), (Moscow, 1931), p. 43. Dolgushin, born in Tara (Tobolsk province), is known to have been influenced by Nikolai Shchukin in Tomsk in the early 1860's (see above, p. 298). Dolgushin came to Petersburg in 1866.

this time, according to testimony at the trial,

> We recognized that the goal of the commune was not gathering together and helping poor Siberian students, and not a fund and a library, but the one goal was a supposed separation of Siberia from Russia. To attain this, the same statute said, apparently, that it was necessary to study Siberia in advance, theoretically, with its trade and products, and to study each of the provinces separately so as to apply all of this later to the cause. At first the time was to be ten years, and then Koshkin decreased it to three. Upon expiration of this time, one or two men were to have gone to Siberia to propagandize. Then, if it became necessary, the rest were to have gone there with the same purpose. . . . Also it was necessary to correspond with some kind of circles in Siberia, chiefly in Tomsk. Of their existence I know nothing. I remember that I often objected to many articles of this statute, and so I was told that if I didn't want to follow them, to clear out. I did this and thereafter I did not once attend the meetings. [124]

Koshkin, however, presented the issue of Siberia's separation in a different light: "this question arose quite naturally, because in Siberia the defendents ever since childhood had heard of attempts to separate Siberia, which perhaps exist even now. In any case, the circle did not consider this question as its goal." [125] Still another member, Dudoladov, simply stated that "among other things, we also spoke about Siberia's separation, to which some were either silent or replied with laughter." [126]

Though testimonies differ as to how the group responded to the idea of Siberia's separation, it is clear that initially the Dolgushin Siberian circle revived the regionalist ideas of Potanin and Yadrintsev with respect to studying Siberia, intending to spread propaganda there upon their return,

---

124 Krokhalev's testimony in Pravitel'stvennyi Viestnik, (1871) no. 265; quoted in Kunkl', Dolgushintsy, pp. 43-44.

125 P. M. Koshkin's testimony in Pravitel'stvennyi Viestnik, (1871) no. 205; quoted in Kunkl', Dolgushintsy, p. 44.

126 From Dielo III Otdieleniia (File of the Third Section), (1869) no. 115, pt. 4, line 14 b; quoted in Kunkl', Dolgushintsy, pp. 44-45.

and even banking on separation, though, supposedly, at a rather accelerated tempo. From "radical" thoughts of Siberia's separation it was not long before links with Russian radical extremists began to be cemented. Indeed, in the room where the meetings were held a portrait hung of the Russian radical, Chernyshevsky, who, as an exile and "honorary Siberian," served as an inspiration to the group.[127]

In contrast to the Potanin circle of the early sixties, individual members of the Dolgushin circle in the late sixties became much more intimately caught up in revolutionary political activity. One of the group, Pyotr A. Toporkov (from Tobolsk province), quite by accident became drawn into Sergei Nechaev's conspiratorial and terrorist organization and then tried to get several of his fellow Siberians to join. Dolgushin and Koshkin agreed, and a program was drawn up similar to Nechaev's own program, which called for a popular revolution and the extermination of high-ranking persons, including the imperial family.[128] This indeed indicates how quickly erstwhile Siberianspatriots and separatists changed colors and blended into the general Russian revolutionary movement. This new shift twward extremist and non-Siberian tendencies caused another Siberian, Cheremshansky, to withdraw "from the circle, because the conversations at its meetings were turned to political questions concerning contemporary European history, which diverted the circle's attention from its true goal— assistance to poor Siberians."[129] Thus, the political development of both

---

127 Kunkl', Dolgushintsy, p. 45; and Venturi, Roots, p. 496. Chernyshevsky at the time was living in Vilyuisk in northeastern Siberia.

128 Kunkl', Dolgushintsy, p. 50, 51. It is believed that Bakunin had a hand in drawing up Nechaev's manifesto, written abroad.

129 Pravitel'stvennyi Viestnik, (1871) no. 206; quoted in Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 65.

Khudyakov and many in Dolgushin's circle well supports Yadrintsev's remark on "how a provincial or regionalist gradually turned into a centralist in the capital." [130]

Through their connections with Nechaev's organization, Dolgushin and all those originally involved in the Siberian circle were arrested in January 1870. At the trial they were accused of desiring "to overthrow the government in a certain part of the state [i.e. to separate Siberia], the intent of which was discovered by the government ahead of time." [131] Most of those in the circle were acquitted by the Petersburg Judicial Chamber in August 1871, but Koshkin was sentenced for two months' confinement — not for separatism, but for impudent and insulting words against the tsar. The Dolgushin "conspirator-separatists" were evidently much less a threat to the state than the Siberian "separatists" had been a few years earlier in 1865.

Nevertheless, this event, along with the independence affair of 1865 and the Karakozov affair of 1866, merely reaffirmed government suspicions of any group of Siberians, even in the most harmless social gatherings. Many still felt that the specter of Siberian separatism might raise its head anywhere or at any time. As a result, the Siberian compatriotic groups in St. Petersbufg did not have an easy time of it even into the 1880's. [132] Yet, with the exception of a new revolutionary group organized by Dolgushin in 1872, which included one Siberian from his former circle, the seventies witnessed no notable Siberian groups or individuals (with or without

---

130 See above, p. 395.
131 Quoted in Pravitel'stvennyi Viestnik, (1871) no. 206; quoted in Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 65.
132 Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 66.

regionalist sympathies) in the revolutionary movement. If anything, the trend tended to reverse itself somewhat by the 1880's, when some of the Russian radicals exiled to Siberia became involved in various regionalist causes and activities.

In view of the considerations given above to the development of regionalist and federalist thought up to 1860, what role did Siberia play in the plans and schemes of Russian radicals in the sixties and seventies, and to what extent was it changing? As noted above, the Land and Liberty group reflected a regional organizational structure, based on historical and traditional areas. Potanin, for instance, was considered as a potential organizer of a regional Land and Liberty unit in the Urals, and a sub-group is known to have existed in Omsk. Land and Liberty was definitely not as rigidly centralistic, as most groups of the sixties were not (even Ishutin's and the Dolgushin-Nechaev organizations). Though Land and Liberty made allowance in its organization for such regions as North Russia, the Volga area, the Urals, Moscow, Lithuania, Siberia, and the Ukraine, this group (like most of those of the sixties and seventies) did not go so far as to draw up a constitutional draft plan for a reconstructed Russian Empire.

With the crushing of the Polish Insurrection of 1863 and with the arrests and exile of Siberian regionalists beginning in 1865, regionalist, federalist, and autonomist tendencies with the empire and within the revolutionary movement itself began to decline. This can be noted in the reorientation of the Dolgushin circle in the late 1860's. It was not until well into the 1870's that anti-centralist tendencies slowly began to reassert themselves. As Svatikov has put it:

> After the destruction of the Siberian regionalists, mention of Siberia disappears for a long time from political programs and trials. The revolutionary groups in Russia more and more diverted themselves from the idea of a political reconstruction of Russia in general, and on federative foundations in particular, in favor of the idea of a social revolution. The idea of federalism is repeated in Russian political programs, but somewhat lifelessly, without a clear and concrete presentation of its real implementation as applied to Russia. [133]

Political movements and even revolutionary uprisings were considered by most Russian radicals of the late 1860's and of the 1870's as mainly a means to an end: the overall transformation of Russian society. The idea of a federative Russia consisting of various autonomous regions became more abstract and formalized among Russian radicals after the early 1860's than it ever had been among the federalist theorists and innovators in the half-century before this time. With few exceptions (such as Chernyshevsky, Shelgunov, and Nikolai Serno-Solovyovich), revolutionary groups and thinkers gave little more than passing attention or token consideration (if even this) to Siberia. [134]

Yadrintsev's portrayal of the "centralistic" atmosphere in St. Petersburg during the mid-1870's tends to confirm the general attitude of disinterest in federalism and the outlying parts of the country on the part of most Russian radicals.

> For the resident of the capital the provinces were a backwoods, an example of stagnation and ignorance, and a manifestation of the coarse instincts of the

---

133 Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 63.

134 For details on views of Siberia and of federalism (or the lack of it) among such Russian radicals as N. G. Chernyshevsky, N. V. Shelgunov, N. A. Serno-Solovyovich, P. G. Zaichnevsky, S. G. Nechaev, P. N. Tkachov, N. Zhukovsky, and the People's Will and Black Redivision groups, see, for example, Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 66, 71-74; Gertsen, Polnoe sobranie, XVI: 75; Koval', "Kharakhter obshchestvennogo dvizheniia," p. 42, 43; Venturi, Roots, p. 267, 294, 302; and Panteleev, Vospominaniia, pp. 567-68.

> masses and of obsolete serf-owning interests. The provincial intelligentsia was seen as a non-entity, as small fry; and the provincial press viewed as wretched. . . . In Great Russia the idea of centralization has always prevailed, and this has imposed an historical, traditional, and inherited stamp on the Russian intelligentsia and on the central metropolitan press. Subsequently, this habit of seeing the life of the people from a centralistic point of view has passed over into liberal, oppositional, populistic, and revolutionary theories. The centralist bureaucrats have been replaced by centralist culture-bearers, centralists going to the people, Jacobin centralists, and so forth. The intelligentsia has long been accustomed to looking down upon the people, the regions, and the provinces, and imagines itself as disposing of their fate, bringing reforms and changes from whatever center, and forcing the people to subject themselves to this or that direction.

To all this he added, looking into the future,

> The physical force of centralists may be replaced by some kind of bureaucratic or party organization, but its character and tendencies will not change. France is an example. The centralistic, Great Russian, Muscovite Russia will probably remain centralist for a long time, and regional currents will remain incomprehensible to it. [135]

After the birth of Siberian regionalism and after the relative eclipse of Herzen and Ogaryov by the mid-1860's, Russian thinkers and radicals contributed little to either the further development of regionalism or the awakening of Siberia for the rest of the sixties and seventies. During this period the developments at the "center" which concerned Siberians and regionalists most of all were not the ups-and-downs, and ins-and-outs of the Russian revolutionary movement, but the Great Reforms, the other great hallmark of Alexander II's reign.

---

135 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," p. 166.

Siberia, Regionalists, and the Great Reforms

The Great Reforms of the reign of Alexander II bypassed Siberia in many ways. The most important of the reforms, the abolition of serfdom and the emancipation of serfs, had little relevance to Siberia at first. "Peasant Siberia" was inhabited almost entirely by peasants that cultivated state-owned lands rather than land held privately by gentry landlords. The reason that Siberia before 1861 had had so few serfs was, of course, due to the extremely small number of gentry estates in Siberia. One count showed thirty-six estates in Siberia (28 of them in Tobolsk province), with a total of 2,800 agricultural serfs and 900 household serfs. [136] Serf labor was also employed in government-run factories in Siberia, such as those at Nerchinsk; here, however, prisoners and exiles were used for this purpose (though they might be of peasant or serf origin). A special category of peasants lived and worked in the Altai Mountain Area on the lands of "His Majesty's Imperial Cabinet." These peasants belonged directly to the imperial family, many of them working in the Altai factories and mines. The total population on these special "cabinet" lands in the 1860's was estimated at 140,000. [137]

Agricultural, household, and factory serfs, along with "imperial" peasants in the Altai, were alone in being affected by the peasant reforms. Private serfs were freed by the proclamation of February 19, 1861, though provisions for land allotments were made only for agricultural serfs.

---

136 P. Golovachev, "Chastnoe zemlievladienie v Sibiri" (Private Landownership in Siberia), Sibirskie Voprosy, (1905) I: 133-34.

137 (M. I. Veniukov ?) "Iz Sibiri. (Otryvki iz pisem k izdateliu Kolokola v 1862 g.), Sibir' i russkoe pravitel'stvo, p. 25.

"Serf" labor at Nerchinsk and in other similar government enterprises was discontinued that same year. In 1863 imperial peasants received relatively substantial land allotments, but were required in two years to begin a forty-nine-year cycle of redemption payments. The "cabinet" lands were liquidated and the factories and mines on them were closed. In Potanin's words, the local administration "turned from silver smelter to landlord, turning its land over to lease. The engineers were dismissed, and instead of pseudo-lovers of science and literature, the area was settled by pseudo-agriculturalists." [138]

The overwhelming majority of peasants in Siberia, working on state domains, to which almost all the land in Siberia belonged, was left completely untouched by the peasant reforms. In European Russia the peasants on state lands, by the provisions of a statute of 1866, received as permanent allotments the land they had earlier cultivated (with certain stipulations), plus a complicated redemption scheme of payments to the state. In return for this they had to pay an annual quit-rent (obrok) to the state that was valued at their total income. In contrast, in Siberia and Transcaucasia the state peasants were given no basic changes, and they continued to occupy state lands and pay dues to the treasury as before.

One change in European Russia which did affect Siberia, though, was another decree, issued in 1866, which cut off government credits to state peasants who wished to emigrate to Siberia. Of the reaction among Siberian regionalists to this policy in particular, and to the peasant reforms in general, Potanin wrote:

---

138 Potanin, "Goroda Sibiri," p. 255. As a result, he adds, "the brilliance of life in Barnaul died out."

> the thinness and dispersion of the population was viewed as a reason holding back the achievements of culture in Siberia. The absence of immigration, which could have made the population in Siberia more dense, then constituted the sorrow and concern of Siberian patriots, and when serfdom fell and peasant masses moved into Siberia, Siberian patriots joyfully greeted the beginning of a new colonization. But the government began to take measures to restrain the waves of settlers; gendarmes got settlers out of their wagons and turned them back. Siberians did not sympathize with this policy of the government, carried out in the interests of agrarian landowners, and they even protested in the newspapers. [139]

Following the emancipation and peasant reforms, and in many ways a consequence of them, was the establishment of zemstvo local government units in 1864. This reform, however, was applied only at the provincial and district level and only in European Russia. Even there by 1875 zemstvos had been introduced in only 31 provinces (out of about 70 in the empire as a whole). Again, Siberia was neglected. In 1864 the State Council had approved introducing zemstvo institutions in Siberia, and it had the backing of the committee on judicial reforms. But the Minister of Interior, Valuev, rejected the idea on grounds that Siberia lacked "zemstvo elements," that is to say, landed gentry. [140]

The structure and organization of zemstvos in European Russia, though representing peasants, urban dwellers, and gentry landowners, gave to the gentry delegates dominant control in decisions and executions of the zemstvo's functions. Among the chief concerns of these local government institutions were public education, organization of medical care, and super-

---

139 Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," p. 277.

140 D. Zaitsev, "Zemstvo v Sibiri" (A Zemstvo in Siberia), Russkaia Mysl', (1904) no. 12, p. 61.

vision of public works and improvements. If there was to be a zemstvo in "peasant, democratic Siberia," the government would have had either to create a Siberian gentry artificially, or else accept a largely peasant-dominated local self-government in the countryside. And further, during the great peasant migrations to Siberia in the 1890's and 1900's, Siberia was considered too unstable to introduce a zemstvo satisfactorily.[141] Of all the Great Reforms undertaken in European Russia that failed to be implemented in Siberia soon thereafter, the zemstvo was the most sought after and the longest desired among regionalists and local public figures. So much was this so, that regionalists were sometimes accused of believing that the introduction of a zemstvo would be a panacea for all Siberia's other problems.[142] Instead of one or more zemstvos, however, Siberia was to receive in time new peasant self-government institutions in accordance with the principles of the statute of February 19, 1861. These were delayed to such an extent that they were introduced in Siberia only piecemeal in the 1880's.

The judicial reforms of the mid-1860's created, among other things, a new system of courts, which encompassed all classes at once (instead of separately). The new courts were open and public, equipped with defense lawyers, and they provided trials by a jury chosen from among all classes of the local population. A tier of courts was established, going from those of the justices of the peace, elected by district zemstvos, through district courts, and on to several higher courts, ending with the Senate (organized as a type of supreme court). As with the zemstvos, the new court system

---

141 See D. W. Treadgold, The Great Siberian Migration, p. 21, 180.

142 See, for instance, Zaitsev, "Zemstvo v Sibiri," p. 59, 62; and for Yadrintsev's attitude toward a zemstvo in the 1870's, above, pp. 368-69.

was not introduced everywhere at once. In 1866 the new law courts were established in the ten provinces of the Moscow and Petersburg judicial districts, but elsewhere their introduction dragged out over decades. It was not long before the liberal provisions of the 1864 statute were encroached upon, for the idea of the supremacy of law, of independent courts, and equality of all before the law did not easily coexist with the idea of autocracy and the omnipotence of civil authorities. Certainly, Siberia as a land of exile, treated as a type of semi-colony and private preserve for despotic, self-willed administrators, and without enough educated and socially "reliable" elements, was not prepared for such a far-reaching judicial reform. Indeed, only in 1896 was the statute of 1864 permitted to be implemented in Siberia, with certain limitations. In July 1897, thirty-five years after the initial legislation, Minister of Justice Muravyov formally inaugurated the judicial reform in Irkutsk for all Siberia.[143]

The fourth among the Great Reforms involved the municipal statute of 1870, which provided for self-government in the larger towns of the Russian Empire. In 1870 ten percent of the total population was urban, and in Siberia this percent was even smaller. In a Siberia of roughly four million inhabitants, the two largest towns in the late 1870's, Irkutsk and Tomsk, had little more than 30,000 residents apiece.[144] Nevertheless, Siberia was regarded on an equal plane with Russia when it came to the municipal reforms. In 1870 the reform statute was ordered to be implemented immediately in a number of Siberian towns. Thus, the reforms were carried out in Tomsk and Krasnoyarsk in 1871, in Irkutsk, Tobolsk, Semipalatinsk, Tyumen, and

---

143 For a description of the official ceremony, see Jules Legras, En Sibérie (2d ed., Paris, 1899), pp. 259-60.

144 Shcheglov, Perechen', pp. 749-50; and Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 116.

Tara in 1872, in Omsk, Petropavlovsk and Ishim in 1873, and in others later.[145]

The chief feature of the reform was the establishment of a municipal duma composed of at least thirty deputies, elected for four-year terms. The duma was to elect a mayor and the members of the town council; the mayor was subject to the approval of the local government authorities. Suffrage depended upon a certain amount of immovable property, upon ownership of an enterprise, or upon payment of a certain amount of taxes. Thus, in Irkutsk in 1872 there were 2,213 citizens who had the right to elect deputies. The voters themselves were divided into three curiae determined by wealth: in Irkutsk there were 56 in the first category (mostly "honorable citizens" or merchants), 305 in the second, and 1,852 in the third.[146] Each curia elected one-third of the duma members. The first assembly of the Irkutsk duma met in November 1872 and elected V. V. Petrov as mayor; among the deputy members was V. I. Vagin.

The introduction of the Great Reforms in European Russia (which also included important changes in the military) aroused among Siberians great expectations of improvements affecting them too. Yet these expectations went largely unfulfilled during the rest of Alexander II's reign, and indeed for most of the remaining part of the century. Consequently, some Siberians, such as Yadrintsev and Potanin felt confirmed in their opinion that Siberia was still being treated as a colony of metropolitan Russia. They felt that Siberians by nature, tradition, and environment were different from European Russians, and if Siberia could not attain institutional equality with Russia,

---

145 Shcheglov, Perechen', pp. 655-56, 666-67, 674, 677.
146 Sukachev, Irkutsk, pp. 99-100.

so that their distinctive way of life could better flourish, then they wanted self-government or autonomy and even toyed with the idea of eventual separation or independence as a very last resort.

Though Siberia was indeed left out of the zemstvo and judicial reforms, the decade of the 1870's saw the extension of municipal reforms to Siberian towns, the approval of a Siberian university, and the establishment of a second Siberian Section of the Geographical Society. These institutional innovations, promoted by the government, actually helped consolidate Siberia's ties with Russia more firmly and helped deflate lingering thoughts of Siberian secession. Despite these gains, many crucial problems were left untouched: the unreformed exile system, Siberia's economic subordination to Russia, the delays in setting the university on its feet, the lack of free peasant migration, and the deteriorating conditions among many natives, not to mention the neglected Great Reforms; all this tended to reinforce the general cause of the regionalists, and of Yadrintsev in particular, who vigorously pressed for the removal of these obstacles.

Specifically, Yadrintsev had said of himself and his fellow regionalists involved in the independence affair of 1865: "We desire for Siberia a new public court system, zemstvo institutions, greater publicity, encouragement of industry, and more equal rights for natives." [147] This certainly reflects the hopes for reforms applied to Siberia. But of all the reforms Yadrintsev pressed hardest for in the 1870's, the abolition of exile stands out most prominently. For him the exile system was as harmful to the civic and economic growth of Siberia as serfdom had been to European Russia's.

---

147 See p. 333, above.

The abolition of serfdom in 1861 and Yadrintsev's own deportation to northern Russia in 1868 spurred to work all the harder for the abolition of the exile system in Siberia. This motive can be seen in his book The Russian Commune in Prison and Exile, in his consultative work for Count Sollogub and his reform commission, and in his reports on exile to the Juridical Society in 1880 and 1881.

Despite the fact that a new Main Prison Administration, attached to the Ministry of Interior, was set up in 1879, the committees of Sollogub and others did not get far on the problem of Siberian exile. Shortly before this time (in early February 1879), Yadrintsev had written:

> Regarding the decisions of Grot's committee /on prison reform/, I can say that it reworks the old material done by the committees of Sollogub, Frisch, and Zubov, and . . . seeks compromises . . . we have no unity in the organization of exile, and no one institution managing it. Our superintendence of exiles is divided up between various institutions: departments, dispatch offices, and fiscal chambers. . . . Not only does no one dare to touch the organization of the exiles' way of life, but also in transferring them from one institution to another one cannot even find information on how many of them there are.[148]

Indeed, it is interesting to note that estimates show the 1870's with a greater number of Russian exiles and prisoners migrating (involuntarily) to Siberia, about 180,000 in all, than any other decade in the 19th century. It was not until 1899 that the first concrete steps were taken toward abolishing the exile system, when certain types of political exile to Siberia were discontinued.

Even in the early 20th century Potanin voiced a set of demands for Si-

---

148 Letter to I. A. Dmitriev-Mamonov, written in early February 1879 at Omsk, "Pis'mo N. M. Iadrintseva o ssylkie," Stepnoi Krai, (1894) nos. 83-84; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 114-15.

beria not far removed from those expressed by regionalists as far back as the mid-1860's — indicating just how few institutional changes for the better had been made since then. Potanin felt that the judicial reforms introduced in the late 1890's were only token concessions. In his opinion, however, with the establishment of a regional duma or zemstvo which "controlled regional finances, an equalization of the colony with the mother country would be attained in the realm of industry; with the establishment of a vast system of schools, with a university at its head, there would be an equalization . . . in education . . . and in judicial institutions."

> The introduction of public courts are necessary, as is instituting elected judges that are independent of administrative judicial investigators, along with abolishing peasant land captains and handing over their judicial functions to judicial authorities and their economic functions to zemstvo self-government. The exile system should be abolished once and for all . . . ; exile to Siberia for political acts and for acts against the faith should also be discontinued, as well as for criminal acts. Siberian prisons should be intended only for the Siberian percentage of criminals . . . [149]

Thus, the persistent demand for equal rights and treatment in Siberia lasted until the very last years of the Russian Empire.

The actual introduction of municipal dumas in numerous Siberian towns in the early 1870's gave rise to speculations and expectations of further reforms forthcoming for Siberia. This was especially the case in Irkutsk, one of the largest towns east of the Urals and the only one before 1881 with a private newspaper. The successful establishment and endurance of the newspaper Siberia, despite its somber moments, reinforced in some the feeling that a new era was perhaps in the offing. Indeed, Yadrintsev wrote

---

149 Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri" (1908), p. 287.

that "the years 1875-77 were remarkable in that the Siberian population lived with great expectations, and the words 'on the eve of reforms' did not disappear from the lips of those interested in the fate of their homeland. Many articles were devoted to reforms in general and to exile in particular." [150] As both Vagin and Zagoskin were actively involved in the Irkutsk duma and in various duma affairs, this sense of expectancy and this increased discussion was easily transmitted to the pages of Siberia.

In one of the first issues of Siberia in 1875, Zagoskin stressed the need for a Siberian university, without which, he felt, all other reforms in Siberia would be hollow.

> If Siberia really does not need a university, then there is nothing to say about the other reforms completed in Russia. In our Siberian opinion, for the successful development of the country and, in particular, for the successful application to Siberia of new institutions, it needs first of all a university. Our region suffers even now from the absence of scientifically educated people in all areas of state service and private activity. The flabbiness and unreliability of men, the absence of training, with even the most honorable intentions, and the lack of moral self-restraint in the face of the smallest temptations of profit are characteristic traits, noticeable even in the best of our men — are these not really enough grounds to wish for an institution of higher learning, which alone is in a position to give us a personnel of honorable and knowledgeable judges and zemstvo leaders who understand the means and needs of the country, and lawyers, doctors, and teachers. [151]

Zagoskin recognized that "good institutions" alone were not enough; "good men" were needed to administer, and to developesuch capable, knowledgeabbe

---

150 (Iadrintsev) "Nachalo pechati," p. 398; see also Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 216.

151 Zagoskin, "Po povodu mnieniia 'Otechestv. Zapisok' o sibirskom universitetie" (Apropos of the Views of Notes of the Fatherland on a Siberian University), Sibir', (1875) no. 10; quoted in Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 225.

men he saw that the one definite institution needed, of which European Russia already possessed several long before the Great Reforms, was a university.

Another article in Siberia of 1875 was entitled "On the Eve of Reforms." Instead of advancing the prevalent idea that the introduction of a Siberian zemstvo or a university was the first and most important step needed, Siberia argued here that abolition of exile would constitute the most far-reaching reform for the region. Here the solution of this problem was viewed as a precondition on which the success of any subsequent reforms depended.

> As a country of exile, Siberia could never enjoy equal rights; it could not be a country of solid culture and citizenship, because there has been no security here; it could not promote the development of trade and industry. Its colonization has been retarded, for penal colonization has delayed the question of free development. Finally, reforms have been unattainable for it because the population has been divided into two classes, free and exile, that is, a type of serfs who do not enjoy all civil rights.[152]

Thus, the abolition of exile, like the abolition of serfdom in Russia, could be regarded as a measure upon which all subsequent reforms depended. With a single "class" of free citizens, full judicial and self-government reforms were a logical consequence. Indeed, it was only in the late 1890's, when the exile system began to be revised, that the first judicial reforms were introduced in Siberia.

Siberia also expressed its views on judicial and zemstvo reform. The paper cited the "surrounding lawlessness and the complete worthlessness of the old judicial institutions," and urged the introduction of the new court system.[153] As for a zemstvo, Vagin pointed to the advantages of Siberia's

---

152 "Nakanunie reform," Sibir', (1875) no. 23; quoted in "Nachalo pechati," p. 398; and in Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 217.

153 (Iadrintsev) "Nachalo pechati," p. 398.

relatively homogeneous population. "Here there is no large landownership, and owing to this the composition of zemstvo members will be more equal. All those living by and from the land are ploughmen and workers. Their interests are not opposed, but are completely similar." [154] The editors even saw room for improving the Siberian municipal dumas, and especially their electoral procedures. Thus, among other suggestions, they wrote, "from our observations, the unsatisfactory state of the composition of the municipal dumas originates chiefly in the fact that we know each other very little and that elections are held for no purpose and at random." [155]

Demands for reforms in Siberia, not only for the extension of several of the Great Reforms, but also for other reforms related more specifically to Siberia and its distinctive position within the empire, increased during the late 1870's. They were voiced especially by leaders of Siberian public opinion: by prominent local citizens in the town dumas and by regionalists such as Yadrintsev, Vagin, and Zagoskin — whether in exile, Petersburg, or in Siberia. The most vigorous collective voice of all in this campaign was the newly established newspaper Siberia.

This rising crescendo of demands was to reach a fortissimo in 1881, when the attention of both Siberians and Russians was drawn to the fact that Siberia was now celebrating its 300th anniversary. Certainly by this time, many reasoned, the local population was old and mature enough to be granted the reforms and rights already enjoyed by European Russians.

---

154 Vagin, "Elementy zemstva v Sibiri" (Elements for a Zemstvo in Siberia), Sibir', (1881) nos. 40, 41; quoted in "Nachalo pechati," p. 399.

155 "Gorodskoe dielo" (Municipal Affairs), Sibir', (1881) no. 4; quoted in Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 227.

PART THREE

REGIONALISM AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF SIBERIA

(1881-1894)

CHAPTER VIII

YADRINTSEV'S LATER LIFE AND WORKS

For Nikolai Mikhailovich Yadrintsev the year 1881 witnessed his return to St. Petersburg from Western Siberia and the beginning of a relatively brilliant journalistic and scholarly career. For Russia and the Empire as a whole, this year signaled the endoof the reign of Alexander II and the beginning of an era of "Counter-Reforms" under the new emperor, Alexander III (1881-94). For Siberia, however, the year 1881 was especially significant in that for the first time perhaps since the late fifties and early sixties a distinct revival took place in urban society. The immediate occasion for this was the celebration of the region's 300th anniversary since Yermak's conquest of Sibir. Public opinion became aroused and articulate at this time to an unprecedented degree. This new civic spirit and consciousness continued to last in Siberian towns, though admittedly in less heightened form, throughout the reign of Alexander III. At the forefront of this new

awakening stood Yadrintsev, both in St. Petersburg.

The period 1881-94, which witnessed a widespread social ferment in many parts of Siberia, can be characterized by high points in several distinct areas. Around the year 1881 a wave of tricentennial speeches, articles, and festivities swept much of Siberia. About this same time several new regionalist newspapers were established, devoted especially to Siberian affairs. By the late 1880's increased activity and progress was evident in the life and culture of most Siberian towns, a phenomenon which separated this relatively bustling decade from the slower-moving seventies as were the more vibrant fifties set off from the slumbering forties. Perhaps the one most important event of the period was the opening of the Siberian university, so long-sought by regionalists and local Siberians. By the early 1890's most Siberian towns had their own private newspapers, libraries, museums, secondary schools, and distinct forms of cultural and scientific activity. At long last, some of the finer aspects of western civilization were relatively widespread in Siberian urban centers.

The period 1881-94 not only coincided with the reign of Alexander III, but also with the last and most productive years of Yadrintsev's public life. At this time he emerged par excellence as the champion of Siberia's interests, at least as he conceived them. By the time of his death in 1894, however, new trends were setting in which in time transformed Siberia far beyond what the regional awakening of the eighties and early nineties alone had done. Siberia had gradually been linked more integrally to Russia in its administration. A transcontinental railroad was in the process of construction that would soon connect Siberia much more closely to Russia and to

the outer world at large. Industry and a new working class were beginning to grow, especially in connection with the railroad. A swelling influx of Russian and Ukrainian settlers into Siberia in the mid-1890's also began to break down much of the previous regional distinctiveness of the older Siberian population. By 1894 (roughly speaking), Siberian society had not only come of age, but was almost overnight faced with meeting the intruding realities of modern commerce, industry, and transportation, and with relocating millions of new residents arriving in the wake of the greatest short-term migration in history.

* * *

Yadrintsev and Siberia's Tricentennial (1881)

Yadrintsev's return to St. Petersburg in early 1881 from service in the Main Administration of Western Siberia marked an important turning point in his life. From this time on, for the rest of his days, his energies were almost solely devoted to journalism, scholarship, and exploration, undertaken on his own initiative and supported largely at his own expense.

His return to the capital coincided not only with the assassination of Tsar Alexander II, but also with the forthcoming commemorations that year of the conquest of Sibir by the Cossack mercenary, Yermak Timofeevich, in 1581. Though there was some debate concerning the exact date upon which Siberia's 300th anniversary should be celebrated, Yadrintsev and many others settled upon October 26, 1881. On this day, 300 years earlier, according to the Stroganov chronicle, Yermak and his Cossack band, having defeated the Siberian Khan, Kuchum, three days earlier, captured his capital, Sibir (or

Isker), located on the Irtysh River across from present-day Tobolsk. [1] In the eyes of Yadrintsev and others, the jubilee in 1881 was symbolic of an ensuing "new period of Siberian history."

What in fact was most important about Siberia's tricentennial and the scattered celebrations that commemorated it was that various representatives of Siberian society found it an excellent opportunity to voice demands for long-awaited reforms and to ponder conscientiously the significance of Siberia's lethargic past, its awakening present, and its unknown but promising future. Various commentaries and speeches were made by Siberians on this occasion, as well as articles in the Russian press. As might be expected, however, it was the articulate Yadrintsev, the standard-bearer of Siberian regionalism during the reign of Alexander III, who most and best of all pointed out the meaning of the tricentennial. Not only did he give speeches and write several articles for the occasion, but it was also to this event that he dedicated his magnum opus, Siberia as a Colony, first published a year later, in 1882.

Yadrintsev was active in many ways preparing for and commemorating the tercentenary. Even before he left Western Siberia he had begun laying plans for celebrating the event in Tomsk and Irkutsk, for a special exhibition of local Siberian products, and for founding a museum as a memorial to the 300 years of Russian Siberia. He drew up these plans in an article published in Siberia in 1880. [2] After his arrival in Petersburg he delivered a lecture

---

1 Other possible dates for marking the beginning of Russian Siberia are October 23, 1581 (Kuchum's defeat); 1582, when news of the "annexation" reached Moscow; and 1583, when the first voevoda (military governor) sent from Moscow reached Sibir. The date of Yermak's conquest of Sibir has recently been established as October 26, 1582; see "Anketa o Sibiri" (Particulars on Siberia), Sibirskii Arkhiv (Prague), (1932) IV: 189,

2 Iadrintsev, "Predstoiashchee trekhsotlietie Sibiri" (Siberia's Forthcoming Tricentennial), Sibir', (1880) no. 9; see Glinskii's commentary in "Iadrintsev," p. 441.

on Siberia's "cultural achievements" over the past 300 years to the Society for the Promotion of Industry and Trade.[3] Also in honor of the festive occasion he presented a lecture at the Geographical Society on conditions among Siberian natives and the threat of extinction among some of them. And at the commemorative dinner in St. Petersburg, held on October 26, 1881, he named the Siberian university soon to be established as an immortal monument to the tricentennial, and he called for increased donations and contributions to the institution.

A letter of Yadrintsev, written in the summer of 1881 (while vacationing in the country) to a friend in Tobolsk, reveals some of his personal thoughts on the forthcoming tricentennial commemoration. He asked, for instance,

> Will Siberians be able to assert their sympathies and create their own popular festival? I have cause strongly to doubt the forces of urgency among Siberian municipal societies . . . The matter should not be limited to balls and public prayers. It is necessary that in speeches, toasts, and statements the various representatives announce the social needs and expectations of the region: a new court, a zemstvo, enlightenment, more freedom of the press, etc. . . . Siberia's needs are so crying that they must be repeated more often. . . . In the foreign papers it is written that /Minister of Interior/ Count Ignatiev is intending to introduce zemstvo institutions in Siberia. I will have a chance to learn of this in the autumn in Petersburg, and I will also be presented to the minister, for whom I will prepare a memorandum on Siberia's needs.[4]

Though there is no evidence that Yadrintsev met Ignatiev, he did make

---

3 His report was later published as a brochure entitled Kul'turnoe i promyshlennoe sostoianie Sibiri (doklad po sluchaiu torzhestva 300-lietiia Sibiri) (Siberia's Cultural and Economic Condition: A Lecture on the Occasion of Siberia's Tricentennial Celebration), (St. Petersburg, 1884). I have been unable to gain access to this 32-page work.

4 Cited in V. K., "K sibirskoi molodezhi" (To Siberian Youth), Stepnoi Krai, (1894) no. 60; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 123-24. For a brief account of N. P. Ignatiev's achievements elsewhere, see above, p. 158.

an extensive declaration of Siberia's needs in his most important article on the jubilee, entitled "Siberia's Three Hundred Years since October 26, 1581." Linking the distant past of Yermak with the present, he wrote:

> Let's therefore consider the hero of the forthcoming 300-year jubilee to be not Yermak and the voevodas, but the Russian people in general. The great cultural conquest in the East is still continuing. . . . Achievements of the people's genius and creativity from their powerful energy also have continued since Yermak's feat. . . . Now, 300 years later, there lies before us a huge land acquired that exceeds the possessions of European Russia more than 2½ times and represents the most extensive country in the world. [5]

Yadrintsev felt that this vast expanse of free land in Siberia served as a guarantee to "ensure the fate of the Slavic population for a long time from the accidents of future history. Along with this, rudiments of a new life and a new social organism are destined to develop in the distant borderland . . . and we feel how the pulse of public life is gradually awakening here." [6] After reviewing conquests, subjugations, revolts, colonization, and settlement, along with the past exploitation and extraction of natural resources, Yadrintsev moved on to the present and the future.

> At present, on the verge of the 300th anniversary, this period of conscious life and an understanding of its role in the future is already coming for Siberia too. In the society which has formed in the East, with four millions of the Russian population, aspirations to develop its own economic, material, and intellectual forces are appearing; civic and educational needs in these aspirations are beginning to occupy a certain role. With this consciousness of a common existence with all mankind and with a conscious relationship to its own life, a new period of Siberian history is beginning.

---

5 Iadrintsev, "Trekhsotlietie Sibiri s 26 oktiabria 1581 g.," Viestnik Evropy, (December 1881) no. 12, p. 844.

6 Ibid.

Yadrintsev then went on to speak of the institutional needs recently voiced by himself and by Siberian society:

> The gift of self-government and the establishment of justice and equity for this unhappy country are becoming all the more necessary in that Siberia throughout all its past existence has experienced many oppressions, injustices, and disorders. These disasters began ever since the voevoda administration; arbitrariness has prevailed in Siberia more than anywhere else; the region has been subjected to all possible abuses, and its life has remained far from settled right down to the present.
>
> Moreover, numerous social questions and needs have now come forth which demand urgent satisfaction. To such belong the abolition of criminal exile, which impedes the safety and development of civic life, the organization of migrations, the /proper/ arrangement of the natives' way of life, the adoption of measures against exploitation and usury, the improvement of the lot of gold miners, and many others. Finally, there is the need for intellectual life in the region, the quest for publicity, and the desire to work out social needs by means of the press; the public seeks guarantees of person and defense ~~from local arbitrariness~~ of rights.[7]

After referring to what others in Siberia thought about such questions, Yadrintsev turned to praise the present generation of Siberians.

> There is no doubt that the development of the country has at present attained a certain civic maturity, and that the moment of the 300th jubilee coincides with the moment of the expected equality of rights. The necessity of Siberian reforms is now clearly recognized by government and by society to such an extent that it is hard to suppose that the urgent needs of the population should not be satisfied. . . .
>
> The Siberian population, having lived outside the tutelage of serfdom, long ago acquired the skill toward self-government, and the struggle with circumstances made it developed, alert, and enterprising. One can hardly encounter a doubt in the legal capacity of the free Siberian population: Speransky already summoned Siberian society to this self-awareness and spontaneous action fifty /sic/ years ago.[8]

---

7 Ibid., p. 845.

8 Ibid., pp. 847-48.

From here Yadrintsev went on to develop the idea of an undeveloped, "young" society in Siberia and its role in the future. "One must take into account that despite its 300th anniversary, Siberian society is nevertheless a historically young society, and the fate of young societies and colonies quite often presents an enviable existence when compared to old societies which have experienced a long life." Young societies, such as Siberia's, he felt, "seethe with a surplus of productive forces, possess many gifts of nature, and stand at the beginning of history . . ." Moreover, they lack "the prejudices of the old world."

Both as a young society and as a colony, Yadrintsev could draw for Siberia certain historical comparisons, to some extent indicating the path of Siberia's future. "Great ideas and fruits of human progress often reach colonies, and they progress faster than the mother countries. In the West, new political systems, which create new civilizations, are often developed from them." Still, Yadrintsev was far from dreaming of a future for Siberia like that of former European colonies:

> here there is not even a distant resemblance. America and Australia, which are often pointed to, achieved supreme successes in a much shorter period with regard to civil, cultural, and industrial life. . . . It is enough to remember that North America experienced the bitter injustices of England, and Australia only a short time ago was freed from exile. Siberia has nevertheless been a product of old Russia and has been closely tied to its life and conditions of development. . . . still, there cannot but be felt here the life of a young, perceptive organism. . . .
>
> A geographical position in Asia connecting the European world with the Asiatic indicates a certain distinctive political role and significance in the future for this region. Of course, Asiatic peoples will not always remain in a period of stagnation, seclusion, and half-barbarism. A great task common to humanity will emerge here at some time in the future. [9]

---

9 Ibid., pp. 848-49.

Despite simplifications (and indeed misconceptions) of American, Australian, and Oriental history, Yadrintsev saw certain comparisons between Siberia and North America and Australia. When Siberia became as fully developed as the latter countries, it would act as a mediator, culturally and politically, between the Oriental and the European worlds.

In conclusion Yadrintsev felt the real significance of the 1881 tricentennial consisted of Siberia's entrance into a history in common with the rest of the world and mankind, and an end to its age-long geographical, economic, and intellectual isolation.

> Standing at the beginning of historical development, at the cradle of emerging existence, it is natural to pause and think of this future and to recognize the tasks imposed by the present.
>
> In the interests of humanity and in the interests of the Russian people, the time is coming to summon our borderlands to a new life, to arouse their social energies to sponatneous action, and with this to lay the beginning of a new historical period. [10]

In retrospect, Yadrintsev was indeed correct. The 1880's in many ways ushered in the beginning of Siberia's "modern" period of history.

Several years later Yadrintsev reviewed in brief his general impressions of the tricentennial year, his first year back in St. Petersburg. The expected "constitution" of the Minister of Interior, Loris-Melikov, had "brought some hopes." On March 1, 1881, however, Alexander II had been assassinated. With this,

> everything quickly changed, owing to the unexpected catastrophe, which produced a paralyzing effect on all of Russian life; even the pulse of life has stopped, and we live in immobility and full stagna- Our Siberian reforms also could not be advanced,

---

10 Ibid., p. 849.

> and the 300th anniversary has passed without a trace. Since then, however, our countrymen have determined that we should dine together each year on October 26, the day of Yermak's first victory. [11]

True, the expected reforms for Siberia did not materialize. But Siberian society, once invigorated by the tricentennial, never lapsed back entirely into the same, old mold. And Yadrintsev himself was the first to see to it that Siberian society should not and would not.

* * *

The Major Works: Siberia as a Colony and Siberian Natives

In 1882 Yadrintsev published his magnum opus. Its full title was Siberia as a Colony, Commemorating the Tricentennial Jubilee. Siberia's Present Condition, Its Needs and Necessities, and Its Past and Future. [12] Yadrintsev had been busy laying the foundations for this work even during his stay in Western Siberia. The book, in fact, incorporated a number of his earlier studies, observations, lectures, and articles. It was the first large-scale study of Siberia since the publication of Slovtsov's two-volume Historical Survey of Siberia in 1838 and 1843. Yadrintsev's work, however, was at base not a history but a topical analysis of Siberia's existing conditions and how they had developed from past to present.

In brief, the contents of the work, as it appeared in 1882, can be outlined by chapters as follows: 1) "The Russian Nationality in the East": the relationship of Russian-Siberians to the natural elements of the region

---

11 Letter to A. Kh. Khristoforov, dated December 6, 1883, printed in Vol'naia Sibir', (1927) no. 2, pp. 185-86. Khristoforov had been a fellow-exile of Yadrintsev's in Shenkursk and had emigrated abroad in 1875. In 1883 he was living in Geneva.

12 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (k iubileiu trekhsotlietiia). Sovremennoe polozhenie Sibiri. Eia nuzhdy i potrebnosti. Eia proshloe i budushchee (St. Petersburg: Stasiulevich, 1882), 470 pp.

(climate, topography, resources, etc.) and to the indigenous population; 2) "The Russian Nationality's Regional Type in the East": the character of the Sibiryak, his traditions, talents, and cultural and institutional peculiarities; 3) "The Natives and the Native Question in Siberia": their needs and deteriorating way of life, and the cultural and economic influence of Russians upon them; 4) "Conditions for Settling the Native Question": past and present legislation and social action, along with suggestions for future improvements; 5) "The Colonization of Siberia and Contemporary Migrations": present inadequacies, the organization of settlements, the situation among migrants, and the significance of free and compulsory colonization of lands for Russia and Siberia; 6) "Exile to Siberia and the Status of Exiles": the influence of exiles on Siberia and their way of life; 7) "The History of Resource Exploitation in the East": the extraction of furs, gold, and agricultural products from Siberia and the consequences of this; 8) "Siberia's Economic Condition": economic exploitation of various social groups by monopolists and other exploiters and by the administration, and Siberia's economic future; 9) "The Administration of Siberia and Speransky's Reforms": the development of officialdom, their habits and influence in Siberia, the reforms of 1822 and their effect, and contemporary administrative tasks; 10) "The Need for Knowledge in the East and Education in Siberia": past and present needs and the growth of schools, scholarly societies, the press, and the university question; and 11) "The Country's Future and the Conditions for Its Prosperity": Siberia as a Russian colony, comparisons with other colonies, the tricentennial, and hopes for the future. The work concluded with supplementary "Statistical Information on the Present Condition of Siberia." Despite the heterogeneous assortment of subjects, they all touched

upon the most basic and pressing issues and interests of Siberian life. [13]

The title of the work reflects Yadrintsev's basic view of his homeland, as the epigram from Adam Smith well illustrates on the title page: "The colony of a civilized nation which takes possession either of a waste country, or of one so thinly inhabited that the natives easily give place to the new settlers, advances more rapidly to wealth and greatness than any other human society." [14] In the preface Yadrintsev indicated that he hoped to dispel prejudices and misconceptions about Siberia and intended to show in his work that "this country under better conditions could be a land of prosperity, riches, and happiness." He noted further that the book might be useful not only to Siberians, but also to educated Russians, who, increasingly interested in the "life of the people in European Russia," should show an interest in "the same life of the Russian people in vast borderlands under new conditions." [15] He asked not to be condemned for not always giving an objective account or remaining dispassionate, since,

> responding to the call of life, we have sought to answer it with all the strength of our souls and have placed all the ardor of our hearts here. Belonging to a generation which has consciously sought to regard our hameland's needs and to be useful to it, we have tried to give a strong impulse toward studying it and its problems, believing that other generations . . . will fulfill the subsequent tasks more fully and better than we. [16]

A few excerpts from Siberia as a Colony will better illustrate the variety, scope, depth of observation, and firsthand facts contained in the

---

13 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1882), pp. v-vii.
14 Adam Smith, The Wealth of Nations (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1961), bk. IV, ch. VII, pt. II (Causes of the Prosperity of New Colonies), p. 186. Smith's work was first published in 1776.
15 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1882), p. ix.
16 Ibid., p. xi.

work. One important question the author touched on was that of a regional Siberian "type" among the Russian people as a whole. Though he did not go into specialized research on this problem, he stated general propositions based on the more immediate studies of others (such as Shchapov and Rovinsky) and from his own observations in the Altai. He tried to show how ethnic intermixtures between Russians and natives, which had occurred since the conquest of Siberia, often had favorable results in the interaction of ethnic capabilities, but also led at times to the detriment of the Russian stock and to a degeneration of the regional type.[17] Of the Sibiryak regional variant he wrote,

> In Siberia there is no class that monopolizes cultural life by itself, and therefore the Siberian peasant and the middle class of the population act unconstrained, in a free and easy manner. The Siberian peasant feels equal in rights; he boldly enters the room, gives you his hand, sits down with you to table, and if you invite him, will drink tea and eat completely at ease, and will freely engage in conversation with you. . . . To a certain extent, with good relationships, such treatment is practiced between the authorities and the people. Even a noble of the blood, visiting in Siberia, must make concessions to the merchants, the petty bourgeoisie, and the peasantry if he wishes to approach them . . . Thus, Siberian society, undivided by any restrictions, constitutes a homogeneous mass, where life and its interchange are free. All this cannot but raise the level of the peasant's life.[18]

And pointing to the inclination of the Sibiryak population toward wide-open spaces, freedom, and equality, he wrote:

> Siberia has suffered much from the arbitrariness of administrators and voevodas; but this still

---

17 See the comments of A. N. Pypin, Istoriia russkoi etnografii, IV: 442.
18 Sibir' kak koloniia (1882), pp. 64-65; and in the 1892 edition, pp. 109-110.

> could not stifle all life, and the very pressure on the personality was of another type than the feudal yoke of serfdom. The Siberian peasant has no conception of a yoke in the economic sphere, with respect to restricted use of natural resources. When the Siberian peasant is told of serfdom and of its constraints regarding land, he cannot believe it and almost cannot imagine life under these conditions. . . . Administrative arbitrariness has differed from serfdom in that it did not enter into the beliefs of the popular masses as an awareness of its inevitability, necessity, and legality. [19]

Administrative arbitrariness depended upon individual persons and could be fought and protested; moreover, everyone knew of its illegality. Thus, in Siberia,

> denunciations of abuses and petitions were the usual forms of protest, though this struggle was not cheap; it cost the local population many sacrifices. But nevertheless, the search for justice, legality, and truth stirred Siberian society, and this was manifested on the occasion of each official inspection tour of the country; it received even greater strength and confidence when several administrators, like Speransky, stood on the side of the population's interests. [20]

Yadrintsev wanted a policy of free migration to Siberia, claiming that "the right to migrate is the right to live."

> In any case, colonization cannot be considered from the viewpoint of the interests of people concerned about competition of workers . . . ; nor can it be subordinated to the private interests of provinces — it is the affair of those very people who feel the need to emigrate and the affair of the state, which will not lose from this but will gain, by encouraging prosperous producers instead of ruined proletarians. [21]

---

19 Sibir' kak koloniia (1882), p. 68; and in the 1892 edition, p. 114.
20 Ibid. (1882), p. 70; (1892), p. 114, 115-16.
21 Ibid. (1882), p. 148; (1892), pp. 211-12.

He blamed bureaucratic self-confidence and meddling for the delay in the "cultural, historical work in the area of colonization. Here is why our colonization and the very renewal of our colonies often do not have the success and progress which they have in the West." [22] Yadrintsev urged the government to make greater efforts toward permitting free colonization to and in Siberia.

> The entire future of this region and its cultural success and development will depend upon the freedom of migration to Siberia and on the solid settlement of migrants. We mean, of course, migration of the free agricultural class in Russia. The whole question is whether we wish to have this a settled, flourishing country full of life, or whether we leave it a lifeless wilderness as before. [23]

Turning to the exile question, Yadrintsev pointed out the little-known fact that exiles already living in Siberia were not increasing in number (i.e. propagating) but were diminishing. After an array of facts and figures to prove his point, he concluded that

> The present situation reveals a most sad and corrupt way of life among the exile population; exiles live in poverty, and Siberia is flooded by a mass of homeless and idle proletarians instead of useful workers. Instead of correction, under the sad conditions of exile life, this punishment gives them the reverse results, namely: depravity, vagrancy, and crimes among exiles.
>
> Instead of protecting society by means of isolating and displacing the criminal, the exile system in our midst has promoted the corruption of criminals, and finally, it has inundated Siberia with crimes, year by year increasing in unbelievable dimensions; in this way a whole area is deprived of security, and life in the East has presented conditions with which life in no other civilized country has in common. [24]

---

22 Sibir' kak koloniia (1882), p. 157; and in the 1892 edition, p. 220.
23 Ibid., pp. 162-63; (1892), p. 226.
24 Ibid., p. 221; (1892), p. 300. In the German translation, Sibirien (1886), p. 258.

With respect to Siberia's administrative system, Yadrintsev declared that Siberian institutions as such had outlived their time. He cited, for example, an official report of 1873 which concluded: "The administrative and judicial structure remains for Siberia the same since Speransky's time, i.e. since 1822, and especially the judicial institutions, despite the increase in population and the overcrowding of the region by the exile element; that is why the acting institutions now cannot cope with the huge quantity of criminal and civil affairs." [25] Yadrintsev went on to recommend the complete abolition of the Siberian governor-generalships, or at least reducing their number, for he felt that such a step would hasten the development of civic and cultural principles in the local population.

> Siberian governors-general since Speransky's time, disregarding the spirit of the "Siberian institutions of 1822" and existing legislation, have sought to expand their authority, to concentrate the subordination of all departments, and with this to destroy all reciprocal control and the soil for the proper development of legality.
>
> In Siberia, as everywhere, there is forthcoming a separation of military authority from civil authority, which are now united in the person of the governors-general and military governors; a separation of the functions of the courts from the administration, which can be attained by full implementation of the new judicial institutions; the destruction of the peculiarities in administrative government and the introduction of an overall statute on the administration of provinces, with the subordination of provincial institutions to the ministries; and finally, a separation of rural economic affairs from the administration . . . The provincial and especially the rural-police administrations are impotent in controlling the various needs of the land, and they can neither promote literacy and enlightenment, aid public welfare, nor regulate obligations.

---

25 Sibir' kak koloniia (1882), p. 355; and in the 1892 edition, p. 526.

> . . . A reform of the provincial administration alone is unthinkable now without the aid of other institutions, such as public and zemstvo ones. These are the same organs of which Speransky and Kozodavlev dreamed. [26]

Thus, Yadrintsev spelled out the need for institutions on an equal basis with those in European Russia. In other words, the government no longer should regard Siberia as either a special administrative or institutional entity (or, from Yadrintsev's viewpoint, as a colony).

With respect to Siberia's future in the realm of education and culture, Yadrintsev foresaw a special destiny for the East in which the aboriginal, non-Russian population of Siberia would also play an important role. As in his tricentennial article of 1881, Yadrintsev prophesied Siberia's "westernizing" role in the Orient. By its very geographical position,

> Siberia will naturally be in contact with Asiatic states, which will not always lead a secluded life and at some time will gain access to European enlightenment. If Siberia is destined to play any kind of role in this world-civilizing influence, then Siberian natives who have assimilated European enlightenment by means of the Russian people can be quite prominent intermediaries of this civilization and can render great services to human progress in general. [27]

Also of interest are Yadrintsev's thoughts on Siberia as a colony and its comparison with other colonies. To the assertion that Russia as a whole formed a great colony between East and West, he replied:

> Siberia can be considered a colony much more than European Russia can. The comparisons between America and Siberia are also made very often. . . .
> Siberia is an agricultural colony, and as such its significant merits are at hand. One of these advan-

---

26 Sibir' kak koloniia (1882), pp. 362-64; (1892), pp. 534-35.
27 Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 184.

> tages is the immediate proximity of the colony to the mother country . . .
>
> A comparison of Russian colonies with those of other peoples teaches us that, relatively speaking, Siberia is favorably endowed by nature. An immense, free region, which with respect to space admittedly surpasses that which the colonies of other peoples have to offer, a rich nature, a virgin soil, and the keen, enterprising spirit of the Russian colonists . . .
>
> The Russian colonies differ from the English, Spanish, and Dutch ones through the fortunate peculiarity that the right to the free use of the soil for the colonists is maintained to a higher degree than elsewhere. . . . Another peculiarity that distinguishes our colonies is the communal economy of the peasants. The typical commune system can, with general prosperity, reach a significant development in a new land and with rich soil. Just as the Anglo-Saxon race has now developed its best physical and moral qualities in its colonies and in the work of colonization, so too will the Slavic race have to demonstrate its essence in the same work. [28]

Though Yadrintsev never clearly spelled out which "Russian colonies" other than Siberia, if any, he had in mind, such were some of the chief differences that he noted between Russia's Siberian colony and those of other nations.

Yadrintsev closed his work recollecting the recent tricentennial celebrations, to which the book was dedicated. He reflected:

> How strange it is that after passing raptures and patriotic pride in the acquisition and in the immense conquered territory, we have, as it were, forgotten the same and have not worried about its internal life at all. The land of the future, our "Peru and Mexico," and our "gold mine" reverts on the day after to a rejected place of exile and forced labor, a lifeless desert, without any political significance. [29]

---

28 Jadrinzew, Sibirien (1886), p. 426, 428. This is a condensation of what is described in broader detail in Sibir' kak koloniia (1882), pp. 432 ff. Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu in his work L'Empire des Tsars et les Russes (Paris, 1882) had called Russia one big colony between East and West (pt. 1: 40-42).

29 Sibir' kak koloniia (1882), p. 444. Yadrintsev attributed the phrase "Our Mexido and Peru" to Finance Minister Egor Kankrin in the 1840's, and the phrase "gold mine" to the scholar Soimonov (1892 ed., p. 710).

With an extract from his tricentennial article, Yadrintsev concluded his last chapter — on Siberia's future:

> It is the sacred duty of the mother country to recognize society's coming of age, to present it with civil rights, and to satisfy aspirations common to humanity with respect to each young developing country in its hands: Providence has laid a great obligation upon it before the face of all humanity and future history. [30]

The reviews of Siberia as a Colony were quite favorable. One of the more flattering compliments paid to the book came from the literary critic Pypin, who called it "one of the most remarkable works in all Siberian literature." Referring to the contemporary issues discussed in the work, Pypin concluded that "historians do not usually get that far, and the history of Siberia and the most recent history of our political and social life in general have only now begun to be discovered in their real, genuine aspects." [31] Another literary critic, Glinsky, claimed that "the appearance of Yadrintsev's book made a deep impression in society and in literature" and went on to note the work's "high merits." [32] A third, anonymous reviewer remarked that "the name of Yadrintsev is so well known in our literature that it does not need recommendations." [33] Besides these and other sympathetic reviews among Russian critics, Siberia as a Colony spurred thoughtful consideration in certain official circles. The chief of the Main Prison Administration, A. P. Salomon, called the author "fully competent in judgment," and the Ministry of Education recommended the book for libraries in

---

30 Sibir' kak koloniia (1882), p. 449; (1892), p. 720; Sibirien, p. 436. See also (for the original) Iadrintsev, "Trekhsotlietie Sibiri," p. 849.

31 A. N. Pypin, Istoriia russkoi etnografii, IV: 377.

32 B. B. Glinskii, "Iadrintsev," p. 440.

33 Otechestvennyia Zapiski, (1882) no. 5; cited in Glinskii, "Iadrintsev," p. 440. The original source was unavailable to me.

secondary schools.[34]

The work drew the attention of Siberians too. In a pseudonymous article Potanin wrote:

> One person, who has occupied a high administrative position, has said that Siberia has no local questions of its own, and that its questions are the same as European Russia's; but it is worth reading Yadrintsev's book to become convinced that each of the questions mentioned has its distinctive aspect, and all Siberian questions are distinguished by their own peculiarities from those of European Russia under the corresponding rubrics.[35]

Potanin could still comment twenty-five years later: "Mainly everything has been done by Yadrintsev, who almost alone, without prominent assistants, labored over Siberian problems; the elaboration of details has been left for following generations."[36]

Another assessment of the work was written by Semyon Kapustin, a Siberian publicist, administrator, and expert on peasant life. Of the contents Kapustin wrote:

> All this is a very full and diversified picture of Siberia, composed on the basis of very conscientious extracts from everything that has been written about Siberia by its administrators, scholars, explorers, and travelers — from everything that could be drawn out of foreign and Russian literature — both general and historical. Each page of this book tells an event with facts, data, traditions, conclusions, and opinions of historians, scientific experimenters, travelers, trapper-hunters, traders, etc. — in a word, by selections from a very extensive literature. It is thereby remarkable that despite the book's composition, its statement is distinguished by being easily understood by the majority of the reading public.[37]

---

34 Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 132-33.

35 L. (Potanin), "Sibir' kak koloniia," Ustoi, (1882) no. 6; quoted in Glinskii, "Iadrintsev," pp. 440-41. Lemke cites evidence proving that Potanin was indeed the author (p. 132).

36 Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibir," p. 275.

37 S. K-----tin, "Zerkalo Rossii. (Po povodu knigi g. Iadrintseva: 'Sibir' kak koloniia'.)" (Russia's Mirror: Apropos of Mr. Yadrintsev's Book, Siberia as a Colony), Russkaia Mysl', (1883), I: 5.

Kapustin's analysis of the work, however, did not share Potanin's regionalist slant. His main contention was that Yadrintsev's book showed Siberia to be a "mirror of Russia," demonstrating no really essential differences between it and Russia.

> Thus, is not present-day Siberia, if it is the daughter of Russia, similar to its own mother in everything, with the only difference that the latter as an adult knows how to hide many of her deficiencies, while the former has not yet learned to? . . .
>
> Thus, in this book on Siberia we see many phenomena from our own Russian life. Like a mirror, this book reflects us, and like a mirror it gives us opportunity to view ourselves from head to toe, to grasp in such a way our general outline, to evaluate correlations of various parts of the organism among themselves and in entirety, to see our own face, eyes, and — in a word — all which is impossible to see without the help of a mirror. [38]

Kapustin was chiefly interested in the question of self-government in Russia and Siberia, and did not specify in detail other "reflections" of Russia in the Siberian mirror.

Yadrintsev's Siberia as a Colony was a success, and it 1886 it was published in German translation. [39] The editor and translator, Dr. E. Petri, a professor of geography and anthropology at the University of Berne, had been in contact with Yadrintsev both in correspondence and in person, when the latter visited Switzerland in 1885. In the German edition several chapters were supplemented, others were reduced in scope, and a new chapter on Siberia's significance in a world economy was added. For the first time a number of illustrations appeared in the work.

---

38 Ibid., pp. 28-29, 36.

39 Sibirien. Geographische, ethnographische und historische Studien von N. Jadrinzew, (trans. and ed. by Dr. Ed. Petri (Jena: Hermann Gostennoble, 1886).

A second Russian edition of Siberia as a Colony came out in 1892, which included most of the supplements of the German edition, along with the pictures. The original Russian title was now revised.[40] Though much was left entirely unchanged, the new edition included up-to-date statistical facts, and special chapters on geographical, climatic, and hydrographical conditions. Many chapters were extended to take into account important developments during the previous ten years. Moreover, seven new chapters (making sixteen in all) included such topics as the cottage industry, the social life of Siberian towns, and the history of local literature.[41] In this edition, ten years after the first, Yadrintsev commented that since the tricentennial jubilee

> The social life of the region has made noticeable steps . . . Such changes have followed in the region's life that can be acknowledged as the beginning of a renewal; for example, the introduction of rules for a new legal procedure in the borderland, the transformation of the communal village government, the opening of the Tomsk university, etc. Indeed, signs of a more conscious regard toward these questions have emerged within Siberian society itself.

In view of the efforts and progress made in the area of education, museums, libraries, and cultural life, the past decade in his opinion had actually begun to constitute a "new historical period."[42]

By the 1880's about 15% of the population of Siberia proper was composed of indigenous peoples. Even less was generally known among the Russian

---

40 N. M. Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia v geograficheskom, etnograficheskom i istoricheskom otnoshenii (Siberia as a Colony in its Geographical, Ethnographical, and Historical Aspects), 2d ed. (St. Petersburg: I. M. Sibiriakov, 1892), 720 pp.

41 Semevsky noted, however, that Yadrintsev "did not take enough advantage of the remarkable materials on the economic life of the Siberian peasantry which have recently appeared." V. Semevskii, "Nieskol'ko slov," p. 36.

42 Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. xi.

public of aboriginal Siberians than was known of the Russian Sibiryaks. It was not until 1891, however, that the first systematic, scholarly study of Siberian natives appeared in print. This was Yadrintsev's other major work of this time, Siberian Natives, Their Way of Life and Present Condition. Ethnographical and Statistical Investigations with a Supplement of Statistical Tables.[43] This book was the culmination of his research of over ten years, in the field, at his desk, and in the archives.[44] Among the questions he considered were several of those brought out in earlier articles and in Siberia as a Colony: the reasons why certain peoples were dying out, the capacity of natives to assimilate Russian culture, the interaction between Russian and native populations, and the influence of education on Siberian natives. Besides presenting purely descriptive and factual material, Yadrintsev, as in Siberia as a Colony, brought out his latest views on the past fortunes and the potential future of Siberian natives.

Though Siberian native peoples were not diminishing in numbers everywhere, especially not in the southern, more agricultural areas, Yadrintsev established beyond doubt the fact that many nomadic tribes decreasing in size, and chiefly where they fell into a kind of economic servitude to Russian hunters, trappers, and entrepreneurs. Added to this, crop failures, forest fires, and decline in animal food supply were causes for gradual extinction among some indigenous peoples. Yadrintsev rejected the somewhat fashionable social-Darwinian supposition that natives were doomed to die

---

43 N. M. Iadrintsev, Sibirskie inorodtsy, ikh byt' i sovremennoe polozhenie. Etnograficheskiia i statisticheskiia izsliedovaniia s prilozheniem statisticheskikh tablits (St. Petersburg: I. M. Sibiriakov, 1891), 308 pp.

44 Ibid., pp. 1-2.

out because of their innate "incapacity for culture." Instead, he pointed out various capacities among natives which could be and sometimes were developed. "We must regret that this talent and these abilities of the natives have been lost, that they did not have a proper outlet and application, and that we have not made use of them otherwise, since they would benefit the general cultural tasks of humanity." [45]

Though the decrease in the population of many tribes was ascertained, Yadrintsev declared that

> nevertheless, a precise, scientific, statistical, and economic investigation of each tribe by itself has not been made; also the reasons why natives die out have not been clarified. Is this dying out an inevitable law weighing upon a certain race, or do accidental, unfavorable conditions engender it, with the removal of which this dying out would cease? Various opinions exist on this. [46]

In this respect Yadrintsev also brought up the problem of civil rights and equal guarantees before the law for natives.

Concerning education the author felt that schools, as instruments of civilization, should be introduced without coercion, with instruction in the native language, and with teachers recruited from the natives themselves, who knew and cherished their ethnic identity and traditions.

> The goal of education should be the inspiration of love to one's own tribe, to its destiny, and not the aspiration to alienate the native from his former community, to tear him away from the masses and to permit the same misery, misfortune, and extinction. Only very few educated natives have preserved ties with their own tribe and have wished to dedicate themselves to its development. [47]

---

45 Sibirskie inorodtsy, p. 166.
46 Ibid., p. 2.
47 Ibid., p. 241.

After listing the names of several educated natives, Yadrintsev discussed two in particular.

> Both Valikhanov and Banzarov received a higher education;[48] they were very talented and scholarly men, even in a European milieu, and yet their sympathies remained on the side of their ill-fated tribes. Unfortunately, such personalities have broken out only occasionally from amidst a native environment. Higher European education has remained alien to the majority of natives, and moreover, such persons could have rendered services to native enlightenment most of all and could have looked after the fate of their people. . . . The spirit of the Siberian native remains humbled, a deep melancholy encumbers it, and a gloomy hopelessness binds his heart; there is notfaith in anything better and no hope in the future. Here native enlightenment should create this faith and hope, common to all mankind. When the native sees no coercion and danger in inculcating education, he will learn to respect it.[49]

Thus, in Yadrintsev's opinion, the need for enlightenment, education, and self-awareness was just as important among indigenous Siberians as it was for the Russian-Sibiryak element. A sense of pride, identity, and confidence was needed not only among the Russian-Siberian "minority" within the Russian Empire as a whole, but also among the native "minority" within Siberia itself.

Yadrintsev viewed the Siberian university, which by this time had finally been opened in Tomsk, both as a promising factor in attracting Siberian natives to higher education and as a means to promote "ethnic studies" and scholarship. Referring to Valikhanov and others who had furthered science and scholarship in Russia, he remarked: "Remembering their own languages, they have been the most capable as oriental scholars and have

---

48 Dorzhi Banzarov (d. 1855) was a Buryat orientalist and scholar; on Chokan Valikhanov (d. 1866) a Kazakh scholar and Potanin's friend at one time, see above, p. 259, 260, 261, and 279.

49 Sibirskie inorodtsy, p. 241.

brought invaluable contributions to ethnography by studying their own tribes and the geography of nearby borderlands. An oriental faculty in Siberia can provide an even larger contingent of such orientalists." [50]

One of Yadrintsev's objectives in the book was to suggest means whereby the overall situation could be improved.

> The question of preserving and caring for the native population, which should be the responsibility of civilizers, comes forth all the more sharply and clearly. Providing the north with hospitals, missions, and schools for the natives is becoming urgent. Finally, for promoting and facilitating aid to the native it is time to found a society which will attract educated people, investigators of indigenous life, and persons able to sympathize with enlightening the native. This society of protection will be of no less use to the native's enlightenment than are first aid societies, philanthropical societies, and humane societies for animals. Here the cause concerns people. We think that the Russian public would have enough philanthropic feelings for this purpose. [51]

Regarding this last suggestion, Potanin wrote a few years later that Yadrintsev's study of native peoples that faced possible extinction often gave him

> cause to reproach society or to complain to the reader regarding public indifference to this question. Yadrintsev tried to demonstrate that educated society, pluming itself on civilization, is inexcusably apathetic toward the fate of unhappy natives. Not a single person stepped forth from this public who was struck by the situation of people tragically and slowly dying out. [52]

Though the government had subsequently established a "commission for the improvement of the natives' way of life," Potanin was unimpressed by its

---

50 Sibirskie inorodtsy, p. 242.
51 Ibid., p. 90.
52 Potanin, "Nikolai Mikhailovich Iadrintsev," p. 174.

work. Of Yadrintsev's overall efforts on behalf of Siberian natives Potanin wrote that in real life he "thought of their present situation, of measures to save them from extinction, and of means to arouse in them a self-consciousness and interest toward their own needs. He got to know prominent natives and rendered them support and protection." [53] Again, Yadrintsev was easily able to sympathize with the needs and priorities of the indigenous population, since they closely corresponded in so many respects to the same needs and interests of the Sibiryaks, and indeed of the entire region.

Yadrintsev's two major works, Siberia as a Colony and Siberian Natives have been important and unique contributions to the general knowledge of Siberia, especially as it was in the 19th century. They incorporated much of the more specific work of other investigators and of the author's own studies. Of special value was Yadrintsev's assessment of the significance of the past, the problems of the present, and the possibilities of the future all in one, supplemented by concrete proposals and suggestions for improvement. [54] Siberian Natives was a broad, but detailed study of a particular problem, and as such it was unique in the literature written on Siberian natives in the 19th century. It concerned, however, only one of the issues which the Siberian regionalists, and Yadrintsev in particular, sought to clarify and resolve. On the other hand, Siberia as a Colony ranks not only as the leading scholarly work on nineteenth-century Siberia and its problems to this very day, but it can also be considered as the most important single declaration of the directions and objectives of Siberian

---

53 Potanin, "Nikolai Mikhailovich Iadrintsev," p. 174.

54 This writer knows of only two evaluations in English of Yadrintsev's two major works. In one Anatole Mazour writes briefly: "Both studies contain much that retains importance to this day" (Modern Russian Historiography, p. 166). In the other S. V. Utechin calls Siberia as a Colony "the main work of Siberian regionalism." Utechin, Russian Political Thought (New York: Praeger, 1964), p. 151.

regionalism. The first edition of 1882 and the revised and up-dated editions of 1886 and 1892 reflected both an increasing interest in Siberia on the part of the reading public in Siberia, Russia, and abroad, and the evolving demands and assessments of Siberia's problems of that time.

With these major scholarly works Yadrintsev contributed much to the awakening of thought, self-consciousness, and public opinion in Siberia of the 1880's and early 1890's. Yet these efforts were far from his only contributions. Yadrintsev's journalistic activities had a more regular and perhaps more profound impact on Siberian society of the 1880's, giving it an increased sense of identity, purpose, and confidence.

* * *

The Newspaper Eastern Review (1882-94)

The high point in Yadrintsev's activity as a regionalist spokesman for Siberia can probably be considered his founding the regionalist newspaper Eastern Review in 1882 and his direction of the paper as editor-in-chief and publisher until the year of his death, 1894. The establishment of a regional press was for Yadrintsev the fulfillment of what he had been striving toward since the early 1860's. In many ways the written word, especially through the press, was, he felt, the most potent force possible in promoting Siberia's cause. This outlook went back to his student years in St. Petersburg when, along with many others at that time, he "worshipped" literature and its possibilities.

> We saw a very close tie between literature and life. . . . a respect for science and literature filled our souls in general, and we never blasphemed about them even in the very worst times. This faith remained with us our entire lives. Literature and

> science in all their aura won our hearts forever, for we saw them in their very best manifestations. We understood and revered literature as a mighty weapon for man's spiritual activity and for all human progress; we did not consider it from only a party point of view and did not suspect it for its ugly and temporal appearances. . . . We considered the human word as the best means for the victory of knowledge over ignorance, for the triumph of an idea, and for the conquest of human rights. Thus, it is not surprising that many of us dreamed of becoming writers and that literature took many into its priesthood. [55]

At just about the time that Siberia as a Colony was published, Yadrintsev began to petition for permission to establish an uncensored Siberian newspaper in Petersburg. [56] Some of his ties in official circles, such as former Siberian administrators Kaznakov and Despot-Zenovich, helped him gain the desired permission to publish. Yadrintsev had proposed that the name of the newspaper be "Siberian Review," but Semyonov, then the vice-president of the Geographical Society, who had also helped him obtain permission to publish, suggested that the name "Siberian Review" might irritate certain officials, who would see in this the specter of Siberian separatism. Instead, Semyonov recommended the name be changed to "Eastern Review." [57] Meanwhile, fellow Siberians were putting together a fund of about 4000 rubles for Yadrintsev's paper, of which 2,500 rubles were used as security for its uncensored status. [58]

The first issue of the Eastern Review came out on April 1, 1882, and featured a full statement of the regionalist paper's program:

---

55 Iadrintsev, "Studencheskiia i literaturnyia vospominaniia sibiriaka," Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1884) nos. 33, 36; quoted in Glinskii, "Iadrintsev," pp. 422-23.

56 Under the rules of August 27, 1882, a newspaper "warned" three times by the censor would thenceforth be subject to preliminary censorship on the day before publication of each issue.

57 Popov, "K 80-ti lietiiu," p. 293. 58 Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 133.

> For some time the position of the distant borderlands and of life in the Russian East has received special interest, has called forth investigations, and has aroused all the more the attention of the government and of Russian society. Wishing to give, if possible, a truthful picture of life in the East in its various aspects and to try to determine the role of the Russian people in the Asiatic East and their mission common to mankind, and also desiring to express the needs and requirements of Russian society in the borderlands, we have undertaken a publication which acquaints European Russia with Asia and Siberia, and conversely, the inhabitants of the borderlands with Russian life and development.
>
> Perhaps we are mistaken, but at present our deep conviction is that a detailed regional study of Russia can render a certain service and is not superficial amidst the Russian periodical press.
>
> We consider our task all the more timely in that Siberia, on the eve of its 300th anniversary, awaits a social renewal and the elaboration of various questions which its life has raised. Our obligation will be to solicit and present the interests of the population of the eastern borderlands. In Petersburg, the center of Russia, this presentation may be of some use in clarifying the country's status and may shed some light on local problems. We will give the repressed voice of the eastern borderlands and their needs a chance to be expressed openly and impartially.
>
> Our sincere intention will be to unite the opinions of people who know the life of Siberia and the East, and who love their country and wish it well. At the same time we invite all oriental experts and scholars to take part in the familiarizing of Russian society with Asia which we propose; with this goal we are ready to give extensive space to scholarly research, travels, and to a bibliography of the East as full as possible. [59]

Yadrintsev also promised to "acquaint Russian readers with what is occurring of greatest note in such neighboring countries as Japan, China, and India." [60] Thus, the Eastern Review appeared to be taking on the aspect of a serious, scholarly weekly newspaper devoted to all of Eastern Asia.

---

59 Iadrintsev, "Ot redaktsii" (From the Editors), Vostochnoe Obozrienie. Gazeta literaturnaia i politicheskaia, (1882) no. 1, p. 1; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 134 (see plate between pp. 64-65). All issues of Vostochnoe Obozrienie have been inaccessible to the writer.

60 Iadrintsev, "Ot redaktsii"; quoted in Glinskii, "Iadrintsev," p. 442.

Yadrintsev concluded his inaugural article with a list of people who had already written on Siberia or the Orient, and who had promised to assist and contribute to the Eastern Review. Among those mentioned were Professors Wilhelm Radloff and I. Ya. Foinitsky; the Siberian-born explorers Av V. Adrianov, I. S. Polyakov, and Potanin; such Siberian writers as Naumov, Shashkov (who died later that year), Kapustin, and M. S. Znamensky; and the noted Russian writers S. V. Maximov and the elderly Decembrist Zavalishin.[61] Other publicists of prominence who later took part in the Eastern Review were the Siberian exiles, I. P. Belokonsky, L. F. Panteleev, and D. A. Klements; regionalist writers like V. I. Vagin, M. V. Zagoskin, I. V. Fyodorov-Omulevsky, and the northern regionalist, A. S. Prugavin; and the noted Russian historian and Siberiophile V. I. Semevsky. With such a roster of contributors the Eastern Review soon won itself a place in Russian journalism of the 1880's as an important progressive, though not radical publication.

Yadrintsev and his wife Adelaida were the editors of the paper. The lack of funds did not permit expansion of the editorial staff, and Yadrintsev very often had to work day and night in the newspaper office. Mme. Yadrintseva took care of the weekly summary of news items, or "chronicle," and, in addition, became proof-reader, secretary, and bookkeeper for the paper. Yadrintsev was well aware that the success of a newspaper depended to a great extent on widespread social connections and especially on the interest of leaders of public opinion. For this reason he and his wife organized a weekly open house in their modest Petersburg apartment. These events were held each Thursday, when the weekly issue of the paper came out.

---

61 See Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 134.

Semevsky wrote that "their Thursdays, with their animation and ease, brought to mind the best period of the 1860's, when society lived with a fuller life." [62] These gatherings were especially popular with Siberian students then in St. Petersburg.

In 1883 Yadrintsev briefly reviewed his journalistic intentions of the past few years to a friend abroad, Khristoforov. He wrote:

> I had thought of founding a journal in Tomsk but did not succeed; I then arrived in Petersburg and decided to try to create an organ without censorship, an organ of publicity for the East, a mediator between the center and the borderland, and a solicitor for our interests in the capital. At the same time I intended to touch upon the regional question in general and to survey the Asiatic East, and I focused the fullest bibliography on it. The latter was not successful; our public has not been mature enough for a serious Eastern Review, and in Russia there is an insignificant number of subscribers. [63]

The contents of the Eastern Review were indeed just as varied as Yadrintsev had promised in his initial "program" for the paper. There were articles on such regional issues as migration, exile, natives, the university, and public education. Among other subjects discussed in its pages were the gold industry, past Siberian history, local courts and administration, industry and trade in Siberia, and the peasant economy and land use. In addition there were short stories and articles on geography, ethnography, and archeology, along with essays on the press and social life in the provinces.

At the beginning of one of the articles in the first number of the newspaper ran the statement: "'Region' is the motto with which we step forth

---

62 V. Semevskii, "Nieskol'ko slov," p. 34. He is, of course, contrasting the repression and reaction setting in at the beginning of Alexander III's reign with the vibrant first years of the reign of Alexander II.

63 Letter to A. Kh. Khristoforov, dated December 6, 1883, in "Pis'ma N. M. Iadrintseva k A. Kh. Khristoforovu" (Letters of N. M. Yadrintsev to A. Kh. Khristoforov), Vol'naia Sibir', (1927) II: 186.

among the other organs of the Russian press." Though the articles devoted directly to this subject were not many, as seen in the above paragraph, the paper remained guided by this principle. As Lemke, a historian of Russian journalism, noted, the idea of "region penetrated distinctly through its pores and looked out from each line. Proper due was always rendered to Shchapov and Kostomarov, as regionalist historians."[64]

The impressions the newspaper made on Siberian society were indeed varied. One observer, Kacherets, related the following:

> In Tomsk, Irkutsk, and Yakutsk each issue of the Eastern Review was awaited with impatience. The reader liked to find in the new paper the sarcastic polemic against the magnificent culture-bearers who came to Siberia in state coaches . . . He liked even more to recognize under comic nicknames and masks personages which the local press could not touch, because of the so-called local conditions of the press. The reader felt satisfaction in looking through the satire of the "Good-Natured Sibiryak" /a pseudonym of Yadrintsev/ . . . ; what the bridled local press could not give him, the new Petersburg paper gave him: he saw that irresponsibility in Siberia was not eternal and was not infinite, that caprice and arbitrariness . . . were not completely uncontrolled, that there was fear even among those who brought fear, and that the limits of evil were finally revealed.[65]

It is evident that the amount of pleasure and expectation that the newspaper brought to intellectuals, such as Kacherets' "reader," corresponded to the degree of indignation among the maligned bureaucrats and officials of the "old school."

Though certain Siberian intellectuals and officials may have regarded the Eastern Review with keen interest, positively or negatively, it was

---

64 See Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 137-38.

65 G. Kacherets, "Vostochnoe Obozrienie" (The Eastern Review), Sibir', (1897) no. 39; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 136.

obvious that beyond these two broad groupings there was little interest in the paper. As another observer later wrote, the paper was "managed very interestingly and literarily, with spirit and talent, but how and on what it survived was hard to tell. It seems that N. M. /Yadrintsev/ found the support of some patrons among educated and wealthy Siberians, but the inert, backward, and little educated Siberian public regarded his paper rather indifferently." [66]

The Eastern Review made an impression not only in Petersburg and Siberia, but also elsewhere in provincial Russia. For instance, in 1882, the Perm Provincial Gazette (in northeastern Russia) wrote: "One cannot but wish success to a publication which has appeared so opportunely and which answers so well the present state of affairs; one can hope that directed by a person as competent as Yadrintsev . . . it fully justifies expectations." [67]

One section in the paper was set up especially for "correspondence from Siberia," to which educated and thoughtful Siberians, who generally stood firmly behind Yadrintsev, contributed. Full of lively and interesting comments and information, this section was quite popular among readers. Yadrintsev himself wrote many of these letters, making as much use as possible of the right of the newspaper to be issued without preliminary censorship.

It was almost inevitable, however, that the Eastern Review, in view of displeasure it often aroused in Siberian official circles, would also incur the wrath of censorship authorities in Petersburg. Indeed, the paper had not been published for over six months when it received its first official

---

66 G. Mikhnevich, in Novosti, (1894) no. 165; quoted in Glinskii, "Iadrintsev," p. 442.

67 Permskiia Gubernskiia Viedomosti, (1882) no. 33; quoted in Glinskii, "Iadrintsev," p. 442.

"warning." Three such warnings meant that an uncensored newspaper would thereafter become subject to preliminary censorship. According to the issue of the paper immediately following this, the Minister of Interior decided to "announce to the newspaper Eastern Review a first warning to the person of the editor-publisher Nikolai Yadrintsev." This was done after "having taken into consideration that the newspaper Eastern Review, by its tendentiousness and incessant attacks on the Siberian administration, is seeking to discredit it in the eyes of the local population . . ." Several articles were indicated as examples of these attacks," along with certain "correspondence" from Siberia.[68] From Lemke's brief summary of the contents of these incriminating articles and letters, the reasons behind this warning seem somewhat far-fetched. But if the above-cited statement of Kacherets was a fairly accurate portrayal of the paper's style, approach, and impact in Siberia, perhaps there were justifications indeed for a warning.

On June 10, 1884, the Eastern Review was issued a second warning by censorship authorities. The Minister of Interior (Count D. A. Tolstoy) this time took

> into consideration that the newspaper Eastern Review, despite the warning given on October 27, 1882, again has begun to report false news of the activities and decrees of Siberian authorities, with the obvious purpose of weakening the administration's authority among the population and of arousing distrust toward its activity . . .[69]

A third warning was not long in following. On September 19, 1885, "the editors of the Eastern Review, despite having received two warnings, seek as

---

68 Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1882) no. 32; quotations from Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 137. Brief summaries of their contents are given on p. 137.

69 Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1884) no. 24; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 140-41.

before to portray the activity of the Siberian administration in an extremely unfavorable light . . ." The cause this last time was the contents of the article, "The Amur: Illusions and Disenchantments." This third warning carried with it not only the suspension of the paper for two weeks, but also the "return" of the paper to preliminary censorship. Thus, the first issue to come out after the two-week suspension bore the stamp: "permitted by the censor, October 9, 1885." [70]

Thus ended what can probably be considered the best days in the life of the Eastern Review. Thenceforth, a decline in the number of subscribers set in which during Yadrintsev's lifetime never reversed itself to the point of reaching the level of mid-1885. Before the last warning the paper had about 1,300 subscribers, but only a half-year later, in April 1886, the number fell precipitously to 150. [71] Despite the first two warnings, the paper's circulation had grown continuously, but the third warning, with its ensuing preliminary censorship proved to be nearly fatal. The approximate annual total of subscribers runs as follows: [72]

1882	—	500
1883	—	900
1884	—	1,100
1885	—	1,300
April 1886	—	150

Together with the two other private, regionalist Siberian newspapers, Siberia and the new Tomsk paper, the Siberian Gazette, the three in 1885 had a combined circulation of 2,000, though, as Yadrintsev put it, they could

---

70 Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1885) no. 39. Quotations are from Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 141. The controversial article was "Amurskiia illiuzii i razocharovaniia," Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1885) no. 35.

71 D. Ponikarevskii, "Vospominaniia o N. M. Iadrintsevie," Sibirskii Sbornik, (1896) II: 211; cited in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 142.

72 The source for the annual totals is Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1897) no. 40; cited in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 142 n.

"scarcely pay for their publication." [73]

What was the relationship of the Eastern Review at this time to Siberian journalism in general? One commentator wrote of its establishment in 1882:

> At the dawn of Siberian journalism, all of vast Siberia was supplied by only two censored weekly papers, Siberia in Irkutsk, and the Siberian Gazette in Tomsk /founded in 1881/. The uncensored Eastern Review appeared as a third, which made up a very essential deficiency. Maintaining an active and close tie with the editors of the Siberian papers, Yadrintsev firmly held the banner which they raised, stirring the local papers to go along the same path and not to lose their way, and constantly rendering them moral support. [74]

Relations between the three private Siberian papers were friendly, but the appearance in 1885 of a fourth private publication, the Siberian Herald, in Tomsk tended to interrupt this cordial atmosphere. At this point Yadrintsev began a ruthless campaign in the Eastern Review against this new paper, led, in his opinion, by several "exiled tricksters and rogues," who curried the favor of the administration, and who "cleverly cloaked themselves with the interests of the Russian people." Of his campaign he wrote: "I led an attack and an exposé, and I give no quarter." [75] This bitter rivalry between the two papers would indeed last for several years.

The year 1885 also witnessed the publication of the first collection of literary essays to be put out by the editorial staff of the Eastern Review. In October 1884 the newspaper announced it would be supplemented by

---

73 (Iadrintsev) "Nachalo pechati," p. 404.

74 Quoted in Dubrovskii, "Slavnyi syn Sibiri," p. 118. The source is not identified.

75 Letter to A. Kh. Khristoforov, dated July 25, 1885, at St. Petersburg, in "Pis'ma Iadrintseva k Khristoforovu," p. 188. For more details on the Siberian Herald and on this struggle, see below, pp. 603-05.

a "literary anthology," which annual subscribers would receive free of charge. Somewhat similar to the one-volume collection put out by Siberia in 1876, this anthology would also present works too extensive to fit into a newspaper format, and which had accumulated for a period of time. The anthology of 1885 can perhaps be considered the most important of all the yearly or semi-annual collections put out as supplements by the Eastern Review. Not only was it the first one, but it also afforded a very wide range of selections, including valuable essays of Yadrintsev, Vagin, Kapustin, and the young Siberian historian A. V. Oksyonov.

In the preface to the Literary Anthology Yadrintsev set forth his motives for publishing such a work. He stated that collections of regional literature were becoming a necessity of Russian life and a measure of the growth of intellectual life in the regions of Russia. He then cited regional anthologies published in Perm, Kazan (First Step), and southwestern Russia, along with Spassky's Siberian Herald of the 1820's. Many more literary and scholarly works from the provinces remained unpublished and unrecognized. Many specifically regional articles often could not get into metropolitan publications. This situation would hopefully change with the recent establishment of a regionalist press. However,

> Regional journalism, as an indispensable condition, will set definite demands and a severe critique of local works to begin with. Only with a certain quality of work will regional talents be recognized and will regional literature occupy a prominent place. Guided by this we have chosen only that material which most closely has approached literary demands, had scholarly value, presented a conscientious relationship to the subject, and could count on a more prolonguedexistence. In any case, we have tried to present that which has seemed to us most valuable and useful for the study of the region and

for getting to know it. [76]

Yadrintsev's contributions to the Anthology were impressive and at the same time indicative of his stature in the world of Siberian letters. Besides editing the collection, he contributed six of the seventeen essays, some of them pseudonymous. Essays in the volume which touched on the social and literary awakening in nineteenth-century Siberia were Vagin's "Irkutsk in the 1840's," and Yadrintsev's "The Beginning of the Press in Siberia," "The Fate of Siberian Poetry and Early Poets in Siberia," and extensive review of Shcheglov's compendium of Siberian history.

From 1886 on, an annual supplementary collection to the Eastern Review became a permanent feature. However, the name was now changed to Siberian Anthology. These supplements came out two or three times a year, though in smaller format than the large Literary Anthology of 1885. For the first time since Spassky's regional periodicals in the early 1820's, an anthology devoted to Siberia lasted for more than a year or two. The first three issues of 1886 included historical articles, Potanin's travels, studies on Siberian natives by the Swiss professor E. J. Petri (Yadrintsev's translator), a poem of Yershov, articles on Slovtsov and Shchapov, and a large bibliography of works on Siberia. [77] Among the writers listed in the first issue as having offered to contribute their services were Naumov, M. S. Znamensky, D. I. Mamin-Sibiryak, L. F. Panteleev, Potanin, Adrianov, Semevsky, and several foreign scholars. [78]

---

76 "Ot redaktsii" (From the Editors), Literaturnyi Sbornik. Izdanie "Vostochnago Obozrieniia. Sobranie nauchnykh i literaturnykh statei o Sibiri i Aziatskom Vostokie (St. Petersburg: Skorokhodov, 1885), pp. vii-viii.

77 Sibirskii Sbornik, (1886) 3 bks.

78 Sibirskii Sbornik, (1886) bk. 1, p. vii.

Despite the warm reception that the Literary Anthology and the subsequent Siberian Anthologies encountered, the fortunes of the Eastern Review, as noted above, declined from the high point reached in mid-1885. The falling circulation and the transfer of the paper to censorship control had a great impact on the already high-strung and restless constitution of Yadrintsev. The subscriptions for 1887 were so few that even with the donations from "friends" of Siberia, it looked as though the Eastern Review might have to cease publication. It was at this time that a last-chance attempt to revive interest in the paper presented itself. According to Potanin's account:

> Friends then advised Yadrintsev to transfer the paper to Siberia; in this they were guided by several considerations: a paper published in the capital for Siberia should reckon on only a small group of people interested in it; these are people interested in Siberia's social questions. . . . A paper published somewhere in the borderland has a quite different circle of readers; its reader is interested in unimportant facts of local life; for him, at least in the majority of cases, the pursuit of serious goals in a paper does not represent a necessary requirement. A simple sheet of announcements, published in a place where there is not a shadow of publicism, has a much greater guarantee of subscribers than does a publicistic organ published for the borderland in the capital. The Eastern Review, transferred to Irkutsk, could count on 300 loyal subscribers in town and 500 out of town. Here were the considerations guiding Yadrintsev's friends, who advised him not to close down the paper, but to transfer it to Irkutsk. . . . he moved to Irkutsk not because he wished to become closer to Siberian life; there were simple economic considerations. Yadrintsev's friends wanted to continue the existence of the Eastern Review in any way possible; they did not want their friend's voice to be silenced. Let it ring out weakly, but still let it ring out.[79]

---

79 Potanin, in Sibir', (1897) no. 39; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 143. According to Obruchev, Potanin himself was one of these persuasive friends (Potanin, p. 211).

Potanin's account, written a decade later, does not seem to have been correct. Semevsky states, for instance, that

> in 1887 the editors, for reasons independent of themselves, were deprived of several young contributors, and the thought of transferring the publication to Irkutsk occurred to Yadrintsev. Several Petersburg friends resolutely tried to dissuade him in this, finding that in the provinces the external conditions for publishing the paper would be even less favorable . . . [80]

Moreover, I. P. Belokonsky, an exile and contributor to the Eastern Review since 1882, wrote many years later that Yadrintsev on a visit to Siberia in 1886 told him: "Yes, my dream in the end is to transfer the publication to Siberia, and this will be done." [81] Mikhnevich, however, tends to agree with Potanin's version: Yadrintsev "devised everything possible to stay in business. He did not want to give it up, as another would have in his position, and he finally thought of transferring the Eastern Review to the heart of Siberia itself — to Irkutsk, which he succeeded in doing after countless 'pacings' and 'deliberations'." [82]

Whatever the circumstances, in late 1887 Yadrintsev decided to transfer publication of the Eastern Review to Irkutsk. He took up the matter cheerfully and energetically, unaware of the tremendous problems that would soon arise. In one of the last issues published in Petersburg he explained his decision:

> Having finished the mission which the local organ in the capital temporarily took on itself, it must

---

80 V. Semevskii, "Nieskol'ko slov v pamiat' Iadrintseva," (1895), p. 34.
81 I. P. Belokonskii, Dan' Vremeni: Vospominaniia (The Gift of Time: Memoirs), 2d ed. (Moscow, 1928), p. 314.
82 Mikhnevich, in Novosti, (1894) no. 5; quoted by Glinskii, "Iadrintsev," p. 442.

> feel after a certain time the need to return to the milieu from which it came. Such a time has arrived for the Eastern Review. Its further existence in the capital can make it too abstract and not always capable of answering the problems of the day. We therefore think that transferring the organ to a place where it may better perceive the needs of the population, will give it more strength and vitality.[83]

One of the paper's chief problems was that after the third warning, it could not afford to present a section of general articles on Siberia under the conditions of censorship it faced. Only trivia on Petersburg or provincial life was assuredly harmless.

The Eastern Review was scheduled to begin publication in Irkutsk on January 1, 1888. Permission to transfer publication had been obtained, and the move was made. In the first issue of 1888 Yadrintsev explained his reasons for coming to Irkutsk.

> We chose Eastern Siberia and the town of Irkutsk as the residence of the editorial staff because here the pulse of social life has always beat more strongly and society has been more perceptive to social questions. The intellectual life of Eastern Siberia has made itself felt and has shown its worth since the time of Speransky. Eastern Siberia has answered all the urgent and living questions of the country with remarkable flair. Lately too, the initiative on the main questions of the country has come from Eastern Siberia . . . Can it not be said that the press has something to do here?[84]

One of the chief reasons Irkutsk during the 1880's could be so characterized was due to the activity of Siberia. In 1887, however, this paper had been suspended by administrative order. This action left Irkutsk temporarily

---

83 Iadrintsev, "Po povodu pereneseniia gazety 'Vostochnogo Obozrieniia iz Peterburga v Sibir'" (Concerning the Eastern Review's Transfer from St. Petersburg to Siberia), Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1887) no. 47; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 145.

84 Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1888) no. 1; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 143-44.

without a voice of public opinion. Although Siberia revived in Irkutsk in the late 1890's, at present the vacuum could best be filled by the Eastern Review. It appears that some kind of agreement was reached by the group of writers connected with the suspended Siberia and by Yadrintsev and his friends whereby the Eastern Review would move to Irkutsk.[85] Despite Siberia's suspension, Yadrintsev had greater confidence in the toleration of the East Siberian administration over the West Siberian toward a private newspaper.

In the first issue of the Eastern Review in Irkutsk Yadrintsev also addressed himself to the local public:

> "How will the editorial staff of the Eastern Review get along in Irkutsk?" This question is heard not without the secret smile of enemies and local skeptics. Others also answer maliciously, "This will quickly be disclosed." Until local aid and efforts succeed in reaching us, we will stand alone and await what Siberian society and life say to our appeal. . . . Yes, reader, if our work for the benefit of the region has said nothing to you up to now, if you do not recognize us, and if years of our work, struggle, deprivations, and fervent prayers for the happiness of our homeland have passed without a trace for you, why is this? Let's not grumble and let's start all over again. . . . Let's aspire to awaken life and light in our borderland with united forces, and for the new year let's call for cheerfulness and faith in all those who are able to work for our dear homeland.[86]

Nevertheless, the transfer of the Eastern Review did not bode well for Yadrintsev. The move did not justify the hopes of him and others that the circulation of the newspaper would increase and its fortunes improve. The paper now took on more the appearance of a local, provincial publication,

---

85 See Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 227.

86 Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1888) no. 1; quoted in Glinskii, "Iadrintsev," p. 444.

and, according to Potanin, "the Siberian public was accustomed to the Eastern Review in Petersburg and could not reconcile itself to the paper's Irkutsk physiognomy." All in all the somewhat detached of Irkutsk intellectuals began to embitter Yadrintsev.[87] To these problems were added censorship troubles with the administration of Count A. P. Ignatiev.

Yadrintsev wrote of his first days in Irkutsk, "I flew to Siberia, thinking of creating my nest here and of bringing my family, but I found myself alone. I experienced all the difficulties of a town alien to me. Irkutsk is not Tomsk."[88] Yadrintsev had come to Irkutsk by himself, having to leave his wife (his chief editorial assistant) in Petersburg to take care of the children and to provide for their schooling until circumstances improved. His difficulties with the newspaper in Irkutsk, however, were immensely compounded by the sudden and completely unexpected death of his wife in St. Petersburg on July 17, 1888. Not only had she been his main support in publishing the Eastern Review, but she had also been a dearly beloved wife to him, deeply devoted to all his activities and causes.

Her death was a great blow to Yadrintsev and in many respects caused a turning point in his life, both public and private. Unable to regain much of his former energy, faith, and confidence after this, Yadrintsev was also unable to devote as much time and effort to the paper as he had before. Apropos of all this, Potanin wrote that the eight years in which Yadrintsev was absorbed in the Eastern Review "was the most seething and brilliant period of his activity." Thus, he gave very little spare time to archeolo-

---

87 Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 152. Potanin's comment is from Sibir', (1897) no. 39. The paper's name was even besmirched as the "Gutter Review" (vodostochnoe obozrienie).

88 Letter to P. M. Golovachev and V. I. Semidalov, dated August 28, 1888, at Irkutsk; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 155.

gy, ethnography, and other interests. But after his wife's untimely death, his "energy was broken," and he found himself in a "milieu in which he had expectedly to find warm sympathies," but unfortunately did not.[89]

During the next six years (1888-94), though Yadrintsev remained editor-in-chief and publisher of the Eastern Review, he did not participate as closely or constantly in its day-to-day work. For a year after his wife's death he lived chiefly in Irkutsk, busy with newspaper business and directing his interests to the new university just opened in Tomsk. However, in mid-1889 he set off on an archeological expedition to Mongolia and upon returning left for Petersburg that fall. In the meantime he had handed over the editorship temporarily to V. A. Oshurkov, a native of Irkutsk of Mongol origin. However, Oshurkov was not as circumspect with the paper as Yadrintsev had been, and Governor-General Ignatiev suspended it for four months. Yadrintsev, in European Russia at the time, began to think of moving the paper back, to Moscow or preferably to Petersburg. According to Potanin, he wanted to move to the capital, where there was comparatively more room and independence. His request to transfer the paper there was turned down, and he began to feel himself somewhat chained to the paper. He therefore had either to return to Irkutsk or give up journalistic activity altogether, though he could hardly have sold the paper for more than 2,000 rubles.[90] In 1890 Yadrintsev wrote that "the situation is so hopeless that I don't see a favorable outcome, and I would consider discontinuing the paper at the present moment as the easiest way out. . . . The prospect of discontin-

---

89 Potanin, "Nikolai Mikhailovich Iadrintsev," p. 172, 173.
90 Potanin, in Sibir', (1897) no. 39; see Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 163-64.

uing the paper and remaining without my organ will be for me personally tantamount to my personal death. . . . I cannot bear the humiliation of being a writer and not a publisher." [91]

In early 1890 the matter was resolved somewhat when suspension of the paper was lifted. On the masthead Oshurkov was now named as editor and Yadrintsev as publisher. In this way the paper was transferred into the hands of new people. However, this change did not prove to be stable, as Oshurkov fell ill and was replaced temporarily by D. A. Klements, a talented exile of regionalist sympathies. By late 1892, however, Oshurkov again took over the editorship. Meanwhile, Yadrintsev — in Petersburg and on expeditions — sent much of his own material for the paper to print.

On April 1, 1892, the Eastern Review celebrated its tenth anniversary. Many tributes were paid to the founder, publisher, and editor-in-chief by other publications, by Siberians, and by friends of Siberia in St. Petersburg. Yadrintsev wrote of the occasion:

> On April 1, I was unexpectedly attacked by guests, well-wishers, and deputations. Siberian student youths presented an address. And the older generation of Siberians came as a deputation (Potanin, Pavlinov, Cheremshansky, Makarov, Panteleev, and many others), and after congratulations they gave me a silver ink-pot with an inscription, as an excellent paper-weight, and a briefcase with a monogram in commemoration of the tenth anniversary. Semevsky was here in the morning. I was very touched by the attention of the Siberians and responded as best I could. . . .
>
> In the evening Siberians gathered again and brought me a bouquet of flowers with ribbons and an inscription. We spent the evening in friendly conversation. Telegrams were received from students in Tomsk, from

---

91 Letter to V. I. Semidalov and V. A. Oshurkov, dated November 7, 1890; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 164.

> friends of the Eastern Review in Tomsk, from young people in Moscow, . . . from /the Siberian poet V. M./ Mikheev, and others. [92]

In 1893 more new changes occurred in the life of the Eastern Review. The ailing Oshurkov was replaced as editor by A. N. Ushakov early that year. However, when Ushakov was transferred from his civil-service position in Irkutsk in mid-1893, the editorship then passed into the hands of I. G. Sheshunov. Moreover, toward the end of the year the Eastern Review began to come out three times a week, instead of one. Despite this last innovation, which Yadrintsev had sought for some time, he often complained in his letters of the paper's decline, its colorlessness, and its lack of self-control in direction. [93]

Shortly before his death in June 1894, Yadrintsev began talks with Ivan I. Popov, a political exile, about the latter's acquisition of the paper. He was evidently quite satisfied that by turning over the paper to Popov as editor-publisher the Siberian paper would again obtain a solid footing. In March 1894 he confided to the new editor-publisher his "credo" for the paper:

> I believe that patriotism is a great force. It gives the heart nourishment and it gives faith. Preserve this relic and this sacred cause of the newspaper. You have had to grow fond of Siberia, to pity it, and to regard it tenderly. It is good to expose, but it is not necessary to be indignant with the whole country and with all the people. I ask your love and kindness toward the people. In this we will be united. [94]

Popov remained as editor-publisher of the Eastern Review until 1906,

---

92 Letter to V. I. Semidalov, dated April 2, 1892; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 172-73. Concerning the event also see Glinskii, "Iadrintsev," p. 449.

93 See Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 187.

94 Letter to I. I. Popov, dated March 19, 1894; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 187.

when the paper ceased publication. According to the account of this "assimilated Siberian," Potanin once said to him: "Yadrintsev adopted you and recognized you as a Siberian." And Popov himself confessed:

> In the course of twelve years I actually guided Siberian public opinion and managed a newspaper that was authoritative and recognized by everyone as an interpreter of Siberian trends and of the precepts of Yadrintsev and Potanin. I, a non-Siberian, became an ideological leader of Siberian public opinion and an interpreter of the Siberian world-view, and no one disputed this right with me. [95]

Thus, Popov became a worthy heir to Yadrintsev's regionalist newspaper, and he did much indeed to promote the ideals of Siberian regionalism, even into the 1920's. After Yadrintsev's death, he was, of course, assisted in this by such regionalists as Potanin, Vagin, Zagoskin, and Mikhail Ya. Pisarev (an Irkutsk doctor), who continued to contribute to the Eastern Review. Moreover, Potanin served on the editorial staff in the early 1900's, and Vagin remained on the staff up to his death in 1900.

The Eastern Review during Yadrintsev's lifetime was highly esteemed by many. During the Petersburg years and the first few years in Irkutsk under Yadrintsev's immediate direction it took a bit more serious, sophisticated bent than it did subsequently. Not only did Yadrintsev complain about the paper under his successors in the early 1890's, but an equally prominent editor and Siberiophile, A. N. Pypin, concerned about the paper's standards, told Yadrintsev in 1890 that he regretted the paper had been transferred to Irkutsk in the first place. [96] Despite the overall decline in circulation

---

95 Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II: 5.
96 Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1896) no. 58; cited in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 163.

and, apparently, in quality after 1885, the strong influence of the paper remained and was generally acknowledged. Popov wrote that in Siberia during the 1880's the Eastern Review "was distinguished even among the papers of the capital both for the firmness of its direction and for the seriousness of its tone and literary style." [97]

Perhaps in the best position to appreciate the significance of Yadrintsev's Eastern Review was Potanin, who claimed rather broadly that Yadrintsev "laid the basis of social self-consciousness in Siberia. The voice of Siberia, turned toward the mother country, resounded for the first time in Yadrintsev's publicistic activity." [98] Several years after Yadrintsev's death, Kacherets wrote in greater detail of his journalistic legacy (though omitting to mention, as did Potanin, the pioneering significance of the earlier paper Siberia):

> One siggle work of Yadrintsev was not at all in vain. Journalists were brought up on the Eastern Review. Except for one or two, if I may say, "heralds" or "gazettes," all the Siberian press breathes with traditions whose foundations were laid by the Eastern Review, and the hand of the teacher, who is no more but who leads his pupils by the hand from the grave, is felt everywhere. . . .
>
> The Eastern Review represents not only the brightest, but perhaps also the richest episode in Yadrintsev's activity, as judged by results. It imperceptively laid a firm stamp on the mind of Siberian society and awakened it to many needs. . . . And the present Siberian gazettes with an honorable direction, I repeat, are direct children of the Eastern Review. This side of its significance is already certain and clear. Other sides still await appraisals. But even now one can be convinced that in the future history of the Siberian press the

---

97 Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, I: 150.
98 Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," p. 280.

> existence of the Eastern Review, which belonged to this passionate and forceful pioneer of public self-consciousness in Siberia, will be the most brilliant chapter. [99]

Though the pre-eminence of the Eastern Review cannot be denied, the emergence of at least two or three other private Siberian papers during the 1880's also contributed most definitely to the "brilliance" of Siberian journalism in its first full decade.

* * *

Yadrintsev at His Peak (1882-88)

As noted above, Yadrintsev's most enduring and most immediately influential contributions toward regional self-awareness and awakening were his two chief scholarly works, Siberia as a Colony and Siberian Natives, and his newspaper, the Eastern Review. Yet during the last thirteen years of his life, Yadrintsev was active in many other lesser-known ways, promoting the general interests of his country and countrymen. In this respect it is of value to fill in the more significant gaps of his later life which were not immediately connected with either his work on the Eastern Review or his two scholarly books.

Among the activities falling into this area between the year 1881 and his death were his articles in publications other than the Eastern Review (in the 1890's especially), his archeological expeditions, his various trips abroad and through Siberia, the assistance he and his wife rendered to Siberian students in Petersburg, and his work in the field on such problems as peasant migration, natives, famine, the university, and the railroad.

---

99 Kacherets, "Vostochnoe Obozrienie," Sibir', (1897) no. 39; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 198-99.

This somewhat more personal side of Yadrintsev's life, in contrast to the more public side of his journalistic and scholarly activities, shows especially the strong influence of his wife, Adelaida Fyodorovna Yadrintseva. For this reason, his later life can be divided into two parts, before and after he death: from 1881 to 1888, and from 1888 to 1894.

In the earlier period Yadrintsev's life was so taken up with the Eastern Review that his "outside" activities were relatively few and far between. After playing a prominent role in celebrating Siberia's 300th anniversary in 1881, he subsequently became quite involved with and devoted to Siberian students in St. Petersburg. Since the founding of the Eastern Review in 1882, he and his wife had held open house on Thursdays in the interests of the paper. Siberian students began to flock to these receptions, which in time began to serve as a type of center for the Siberian colony in Petersburg. Indeed, many of the students, thousands of miles from home, willingly looked on the Yadrintsevs as a kind of collective in loco parentis; they even referred to Mme. Yadrintseva at times as "our mother." [100] Moreover, as Semevsky writes,

> the material condition of more than one Siberian student improved, thanks to the solicitations of A. F. Yadrintseva; in her home these youths always found a hearty welcome and met in a circle of honorable people . . . The Thursdays of A. F. Yadrintseva recalled the best time of the early 1860's, when Petersburg intellectual circles still did not hide in their corners with the approach of hard times. [101]

Potanin, however, felt that at the Yadrintsevs' "Thursdays" "the mood of

---

100 See Glinskii, "Iadrintsev," p. 435; and Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 150.
101 V. I. Semevskii, "Adelaida Thedorovna Iadrintseva," Russkaia Starina, (September 1888), p. 696.

youth that gathered then was, of course, much more revolutionary than in the 1860's" (though he failed to provide further details on this "revolutionary mood").[102] Another contemporary, Pypin, presents a more personal view of Yadrintsev in his social life:

> In his everyday relationships he was a man not of this world, was completely incapable of worrying about his material life, and could concentrate only on intellectual and social interests; actually he could not conduct an everyday conversation about trifles, and his conversation from the very first words passed over to the general questions that constantly occupied and agitated his thought; having known him for many years, we never heard an idle word from him.[103]

Yadrintsev and his wife were instrumental in founding the "Society for the Assistance of Siberians in St. Petersburg," whose statute was confirmed in March 1884. Yadrintsev was chosen as a member of the board, and at first the meetings of the society were held in his apartment. According to Lemke, he and his wife could not live without helping their fellow men and often shared their last crumbs with others. They were constantly soliciting help for some Siberian and always seemed to be busy arranging charity soirées and concerts.[104] Another contemporary wrote,

> Who among young Siberian students does not remember the hospitable home of the Yadrintsevs . . . ? The doors of this home were wide open for each Siberian and everyone came to the Yadrintsevs — some to seek work, some to get advice on studies, and some simply to talk or to hear news of Siberia. Abandoned thousands of versts from their homeland, and in the majority of cases without a penny in their pockets, Siberian students were confident that it was worth turning to N. M. or A. F. for things to improve, as if with a magic wand.

---

102 Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," p. 273.
103 A. N. Pypin, "Nikolai Mikhailovich Iadrintsev," Viestnik Evropy, (1894) no. 7, p. 448.
104 Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 148.

In a word, "Yadrintsev was like a close relative of yours . . ." [105]

In return, Yadrintsev summed up his own feelings toward these students: "These are Siberia's men of the future. . . . Just wait, new people will come, equipped with knowledge, and then Siberia's new era will come. Our duty is to facilitate the road to knowledge for young people, for in these people lies all our hope." [106] Ironically, however, the generation of the eighties, for whom Yadrintsev did so much, was to produce very few men that equaled the caliber of the earlier leaders who had represented Siberia in some way or another since the late fifties and sixties.

Yadrintsev was concerned not only with the fortunes of Siberians in St. Petersburg, but in Moscow too. He corresponded with Siberians there on organizing a Siberian section of the student library. For his efforts on their behalf Yadrintsev in January 1886 was given a cordial tribute by a group of Siberian students from Moscow, who expressed a "deep respect for N. M. and gratitude for his literary activity of many years." Moreover, they presented him with a blotting pad with an inscription in gold: "From Siberian students in Moscow." Almost sixty signatures were attached to it. [107]

A second area of Yadrintsev's activities in the period before his wife's death consisted of his infrequent, though extensive travels. In mid-1885, for the first time in his life he left Russia, going to Switzerland on the advice of his doctor. His overworked pace of life as editor-publisher of the Eastern Review had had a detrimental effect on his physical constitution.

---

105 N. Levin, "Pamiati khoroshago chelovieka" (Memories of a Fine Man), Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1894) no. 89; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, 149.

106 Quoted in Levin, "Pamiati khoroshago chelovieka," quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 150.

107 P. Golovachev, "Vospominaniia o drugie molodezhi" (Recollections of a Friend of Youth), Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1896) no. 56; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 142.

It was on this trip that he met in Berne Professor E. J. Petri, subsequent translator of his work, Siberia as a Colony. He later wrote to Nikolai Belogolovy:

> My Bernese friend, Petri, advised me to begin a more tranquil work (than managing a political paper) on the order of creating a popular anthropological journal. In part he struck at a weak chord. He knows how I love anthropology and how my soul is at times divided between scientific questions, some sort of archeology, and the current evils of the day. [108]

In Berne, while viewing the museums and galleries, his thoughts often returned to his native Siberia, and he wrote: "I wish our small museums would grow and each one of our countrymen, wherever he might be, would not forget to send a present to his homeland." [109] And the landscape and roads of Switzerland also brought him back momentarily to the Altai.

Despite this restful interlude, as his old friend Ponikarevsky related, "on his return he again felt the same ailment and again took up exhausting work at night." [110] For his ill health, he had not his own restless nature and "weak constitution" alone to blame, but also the increasing financial worries in his life. The Eastern Review gave him little financial or material security, and he was often forced to write for other publications to bring in additional income.

Yadrintsev was a member of several scientific societies, among them the Imperial Russian Archeological Society, the Leipzig Folklore Museum, and the Imperial Russian Geographical Society (since the late 1870's in Omsk). In

---

108 Letter of 1886 to N. A. Belogolovy; quoted in Potanin, "Nikolai Mikhailovich Iadrintsev," pp. 172-73.

109 Iadrintsev, "Pis'ma sibiriaka iz Evropy" (Letters of a Siberian from Europe), Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1885) no. 42; quoted in Glinskii, "Iadrintsev," p. 443.

110 D. Ponikarevskii, "Vospominaniia o N. M. Iadrintsevie," Sibirskii Sbornik, (1896) II: 211; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 147.

May 1886 the East Siberian Section of the Geographical Society sponsored a trip which took Yadrintsev from Irkutsk via Transbaikalia into the upper reaches of the Orkhon River in northern Mongolia. Yadrintsev's objectives on this expedition were several: to look over local museums in Transbaikalia (inspired by his visits in Switzerland) and archeological sites, to verify the direction of ancient colonization along the Orkhon toward Siberia, and to observe the nomadic life of Mongols in an effort to compare their past and present.

Yadrintsev's mood in Petersburg at the very outset of the journey was greatly uplifted. After a five-year absence he was again to return to his homeland. According to Pyotr M. Golovachev, who along with fellow Siberian students met him during a stop-off in Moscow, he

> boiled with energy, was full of plans and proposals. In the evening we took him to the station; I remember there the long conversation about Siberian natives. N. M. was, as always, an earnest and convinced defender of these people, and he brilliantly refuted the arguments of one of us that, according to various facts of the animal and vegetable world, the dying out of natives represented a fatal, natural fact which the inexorable evolution of history and of nature demands. . . . At this meeting we once again saw how every interest toward Siberia affects N. M., especially on the part of the natives. [111]

One of the few accounts of Yadrintsev in Siberia in 1886 comes from the exiled Belokonsky. Already a contributor to the Eastern Review, he met the editor in a small village in Minusinsk district that summer. Of this encounter Belokonsky recalled:

---

111 P. M. Golovachev, "Vospominaniia o drugie molodezhi," Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1896) no. 56; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 147.

> The noted publicist, tall and thin, made the impression of a Don Quixote on me. A fervent Siberian patriot, he also believed in a great future for his country, as Don Quixote did in a renaissance of chivalry. He came to Minusinsk district, if I am not mistaken, with some sort of archeological goals, but in conversation with me he spoke only on political themes, ardently sizing up the role of the regional principle in the organization of the state, enraptured with Siberia, and reproaching me for insufficient love toward it.

Yadrintsev's attempt to convince Belokonsky to stay and work in Siberia, with its "endless, broad field for activity," seems to have been fruitless. When Belokonsky replied that the local intelligentsia could do this much better than he, Yadrintsev responded that, contrarily, when the Siberian intelligentsia finished its higher education, it could "not be brought to Siberia for love nor money." [112]

One of the more important local museums visited on this trip was the well-known Martyanov museum in Minusinsk. From what Potanin indicates, Yadrintsev extensively propagandized the idea of local museums, and this fine museum he patronized especially. Thus, to a limited extent, Martyanov's museum was, in its growth and popularity, indebted to Yadrintsev for spreading its reputation. [113] In the Minusinsk area Yadrintsev also made ethnographical observations of the local Ostyak and Sayan tribes.

After explorations in Eastern Siberia and Mongolia he returned to St. Petersburg in September 1886. Here he subsequently wrote an account of his trip and findings in the Proceedings of the Russian Archeological Society.[114]

---

112 I. P. Belokonskii, Dan' Vremeni, p. 313.

113 Potanin, "Nikolai Mikhailovich Iadrintsev," p. 173.

114 Iadrintsev, "Otchet o poiezdkie v Vostochnuiu Sibir' v 1886 g. dlia obozrieniia miestnykh muzeev i arkheologicheskikh rabot" (Account of a Trip to Eastern Siberia in 1886 to Survey Local Museums and Study Archeology), Zapiski Imperatorskago Russkago Arkheologicheskago Obshchestva, (1887) bk. 3.

In 1887 he gave lectures on his trip to the Archeological and Geographical Societies in St. Petersburg, and to the latter institution he also presented the maps he had compiled showing the distribution of Siberian natives province by province.

Besides work on the Eastern Review and on the anthologies connected with the newspaper, Yadrintsev, for financial and publicistic reasons, contributed to a number of other periodicals during these years (though proportionally far fewer than he contributed before 1882 and after 1888). During the years 1882-1887 he published between 25 and 40 separate titles per year. Of these roughly two or three each year were either separate brochures or in publications other than the Eastern Review and its anthologies. Among these were the Petersburg journals Historical Herald, the Herald of Europe, and Russian Thought; the Siberian newspapers Siberia and Siberian Gazette; and the various publications of the Geographical and Archeological Societies, including those of the former's Siberian sections. Yadrintsev also wrote a unit on Siberian geography for the multi-volume series Picturesque Russia (1884) and several poems for I. M. Sibiryakov's literary anthology, Siberian Motifs (1886).[115] According to one account, he also did work over a period of several years for the Geneva-based émigré journal of Khristoforov and Nikolai Belogolovy, Common Cause.[116]

The content of his writings for these publications differs in no exceptional way from the content found in many of his articles in the Eastern

---

115 See Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 209-15. The first three Petersburg publications cited are in Russian: Istoricheskii Viestnik, Viestnik Evropy (edited by A. N. Pypin), and Russkaia Mysl'.

116 See E. N. Vagner, ed., "Pis'ma Iadrintseva k Khristoforovu," Vol'naia Sibir', (1927) II: 182. Lemke, however, lists no articles of Yadrintsev's in this publication (in Russian: Obshchee Dielo).

Review. A new topic of concern to him in the 1880's was the railroad question, and his ideas of industry and migration he expounded at great length in Russian publications. As for Yadrintsev's overall journalistic activity during this period and on the general direction of his articles, Potanin wrote that ever since his arrival in Petersburg in 1874, his

> intensive literary activity, which continued incessantly until 1888, that is until the death of his wife, began. With her support he worked out local Siberian problems directed toward destroying the harmful peculiarities which differentiated Siberia's social life from the life of European Russia. The exile system, the dependence of the Siberian market, the delay in the development of local factory production, a pre-reform public life, and the absenteeism of youth, but especially the exile system, distinguish Siberia from a number of other regions of Russia. . . . Yadrintsev's publicistic activity aspired only to equalize Siberia with the central regions of the empire; such was the intent of his petitions for the abolition of exile, his agitation in favor of a Siberian university, his articles on spreading the reforms of Alexander II to Siberia. In other words, Yadrintsev's life and works were devoted to the destruction of those separatistic elements which were a part of Siberia's social life. [117]

Potanin, in essence, was implying here that Siberian regionalism, as a movement, could begin only when Siberians, such as Yadrintsev, became aware of and began to struggle against inequalities and unequal treatment. It would end only when Siberia was no longer treated as unequal and separate from the rest of Russia.

Potanin also provided a contrast between Yadrintsev and his contemporary, fellow Siberian publicist and historian, Shashkov (who died in 1882):

> Between Shashkov and Yadrintsev there was a striking difference. The logic of the former was amazing; he pressed his opponent mercilessly to the wall, he read

---

117 G. N. Potanin, "Nikolai Mikhailovich Iadrintsev," pp. 171-72.

> a great deal, had an enormous capacity for work, wrote a vast amount, and was occupied with general publicistic questions. Yadrintsev never got involved in general publicism, but limited himself to his own region. However, all of Shashkov's articles were stereotype; he did not write with the blood and juice of nerves, even though he wase angry — not with the anger of the heart, but of the head. With Yadrintsev everything was just the opposite.

Moreover, added Potanin, all of Yadrintsev's articles "with a regionalist tendency should be printed as a special collection, so that they, like the Gospel, should lie on the table of every Siberian who loves his homeland."[118] As earlier in his youth he had done, Potanin described patriotism with a religious analogy. By the mid-1880's, however, a passionate regionalist "prophet" had emerged, whose writings could begin to be venerated.[119] The closest realization of Potanin's wish to have a special collection of Yadrintsev's regionalist writings put together was perhaps a book published in 1919 entitled Selected Articles of N. M. Yadrintsev.[120] Its circulation, obviously, fell far short of Potanin's hopes.

The early and middle-1880's, before Yadrintsev transferred the Eastern Review to Irkutsk in late 1887 and before the death of his wife the following year, were the best and most prosperous years of his life. His family environment was happy, newspaper affairs were generally going well (especially before mid-1885), scholarly societies opened their doors to him, other publications readily accepted his articles, and Siberian students testified their appreciation of his work and service in the interests of them and their

---

118 Conversation with Potanin cited in T. Farafontova, "Cherty iz zhizni sibirskago patriota," Russkaia Mysl', (1915) IX: 154-55.

119 Vagin, however, preferred to regard Yadrintsev as a "fanatic of Siberia"; cited in Podol'skaia, "Dnevnik Vagina," p. 124.

120 Iadrintsev, Izbrannye stat'i N. M. Iadrintseva (Krasnoyarsk: Sibirskie Zapiski, 1919). I have been unable to view this work.

homeland. Glinsky rightly states that this period witnessed the "zenith of his fame and popularity." [121] Belokonsky, who became personally acquainted with Yadrintsev in mid-1886, recalled many years later his initial impressions of the man at his peak.

> A fortunate man, I thought, watching Nikolai Mikhailovich going away. The worms of doubt, disappointment, and unbelief had not yet penetrated into his soul, which was tempered by the ideas of the sixties. He was almost twice my age, and reaction was stifling his organ, which had already received a second /sic/ warning; but Nikolai Mikhailovich, as if preserved in alcohol, remained the same as he probably was in those happy, young years, when leaving Tomsk high school he went to Petersburg . . . Twenty years passed since he was arrested and began to serve the common obligation of the thinking Russian intelligentsia — searches, arrests, prison, and exile — but with no changes, and I think Nikolai Mikhailovich even at this moment sees his Siberia as not far from the republic of the North American United States! [122]

Nevertheless, Yadrintsev was not totally steeled in the optimism and faith of the early 1860's. Forebodings of an approaching end to this happiness, good fortune, and confidence can perhaps be detected in a poem of his published in 1886, describing the early death of a flower, the "vetryanka." [123]

> This quiet springtime death
> Aroused in me strange feelings:
> I perceived my fate in the early flower,
> In the late one, my homeland's happiness.

Such ominous sentiments were to be fulfilled all too soon.

* * *

121 Glinskii, "Iadrintsev," p. 444.
122 Belokonskii, Dan' Vremeni, pp. 314-15.
123 "Vetrianka," Sibirskie Motivy (St. Petersburg, 1886); cited in Glinskii, "Iadrintsev," p. 444.

The Last Years (1888-94)

Thus, the year 1888, with the transfer of the Eastern Review to Irkutsk and the death of his wife, Adelaida Fyodorovna, caused a decisive turn in the life of Yadrintsev. However, the very month of his wife's death, July 1888, saw the realization of one of Yadrintsev's fondest and oldest dreams — the opening of a Siberian university in Tomsk. Thus, under new circumstances, the last five or six years of his life witnessed a change of direction in his activities. With the lack of any real success of the Eastern Review in Irkutsk, he turned away from the almost constant preoccupation with the paper that had characterized his first seven years as editor. Moreover, after the loss of his wife he tended to immerse himself in long expeditions or trips abroad. And with the realization of a Siberian university (though somewhat incomplete), he began to put more effort and time into other pressing regional problems — migration, famine, natives, and the railroad.

The fateful days of mid-July 1888, when Yadrintsev was preparing a special issue of the Eastern Review to commemorate the opening of the university in Tomsk, he later described as follows:

> I composed the university issue with a telegram in my hands, deadly for me. I had to greet the university, but my heart grew cold. . . . I could leave the editorship and depart, for I had responsibilities with respect to my family. However, comrades and friends asked that I stay. . . . I strengthened my spirit and continued to direct the paper. . . . I can only assert myself and my independence, not allowing myself to be played with; I cannot serve as a tool of local circles and opinions, because I have my own opinion and standard. In any case, circumstances here are unfavorable and difficult. . . . I

> am not thrusting myself on my homeland, nor even on Irkutsk. There is nothing attractive or binding for me here. [124]

A new sense of bitterness, sadness, and pessimism, so unusual in Yadrintsev's earlier character, began to replace his earlier confidence, cheerfulness, and optimism. Many began to notice Yadrintsev's new face. One observer recalled that "he made a painful impression. This was not the earlier Yadrintsev, and he seemed to be a man with whom it suddenly became hard to talk at times, as it is sometimes difficult to touch a person dangerously sick from fear of causing him suffering." Another wrote, "Those who had not seen Nikolai Mikhailovich for a long time would have found a striking change in him — before us was a gray, bent, terribly thin old man, with a sickly, nervous face." [125]

Things remained depressing for Yadrintsev until the summer of 1889, when he was presented with the opportunity of heading an expedition to investigate the location of Karakorum, Genghis Khan's ancient capital in Mongolia. He had been interested in Karakorum for a number of years, and in 1886 had written an article on it in the Eastern Review (in connection with his trip that summer to the Orkhon River). He had by now come to the conclusion that the real Karakorum lay on the banks of the Orkhon River, about thirty miles south of Kyakhta. Yadrintsev lost no time in accepting the offer presented to him; the East Siberian Section of the Geographical Society provided 400 rubles for the expedition (under its sponsorship), and

---

124 Letter to P. M. Golovachev and V. I. Semidalov, dated August 28, 1888; Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1896) nos. 57-58; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 155.

125 From Tobol'skiia Gubernskiia Viedomosti, (1894) no. 25, and Sibirskii Listok, (1894) no. 46, respectively; quoted in Glinskii, "Iadrintsev," p. 445.

Governor-General Ignatiev also rendered patronage and assistance. Yadrintsev himself could contribute only 400 rubles.[126] Popov, who met the expedition party of five in Kyakhta, states that after the death of his wife the "brilliant" Yadrintsev "lost some of his luster." Moreover, Popov "caught tears in his eyes and deep sighs, which he tried to suppress and hide behind talk of business and tales of Karakorum. N. M. steered clear of talking about A/delaida/ F/yodorovna/ and the university — memories of the one evoked memories of the other."[127]

Yadrintsev's interest in Karakorum was not simply a fascination with an antiquarian or exotic subject. As Pypin points out, "Besides studying contemporary Siberia and the life of its people, Yadrintsev was for a long time interested in the primeval history of the country, where he naturally sought explanations of the native elements in Siberia."[128] Thus, one motive for undertaking the trip was to seek a key to explaining the settlement of natives in Northeast Asia (such as Yakuts) and the emigration of Turkic tribes to the west.

Yadrintsev, who had never considered himself a scholarly archeologist, actually discovered the ruins of Genghis Khan's capital on the banks of the Orkhon. The expedition discovered two monuments, one of which had an inscription in Chinese, Mongolian, and runic characters, and was subsequently dated back to 731 A. D. Though Yadrintsev was unable to make detailed investigations of the Orkhon valley, the expedition was a great success. His

---

126 See Glinskii, "Iadrintsev," p. 446; and Semenov, ed., Istoriia Geograficheskago Obshchestva, III: 1190.
127 Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II: 132-33.
128 Pypin, "Nikolai Mikhailovich Iadrintsev," p. 447.

discoveries were to make a strong impressionson scholars both in Russia and abroad. Moreover, the discoveries affected the explorer himself. Of this Potanin wrote: "The Orkhon discoveries enlivened Yadrintsev. His nature demanded sympathy and approval; applause inspired him to feats and work, while cool relationships discouraged him." [129]

Among the conclusions Yadrintsev drew from his expedition, the following concerned not only the civilizing mission of Siberia envisaged in Mongolia, but of Russia's overall destiny there as well.

> Mongolia can no longer threaten us or Europe by the invasion of its hordes. The Mongol is now a slave of China; under the influence of Buddhism, which penetrated into Mongolia from Tibet, the moral, spiritual, and economic needs of the Mongol have changed. Among the Mongols one can look upon Buddhism as a cultural step, after which Mongolia, having experienced the influence of Tibet and China, will still have to experience the influence of European culture. Where will it come from? Naturally, our attention must rest on the Russian centers near the Mongolian borders. Such centers of Russian culture should be towns like Kyakhta, where treaties are concluded with China, and Russian factories are in Chinese towns, as, for example, Urga. [130] Unfortunately, despite the long relations and treaties concluded in the past century, our culture has not been strong in neighboring Mongolia. There is no doubt that with the development of industrial activity in Siberia Russian products will find a market in Mongolia. But if in the area of economics we have not immediately gained victories, we still have a force about which I wish to say a few words. This is the force of enlightenment and of present-day civilization, which can rival lamaism and the Buddhist influence. We have an advantageous intermediary and ally for familiarizing Mongolia with the Russian people and Russian culture; this is our native population beyond Lake Baikal, which has already given way to Russian influence. . . . Russian

---

129 Potanin, "Nikolai Mikhailovich Iadrintsev," p. 174.

130 Though located in the Chinese Empire since the 18th century, Urga (present-day Ulan Bator) was (and is) a Mongolian town.

> lamaists are far from being so fanatical and hopeless, and we think that the spirit of Christian patience, meekness, and love will complete the victory. . . . We are convinced that the Mongol world, with the help of friends of enlightenment, will also feel this influence, and this will be a cultural stage with which the history of wild Mongolia will come to an end. [131]

After the independence of Outer Mongolia was gained in 1912, a quarter century later, many of Yadrintsev's objectives regarding this country actually began to be implemented.

Yadrintsev returned to Irkutsk from Mongolia in mid-1889 in new spirits, and in November he left for Petersburg to communicate to scholars the results of his expedition, including such thoughts as those noted above. In February 1890 he wrote to a friend, "I was with professors, three academicians, Petri, Semevsky, and others. The analysis of the transcriptions has moved along; . . . The Academy of Sciences promises me support for a new expedition. In a word, the wheel is turning, and I feel the strength to live and act." [132] Later that month he presented a lecture on his expedition to the General Assembly of the Geographical Society. Plans for a new trip to the Orkhon were not realized immediately, however. That spring he went to Paris, where he reported on his discoveries to the Paris Geographical Society and was well received. Upon returning to Petersburg he gave another report, this time concerning the exile system, to the International Prison Congress in July 1890. At this time too Yadrintsev was busy preparing his third book, Siberian Natives (1891), and the second, revised edition of his Siberia as a Colony (1892). His participation in the affairs

---

131 "Puteshestvie na verkhov'ia Orkhona, k razvalinam Karakoruma" (A Trip to the Upper Orkhon and the Ruins of Karakorum), Izviestiia Imperatorskago Russkago Geograficheskago Obshchestva, (1890) v. 26; quoted in Glinskii, "Iadrintsev," p. 447.

132 Letter to V. I. Semidalov, dated February 14, 1890; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 162.

of the Eastern Review also picked up.

Meanwhile, in the summer of 1890 a Finnish expedition to Karakorum found a third monument, larger than the two discovered by Yadrintsev the previous summer. The following summer (1891) the Academy of Sciences equipped its own expedition to Karakorum, headed by the archeologist W. W. Radloff. Among others on this expedition were Yadrintsev himself and Dmitry Klements, an exile active in Siberian affairs. Yadrintsev's archeological interests diverted him only temporarily from the regionalist cause, as the following account of Semevsky's indicates:

> In the fall of 1891 I saw Yadrintsev in Irkutsk on a trip back from an archeological expedition to Mongolia, and I saw how alone he felt in this town. This tireless toiler for the good of Siberia did not find, for the time being, a supplement to his efforts while in Irkutsk, but this did not cool his love for his homeland, and I witnessed how in Tomsk he gave very fiery speeches to the university youths who honored him on the need to work together for Siberia's welfare. [133]

Yadrintsev's absence from Irkutsk after mid-1889, however, did not aid the cause of the Eastern Review. For instance, in 1891 the Irkutsk paper, under Oshurkov's editorship, let itself be drawn into a quarrel with the new Tobolsk paper, the Siberian Leaflet, in what Semevsky termed a "fratricidal polemic between two organs of the same direction." Having full reason to attack the Eastern Review (for a stand it took on the Siberian gold industry), several writers in the Tobolsk paper went so far as to attack Yadrintsev himself. Among other things, they reproached him for engaging in archeology at a time when, in their opinion, there were more important and pressing tasks. Thereby they first lost sight of the fact that Yadrintsev's

---

133 V. I. Semevskii, "Nieskol'ko slov v pamiat' Iadrintseva," p. 36.

archeological interests were directed toward providing material for studies on the history of indigenous tribes and their cultures. "Secondly," wrote Semevsky, "they forgot . . . he had to take up work which did not fully correspond to his personal tastes and inclinations. The days have long passed for us when scientific and literary work was the sole property of people in some way or other materially secure." Not only was Yadrintsev not among those so fortunate, but his life depended on literary and journalistic work for subsistence. Finally, concluded Semevsky, his valuable discoveries more than justified his archeological activities.[134]

On his way back to St. Petersburg from his second Mongolian expedition (of 1891), Yadrintsev witnessed in parts of Western Siberia how famine was threatening Siberian peasants and natives. By the spring of 1892 he had become fully aware of how strongly both famine and typhus had set in. He therefore set out for Tobolsk province at the head of the first sanitary detachment of student-medics to be organized in Siberia during the famine. Financial support for the unit was provided by the well-known Siberian philanthropist (and publisher), I. M. Sibiryakov. The situation in Western Siberia Yadrintsev described in the following terms:

> Seeing the full helplessness of the districts, the full apathy of officialdom, disorder in the guardianship put into the hands of priests, the absence of all organization, and the difficulting of constructing such without a zemstvo, the complaints of the population, the poverty, the general flight of the peasantry from the districts, the boarded-up houses, and, added to this, the chaos of exile (4000 exiles were sent to the famine districts), along with the movement of half-starved migrants fleeing from Tyumen from the epidemic . . . — all of this

---

134 Semevskii, "Nieskol'ko slov v pamiat' Iadrintseva," pp. 35-36.

> made an awful impression. . . . Note that in the detachments there were no Siberians . . . , and this completed the bitterness of my consciousness and the wounding of my patriotic feelings. [135]

Yadrintsev traveled with his detachment to the famine-stricken districts around Tyumen, Kurgan, Ishim, and Yalutorovsk. While administering aid to the famished, he also helped organize other detachments.

On the first of July, 1892, having done all he could for the moment, Yadrintsev returned to European Russia. He had just settled down with his children and had given lectures on his two recent Orkhon expeditions and on Siberian natives at the international congress on historical archeology and anthropology in Moscow, when more bad news from Siberia reached him. Cholera, spreading from European Russia, had broken out suddenly and on an extensive scale in Western Siberia. His first impulse was to return, but upon reconsidering the condition of his health, he realized he could not. He wrote to a friend, "I am restraining myself and will not rush off now only because my energy has not gotten stronger after my trip, and my emotional state, often causing me a dreadful melancholy, has so weakened me that I might fall ill en route, and what could I do while sick?" He concluded, however, "My life must end in social service." [136]

Thus, unable in late 1892 to help out on the spot during the famine and cholera epidemic, Yadrintsev took to his pen with all the more vigor. It was in this year that he wrote most of his articles for two European Russian newspapers, Russian Life and Russian Gazette. [137] To the latter especially

---

135 Undated letter to V. I. Semidalov; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 177.
136 Letter to V. I. Semidalov, dated July 26, 1892; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 178-79.
137 In Russian: Russkaia Zhizn' and Russkiia Viedomosti.

he contributed a number of articles on problems connected with the famine, crop failure, and means of coping with the situation. He called for public donations and for the administration to suspend irregular exile into the areas of Tobolsk province stricken by the disaster. That autumn Yadrintsev was honored by student medics back from Western Siberia. Along with Yadrintsev, another leading publicist also popular in student circles was feted at the same time, the populist writer, Nikolai K. Mikhailovsky. Toward the end of 1892 Yadrintsev could rightly remark, "Publicistic activity has seized me." [138] He had indeed regained much of his old passion for writing, putting together almost 30 articles that year, an annual output unequaled since the mid-1880's.

After having given up the editorship of the Eastern Review in 1890, Yadrintsev before long felt the need for a niche of his own on a publication. In 1892 he was offered the management of the Siberian section of the newspaper, Russian Life, a position which he readily accepted. This job cheered him up a good deal and gave him a certain amount of work, along with a modest salary. That this paper was then popular in the provinces and was uncensored caused Yadrintsev to value this opportunity. Among other contributors to Russian Life at the time was the Siberian short-story writer Dmitry N. Mamin-Sibiryak (1852-1912). [139]

From 1891 to his death Yadrintsev became especially interested in a problem of great significance for Siberia: peasant migration. As with the

---

138 Letter to V. I. Semidalov, dated October 8, 1892; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 179.

139 For details on his activities connected with Russian Life, see Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 180-81, 216-18.

issues of exile and the university, he had been involved in this problem long before it became a prominent question on the Russian and Siberian scene. Indeed, in 1881 he had written an important article, "The Status of Migrants in Siberia," which proposed a number of ways to improve migrant conditions and which established Yadrintsev as one of the leading authorities on the question. [140] With the plans of a Trans-Siberian Railroad developing in the late 1880's and with its initial construction in 1892, the implications of a great increase in peasant migration to Siberia became obvious. Moreover, the famine of 1891-92 drew special attention to the plight of the Siberian migrant.

In 1891 he wrote several articles on migration, including an essay of significance that reviewed the last decade (and more) of migration to Siberia. [141] About the same time Yadrintsev became active in the Society for the Assistance of Needy Migrants. As one of the society's committee members noted of Yadrintsev,

> In this hall and in the meetings of our committee he often portrayed the deprivations of Russian people in wagons and in the Siberian taiga, in the Tyumen barracks, on barges, and in places of settlement. Many times the Russian public read his telegrams in the newspapers, eloquent in all their conciseness, on how famine and disease had devastated whole armies carrying the Russian name into the distant east. [141]

Not only did Yadrintsev's work on behalf of migrants enhance his reputation amidst the Russian public, but it also impressed individual migrants too.

---

140 Iadrintsev, "Polozhenie pereselentsev v Sibiri," Viestnik Evropy, (1881) bk. 8, pp. 601-20. For a further discussion of Yadrintsev's views on this subject, see below, pp. 687-89.

141 Iadrintsev, "Desiatilietie pereselencheskago voprosa" (The Migrant Question in the Last Decade), Viestnik Evropy, (1891) bk. 8, pp. 790-826.

142 A. Isaev, "Pamiati N. M. Iadrintseva, druga sereselentsev" (Memories of N. M. Yadrintsev, The Friend of Migrants), Sievernyi Viestnik, (1895) IV: 187; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 181.

For instance, when in 1892 Yadrintsev helped organize a settlement of migrants from Tambov province in the Siberian province of Tobolsk, the grateful peasants named their community Yadrintsevsky settlement (Iadrintsevskii posëlok). According to one of them, the "Yadrintsevtsy" regarded "the memory of the perpetrator of their migration — N. M. Yadrintsev — with deep respect." [143]

In autumn 1892, plans for a new trip began to take shape in Yadrintsev's mind. He started to contemplate a trip to the World Exposition to be held in Chicago in 1893, at which he would represent the Siberian contingent of the Russian delegation. Among other things, he wanted to investigate the colonization and settlement patterns and practices in North America firsthand. The Department of Manufacturing and Trade approved of the idea, but at the same time Yadrintsev was offered the job of organizing the bureau of statistics and inquiry in Tyumen. Moreover, the Society for the Assistance of Needy Migrants entrusted him with studying the migration movement and with organizing mess-halls.

At first, the proposed trip to the United States did not look promising. Though the Department of Manufacturing and Trade, responsible for the Russian delegation, approved of the trip, it declined to subsidize Yadrintsev's costs. He did, however, obtain promises of assistance from two wealthy Siberians, A. K. Trapeznikov and V. P. Sukachov, but no other contributions materialized, and he began to give up on the trip. Yet the course of events soon changed. As he related in a letter to Sukachov (written after his return home):

---

143 Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1900) no. 156; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 183.

> Since last year the migration question has occupied me, and thanks to our efforts a trip for 100 orderlies to Western Siberia was realized last winter; these young medics invited me with them to organize statistics on migration, and I was ready to take on this work, having denied myself the trip to America for lack of funds. . . . But it so happened that when I abandoned the hope of realizing the trip overseas, people were found who agreed to supplement the amount, and I collected a sum of 2000 rubles. [144]

After a short trip to Helsinki in March 1893, where he presented a report on his Mongolian discoveries to the Finno-Ugric Society, he set out in late spring for Chicago by way of Great Britain. To Sukachev he wrote of his progress from this point on:

> In London I visited the British Museum, and I will send the East Siberian Section of the Geographical Society its catalogs and descriptions. Arriving in New York, I tried to see the sights of this important city of the States and went to our consul, Mr. Olorovsky, to whom I had recommendations. I expressed a desire to see the institutions where immigrants are taken in, and I visited Ellis Island — the place where they disembark and are registered. Thanks to Dr. Sayner, the commissioner of immigrant affairs, I got acquainted with the institutions and acquired detailed accounts on immigration and on conditions of reception. [145]

Of the exposition in Chicago he wrote, "Being struck by the diversity of the wealth of American and European manufacturing and techniques, I could only marvel at the shortcomings and poverty of Russian products; as for objects from Siberia, I saw almost none." The chief exception was a Siberian chest covered in leather, which "surprised Americans." "Siberia," he noted, "interested Americans, as I became convinced, from the viewpoint of exile,

---

144 Letter to V. P. Sukachev, dated August 26, 1893, in Farafontova, ed., "Iz bumag sibirskago patriota," Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1903) no. 184; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 184-85. According to Semevsky, the new patrons were I. M. Sibiryakov and V. I. Bazilevsky ("Nieskol'ko slov," p. 36).

145 Letter to Sukachev, dated August 26, 1893; loc. cit., p. 185.

after the appearance of Kennan's book," Siberia and the Exile System, published in 1891. And he added, "I tried to persuade educated Americans whom I met that Siberia was not only a land of exile, but a land presenting all the rudiments of civic development and industry." [146]

While abroad, Yadrintsev succeeded in gathering enough information and material to put together a book which he envisaged, to be called "Siberia and America." Of this he wrote to Potanin from America: "This would be my last word. America has staggered me; this is Siberia in a thousand years, as if I were seeing the future of humanity and our homeland." He continued, "I am writing you on the Fourth of July — the holiday of independence; everything is in flags, shots, and firing. . . . Imagine my feelings. . . . My heart sinks with pain and anguish for our homeland. My goodness, will it ever flourish so?" [147]

With respect to his research on America, Yadrintsev also collected data on industry in Australia and Canada, along with statistics on various economic sectors. On his return to Russia in August he wrote,

> I am already investigating the materials and accounts cited above, and I will translate them and make notes. There is much that is instructive for us in this rapid growth and development of the American States, owing to the freedom of colonization, to institutions, to the patronizers of industry, to education, and to highly developed techniques. Railroad speculation and the seizure of lands can serve as a warning for us. [148]

Thus spoke one of the earliest firsthand Siberian observers (if not the

---

146 Letter to V. P. Sukachev, dated August 26, 1893, in Farafontova, ed., "Iz bumag sibirskago patriota," Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1903) no. 184; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 185-86.

147 Letter to G. N. Potanin, dated July 4, 1893 (N.S.), in Farafontova, ed., "Iz bumag sibirskago patriota," loc. cit.; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 186.

148 Letter to V. P. Sukachev, dated August 26, 1893, loc. cit.; p. 186.

first) of the American industrial and immigration experiences, and by extension of its post-colonial and frontier development. He contemplated similarities and, more especially, differences between the development of the United States and Siberia. Moreover, his earlier, long-held convictions that the American example might be put to good use for Siberia were reinforced and broadened as a result of his journey to Chicago.

Yadrintsev felt, for example, that his views on free and government-supported colonization in Siberia were completely confirmed by the facts he witnessed in the new world. As soon as he returned to his country-place at Bolshoe Selo (in Ryazan province) in mid-July 1893, he began work on his new project on Siberia and America. Though he never finished it, he wrote more than 100 pages, entitling them: "Journey to America. Sketches from the Life and History of European Colonies."[149] About this time he also gave a long lecture at the Petersburg Polytechnical Museum on colonization and settlement in America.

Semevsky writes that Yadrintsev returned from his voyage overseas much healthier, but that difficult material conditions and a feeling of solitude continued to depress him.[150] His journalistic activities did not diminish, however. During the rest of 1893 and early 1894, he remained busy as usual, putting out articles. Though some of these concerned reflections on his trip to the United States, the majority dealt with Siberian problems centering around the issues of land, migration, and transportation.[151]

---

149 Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 187. As of 1904, these pages were preserved in the museum of the Geographical Society's East Siberian Section.

150 At this time his young daughter was being brought up by his wife's relatives, and his two sons were going to school in Ryazan.

151 See Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 217-18.

Sometime before the spring of 1894 Yadrintsev went to work on an autobiographical essay. In 1884 he had written a sketch of his student years for the Eastern Review. In this he indicated that he planned to continue the story of his life subsequently. After his death, ten years later, an autobiographical manuscript was found among his papers, devoted chiefly to his activities in Siberia following his student years (i.e. before and during the Siberian independence affair) and through his years in exile. Though most of the narrative kept closely to immediate events and facts, Yadrintsev at times fell to musing. For instance, he asked, perhaps reflecting on his impressions of America,

> What will the fate of our country be in 100, 200, or 500 years? Who can foretell it? What will the relationship be between the daughter (the colony) and the mother (the metropolis) as both of them move apart and advance, as civic interests and questions form on this or that side? Neither dreamy-eyed children nor wise old philosophers can determine this.

Nevertheless, he seemed convinced that whatever the relationship, Russia and Siberia were destined to draw farther apart as both advanced.[152]

While in St. Petersburg in early 1894 Yadrintsev met a high official of the Altai Mountain District, Colonel Boldyrev, who informed him that in Barnaul the organization of a statistical research bureau on the economic life of the peasantry was being proposed. Boldyrev, in fact, suggested that Yadrintsev head the investigations. Yadrintsev's immediate response was enthusiastic, and he accepted the job. One problem that interested him especially was the hostile relations arising between Siberians — between new migrants and old settlers in particular. Looking ahead, he wrote:

---

152 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," Russkaia Mysl', (1904) VI: 156-57.

"Statistics is, of course, rough work, and I could stay outside of it, directing the matter by means of the press. But I must undertake statistical work out of necessity, for the sake of a salary, and also in view of my having to spend more and more on the children. Journalism will not save me." [153]

In May 1894 Yadrintsev therefore set out for Barnaul to manage the Altai statistical bureau. The state of his health at this time is, in retrospect, hard to determine. On the one hand, he wrote that he felt "an influx of energy such as never before," and Naumov later said of him in Tomsk, "I confess I did not expect that the fatal but inevitable outcome was so close; he was kind, fresh, and cheerful." [154] On the other hand, in Tyumen he was described as "terribly aged, . . . having acquired a very sickly, rather yellowish-green color in his face." And in Barnaul Yadrintsev privately confided, "I have come to die in Barnaul." [155] Arriving in Barnaul, however, on June 2, 1894, he immediately began to petition for the construction of a statistical bureau. He appeared energetic and invigorated; he spent his free time among friends, read them some of his unpublished writings, and recounted his recent trip to America.

Early on the morning of June 7, however, he "felt a peculiar decline in strength and became weak"; he apparently took too much opium and in the evening became unconscious. Despite the efforts of doctors, he died at ten o'clock that night. One version ascribed his death to a "paralysis of the

---

153 Letter of March 9, 1894, presumably to Semidalov; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 189.

154 Novosti, (1894) no. 166; quoted in Glinskii, "Iadrintsev," p. 450; and Naumov in Sibirskii Sbornik, (1895) IV: 1; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 190.

155 P. Golovachev in Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1896) no. 58; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 190; and Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II: 236.

heart."[156] Others, including Semevsky, felt the overdose of opium was not accidental.[157] Whatever the cause, Siberia thus lost its leading publicist, patriot, activist, and spokesman for its interests.

Various citizens of Barnaul arranged his funeral, and students on vacation from Petersburg and Tomsk universities, along with friends from the statistical bureau, carried his coffin, accompanied by a large crowd. His grave was strewn with garlands, sent by numerous Russian and Siberian newspapers, journals, scholarly societies, and museums. The loss was felt deeply by many, Russian and Siberian alike, and especially by those affected directly by Yadrintsev's work and activities. His death, at age 52, was considered by all to have been both premature and completely unexpected.

Despite the many respects paid to the regionalist champion at his funeral commemoration in Barnaul and at various solemn occasions in his honor at Irkutsk and elsewhere, just a year later Yadrintsev's grave was reported in bad condition. In view of the indifference shown it, the Eastern Review began to appeal for donations toward its upkeep. In 1897 the recently re-established newspaper, Siberia, wrote of these developments:

> Yadrintsev has died. Some Siberians do not know what he did for the country. With rare unanimity all of the press, not only in Siberia, but in Russia as a whole, has noted the important significance of his publicistic activity. . . . It was decided to erect a monument above his grave. Collections were begun. For the most part the intelligentsia and students gave money. . . . the entire sum collected at present does not exceed 2,500 rubles. Where is wealthy Siberia, and where is the whole country?[158]

---

156 Stepnoi Krai, (1894) no. 52; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 191.

157 Semevskii, "Nieskol'ko slov," p. 37. Lemke, however, feels this conclusion is "hardly possible" (p. 192).

158 Editorial article in Sibir', (1897) no. 91; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 194. A monument over his grave, with a bust done by the Siberian sculptor, K. M. Sibiryakov, was unveiled in 1900.

Yadrintsev's death was perhaps somewhat premature for Siberian society as a whole.

Yet many of his contemporaries highly valued his contributions and work. Among the tributes to Yadrintsev several of special interest with respect to content, origin, and time are worth citing. For instance, the Russian social historian and close friend of Yadrintsev, Vasily Semevsky, wrote in late 1894,

> he was, so to speak, a living Siberian university — not in the spirit of dry, official science — but a university immediately connected with life, spreading its knowledge, as in England, to the masses of society. Under other circumstances Yadrintsev could have become a true scholar, but with us he became a prominent publicist, and this form of activity gave him a stronger and wider influence in Siberia than a specialized scholarly career could have given; in his books and articles he taught all Siberian society and youth to know and love their homeland, to regard humanely all its diverse population without difference of origin or religion, and to serve the interests of the people; in this respect his services were very great, and for this reason one can say, without any exaggeration, that the name of Yadrintsev is writ large in the history of Siberia.

Semevsky also noted (without going into details) that regionalists such as Yadrintsev by their works "have introduced very essential corrections into centralist programs."

> Siberians must not forget that if the first urgent matter of Siberian society is to acquire those reforms for their homeland that European Russia has already attained, then further movement in the spirit of reforms and the realization of <u>all</u> conditions of prosperity in this region . . . are a task for Russia as a whole . . . [159]

---

159 V. I. Semevskii, "Nieskol'ko slov," p. 37. That Yadrintsev could have become a real scholar Potanin did not agree: "By nature Yadrintsev could not have been an objective scholar . . ." ("Nikolai Mikhailovich Iadrintsev," p. 175). Popov called him "a true journalist by nature" ("Vvedenie," in Lemke, <u>Iadrintsev</u>, p. viii).

In 1904 Ivan Ivanovich Popov, Yadrintsev's heir to the Eastern Review, stated that not one question touching Siberia was left uncovered by Yadrintsev (excluding, of course, the problem of a regional Siberia duma, which arose in 1905). Siberia was indebted to Yadrintsev, wrote Popov, "as to no one else. He was its historian, ethnographer, archeologist, economist, promoter of public education, publicist, poet, and man of letters." Popov considered him as a "regionalist in the best sense of the word," an "incorrigible westernizer," and one who "believed in progress and the life-giving principles of European civilization." Along with many others, he regarded Yadrintsev as "a man of the sixties of the purest water." [160]

There is no doubt that one of Yadrintsev's basic traits, and perhaps the most basic of all, was patriotism. Kacherets has described one interesting "influence" upon his Siberian patriotism: "As a child of the sixties who witnessed the liberation movement in Italy, and brought up on the publicists of that era, Yadrintsev formed a conception of patriotism concerning the right of each people to develop themselves freely. He also said this about the natives." Indeed, the portraits of the Italian patriots and nationalists Garibaldi and Mazzini hung on the wall of Yadrintsev's study. [161]

With respect to his patriotism, Potanin noted that "Yadrintsev differentiated the feeling of an overall Russian patriotism into a feeling toward his own region, Siberia; his publicistic activity did not destroy the overall Russian patriotism in the hearts of Siberians, but within this patriotism he reproduced a new feeling of local patriotism." As for his more

---

160 Popov, "Vvedenie," (Introduction), in Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. vi-vii.
161 G. Kacherets, in Sibir', (1897) no. 39; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 198.

concrete legacy,

> Yadrintsev left to subsequent generations not only the standards of destructive criticism of Siberian life, but he also bequeathed the guiding idea of constructive activity. He propagandized spontaneous action within Siberian society. It should not only receive new blessings with gratitude, but should also create new conditions by itself, open up useful institutions, adorn Siberian life, and try to make Siberia not only tolerable for life but attractige as well. [162]

It is to the "spontaneous" initiative and activity toward a better life which Yadrintsev sought so strongly to stimulate in Siberian society that we shall now turn.

---

162 G. N. Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," p. 280.

CHAPTER IX

REGIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF URBAN SOCIETY

The 1880's and early 1890's witnessed a remarkable growth in civic consciousness and public opinion in the major towns of Siberia. The reasons for this seemingly sudden awakening in urban Siberian society are several. First, in such a town as Irkutsk social and intellectual ferment had gradually developed and expressed itself in the late 1850's and early 1860's, and then again revived from the mid-1870's on, with the establishment of a municipal duma and the newspaper Siberia. Moreover, the initiative taken by Yadrintsev through his publications and activities, both in Petersburg and in Siberia, had much influence on students, professional people, and intellectuals scattered throughout the region. Furthermore, in the early 1880's a new influx of political exiles included a number of talented Russians who were willing to contribute to establishing and strengthening public and private institutions for the betterment of both Siberia and the

empire as a whole. The early 1880's also saw the emergence of a number of younger Sibiryaks who, though strictly speaking cannot be considered regionalists, nevertheless contributed much toward rousing public opinion and working in the public's interest in their respective localities. Such men included P. I. Makushin and A. V. Adrianov (perhaps the most regionalistic among them) in Tomsk, V. I. Shtilke in Barnaul, and N. M. Martyanov in Minusinsk. Still another cause for the relatively flourishing civic life in Siberian towns at this time can be attributed to a more tolerant and even encouraging attitude among Siberian administrators (beginning with Kaznakov in the late 1870's) toward public and individual initiative. Though it is true, for example, that Yadrintsev experienced troubles with his paper in 1888-89 in Irkutsk, the trials and tribulations that the editors of Siberia had been subjected to during the late 1870's were never again repeated. Though the general climate for public and individual initiative certainly improved during this period, indifference or lingering hostilities on the part of elements in local society and the administration hardly disappeared and could still hamper innovating and enterprising spirits.

The relation of regionalism, as a specific set of goals and objectives, to this public and social awakening cannot definitely be determined, of course. The development of urban life obviously had a local and municipal element to it, and the much broader regional awakening influenced the social ferment in towns only partially. But to almost the same extent that the speeches and articles of Yadrintsev, Potanin, and Shashkov in the mid-1860's, and the regionalist papers Siberia and the Eastern Review in the late 1870's and the 1880's influence public opinion on a region-wide basis, so too did several newly emerging newspapers in the eighties speak not only for a

local town or area, but for the region as a whole. The most important of these were the Siberian Gazette (Tomsk), the Siberian Leaflet (Tobolsk), and, on the opposite side of the ideological fence, the Siberian Herald (Tomsk).

If one can say that during the 1860's individual Siberians, such as Yadrintsev and Potanin, stepped forward on their own to advocate the needs and requirements of Siberia as a whole, the late 1870's and early 1880's witnessed the emergence of individuals connected with organizations or associations who expressed their concern for the region as a whole. An important step in the development of this phenomenon was the establishment of municipal dumas (assemblies) during the 1870's in most of the major Siberian towns — in accordance with the one Great Reform applied to Siberia, the Municipal Statute of June 16, 1870. Not long after the formation of dumas, two issues arose which tended to cement sommon Siberian public interests, or at least provide public discussion throughout Siberia and between the various towns of the region. These were the question of the location for the proposed Siberian university and the commemoration of Siberia's tricentennial.

* * *

The University Site, the Tricentennial, and Public Response

Imperial approval for consideration of the establishment of a Siberian university was granted on April 25, 1875. Though official discussions regarding the plan to found the university were not made public, even in Siberia one aspect of the question received a fair amount of attention from the Siberian public and press. This issue, the choice of a proper site for

the university, came to a head when on April 24, 1876, the tsar accepted Omsk as the preferred location. However, the decision was not yet final. Strong efforts were made from various quarters on behalf of three Siberian towns for the ultimate choice. Along with the Emperor, many in administrative and government circles preferred Omsk; so did local interests in Omsk and nearby Tyumen. Tobolsk had long been proposed as a site, and its residents naturally wanted the university there. However, the overwhelming preference among Eastern Siberians and most Western Siberians opted for Tomsk.

The issue of a location for the prospective Siberian university had, in fact, existed since 1803, when the Siberian capitalist Demidov donated 100,000 rubles toward the university, stipulating Tobolsk as the site. When in the 1860's the need for a university was voiced, Irkutsk was proposed as the most advantageous spot. Then, in the late 1870's, when actual plans for the Siberian university were being drawn up, the majority of Siberian opinion considered Tomsk as the most suitable location. Not only was Tomsk now the largest town in Western Siberia, but it equaled Irkutsk in population as well. Moreover, it was the most centrally located large town and lay on the main Siberian highway.

Those who favored Omsk, however, laid claim to its potential future and special administrative advantages. Indeed, Omsk, as a former military outpost in the first half of the century, had witnessed rapid population growth and had become a major administrative center, with a large number of civilian and military officials (many of them retired). The town was located, however, off the main Siberian highway and west of the "center" of Siberia's population, factors which might make for a smaller student en-

rollment in Omsk than in Tomsk. Another argument against Omsk was the fact that many of its residents were transient or temporary, having little or no connection with Siberia. With these reasons in mind, Yadrintsev wrote, while living in Omsk, in 1879, "Here is why Siberian public opinion came out quite definitely against Omsk and the local and metropolitan press resolutely gave preference to the town of Tomsk." Moreover, he continued, "The history of this struggle and of the rivalry between towns for the university constitutes a striking episode and a lively page in Siberian public life." [1]

The liveliness of the debate becomes more apparent upon examination of the arguments on behalf of Tomsk. Prominent among local boosters for Tomsk was, of course, the mayor himself. Speaking for himself and many duma members, he stated that the purpose of establishing a university was

> to let the inhabitants of Siberia give their children a higher education without the unnecessary expenditures that inevitably attend their sending them off to the university towns of European Russia to be educated. To attain this goal, the location of the university should, of course, be chosen in whichever town would be not only in the center of Siberia by its geographical position, but at the same time closely connected with all the towns of both Western and Eastern Siberia. The town of Tomsk is just such a central point. [2]

To this another prominent Tomsk citizen added in a duma report "that a university in Omsk runs the risk of remaining without any students at all and of being closed or transferred to Tomsk." His report also stated,

> If, in accepting as the basis for establishing a university in Omsk, a greater opportunity is found in

---

1 -skii (Iadrintsev), "Pervyi sibirskii universitet" (The First Siberian University), Viestnik Evropy, (November 1879) bk. 11, pp. 83-84. Yadrintsev himself preferred Tomsk as the site.

2. Quoted in ibid., p. 84.

> that town for supervising students by the higher central administration, then the citizens of Tomsk think it would be more convenient to transfer the administration of higher education to Tomsk than to risk a university without students. [3]

Backing up their words with deeds, on January 19, 1876, the Tomsk duma in a unanimous decision allotted a large plot of land, 2½ square miles in area, for the future university. On that same day a local philanthropist, Z. M. Tsibulsky, donated 100,000 rubles for the construction of the university. [4] However, according to the duma report,

> If the place allotted were regarded as unsuitable for any reason, then the citizens of Tomsk, in view of the enormous significance that a university would have for Siberia, would not hesitate to set aside another place to be chosen, if only the university, when established, would satisfy the convenience of the inhabitants of all Siberia by its location. [5]

Not only did the Tomsk duma, along with other Siberian dumas, petition its request and opinion to Petersburg authorities, but Tsibulsky himself wrote directly to the Minister of Education, Count D. A. Tolstoy, in 1877. "I will not repeat," he stated, "the arguments for Tomsk expressed in the petition presented by the Tomsk municipal duma."

> The views of the Tomsk duma are shared by other Siberian towns, among which some joined in to petition for Tomsk. The Yeniseisk duma, after having heard of the intention to select Omsk as the university town, petitioned through the local governor in a resolution of June 15, 1877, and sent a telegram to your excellency that demonstrates the advantages of Tomsk. The Verkhneudinsk duma did the very same in its resolution of July 12. And the mayor of Krasnoyarsk in a letter of July 5 . . . told the mayor of Tomsk that his society [i.e. duma] sympathizes with building

---

3 Quoted in (Iadrintsev) "Pervyi sibirskii universitet," p. 84, 85.
4 Jadrinzew, Sibirien, p. 421; and "Pervyi sibirskii universitet," pp. 84-85. By Russian measurements of the day 2½ sq. miles equaled 35,000 sazhens.
5 Quoted in "Pervyi sibirskii universitet," p. 85.

> the university in Tomsk . . . The municipal chairman of Barnaul wrote in July that the public there unreservedly shared the view of the Tomsk duma, but it could not express itself officially, because no municipal statute had been introduced there.

Tsibulsky concluded: "To be mistaken in the choice of a spot for the university would mean discrediting the very idea of higher education here and postponing the good results for Siberia anticipated from the university for, perhaps, a whole century." [6]

Along with Tomsk and the four towns mentioned by Tsibulsky, the largest town in Eastern Siberia and itself a previous candidate for the choice of the university site, Irkutsk, also formally expressed support for Tomsk. A full session of the Irkutsk duma presented a declaration to the Minister of Education which opened with the words: "The establishment of a university in Siberia will be recognized, without a doubt, as a third epoch in the historical life of this country" (presumably following the "epochs" initiated by Yermak and Speransky). Explaining its position, the declaration stated:

> the town of Irkutsk, moved by feelings of justice and by the interests not only of Eastern but of all Siberia, has ceded its rights to Tomsk. No one in Eastern Siberia has objected to the advantages of Tomsk's geographical position. This did not happen, however, when the news came that Omsk was proposed as the place for founding the Siberian university.

The Irkutsk duma felt that since Irkutsk had willingly conceded Tomsk the "great right of having within its walls a seat of higher education, then it is painful and lamentable for it to concede this right to distant and little-known Omsk." The declaration concluded that the choice be resolved "in the

---

6 Document addressed to the Minister of Education in the name of Zakhar Mikhailovich Tsibul'skii; quoted in "Pervyi sibirskii universitet," p. 86. The municipal statute, permitting establishment of a duma, was introduced in Barnaul later that year (1877).

spirit of the general wishes of Siberians, who nourish the hope that in a matter of such importance their voice will be heard and their considerations be taken into account regarding the place where the Siberian university is to be." [7]

The well-known former governor-general of Eastern Siberia, Count Muravyov-Amursky, also thought along these lines. In 1877 the Siberian writer I. V. Yefimov visited Muravyov in Petersburg and sought the latter's support of Tomsk for the site. Thereupon the Count replied:

> Is it possible that you thought I would speak for Omsk? Indeed, the university must be built in Tomsk. Every time I have had the chance, I have insisted on it. I had already written about it from Paris, when Golovnin sent me a telegram on their decision to build a university, but in Omsk, not Tomsk. That is a great mistake. [8]

The final decision on the university location was resolved, fortunately for most of those concerned, in favor of Tomsk. A commission set up to select the proper site weighed all the arguments in favor of the various Siberian towns, evaluating them impartially. After stating its preference for Tomsk, as a central location in Siberia, the commission passed on its recommendation to the State Council. Here the final decision was made in favor of Tomsk on May 1, 1878. Imperial confirmation followed soon thereafter.

It is difficult to ascertain just what influence the various declarations of Siberian dumas and leading citizens had upon the Ministry of

---

7 Declaration of the Irkutsk Duma presented to the Minister of Education, made in the name of Nikolai Lavrent'ev, acting mayor of Irkutsk; quoted in "Pervyi sibirskii universitet," pp. 86-87.

8 I. V. Efimov, Graf N. N. Murav'ev-Amurskii pered sudom professora P. N. Butsinskago (Count N. N. Muravyov-Amursky As Judged by Professor P. N. Butskinsky), (St. Petersburg, 1896), pp. 156-57; quoted in Sullivan, "Count N. N. Muraviev-Amursky," p. 319. A. V. Golovnin was former Minister of Education (1861-66).

Education and its commission. In any case, this was the first time that an overall demonstration of Siberian opinion made itself officially known to Petersburg authorities. In Siberia itself an important side-effect of these declarations was the first manifestation of region-wide public concern and the first major exchange of views generated among Siberian towns. Thus, the question of the university's location signified another step in the broadening development of Siberian public opinion on a regional scale.

After the final decision had been made, Tsibulsky noted,

> In no single part of Russia has society felt the lack of higher education so deeply as in Siberia, so distant from intellectual centers. For this reason the news of the government's intention to establish a university in Tomsk was met by Siberians with inexpressible enthusiasm. Our undertakings, whether they touched on science and education or on urban economy or industry, have almost always turned out poorly done as a result of a lack of knowledge . . . This is why the news of the university was met by unanimous sympathy, which the successful selection of Tomsk as the university town has especially furthered. 9

Not long after the public discussions and declarations had taken place throughout Siberia on the university question, another occasion for regional public interest and solidarity emerged: the 300th anniversary of Yermak's conquest of Siberia. Not only did this arouse greater interest outside of Siberia than did the question of the university site, but it was also attended by much more display of sympathy within Siberia. The jubilee was not just the short-lived, specific, and immediately vital issue soon favorably resolved that the question of the university location was. On the

---

9 Quoted in (Iadrintsev) "Pervyi sibirskii universitet," pp. 85-86.

contrary, it was a major historical event, which was prepared for, or at least commemorated, by all those concerned about Siberia's past, present, and future. Indeed, preparations for honoring the tricentennial were begun as early as 1877 by the Russian Geographical Society in St. Petersburg, and the Irkutsk paper Siberia began in 1879 to print pertinent essays and extracts from historical documents.[10]

Commemorations of Siberia's jubilee fell into three broad categories: public declarations and festivities, newspaper and journal articles, and and scholarly works published in conjunction with the event. Thus, Yadrintsev, for example, took part in various festive banquets and celebrations among Siberians in Petersburg, wrote several articles, and put together his most well-known book on behalf of the tercentenary. So too, many Siberians and Russians paid their respects at public or private occasions, in written articles, and in a number of monographs.

Examples of the first type were the declarations made in 1881 by the dumas of Yeniseisk, Irkutsk, and Tomsk. In each case ample cause was found to petition for the introduction of reforms in Siberia. Such was the proposal made in March 1881 by N. V. Skornyakov, a member of the Yeniseisk Duma; his petition was accepted by that body and was the first of its kind in Siberia to be submitted to the central government. Skornyakov declared:

> In the present year, as we well know, 300 years have passed for Siberia — a period, it seems, too long for it to be developed, to get firmly established, and to stand on its feet. But glancing back on the past, the heart involuntarily shudders, seeing nothing comforting and stable. There are only weak beginnings here and there, and all of this is

---

10 See I. V. Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 717 n., 723; and Iadrintsev, "Trekhsotlietie Sibiri," p. 835.

> pale and consumptive; it is evident that something is lacking for its development. . . . Isn't it time for us to regain consciousness? Isn't it time now to declare our vital needs on the eve of Siberia's 300th anniversary . . . ? . . . Our existence for 300 years gives us the right to speak of our benefits and needs, and now, it seems to me, is the best time to do this. Siberia's needs and ours are too great and extensive; great, because we have been step-children of Russia for almost 300 years here and have not had a just share of anything, with the sole exception of the well-known legislative act of June 16, 1870 [the Municipal Statute], which was also extended to the Siberian borderland. Our mother Russia has already enjoyed many radical reforms; however, we Siberians, suffering from our disorders, can only weep and envy her. . . .
>
> Our first and urgent needs are the introduction of a zemstvo, public courts, the freedom of the press and speech, the freedom of the inviolability of person and property, the freedom of migration, and the discontinuance of exile to Siberia.
>
> Acquiring them, we will obtain a necessary and great force in the struggle against ignorance, the poverty of our life, and the arbitrariness of the courts and administration; we will ensure our persons and property from the invasion of various plunderers of Siberia. The time has now come, my fellow deputies, to become concerned about these needs of ours. We shall have to petition for them to His Majesty on the eve of our 300th anniversary, so as to embark upon a new path of social action for serving the good of our region with new power. [11]

Broadly speaking, these same hopes and needs were often voiced not only in other Siberian dumas, but in various speeches at Siberian dinners in Petersburg and Moscow. [12] Skornyakov's proposal well illustrates that a consciousness of Siberia's basic needs was not just limited to a small circle of prominent regionalist writers, but was also present and active among a large segment of thinking society.

---

11 Skorniakov's speech was first printed publicly in Sibir', (1881) no. 17; Iadrintsev first quoted it in "Trekhsotlietie Sibiri," pp. 846-47.

12 Other desiderata mentioned on these occasions were the opening of the university as soon as possible, the establishment of improved means of land and water communication, the promotion of trade and industry, and the organization of local expositions (Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 722).

Not being permitted to organize public celebrations on either a region-wide or local scale, Siberians living in Petersburg and Moscow decided to gather privately at dinners in each city to commemorate the anniversary together. The necessary permission was obtained from the Ministry of the Interior and the local governors, and the following announcement thus appeared in local papers: "In view of the approaching tricentennial of the conquest of Siberia, Siberians and persons devoting their work to Siberia are invited to take part in a dinner on October 26, on the day Isker was taken." At the Moscow dinner, Basnin (of an old Irkutsk merchant family) stated, "The reasons why we have chosen this day consist mainly of its significance as a fact of public life and a fact of popular spontaneous action." However, the general tone of the various speeches presented revealed "an undisguised sadness about the fortunes of the region and its present situation." [13]

At the Petersburg dinner, the participants sent telegrams to Mosoow and to Siberian towns with roughly the same content: "celebrating a day significant for Siberia, the 300th anniversary on October 26, we greet the citizens of . . . , expressing the wish that the Siberian jubilee, having fulfilled Siberia's cherished hopes, has served as a beginning of the renewal of this region." In answer to these telegrams, the sponsors in Petersburg received replies from Blagoveshchensk, Khabarovsk, Tyumen, Yeniseisk, Moscow and other towns, and from various public figures and scholars. [14] According to a twentieth-century regionalist, Yakushev, the slightest manifestation of such independent action on the part of Siberians

---

13 The quotations are found in I. A. Iakushev, "K trekhsotpiatidesiatiletiiu Sibiri" (On Siberia's 350th Anniversary), Sibirskii Arkhiv (Prague, 1932), IV: 147.

14 Iakushev, "K trekhsotpiatidesiatiletiiu Sibiri," pp. 147-48.

was regarded by the government with suspicion, and these get-togethers in the capitals were well supervised. "Under these conditions the Petersburg and Moscow dinners were a peculiar safety valve, through which the voice of Siberians, however timid and uncertain, still sounded regarding the needs and reforms so long awaited by Siberia." [15]

The participants at these two celebrations resolved to repeat the festivities with annual dinners each October 26. Indeed, a year later, in 1882, the Siberians in Petersburg had a brochure printed in honor of the event, which contained extracts of the various speeches made that year on the occasion. [16] Tributes to Siberia's "birthday" were not limited only to Siberians either. The vice-president of the Russian Geographical Society, P. P. Semyonov, gave, in honor of the event, a long speech on Siberia to the Society's General Assembly in December 1882.

In Siberia proper, except for the declarations presented by the dumas, there were few, if any celebrations in 1881 similar to the dinners in Petersburg and Moscow. In Tomsk, for example, an attempt to commemorate the day with a special celebration was forbidden by local authorities. However, the tradition of the annually-held private dinner on October soon penetrated Siberia, and the first one east of the Urals was held in Irkutsk in 1883. And the following year, the local governor, S. I. Nosovich, even attended the Irkutsk dinner, on which occasion he sent a telegram to the Eastern Review in St. Petersburg, saluting its "honorable and staadfast service of the needs and interests of the forgotten region." [17] At the

---

15 Iakushev, "K trekhsotpiatidesiatiletiiu Sibiri," p. 147.

16 The brochure was entitled 300-lietie Sibiri. Prazdnovanie v Peterburgie i Moskvie 26 dnia oktiabria 1581 goda (Siberia's 300th Anniversary: The Celebration in Petersburg and Moscow of October 26, 1581), (St. Petersburg, 1882).

17 Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1884) no. 50; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, 141 n.

Irkutsk dinner of 1885 Vagin spoke first of Siberia's needs concerning public education. He was followed by S. I. Moskvin, who declared: "However remote our land may be, neglected and abandoned to the will of fate, and however dismal its past, so full of injustice, caprice, and lawlessness, our society has found enough strength in itself not to lose faith in the coming of a better day." [18] Still another year later, the regionalist-minded doctor, Mikhail Pisarev, stated, "The social significance of commemorating the 26th of October consists of the fact that we . . . affirm in it one and the same thing, openly stating the needs and requirements of our distant borderland. This colony without a doubt needs a renewal in its intellectual, spiritual, and civic life." After describing the oppressive economic and legal status of the Siberian peasantry, Pisarev ended with a toast to their health. Another speaker at the dinner of 1886 was the merchant, S. S. Popov, one-time author of the ill-fated "independence" proclamation of 1865, who read some of his patriotic Siberian poems. [19]

Whether or not duma declarations were made or festive occasions were held (however "supervised" they might be), numerous Russian and Siberian newspapers helped spread information and comments on the significance of the jubilee. Such local Siberian papers as Siberia, the official Tobolsk Provincial Gazette, and the newly-formed Siberian Gazette quite naturally featured articles, editorials, and accounts. What was perhaps more significant, however, was the considerable number of Russian papers that concerned themselves with the event. This sudden interest in Siberian affairs on the part of metropolitan papers marked a new (but not permanent) turn in the

---

18 Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1885) nos. 49-50, p. 3; quoted in Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 92.

19 Sibir', (1886) no. 44; quoted in Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 92.

attitude of Russian public opinion toward Siberia. Despite the fact that this interest was rather ephemeral, it could no longer be maintained that Siberia always received secondary attention in the Russian press.[20]

The Petersburg newspaper, News, wrote, for instance, that "the Siberian jubilee is important for Siberians not in the sense of a mere memorial of the past: it has great significance for the future too. In the heart of this country timid hopes are cherished, and the pulse of public life is beginning to beat in its young body."[21] And the Russian Gazette of Moscow, discussing the expectation of reforms in Siberia, wrote, "only the presence of these /reformed/ conditions will enable the regular development of industries, agriculture, cattle-raising, trade, education, and moral and economic well-being. Siberia has experienced too many difficult moments in its three hundred years; that is why one can only wish it a tranquil development in the future." In comparing Siberia with the United States, the Russian Gazette felt the former potentially possessed commercial and natural resources "which might even outdistance the advantages of America."[22]

The Moscow Telegraph, however, displayed its centralistic colors by writing that "for 300 years we have not known how to make use of this conquest." A land "which has provided and is now providing the Russian state with gold" has been made "solely a place of exile." Yet the Telegraph considered Yermak's conquest "one of the most glorious days in Russian history." Echo, on the other hand, showed a better understanding of Siberia and

---

20 Cf. such an assertion in "Pervyi sibirskii universitet," pp. 82-83. The jubilee was perhaps the first major "Siberian" event since Muravyov's annexation of the Amur to receive such public attention.

21 Novosti, (November 2, 1881) no. 290; quoted in Iakushev, "K trekhsotpiatidesiatiletiiu," p. 146.

22 "Trekhsotlietnyi iubilei zovoevaniia Sibiri" (The 300th Jubilee of the Conquest of Siberia), Russkiia Viedomosti, (October 25, 1881) no. 288; quoted in Iakushev, "K trekhsotpiatidesiatiletiiu," p. 148; and in Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 699.

its needs.

> For 300 years Siberia has not advanced very much; it has remained almost in a primitive simplicity of morals and has scarcely moved away from the despotism of voevodas. . . . What do the hopes of Siberians consist of? . . . Siberian papers, as mouthpieces of public opinion, have declared for some time already the necessity of introducing zemstvo and judicial institutions, the easing of conditions for colonization, the improvement of the natives' way of life, and the construction of railroads; in a word, they expect a whole system of radical transformations.[23]

Another Russian paper, the New Times of Petersburg, referred to Siberia as "our United States" with respect to a place where Russia's surplus population could emigrate. To the reforms enumerated by Echo, this generally conservative paper added such measures as the abolition of the governor-generalships (the symbol of a colonial system) and the removal of economic affairs from the hands of local officialdom (turning them over to a zemstvo). In its opinion the Siberian administration had remained "unchanged in the form that Speransky left it sixty years ago."[24]

Along with the sympathetic support that many papers and sectors of Russian opinion gave Siberia on its tricentennial, the event also evoked reproaches. Indeed, Yadrintsev cites one such commentary, which he termed "not unjustified."

> America has in one century had achievements to show and has reached a development, of which we have not once permitted ourselves to dream; the Indians are giving up their cruel life of war and let themselves gain culture; the Negroes, former slaves, are civilizing themselves and will soon be a cultured people. Australia has also taken a mighty step forward in this century and enjoys a culture yet unheard of in Siberia.[25]

---

23 Moskovskii Telegraf, (October 25, 1881) no. 295, and Ekho; quoted in Iakushev, "K trekhsotpiatidesiatiletiiu," p. 148

24 Novoe Vremia, (October 26, 1881) no. 2034; quoted in Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), pp. 698-99.

25 Quoted in Jadrinzew, Sibirien, p. 427.

The tricentennial brought forth a number of scholarly works devoted to Siberia's past history. Of these Yadrintsev's Siberia as a Colony was undoubtedly the best known and most influential. Regarding others Yadrintsev wrote in 1881:

> For Siberia's 300th jubilee, publication has been proposed of various scholarly works and memorials, bibliographical works on Siberia, and the description of discoveries and travels in local Siberian publications; several articles devoted to the event of the conquest have appeared. Some of the scholarly works have been realized, while others are being so . . .[26]

Among the historical works were the first scholarly editions of two valuable documents (put out by the Archeographical Commission): Semyon Remezov's Siberian chronicle, written in the late 17th century, and Remezov's "Sketch Book of Siberia," consisting of early maps of the country compiled in 1701.[27] Published in 1882 was the first volume of Monuments of Siberian History of the Eighteenth Century, comprising the years 1700-13. This same year also saw publication of other works commemorating the jubilee: the travels through Siberia in 1675 of the Russian envoy to China, Spathar-Milescu; a collection of documents on Russo-Chinese diplomatic relations from 1619 to 1792; and a study on the contemporary economic conditions in Siberian towns.[28] Moreover, in 1884 the Russian Geographical Society published, a bit belatedly, the eleventh volume of the series, Picturesque

---

26 Iadrintsev, "Trekhsotlietie Sibiri," p. 835.

27 Russkaia Arkheograficheskaia Kommissiia, ed., Kratkaia Sibirskaia Lietopis' (Kungurskaia) s 154 risunkami (St. Petersburg, 1880); and Chertezhnaia Kniga Sibiri (St. Petersburg, 1882).

28 Russkaia Arkheograficheskaia Kommissia, ed., Pamiatniki sibirskoi istorii XVIII vieka, bk. 1: 1700-1713 (St. Petersburg, 1882). The second and last volume (1713-24) was issued in 1885. Russkoe Geograficheskoe Obshchestvo, Puteshestvie cherez Sibiri Spathariia v 1675 g., ed. by Iu. V. Arsen'ev (St. Petersburg, 1882). N. Bantysh-Kamenskii, ed., Diplomaticheskoe sobranie diel mezhdu Rossiiskim i Kitaiskim gosudarstvami, 1619-1792 g.g. (Kazan, 1882). L. N. Maikov, ed., Ekonomicheskoe sostoianie gorodskikh poselenii Sibiri (St. Petersburg, 1882).

Russia, on Western Siberia in honor of the jubilee. This work included sections written by such Siberian writers as Yadrintsev, Potanin, Polyakov, and Adrianov, and by such Russian scholars as Semyonov and Radloff.[29]

This impressive group of scholarly publications evoked the following response from the Siberian "chronicler," I. V. Shcheglov in 1884:

> One cannot but conclude that not one of the regional jubilees hitherto celebrated in Russia, and also those of individual persons and institutions, has called forth in connection with this such a quantity of various scholarly and literary publications, not to mention journal articles too . . . Precisely this feature has distinguished the celebration of the Siberian jubilee in broad relief from other similar ones (as, for example, no farther back than 1883 was the centennial jubilee of the annexation of the Crimea celebrated, but was it marked by anything similar to the Siberian one?).[30]

Next to Yadrintsev's magnum opus, certainly the most important work occasioned by the tricentennial which concerned Siberian history in the 19th century was Shcheglov's own publication, A Chronological List of the Most Important Facts of Siberian History: 1032-1882, put out in 1884. Ivan Vasilievich Shcheglov was born on the lower Volga at Astrakhan and had studied at the Institute of History and Philogy in Petersburg. After teaching in Yeniseisk and Irkutsk, he was transferred to teach history in the vocational school at Troitskosavsk (near Kyakhta). While teaching here, he spent six years working on his chronological compilation, but he died before he could fully finish it. Pypin writes of him and his goal: "Dreaming of writing a history of Siberia, Shcheglov saw that many preliminary works for this were still lacking, including a correctly organized chronology of the

---

29 P. P. Semenov, ed., Zhivopisnaia Rossiia, v. XI (St. Petersburg, 1884).

30 I. V. Shcheglov, Khronologicheskii perechen' vazhneishikh dannykh iz istorii Sibiri. 1032-1882 g.g. (Irkutsk, 1883 /sic/).

events of Siberian history . . ." Thus, he compiled for the first time a systematic list of events important in Siberian history, which was published posthumously. [31] Indeed, Shcheglov had just finished the postlogue to his work a month before his death in May 1884. According to Popov, he had lamented the poor conditions in the Kyakhta area for scholarly research and had dreamed of moving to a university town, where he could better follow these pursuits. [32]

In the postlogue Shcheglov stated:

> As my chief goal I set out to compile a compendium of historical facts on Siberia that could serve as a reference book on its past, beginning with the first information recorded in our chronicles on the conflicts between Novgorodians and Yugrians, the ancestors of the present Ostyaks, aborigines of Siberia, and ending with the celebration of the Siberian jubilee not long ago. [33]

Despite the vast scope of the work, well over half of the 750-page book comprises information concerning the 19th century to 1882. Shcheglov noted too how difficult it was to set oneself straight, in the absence of studies on various questions of Siberian history, on even such basic elements as chronology and dates, and even in the more recent period. The author also regretted the inconvenience of doing research and the difficulty in obtaining sources while living in Siberia. He even had to give up recording certain facts in his Chronological List, because of the impossibility of verifying these data. In this broad respect, Shcheglov was the first historian in Siberia since Slovtsov to embark upon such an ambitious historical project, with all the accompanying drawbacks (and advantages)

---

31 A. N. Pypin, Istoriia russkoi etnografii, IV: 365.
32 I. I. Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II: 65.
33 I. V. Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 757.

of the milieu.

Pypin, in concluding his appraisal of the Chronological List, wrote: "With all this, Shcheglov's book can serve beneficially for popular consumption, but as an historical guide, it is generally lacking in verifications." [34] Yadrintsev, however, considered the work more favorably and, despite its shortcomings, of much value and importance. In his review of 1885, he concluded that

> in general we should note that this work constitutes a necessary textbook for anyone interested in Siberian history, especially for the beginner, since Shcheglov's book goes into the sources and helps find one's bearings among a mass of material on the history of Siberia scattered everywhere and almost completely unsystematized. From the bottom of our souls, we wish that an interest in studying Siberian history, after a long interval, and after the initiative of the late Shcheglov, has not come to a stop among Siberians. This history demands a renewal and new energetic work, to which the present time is now calling educated Siberian historians and philologians. I. V. Shcheglov's book is an important step in this work. [35]

Yadrintsev's hopes, however, were not about to be fulfilled immediately. Just as the controversy over the university's location and the general impact of the tricentennial were slowly to die down, so too was the raft of historical works on Siberia engendered by commemoration of the jubilee to diminish.

As a kind of postscript to the historical works on Siberia that appeared in conjunction with the tricentennial, several publications deserve comment. Among the most important of these was the issuing of a second

---

34 Pypin, Istoriia russkoi etnografii, IV: 365.

35 (Iadrintsev) "Khronologicheskii perechen' vazhneishikh dannykh iz istorii Sibiri (1032-1882) . . . ," Literaturnyi Sbornik, pp. 483-84.

edition of Slovtsov's Historical Survey of Siberia in 1886. One justification for republication was made on historiographical grounds in the biographical introduction to the work.

> The need to produce historical materials, to clarify historical facts, and finally, to compile a new systematic survey of the past is without a doubt felt by thinking Siberia to a great extent. This need is all the more urgent in that our youth, in preparation for future activity, is being forced to draw meager information about our native land from general textbooks, where only a few pages are allotted to this vast region and to its 300 years of life under Russian dominion, pages often composed from dubious sources and without any critical regard toward them.
>
> If works have lately appeared in print on the history of Siberia, then they have encompassed either certain details, separate historical periods, or small areas; up to now no one has presented a general history of all "Transuralia" /Zakamen'e/, as common people call the Siberian region . . . [36]

As intimated in the above statement, there were also "social" reasons for republishing Slovtsov's work. The need felt by "thinking Siberia" for such a history throws light on the demands of the Siberian (and the Russian) reading public and of regional interests and sympathies in the 1880's. The introduction concluded:

> Almost half a century has passed since the first part of this work was issued /1838/, but it has not lost its significance. On the contrary, with the growth of the intellectual consciousness of the population and with the absence of a new work worthy of replacing it, interest in it has increased to an even greater degree, and the book has become a remarkable bibliographical rarity. . . .
>
> There is no doubt that by becoming accessible, this excellent book will not only tell a mass of people

---

36 K. M., "Petr Andreevich Slovtsov, 1767-1843 g.," in P. A. Slovtsov, Istoricheskoe obozrienie Sibiri, 2d ed. (St. Petersburg: I. N. Skorokhodov, 1886), p. 3. "K. M." was either K. P. Mikhailov, friend of Yadrintsev and contributor to the Eastern Review, or K. M. Golodnikov, a West Siberian writer.

> about their homeland's past, but it will also arouse interest amidst Siberian society in the further study of the homeland's history and thereby render a great service to this unfortunate region. It is high time for the Siberian population to know its own history.[37]

Thus appeared in print the second (and last) edition of Slovtsov's celebrated work.

In the late 1880's the most important Siberian historian to emerge, seemingly to take up the above-mentioned challenges recently tossed out, was Alexandr Vasilievich Oksyonov. Born in 1860, he studied at the Tomsk secondary school and graduated from the University of St. Petersburg in 1882. Oksyonov then worked with the Eastern Review and other papers in Petersburg before returning to Siberia in 1887, where he became a librarian's assistant at the new University of Tomsk and a school teacher. His historical works, which began to be published from 1885 on, concentrated chiefly on the earliest periods of Russian history in Siberia, such as Novgorod's relations with "Yugria" and the early Siberian chronicles.[38]

Moreover, it was about this same time that a systematic bibliography of works on Siberia, a project long proposed by Yadrintsev, was finally realized. The executor of this monumental task was not a Siberian, however, but the Russian bibliographer Vladimir Izmailovich Mezhov (1831-94). His three-volume Siberian Bibliography, published in 1891-92, was the last work undertaken by this distinguished scholar, and it attested to the growing interest in Siberia on the part of Russian researchers. Mezhov's compilation was indeed the last important bibliographical work on Siberia in pre-

---

37 K. M., "Slovtsov," pp. 22-23.

38 See Pypin, Istoriia russkoi etnografii, IV: 369 n.; Oksenov's studies in Literaturnyi Sbornik, pp. 425-55; and Mazour, Modern Russian Historiography, p. 167.

revolutionary times, and to this day in many ways it has not been surpassed.[39]

The Russian critic, A. N. Pypin, reviewing in 1892 the works written on Siberia since the tricentennial, characterized these efforts thusly:

> The attempt toward an integral exposition of Siberian history up to the present has remained unsatisfactory; nevertheless, in the last decade . . . the study of Siberia especially has been revitalized, and its interests have become much broader than they were before this time. Earlier, only one external, official history of Siberia was possible /a reference to Slovtsov?/; now not only have many appeared, . . . but research is trying to penetrate those internal processes which were produced in Siberian life under the influence of its basic factors: tribal, customary, administrative, and natural conditions. Of course, as this new direction is still just being established, one can point for the time being only to a few large works here; it has been necessary to rework old material and to collect new material. The difficulty of forming literary organs, the absence of a scientific center with which there could have been a local university, and a low degree of education in local society have all forced men to work in isolation with incomplete resources. Nevertheless, we have recently seen some remarkable publications, which promise to herald a new epoch in Siberian studies.[40]

Pypin added that since the 1860's a good deal of literary and scholarly work had been done by the Sections of the Geographical Society in Siberia — by local writers, travelers, and exiles. While the number of historical works relating to Siberia tended to diminish soon after the 300th jubilee and the public commemorations drew to a close in most places, the more solid, yet more difficult work of building up cultural and educational life, scientific achievements, and public opinion on a local level began to develop

---

39 V. I. Mezhov, Sibirskaia bibliografiia. Ukazatel' knig i statei o Sibiri na russkom iazykie i odnykh tol(ko knig na inostrannykh iazykakh (St. Petersburg, 1891-92), 3 vols.

40 Pypin, Istoriia russkoi etnografii, IV: 366-67. As examples of these "remarkable publications" Pypin cites the Eastern Review, its Literary Anthology, Picturesque Russia (vol. XI), the Siberian Anthology, and the works of the Siberian Sections of the Geographical Society.

surprisingly rapidly, at least in comparison with the past. It is in these forms that the social awakening in Siberian towns took shape during the remainder of the eighties and into the early nineties.

* * *

Tomsk and Irkutsk Come of Age

In 1881 the two largest towns in Siberia were Tomsk and Irkutsk, both with populations approximating 33,800 inhabitants.[41] The awakening of the 1880's was indeed more pervasive in these two centers than it was anywhere else in Siberia. Tomsk was an important trading town, located on the main Siberian east-west highway and on the banks of the river Tom, near its juncture with the Ob River. The town was neither a major administrative center, such as Omsk, Irkutsk, and Tobolsk, nor did it have a long-standing historical tradition of social and educational prominence, as did Irkutsk and Tobolsk. In comparison to Irkutsk, Tomsk was sometimes looked on as a "grayer" and more plebeian town, its inhabitants generally less "European" in character, dress, and outlook, and its intellectual life and public opinion undeveloped.[42] According to some accounts, robberies, violence, and murder were frequent, with criminal exiles often to blame.[43] Nevertheless, in the late 1870's new developements were set in motion which spurred an unprecedented public spiritedness and pride in Tomsk. Indeed,

---

41 See Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 749.

42 Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, I: 161; Potanin, "Goroda Sibiri," p. 244, 246; and (Iadrintsev) "Nachalo pechati," p. 404.

43 A. A. Argunov, "Studencheskie gody. (K 175-letiiu Moskovskogo universiteta)" (Student Years: In Commemoration of Moscow University's 175th Anniversary), Vol'naia Sibir', (1930) bk. 8, p. 18; and P. Golovachev, Sibir'. Priroda, Liudi, Zhizn' (Siberia: Its Nature, People, and Life), (Moscow, 1902), p. 288.

of the 1880's Popov could write: "In Tomsk they lived and spoke more freely than in Petersburg. Society was democratic, and spontaneous action arose more strikingly than in the capitals." [44] A chief stimulant in this new awakening of Tomsk society was, of course, the debate over the univerwity site and the ensuing decision of 1878 to establish the university there. Besides this, however, other factors contributed to the increasing pulse of Tomsk public and intellectual life.

One important factor was the arrival of a number of talented exiles in Tomsk — both political and criminal exiles. As a group they played a prominent role in the social awakening of Tomsk during the eighties. It is quite clear that exiles had more influence on Tomsk social life during this decade than at any other time in the past, the earlier contributions of Bakunin and Toll notwithstanding. Of this influence, Argunov, who spent his youth there, has reminisced:

> In Tomsk during these years a rather large colony of such exiles was formed. These were largely intellectuals from various parts of Russia and of various nationalities. On the streets of the town their figures by external appearance stood out distinctly, and the local resident involuntarily followed these "foreign" figures with his eyes . . .
>
> We soon, by various accidental threads, became tied up with this exile milieu, and here we found that which the high school did not and could not give. . . .
>
> Here in such an environment I was to spend my early, pre-student years. Before us a new world of interests and ideas was quickly revealed, and from the live tales of the participants of the Russian /revolutionary/ movement there arose a real picture of Russian reality with its negative and positive sides. [45]

Argunov's description of the 1880's differs little from those drawn by Yadrintsev and Potanin of their early years in the 1850's in Tomsk and Omsk,

---

44 Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, I: 161.
45 Argunov, "Studencheskie gody," p. 20, 22.

respectively.

Another observer, Shvetsov, looking back upon life in Western Siberia as an exile in the 1880's and after, stressed the influence of exiles even more strongly.

> In those times now distant from us, there was still very little of a local Siberian intelligentsia; moreover, the life of the awakening country more or less authoritatively laid claims on diverse intellectual work, for which local forces were not enough to satisfy, and willy-nilly the energies of political exiles took their place.

He wrote, moreover, that regarding "organized" activity among political exiles, "one cannot pass by in silence the West Siberian periodical press, since in this area of political exile during the quarter century before the 1905 Revolution a great deal was done, perhaps more than in any other branch of public activity." [46]

Despite substantial contributions of local political exiles, however, among the pre-eminent names of Tomsk journalism in the 1880's none belonged to political exiles. The two leading lights of the Siberian Gazette, P. I. Makushin and A. V. Adrianov, were native Siberians (by birth or by adoption), and the two chief founders of the rival Siberian Herald, V. A. Kartamyshev and Ye. V. Korsh, though Russian-born, were not political exiles. [47] The Siberian Gazette, founded in 1881, was the first private paper in Tomsk, and in general it took a regionalist approach to Siberia's problems. Though not all of the editorial staff and contributors thought along regionalist lines,

---

46 S. P. Shvetsov, "Kul'turnoe znachenie politicheskoi ssylki v Zapadnoi Sibiri" (The Cultural Significance of Political Exile in Western Siberia), Katorga i Ssylka, (1928) kn. 47 (10), p. 102, and kn. 48 (11), p. 90.

47 The Russian titles of these papers are Sibirskaia Gazeta and Sibirskii Viestnik, respectively.

the publisher, Makushin, to some extent, and the editors, Adrianov and A. I. Yefimov, to a greater extent, cna be considered Siberianaregionalists.

Pavel Ivanovich Makushin (1844-1926) was born in Perm province (which straddled the Urals), the son of a village psalmist. On finishing the ecclesiastical seminary, he want to the ecclesiastical academy in Petersburg. In 1866 he left the capital for the Altai mountain district as a missionary to spread the Gospel among natives. Here he opened a mission school, which educated many native pupils, a number of whom later became teachers. After 2½ years he was transferred to Tomsk to become inspector of the local ecclesiastical school. Here he served for four years and put through numerous reforms. In 1870 he opened in Tomsk a public library which was to survive for a half-century. Another important contributionsof Makushin's was the bookstore that he and the merchant Mikhailov opened in 1873.[48] According to one biographer, the bookstore

> was an event of enormous importance for Siberia's cultural life. Indeed, if we remember that at this time in Siberia there was still no railroad, that mail from Moscow to Tomsk took 20 to 25 days, and that one had to wait months for a book order, then it becomes understandable what a transmitter of culture the first bookstore in Siberia, which P. I. Makushin, opened, really was.[49]

Makushin always tried to supply his store with the best books on the market. His influence in local affairs increased even further when in 1875 he was elected member of the Tomsk Municipal Duma and soon thereafter became president of the school commission, which enabled him to open new schools and

---

48 At this time he resigned from his ecclesiastical position and gave up his clerical vocation.

49 E. Iakusheva, "P. I. Makushin," Vol'naia Sibir', (1927) no. 1, p. 192. N. Zdobnov writes almost the same in "P. I. Makushin (Nekrolog)," Severnaia Aziia, (1926) bk. 4, p. 103.

libraries. All in all, he well deserved being described as "one of the pioneers of enlightenment in Siberia." [50]

Another distinguished personage in Tomsk public life, also instrumental in founding the Siberian Gazette, was Alexandr Vasilievich Adrianov (1853-1920), born the son of a priest in Kurgan district, Tobolsk province. From the Tobolsk gimnaziia he went on to the university in St. Petersburg, where in 1878 he graduated in natural sciences. Soon after graduation, Adrianov accompanied Potanin on his second expedition to Mongolia (in 1879-80), serving as photographer and naturalist. Besides getting to know Potanin and his regionalist views, Adrianov developed an interest in archeology and ethnography. In fact, soon after the helped establish of the Siberian Gazette in 1881, he made expeditions of his own to the Altai in 1881 and 1883. On his return from the second trip he settled down in Tomsk, where he became editor of the Siberian Gazette until its demise in 1888. Especially important among his later writings was a topical history of Tomsk, published in 1890. [51]

The birth of the first enduring private paper in Western Siberia, the Siberian Gazette, in the words of its founder and publisher, Makushin, came about as follows:

> Year by year the increasing demand for books from the bookstore and the growing number of subscribers who read books from the public library, as well as the number of visitors to the reading room set up by the literary club, were for me indications of the awakening interest of the local public both toward knowledge and toward public affairs. Thus came the

---

50 I. I. Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, I: 160.

51 A. Adrianov, G. Tomsk v proshlom i nastoiashchem (The Town of Tomsk: Past and Present), (Tomsk, 1890), 433 pp. On Adrianov's life, see S. Vengerov, Kritiko-bibliograficheskii slovar', I: 127; and Pypin, Istoriia russkoi etnografii, IV: 370-71.

> thought of creating a local paper. There could be no lack of contributors; there was a sufficient cadre of local intellectuals and a significant number of political exiles scattered over various parts of Siberia who had had relations with me through the book store. A difficulty presented itself in finding an editor politically trustworthy from the viewpoint of the authorities, and an even greater difficulty in receiving permission to publish a borderland newspaper. To my great satisfaction circumstances turned out favorably. A. I. Yefimov, a teacher in the vocational school, agreed to be editor, and the local governor, V. I. Mertsalov, . . . regarded my undertaking "favorably," having declared his willingness to censor the paper, in the event it was given permission. I decided to give the name "Siberian Gazette" to the proposed publication. [52]

The contents of the newspaper were to include government instructions and statutes that chiefly concerned Siberia, foreign and domestic news, articles on local history, trade, industry and ethnography, scientific articles, literary pieces, accounts of the meetings of local societies and the duma, book reviews, and letters to the editors.

In July 1880 Makushin petitioned to the Minister of Interior to publish a weekly newspaper according to the above-indicated program. On February 5, 1881, Makushin received permission to publish, and an editorial staff was immediately put together, consisting of Makushin, Yefimov, Adrianov, I. G. Muromov, and a Polish exile, A. M. Wojciechowski. The staff was soon joined by the political exiles F. V. Volkhovsky, D. A. Klements, and the criminal exile, Ye. V. Korsh. [53] The Siberians Yefimov, Adrianov, and Muromov were to take charge of editorial articles on regional questions, Wojciechowski

---

52 P. Makushin, "Gazetno-izdatel'skaia deiatel'nosti vo vremeni tsarizma" (Newspaper-Publishing Activity in Tsarist Days), Severnaia Aziia, (1928) bk. 2, pp. 91-94; quoted in B. Zherebtsov, ed., Staraia Sibir', p. 117.

53 According to Makushin, Korsh was sent to the editorial staff by the authorities; "Gazetno-izdatel'skaia deiatel'nosti," quoted in Zherebtsov, ed., Staraia Sibir', p. 117.

the foreign news, and Korsh the domestic news and literary review. [54]

The first issue of the Siberian Gazette came out on that fateful day, March 1, 1881. Although "everyone talked about the new paper and predicted great success for it," the local gendarmes feared a connection between the paper's first issue and the assassination of Alexander II. [55] Despite this initially ominous development, the affairs of the Siberian Gazette ran much more smoothly in its first year of existence than had the fortunes of Siberia in its first year (1875). By "speaking Aesopian language and by steering between Scylla and Charybdis," Makushin tried his best not to frighten local authorities. Nevertheless, his apartment, where the editorial office was housed, acquired the reputation of a "hotbed of revolution." Moreover, a substitute censor, in Mertsalov's absence, reported to higher authorities that the paper was harmful and was published by people "who had no roots in Tomsk society"; however, upon the governor's return things came back to normal. [56]

One event, though, that had significant consequences for the future was the intense antagonism which developed between Korsh and Yadrintsev, apparently resulting from Korsh's decision not to print an article sent by Yadrintsev to the Tomsk paper. According to Korsh, Yadrintsev "intended to drive me out of the editorial staff of the Siberian Gazette, and in this he succeeded." In May 1882 Yadrintsev sent his "delegate," Mikhail I. Pisarev, to an editorial staff conference, where he "reprimanded" the editors for

---

54 E. V. Korsh, "Vosem' liet v Sibiri" (Eight Years in Siberia), Istoricheskii Viestnik, (1910) CXX: 430.

55 Ibid., p. 432; and Makushin, "Gazetno-izdatel'skaia deiatel'nost'," in Staraia Sibir', p. 117.

56 Korsh, "Vosem' liet," p. 435; and Makushin, op. cit., p. 119.

their conduct. Pisarev went on to ask that they no longer deal with the criminal exile element "against which Siberians who love their country should struggle by all means and should not permit it to direct a local organ of the press and to conduct correspondence in the name of the paper." Thereupon Korsh jumped up, quickly answered his critics, walked out of the conference, and left the paper for good, despite Makushin's efforts to change his mind.[57]

Generally speaking the Siberian Gazette followed a regionalist approach. In fact, according to Makushin, "a close tie was established with the Irkutsk paper Siberia and the Eastern Review of Petersburg. Owing to this,connection, articles and comments which did not get past the censor were able to be published, if not in this paper, then in another of the above papers."[58] Along with regionalist tendencies, however, other shades of opinion began to develop within the newspaper. Popov writes that in 1885 many political exiles had "grouped around the Siberian Gazette, which was the center of educated life in Tomsk." Besides Makushin, Yefimov, and the "obstinate Siberian," Adrianov, who by then was de facto editor, Popov singles out several political exiles also quite active on the paper. Two of them, P. A. Golubev and D. A. Klements, "occupied a position between the regionalist Siberians and the /other/ political exiles." He adds, "Two tendencies always fought in the Siberian Gazette: the Siberian regionalist, the representatives of which were Adrianov and the Siberians, and the radical-socialist, led by Volkhovsky, Belomez /a Bulgarian/, M. Timofeev, and other exiles. But both of these

---

57 Korsh, "Vosem' liet," pp. 436-37. Korsh's account is generally corroborated by Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, I: 157.

58 Makushin, op. cit., p. 118.

directions got along together amiably." [59] Svatikov, however, claims that "this struggle between the Siberian-regionalist direction and the radical-socialist one in the core of the editorial staff continued until the very end of the newspaper." [60] Despite their disagreement on the relationship between regionalists and exiles, Popov and Svatikov both contradict Shvetsov's questionable assertion that "in the Siberian Gazette all the editorial staff right down to the reporters were exclusively political exiles." [61]

Indeed, in his essay on the Siberian press Yadrintsev referred to the Gazette as an "imitation" of Siberia: "Thus, in Tomsk there arose the Siberian Gazette, which is trying to develop the same issues as the Irkutsk paper is, though it has come forth with less literary talent." He added, "It is also trying to draw educated people to it and to create a circle of readers to lead public opinion; its intentions are also patriotic and honorable . . ." [62] After contributing a few articles to the Gazette in 1881, and after his incident with Korsh and the establishment of his own paper in 1882, Yadrintsev had almost no further articles of his published in the Tomsk paper. [63] Other occasional contributors of note were Potanin, Naumov, Fyodorov-Omulevsky, and I. V. Shtilke of Barnaul. [64]

The lifespan of the Siberian Gazette did not extend nearly as long as either Siberia's or the Eastern Review's. According to Makushin, "Among influential persons who did not wish the paper well there turned out to be a real troika. First of all, the new governor, Krasovsky, who replaced Mertsalov, then the Moscow Gazette, and finally the trustee of the West Siberian

---

59 Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, I: 156.
60 Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 88.
61 Shvetsov, "Kul'turnoe znachenie," Katorga i Ssylka, kn. 48, p. 91.
62 (Iadrintsev) "Nachalo pechati," p. 454.
63 See Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 208, 212.
64 See Makushin, op. cit., p. 118; and Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, I: 156.

school district, V. M. Florinsky." Krasovsky, after having created his own "counterweight" in the Siberian Herald, wanted to stifle the Gazette. And Mikhail Katkov, editor of the Moscow Gazette, railed against the paper that "under the mask of local patriotism are hidden our old acquaintances — nihilists and socialists . . ." According to Katkov, these collaborators of the terrorist Karakozov, Jews, Poles, and simple riff-raff "fill the role of public opinion in Siberia. In Tomsk a whole staff of socialists has formed, who have gathered there from all parts of Siberia. The editorial staff of the Siberian Gazette is entirely composed of them." [65]

Though the Siberian Gazette was more than once closed down by authorities for its "harmful direction," it was Florinsky, the trustee of the school district, who delivered the last, final blow to the Tomsk paper. The last issue of the Gazette inadventently marked the end of the pre-university era in Siberia and in Tomsk. Its "elegant jubilee issue," coming out on July 24, 1888, was devoted exclusively to the Siberian university in commemoration of its opening. Florinsky, who was also in charge of the university, notified the Minister of Interior that he could not guarantee peace and quiet among the students as long as the newspaper continued. Thus, just as the university was born, orders from the Minister of Interior were received to suspend the paper. After Florinsky submitted a new petition for its final closure, the Siberian Gazette was closed down for good at the end of 1888, having published intermittently for a little over 7½ years. [66]

---

65 Makushin, op. cit., p. 119, 120. Makushin cites Katkov in Moskovskiia Viedomosti, (1886) no. 25.

66 Makushin, op. cit., pp. 120-21; and Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, I: 157. Popov states that Florinsky thought Makushin more harmful than any political exile (II: 180).

Svatikov claims, however, that the reason for the Gazette's discontinuance was that several men closely associated with the paper (Volkhovsky, Klements, and Golubev) were found by local gendarmes to be linked with a "self-education" circle in Tomsk, which was discovered in late 1887 and whose members were arrested.[67] George Kennan, the American writer who visited Siberia in the mid-1880's, provides still another explanation of the demise of the Tomsk paper.

> The Siberian Gazette, the only liberal and progressive newspaper in Western Siberia, was suspended for eight months of the 3d of April, 1887, as the result of a secret report made by the Governor of Tobolsk to the Minister of the Interior. It survived this blow, but was finally suppressed altogether in the latter part of 1888. The only reasons assigned for this persecution of an able and honorable newspaper were first, the use by it of news and anderary material furnished by political exiles, and second, the publication by it of an obituary notice of a political exile named Zabaluief, whose life and character had won the respect of everybody in Tomsk.[68]

Whatever the officialsreasons, they were not made public. Despite suppression of the Siberian Gazette, Makushin did not give up his journalistic activities altogether, for in 1894 he subsequently founded the Tomsk Inquirer. This in 1897 was renamed Siberian Life, and in the early 20th century it became a well-known and important Siberian daily.[69]

In 1882 another journalistic venture was undertaken in Tomsk, this time, however, in close connection with the official Tomsk Provincial Gazette. The Tomsk governor, Mertsalov, interested in reviving the earlier reputation of

---

67 Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 88. His source he cites as XIII-i Obzor zhandarmskikh doznanii, pp. 33-34.

68 G. Kennan, Siberia and the Exile System (New York: Century, 1891), I: 336 n.

69 The Russian titles are Tomskii Spravochnyi Listok and Sibirskaia Zhizn', respectively.

the Provincial Gazette, approached the ubiquitous Korsh, now free of his ties with the Siberian Gazette. Mertsalov proposed that Korsh take over the languishing unofficial section of the paper, putting it under a separate subscription. He assured Korsh that an unofficial section of the Tomsk Provincial Gazette and the Siberian Gazette could easily coexist together, as their purposes and tasks were different. The governor further recalled the

> time when the Tomsk Gazette thundered over all Siberia, and Yadrintsev, Potanin, and other well known Siberians worked for it. Then the ill-fated affair of "Siberian separatism" began, all the chief Siberian writers were put in prison, and our Provincial Gazette suffered too, its unofficial section all but disappearing . . . [70]

Mertsalov soon agreed upon conditions with Korsh and appointed him editor of the unofficial section of the Tomsk Provincial Gazette.

Korsh was able to build upon the circulation of the official part of the paper, and for five rubles a year instead of three he offered both parts of the paper to subscribers. According to Korsh's account, his weekly paper had over 600 subscribers in less than a month. The content of the unofficial section does not appear to have been out of the ordinary though, consisting of a local chronicle, foreign and domestic news, and editorials. Korsh's inaugural editorial, "Our Tasks," was evidently well received by many in town (though in his memoirs he gives no indication of its content, or that of anything else in the section). [71] The Minister of Interior, Count D. A. Tolstoy, had few kind words for the unofficial section of the paper, however. A criminal exile in a prominent position as editor on an official paper he

---

70 Korsh, "Vosem' liet," p. 438.
71 Ibid., pp. 439-41.

found distasteful, and he demanded that Korsh's name be taken off the paper's masthead. Tolstoy actually brought on the final suppression of the unofficial section by asking the new Tomsk governor, I. I. Krasovsky, in a provocative manner:

> on what basis are reports allowed to be printed in the unofficial section of the Tomsk Provincial Gazette under the rubrics: "we have heard," "they tell us," "we have learned," etc., along with critical comments on new books having no relationship to Tomsk province, theatre reviews, articles on local questions which have not yet been definitely solved in accordance with established procedure, /and/ various rumors that are not always true about government intentions and suppositions . . . ?

Tolstoy concluded by requesting that the publication of the unofficial section be brought to a "legal end." [72]

It was clear that Korsh, in Tolstoy's "official" opinion, had overstepped the bounds of propriety in an adjunct to an official local paper. Krasovsky was not about to cross swords with his superior, and consequently, as Korsh put it, "I had to write off two years' work as a bad job, cancelled by one stroke of the pen of an all-powerful minister, to the joy of local champions of darkness and public ignorance." [73] Thus, what Shcheglov described as a "first and unique experiment in Siberia" and what Korsh termed "Mertsalov's educational and literary 'venture'" died abortively in 1883. [74]

The second important private newspaper to emerge in Tomsk during the eighties was the Siberian Herald, published by V. P. Kartamyshev and edited by Korsh. Vasily Petrovich Kartamyshev came to Tomsk in 1881, a year after Korsh arrived. Quite unlike the latter, Kartamyshev was a barrister, who had

---

72 Quoted in Korsh, "Vosem' liet v Sibiri," Istoricheskii Viestnik, (1910) CXX: 822. He gives no source.

73 Ibid., p. 823.

74 Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 732; and Korsh, "Vosem' liet," p. 823. According to Makushin, the unofficial section, created by Mertsalov as a counterbalance to the Siberian Gazette, just "withered on the vine." See Zherebtsov, ed., Staraia Sibir', p. 119.

studied in Moscow and had practiced in Kharkov and Kiev. With the thought of seeking his fortune in Siberia he wrote to Zagoskin in Irkutsk, asking him for his advice. Zagoskin assured him of the great need for "knowledgeable, educated, and honest jurists" in Siberia and persuaded him to come. The die was cast, and Kartamyshev, soon to become the bête noire of the regionalists Zagoskin and Yadrintsev, came to Siberia, settling down in Tomsk.

The outspoken, hard-drinking Kartamyshev quickly became a controversial figure in Tomsk, and at one point Governor Mertsalov contemplated banishing him from town. Through various legal cases he was able to amass a sizeable sum of money, and subsequently in 1885 he approached Korsh with the idea of petitioning to publish a newspaper. In short, the program that Kartamyshev proposed for his paper was decidedly anti-regionalist and based on the assumption that "Siberia is for Russian and for the Russian people." [75] Korsh suggested naming the newspaper the "Siberian Herald," which Kartamyshev promptly accepted.

Needless to say, news of this proposed paper caused quite a ripple in certain circles of Tomsk and St. Petersburg, and especially among regionalists. Nevertheless, Makushin, who was less a regionalist than a promoter of education and culture, agreed to help the new paper. In Korsh's words, he

> obligingly agreed to print the Siberian Herald on his excellent printing press on tolerable financial terms; the Siberian Gazette printed an announcement concerning subscription to the new paper; and large announcements of our editorial staff, printed on separate sheets, were pasted about town and hung in

---

75 Korsh, "Vosem' liet," p. 831. For further details on the paper's ideological stance, see below, pp. 602-03.

> all the large stores on the main street. Subscriptions were accepted in Makushin's book store and in Kartamyshev's photography studio. [76]

Makushin's initial impressions of this enterprise evidently changed, for he later referred to the Herald as a "literary reptile." [77]

With permission to publish granted, the first issue was set for May 16, 1885. By that time the Siberian Herald already counted on 500 subscribers. Korsh wrote the lead editorial, and according to him, "the program was as clear as day and stating it did not present the slightest difficulty." Other features were a town chronicle, satire, and correspondence from various parts of Siberia. Korsh, in his usual opinionated and self-congratulatory manner, described the reception given to the inaugural issue:

> The local subscription on the day the first issue came out increased significantly; more than 200 copies were sold by retail (in Tomsk an unprecedented phenomenon). We had triumphed. The villainous baiting of Yadrintsev and Company had rendered us an excellent service: it had gotten local society interested, which hurried to get acquainted with the new paper and to check the rumors put out about it. Subscriptions also grew from within Siberia. The metropolitan press of Petersburg and Moscow greeted our paper with sympathy and expressed bewilderment as to why the old local press [i.e. the Siberian Gazette and Siberia subsequently] persecuted it so maliciously. [78]

Toward the end of the first year of publication as many as 1200 copies per issue of the Siberian Herald were printed (almost equaling the Eastern Review in its peak year, 1885). Besides the permanent editorial staff, which consisted chiefly of Korsh, Kartamyshev, and the satirist P. M. Polyan-

---

76 Korsh, "Vosem' liet," Istoricheskii Viestnik, (1910) CXXI: 29.

77 Makushin, "Gazetno-izdatel'skaia deiatel'nost'," in Staraia Sibir', p. 120.

78 Korsh, "Vosem' liet," CXXI: 30-31. On Yadrintsev's initial reaction to the Siberian Herald, see above, p. 470.

sky (also a criminal exile), new contributors to the paper appeared. In the opinion of Shvetsov, they were a rather shady bunch, for behind the "sot-lawyer" Kartamyshev was "concealed a band of so-called 'knaves-of-hearts' and bank-robbers, exiled to Siberia for various criminal acts . . ."[79] Nevertheless, among those at times associated with the Herald were such prominent figures as E. F. Kudryavtsev (subsequent founder of Krasnoyarsk's first private paper), N. V. Skornyakov (member of the Yeniseisk Duma and director of the local library), and K. M. Golodnikov of Tobolsk. All in all, the success of the first year encouraged Kartamyshev to publish the paper twice a week without raising the price.[80]

All was going well for the Siberian Herald when suddenly the joint-owner of Makushin's printing press, V. V. Mikhailov, announced that he could no longer print the newspaper. Evidently Mikhailov wished to have no part in assisting a newspaper that had recently attacked in print his brother, P. V. Mikhailov, the mayor of Tomsk. With some difficulty Kartamyshev procured a printing press from European Russia, along with a substantial supply of newsprint, and events returned outwardly to normal. Kartamyshev, however, had been forced to make extensive expedditures and was now seeking ways to ease the monetary difficulties of his paper, including partnership.

By late 1886 circulation of the Siberian Herald had reached 1500, and Kartamyshev wanted to increase publication to three times per week. This would entail, however, raising the price of subscriptions, for which permission was needed from the Ministry of Interior. Indeed, beginning in January

---

79 S. P. Shvetsov, "Kul'turnoe znachenie," Katorga i Ssylka, no. 48, p. 90.
80 Korsh, "Vosem' liet," CXXI: 36.

1887 the paper came out thrice weekly, but permission to raise the price was refused the following month. Kartamyshev was still seeking a partner when Count Tolstoy notified him that the paper was to be suspended for four months. No official explanation (as usual) was given, though Korsh later learned unofficially it was "for a harmful direction." [81] It goes without saying that Kartamyshev's efforts to form a partnership fell through at this point.

After publication was resumed, the situation of the Siberian Herald began to alter considerably. In early 1888 Korsh received an official amnesty from exile, and later that year he returned to St. Petersburg. The editorship of the paper now passed into the hands of the librarian of the Tomsk university, S. K. Kuznetsov. The Herald continued publication through the 1890's, but in a much milder, less controversial manner than during the years of Korsh's editorship. Kartamyshev remained as publisher, however, until 1894. As for the eventual fate of the paper, in the early 1900's it fell into the hands of local "Black Hundred" elements and became a mouthpiece of reaction (in some ways not far removed from where it started out).[82]

Besides the newspapers founded in the 1880's, Tomsk also witnessed the emergence of numerous other public undertakings. Probably the most famous and influential among these was the "Society for the Promotion of Primary Education," founded in 1882 by Makushin, then the president of the duma's school commission. The motto this society adopted for itself was "Not One

---

81 Korsh, "Vosem' liet," CXXI: 49-50.

82 Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 140 n.; Shvetsov, "Kul'turnoe znachenie," no. 48, p. 91; and V. I. Nikolaev, "Sibirskaia periodicheskaia pechat' i politicheskaia ssylka" (Political Exile and the Siberian Periodical Press), Katorga i Ssylka, (1928) no. 41, bk. 4, p. 112.

Illiterate." The program of this institution was to assist the public administration in improving schools in town, to help capable but poor pupils, to provide them the means to continue their education in secondary school, and to assist in the opening of private schools in town.[83] As the first such society not only in Siberia, but in all Russia, it served as a model for school societies founded subsequently in other Siberian towns. Membership in this society was open to any citizen (including exiles) upon payment of a one-ruble fee; honorary members paid fifty rubles. In one year the society could claim over 900 members and had collected over 3,600 rubles.

Among the activities of the "Society for the Promotion of Primary Education" in its first year was the organization of a girls' school in Tomsk. With funds on the increase, by 1885 the society was able to maintain two elementary schools and provide scholarships and allowances for pupils. Evidently the society had few, if any, wealthy patrons at first, though as time went on such benefactors as I. M. Sibiryakov and S. S. Valgusov (an illiterate merchant) contributed liberally.[84] Thanks to Makushin's energy, the society organized such fund-raising functions as plays, concerts, mascarade balls, public lectures, and even a voluntary tax on cards at the various clubs in town — at ten kopeks a pack! Reflecting the educational activities of Governor-General Kaznakov in the late 1870's and of Makushin's school society in the 1880's, the number of schools in Tomsk increased from only a few in the late sixties to seventeen in 1888. And many of these were built on private funds, chiefly from local merchants.[85]

---

83 See Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 737; and Korsh, "Vosem' liet," CXXI: 45.
84 Korsh, "Vosem' liet," CXXI: 45; and Potanin, "Goroda Sibiri," p. 247.
85 See Potanin, "Goroda Sibiri," p. 245; and "Makushin (Petr Ivanovich)," Entsiklopedicheskii slovar', vol. 18, pt. 1 (St. Petersburg: Brokgaus-Efron, 1896), p. 450.

The "Society" did not limit its activities to schools alone, as the realm of education went beyond just this. In September 1884 the first free public library since Kuznetsov's in the early 1860's was opened under its aegis, attracting in its first year 440 subscribers. Three years later the number of subscribers had reached 800.[86] Makushin undertook to have a large stone building constructed as soon as possible to house the library. With the aid of donations large and small, the library was moved into a two-storey building in 1885.

This spirited organization also opened a ladies' needlework school, set up Sunday drawing classes and courses in choral singing, and, in 1889, founded a museum of applied sciences. The society continued to operate successfully for over twenty years until closed in 1906 by the local governor for its "harmful direction." Makushin, however, was able to revive it three years later under a slightly changed name. The free library founded by the society was also closed by the governor in 1906, its building given over to the disposal of the arch-conservative "Union of the Russian People."[87]

Summing up the influence of the "Society for the Promotion of Primary Education," Grigory Potanin wrote in 1908 (when living in Tomsk):

> For the unification of the Tomsk intelligentsia and for the cultivation of civic solidarity this society played the same role as the Section of the Geographical Society with its museum did for Irkutsk, as the Martyanov museum did for Minusinsk, and as the book center did for Krasnoyarsk . . . Its celebrations often turned out to be celebrations of the town's intelligentsia; and in the life of /local/ society there

---

86 Zdobnov, "P. I. Makushin," p. 104; and Iakusheva, "P. I. Makushin," p. 192.

87 Zdobnov, "P. I. Makushin," p. 104; and Korsh, "Vosem' liet," CXXI: 46.

> were moments of an upsurge of civic feeling. The reactionaries called this society ironically "a three-ruble parliament," and it really was a democratic institution. . . . The auditorium of this society served as a place for unifying the town's intelligentsia with the town's masses, and it trained the intelligentsia to serve the people. [88]

As for Makushin's activities in Tomsk besides the newspaper, the duma, and the school society, after the early 1880's the sky almost became the limit. His most accurate biographer, Zdobnov, appraised his aspirations from the 1880's on as follows:

> Wide horizons and grandiose designs attracted him, and his merit for Siberia goes far beyond that which has been said /above/. In the course of many decades he emerged in the capacity of organizer of all possible cultural and educational undertakings of a public character. He organized public readings (1875-1878), public lectures (1881-1885), Sunday /vocational/ schools (1881-1891), public Sunday readings (1883-1891), a scientific exhibition (1887), manual training classes (1890-1895) . . .

and so forth, on into the 1890's and 1900's. [89]

These efforts made during the 1880's and early 1890's on the part of local residents of Tomsk — be they primarily avowed regionalists, distinguished exiles, wealthy philanthropists, or avid disseminators of culture — not to mention the establishment of the university and the positive endeavors of local administrators, all combined together to turn Tomsk into the leading town in Siberia in many ways by the turn of the 19th century. Owing to these strides forward, the Siberian writer P. M. Golovachev stated in 1902 that with a population of 56,000 Tomsk was now "the first in Siberia in buildings, animation, and abundance of educational and scholarly insti-

---

88 G. N. Potanin, "Goroda Sibiri," p. 247.
89 N. Zdobnov, "P. I. Makushin," p. 104.

tutions." In one breath Golovachev could mention a university, a technical institute, boys' and girls' high schools, a schoolsof "modern studies," an ecclesiastical seminary, three newspapers and one magazine, scholarly societies, a theatre with opera and drama facilities, and last but not least the school society and the free public library. [90]

Irkutsk by the late 19th century had been the economic capital of Siberia for well over a century, and it had been the most important administrative center of Siberia since the early 1800's. Moreover, the legacy of Governor-General Muravyov-Amursky and of eminent exiles from among Decembrists, Poles, and Petrashevtsy had further contributed to the emergence of a sophisticated social life in this East Siberian town. The very articles of commerce that Irkutsk entrepreneurs handled were often luxury items that yielded large profits: furs, gold, and Chinese tea. This type of trade also provided the wealthier Irkutsk merchants with important connections and contacts in Moscow and St. Petersburg, and cultural influences from the capitals were thereby more easily transmitted to Irkutsk society. Both the large profits and the cultural tastes which many Irkutsk merchants had acquired vastly exceeded those which the typical wheat or leather merchant of Tomsk, who dealt more in local trade, might build up.

Yadrintsev, writing in 1885, summarized the causes for Irkutsk's preeminence thusly:

> Eastern Siberia is indebted . . . to the fact that an educated society was formed earlier in Irkutsk, and a local intelligentsia arose which possessed better

---

90 P. Golovachev, Sibir'. Priroda, Liudi, Zhizn', p. 282. Over the period 1881-1897 the population of Tomsk increased 40%, from 33,800 to 52,210 (see I. Iakushev, Sibir' v tsifrakh /Prague, 1931/, p. 12).

> forces and greater preparation. As is evident in the memoirs about Irkutsk, even in the 1820's and 1830's educated elements were here; and in the 1860's intellectual life had already appeared, and thirty years later it ought to have developed still more. Thus, the force of the press and its influence is more noticeable here. [91]

The exiled Ivan Popov, passing through Tomsk in 1885 on his way eastward, was told: "go east and there you'll find a more cultured life. Social initiative manifests itself more strikingly in Irkutsk than it does among us; even the governors-general there align themselves with society, and the merchants are quite European; and in Kyakhta it goes without saying that the merchants there are Englishmen . . ." [92] Despite commendatory descriptions, however, Irkutsk society was, on the other hand, hardly immune from a love of scandals, gambling, hard drinking, and gossip. And crime and corruption were just as prevalent as in Tomsk.

An important event which divided Irkutsk of the 1880's from the earlier years was the catastrophic fire of June 22-24, 1879. This blaze destroyed the best and wealthiest part of town, including the administrative archives, public library, and the museum and library of the East Siberian Section of the Geographical Society. In all, property and goods valued at 20 million rubles perished in the fire; eleven lives were lost, 4000 individual buildings burned, and 20,000 citizens were left homeless. Thus, Irkutsk for the next few years was deeply engaged in reconstructing much of the town. [93] By the end of 1880 one quarter of the burnt section of town was rebuilt, and in a few years much of the important reconstruction had been finished.

---

91 (Iadrintsev) "Nachalo pechati," p. 404.
92 Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, I: 161-62.
93 Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 712. Also see Harmon Tupper, To the Great Ocean: Siberia and the Trans-Siberian Railroad (Boston: Little, Brown, & Co., 1965), pp. 196-98.

Despite the fire and the problems of rebuilding, the town's population steadily increased from about 33,800 in 1879 to approximately 50,000 in 1890.[94]

Irkutsk throughout the years had been blessed with a number of wealthy merchant families active in public philanthropy. Foremost among these families in the 19th century were the Sibiryakovs, the Trapeznikovs, and the Basnins. For instance, A. M. Sibiryakov donated almost a million rubles altogether toward maintaining a school in Irkutsk, toward student assistance funds for Tomsk University, and for prizes for the best works written on the history of Siberia (a competition held in 1886). His younger brother, I. M. Sibiryakov, owner of a printing house, was even more assiduous in his donations toward public enlightenment. Of him Potanin wrote:

> there is not an educational undertaking in Siberia which would have gotten along without the monetary assistance of I. M. Sibiryakov; from his funds extensions were added on to museums in Irkutsk, Minusinsk, and Tomsk; with his financial aid . . . schools were built, libraries were opened, and books on Siberia were published; he subsidized poor Siberian writers and gave stipends to Siberian students with a cheerful hand.

Potanin added that "in no other town in Siberia does the bourgeiosie's understanding of duty toward their home town reach the height that it does in Irkutsk, . . . and no other Siberian town has such a renowned bourgeoisie."[95]

Among the public institutions important in Irkutsk was the municipal duma. Potanin also praised the Irkutsk Duma as the most "sensitive" one of

---

94 V. P. Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 108, 116-17. In 1890 Irkusk ranked 34th in size among Russian towns. Sukachov adds that as a result of the fire not one copy of Milyutin's Siberian Herald (published from 1864-67) and only a few scattered copies of Zagoskin's Amur (1860-62) remained in Irkutsk (p. 215).

95 Potanin, "Goroda Sibiri," p. 239, 240. Among the histories published by Sibiryakov's press were Slovtsov's Survey (1886) and Yadrintsev's Siberia as a Colony (1892).

all with respect to Siberia's "dignity," and he considered its voice of protest against the exile system to have been the most energetic among all Siberian dumas. However, the duma's "sensitivity" was not enough to make it immune from Vagin's one-time criticism of its niggardly penny-pinching support of the Siberian university in Tomsk. [96] Among cultural institutions, the Irkutsk theatre, built entirely on the funds of private donors and coordinated by Governor-General Goremykin (1889-94), became the largest in Siberia. This was a new, stone theatre, replacing the one burned in 1879 and its temporary wooden replacement. The new theatre, begun in 1894, in time had a seating capacity of 1000 spectators. The three hospitals in town were also built on funds given by wealthy Irkutsk merchants.

Other public institutions by 1894 included an orphanage, a school of "modern studies" (real'noe uchilishche), two high schools, a Red Cross unit, an ecclesiastical seminary, a music society, a society for aiding migrants, a doctor's society, and a public assembly hall for gala events — many of these in existence since the sixties and earlier. The mayor of Irkutsk, V. P. Sukachov, writing around 1890, claimed that "Irkutsk at present can justly be called a town of philanthropical and educational institutions," which were housed in the best and largest buildings in town. [97] On the other hand, a "democratization" of the Irkutsk intelligentsia had taken place much more slowly it had in "plebeian" Tomsk. An example of this was the delayed establishment in Irkutsk of an educational society like Makushin's in Tomsk. Moreover, even when such societies were founded in Irkutsk they

---

96 See L. Ia. Podol'skaia, ed., "Dnevnik Vagina," p. 124.

97 Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 118. See too Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II: 224-25.

enjoyed nowhere near the success obtained in Tomsk.[98] A book store on the model of Makushin's store was not opened in Irkutsk until 1893 — and was in fact a branch of Makushin's Tomsk store.

Of all the organizations in Irkutsk, though, the most prominent by far in local cultural and scientific life during the eighties and early nineties was the East Siberian Section of the Geographical Society. The Section, founded in 1851 by Muravyov, did not gain a successful status for itself without difficulties however. According to Potanin, the history of the Section was "the history of a constant, smouldering struggle with local higher authorities for the dignity of science, the history of the gradual conquest of autonomy for a scholarly society, and its transformation from a bureaucratic appendage to the governor-general's office into an active assembly of scholars recognizing no other authority than that of science."[99]

The gradual and hard-won success of the East Siberian Section and its museum received, however, a rude jolt in 1879 from the devastating fire that destroyed its headquarters and its fine scientific collections. Members of the Geographical Society, separate individual citizens, and scientific institutions elsewhere all joined together to rebuild a home for the Section. By 1883 a two-story edifice had been constructed which could accommodate the main offices, an auditorium, and the halls and rooms of the museum. Moreover, the various scietific collections of the museum had by then been reconstituted to some extent.

Popov, after visiting the Irkutsk Section in 1888, felt it "was the

---

98 Potanin, "Goroda Sibiri," p. 247.
99 Ibid., p. 241.

most active and productive among the sections of the Society. The Section was housed in its own building, and it had a splendid museum, the richest in Siberia, and indeed not only in Siberia but in all Russia, excluding the capitals." The library and museum, he added, were continually in use and were often frequented by foreign scholars. [100] Potanin too paid tribute to the Section and its "very strong influence on the education of Irkutsk society." In particular, he praised its museum and its theatre:

> The first served to propagate scientific knowledge, nourished respect for science, and was also the only arena for expressing political sympathies and opinions. The theatre developed artistic tastes in the population; thanks to the directors . . . not one Siberian town had such operas as Irkutsk did, which made Irkutsk the most musical town in Siberia. [101]

Among Siberians especially active in the affairs of the Section at this time were Vagin (in his various studies and investigations), the Irkutsk mayor, Sukachov, who was chairman of the Section from 1891 to 1895, and Pisarev and Potanin, who served as Managers of Affairs. During a four-year stay in Irkutsk from 1886 to 1890, Potanin participated directly in the affairs of the Section. On returning to Irkutsk from an expedition to China, he accepted in 1886 the position of the Section's Manager of Affairs, hoping that this would allow him extra time to prepare materials collected on the expedition for publication. It seems, too, that Potanin wanted to take advantage of the increasingly active cultural life that Irkutsk now had to offer. In 1887, for instance, he helped persuade Yadrintsev to move the Eastern Review to the East Siberian capital.

In Irkutsk Potanin immersed himself in the activities of the Section,

---

100 Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II: 118-19, 212. Popov, in fact, was curator of the museum from 1894 to 1897.

101 Potanin, "Goroda Sibiri," p. 243. From what Potanin indicates, the Section's theatre was not the same as the public theatre described above on p. 560.

giving speeches and lectures, and petitioning authorities for various improvements. He was instrumental in adding to the museum's exhibits a large and successful display of Buddhist deities, costumes, and statuettes, which he obtained from local collectors and lamaseries in the Irkutsk area. He was also active in initiating research on the life and history of the local Buryats — both shamanist and Buddhist. The results of these investigations Potanin edited in the first volumes of the Russian Geographical Society's ethnographical division. Under his direction the activities of the Section and its museum both enlivened and increased. The Section opened up subdivisions in physical geography and statistics, and it inuagurated a series of Sunday lectures which drew not only substantial attendance but also donations. Moreover, under Potanin's editorship the Proceedings of the Section increased its publication to five times a year instead of the previous once or twice.[102] No wonder Potanin compared the Irkutsk Section to Makushin's school society in Tomsk.

Potanin's social life, apart from affairs of the Section, was quite active, and the well-known explorer-regionalist became a center of attraction in Irkutsk. N.M. Mendelsohn tells of when, as a high-school student in Irkutsk, he first got to know Potanin and his wife, Alexandra. "In their modest room, small and low, amidst representatives of the Irkutsk intelligentsia, political exiles, and student youth, Mongols and Buryats were often there." Both guests and hosts greatly enjoyed these social occasions.[103] During these four years, however, all these activities did not permit Potanin

---

102 V. Obruchev, Potanin, pp. 213-14.

103 I. I. Popov and N. M. Mendel'son, "Iz vospominanii o G. N. Potanine" (From Recollections of G. N. Potanin), Golos Minuvshego, (June 1922) no. 1, p. 151.

to write up much of the projected account of his expedition, and in autumn of 1890 he left for Petersburg with his wife to finish the work. Nevertheless, during these four years Potanin (now in his fifties) "served" his Siberian homeland especially diligently. On completing his writing in 1891, Potanin was free to plan a second expedition to China (undertaken in 1892-1893).

Also active in the East Siberian Section were exiles, both Russian and Polish. Perhaps the most outstanding of these was Dmitry Alexandrovich Klements (1848-1914). As a member of the second "Land and Liberty" group and editor of its paper, Klements had been arrested in 1879 and was exiled to Siberia. After spending time in Minusinsk, Klements arrived in Irkutsk in 1891 and soon became curator of the Section's museum. Not long afterward he was chosen Manager of Affairs. Just before his departure from Irkutsk in 1894 he organized the well-known Yakutsk expedition, led by the exile-anthropologists Waldemar Jochelson and V. G. Bogoraz, and subsidized by the Siberian philanthropist I. M. Sibiryakov. Of Klements' three-year stay in Irkutsk Popov writes:

> He quickly became a central figure in Irkutsk, head of the Geographical Society, and Yadrintsev's co-editor in the Eastern Review, where "Nurgali" (Klements) conducted satires on the evils of the day, in which the public became engrossed. For the Section's fortieth anniversary [in 1891] Klements composed a brilliant account of the Section's activity, conducted a systematic explanation of the collections, had members of the Section read reports, [and] organized a number of expeditions . . . [104]

104 I. I. Popov, "D. A. Klements. Ego zhizn' i deiatel'nost'" (D. A. Klements: His Life and Activity), in D. A. Klements, Iz proshlogo; Vospominaniia (Leningrad, 1925), pp. 51-52. On Klements and the Yakutsk expedition, also see Semenov, ed., Istoriia Geograficheskago Obshchestva, III: 1037-1039.

Among other Russian exiles involved in the activities of the Section were Popov, who became curator of the museum in 1894, and Yekaterina K. Breshko-Breshkovskaya (1844-1934), a subsequently prominent Socialist Revolutionary, later known as the "Grandmother of the Russian Revolution."[105] A number of Poles exiled to Eastern Siberia after the 1863 Insurrection had been quite active in strictly scientific research for the Section. Among those who gained a high reputation were Aleksander Czekanowski and Jan Czerski, for their geological investigations, Benedykt Dybowski, for his hydrobiological studies of Lake Baikal, and N. I. Witkowski, archeologist and successor to Klements as museum curator in the early 1890's. With the imperial manifesto of May 1883, however, many of the prominent Polish exile-scholars were allowed to return home, and they left Irkutsk soon thereafter. "All the members of this group," wrote Potanin, "served to adorn the Geographical Society in Irkutsk, enlivened its activity, and with their works created a brilliant episode in the history of this society."[106]

By the late 1880's there were between 20 and 25 political exiles in Irkutsk, some of them making a mark in newspaper work. Besides Klements and Popov, those active on the Eastern Review included S. L. Chudnovsky, formerly of the second Land and Liberty group and an accomplished economist and statistician; the Polish writer Wacław Sieroszewski; the "Jacobin" revolutionary Pyotr G. Zaichnevsky, in and out of exile since 1862; and the future Socialist Revolutionary Mark A. Natanson (1850-1919), who previously

---

105 See Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II: 206, 213.
106 Potanin, "Goroda Sibiri," pp. 237-38. On these Polish scholar-exiles see Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 610; Nikolaev, "Sibirskaia ssylka," p. 103; Obruchev, Potanin, p. 212; and above, pp. 97-98.

had been exiled in the Russian North with Yadrintsev in the early 1870's.[107] The exiles of this period generally got along well among themselves and usually gathered in the offices of the Eastern Review, of the East Siberian Section, and of a local fur-exporting firm (which employed many of them). One frequent topic of discussion (among many others) among the exiles was the question, which is better: Russia or Siberia? [108]

Several contemporary observers attest to the fact that the administrative power of the authorities was exercised more mildly in Irkutsk than in most other Siberian towns. This circumstance tended to attract exiles, when given a choice of residence in Siberia, to Irkutsk. Potanin wrote that "nowhere in Siberia has administrative authority been so disciplined by sensitive public opinion as it has been in Irkutsk; at least in no other town has it treated public opinion with greater caution than here." Other Siberians event went so far as to call Irkutsk as "Athens." [109]

One example of the strength of public opinion in Irkutsk occurred in 1883, when Governor-General Anuchin ordered a high-school teacher, G. K. Neustroev (a Yakut), shot for having made a slur in his presence. Perhaps for the first time since the Beklemishev-Nekliudov affair of 1859 did Irkutsk society become as indignant as it did over this unjustified execution. Vagin, in his diary, noted that he did not "remember such a general agitation for a long time." Vagin printed a notice in Siberia openly referring to a

---

107 See Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II: 121, 213, 205, 216, 118.
108 Ibid., II: 123.
109 Potanin, "Goroda Sibiri," p. 241. See also Nikolaev, "Sibirskaia ssylka," p. 102.

"brutal murder." Though the police duly made inquiries regarding this notice, it came to nothing. Indeed, Anuchin was soon removed from his post. Anuchin's removal, however, was due much less to the force of public opinion than to his having disregarded instructions from Alexander III giving him the right to pardon Neustroev. [110]

In the early 1880's Irkutsk's three newspapers were the official Irkutsk Provincial Gazette, the ecclesiastical Irkutsk Diocesan Gazette, and the privately owned Siberia. Though Zagoskin, one of the founders of Siberia, had by now for the most part retired to a nearby village, he still wrote occasional articles for the Irkutsk paper. After its suppression in 1888, he contributed to the newly-transferred Eastern Review a series of articles entitled "Letters from the Village"; in these he stressed the problems of the Siberian peasantry. Popov relates how many of the local inhabitants and exiles annually went to visit Zagoskin and his wife at Granovshchina to pay their respects on his name day, September 6. Another founder of Siberia, the former Cossack colonel and participant in the Siberian independence affair, Andrei Nesterov, continued to support the paper until its end. Still another regionalist active in the affairs of Siberia at this time was Mikhail Ya. Pisarev, a local physician (and prominent in the Irkutsk Society of Doctors). Until the very end Siberia concentrated its attention on local and regional problems, omitting nothing that affected Siberian society. [111]

By the late 1880's several new periodicals were published in Irkutsk: the News of the Irkutsk Municipal Duma, founded in 1886, and from 1888 on,

---

110 Podol'skaia, ed., "Dnevnik Vagina," p. 241; and Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II: 66. According to Belokonsky, Neustroev had given Anuchin a "box on the ear," which was probably "the consequence of a very strong nervous disorder, bordering on irresponsibility" (Dan' Vremeni, p. 237).

111 On Zagoskin, Nesterov, and Pisarev, see Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II: 226; see also, Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 212.

Yadrintsev's Eastern Review and its appendage publication, the Siberian Anthology.[112] Besides these periodicals, however, there were almost no books privately published in Irkutsk — a phenomenon caused by the lack of a regular censor for such. Sukachov's comment regarding this was:

> The question of censorship for Irkutsk is very important. Until there is a permanent censor immediately subject to either the Main Administration of press affairs or the nearest censorial committee, publishing activity is unthinkable here. To print or publish a book in absentia, some thousands of versts away, can be done only in rare and extreme cases.

This usually entailed a personal trip to Petersburg or Moscow, and it explains why almost all the books concerning Siberia were published in the two capitals.[113]

By the early 1890's the two focal points of intellectual and cultural activity in Tomsk were the university and Makushin's "Society for the Promotion of Primary Education." The struggle between the Tomsk papers and with officialdom had by now subsided, leaving one major casualty, the demise of the Siberian Gazette. By this same time in Irkutsk, however, the two centers of intellectual and cultural ferment had become the East Siberian Section of the Geographical Society and the Eastern Review. One notable casualty was evident here — the newspaper Siberia. Most Siberian towns, however, did not even have one prominent organization or center to generate intellectual and cultural progress. Nevertheless, by the early nineties significant improvements and innovations were made in a half-dozen or more of the smaller Siberian towns to arouse and uplift local society.

---

112 For a description of Irkutsk's seven periodicals as of 1892, see Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 695.

113 Sukachev, Irkutsk, pp. 213-14.

Development of Smaller Siberian Towns

One of the more important towns in the awakening of Siberian public consciousness in the 1880's was Minusinsk, a town of about 6,000 inhabitants, nestled in the Sayan foothills of the upper Yenisei valley. Playing somewhat the same social, scientific, and education role in Minusinsk as the East Siberian Section of the Geographical Society was doing in Irkutsk was the public museum, founded in 1877. Indeed, its founder and director, Nikolai Mikhailovich Martyanov, can be said to have played in this small Siberian community a role not unlike Makushin's in Tomsk. Over the years Martyanov's museum and the adjoining library attracted public attention and support from all over Siberia, and they drew visitors and scholars from various parts of Siberia, and from Russia, Europe, and even the United States in achieving an international reputation.

Long before Martyanov's coming to Minusinsk, however, the soil had been prepared locally by numerous educated exiles in the area, among them Decembrists, Poles, and even Petrashevsky himself (after his deportation from Irkutsk). Ivan Belokonsky, a political exile in Minusinsk in the 1880's, thus wrote:

> One must say that the high educational level of these newcomers could not but have a favorable effect . . . at least on a significant percentage of the residents of Minusinsk and the district.
>
> In the district and in the town itself were people whose teachers had been Decembrists and Poles of the old exile [the 1830's], or if not literally teachers, then, so to speak, examples of culture in its various manifestations. Sectarians, especially rationalists, also contributed without a doubt to a certain awakening of thought in the mass of the population.
>
> It is difficult, of course, to undertake a strict analysis of the influence of these elements on the everyday milieu, but one thing is clear: that they

> created a certain atmosphere which at least was not opposed to cultural undertakings but regarded them rather sympathetically.
>
> . . . Before N. M. Martyanov's arrival no one had paid attention to these elements, since no one was interested, except for personal ends, in the wealth and variety of Minusinsk district. [114]

The future founder of the museum, Martyanov, had come to Minusinsk in 1874 and had begun work there as a local pharmacist. Just graduated from the University of Kazan, where he had majored in botany, soon after his arrival he began putting together collections of local plants, insects, birds, mineral and rock specimens, and objects of local ethnic origin. [115] Devoting a few hours a day to scientific study, Martyanov would make a dozen or more identical collections of whatever plants and minerals he could find in a hour's walk from town. After carefully classifying and labelling the specimens, he would send one of these collections to every country schoolteacher in the district, requesting that the pupils be asked to make similar collections in their locality. Martyanov requested then that the specimens be sent back to him. The response was sympathetic, and soon collections of rocksaand flowers poured in. Despite much worthless material, some of it was of great value. Moreover, Martyanov also exchanged some of his collections with those of other scientists elsewhere in Russia. By such means he built up an aggregate collection of 1500 different objects in two years' time. [116]

As time went on, however, his collections became too large for his

---

114 I. P. Bielokonskii, "N. M. Mart'ianov i minusinskii muzei, 1877-1902 g." (N. M. Martyanov and the Minusinsk Museum: 1877-1902), Vestnik Evropy, (April 1902), pp. 751-52. Among the Decembrists were the Belyaev and Kryukov brothers, Mozgalevsky, and Tyutchev. The houses of Decembrists even set a model for building subsequent homes in town.

115 Kennan, Siberia and the Exile System, II: 390. To date I have been unable to determine when and where Martyanov was born.

116 Kennan, Siberia and the Exile System, II: 391.

private apartment. According to Klements, the idea of a museum crossed his mind, but it would have been unheard of in those days to announce such an idea openly in Minusinsk. Despite objections and discouraging remarks from close friends, in time he found someone to champion the idea of a public museum, the mayor of Minusinsk, Gusev. Though lacking a formal education and not considered one of the town's "intelligentsia," Gusev was "an innovator by nature," and he brought up the question of establishing a public museum in Minusinsk before the town duma. Upon his initiative, the proposal was approved. The mayor personally provided enough money for shelving, cases, and chairs, while Martyanov's private collections formed the initial basis for the museum. The official inauguration took place on January 10, 1877.[117]

Martyanov now became director of the museum, which was located in two rooms of the lower floor of a local school. As both donations and the size of the collections increased, he divided the museum into six sections: natural history, archeology and anthropology, ethnology, technology and industry, agriculture, and education. A weather station was soon established in connection with the museum, and in 1878 Martyanov opened a library. The museum's main task, as Martyanov saw it, was to serve as a central point for collecting information and spreading knowledge of natural and physical science, both in general and of Minusinsk and the district in particular.[118]

The museum was open to the public for several days a week. Not only

---

117 D. Klements, "Miestnye muzei i ikh znachenie v provintsial'noi zhizni. (Publichnaia lektsiia, chitannaia v Kiakhtie 8-go oktiabria 1892 goda)" (Local Museums and Their Significance in Provincial Life: A Public Lecture Presented in Kyakhta on October 8, 1892), Sibirskii Sbornik, (1892) no. 2, pp. 26-27. See also "Minusinskii muzei i N. M. Mart'ianov" (The Minusinsk Museum and N. M. Martyanov), Istoricheskii Viestnik, (1902) v. 87, p. 1196; and Bielokonskii, "N. M. Mart'ianov," p. 755.

118 Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 699; Kennan, Siberia, II: 392; and "Minusinskii muzei," p. 1198.

were the exhibits classified and explained, but the museum also began to publish catalogs describing its holdings. The growth of the museum over the years was rapid. In 1877 there were 1,270 objects pertaining to natural history; 8,471 in 1881; and roughly 15,000 by 1895. In 1892, of the 57,000 total objects contained in the various museums of Eastern Siberia, almost half (28,000) belonged to the Minusinsk museum. The library held 3,700 volumes in 1880; by 1890 about 13,000; and by 1896 over 17,000 volumes. The number of annual visits to the museum reached as high as 10,000 on occasion.[119]

As quarters in the two rooms of the school soon became cramped, by 1885 the location was changed to six or seven rooms in the duma building. Even here accommodations became crowded once again. Martyanov was able to get enough public sympathy and contributions to have a separate stone building constructed for the museum and its library in 1889. The Siberian philanthropist I. M. Sibiryakov contributed over half of the necessary funds, most of the rest coming from local donations.[120] Martyanov was not only active in the administrative and more sedentary affairs of the museum. He was also quite involved in exploratory and rock-collecting excursions in the vicinity and helped sponsor expeditions undertaken by others. Among these was the expedition led by Adrianov and Klements in 1883 into the mountainous area south of Minusinsk.

Besides support from local sources and from regional benefactors, the museum enjoyed the encouragement from regional Siberian newspapers. Even

---

119 The figures are taken from "Minusinskii muzei," p. 1199; Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 700; and Klements, "Miestnye muzei," p. 26.

120 Klements, "Miestnye muzei," p. 29; and Kennan, Siberia, II: 392, 395.

such higher authorities as Governor-General D. G. Anuchin (hardly a liberal) looked upon Martyanov's efforts with sympathy. Potanin asserted that

> it is really impossible to point to one institution in Siberia which was so completely and fully indebted to society for its existence, without the assistance of the administration, as was the Martyanov museum. Even the Siberian university could not collect as much sympathy, owing to the fact that it was in part a creation of the administration. [121]

With financial contributions the museum was able to print up various catalogs and even an atlas, and published works of various local researchers under its auspices. Klements concluded that "it is proven that a local museum is really one of the institutions most suitable for studying a locality, especially in such a country as our Siberia." [122]

George Kennan, who visited the museum in 1886, felt that "it is, in every sense of the word, the creation of Mr. Martianof, and it represents, almost exclusively, his own individual skill and labor." Klements, however, tended to disagree: "Many attribute everything to his personal qualities and skill in attracting people. Of course, very many helped the museum only for Martyanov's sake; but then, many worked unconsciously for the sake of the cause." Popov takes still another view: it was Klements who "breathed life into the museum through his scientific work and created a world reputation for the Minusinsk museum." He argues that before Klements' arrival on the scene in 1881, the museum was barely known even in Siberia. [123]

On his trip to investigate the conditions of Siberian exile, George Kennan undertook a special detour to Minusinsk "partly because it contained

---

121 Potanin, "Gorodą Sibiri," pp. 256-57.
122 Klements, "Miestnye muzei," p. 28.
123 Kennan, Siberia, II: 390; Klements, "Miestnye muzei," pp. 28-29; and Popov, "D. A. Klements," p. 11, 43.

the largest and most important museum of archæology and natural history in Siberia, and partly because it was the place of exile of a number of prominent Russian liberals and revolutionists." Armed with a letter of introduction from Yadrintsev, Kennan found Martyanov working in the small drug store, which he still owned. Kennan spoke of the favorable accounts of the museum he had heard in Tomsk, Krasnoyarsk, Irkutsk, and Petersburg, and claimed he could not leave Siberia before having seen it. As he later commented:

> The Minusinsk museum, of which all educated Siberians are now deservedly proud, is a striking illustration of the results that may be attained by unswerving devotion to a single purpose, and steady, persistent work for its accomplishment. . . . When he /Martyanov/ emigrated to Siberia, in 1874, there was not a public institution of the kind, so far as I know, in all the country, except the half-dead, half-alive museum in Barnaul; and the idea of promoting popular education and cultivating a taste for science by making and exhibiting classified collections of plants, minerals, and archæological relics had hardly suggested itself even to teachers by profession. [124]

Martyanov's museum in Minusinsk was the oldest local, public museum of its kind in Siberia. Not long after it was established, however, other local museums arose in the 1880's in such Siberian towns as Yeniseisk, Tomsk, Krasnoyarsk, Nerchinsk, and Tobolsk. In the 1890's Yakutsk and other towns followed suit. Many of these were organized along the same lines as the Minusinsk museum, though only a few of them had their own private building or scientific publications. Most of them developed on public initiative, and many sponsored their own scientific expeditions, influenced by Martyanov's example. Klements saw this public initiative (often in conjunction

---

124 Kennan, Siberia, II: 386, 390. The museum of the East Siberian Section, dating back to 1851, was not considered a local museum.

with dumas or other local organizations) with respect to museums as evidence of "maturity and understanding of their responsibilities." [125]

As a political exile sent to Minusinsk in 1881, Dmitry Klements worked closely with Martyanov for six years. Klements did not find it hard to make the transition from a revolutionary (involved in the Chaikovsky populist circle and the Land and Liberty group) to a Siberian man of affairs, explorer, and scientific investigator for more than twenty years — with a regionalist outlook to boot. On completing his term of exile in 1894, Klements (in the words of another Minusinsk exile, Belokonsky), "enthused by the study of anthropology and ethnology of the peoples of Siberia and Mongolia, willingly spent ten more years in the 'land of exile'," returning to Russia permanently only in 1904. [126] Klements' biggest contributions to the Minusinsk museum was perhaps the catalog he compiled describing the museum's archeological collection. [127] His own geological and archeological investigations of Minusinsk district were published in the News of the Russian Geographical Society in the late 1880's and early 1890's. Besides this work of his own, Klements was instrumental in drawing other political exiles into the area of scientific research too.

Consequently, Klements was not the only political exile in Minusinsk active in museum affairs. Indeed, Prince A. A. Kropotkin, brother of the by now well-known anarchist Peter Kropotkin, managed the museum's weather station from 1877 to 1882. In this he was succeeded by Ivan Belokonsky, who headed the station from 1882 to 1884. Two other exiles in Minusinsk,

---

125 Klements, "Miestnye muzei," p. 31.
126 I. P. Belokonskii, Dan' Vremeni, p. 296.
127 Klements, Drevnosti minusinskago muzeia (The Antiquities of Minusinsk Museum), (Tomsk, 1886). For full titles of Klements' other works in this period, see Nikolaev, "Sibirskaia ssylka," p. 99.

T. O. Lukashevich and P. A. Argunov, wrote important works dedicated to the museum: a history of the museum's first decade of existence, and a work on the agriculture of the Minusinsk district, respectively.

It is worth noting that the chief figures involved in the cultural and scientific awakening in Minusinsk, as far as can be determined, appear to have been men of other than local origin. The small size of the town, in contrast to Tomsk and Irkutsk, almost foreordained that Minusinsk's reputation as a cultural and scientific oasis should depend chiefly on a few industrious outsiders, such as Martyanov and Klements. As for the town itself, Potanin remarked in 1908 that "despite the existence of such an institution in it, social life there differs little from the sluggish life of other towns." Indeed, he felt that sympathy toward the museum was greater in neighboring Krasnoyarsk than in Minusinsk itself.[128] Thus, even after 30 years of the museum's existence the maturation of society in Minusinsk had developed much more slowly than it had in the larger Siberian towns.

Among Siberian towns Tobolsk was not only the oldest, but was also until the early 19th century one of the most important and prestigious among them. Located in Western Siberia, close to the spot where Yermak and his Cossack troops had defeated the Tatar khan of Sibir, Tobolsk had since become the administrative and ecclesiastical capital of Siberia. During the reign of Catherine II, when Siberia was divided up into several lieutenancies, Tobolsk began to yield its administrative pre-eminence to other towns, and especially to Irkutsk. Nevertheless, Tobolsk held on to its reputation as the "mother of Siberian cities," a kind of Siberian Kiev; indeed, it also

---

128 Potanin, "Goroda Sibiri," p. 257.

possessed ancient relics in its own St. Sophia Cathedral, just as did Kiev and Novgorod in their cathedrals of the same name. Potanin, in fact, considered Tobolsk to have engendered the "third stage in the spread of Russian Christianity" (after the Kiev and Novgorod "stages"), serving as a center for the extension of Orthodoxy beyond the Urals.[129] Despite its administrative, religious, commercial, and, later on, intellectual significance (in the days of Slovtsov and Yershov), Potanin claimed that the town would have turned into just an ordinary provincial town by the mid-nineteenth century, if large silver deposits had not been found nearby, giving it an industrial base.[130]

Tobolsk in the 19th century became increasingly isolated as major trade routes between Siberia and Russia, both road and, subsequently, railroad, developed to the south. Tomsk gradually became the chief trading center of Western Siberia, and with Speransky's division of Siberia into two governor-generalships in 1822, the seat of the West Siberian administration was soon thereafter transferred from Tobolsk to Omsk (though Tobolsk still retained a provincial governor). With respect to population, Tobolsk in 1825 was still the largest town in Siberia — with 16,994 residents. By 1884, however, the population had risen only to 17,503, and Tobolsk placed fourth in size among Siberian towns.[131]

In the early 19th century Tobolsk was known for it ecclesiastical seminary, and it was one of the first towns in Siberia to have a secondary school (gimnaziia). The town was also noted for its famous monument dedicated to Yermak, "conqueror of Siberia," erected in 1839. One Russian

---

129 Potanin, "Goroda Sibiri," p. 251.
130 Ibid., p. 251-52.
131 Tobolsk ranked far behind Tomsk, Irkutsk, and Omsk at this time; see Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 465, 561-62, 749-50.

observer, recalling his stay in Tobolsk during the 1870's, stated that "it was evident that the spirit of Yermak, along with his monument, prevails in the town . . . , and it does not wish to give in to any novelties." [132] Even at the end of the century, when the population exceeded 20,000, the relative stagnation was still apparent: amidst many aged buildings few new ones were to be seen, and the nearest railroad connections were far to the south. [133]

Nevertheless, by the early 1890's the cultural and civic awakening which permeated the larger Siberian towns also caught up with Tobolsk. The chief manifestations of this were the publication of several new newspapers and the establishment of a local museum. Here too, local Siberians of a regionalist bent, educated and dedicated exiles, and public-minded administrators all contributed to this development in Tobolsk. The first new paper to emerge at this time was the Tobolsk Diocesan Gazette, founded in 1883. [134] The first private secular newspaper in Tobolsk, the Siberian Leaflet, began publication in late 1890 and came out twice weekly. Published by the Siberian, A. A. Syromyatnikov, the paper took a regionalist approach, despite its "fratricidal polemic" with the Eastern Review in 1891. [135] Nevertheless, a year later Yadrintsev wrote that the Leaflet "tried sincerely and

---

132 P. P. Suvorov, "Zapiski o proshlom," p. 693.

133 See P. Golovachev, Sibir', p. 281. Only recently has a railroad to Tobolsk (from Tyumen) been under construction.

134 Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 732. By 1884 there were four ecclesiastical newspapers in Siberia: in Irkutsk, Tomsk, Tobolsk, and the Yeniseisk Diocesan Gazette, established in Krasnoyarsk in 1884.

135 During Yadrintsev's absence the Eastern Review called for more protection and privileges for the Siberian gold industry; the Leaflet (Sibirskii Listok) not only attacked this position as detrimental to the interests of Siberians, but also reproached Yadrintsev for putting archeology ahead of pressing regional problems. See above, pp. 499-500. Popov claims the dispute involved the immigration question (Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II: 204).

honestly to regard Siberian problems affected by present-day life." In 1894, when Yadrintsev visited the editorial office of the Leaflet in person, he commented on the liveliness and "correctness" of the paper's direction and found its editor, Zubkovsky, to be excellent. [136]

In April 1889 a local historical museum was founded in Tobolsk, supported by a special committee, whose president was the governor of Tobolsk province. According to Klements, "This example demonstrates what a well-intentioned administrator can do for the benefit of the region's enlightenment." [137] The Tobolsk museum was fortunate in that a building to house it was provided at the outset, the first such case in Siberia; indeed, as of late 1893 only the Tobolsk and Minusinsk local museums had their very own quarters. Prominent in the activities of the Tobolsk museum from the start, was the exile L. E. Lugovsky, who came to Tobolsk province in 1883. Lugovsky had helped prepare the museum's establishment, including its statute, in 1889. He also founded and edited the museum's yearly publication, the Annual, from 1893 to 1897, engaging in scientific research on the side. Moreover, he was secretary of the museum board from 1890 to his death in 1898. [137]

During the second half of the century the third largest Siberian town was Omsk. From a small military outpost on the edge of the Kirghiz steppe with little over 8,000 inhabitants in 1825, Omsk by 1858 had grown to have a population of 18,676. By 1884 the population had almost doubled (to 30,890), and by the turn of the century Omsk could boast approximately

---

136 See Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 685; and Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 190.

137 Klements, "Miestnye muzei," p. 31; and Nikolaev, "Sibirskaia ssylka," p. 95. Klements asserts the Tobolsk museum was founded in 1887; however, Nikolaev's source, which indicates 1889, appears more reliable.

43,000 residents.[138] This steady increase in Omsk's population was due in part to its becoming an important administrative center. Soon after Speransky's reforms of 1822, Omsk became the residence of the West Siberian governor-general. And after 1882, when this administrative entity was abolished, Omsk became the capital of the newly created Steppe Territory, which encompassed much of southwestern Siberia. Also of great significance for Omsk at the end of the century was the construction of the Trans-Siberian Railroad, which ran directly through the town.

Despite its relatively large size, its administrative importance, and its belated emergence as an important commercial and railroad center, Omsk remained far behind both Tomsk and Irkutsk in terms of material wealth, cultural life, and public spiritedness. Potanin points out that in these respects Omsk's unfortunate situation was in large part due to the attitudes of the top local administrators. Thus, the "unhealthy tradition" of Western Siberia's first governor-general, the "despotic" P. M. Kaptsevich, continued on until the 1860's, and before 1881 only Governor-General Kaznakov had left a good impression among local Siberians. According to Potanin, who knew the town well in his youth,

> The population of Omsk thus remained without those beneficial influences that came to Irkutsk. Even if the governors-general had had educated retinues, they would not have found a receptive soil here. Omsk was always a poor town, without any commercial significance. There were no wealthy merchants at all, and the small businessmen were even few compared to other towns. A significant percentage of the population consisted of retired officers, officials, and soldiers. . . . This abundance of offi-

---

138 Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 465, 561-62, 589, 749; and Golovachev, Sibir', p. 281. According to Yakushev's figures, Omsk in 1897 had 37,376 inhabitants (Sibir' v tsifrakh, p. 12).

> cials, both employed and retired, transformed Omsk into a town of Akaky Akakieviches.[139] . . . In the club there was only one member of the bourgeoisie, a wine dealer. Nowhere in Siberia was there such an alienation of educated society from the masses aw in Omsk; the intelligentsia here did not serve the local population. . . . Omsk never had an institution which would focus on the sympathies of the whole area, as did the Tomsk school society or the museum of the Geographical Society in Irkutsk.[140]

George Kennan, who passed through Omsk in 1885, had the following comments:

> If I were asked to characterize Omsk in a few words, I should describe it as a city of 30,000 inhabitants, in which the largest building is a military academy and the most picturesque building a police station; in which there is neither a newspaper nor a public library, and in which one-half the population wears the Tsar's uniform and makes a business of governing the other half.[141]

Indeed, an educated but languishing resident of Omsk had summed up the intellectual side of this picture in 1875: "Somewhere beyond the Urals, three to five thousand versts away, there is life; there humanity struggles for a better form of life; there they fight for ideas . . . But what is there here? An undisturbed sleep, an impenetrable darkness, and no hope of any sort."[142]

Nevertheless, in keeping with the changing spirit of the times in Siberia during the 1880's and 1890's, Omsk also witnessed new developments, limited though they were. As seen above, the West Siberian Section of the Geographical Society was founded in Omsk in 1877. During the next two decades its activities were definitely fewer and smaller in scope than those of the older East Siberian Section. Besides occasional expeditions which

---

139 An impoverished bureaucrat and the "hero" of Gogol's Overcoat.
140 Potanin, "Goroda Sibiri," pp. 250-51.
141 Kennan, Siberia and the Exile System, I: 140-41.
142 Quoted in Jadrinzew, Sibirien, p. 407.

it sponsored, the Omsk Section established a little museum, which was, according to Kennan, "the only evidence of culture that the city afforded."[143] During the 1890's, however, a series of free public lectures on various scientific subjects was organized in conjunction with the Section, various exiles being well represented among both lecturers and audiences.[144] Omsk in the early 1890's also witnessed the birth of its first newspaper in 1893, which soon became one of the more important organs in Siberia. At first called the Steppe Leaflet, by 1894 it was renamed the Steppe Territory and came out twice a week.[145]

Soon after the Trans-Siberian Railroad reached Omsk in the mid-1890's the town was almost completely transformed. Already having made the transition from a "military camp" along the frontier to an administrative center and haven for officialdom, Omsk subsequently was to become a booming center for grain and livestock shipping. Indeed, just after the Bolshevik Revolution Omsk was to surpass both Irkutsk and Tomsk in size and economic importance, and during the 1920's it temporarily became the largest city in Siberia.[146]

The three other towns most prominent in Western Siberia toward the end of the 19th century were, moving from west to east, Tyumen, Semipalatinsk, and Barnaul. According to one set of figures, in 1884 the population of Tyumen stood at 15,590; that of Semipalatinsk at 17,817; while Barnaul

---

143 G. Kennan, Siberia and the Exile System, I: 142.
144 P. Semenov, ed., Istoriia Geograficheskago Obshchestva, III: 1048; and Shvetsov, "Kul'turnoe znachenie," Katorga i Ssylka, no. 48, p. 93.
145 Shvetsov, "Kul'turnoe znachenie," no. 48, p. 90; and Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 191 n. The Russian titles are Stepnoi Listok and Stepnoi Krai.
146 See Iakushev, Sibir' v tsifrakh, p. 12. According to the 1961 census, Omsk had a population of 650,000, second in Siberia only to Novosibirsk.

counted 13,529 inhabitants.[147] Tyumen before construction of the Trans-Siberian Railroad served as an important communications center between European Russia and Siberia, directly linked to Tomsk and points east by rivers and highway. Moreover, Tyumen was the home of the notorious forwarding prison for exiles on their march eastward into Siberia. Economically and socially, it was an important factory town, noted for its leather goods and conservative industrialists, and was — in Potanin's words — "the most typical bourgeois town in Siberia."[148]

Tyumen was certainly not among the leading Siberian towns, culturally speaking. Only in 1879 did it first obtain its own high school. Tyumen's chief achievement by the mid-1880's in the area of culture and education was the establishment of an impressive school for modern studies, which occupied the largest and finest building in town. The school building had been erected and equipped by one of Tyumen's wealthy and public-spirited merchants, who then presented it to the town as a gift. According to Kennan, "One would hardly expect to find such a school in European Russia, to say nothing of Siberia, and indeed one might look far without finding such a school in the United States." The school even possessed a fine mechanical department and chemical laboratory with up-to-date equipment, plus an impressive art department and library.[149] The Tyumen museum, inspired by the example set by Martyanov in Minusinsk, with its large botanical collection, Kennan described as excellent. According to Shvetsov, this museum

---

147 Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 749.
148 Potanin, "Goroda Sibiri," p. 252; see also p. 235.
149 Kennan, Siberia and the Exile System, I: 107.

was one of the few in Western Siberia where political exiles did not have an important say in its establishment and maintenance.[150]

Due southeast of both Tyumen and Omsk lay Semipalatinsk, a commercial town on the caravan route to Central Asia, with a mixed population of Russians, Kazakhs, and Tatars. Nicknamed "the Devil's Sandbox" by local officers, Semipalatinsk gave the impression of a desert Moslem town, with its mosques, minarets, mullahs, camels, and swarthy nomads from the steppe. Nevertheless, some progress had been made since Dostoevsky's day, as the town now accommodated a small anthropological museum and a reading room. The former was evidently influenced by Martyanov's example. As for the reading room, Kennan writes that it was provided with "all the Russian newspapers and magazines, and a well-chosen collection of about one thousand books," among which were Spencer, Buckle, Mill, Huxley, Darwin, and Lyell. Most of the scientific works, however, the censor had expurgated, cutting out of them as many as sixty consecutive pages whenever something with a "dangerous" or "demoralizing" tendency appeared. In fact, special permission from the Ministry of Interior was needed before such a book could be issued to a reader on loan. Despite all this, Kennan concluded that this collection of books gave him "a better opinion of Semipalatinsk than anything that I had thus far seen or heard."[151]

In contrast to most WesteSiberian towns, Barnaul since the 18th century had been first and foremost an administrative and mining town, built on the silver, gold, and copper deposits of the nearby Altai. "Society" in Barnaul was, according to Potanin, split into three tiers: the top engi-

---

150 Shvetsov, "Kul'turnoe znachenie," Katorga i Ssylka, no. 48, p. 92.
151 Kennan, Siberia and the Exile System, I: 158, 160, 160 n.

neers, followed by local mining and administrative officials, along with merchants and infantry officers, and lastly the police officers connected with the mines. Of all the towns in Siberia, Barnaul had the closest connections with Petersburg, as gold caravans left there bound for the capital five times a year. Indeed, the connection was such that "in the 1860's one could find Herzen's works in the shops of Barnaul's arcades, but the influence of Herzen on the minds of Barnaul's engineers was just as superficial as Voltaire's influence was on the courtiers of Catherine II." [152]

As indicated earlier, the superficially brilliant social life of Barnaul that had flourished since the late 18th century came to a close with the closing of the government factories and mines in the 1860's. From this point on Barnaul's cultural development was to take off slowly but surely in a new, more solid direction. This new tendency revolved especially around one of Barnaul's best known native sons, Vasily Konstantinovich Shtilke. After an elementary education in the Barnaul mining school (reserved for sons of mining officials), young Shtilke had gone to the Tomsk secondary school, graduating in 1871. He then spent a year teaching at the Tomsk ecclesiastical school (bursa), under Makushin's directorship at the time. Following in the footsteps of countless Siberians who had gone west to study, Shtilke went in the early 1870's to the Petersburg Medical-Chirurgical Academy. And as with many of his predecessors, the general ideas of populism and of serving the people affected him strongly, and he returned soon thereafter to Siberia. [153]

---

152 Potanin, "Goroda Sibiri," p. 254.

153 I. P. Belokonskii, Dan' Vremeni, pp. 74-75. According to Shvetsov, however, Shtilke was banished to Barnaul for his connections with the populist Dmitry Lizogub, arrested in 1877 and subsequently hanged. See "Kul'turnoe znachenie," no. 47, p. 105.

Arriving in Barnaul in 1874, Shtilke decided to help improve the local educational situation, which, institutionally, then consisted of three elementary schools in a town of 13,000. After an unsatisfactory stint of private teaching he was finally able to get established in 1884 a "Society for the Care of Public Instruction." This organization, under the direction of Shtilke and V. Ya. Pokrovsky, attempted to improve education not only in Barnaul, but also in other towns and villages of the Altai Mountain District. Over a 23-year existence (1884-1907), the Society, like its counterpart in Tomsk, completed a number of projects. It established and maintained schools, libraries, a book store, and a new museum, sponsored local cultural events, and built a cultural center with a hall to accommodate 3,000 spectators. Yet of the 200,000 rubles collected and spent by this Barnaul organization during its existence, 85% of the expenditures went toward public education. [154]

Shtilke also played an important role in the Barnaul Municipal Duma, established in 1877. It is indicative of the lowly state of public interest at the time that in the first election of duma delegates to be held, only 1/15 of the total registered electorate voted, the lowest percentage of any Siberian town. [155] Shtilke's work toward promoting education and culture and toward invigorating local self-government in the duma brought little monetary remuneration. To support himself and his large family he had to give private lessons and teach in the mining school on the side. According to Belokonsky, he "had no personal life, everything was spent in public work." [156] As Barnaul was not permitted to have a newspaper of its

---

154 Belokonskii, Dan' Vremeni, pp. 75-76. Of all the achievements of the Society, Shvetsov considered the municipal library to be the "best and most valuable" ("Kul'turnoe znachenie," no. 47, p. 105).

155 Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 700.

156 Belokonskii, Dan' Vremeni, p. 76.

own (despite petitions for one), Shtilke did his best to fill this gap too, serving as Barnaul correspondent for Siberian newspapers elsewhere, namely the Siberian Gazette of Tomsk and the Siberian Leaflet of Tobolsk.

Barnaul had had a mining museum since mid-century. In contrast to most other local museums, however, it had not been established on the initiative of private individuals, be they local townsmen or political exiles, but by district authorities. It was perhaps for this reason that Kennan called it "half-dead, half-alive." [157] In 1891, however, a serious scientific society was organized by the exile S. P. Shvetsov and his wife. Going by the name of "Society for the Lovers of Altai Exploration," this organization, according to its founder,

> was the first scientific society in Western Siberia that did not enjoy government subsidies, either permanent or provisional; it existed solely on private funds, the flow of which was determined only by the intensiveness and productiveness of its activity. The society equipped scientific expeditions to the Altai, had its own printed organ — the Altai Anthology . . . , developed on its own initiative a one-day census of Barnaul, put together scientific collections, arranged public assemblies, etc. [158]

Needless,to say, Shtilke was, along with the Shvetsovs, one of the most important promoters of this society. Indeed, its activities became so impressive that in 1901, with governmental approval, it was converted into the Altai Subdivision of the West Siberian Section of the Geographical Society.

Directly north of Minusinsk, within the administrative boundaries of Eastern Siberia and along the banks of the Yenisei River, were located two fairly large towns — Yeniseisk and Krasnoyarsk. Both of them, founded in the 17th century, had grown only slowly since that time. By 1825 Yeniseisk

---

157 Kennan, Siberia and the Exile System, II: 390.
158 Shvetsov, "Kul'turnoe znachenie," Katorga i Ssylka, no. 48, pp. 93-94. The Russian title of the Society's journal was Altaiskii Sbornik.

had reached 5,500 inhabitants, while Krasnoyarsk did not exceed 3,000. With the rise and subsequent decline of the gold industry in the Yeniseisk area, the wealth and population of Yeniseisk rose and declined proportionately. By the 1880's Krasnoyarsk, located south of Yeniseisk and in a more advantageous position for east-west transport, had surpassed Yeniseisk in size, wealth, and importance. In 1884 its population exceeded 16,000, while slightly over 11,000 people lived in Yeniseisk. [159]

Of Yeniseisk's civic and cultural life in the 1880's little can be said. With the town growing somewhat poorer each year, there was less of the initiative toward innovation witnessed in other more thriving Siberian towns. As seen above, the Yeniseisk Municipal Duma, led by N. V. Skornyakov, played an important part in setting off the commemoration of Siberia's tricentennial. Skornyakov also directed the local library. The other notable public institution was the museum, established in 1884 on the initiative of a local citizen, A. I. Kytmanov. Soon thereafter an accompanying weather station was set up, and various expeditions (led by Kytmanov and others) were undertaken under the museum's auspices. [160]

Krasnoyarsk, according to Anton Chekhov, was "the finest and most beautiful of all Siberian cities." [161] Like Yeniseisk, however, it was greatly dependent on the ups and downs of the gold industry. In addition, though, it bore a strong administrative, official character, serving as capital of Yeniseisk province. Many of the civic and cultural improvements during the eighties and nineties in Krasnoyarsk owed their existence to charitable gold

---

159 Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 465, 750.
160 Klements, "Miestnye muzei," pp. 30-31; Nikolaev, "Sibirskaia ssylka," p. 98; and Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 651.
161 Anton Chekhov, "Across Siberia" (1890), in The Unknown Chekhov. Stories and Writings Hitherto Untranslated (New York: Noonday, 1954), p. 304.

entrepreneurs. First among these was the Kuznetsov family, which generously aided the construction of a town hospital, a girls' high school, a public library, and a public museum.[162] Indeed, one of the pillars of cultured Krasnoyarsk society in the 1880's was Innokenty Kuznetsov, whose hospitality George Kennan so glowingly described:

> How pleasant it was, after months of rough life in dirty post-stations or vermin-infested hotels, to come suddenly into such a house as that of the Kuznetsofs; to find ourselves surrounded by flowers, books, pictures, and innumerable other evidences of cultured taste; to hear good music; to talk with intelligent men and women who did not tell us harrowing stories of imprisonment and exile — all this the reader can hardly imagine.[163]

Innokenty Kuznetsov was also a strong supporter of the Martyanov museum in Minusinsk and made important contributions in archeological research. In 1890 he published an important collection of documents on seventeenth-century Siberia.[164]

Also prominent in the Krasnoyarsk gold business was the Yudin family. Gennady M. Yudin (1840-1912) was also a significant Siberian publicist in his own right, and by the late 1890's he had built up a private library in Krasnoyarsk that was the second largest in Siberia, second only to the university library in Tomsk.[165] Like Kuznetsov, Yudin was interested in early Siberian history, and in the early 1890's he published A. A. Titov's monograph on seventeenth-century Siberia.

The rather bleak cultural milieu in Krasnoyarsk between the days of

---

162 Potanin, "Goroda Sibiri," p. 251.
163 Kennan, Siberia and the Exile System, I: 359-60.
164 I. Kuznetsov, Istoricheskiia akty XVII stolietiia (1632-1699). Materialy dlia istorii Sibiri (Tomsk, 1890).
165 Golovachev, Sibir', p. 283. Yudin's library of 80,000 volumes was sold in 1907 to the Library of Congress in Washington, D. C. for $40,000.

Shashkov and the "revival" of the 1880's was epitomized by the closure of the public library in 1875 due to the lack of interested readers. Indeed, this event was hardly noticed in an environment which then displayed "not the slightest trace of intellectual interests."[166] This unfortuante situation, however, did not remain for long; as a result of the efforts of Kuznetsov and other benefactors, reinforced by an awakening public interest in books and literature, a public library was reinstated, which before long was described as "comprehensive." Moreover, by the mid-1880's Krasnoyarsk offered a well-supplied bookstore; and about this same time an appreciative municipal duma awarded a prize to the exile-writer Solomon Chudnovsky for his statistical and economic study of Yeniseisk province.[167]

In keeping with developments elsewhere, Krasnoyarsk witnessed the founding of its first public museum in 1886. The mayor, I. V. Matveev, was one of the founding fathers, and his wife charitably donated 23,000 silver rubles toward a building for it. As museums elsewhere were doing, so their Krasnoyarsk counterpart sponsored scientific expeditions in the local area.[168] Other institutions of note in Krasnoyarsk were the music society and the medical society, established in 1882 and 1886, respectively.

Last but not least, Krasnoyarsk witnessed the emergence of its first two newspapers at this time. In 1884 the ecclesiastical paper for the Yeniseisk diocese began publication in Krasnoyarsk as the Yeniseisk Diocesan Gazette. This was followed in 1889 by the publication of Krasnoyarsk's first

---

166 Testimony of a Krasnoyarsk resident writing in 1875, quoted in Jadrinzew, Sibirien, p. 407. See also Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 687; and Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 393.

167 See O. O., Sibirische Briefe (Leipzig, 1894), pp. 203-04; Kennan, Siberia, II: 381; and Nikolaev, "Sibirskaia ssylka," p. 99.

168 Klements, "Miestnye muzei," pp. 30-31; and Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 651.

private, secular newspaper, the Yenisei Provincial Inquirer, edited by Ye. F. Kudryavtsev. The Inquirer survived to 1894, at which time Kudryavtsev replaced it with the Yenisei, which continued on into the 20th century. [169]

Three other towns in Eastern Siberia of cultural significance were Chita, Nerchinsk, and Yakutsk, each with roughly 4,000 residents in the 1880's. Chita since 1851 had served as administrative capital of Transbaikalia. Here the energetic Decembrist, Dmitry Zavalishin, had lived until 1863, playing an important role in the political and cultural development not only of the town but of Eastern Siberia in general. [170] In 1885 Chita was described as a "large, straggling, provincial town." It possessed "a public library, a large building used occasionally as a theater, and fairly good schools; politically and socially it is perhaps the most important place in the territory of which it is the capital." [171] Soon thereafter a museum was established in Chita, and among its chief promoters was A. K. Kuznetsov, a long-time Chita resident, exiled for his implication in the Nechaev affair.

In his Siberian travels Kennan also visited Nerchinsk and was favorably impressed.

> In point of culture and material prosperity it seemed to me to compare favorably with most East-Siberian towns of its class. It has a bank, two or three schools, a hospital with twenty beds, a library, a

---

169 The Russian titles are Eniseiskiia Eparkhial'nyia Viedomosti, Spravochnyi listok Eniseiskoi gubernii, and Enisei. On Krasnoyarsk periodicals see Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 732; "Nachalo pechati," p. 404; Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), pp. 696-97; Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 95; and Istoriia Sibiri s drevneishikh vremen do nashikh dnei v piati tomakh (A History of Siberia from Earliest Times to the Present in Five Volumes), (Leningrad, 1968), vol. 3 (Sibir' v epokhu kapitalizma), p. 394.

170 See above, pp. 170-73; and Mazour, First Russian Revolution, pp. 249-52.

171 Kennan, Siberia and the Exile System, II: 128.

> museum, a public garden with a fountain, and fifty or sixty shops, and its trade in furs and manufactured goods from European Russia amounts to about $1,000,000 per annum.[172]

The museum in Nerchinsk was established by the same Kuznetsov. It was founded in 1886 and had the strong support of the Nerchinsk Duma and a small group of local residents. By 1892 the museum had already amassed 10,000 objects, attesting to the great amount of effort its supporters put into it.[173]

Of distant Yakutsk, far to the northeast of the major Siberian towns and located on the banks of the mighty Lena River, little can be said. Only half of the town's population was Russian, the other half Yakut. Indeed, the Yakut language often predominated over Russian: many Russians in Yakutsk had come to speak Yakut, and in outlying areas some Russian settlers had even forgotten their native language, replacing it with Yakut. Of the important ethnic groups in Siberia only the Yakuts had an urban "intellectual center" which they could call their own. What there was of a Yakut intelligentsia was concentrated in Yakutsk. As part of the general public awakening in Siberian towns, and especially as a result of the efforts of the local statistical commission, a public museum was established in Yakutsk in 1890. Among other activities, this newly born institution was quick to begin issuing scientific publications and to equip and send out exploratory expeditions.[174] Yakutsk played an important role in supplying the well-known Jochelson-

---

172 Kennan, Siberia and the Exile System, II: 322-323.

173 Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II: 45; and Klements, "Miestnye muzei," pp. 30-31. Alexei Kirillovich Kuznetsov, as late as 1905, was in Chita, active as a Socialist-Revolutionary organizer.

174 Potanin, "Goroda Sibiri," pp. 258-59. G. K. Neustroev, the schoolteacher executed in Irkutsk (see above, p. 566), was one of the more prominent representatives of this emerging Yakut intelligentsia. On the Yakutsk museum see Klements, "Miestnye muzei," pp. 30-31.

Bogoraz anthropological expedition of 1894.

By its location alone Kyakhta was one of the more unique towns of Eastern Siberia. Situated in Transbaikalia between the Mongolian border (on the edge of the Chinese Empire) and its sister-city Troitskosavsk, Kyakhta served as the commercial depot for Chinese goods entering Russia by land. Through Kyakhta came virtually all the tea imported from China via the caravan route, along with Chinese silks and crepe. In return, Russians exported to China various manufactured goods, herbs, furs, and cash (in the form of Russian, British, and American coin) to pay for tea. Just across the frontier lay the border town and commercial center, Maimachin. A vivid description of the tremendous cultural gap separating Kyakhta and Maimachin, far wider than the short distance between them, is provided by George Kennan, who visited the towns in 1886.

> It would be hard to imagine a more sudden and startling change than that brought about by a walk of two hundred yards from Kiakhta to Maimachin. One moment you are in a Russian provincial village with its characteristic shops, log houses, golden-domed churches, droshkies, soldiers, and familiar peasant faces; the next moment you pass behind the high screen that conceals the entrance to the Mongolian town and you find yourself apparently in the middle of the Chinese Empire. You can hardly believe that you have not been suddenly transported on the magical carpet of the "Arabian Nights" over a distance of a thousand miles. The town in which you find yourself is no more like the town that you have just left than a Zuñi pueblo is like a village in New England . . .[175]

As Kennan implies, little more was exchanged between Russians and Chinese (or Mongolians) in these two border towns than commercial products.

Despite Kyakhta's provincial appearance and the fact that Kyakhta and

---

175 Kennan, Siberia and the Exile System, II: 108.

Troitskosavsk had only a combined population of about 4,000 in the early 1880's, Kyakhta was one of the wealthiest towns in Siberia, some of its merchants drawing annual incomes of $75,000 to $150,000.[176] However, the flourishing commercial situation in Kyakhta did not last much longer, for the Trans-Siberian Railroad was soon to divert the China tea trade by boat to Vladivostok or the Amur mouth, both of which were linked to the railroad.

The subsequent editor of the Eastern Review, Ivan I. Popov, who arrived in Kyakhta in 1885 to serve his term of exile, commented on the lingering Decembrist influence on the town. This was left in the form of "memories and recollections," especially of the Bestuzhev brothers, Ivan Gorbachevsky, and Dmitry Zavalishin. He claimed "the Decembrists aroused in the people of Kyakhta an interest in politics and social problems even at a time when all of Russia was sunken in deep slumber."[177] Yadrintsev felt that since the time of the Decembrists Kyakhta was one of the "most intelligent towns in Siberia."[178] Indeed, the Kiakhtintsy regarded the Decembrists (and Herzen) differently than they did the exiled revolutionaries of the eighties. According to Popov, one of the latter, they

> were sympathetic toward later revolutionaries, but without . . . that esteemed respect which they accorded the Decembrists. The Decembrists did a great deal for Transbaikalia and left a deep furrow behind them. The latest generation of revolutionaries lived in Transbaikalia for a short time and left. They were ephemeral. . . . I am not saying that in my time the people of Kyakhta feared the political exiles, but that they were perhaps terrorized by the denunciations after March 1 /1881/ and regarded political exiles with caution.[179]

---

176 Kennan, Siberia and the Exile System, II: 104.
177 Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II: 39-40.
178 Jadrinzew, Sibirien, p. 408.
179 Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II: 45. Tsar Alexander II was assassinated on March 1, 1881.

One of the most prominent civic leaders in Kyakhta was the wealthy tea-merchant A. M. Lushnikov, upon whom the influence of the "Decembrists, Herzen, and the English missionaries was especially pronounced." Lushnikov was instrumental in founding a school for modern studies, and he served continuously as trustee for this school and one other. With his wife, an "advanced woman," he also established several schools in surrounding villages.[180] Such outside observers as Popov and Kennan were not only impressed by Lushnikov and his work, but by Kyakhta social life as well. Popov perceived among local inhabitants "a social instinct which gave them the chance, in such a remote corner as along the Mongolian border, to create a relatively interesting life. They eagerly supported . . . the creation of cultural institutions."[181]

Nevertheless, much of the work in building these institutions was actually carried out by political exiles, as had often been the case since Decembrist days. In 1886 Popov and several other exiles conceived of organizing a public library in Troitskosavsk. After marshaling support from local teachers and the mayor, M. O. Osokin, Popov and his friends began to collect unwanted books from local residents. Still, reservations were often expressed, engendered by unsuccessful attempts as recently as 1884 to set up a public library. Moreover, the existing schools and many of the wealthier citizens already had good libraries of their own. In 1886 Potanin, passing through Kyakhta, helped persuade people to donate books and money, and in a speech before the municipal duma he convinced the councillors to agree to

---

180 Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II: 47, 49. Lushnikov was also "advanced" enough to permit his daughter to marry the exiled Popov. English missionaries had been working in Transbaikalia since Speransky's time.

181 Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II: 91.

the mayor's proposal to place the library under municipal authority.[182]

The duma thereupon allotted the library an annual subsidy of 600 rubles and a building. Books were donated, a catalog was put together, and alongside the library proper, a free reading room was set up, open to the public.

> The library grew quickly, becoming the townspeople's favorite institution. The library and the reading room were open from 2:00 to 8:00 P.M., when people were least busy. In the evening the public congregated in the library and it became somewhat like a club. The statute was confirmed in Petersburg. The funds — i.e. subsidies, income from /amateur/ plays, subscription and membership fees — were enough to maintain and broaden the library and to order new books and journals.[183]

From this success Popov and his group moved on to another project: establishing a public museum in Kyakhta. And in the background there lay the possibility of founding a subdivision of the Russian Geographical Society by means of this (which was actually done at the end of the century). Efforts were undertaken to build up collections substantial enough to justify a museum, and such eminent visitors in Kyakhta as Klements and Potanin gave lectures that stimulated even greater interest in getting a museum off the ground.

In a lecture on the significance of local museums given in October 1892, Klements suggested to his audience the special importance that a museum in Kyakhta or Troitskosavsk could have, dwelling on the unique circumstances of the locality. He singled out Chinese products and artifacts, as well as objects representing local customs, literature, and religions, as a promising start.

---

182 Popov and Mendel'son, "Iz vospominanii o Potanine," p. 143.
183 Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II: 98-99.

> In Kyakhta the external circumstances for forming such a museum are as favorable as anywhere. In centers of intellectual life in Russia and abroad not one of the chief conditions for achieving such a museum exists, and there is no opportunity to follow continuously the life or China or Mongolia. . . .
>
> Having rendered great service to Russian trade in the past, Kyakhta, having founded a museum, will also serve the distant future, its practical knowledge of China will not be left without an imprint, and it will benefit future generations, along with Russian life and science. But its museum, like a living book, will acquaint the Russian people with China and Mongolia, and its founders will be assured a grateful memory in posterity. [184]

With this convincing appeal to the vanity of his audience, to the potential glory of Kyakhta, and to a greater understanding of the Orient in the future, a building to house the museum was soon donated. By 1893 a public museum in Kyakhta was officially opened.

Potanin, in his lectures promoting a museum, used different justifications. During his stays in Kyakhta in 1886 and 1892, he clarified his social and political views in discussions among exiles and in his public lectures. According to Popov, Potanin

> put local interests at the head of socio-political activity, demonstrating that the awakening of local patriotism and cultural work in the provinces produced more correctly overall political problems and created the firm basis of a lawful democratic order. Jacobin tactics never created anything solid. Arouse self-consciousness in the provinces, and then the center will be forced to yield. As a convinced federalist, G. N. rejected working from the center almost completely, and he disparagingly referred to "dung" officials who only crushed local life and for the most part imposed forms completely unsuited to local conditions.
>
> The borderlands could thank the government only for /the institution of/ political exile, which sent us educated and cultured people in such fashion. Generally speaking, in fact, the center brought greater

184 Klements, "Miestnye muzei," pp. 34-35.

> harm than good. In a governmental structure one should proceed from the periphery to the center, and not the reverse. Put a region into order, and from the regions a state will be constituted at the base of which will lie law, justice, and real freedom.

These were points Potanin vividly brought into his lectures on the significance of local museums (and of local institutions in general). Despite his general preoccupation with exploration and natural science at this time, he still held strongly to the regionalist ideas of his student years. In fact, Popov concludes that from 1886 on Potanin "did not yield one iota" from these regionalist, federalist views.[185]

According to the census of 1897, the population of Siberia proper (excluding the Far East and the Steppe Territory) was about 5½ million. Of this about 9% lived in the fifteen to twenty principal urban centers.[186] The rural remainder of the Siberian population constituted the most illiterate sector of the Russian Empire; the literacy rate of the rural population in the major Siberian provincial units in the 1890's varied from 6.5% to 11.2%, constrasted with 22% of the rural population and 26% of the total population literate in the Empire as a whole. With this in mind Potanin could conclude:

> The towns are the points on the social body of Siberia by which it perceives rays of light coming from the West. Only in the towns are all the educated elements of this region concentrated. In European Russia

---

185 Popov and Mendel'son, "Iz vospominanii o Potanine," p. 143. The first line of the second paragraph is taken from Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II: 103, in which the commentary is essentially the same. According to Potanin's memoirs (1913), he cherished the "dream of a future Russia, consisting of a number of small, enclosed territories . . . and in each such territory its own patriot, defender of local interests, and its 'chief representative' for the interests of the local population." Quoted in Farafontova, "Cherty iz zhizni patriota," pp. 151-52.

186 Iakushev, Sibir v tsifrakh, p. 8; and P. Leroy-Beaulieu, The Awakening of the East (New York: McClure, Phillips & Co., 1900), p. 13.

> towns do not stand in as privileged a position with respect to villages as they do in Siberia. The zemstvos in European Russia have enriched the village environment by means of the intelligentsia; they have studded this environment with teachers, doctors, and technicians. Resulting from the lack of zemstvo institutions in Siberia, the villages exist without the intelligentsia. Thus, all the intellectual and cultural life in Siberia has been organized by the towns, while in the villages there has been a complete intellectual desert.[187]

The extent of urban progress and development in Siberia by the end of the 19th century drew comments from the exile, S. P. Shvetsov, who described the immensity of the change from the vantage point of the year 1905. Though Siberian urban life was to change even more rapidly in many respects during the period 1895-1905 than it did between 1880 and 1894 (as Shvetsov intimates), his summary is quite applicable to the earlier fifteen-year period.

> After a quarter of a century Siberia changed into something hardly recognizable; by the first revolution [1905] it was quite a different country in all respects than what I was forced to observe in 1880.
>
> It began to have its own working class, concentrated chiefly in the largest towns and along the railroad line. . . . True, this was not large numerically, but the quality was quite high. It [Siberia] had its own seed beds of scientific knowledge: a university and a technological institute, which a thousand young people attended. It had its own periodical press, which carried out its difficult obligations with honor. It possessed a network of various cultural and educational institutions; and the development of its population toward the beginning of the century reached unprecedented heights, especially in the large centers. New branches of industry and new aspects of activity, which earlier were quite unknown, arose and developed rapidly. In sum, it was no longer the earlier, pre-reform, uncultured country, but was new, young, strong and extremely rich in various possibilities for the future, full of energy and thirst for life.[188]

---

187 Potanin, "Goroda Sibiri," p. 234. For literacy statistics, see V. Grigor'ev, "Zemstvo v Sibiri i ego miestnyia osobennosti" (A Zemstvo in Siberia and Its Local Peculiarities), Sibirskie Voprosy, (1905) no. 1, pp. 38-39.

188 Shvetsov, "Kul'turnoe znachenie," Katorga i Ssylka, no. 48, p. 99.

Shvetsov concluded, "Together with this there emerged the soil for broad revolutionary work."

Thus, along with the political exiles of the 1880's and 1890's there came to Siberia on a scale greater than ever before various ideologies that involved Russia as a whole. The penetration into Siberian society of both "revolutionary" and "conservative" outlooks, with goals in many ways different from those of regionalists, posed for the first time concrete ideological alternatives for Siberian students and intellectuals. And for the first time in Siberian history broad ideological conflicts between various segments of the public itself came to the fore.

* * *

Regionalism and Centralism in Competition

With the emergence of public consciousness in Siberian towns in the 1880's, which regionalist leaders had advocated since the 1860's, there also arose centralist ideas which contended with regionalism for the minds of thinking Siberians. By and large these centralist currents took on two forms. One tendency stressed the need for an overall Russian revolution, while the other, not far removed from the central government's position, felt that Siberia should exist for the benefit of Russia "as a whole." Indeed, both these currents, despite their different political coloration, appeared to many regionalists as just two sides of the same coin. Potanin, in fact, lumped them into one of "two camps" which had contended within the Siberian press since the 1880's.

> One part of Siberian journalism gives first-rate significance to Russian problems in general, while Siberian problems especially it has considered to

> be of little importance and has at times even denied their very existence.
>
> The other part has given preference to purely local problems. Oneecan call the journalists of the first category centralists and those of the second autonomists.[189]

Both regionalists and centralists did agree, however, that Siberian natives formed a special element in the region, with their own distinctive cultures, problems, and needs. On the nature of the Russian population in Siberia, though, the "camps" disagreed. Autonomists claimed that this element possessed a special "external" way of life and a unique spirit; moreover, special legislation was needed to provide for Siberian autonomy. Centralists, of course, denied these assertions.[190] Yet in other respects, the lines between centralist and regionalist were somewhat blurred. In the late 1880's and 1890's when the "centralist" press in Siberia echoed chiefly the views of government-oriented spokesmen, "revolutionaries" joined forces with regionalists. Due to the absence of revolutionary-oriented newspapers in Siberia (both legal or illegal), revolutionary centralists often worked through such regionalist papers as the Eastern Review or the Siberian Gazette.

One of the biggest threats to Siberia, in the eyes of many regionalists, was the establishment in 1885 of a decidedly anti-regionalist newspaper in Tomsk, the Siberian Herald. All three regionalist papers of the 1880's, the Eastern Review, Siberia, and the Siberian Gazette, sooner or later began to attack the centralistic viewpoints expressed by Kartamyshev, Korsh, and others in the Herald. Even earlier, Korsh, while editor of the

---

189 Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," p. 260.
190 Ibid., pp. 260-62.

unofficial section of the Tomsk Provincial Gazette, had been on bad terms with Yadrintsev.[191] Korsh's impressions of what Siberian regionalists stood for he spelled out in his first conversation with Kartamyshev, soon after the latter's arrival in Tomsk in 1881. Korsh suggested, tongue-in-cheek,

> Perhaps you will become a Siberian patriot like Yadrintsev and Zagoskin, and you will begin to advocate that Siberia is for Siberians, that a railroad into Russia's interior is not needed and is even harmful, and that Siberia should develop internal and not external means of communications, which would export all of Siberia's raw materials and would deprive the population of its share . . .[192]

Kartamyshev, however, was not about to be converted to Siberian regionalism, and he soon discovered that his own thinking corresponded closely to Korsh's.

Several years later, Kartamyshev approached Korsh with the idea of founding a newspaper in Tomsk and stated his projected program as follows:

> The existing papers shout at everyone in a patriotic chorus: Siberia for the Siberians, Siberia needs neither a railroad nor a sea route. Siberia should be developed within itself, should take care of its own riches for its own country and should not enrich the mother country; Siberia is a Russian America. My paper will say: Siberia is for Russia, for the Russian people; all of Siberia's future lies in its close unity with the rest of Russia. The development of Siberia should proceed in connection with the cultural achievements of all Russia, the railroad which was promised by the late emperor in 1880 should be built all the more quickly, and it is useful and beneficial to study in detail the question of the possibility of securing a sea route to Siberia for international trade. The riches of Siberia should be Russia's riches. Siberia is not a colony of Russia but is Russia itself; it is not a Russian America but a Russian province and should be developed just as other borderlands of the Russian state are developed. Here is the program of my paper; it is rather

---

191 E. V. Korsh, "Vosem' liet," p. 437, 439 ff.
192 Ibid., p. 828.

> strikingly different from the program of the existing Siberian papers; in general we alone will have a progressiveness in overall aspirations and will be able to struggle with ignorance and darkness. [193]

Such were the views of Kartamyshev and his subsequent editor, Korsh. The program Kartamyshev proposed was well received by the governor of Tomsk province, Krasovsky. The latter strongly supported Korsh's petition to the Ministry of Interior for permission to publish. Krasovsky seems to have reported to Petersburg that "the Siberian Gazette, the Eastern Review, and Siberia of Irkutsk were separatist, regionalist newspapers, and that the Siberian Herald would combat this tendency and fight for the government principle." [194]

According to Korsh, the news of Kartamyshev's projected paper and its program "produced a storm in the camp of the 'Siberian patriots'." They felt that a "rival to their organs was being born, a serious ideological rival, well armed with money and people, with which they would have to reckon." Thus, even before the first issue of the Herald in May 1885, Yadrintsev began a "campaign" against the projected paper, declaring it to be an "organ of criminal exile" — a reference to Korsh — which had gotten "puffed up, thanks to the patronage of the provincial administration." Then, according to Korsh, Siberia joined in the attack, while the cross-town Siberian Gazette alone refrained from criticism. [195]

After the first issue of the Herald, however, the Gazette also began to protest. According to Korsh, Adrianov and the Gazette, objecting to the

---

193 Cited by Korsh, "Vosem' liet," p. 831. For an abridged version, see Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 89.

194 Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, I: 156-57.

195 Korsh, "Vosem' liet," CXXI: 27-28. On the reactions of Yadrintsev and Makushin to the Herald, see above, p. 470, 551.

editorial article, "with a wise air reiterated that Siberia was a colony of Russia, referring to Yadrintsev, Roscher, and Leroy-Beaulieu, who had acknowledged Siberia to be a Russian colony." Thereupon, the Gazette

> demonstrated that Siberia should be developed within itself and for itself, should improve first of all the internal communication routes, create industry within the country, develop local agficulture, cattle-raising, village industries, and trade . . . all in the old spirit of Yadrintsev: Siberia for the Siberians, Siberia is a Russian America, and it should follow in the footsteps of America. . . . In a word, the good neighbor fully made up for its long temperance and began to sing in unison with Siberia and the Eastern Review.[196]

Aside from Korsh's personal prejudices, his estimation of Siberian regionalism was rather simplistic, repetitive, and one-sided. He stressed almost exclusively the economic aspects of the question which emphasized autarky, while neglecting entirely the social, educational, and institutional demands put forth by regionalists in their attempt to gain equal status with the "mother country" west of the Urals.

Korsh summed up the "persecution" his paper was subjected to by the three regionalist papers as follows: "This amiable trio continued its stubborn baiting, in no way embarrassed by conscience or justice; everything was considered useful — scandals, slanders, patent lies. These alone would lead to the goal which this united triumvirate followed."[197] Despite his exposés against the "tricksters and rogues" associated with the Herald, Yadrintsev did not pay much attention to the paper.inIhishmajo1886worksionInf

---

196 Korsh, "Vosem' liet," CXXI: 31. Siberia had been discussed as an agrarian colony by W. Roscher and R. Jannasch in Kolonien, Kolonialpolitik und Auswanderung (Leipzig, 1885), pp. 18-23. Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu had called Russia a huge colony between east and west in L8Empire des tsars et les russes, vol. 1 (Paris, 1881), pp. 40-42.

197 Korsh, "Vosem' liet," CXXI: 31.

Siberia as a Colony he simply spoke of the Herald's "officious appearance," and he stated that "judging by the extremely sharp polemic of this paper, the Siberian Herald seems to have set as its task to fight against the patriotic and rather liberal tendency by which the Siberian press distinguishes itself, in the interests of reaction." [198] In his essay on Siberian journalism, written in 1885, Yadrintsev castigated more vehemently those connected with the Siberian Herald, though he mentioned no names. He ripped into those

> who want to write about Siberia and Siberian affairs and to speculate in the publishing business, who have nothing in common with the country. Such attempts to encroach on the local Siberian press are already being made by elements who have come to the borderland by their own free will and even more by force [i.e. exile], and wish to establish for themselves here not only a position, but also to represent themselves as an educated element. These are persons with education from a class of derelict people in Siberia, without any moral scruples, and who have no right to lead society, though they have the impudence to pretend to do this.

Despite their "blackmailing organs" and the "demoralization they would bring to ignorant society," Yadrintsev trusted that the Siberian public would "grow wiser day by day" and see through their line. [199]

Meanwhile, in Tomsk Adrianov and his Siberian Gazette conducted a running "polemic and struggle" with the Herald from 1885 to 1888, when the regionalist paper was discontinued. [200] Of this struggle Potanin wrote twenty years later,

> The three patriotic papers simultaneously supported each other, defending themselves against the insinu-

---

198 Jadrinzew, Sibirien, p. 417. In the second Russian edition (1892) Yadrintsev barely mentions the Herald (see p. 685, 696).

199 (Iadrintsev) "Nachalo pechati" (1885), pp. 405-06. This appears to have been written before the Herald actually began to publish in May 1885.

200 Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, I: 157.

> ations of the Siberian Herald, which was not ashamed of resorting even to secret denunciations to the authorities. As a result of its denunciation, Siberia was discontinued; and the same fate soon befell the Siberian Gazette. [201]

As for Yadrintsev's Eastern Review, the Herald tried to renew accusations against it. All in all, the Herald's centralist, pro-government stance certainly helped it survive the 1880's, whereas two of the three regionalist papers were suppressed altogether.

Echoing the sentiments of the Siberian Herald in European Russia was the Moscow Gazette, edited by the conservative nationalist Mikhail Katkov. After Yadrintsev and his Eastern Review (then based in Petersburg) had criticized the Herald, Katkow accused Yadrintsev openly of separatist sympathies. To this immediate accusation, Yadrintsev retaliated obliquely, vilifying his allies on the Herald, those "criminal heroes, bigwigs who had embezzled various banks, and exiled lawyers" who wanted to "play a role in Siberian society, to occupy prominent places in the administration, and to become civilizers." [202]

Katkov could find nothing commendable in the Siberian regionalist newspapers. On the one hadn, he saw among their contributors political exiles, Jews, Poles, and socialists, which autonmtically compromised these papers in the eyes of this militant centralist and defender of the autocracy. [203] On the other hand, he suspected the regionalists of advocating political separation from Russia at the earliest possible moment. In this respect he

---

201 Potanin, Oblastnicheskaia tendentsiia, p. 35. This is the only assertion known to me that the Siberian Herald was directly responsible for the demise of both the Siberian Gazette and Siberia. Though Potanin does not document his claim, the fact may have become common knowledge two decades later.

202 Iadrintsev, "Neudachnaia mistifikatsiia" (Unsuccessful Mystification), Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1886) no. 6; quoted in Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 89. Korsh and Polyansky were criminal exiles, while Kaftamyshev was a lawyer, but not an involuntary exile.

203 See above, p. 546.

tried to link the regionalists with the ill-fated "Zheltuga Republic." This so-called "republic" arose in 1883 on Chinese territory across the Amur River in northern Manchuria. Gold fields had been discovered by Russians along the Zheltuga River and had attracted Russian prospectors and adventurers from Transbaikalia and the Amur area, along with some Chinese. Those who streamed into the Zheltuga valley quickly set up a republic, called by some "California on the Amur," though more commonly referred to as "Zheltuga." Buildings were constructed; a president and delegates to a veche assembly were elected; and a set of laws were drafted by "free Zheltuga miners" which provided a constitution and a criminal code. The Chinese imperial government reacted by sending in troops to crush the Russian "republic," the result of which was numerous fatalities and the end of the short-lived democratic experiment. While the Russian government remained rather aloof from the whole affair, Katkov did not. He vigorously disapproved of the independently organized "free miners" and the constitutional "government" out from under the reach of Russian authorities.[204]

Katkov then linked all Siberia with the Zheltuga republic. He accused Siberia of "raising an insurrection and declaring independence, if not today, then tomorrow." According to Popov's account, twenty years after the Siberian independence affair, Katkov raised this issue again; he wildly asserted that

> Siberians had a war fleet on Lake Baikal and on the Amur, that there were guns in the Ural mountains,

---

204 See Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II: 96-97; Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 90; and "Amurskaia Kaliforniia. (Po razskazam ochevidtsa)" (California on the Amur: An Eyewitness Account), Sibirskii Sbornik, (1886) bk. 1, pp. 138-68.

> and that separatists had been arrested there in the guise of shepherds, that Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands had been armed by Americans, and that Prince Alexander of Bulgaria /then unfriendly toward Russia/ had sent one steamer and five boats to Vladivostok to support the uprising.

These absurd assertions were soon thereafter reprinted in the Siberian regionalist press. [205]

Yadrintsev replied tongue-in-cheek that the Moscow Gazette "can object that we attach too much importance to the nonsense of some ridiculous Siberian nationalist party, which by virtue of its own absurdity cannot have any practical significance." He suggested that fears of separatism had been suggested to Katkov by speculators who wanted to make a fortune by constructing a railroad across Siberia. Yadrintsev felt they had invented a separatism "which increased not day by day, but hour by hour" and were asserting that "Siberian separatists feared nothing so much as the building of a railroad which would closely link Siberia with the rest of Russia." Thus, the argument ran, "construction had to be accelerated before the evil spread to such dimensions that it would then be difficult to control." [206] Yadrintsev also scoffed at Katkov for "lumping Siberian separatism, which he had just discovered /sic/, to such separatisms already existing in Russia as Polish, German, Finnish, Caucasian, and Little Russian." [207]

As Svatikov points out, Katkov's statements in 1886 against Siberian separatism mark "the first manifestation of serious concern in Russia on this matter since the 'Siberian independence' affair." Moreover, Yadrintsev

---

205 Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II: 97.
206 Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1886) no. 9;;quoted in Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 90.
207 Iadrintsev, in Obshchee Dielo (Geneva), (March 1886) no. 83; quoted in Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 91.

was correct in taunting Katkov's fears, for not only was the vast majority of the Siberian population completely indifferent to the idea of separation, but even to regionalism itself, which at most only loosely entertained the idea of Siberia's separation in the distant future. Still Katkov was not totally wrong in detecting separatistic tendencies in circles that advocated Siberian autonomy.[208]

Also important as ideological rivals to Siberian regionalists were some of the revolutionary exiles of the 1880's and 1890's. Many of them tried to spread revolutionary ideas of a socialistic, anti-autocratic, and even centralistic bent among educated Siberians. Indeed, such activists were often well represented on the editorial staffs and among important contributors of the Siberian Gazette and the Eastern Review. Though regionalists and radical socialists found a common enemy in the centralistic, pro-government Siberian Herald, relations between these two groups were not always the best, as both competed for the allegiance of thinking Siberians.

What can be called an "all-Russian" radical tendency began to emerge within the Eastern Review soon after its transfer to Irkutsk in 1888. This development can be explained, of course, by the fact that in Petersburg the Yadrintsevs and other regionalists provided the backbone of the paper, while in Irkutsk (as the only important private paper) many political exiles found in the Eastern Review the only local outlet for expression. Thus, some of them became prominent on the editorial staff. By 1894, when the exile Popov took over the newspaper, three general directions were present among staff members: 1) the radical, represented by the aging "Jacobin-centralist" P. G.

---

208 See Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 91.

Zaichnevsky, the socialist-populist V. V. Demyanovsky, and the "progressivist" A. A. Kornilov; 2) the regionalist, which included Vagin, Zagoskin, and P. P. Pershin; and 3) that of exiles sympathetic to Siberia, represented by Popov, Klements, Chudnovsky, and a few others. [209]

Popov defined his own position as follows:

> In my ideology I was a federalist and sided with the Siberians, yet I went farther than they did. Siberians considered Siberia to be an indivisible region, while I allowed the possibility of forming three or more regions in Siberia. I did not raise the question of exile as sharply as did Yadrintsev, Potanin, and other Siberians; I parted from them in appraising the importance of a railroad for Siberia, whose benefit for the country was still denied by Yadrintsev, Zagoskin, and some others; I considered a railroad to be a blessing. [210]

As an exile, Popov was an exception. Concerning the vast majority of exiles, Yadrintsev could only lament their lack of interest in Siberian problems. He told Popov that "Siberia remains alien for the majority of them and they long to leave." [211] Perhaps an extreme example of anti-regionalism among exiles was Pyotr Zaichnevsky's efforts to use the Eastern Review "not to awaken regional self-awareness, but to educate individuals in a party spirit (of a Jacobin character) and to recruit them from among Siberian youths." [212]

Along this general line, Shvetsov spoke of the need for a "revolutionary transformation of society." "In the early 1890's," he wrote, "society

---

209 Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II: 232.

210 Ibid., 232-33. Subsequent Socialist Revolutionaries also thought of dividing up Siberia into a number of states (see Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 95).

211 Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II: 119.

212 Sbornik k 80-lietiiu G. N. Potanina (An Anthology Commemorating G. N. Potanin's 80th Birthday), (Tomsk, 1915), p. 101; quoted in Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 93.

became an arena for an emerging political and interparty struggle, in which political exiles took a very active part . . ." He added that the local newspapers "played a great role not only in the development of public opinion in Western Siberia, but also in revolutionizing part of the Siberian population to some extent . . ." [213] Shvetsov, of course, was concerned with "revolutionizing" all of Russian society and the state, whereas regionalists sought a more evolutionary transformation of Siberian society.

The competition between regionalism and the broader, "all-Russian" sentiments for the loyalties of young Siberians has been aptly described by A. A. Argunov. Reminiscing of his high-school days in Tomsk, he wrote: "The milieu of the political colony in Tomsk was original and interesting to the highest degree, especially in the 1880's, when representatives of almost all ideological currents and programs were found there . . ." He singled out Dmitry Klements, Felix Volkhovsky, and others, among whom

> a "self-education circle" was formed. [214] We read assiduously and systematically on one of the programs for reading which went around in those days.
>
> One of the points of this program was the question of the fate of our region, our Siberia. And my first report, with which I timidly entered the circle, was on Yadrintsev's book, Siberia as a Colony. One must say that we, along with those adjacent to this circle of Tomsk youth (in the seminary and in the girls' high school), were not especially carried away or captivated by the Siberian question. Siberiophilism, of which we knew and for which the dawn of life was just then beginning, was not on our path, for we were under the spell of what was "all-Russian," within which the "Siberian" was drowned, merging together

---

213 S. P. Shvetsov, "Kul'turnoe znachenie," Katorga i Ssylka, no. 47, p. 103, 104; and no. 48, p. 91.

214 This circle seems to have been the one broken up by authorities in 1887 and linked with the suppression of the Siberian Gazette (see above, p. 547).

> into one. Our older mentors, among whom there were also native Siberians, also possessed such sentiments.
>
> The center of attention was the all-Russian problem, under whose banner people of various nationalities fought shoulder to shoulder, . . . thinking little of their differences or peculiarities, though each was ardently attached to his own region. Of course, questions of autonomy arose among the questions affecting the reconstruction of Russia, but discussion did not lead to concrete conclusions, and still stood at the stage of acknowledging principles. [215]

In this sense, some Siberians became convinced that socialism would change life everywhere for the better, and with its realization autonomy for various regions would easily be attained. They aimed first at a general, total overhaul of the Russian institutional system, after which regionalist goals would logically follow; whereas regionalists first of all aimed at particular, local changes with the framework of the system, and if this did not work out, eventually secession might.

The situation in Irkutsk was not as clear-cut in the 1880's as in Tomsk. Populist organizations of some sort existed there which circulated "forbidden publications." From what Vagin indicates, such regionalists as Zagoskin, Sadovnikov, and Shestunov began to sympathize with exile-populists; moreover, Pisarev and Sadovnikov adhered to a "young party" (which Vagin opposed) without abandoning their regionalist attitudes. [216]

At times Yadrintsev commented on the failure of regionalism to make greater headway among the generations after his own. In 1884, for instance, he remarked,

---

215 A. A. Argunov, "Studencheskie gody," pp. 20-21, 22.
216 L. Podol'skaia, "Dnevnik Vagina," p. 122, 123, 125.

> The theories of the seventies and eighties have only distracted Siberians from their homeland and have allowed almost no notable figures in the field of literature, with the exception of Kushchevsky, who was rather a product of our own time. The need for us to serve our region has degenerated away from common literary aspirations. [217]

A decade later, in an autobiographical essay, he commented more specifically on the past thirty years:

> Whole generations of young people have changed, and after 1865 there were only two or three circles of Siberians in the trials of the 1870's (Koshkin's and a few others) which spoke of separatism. But I have seen a whole number of young Siberian graduates, who even had difficulty adopting the idea of patriotism. They learned much more quickly various social theories and the tendencies of the young Russian parties (populism, Marxism, socialism, etc.). [218]

Siberians in fact became more involved in the Russian revolutionary movement in the 1880's than they had been in the 1870's. According to Svatikov, in the seventies the percentage of Siberians involved in "political affairs" totaled only .7%. Among the increasing number of Siberians involved in the revolutionary movement (by and large a less activist phenomenon in the 1880's than in the 1870's), perhaps the most notable was Vasily Osipanov, who took part in the unsuccessful attempt to assassinate Alexander III on March 1, 1887. [219]

The problem of non-regionalist loyalties among young Siberians was not just the result of the absence of a Siberian universtty, or after 1888, of a more fully developed insitution of higher learning. The university in

---

217 Iadrintsev, "Studencheskiia vospominaniia," Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1884) nos. 33-34; quoted in Glinskii, "Iadrintsev," p. 423. Nikolai Afanasievich Kushchevsky (1847-76) was born in Siberia and came to Petersburg in the late 1860's, where he wrote his most famous work, Nikolai Negorev, or the Happy Russian.

218 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," p. 157. On Koshkin, see above, p. 414 ff.

219 See Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 94.

Tomsk, once established, did little to mitigate "intellectual absenteeism" or to foster Siberian patriotism. By the early 20th century the "brain-drain" had in fact intensified. According to Potanin,

> Siberians still go to European Russia now to study many special sciences, which the higher institution in Tomsk does not offer. Leaving the homeland in their early years, not having been able to get used to local public life, young people who feel themselves to be in an alien region are drawn to the public interests of a new milieu; they fall away from the homeland they left and grow accustomed to the new environment. . . . Consequently, Siberia, contributing its foster-children to the ranks of the Russian intelligentsia, has remained without educated servants to fulfill its needs, and instead of its own sons has received officials, teachers, technicians, and engineers from European Russia. [220]

Thus, by the end of the century the struggle between regional service and patriotism as one force and the ideological and professional attractions that drew young Siberians to Russia and kept them there, as another, was clearly being won by the latter.

Svatikov views the overall course of Siberian development during the reign of Alexander III rather darkly: "Of course, the Siberian social movement, under the influence of cruel reaction between the years 1881-1894, experienced a period of decline . . ." [221] It is true that many conditions at this time were not conducive to a flourishing public life in Siberia. Suppression, control, and censorship by government authorities were still frequent, and the general ignorance and backwardness of Siberian society, both rural and urban, was relatively enormous. But it seems inaccurate to claim that the Siberian "social movement" was declining during these years. This embryonic movement had hardly reached a height from which it could decline.

---

220 Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," pp. 274-75.
221 Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 96.

Moreover, the numerous celebrations and historical works devoted to Siberia's tricentennial in 1881 and the subsequentlyears indicate that among individual Siberians and certain local groups a new awareness of Siberia's past history and future potential was growing. The emergence of civic consciousness and activity, reflected in the burgeoning development of social organizations, regional newspapers, municipal duma activities, new educational institutions, public lectures, museums, and libraries, attests to a new social vigor never before witnessed in Siberian society. Indeed, the limited but growing political consciousness in society , whether directed toward regionalist goals, the Russian revolutionary movement, or toward support of the established order, also points to an unprecedented maturation within the Siberian "body politic." Certainly, the years under Alexander III were retrogressive or static in many respects in European Russia. However, in Siberia, which hitherto had known so little "progress" and "civilization," the public during these same years began to rouse itself as never before. Not just isolated individuals or small groups of them, but broader segments of societyy at large now began to awaken. Siberia began to enter modern history slowly but surely, building an educated and progressive base for itself — a step which once taken cannot easily reverse itself.

CHAPTER X

SIBERIA ON THE EVE OF A NEW AGE

One of the basic points stressed by Siberian regionalists was that the central government should no longer treat Siberia as a colony of European Russia, but as an equal part of the Russian Empire. In this respect they, along with others who did not regard themselves specifically as regionalists, sought to have introduced in Siberia the Great Reforms of Alexander II as they applied to the region, along with a few other institutions that European Russia alone enjoyed. As evidenced in the Siberian independence affair of 1865 especially, certain romantics and dreamers chose not to wait for the government to improve Siberia's lot, and by means of pamphlets and talk they advocated separation as the only way out. Thus, "separatism" became a definite bugaboo in certain government circles, both locally and in St. Petersburg. A fear of Siberia's possible break-away or separate development, whether expressed explicitly or not, tended to cause the central government

to take a dual approach toward the distant borderland. On one hand, St. Petersburg tried to link Siberia ever more closely to itself and to European Russia, reducing the possibilities of autonomous development. On the other, it strove to prevent the full establishment of many reforms and institutions that would place Siberia on an equal institutional plane with Russia.

However, some government officials supported not only closer bonds between Siberia and Russia, but also the "equalization" of Siberia with Russia by means of reforms. Such officials were supported by regionalists, who advocated "equalization" through a full-sized university, zemstvos, judicial reform, and so forth. Yet, suspicious supporters of the status-quo regarded these same regionalists as crypto-separatists. Some of these "conservatives" viewed zemstvos and a university as little more than potential vehicles for the spread of democratic, revolutionary, and separatist ideas in Siberia. They felt that certain reforms and institutions taken too far would somehow undermine a unity between Russia and Siberia established "from above."

Thus, for all the talk on the government's part of a united, inseparable Russian state, some of its more conservative spokesmen followed in practive a concept espoused by regionalists, in that they indeed considered Siberia a unique and different part of the empire. Those who feared separatism essentially agreed with Yadrintsev's thesis: Siberia was a Russian colony and, following a kind of historical determinism, might separate eventually from the mother country, just as had the North and South American colonies. According to these conservatives, any concession to Siberia at all would be tantamount to a concession to separatism.

Attempting to link Siberia more closely to Russia, while simultaneously treating the borderland as somewhat less than equal, the government of Alexander III tried to resolve this contradiction by carrying out a policy of

limited reform. Halfway measures would bring Siberia more into line with European Russia, though not totally. By the end of Alexander III's reign, of the Great Reforms of the 1860's only the statute on municipal government was fully operative in Siberia (having been implemented there in the 1870's). Nevertheless, by 1894 the central government had initiated certain changes and innovations which in time were enough to render a transportational, economic, and demographic transformation of Siberia that linked the region much more closely to Russia than before. Administrative decentralization had been achieved, limited self-government and judicial reform instituted, a university established, legal migration permitted, and a railroad across Siberia undertaken.

One is tempted to conclude that the government was chiefly instrumental in changing only the "outer face" of Siberia in the 1880's and 1890's, while regionalists and their local collaborators were responsible for awakening the "inner mind" of Siberia during this period. The innovating actions of the central government and the response of Siberians to this process of modernization, however halting it was, will be examined in the present chapter.

* * *

Government Attitudes and Administrative Changes

Alexander III acceded to the imperial throne in 1881, the year that Siberia was celebrating its tricentennial jubilee. Many Siberians hoped that the central govennment in honoring Siberia's 300 years would grant long-awaited reforms. The accession of a new tsar added to the expectations that the government would move in this direction. Indeed, the thirty-six year-old ruler greeted Siberia's jubilee with best wishes, good intentions, and

promises for a better future. On this occasion (December 6, 1881), Alexander also for the first time spelled out in detail his views on Siberia. In a telegram to Dmitry Anuchin, governor-general of Eastern Siberia, he included the following:

> This distant region is near to My heart; its well-being, the development of natural riches, and the proper organization of its administration constitutesan objective of My constant concern. I hope that in time, with God's help, this vast and rich Siberian region, which has for three centuries constituted an <u>inseparable part</u> of Russia, will be in a position to enjoy <u>inseparably</u> together with it identical governmental and public institutions, the blessings of education, and the growth of industrial activity for the common weal and glory of our dear fatherland. [1]

In a telegram to the governor-general of Western Siberia, G. V. Meshcherinov, also sent on December 6, 1881, the tsar emphasized the three hundred years of unity between Russia and Western Siberia. The latter, "forming an organic part of the Empire, has invariably shared its destiny with it, bringing considerable benefit and service to the fatherland." The tsar was "fully convinced that in the future too this vast region /would/ serve to consolidate the power of Russia." [2]

In these two telegrams Alexander III expressed his intentions of trying to equalize Siberia with Russia institutionally and to promote educational and economic progress. Though he was not specific regarding steps to be taken, some Siberians, regionalists, included, saw the distinct possibility of zemstvos, new courts, a full university, and revised administrative institutions close at hand. They also hoped the government would defend Si-

---

1 Quoted in Korol'kov, <u>Zhizn' i tsarstvovanie imperatora Aleksandra III</u> (The Life and Reign of Emperor Alexander III), (Kiev, 1901), p. 85; quoted in Svatikov, <u>Rossiia i Sibir'</u>, pp. 76-77.

2 <u>Ibid</u>., p. 77.

beria from private entrepreneurs in European Russia who milked Siberia economically and financially. The Emperor also emphasized a strong centralist approach toward Siberia and its problems. A stress on the inseparableness of Russia and Siberia might usher in equalization to some extent, but it might also deny local self-government in large measure and autonomous or separate development politically and even culturally.

Despite the hopes raised by the tsar's tricentennial telegrams, little was actually done during the thirteen years of Alexander's reign to extend the principles of the Great Reforms to Siberia. This was certainly not surprising in view of the policies of a reign which even undid certain aspects of the reforms of Alexander II. With such tendencies predominant, it followed that not only a distaste for reform in Siberia, but also a fear of latent Siberian separatism would preoccupy some key government advisers and spokesmen.

One of the most influential of these anti-regionalists, of course, was Mikhail Katkov. A centralist, nationalist, and frequent apologist for the government, Katkov fought manifestations of Siberian regionalism and local development in general. These he feared might lead to a Siberia strong enough to tear itself loose from the empire. As discussed above, his anti-regionalist views, playing on hidden fears of separatism, were expressed in the widely read organs, the Russian Herald and the Moscow Gazette (both published until Katkov's death in 1887). Indeed, according to Popov, it was Katkov who coined the word "separatist" in his Moscow Gazette, just after the Polish Insurrection of 1863. [3]

---

3 Popov, "K 80-ti lietiiu Potanina," pp. 293-94.

Even more influential in government circles was Konstantin P. Pobedonostsev (1827-1907), lay head of the Holy Synod and long-time adviser to the tsar. As a staunch centralist, the somewhat cynical Pobedonostsev had little respect for Siberia and labeled it a "stubborn and mute colony" and the "black little finger of the empire." [4] In secular affairs (in which Pobedonostsev dabbled all too frequently) he and state secretary A. A. Polovtsev came out strongly against the opening of the Siberian university in Tomsk. In fact, in a memorto Pobedonostsev, Polovtsev called the forthcoming event a "dangerous political error"; indeed building an "ice palace on the Neva" would be both cheaper and less harmful. [5]

Despite their anti-progressive views, however, these men in one sense had "history" on their side. The historian Guins has pointed out that in retrospect, "Russian bureaucrats and reactionaries, such as Pobedonostsev and Katkov, were incorrect when they delayed reforms and the establishment of a university in Siberia, but there was a historic truth in Russian centralism, in the sense of a close tie between Siberia and the center . . ." [6]

Quite different views were expressed by some government officials in Siberia, however. One highly placed official, Governor Nosovich of Irkutsk province, expressed views similar to those officially stated by the tsar: Siberia was not a colony nor even a unique part of the empire, but was quite similar to European Russia. After 2½ years of study Nosovich concluded that Irkutsk province was no different from the "indigenous" Russian provinces.

---

4 Quoted in "Fevral'skaia revoliutsiia i oblastnichestvo" (The February Revolution and Regionalism), Vol'naia Sibir', (1927) no. 2, p. 4.

5 Pobedonostsev, K. P. Pobedonostsev i ego korrespondenty. Pis'ma i zapiski (K. P. Pobedonostsev and His Correspondents: Notes and Letters), (Moscow-Petrograd, 1923), p. 543. The memo is dated November 26, 1885.

6 G. K. Gins, "Sibirskoe oblastnichestvo," p. 148.

Just as Metternich had considered Italy merely a geographical expression, so too did this official consider the term "Eastern Siberia." Reproaching both regionalists and anti-regionalists of the Katkov-Pobedonostsev stripe, Nosovich stated in 1884 that

> there has been no revival in Siberia, in the sense of giving it new institutions introduced long ago in Russia, not because Siberia has failed to mature to an age capable of knowing how to use them, but chiefly because people here and in Russia have been accustomed to consider Siberia as something different from Russia. [7]

Specifically discounting the dangers of "separatism" altogether was Count A. P. Ignatiev, governor-general of Eastern Siberia from 1885 to 1889. One of Ignatiev's greatest merits, in the eyes of one Siberian, was that he attached no significance to "the legend of some sort of Siberian separatism and of a Siberian party." Ignatiev looked upon this "legend" as an "absolute and even insulting absurdity for Siberian society." [8]

In Siberia, just as in Russia, there were numerous centralists in the administration who did attach significance to the separatist legend. Not only potential separatist sentiments, but even emphasis on regional differences had to be suppressed. For example, the Irkutsk censor, Bezobrazov, in the early 1890's crossed out such "subversive" terms in the Eastern Review as "Siberian population" and "Siberian region." If the term "our country" referred only to Siberia, this was not permitted; if the words "Siberia" and "Russia" were counterposed, the latter had to be designated "European Russia." Even the expression "Sibiryaks" had to be replaced with "native

---

7 Sibir', (1884) no. 45; quoted in V. P. Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 155
8 Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 162.

Siberians." Circumstances had been similar in 1882 when the newspaper proposed as the "Siberian Review" was tactfully renamed the Eastern Review so as not to antagonize officials who might see in it the specter of separatism. [9]

In line with such approaches to "de-Siberianize" Siberia were the administrative and territorial revisions undertaken during the reign of Alexander III. First, however, the background of these changes should be noted. Territorially, the borders of Siberia had witnessed significant changes during the previous reign. The entire Amur region had been annexed by 1860, all the Russian possessions in North America had been sold in 1867, Sakhalin was fully incorporated in 1875, and by 1881 extensive territories in Central Asia had been conquered: Kokand, Bukhara, Khiva, and the Transcaspian area. Administratively, alterations had taken place during the same reign. The Siberian Committee, which had existed in Petersburg off and on since 1813 (and most recently reconstituted in 1852), was abolished by Alexander II in 1864. Its functions devolved to the Committee of Ministers as a whole. As Svatikov puts it, "In this way the organ of supreme regional administration for Siberia, the heir of the Siberian Office . . . (abolished in 1763), was ended." [10] Following this, in 1867 a new governor-generalship of Turkestan was created for the Central Asian lands conquered so far, its borders abutting Western Siberia. In 1874 a committee was set up within the Ministry of Interior, headed by A. I. Despot-Zenovich, to investigate the administrative division of Russian Asia. Here it was proposed to transfer Siberian provinces to the Ministry's jurisdiction, to introduce zemstvos and judicial

---

9 Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II: 239; and "K 80-ti lietiiu," p. 293.
10 Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 76.

reform, and to establish new governor-generalships in the Steppe and Amur areas.[11]

The first important administrative change under Alexander III was the abolition of the West Siberian governor-generalship in 1882. In its place Tomsk and Tobolsk provinces were set up as regular Russian provinces, no longer subordinate to a quasi-independent governor-general, but to governors directly accountable to the Ministry of Interior. The remaining southern portion of the former West Siberian unit became part of a new Steppe governor-generalship, with headquarters in Omsk. This creation also included parts of northern Central Asia (such as the Akmolinsk and Semirechie areas).[12] Significantly, the name "Siberia" was omitted from the new administrative nomenclature. Not only were Tomsk and Tobolsk provinces "equalized" in jurisdiction with their counterparts west of the Urals, but a kind of decentralizing subdivision or splitting up of Siberia itself was set into motion. Though Siberia was inseparable, it certainly was divisible — within the framework of the Russian Empire.

Two years later, in 1884, territorial and jurisdictional reorganization was carried out in Eastern Siberia too. Muravyov had first raised the question of a separate governor-generalship for the Amur area, and in the 1870's Despot-Zenovich and his committee had recommended such a change. But at the outset of Alexander III's reign, Eastern Siberia's governor-general, Anuchin, was strongly opposed to dividing his jurisdiction into two separate entities. By 1883, however, Petersburg officials began to consider not only

---

11 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 536; and Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 673.

12 Semirechie was transferred to the governor-generalship of Turkestan in 1898.

creating a new Amur governor-generalship, but also abolishing the one in Eastern Siberia, following the course just set in Western Siberia. Some officials felt that governor-generalships were more suitable to distant, frontier territories recently acquired, than to long-standing parts of the empire inhabited by Russian stock, as was Siberia proper. If Western Siberia's administration could be transformed, why not Eastern Siberia's? [13] There was also the problem of determining the boundaries of a new Amur governor-generalship: should Transbaikalia be included with it or not? [14]

These questions were resolved in 1884. An Amur governor-generalship was established by imperial order which included the Maritime area, the Amur valley, Sakhalin, and Transbaikalia. Eastern Siberia was to remain only temporarily a governor-generalship. In January 1885 the recalcitrant Anuchin was replaced by Count Ignatiev as governor-general. In name the East Siberian governor-generalship was dissolved in 1887, succeeded by the governor-generalship of Irkutsk. Thus, at this time the name of Siberia disappeared completely as an administrative term. A type of precedent for this had in fact been set in the mid-1860's by changing the name of the Kingdom of Poland to the Vistula Provinces, a geographical term with no historical or ethnic connotations. Thus, Siberia, divided administratively into western and eastern halves since Speransky's time, after 1887 was split up into five different administrative areas: two provinces — Tomsk and Tobolsk; and three governor-generalships — Steppe, Irkutsk, and Amur. These three governor-generalships, along with those of Turkestan and Trans-

---

13 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), pp. 536-37.
14 Sukachev goes into this question in some detail (Irkutsk, pp. 157-58).

caucasia, were to last until 1917.

Also abolished in both Western and Eastern Siberia were the administrative councils established by Speransky to temper the powers of governors-general. These councils, characterized as a kind of "sinecure of servitor officials," were now replaced by chanceries. These in some ways broadened the power of the governor or governor-general, lessening the need for consultation in decision-making. On the other hand, many functions of the administrations in both Irkutsk and Amur governor-generalships were now "decentralized" into offices immediately responsible to the appropriate ministries in St. Petersburg: mining, schools, judiciary, etc. Shortly after this reshuffle took place, Sukachov wrote: "In this one can only see a slow, gradual, but steady movement in the direction of a full unification of the Siberian provinces with those in European Russia." The Irkutsk mayor, along with Siberian society, felt justified in hoping that the desire "to live amidst conditions in which the vast majority of the Russian people lives is not far from realization." [15]

Yadrintsev first viewed the administrative reforms rather optimistically, fully favoring these initial steps toward equalization. After the change in Western Siberia he wrote:

> The abolition of the governor-generalships of Orenburg and Western Siberia has been a significant step in the system of administering the regions of the East, and of the steppe lands especially. Such a move can reduce the budget and accelerate the introduction of civil and cultural rights among the population. Siberian provinces that have a Russian population with full rights no longer require a "special administration" in any way. . . . With the abolition

---

15 Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 161.

> of governor-generalships the last obstacle to the reforms which European Russia has experienced for years would also be eliminated. [16]

Nevertheless, the abolition of the West Siberian governor-generalship set no similar changes in motion elsewhere. Yadrintsev then began to ask, if Tomsk and Tobolsk provinces could be administered without governors-general, why then could not the same principle be applied to Yeniseisk and Irkutsk provinces, which were essentially in the same condition. His optimism fading, he wrote in 1892 that whatever the administrative changes had been, everything still depended much on the top official, his character, talent, and intentions. "Siberia and the Siberian administration have in this way regarded their epochs and regimes to this very day, attaching to them the memory of famous administrators and their personal qualities . . ." [17]

Of the chief administrators during the reign of Alexander III perhaps the most respected by Siberians was Count Alexei P. Ignatiev, governor-general of Irkutsk from 1885 to 1889 (brother of the famous statesman and diplomat Nikolai Ignatiev). Yadrintsev spoke of his humanity, and Sukachov of his sympathetic character. Ignatiev worked hard on regularizing administrative reforms among the peasantry, on conducting statistical investigations in his provinces, and on the question of constructing a railroad through Siberia. [18] He even created "district conferences" of elected delegates to discuss road and transport duties, and urged that the exile system be radically changed. [19] Ignatiev considered it his task to carry through a policy of limited reform, suggested to him by the tsar. In 1887 he related how

---

16 Jadrinzew, Sibirien (1886), pp. 386-87.
17 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 537.
18 Ibid., pp. 538-39; and Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 158.
19 Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 83; and Kennan, Siberia, II: 13-16, 465. By the late 1890's Ignatiev's district conferences (okruzhnye s"ezdy) had ceased to exist.

"His Majesty, in dispatching me to administer Siberia, told me that I am to undertake all kinds of measures and reforms, but not to touch the fundamentals . . ." [20] This attitude well characterizes the reform efforts in Siberia during Alexander III's reign. It also justified perhaps the unfavorable criticism of Ignatiev's administration. Vagin, for instance, described his rule as "oppression under a velvet glove," while the exile Belokonsky called him a "brilliant representative of the new 'course'" of reaction in Siberia. [21]

The Emperor's instructions to Count Ignatiev help explain why the hopes of Sukachov, Yadrintsev, and others were not realized for the remainder of the reign, the century, and indeed the life of the monarchy. If administrative and territorial reforms went only halfway toward equalizing conditions in Siberia with those in Russia, reforms in other areas during this period went even less far. One of the first revisions was an extension of the Statute of February 19, 1861, to Siberia providing for the establishment of township (volost') meetings among the peasantry. Thus, the organization of self-government on the township level, one step above the village commune, was introduced in Western Siberia in 1879 and in Eastern Siberia in 1882. Township meetings gave peasants some say in affairs concerning schools, storehouses, hospitals (if any), public works, and the general administration of the township (usually a group of peasant villages). In their functions township meetings in some ways resembled zemstvos, which in European Russia existed only on the provincial and district levels. [22] In fact,

---

20 Quoted in M. P. Sazhin, "Po Sibiri. (Vospominaniia)" (Through Siberia: Memoirs), Katorga i Ssylka, (1928) no. 49 (12), p. 95.

21 Vagin's diary (line 574), quoted in Podol'skaia, "Dnevnik Vagina," p. 125; and I. P. Belokonskii, Dan' Vremeni, p. 320.

22 V. Grigor'ev, "Zemstvo v Sibiri," p. 46; and Shcheglov, Perechen', pp. 733-34.

some Siberians hoped that the introduction of township meetings on the local level would facilitate establishment of regular zemstvos for townships. Such zemstvos, however, with their assembly, executive board, and expanded economic functions, the government considered unthinkable in a Siberia without gentry; and especially at the township level, where they were not introduced anywhere in Russia until the Civil War.

The extension of another principle of the same Statute of February 1861 brought to Siberia in 1883 the same township court system the Russian peasants had. Decisions were to be meted out on the basis of local peasant customs. In charge of a township court, as well as almost everything else in the township, was the land deputy (zemskii zasedatel'). In the provinces of Tomsk and Tobolsk, wrote one observer, "It is hard to tell where the police ends and where the court begins, so closely connected are the two. The land deputy is simultaneously a police official, a judicial interrogator, and the supreme ruler of the destinies of an entire area, sometimes having a population of up to 100,000." [23]

As with the administrative reforms, so the response of Siberians to these judicial changes gradually passed from optimism to relative despondency. Sukachov felt that the "partial reform of the judicial system and the significant improvement in personal composition" could be considered a "first step toward a radical transformation of legal procedure and the judicial system now operative in Siberia." [24] Other subsequent observers were less than satisfied with the functioning of the "reformed" court system in

---

23 Quoted in Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 541.
24 Sukachev, Irkutsk, pp. 158-59.

Eastern Siberia on the township level.[25] When Tobolsk and Tomsk provinces came under regular administration, justices of the peace and their courts were introduced on the district level there.[26] As was the practice where no zemstvos existed in European Russia, justices were appointed by the Crown. Thus, by 1894 Siberia still lacked courts open to the public, juries, and elected judges.

Many Siberians hoped that these rather token reforms would lead to more significant changes, chief among which was the establishment of zemstvos in Siberian provinces, districts, and even townships. Dominant circles in the central government, however, considered the socio-political conditions in Siberia as unsuited for setting up such organs of limited local self-government. The absence of a gentry class in Siberia, which in Russia was by and large much more loyal to and dependent on the Crown than any other social element, was the primary cause for the failure to introduce zemstvos. Potanin claimed that in "gentry politics" the Vyatka zemstvo (in northeastern Russia), which had an unusually large peasant representation, was set as a "dangerous example" that a Siberian zemstvo (or zemstvos) might follow. According to the gentry viewpoint, the latter

> would be converted into an asylum of oppositional forces in Russia and of those dissatisfied with the existing regime, and into a hotbed of a general Russian revolution. The ruling class regards all the more unsympathetically the idea of giving Siberia more political freedom than exists in the mother country.[27]

---

25 See M. Dubenskii, "Ocherk dieiatel'nosti volostnago suda v vostochnoi Sibiri. Okrug krasnoiarskii" (Activities of the Township Court in Krasnoyarsk Okrug, Eastern Siberia), Sibirskii Sbornik, (1892) no. 2, p. 69; and M. N. Sobolev, "K voprosu o reformie krest'ianskago upravleniia v Sibiri" (On the Question of Reforming the Peasant Administration in Siberia), Sibirskie Voprosy, (1905) no. 1, pp. 96-97.

26 See (Iadrintsev) "Nachalo pechati," p. 403.

27 Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," p. 289.

In other words peasants' running local affairs without the "leadership" of the gentry was unacceptable.

It is worth noting that Siberia was not the only part of the empire discriminated against regarding introduction of zemstvos. Historical and ethnic factors militated against their establishment elsewhere, just as strongly as social ones. At the end of the 19th century, besides Siberia, Lithuania, Byelorussia, southwestern Ukraine, the Polish and Baltic provinces, Central Asia, and Transcaucasia — in short, all the borderlands, both Slavic and non-Slavic — lacked zemstvos.[28] By 1914 zemstvos were functioning in only forty-three of the empire's seventy provinces.

Not only native Siberians began to recognize the need for zemstvos, as evidenced in tricentennial festivities and newspaper articles, but some of the Siberian administrative officials did too. Editorial articles in the official Irkutsk Provincial Gazette, for instance, came out for Siberian zemstvos. In connection with changes in the composition of Russian zemstvos which favored the gentry position (put through in 1890), one such editorial commented delicately: "Along with the transformation of zemstvo institutions, there arises in turn the question of the suitability of extending these institutions to all Russia." However, such a progressive step was hardly likely to follow a counter-reform which restricted peasant representation. Another comment in the Irkutsk Gazette ran:

> Our distant borderland more than any other part of the state needs public schools, protection of pub-

---

28 Finland had its own constitutional diet, whose powers were severely limited by the imperial decree of February 3, 1899. Zemstvos had been taken away from the Don Cossacks in 1882 and not restored.

> lic health, and the improvement of its means of communication. Both means and people are needed for this. . . . We propose that a Siberian zemstvo will be capable of satisfying this need . . . [29]

Of the governors-general of Irkutsk, A. D. Goremykin (1889-94) was especially active in promoting zemstvos for Siberia. In 1899 he presented to the Ministry of Interior a draft for the establishment of zemstvos in Irkutsk and Yeniseisk provinces, formerly under his jurisdiction.[30] This attempt, however, was no more successful thanyany others on the part of officials, from the efforts of ex-governor Despot-Zenovich in the 1870's up to the Imperial rescript of April 2, 1905, to encourage local discussion of the problem.[31] Indeed, as far back as the reign of Alexander I, Kozodavlev had recommended the principle of representation in Siberian government, but to no avail. All in all, it should be stressed that local administrators at times sided with Siberian regionalists and civic leaders in seeking to change the central government's policy of withholding zemstvos from Siberia. The great influence they could wield locally and regionally shrank, however, to almost nothing when it came up against autocratic and bureaucratic resistance in St. Petersburg.

It was to Petersburg that Siberians looked for improvements, whether they were separatists, regionalists, centralists, administrative officials, or just plain citizens. Even Yadrintsev, one of the more radical regionalists (who even called himself, with qualifications, a separatist), reflected this attitude his entire life. He wrote in 1883, for instance, of

---

29 "K voprosu o vvedenii v Sibiri zemskikh uchrezdenii" (On the Question of Introducing Zemstvos in Siberia), Irkutskiia Gubernskiia Viedomosti, (1890) no. 36; quoted in Sukachev, Irkutsk, pp. 153-54.

30 D. Zaitsev, "Zemstvo v Sibiri," p. 62.

31 For a discussion of the zemstvo question in the early 20th century, see D. W. Treadgold, The Great Siberian Migration, pp. 197-98.

the desire of Siberians "to be loyal subjects" and of their "love for the throne." [32] And Sukachov stated that if there were any "party" in Siberia, it was one consisting "of those who ardently love their homeland as loyal subjects of the Russian state in the form that the thousand-year history of Russia had made it." Reflecting on the many decades from the late 18th century to the mid-1880's when Irkutsk had been commonly considered the "capital of Siberia," the mayor wrote in 1891:

> The changes that have recently occurred . . . in the administration of Eastern Siberia have deprived Irkutsk of its earlier significance as an administrative center of this borderland. Having lost its administrative hegemony over the whole country, with each passing year it is more and more approaching the position of a Russian provincial town, which is proper for it to occupy. It should not be any capital: the capital of Siberia is St. Petersburg. [33]

Administrative changes in the 1880's indeed implemented the desire of Alexander III for an inseparable Siberia, closely united with Russia. A policy of "divide and rule," reducing the jurisdiction in area and in power of would-be separatistic or independent-minded administrators (if such should emerge), motivated the most thoroughgoing and successful reform, from the government viewpoint, of all the institutional changes undertaken in Siberia during the reign of Alexander III.

* * *

---

32 Letter to D. I. Zavalishin, dated April 18, 1883; in Sbornik starinnykh bumag, X: 277.

33 Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 162.

The University Question

The one institution discussed over the longest period of time and whose establishment in Siberia was delayed for as many as 85 years was a Siberian university. Intermittently raised by government officials since 1803, the question of a university for Siberia did not become a burning issue among Siberians until the 1860's, the era of Great Reforms in Russia and of the emergence of regionalism. By the late 1870's the demand for a regional institution of higher learning had spread from the voices and writings of a few key regionalists to broader segments of Siberian society. This question had long predated the issue of introducing specific Great Reforms into Siberia, and in the 1860's and 1870's it was often, though not always, looked upon as the most needed reform in Siberia. In part, Alexander II ordered in 1875 the plans for a Siberian university to be drafted in response to petitions and demands of regionalists, officials, and other important figures. This was the first major demand of regionalists to which the central government acceded. However, in some ways it was to become at first little more than a hollow victory.

An initial sketch of the background, leading from the discussion stage to the preparatory period (1875-88), can illustrate the government's policies of delay, indifference, and actual antagonism toward a Siberian university. Such actions by and large characterized government attitudes toward this question from the very first mention of a Siberian university until long after its opening in 1888. Siberian regionalists and intellectuals, from the 1860's to the 20th century, continuously viewed the university issue as not fully resolved, and after 1888 the university itself as incomplete.

In 1803 a decree of the Governing Senate, confirmed by the Emperor

Alexander I, allowed for the establishment of new universities in the cities of St. Petersburg, Kazan, Kharkov, Kiev, and Tobolsk. [34] Subsequently that same year, the industrialist P. G. Demidov, of a well-known Siberian family of iron and mining magnates, donated 100,000 rubles to the universities designated to open in Kiev and Tobolsk. Half of this sum was to go to the projected Tobolsk university and was kept in the hands of the University of Moscow during the following years. [35] Demidov's capital served as a base to which later donations for a Siberian university were added. In 1803, however, Siberia had not so much as a single secondary school; in recognition of this need, two classical high-schools (gimnazii) were founded in Irkutsk and Tobolsk, in 1805 and 1810, respectively. A university could hardly begin to operate successfully without an adequate base at the secondary-school level.

During Speransky's administration (1819-22), the progressive governor-general gave some thought to higher education in Siberia, which included correspondence with the Minister of Education, Prince Golitsyn, regarding establishment of "schools of higher sciences" in Siberia. Constituting one of these "higher sciences" were Oriental languages, and to this end Speransky hoped to re-establish the Oriental-language school in Irkutsk, defunct since 1794. But the chief problem was preparation and motivation: too few qualified and were interested in attending such a school. [36] Moreover, the

---

34 Point 14 of the decree of January 24, 1803. At this time universities already existed in Moscow, Vilno, and Dorpat. In accordance with the Senate's decree, universities were founded in Kazan in 1804, Kharkov in 1805, St. Petersburg in 1819, and Kiev in 1834.

35 (Iadrintsev) "Pervyi sibirskii universitet," pp. 58-59; and Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 51. Popov claimes that Demidov's 50,000 rubles was turned over in 1810 to the use of the newly founded Tobolsk gimnaziia; see "Proshloe i nastoiashchee Sibirskago Universiteta" (The Siberian University's Past and Present), Golos Minuvshago, (1914) bk. 1, p. 293.

36 "Pervyi universitet," p. 62; Raeff, Siberia, p. 42, 51; and Vagin, Is-

brevity of Speransky's stay in Siberia as governor-general stymied whatever plans of his might have gotten off ground.

However, Speransky's nominee and successor as governor-general of Western Siberia, P. M. Kaptsevich, continued the efforts of his illustrious predecessor regarding higher education. Kaptsevich and M. L. Magnitsky, trustee of the Kazan educational district, both influenced by Speransky's concern for improving education beyond the Urals, drew up plans for higher education in Siberia. These the Siberian Committee in Petersburg not only found useful but also approved. Kaptsevich, in a report to the Emperor of March 1823, lamented "the lack of moral principles" in the local population, the absence of educated officials in the region, and the impossibility for Siberians to study in the universities of European Russia due to their poverty. He concluded by stressing the need to establish some kind of institution of higher learning in Siberia. Magnitsky, more specifically, presented to the Emperor a draft plan for a kind of normal school in Barnaul. Here students would be prepared to become secondary-school teachers in Siberia, envoys for the Russian mission in Peking, civil service officials, and merchants specializing in the China trade. Magnitsky hoped to make use of the Demidov funds, whose interest by now had greatly increased their value. [37]

The proposals of Kaptsevich and Magnitsky got no farther than the Siberian Committee, and under the reign of Nicholas I the government kept the university question under wraps for more than thirty years. Kaptsevich's report, however, for the first time advanced major reasons for founding a

---

toricheskiia sviedeniia, II: 139-40.

37 (Iadrintsev) "Pervyi universitet," pp. 62-63; and Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 51-52.

Siberian university — ones which would be heard repeatedly in the last third of the century.

In 1835 the Ministry of Education (under Count S. S. Uvarov) decided to encourage Siberian students to study at the University of Kazan in place of founding a university beyond the Urals. A limited number of government stipends to qualified Siberian students were to be given annually to attend the University of Kazan. This new turn of events resulted from a suggestion of the Committee of Ministers in 1834 that the tsar ask Uvarov to turn his attention to the lack of teachers in Tomsk province and to recognize that the University of Kazan refused to admit Siberians unless they obligated themselves to teach for at least 15 years in Siberia. Consequently, eighteen teaching scholarships were allotted to the secondary schools in Tobolsk and Irkutsk per year. As soon as secondary schools could be set up in Tomsk and Yeniseisk, these were to offer four scholarships apiece.[38] This decision led to the establishment of a third Siberian secondary school: in Tomsk in 1838; not until 1869 was another one founded in Siberia — in Krasnoyarsk.

On the whole, secondary education developed extremely slowly in Siberia during the reign of Nicholas I. By 1853, for example, there were only 95 pupils in the Tomsk gimnaziia. Of this entire period Yadrintsev wrote:

> The university question . . . lay as if hidden from the light of day. This was due to the fact that Speransky and other administrators who dreamt of developing education and who also raised the question of a regional institution of higher education unfortunately relied too much on the usual administrative method of raising

---

38 William H. E. Johnson, Russia's Educational Heritage (Pittsburgh: Carnegie Press, 1950), p. 98. Johnson cites his source as Decree no. 383, of December 9, 1835, in Sbornik postanovlenii Ministerstva Narodnago Prosvieshcheniia, vol. II (1), pp. 793-804.

> these questions — through bureaucratic correspondence; they forgot that in a matter such as education society itself had to be drawn in to participate; a need for life and a spark of consciousness had to be touched off in its midst; and only on this basis were such institutions solid and feasible. The idea of higher education in Siberia, however, could not completely subside, and it arose again in the mid-1850's. [39]

What occurred again in the mid-fifties was once again an unsuccessful initiative undertaken on the part of a high government official. Its failure was again partially due to the fact that Siberians still stood mute on the issue.

At the beginning of the reign of Alexander II, the Minister of Education, A. S. Norov, submitted a report to the Emperor on certain problems of secondary and higher education on March 5, 1856. Discussing the usefulness of establishing a university in Siberia, Norov stated,

> This beneficial measure, if recognized as being possible, promises great consequences to the region, whose natural riches and local circumstances await only the life-giving assistance of science, so that innumerable benefits may be supplied to the state. The ministry will concern itself with a rough draft of a plan for this institution of higher education, which, without losing its character as a university, should accommodate the needs of the country in the number, composition, and direction of its faculties.[40]

Norov's proposal, stressing the economic and financial consequences and side-effects of a Siberian university, fell mostly upon deaf ears. Though, according to Norov's report, the tsar had "acknowledged the establishment of a university in Siberia as useful," the idea was shelved until the latter

---

39 (Iadrintsev) "Pervyi universitet," p. 65. Yadrintsev discusses Siberian educational developments in general during the reign of Nicholas I in "Istoriia prosvieshcheniia," pp. 136-38.

40 Quoted in Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 577; his sources is given as Sbornik postanovlenii Ministerstva Narodnago Prosvieshcheniia. Abbreviated versions are found in "Pervyi universitet," p. 66; and in Popov, "Proshloe i nastoiashchee Sibirskago Universiteta," p. 294.

part of the reign. There is no doubt that far more pressing social, institutional, and educational reforms in Russia itself, slowly being set into motion from the late 1850's on, overrode governmental preoccupation with the Siberian borderland. Amost twenty years after Norov's report, in 1875, Alexander II, by now less pressed by domestic reform issues in European Russia, responded affirmatively and decisively to the question of a Siberian university.

In these intervening twenty years, a great deal of response to the question began to emerge in Siberia itself. As Popov later put it, "While the government was silent, the Siberian press and individual Siberians, especially Yadrintsev, Potanin, Vagin, Shatilov /Shashkov?/, Shchukin, Shchapov, and others, but Yadrintsev most of all, raised this question and aroused Siberian society." [41] During the 1860's the issue came to the fore primarily among the young Siberian regionalists, who as students had to face this issue squarely for several years. Thus, as noted earlier, Shchapov pleaded with the tsar in writing, while Yadrintsev and Shashkov gave speeches in Omsk, Krasnoyarsk, and Tomsk to rally public support for a Siberian university. Articles on this problem appeared in official provincial gazettes, and Yadrintsev in 1864 proposed founding a society to collect public donations. Though such a society was never formed, various philanthropic offers were made, which in time reached a point where a university was financially within the realm of possibility. [42]

---

41 I. Popov, "Proshloe i nastoiashchee Sibirskago Universiteta," p. 294. Instead of Shatilov, Popov probably meant Shashkov, who played an important role in popularizing the idea of a university in the mid-1860's (I. N. and P. N. Shatilov, the most important nineteenth-century figures with this surname, were totally unconnected with Siberian affairs).

42 Pypin, Istoriia russkoi etnografii, IV: 374 n.; and Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 55.

The most formidable and persistent campaigner for a Siberian university was Yadrintsev. Glinsky has even gone so far as to write:

> From the moment he appeared on the public rostrum in Omsk to his last breath, Nikolai Mikhailovich was the most fervent proponent of the university idea in Siberia. He was the first after Speransky to begin to propagandize this idea, and he pursued it like a red thread in all his articles, whatever their subject matter; he presented it before both local and metropolitan administrations, he collected enormous sums for founding the university, he welcomed its beginning, and he spoke of it still into our days. [43]

Before the university opened, however, Yadrintsev's propagandizing was limited chiefly to Omsk and St. Petersburg.

In Irkutsk, which in the 1860's was regarded by most as the logical and preferable site for a university, interest was strong on the subject. Here even before the young Yadrintsev returned to Siberia, Zagoskin had already raised the question of a Siberian university. He wrote in the Irkutsk Provincial Gazette in 1863:

> We do not need the good officials and excellent men of action that appear among us from time to time, We ourselves would like to become educated people, to begin to lead our own rational lives, to have our own judges, performers, and experts. In a word, we need a concentration of intellectual life, a necessary bright spot where our gaze might always turn with love and hope — we need a university. [44]

By the mid-1870's town magistrates and the Irkutsk duma began to make resolutions regarding a university, while local educators discussed the problem with interest.

---

43 B. Glinskii, "Iadrintsev," p. 425.

44 M. V. Zagoskin, "Chto nam neobkhodimo v osobennosti" (What We Need in Particular), Irkutskiia Gubernskiia Viedomosti, (March 30, 1863); quoted in Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 90.

According to Popov, several hundred articles on the university question were written during the 1860's and 1870's.[45] At a time when European Russia was undergoing so much institutional transformation, a university was the one reform which Siberians could expect to have introduced in their region. In official circles, the governor of Tobolsk province, A. I. Despot-Zenovich, continuing in the footsteps of Speransky and Kaptsevich, vigorously supported the university idea in the 1860's. And P. P. Semyonov, vice-president of the Russian Geographical Society, also added his support.

The first important result of this campaign, waged largely in Siberia and by means of public opinion, was the imperial order of April 25, 1875. Alexander II hereby declared that "considerations on the establishment of a general university for all Siberia were to be subject to Imperial Review through the Ministry of Education."[46] This pronouncement was followed a year later by imperial approval (on April 24, 1876) of the Imperial Siberian University, to be established in Omsk. Two years later, however, in May 1878, the tsar ordered the university site changed to Tomsk. Moreover, the projected university would consist of four faculties (fakul'tety): History-Philosophy, Physics-Mathematics, Law, and Medicine.[47]

Since 1875 the Irkutsk newspaper Siberia had kept up a steady campaign for the building of a university with four faculties; the articles of Zagoskin and Shchapov were especially prominent in this respect. As the only private Siberian newspaper in existence when the tsar definitely approved

---

45 Popov, "Proshloe i nastoiashchee Sibirskago Universiteta," p. 295.

46 Sbornik postanovlenii Ministerstva Narodnago Prosvieshcheniia (A Collection of the Resolutions of the Ministry of Education), IV: 1470 ff; quoted in Shcheglov, Perechen', pp. 679-80; and in (Iadrintsev) "Pervyi universitet," pp. 74-75.

47 Decree of May 16, 1878; see Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 702.

the four faculties and the Tomsk location (which the majority of concerned Siberians now favored), Siberia waxed eloquent upon receiving the long-awaited news. The university would "constitute the beauty, honor, and pride of the country, shedding the light of science and truth into a dark, forgotten region, illuminating life's harvest-ground /niva/ and laying the foundations of intellectual activity." [48]

By 1880 private donations of philanthropic Siberians to the university had greatly increased since Demidov's initial gift. This fund was now worth 150,000 rubles, and added to it were the more recent donations of the Siberian merchants Z. M. Tsibulsky and A. M. Sibiryakov of 140,000 and 110,000 rubles, respectively; other individuals and organizations by this time had given about 50,000 rubles altogether. Nevertheless, private donations alone could not cover the estimated cost of the university building: almost 600,000 rubles (it ultimately cost 800,000). Yadrintsev lamented that many refused to give a penny until the cornerstone of the university building was actually laid. As conditions stood at the end of Alexander II's reign, beyond private contributions at least 100,000 rubles would have to be provided by the government toward the university. Among donations too were many books for the university library, which by 1880 totaled about 35,000 volumes (either donated or purchased). [49]

During the 1860's and 1870's resistance to a Siberian university began to build up in reaction to the growing popular ground swell favoring it. Some administrators saw danger in providing Siberians with higher education,

---

48 "Pervye kamni dlia universiteta" (First Stones for a University), Sibir', (1878) no. 22; quoted in "Nachalo pechati," p. 396.

49 Discussions of donations are found in (Iadrintsev) "Pervyi universitet," p. 89; Shcheglov, Perechen', pp. 714-15; and Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 116. Popov claims that by August 1880, when the cornerstone was laid, private contributions reached 700,000 rubles ("Proshloe i nastoiashchee," 295).

contending that local and regional affairs would best be controlled by officials educated in European Russia. This paternalistic outlook tended to regard Siberians as a kind of "hostile nationality" and a university as a potential hotbed of separatism and radicalism. Others, often more progressive in viewpoint, considered a Siberian university as premature in light of the insufficient network of primary and secondary schools. A university, they argued, would be too costly a luxury, funds would be allocated better toward existing universities elsewhere or, following the "American example," toward a broader educational base at the primary-school level. Some held that not only would few well-trained professors be willing to go to Siberia, but also that too few students would show up at the courses offered. [50]

There was also a social dimension to the problem. Many gentry spokesmen disliked the idea of a university in a peasant region without landed gentry; in this the conservative journalist Prince V. P. Meshchersky was most vocal in his opposition. Indeed, when Yadrintsev once told the Siberian-born journalist, Yeliseev, that the Siberian university would become predominantly peasant in composition, the latter replied, "How will they allow you to build a peasant university?" [51] Combatting the fears and resistance of the "gentry party" were such influential dignitaries as Semyonov and Despot-Zenovich, themselves of rather high birth. [52] As a further obstacle, bureaucratic and administrative indifference kept the wheels of progress from turning.

The strong combination of forces opposed in various ways to a Siberian

---

50 Various arguments opposing the university are found in "Pervyi universitet," pp. 68-69.
51 Cited in Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," p. 289.
52 Potanin, Oblastnicheskaia tendentsiia, p. 30.

university helped delay the final opening until 1888 and reduced the four faculties promised by Alexander II to only one. The first delay after Alexander's declared intention to establish the university in 1875 was occasioned in part by the preoccupation of the government and Russian public opinion with the Pan-Slav question and disturbances in the Balkans (1875-1876), followed by the Russo-Turkish War itself in 1877-78. After the war the problem of state finances remained acute. Moreover, the specific university plan had not been made public. [53] After the debate over the appropriate site subsided in 1878, when the tsar decided on Tomsk, developments dragged on until August 1880, when the cornerstone of the main university building was finally laid.

In the late seventies and early eighties Yadrintsev led the campaign against the university's detractors, appealing to many different outlooks in the spectrum of Russian and Siberian public opinion. As Potanin put it, Yadrintsev "clarified the acute need to open a university in Siberia, explained how its establishment would save the country from various local evils, and pointed to circumstances which turned the university question from one of general education to a narrow, regional Siberian question." [54] Concerning general education, he showed that schools in European Russia were attended by 1.29% of the population, whereas in Siberia the percentage was only .38. [55] He claimed that Siberia was caught in an "inescapable vicious circle" in the realm of education. With no university to train secondary-school teachers, these largely came from European Russia and were generally

53 "Pervyi universitet," pp. 82-83, 90.
54 Potanin, Oblastnicheskaia tendentsiia, pp. 30-31.
55 Jadrinzew, Sibirien, p. 402. In 1886 the 1,119 primary and secondary schools in Siberia were attended by 36,744 pupils (Iadrintsev, "Istoriia prosvieshcheniia," p. 143).

of poor quality and insufficient quantity. With "intellectual absenteeism" high among Siberian students, few of them returned to teach in secondary schools.[56] Thus, a university could have only a stimulating effect on all primary and secondary schools in Siberia.

Countering objections raised against the university, Yadrintsev also moved from the narrower, regionalist point of view to a broader, national outlook. He, for instance, defended Russia's mission and national interests in the East, in this respect condeding little to Muravyov.

> The partisans of a Siberian university, exhausting all possible arguments before the conscious stubbornness of the opponents of enlightenment, have recently pointed to a rather obvious political fact. Events occurring in countries next to us in Asia — Japan and China — force us at present to think about the means of /spreading/ our culture in Asia. States of many million people, such as Japan and China, have left a period of stagnation lasting many centuries, and with the aid of European instructors they are trying to approach the level of European states; railroads are being built there and universities created. What is the situation in our borderland regarding these countries?[57]

Reflecting the rapid, extensive efforts of Meiji Japan to catch up and surpass the West, and the slow, stumbling attempts in Manchu China to modernize technologically while preserving the cultural "essence," Yadrintsev's argument transcended the narrower context of the 1870's and 1880's, its relevance evident in view of Russia's twentieth-century conflicts with these two Oriental neighbors.

---

56 "Pervyi universitet," p. 70. During the academic year 1885-86 (just before the Siberian university opened), there were 97 Siberian students studying in St. Petersburg (including women, 150), 89 in Kazan, 50 in Moscow, and some in Kiev (about 300 in all). By class, sons of officials constituted about half; by home town, almost 1/3 came from Tomsk; and by educational background, a large majority came from classical gimnazii. Those at the University of Kazan comprised almost 10% of the student body. "Istoriia prosvieshcheniia," pp. 145-46, 150.

57 (Iadrintsev) "Pervyi universitet," pp. 91-92.

Yadrintsev, however, stated in no uncertain terms that he considered a university far more important than a railroad for Siberia, and for Russia in general. By the mid-1880's, when the opening of the university had been repeatedly postponed and the question of a railroad across Siberia loomed larger than ever, he wrote: "We think that . . . a university can even do much more toward consolidating the borderlands than a railroad, which creates an exchange of materials, for with the help of educational institutions comes a moral and spiritual interchange." [58] On this point, though, he differed sharply both with Alexander III and his advisers, and with later, economic-oriented Marxists on how to bring Siberia closer to Russia.

At the same time (1886), Yadrintsev showed he could espouse rather universal and nationalistic views as well as regional ones. "The development of higher education in the East," he wrote, "is necessary for goals common to all mankind and for the spread of civilization in Asia, along with culture and Christianity." Moreover, a Siberian university was needed "to provide all the advantages of the Russian people and of /its/ spiritual primacy among aboriginal races . . ." [59] In this respect, this fervent regionalist, who looked on his own homeland as something akin to an exploited colony, found more common ground with West European imperialists shouldering the White Man's Burden or dispensing la mission civilisatrice than with most colonial subjects.

Laying the cornerstone of the main building on August 26, 1880, had been anticipated by some as a great festive occasion for all Siberia. Fol-

---

58 Iadrintsev, in Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1886) no. 11, p. 3; quoted in Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', pp. 79-80.

59 Ibid., p. 80.

lowing the ceremony, a large banquet was held, replete with speeches. Among them was one given by the trustee of the West Siberian educational district, Vasily Markovich Florinsky (1833-99). The trustee praised the responsiveness of Siberians to the university in providing financial contributions and of the citizens of Tomsk in allotting the land set aside for the institution. Florinsky pointed to the fact that there now existed in Siberia five high schools and five ecclesiastical seminaries, graduates of which had the right to apply for entrance to the university. He estimated that an annual total of no less than 60 of them would enter the university (supplemented by students from European Russia). "It cannot be," he stated, "that Siberia, so vast and unique, with its population of five million, cannot support one university." [60]

With the ensuing delay of almost a decade before the university was officially open, some of the initial hopes and expectations began to sour. By one account,

> Siberians had believed that a new era had come for Siberia, that sparks of light would not go dim, and that enlightenment would pour like a broad stream through the distant borderland.
>
> But eight years passed and disenchantment set in. The university was opened on July 22, 1888; but this day did not witness the animation and enthusiasm observed when the university's cornerstone was laid. On the contrary, this day presented an unfortunate omen and darkened the joyful feelings among Siberians evoked by the inauguration of the university. [61]

As portents, not only did Tomsk and Siberia in general witness the accompa-

---

60 Quoted in Iadrintsev, "Istoriia prosvieshcheniia," pp. 147-48. In 1880 gimnazii existed in Tobolsk, Tomsk, Irkutsk, Krasnoyarsk, and Omsk, and seminaries in Tobolsk, Tomsk, Irkutsk, Yakutsk, and Nikolaevsk. By 1888 additional gimnazii were founded in Vernyi, Yeniseisk, Yakutsk, Chita, and Blagoveshchensk.

61 Popov, "Proshloe i nastoiashchee Sibirskago Universiteta," p. 295.

nying suppression of the regionalist newspaper, the Siberian Gazette, but Yadrintsev himself, the most indefatigable champion of the university, then suffered a deep personal loss and setback — the death of his wife.

The opening of the Imperial University of Tomsk (as it was now called) was entrusted by the Ministry of Education in 1885 to Florinsky, who as trustee of the educational district now took on responsibilities for higher education too. He was to have special supervision over the university and over student conduct and achievements as well. As of 1885 the university was slated to open a year later on July 1, but the final date was put off another two years. [62] Thus, on July 22, 1888, the long-awaited day arrived. After a special thanksgiving service in the new university church, all those present moved to the large assembly hall, its four walls adorned with portraits of the Emperors Alexander II and Alexander III and two of its chief benefactors, Tsibulsky and A. M. Sibiryakov. Here Florinsky read the text of the imperial order regarding the inauguration of the university. He then declared the university officially open.

Following this, congratulatory telegrams from the Heir Apparent, Nicholas Alexandrovich, and other members of the imperial family were read, as well as those from universities and learned societies in European Russia. Telegrams and speeches representing Siberian schools, municipal organizations and societies, newspapers and private individuals were also presented. Further donations contributed on the occasion by various Siberian dumas and civic groups were reported. [63] The festivities at the university and in

---

62 Memo of A. A. Polevtsev to K. P. Pobedonostsev, dated November 26, 1885, in Pobedonostsev i ego korrespondenty, p. 543.

63 General descriptions of the inauguration are found in Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), pp. 604-07; and Korsh, "Vosem' liet," CXXI: 47-48.

Tomsk itself, decked out in flags and wreathes, lasted until the 24th of July. At this time Florinsky received word from Petersburg of the Emperor's response to the inauguration: "Thank God that the Siberian university has justified my expectations." [64] In the light of accompanying events and later developments, Alexander III appears to have stated (perhaps rather cryptically) the simple truth.

The unfortunate "omen" during the university's initial days was the closure of the Siberian Gazette. For this Florinsky was chiefly responsible. According to one contemporary, he "could not stand the independent ideological position of this paper; he saw its influence upon society and, with the university open, feared its influence upon student youth. In his opinion, its influence would be pernicious for youth." Florinsky refused to take responsibility for student conduct and the "peaceful course of future academic life" if the Siberian Gazette were permitted to continue publication. By the time-tested method of petitions and denunciations sent to the Ministry of Interior, Florinsky was able to have this regionalist newspaper suppressed. [65]

The last issue of the Siberian Gazette came out on July 22, 1888, welcoming the university inauguration. However, Florinsky failed to invite the paper's editorial staff to the official ceremony, an omission noted by most of those present. Moreover, the address prepared by the staff to be read on the occasion was presented by Florinsky to the university a day late. It was thus omitted from the book later published in honor of the event, The Opening of the Imperial University of Tomsk. July 22, 1888. With the

---

64 Quoted in Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 607.

65 The testimony of A. N. Shipitsin, in Sibirskaia Zhizn'; cited in Popov, "Proshloe i nastoiashchee," p. 296. Also see above, pp. 546-47.

Siberian Gazette eliminated from the scene on orders from Petersburg, Florinsky became what was described as the "omnipotent master of the university." Wrote another contemporary, "Without the patronage and consent of Vasily Markovich you could do nothing but beat your head against the wall." [66]

The new university consisted of only one faculty — medicine. Classes began on September 1, 1888. Of the 236 applications for admission only 74 were accepted. By educational background, of the 72 who showed up for classes, 40 had been graduated from ecclesiastical seminaries, 30 from classical high schools, and two were university transfer students. By geographical origin, a relatively large number of students hailed from European Russia: 28 (39%) as opposed to 44 (61%) from Siberia. A full quarter of the students came from gimnazii in Western Siberia. Financially, over 2/3 of the students were dependent on outside aid, some of them receiving stipends, waived tuition, or reduced room and board at the student dormitory. [67]

By January 1890, the number of students had risen to 190, and by January 1891 to 262. By the latter date the percentage of students from European Russia had increased to 65.6%; Jewish students constituted over 10% (quite high in view of the much lower quotas placed on them in European Russian universities). By social origin the number of students coming from the peasantry in 1891 was less than ten, while about half came from the clerical class; clearly the institution was much less a "peasant university" than one of popovichi (sons of priests). [68] By 1894 the student body totaled almost

---

66 The testimony of one Maliar, quoted in Popov, "Proshloe i nastoiashchee," p. 298; see also Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II: 123, 180.

67 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), pp. 607-08; and Adrianov, Tomsk, p. 29.

68 The university was allowed to admit graduates of ecclesiastical seminaries without verifying examinations (perhaps as a hopefully stabilizing measure). On student composition see Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), pp. 613-14; "O. O.," Sibirische Briefe, p. 201; Popov, Minuvshee

400; by 1900 over 500; and after twenty years (in 1908) as many as 3,000 students attended both the university and the Tomsk Technological Institute, founded in 1900. [69]

During the academic year 188-89 the staff of the medical faculty consisted of eight professors and seven laboratory and library assistants. By 1891 the number of professors had risen to seventeen, representing such disciplines as zoology, botany, anatomy, chemistry, physics, histology, geology, and pharmacology. [70] At this time the main university building existed, along with a separate anatomical institute. Housed in the main building were various "cabinets" or sections for histology, botany, physics, and mineralogy, several museums, and the library. The latter was divided into three divisions: foreign, Russian, and medical. As of January 1889 the total number of volumes approximated 96,000, with foreign books comprising well over half. A decade later the library had more than 200,000 volumes, the greater part donated by private benefactors. [71] As for financial support of all these facilities, the government contributed almost 550,000 rubles during the first four years to defray regular expenses. [72]

---

i perezhitoe, II: 180; and Adrianov, Tomsk, pp. 28-29. Regarding comparative student enrollments in 1885, less than 13,000 students attended Russia's eight universities, most of them graduates of gimnazii. The largest universities, Moscow and St. Petersburg, had 3170 and 2430 students, respectively. The University of Odessa, founded in 1865, had 610 students. See Entsiklopedicheskii slovar' (Brokgaus-Efron, 1902), XXXIV: 799.

69 P. Leroy-Beaulieu, Awakening of the East, p. 40; Entsiklopedicheskii slovar' (Brokgaus-Efron, 1901), XXXIII: 91; Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," p. 249; P. Golovachev, Sibir', p. 275; and Nicholas Hans, A History of Russian Educational Policy (New York: Russell & Russell, 1964), p. 238, 240.

70 Adrianov, Tomsk, p. 30; Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 613.

71 Adrianov, Tomsk, pp. 28-29; Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), pp. 609-11; and Leroy-Beaulieu, Awakening of the East, pp. 40-41.

72 Adrianov, Tomsk, p. 28; Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 604.

Once the university was opened, several problems remained to be settled, as far as Siberian regionalists were concerned. These were the relationship of the university toward Siberian society, the admission of women into higher education, the establishment of other faculties within the university, and the "brain drain" to European Russia, then labeled "intellectual absenteeism."

The first of these, smooth relationship between university and society at large, has by no means been a uniquely Siberian issue. Summing up the traditional problem of educated persons co-existing in the relatively apathetic, indifferent human surroundings of Siberia, Yadrintsev wrote:

> It is desirable for Siberia's internal life that the university be closely connected and in contact with local society, without avoiding it and without shutting itself up into a privileged, estranged milieu. The shortage of educated people from Russia and their weak influence on the region's enlightenment has resulted from the fact that transient intellectuals have considered themselves as higher and have detached themselves into circles which had nothing in common with surrounding life. [73]

As of 1891, however, Yadrintsev was pleased to note that the "best professors" (from European Russia) had already begun to bridge this gap by giving public lectures. Attendance at these events averaged around 300 listeners. The university attracted public attention too through its museums, exhibitions, and botanical garden. Even scientific excursions and investigations, conducted by professors in various parts of Western Siberia, could be viewed as "services to society and country." [74]

Despite indications of a fairly successful rapprochement between town

---

73 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 616.
74 Ibid.; see too, Adrianov, Tomsk, p. 73; and Golovachev, Sibir', p. 276.

and gown, other evidence suggests the situation could have been improved. Not only did a number of professors chafe under the "yoke" of V. M. Florinsky, but the trustee also antagonized many townspeople who had previously supported the university. This alienation was greater in Tomsk than elsewhere, as indicated by the donations that continued to be sent from other Siberian towns, while citizens of Tomsk soon gave hardly a kopek. [75] After twenty years, Potanin could still describe the traces of the university's influence on Tomsk as "weak and almost unnoticeable," despite what he termed the stronger spiritual influence of professors than of government officials. Potanin viewed the urban milieu around the university as too hardened and as "unyielding to any spiritual transformation." Though the university and the technological institute, founded in 1900, had "turned Tomsk into the intellectual capital of Siberia and had changed the physiognomy of the town," the transition was far from complete in Potanin's estimation. "This regeneration of Tomsk into a European town will accelerate when the higher school ceases to play the role of a foreign body in Siberia's social organism and stops being a bureaucratic institution that is not bound to the local milieu by mutual sympathies . . ." [76] Despite the efforts of many, the aloofness of Florinsky and his successor, Lavrentiev, along with the suspicions of townspeople, did little to overcome the gap separating local society and the university.

The Imperial University of Tomsk was an all-male institution, as were most schools of higher learning in nineteenth-century Russia. Several women's universities existed in the 1880's, of which those in St. Petersburg

---

75 I. I. Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II: 180.
76 G. N. Potanin, "Goroda Sibiri," pp. 245-46, 249.

and Kiev were the largest. Even before the university had opened in Tomsk, the feminist viewpoint had been represented in the pages of Siberia, expressing the hope that courses for women would be introduced, somehow connected with the forthcoming university.[77] However, with no progress made in this respect, Yadrintsev in the early 1890's reminded the professors "not to ignore these hopes." Once professors took up the initiative to organize women's courses in conjunction with the university, he felt certain that private individuals and municipal dumas would provide aid for them.[78] Only after the 1905 Revolution, with the establishment of numerous courses for women in university towns across Russia, was Tomsk also permitted such a women's school in 1909.[79] The question of women's courses connected with the university in Tomsk was thus one issue fully resolved by the outbreak of World War I.

On the other hand, the Siberian university was never expanded to the four faculties promised by Alexander II. In accordance with a statute of 1835, Russian universities were to consist of three faculties: philosophy, law, and medicine. In 1850 separate faculties of history-philology and physics-mathematics replaced the faculty of philosophy; thus a "full" university consisted of four faculties. The single faculty of medicine, established at Tomsk in 1888, was probably the most utilitarian of the four (especially in judicially unreformed Siberia). Medicine was also at that time the most popular area of study among Russian students, almost half of them seeking degrees in medicine in the 1880's.[80] By establishing only a

---

77 Article by "Sibiriachka" in Sibir', (1885) no. 37; discussed in Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 615.

78 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 615.

79 See N. Hans, History of Russian Educational Policy, p. 200.

80 See M. T. Florinsky, Russia, II: 1046; and S. G. Pushkarëv, The Emergence of Modern Russia, 1801-1917 (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963), p. 58.

medical faculty in Tomsk, government authorities were able not only to satisfy the largest number of prospective students but also to avoid the less utilitarian and potentially more controversial and "radical" faculties of law, letters, and sciences.

Siberians assumed that in time the remaining faculties would be instituted, trusting that once the ice had been broken with the first the others would follow more easily. Yadrintsev, typically, had even greater expectations. In view of Siberia's unique geographical location, he proposed that a new faculty of Oriental languages be established. Here he followed along lines suggested by Speransky seventy years earlier. To satisfy the "all-round need of the borderland for people educated in various specialties," Yadrintsev felt that as part of the university "an Oriental faculty should some day exist, with Turkic, Chinese, Mongol, and other languages." [81] Such an institution would be of great importance both in foreign relations and in Russia's civilizing mission within her own eastern boundaries.

When Yadrintsev visited the university in 1894, he raised the question of even further academic additions: a faculty of natural history, along with a chair of agronomy. And soon after his sudden death that year, the Siberian Leaflet suggested that "Siberian society . . . would honor the memory of the deceased if funds could be collected to organize a faculty of natural history or a special institution with a program of natural-history faculties." [82]

In time limited expansion took place. In 1898 a faculty of law was established at the University of Tomsk (two years after judicial reforms

---

81 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 614.
82 Sibirskii Listok, (1894) no. 48; quoted in Glinskii, "Iadrintsev," p. 426.

were introduced in Siberia), and in 1899 an oriental institute was founded in Vladivostok.[83] But the suggestions and hopes of many for a much broader center of learning in Siberia went largely unrealized. Even a man as influential as Premier Peter Stolypin (1906-11), who considered agricultural courses at the university level as essential for Siberia, could bring about no change.[84] Repeated attempts on the part of the professors' council and of non-academic institutions (including the State Duma after 1906) to open faculties of physics-mathematics and history-philology, as stipulated by the decree of 1878, remained unanswered. Lavrentiev, successor to Florinsky as trustee, reportedly felt that "even with two faculties in Siberia — medicine and law, there are too many idle people who would not be productive in the interests of the state." Thus, one the eve of World War I Popov could claim that "the result of the hundred-year history of the Siberian university question is that the distant borderland still does not have a real university."[85]

Among regionalists it was Potanin especially who addressed himself to the problem of intellectual absenteeism. This was in part due to the fact that of the Siberian "men of the sixties" he alone lived relatively far into the 20th century and could witness firsthand that the Tomsk university, with only one or two faculties, did not greatly alleviate this problem. Apropos of this Potanin wrote in 1907:

> By the university question Siberian publicists have meant not the opening of a university alone,

---

83 See P. Golovachev, Sibir', pp. 275-76; Istoriia Sibiri, III: 374; and Hans, History of Russian Educational Policy, p. 240.

84 See, for example, Treadgold, The Great Siberian Migration, p. 168.

85 Popov, "Proshloe i nastoiashchee Sibirskago Universiteta," pp. 298-99.

> but stopping the outflow of young people from the region; they have looked on the university as only one means of accomplishing this. If the opening of the university has not removed this evil, then it cannot be said that this Siberian problem was eliminated with a functioning university. Indeed, even if the university consisted of a full number of faculties, it could not provide all the diverse scientific knowledge and occupations that the region needs; this is why youths in search of specialized knowledge to a great extent pour out to other, non-local cultural centers.[86]

Potanin concluded that much time would be needed before the ratio of "indigenous intelligentsia to intelligentsia from elsewhere would be such as it exists in other regions of the empire." Despite the university's drawing many students from European Russia, in Potanin's eyes this tendency was not widespread enough to resolve the university question in the near future.[87]

Despite his own dislike of the "brain drain" from Siberia, in practice Potanin did all he could to aid and assist young Siberians who wished to pursue their education in European Russia. Thus, by force of circumstance, this patriotic regionalist indirectly encouraged "intellectual absenteeism" among his younger compatriots, hoping, however, that in time they would return to Siberia as he had done in the 1860's. When in St. Petersburg, he served as a kind of "nanny" (to use one description) to Siberian students in the capital, arranging parties and receptions, helping needy students, and acquainting new arrivals with the city. For students going to Moscow, leaving from either Siberia or Petersburg, Potanin supplied them with letters of recommendation to the more established members of the Siberian colony there.[88]

---

86 Potanin, Oblastnicheskaia tendentsiia, p. 43. He makes roughly the same points in "Nuzhdy Sibiri," p. 281.

87 Potanin, Oblastnicheskaia tendentsiia, p. 44.

88 N. M. Mendel'son, "Iz vospominanii o Potanine," p. 151. Members of the Moscow colony included V. I. Semidalov, P. M. Golovachev, and N. M. Mendelsohn.

Although a university existed in Tomsk and attracted students from Tomsk and its province especially, the allure of the metropolitan cities and universities continued to exert an inevitable pull on many aspiring young Siberians. One former student in Tomsk in the mid-1880's, Argunov, recalled both the aspirations and difficulties of young men who wanted to go west to study.

> Some dreamt of Moscow, others of Petersburg. All the difficulties of realizing this dream were present, however. There were many of them, especially for those without homes and in poverty, who studied and lived at state expense. A long journey and a free but insecure life lay ahead. It is not easy for the present traveler to imagine conditions then of moving across Siberia and beyond its borders. As yet there was no Trans-Siberian Railroad, and one had to travel by the water route.

Argunov at the time was not swayed by the forthcoming opening of the University of Tomsk. By helping the university library ready itself, he earned enough in a year's time to cover the coming trip to the University of Moscow. Despite promises offered to him of a guaranteed wage as librarian and the prospects of study in the medical school, he found it "not hard to resist the temptation, for in the distance was Moscow . . ." [89]

Argunov's ambitions well portray the problem of absentee students in nineteenth-century Siberia, especially if they opted not to return to "serve the homeland." Student years, to paraphrase Potanin, comprised a period of life when social questions took on interest and invited participation in "public life." If the university environment, where these questions came to the fore, was not located in the student's home region, he then became easily attached to a new milieu and its own problems, originally quite foreign

---

89 A. A. Argunov, "Studencheskie gody," pp. 22-23. Argunov went on to become a prominent Socialist Revolutionary.

to him. Thus, "his link with his homeland weakens and ends with a complete break." [90] Indeed, by 1908 there were as many as 500 Siberians studying in Petersburg's various institutions of higher learning alone — compared to 20 or 30 in the early 1860's. [91]

The problem of student "absenteeism," and with it the university question in general, faced far too many difficulties to be resolved successfully during the remaining years of the Russian Empire. Nevertheless, the opening of the University of Tomsk in 1888 laid the foundation of what has become an impressive network of academic, research, and higher educational institutions that exists today in Soviet Siberia.

* * *

The Trans-Siberian Railroad

Several years after Siberia's first university was opened, a second achievement, far more significant for Siberia in years to come, was begun. In 1891 the Tsarevich Nicholas Alexandrovich drove in the first official spike of the Trans-Siberian Railroad in Vladivostok. By the end of the decade it was becoming apparent that the transcontinental railroad, still under construction, was transforming Siberia's economy, population, food supply, and transportation system as nothing else could or would do in the future. If the university's influence upon Siberian society was not extensive and in many ways open to question, the effect of the railroad was indubitably tremendous. Sectors of the Siberian economy, for instance, were suddenly and forcibly transformed from predominantly natural production and local

---

90 G. N. Potanin, Oblastnicheskaia tendentsiia, pp. 28-29.
91 Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," p. 275.

trade to an almost-overnight dependence on monetary exchange and nation-wide commercial patterns. In short, the railroad wrought a commercial revolution and a new chapter in the history of Siberia.

Interestingly, a latent fear of a Trans-Siberian railway haunted both regionalists and centralists alike, right until its actual success was obvious. Some regionalists were afraid that such a railroad would only intensify the long-standing economic and financial exploitation of Siberia by the Russian mother country. On the other hand, some centralists saw in a railroad, and especially one through Eastern Siberia, increased dangers of separatism. In the end, the great cohesive effect of the completed railroad destroyed all traces of the fear of Siberian separatism which had lingered on among some centralists since at least the late 1840's. As Svatikov puts it:

> This railroad linked Siberia with Russia more solidly than the 300 years of Russia's dominion over this country. We know that the railroad seemed to be a danger to Petersburg, namely from the viewpoint of Siberia's possible separation. These views, which had played their role in the 1850's, did not disappear immediately. In the struggle against them no little time, energy, and ink had to be spent. [92]

The issue of a railroad across Siberia, which arose in the mid-1850's, was not fully resolved by the government until the early 1890's. This delay, however, was caused much more by governmental indifference in Petersburg, public apathy in Siberia, and financial difficulties in general than by fears of separatism. Indeed, the facts indicate that the major amount of effort spent and ink consumed during the intervening decades was directed toward settling just when, where, and how Siberian communications could best

---

92 Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 80.

be improved. A Trans-Siberian railway formed only part of this question.

Communications across Siberia's vast reaches had always posed problems. Until the 1890's the major overland route linking Siberia with Russia was the "Siberian highway," which often presented great hardships and perils for travelers. Before the mid-nineteenth century non-mechanized forms of land and water transport were used exclusively. In 1843 the first steamship was introduced on a Siberian river — the Ob; not until the early 1860's did steamships begin to ply the Yenisei and Lena Rivers. In the 1880's the problems of Siberian water transport and communications began to attract the attention of the central government with respect to auxiliary railroads connecting the river systems. With initial construction of railroads underway, by 1890 there were 65 steamships on the rivers of Western Siberia, and only two years later, as many as 145.[93] Water-borne commerce consisted of imported goods from Europe and European Russia in exchange for Siberian raw materials. Until construction of the railroad to Omsk and beyond, the Ob and its tributaries served as the chief commercial transportation route between Russia and Siberia. Thus, even before the Trans-Siberian line was completed Siberia was gradually being drawn into the world economy by steamship transport.

The year 1862 saw the beginning of a telegraph line between Russia and Western Siberia, initiating an era of much more rapid transmission of news and administrative instructions both to and from Siberia. This first line extended from Yekaterinburg in the Urals; by 1870 telegraph lines went all the way to the mouth of the Amur, and an overland telegraph network now

---

93 M. Sobolev, "Puti soobshcheniia v Sibiri" (Communication Routes in Siberia), in I. S. Mel'nik, ed., Sibir': eia sovremennoe sostoianie i eia nuzhdy (St. Petersburg, 1908), p. 24; and Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 538, 607, 611.

linked the Atlantic with the Pacific across the Eastern Hemisphere.[94] Construction of branch lines continued apace since this time, increasing administrative efficiency and control, as directed from centers of authority. As one observer wrote at the end of the century, the "governors of provinces, who were in days of yore kings or demigods, are no longer looked upon with any sense of awe, everybody being aware that they receive their daily orders by telegraph from St. Petersburg."[95] Moreover, the public also profited by the more rapid transmission of news and communication from the outside world, which helped break down local and regional isolation.

The first railroad open for public transport in European Russia was built in 1837, connecting Tsarskoe Selo and its imperial palace with Petersburg, a distance of 15 miles. By 1851 Moscow and Petersburg were linked by rail, and it was not long before railroads in and through Siberia were discussed and proposed. For instance, Governor-General Muravyov in 1857, deeply involved in his Amur projects, ordered investigations made regarding construction of a road from the Amur River to the Sea of Japan, which could later be converted to a railroad. After engineering surveys were completed and reports sent to Petersburg, Muravyov's proposal was rejected in 1858 by unsympathetic officials in the central government.[96] About the same time that Muravyov was opening up the Amur area, several Anglo-Saxons began to

---

94 Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 606, 626, 632, 652.

95 Pierre Leroy-Beaulieu, Awakening of the East, p. 42.

96 See S. V. Sabler and I. V. Sosnovskii, Sibirskaia zheleznaia doroga v eia proshlom i nastoiashchem. Istoricheskii ocherk (The Trans-Siberian Railroad: Its Past and Present. An Historical Essay), (St. Petersburg, 1903), pp. 1-2. According to one account, as early as 1850 Muravyov supported the idea of connecting Eastern Siberia with Petersburg by rail. After a survey and report were made for the Ministry of Finance, the whole project was written off as patently impossible. See Sullivan, "Count Muraviev-Amursky," pp. 263-64; he cites as his source B. V. Struve, Vospominaniia o Sibiri, 1848-1854 (St. Petersburg, 1889), p. 158.

show interest not just in local Siberian railroads, but also in connecting Siberia with Russia by an overland route.

Among these foreign proposals was that of the California entrepreneur, Perry McDonough Collins, who visited Eastern Siberia in 1857. While there he prepared a draft plan for a steam railway connecting Chita, on the upper reaches of the Amur, with Irkutsk. Collins presented his plan for an "Amoor Railroad Company" to the Governor of Transbaikalia, Korsakov, who in turn passed it on to Muravyov; the Governor-General lost no time in forwarding the proposal to the Minister of Communications, K. V. Chevkin, in Petersburg. Collins felt that such an undertaking would link Irkutsk and interior Siberia more closely with the Amur and the Pacific, thereby facilitating trade and the defense of Russia's eastern possessions. The American counted on raising 40 million rubles in capital from Siberian merchants to finance the project. Chevkin, however, expressed doubts as to how well the Chita-Irkutsk route had been surveyed, how the money could be raised, and how thousands of railroad workers could be transported to and fed in Transbaikalia, where agricultural production was already limited. Moreover, the Siberian Committee opposed Collins' project on political grounds: it would be "premature to decide to construct a railroad which would subsequently make the interests of Siberia's eastern part dependent on foreigners, and not on the mother country, as it has been up to now." [97] The Siberian Committee's manager of affairs, V. P. Butkov, even sent word to Muravyov that, "Everything Chevkin wrote is rubbish; the crux of the matter is that we

97 Sabler and Sosnovskii, Sibirskaia zheleznaia doroga, pp. 4-5. See also Tupper, To the Great Ocean, pp. 59-62; and Vevier, ed., Siberian Journey, pp. 129-34.

cannot allow Americans on the Amur and in Transbaikalia. They would spread their habits around there and Siberia would detach herself from us." [98] Fears of Siberia's secession, especially if republican Americans gained a toehold through a railroad, unofficially doomed Collins' project to failure.

Another foreign proposal was made about this time by three rather uninformed Englishmen: Morrison, Horn, and Sleigh. This was the first project to date that allowed for an overland railroad for steam engines, from Nizhny Novgorod to the Gulf of Tatary. This English plan would be supported by a joint-stock company of foreign capitalists who would receive land concessions, exclusive rights for 90 years, and tariff-free imports on articles necessary for the railroad — all so "that Europe could communicate with China, India, and America." [99] This proposition Chevkin in 1858 also rejected, again as being overladen with foreign influence and penetration into Siberia. According to reports, Chevkin feared that "under the guise of goods for us, they would bring an army of 50,000 into the center of Siberia in sealed wagons and would capture it unexpectedly." [100] To such an extent were fears aroused concerning Siberia's instability, especially in foreigners somehow intervened. Though Chevkin, Butkov, and others in Petersburg were themselves hardly aware of actual conditions in Siberia, they were easily able to reject these foreign proposals of 1857-58 on grounds of the authors' inadequate knowledge of the same conditions.

The foreign proposals came to nothing for another reason too. According

---

98 Quoted in M. I. Veniukov, "Vospominaniia o zaselenii Amura v 1857-1858 gg." (Recollections of Settling the Amur: 1858-58), Russkaia Starina, (January 1879) XXIV: 111.

99 See Sabler and Sosnovskii, Sibirskaia zheleznaia doroga, p. 6; Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 30; and Tupper, To the Great Ocean, p. 40.

100 A. I. Shtukenberg, "Iz istorii zhelezno-dorozhnago diela v Rossii" (From the History of Railroad Affairs in Russia), Russkaia Starina, (1885) v. 46, no. 5, p. 314.

to Sabler and Sosnovsky,

> these projects were completely unconnected with the actual needs of Siberian society at that time. With the relatively undeveloped railway network in the empire at the end of the 1850's, the representatives of Siberian trading and industrial classes were still unable to realize clearly the benefits of constructing a railroad through Siberia; moreover, even within the local higher administration, with the exception of Count Muravyov-Amursky, people did not yet recognize the important need for such a route. [101]

In other words, a "Siberian lobby" for a transcontinental railway was totally lacking among Siberians themselves and almost completely absent among Siberian officials. Indeed, one observer, Wrangel, related how such a plan in 1858 "would have been considered the raving of a madman." He himself only laughed at the idea when Bakunin informed him of it in Tomsk at that time. [102]

After the government's rejection of these various projects of 1857-58, no more proposals on the part of private individuals were raised until the 1880's. In Siberia itself "the needs of industry, trade, and other sides of Siberian social life were still far from reaching the tension that could make the building of a railroad desirable; moreover, there was no one consciously interested in such an enterprise or sufficiently reliable, financially speaking." [103] The 1860's and 1870's instead witnessed more modest plans for building short railway lines into Western Siberia that would link up with the network in European Russia. Those who promoted these plans were more interested in the needs of eastern Russia than of Siberia (i.e. increasing mining production in the Urals and trade east of the Volga). In short, at this time there was much greater public and private interest in

---

101 Sabler and Sosnovskii, Sibirskaia zheleznaia doroga, p. 7.
102 A. E. Vrangel', Vospominaniia o Dostoevskom, p. 33.
103 Sabler and Sosnovskii, Sibirskaia zheleznaia doroga, p. 8.

railroad construction in the Ural and Trans-Volga areas than there was in Siberia. One significant exception, though, was a group of West Siberian merchants who in 1868 petitioned for a connecting railroad, so that "Siberia would become rooted into one and the same state." [104] Yet for the most part, the question of a transcontinental railroad lay dormant within Siberia during the 1860's and 1870's.

The first high Siberian official after Muravyov who actively promoted a Siberian railroad was Governor-General Khrushchov of Western Siberia. From 1868 on, in his annual administrative reports, he stressed the need for the central government to encourage Siberia's cultural and industrial development. This could be done especially by building a railroad linking Western Siberia with European Russia. In 1869, four years after the "Siberian independence affair," Khruschov wrote the tsar that Siberia's remoteness from the center of Russia was "the main reason for the weak development of this region." Moreover, "just one railroad, from the river systems of Western Siberia to Moscow, can develop commercial and industrial activity in Siberia and can secure it politically." Khrushchov thus felt that the region's economic backwardness caused its political unreliability. His opinions were influential in Petersburg to the extent that the new Minister of Communications, Melnikov, now placed a proposed "Ural-Siberian" line under more important consideration. [105] Indeed, after 1870 the Committee of Railroads began to discuss this question in earnest.

However, from this point on arose the problem of which should come first: Ural mining interests or Siberian commercial interests. Opinions also differed as to the best route to and beyond the Urals. Of the three

---

104 Quoted in Sabler and Sosnovskii, Sibirskaia zheleznaia doroga, p. 16.
105 Sabler and Sosnovskii, Sibirskaia zheleznaia doroga, pp. 18-19.

most strongly choices, the middle route, running from the Volga through Yekaterinburg to Tyumen, corresponded more closely to the traditional trade route between Siberia and Russia. In 1875, in fact, the new governor-general of Western Siberia, Kaznakov, came out in favor of this route, arguing that an attempt to create "new ties" for Siberia in a relatively unproductive part of northern Russia would act as a brake on Siberian trade.[106]

In 1875 further progress was made. The Minister of Communications, Konstantin N. Posyot, became the first high government official in Petersburg to support a Trans-Siberian Railroad. Like Khushchov before him, Posyot felt it "necessary to give wealthy Siberia the chance to embark on a path of development." He brought to a vote in the Committee of Ministers the issue of which route the "Trans-Siberian" line should take. The "northern" route (which Posyot supported) was defeated in favor of the middle route by a healthy majority of ministers. This route was chosen less out of consideration for Siberian interests than for the interests of Nizhny Novgorod and Kazan. Consequently, in December 1875 Tsar Alexander II confirmed the decision to build a line as far east as Tyumen.

About the same time, at the opposite end of Siberia, preliminary investigations were undertaken regarding future construction of a local railroad from Vladivostok to the Amur basin. However, progress on both this "Amur" line and the "Ural-Siberian" line just approved was sidetracked for several years, as was the Siberian university at this time — and for many of the same reasons. Bad harvests in 1875, Pan-Slav and Balkan problems in 1875-1876, the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78, and consequently a very tight financial situation for the government together contributed to the delay. By

---

106 Sabler and Sosnovskii, Sibirskaia zheleznaia doroga, pp. 24-26.

1878 a line could be built only as far east as Yekaterinburg.[107]

With the new reign of Alexander III the situation began to change considerably. Among other things, the governor-general of Eastern Siberia, D. G. Anuchin, in 1881 strongly urged improving Siberian communication routes so as to develop trade with China and Japan. Not only did he urge completion of the line to Tyumen, but also the construction of a railroad between Tomsk and Irkutsk.[108]

Moreover, Posyot began to have doubts about the suitableness of the "middle" Yekaterinburg-Tyumen line (which was not completed until 1885) as the major rail link between Russia and Siberia. In his report of January 1882 to the tsar he declared that a

> proper decision on the Siberian railroad question can proceed solely from consideration of Siberia's needs and requirements, the satisfaction of which should constitute the government's task by establishing improved means of communication both within Siberia itself and for uniting it with European Russia.

The goal of a Siberian railroad should be "to rouse the sources of Siberia's future prosperity to life and to guarantee the development of its life already born." With Siberia's rivers flowing north and with only one postal highway it was understandable, Posyot noted, that

> the Siberian population under such conditions has developed slowly and peculiarly, that the greater part of the region's natural resources has remained untapped, and that the government, if any international confusion should affect our distant Chinese borders, would be doomed to huge sacrifices in conveying means of defense, which are fully lacking there at present.[109]

---

107 Ibid., pp. 34-35; Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 700; Tupper, To the Great Ocean, pp. 68-70.

108 Sabler and Sosnovskii, Sibirskaia zheleznaia doroga, p. 37; and Tupper, To the Great Ocean, p. 69.

109 Sabler and Sosnovskii, op. cit., p. 43, 45; and Sobolev, "Puti," p. 24.

Thus, Posyot certainly seemed to express a genuine concern for the best interests of Siberians.

In the light of Posyot's rather broad views on how best to develop Siberia's cultural and commercial potential and how best to improve strategic position along Siberia's borders, it was natural that he should also propose a new railroad route into Siberia more consistent with these ends. The route suggested would extend from Samara on the Volga through Chelyabinsk in the Urals to Omsk in Western Siberia (considerably south of the Yekaterinburg-Tyumen line). Moreover, Omsk would serve as an excellent rail center, connecting such points east as Tomsk, Krasnoyarsk, and Irkutsk, and such points southeast as Barnaul and the Altai area. Furthermore, two gateways into Siberia from Russia would, in Posyot's opinion, be incomparably more advantageous than just the Yekaterinburg-Tyumen line alone.[110]

Though Posyot's report was discussed in the Committee of Ministers in 1882, the question of which route the main Siberian line would take was not decided until early 1885. The Committee, after lengthy debate, now ruled in favor of the projected Samara-Chelyabinsk line as the starting point for a major Siberian railroad. Meanwhile, the line to Tyumen, approved in 1875, had just been completed. Construction of the Samara line began immediately and by mid-1890 reached the Urals.

At this point, with the construction of two railways into Siberia either completed or underway, the question of an extended Trans-Siberian route took on a new significance.

> The consequence of this was the coming of a new period in the history of implementing a Siberian railroad; instead of the earlier, more or less fragmentary

---

110 Sabler and Sosnovskii, Sibirskaia zheleznaia doroga, pp. 45-47, 51-52.

> proposals for building railroads inside Siberia, during the late 1880's a detailed plan was worked out for building these lines whereby the original plans for constructing separate, most needed sections . . . soon gave way to the idea of building a continuous railroad through all Siberia.

This period was roughly to cover the years 1886-1892.[111]

In 1886 the new governor-general of Eastern Siberia, A. P. Ignatiev, in a report to the tsar warned of a need to bolster Siberia's frontier defenses, especially in view of the reorganized Chinese army (after the defeat in the Sino-French War of 1884-85). To build up Russian defenses in Transbaikalia, Ignatiev urged that a railroad be built between Tomsk and Irkutsk (the former already being linked by steamship with the Tyumen rail terminus). The governor-general also emphasized that the absence of such communications in Siberia so far helped account for the industrial stagnation and poor productivity of the region. Ignatiev's recommendation won the immediate approval of Alexander III. In response the tsar noted: "How many reports from the governors-general of Siberia have I read already. I must confess with sadness and shame that the government has done almost nothing to date to satisfy the needs of this rich but neglected land. It's time, high time!"[112]

Moreover, the governor-general of the Amur, Baron Andrei N. Korff, in his annual report to the tsar (of July 1886) urged construction of a railroad through Transbaikalia as quickly as possible. This would not only improve the tea trade with China but would also remove the economic dependence of Russians in the Amur Valley on Manchurian wheat and cattle. Such a rail-

---

111 Sabler and Sosnovskii, Sibirskaia zheleznaia doroga, p. 68.
112 Quoted in ibid., pp. 68-69.

road would strengthen the Transbaikalian frontier even more than the line proposed by Ignatiev.[113]

The prodding of Ignatiev and Korff was not in vain. The Committee of Ministers received their latest reports so sympathetically that in June 1887 the ministers agreed unanimously on the need for a railroad extending all the way from Tomsk to Vladivostok (then linked precariously only by road with the Amur basin). The ministers resolved that research and engineering surveys of the overland areas between Tomsk and Vladivostok be undertaken. On the Committee's final report Alexander III commented: "All this is perfectly true. I hope that the Ministry [of Communications] will demonstrate that it can build both quickly and cheaply."[114] Preliminary surveys were begun in late 1887 along the three stretches of the Siberian railroad so far approved: the Mid-Siberian, the Transbaikal, and the Ussuri lines.

Initial construction work, originally planned for 1888, could not be undertaken that soon, owing to the objections of Finance Minister I. A. Vyshnegradsky. During this delay Posyot broached for the first time the question of connecting the three Siberian sections proposed thus far with another rail connection from Tomsk to the Russian network extending as far east as Zlatoust in the Urals. The disadvantages of a mixed rail and river system, with its climatic and logistic problems, had been readily apparent to many, including the tsar. By 1890 the Committee of Ministers approved the continued construction of the line through the Urals from Zlatoust eastward. Though several offers had been received from private individuals and firms, the government was determined to finance the project by itself.

---

113 Sabler and Sosnovskii, Sibirskaia zhelznaia doroga, pp. 70-71.
114 Quoted in ibid., p. 76; Tupper discusses this in To the Great Ocean, pp. 73-76.

Only state financial considerations were now holding up the work within Siberia.[115]

Renewed impetus was given to the project by Baron Korff's report to the tsar in July 1890. This time the governor-general warned not only of Vladivostok's isolated position but also of impending Chinese plans to allow British engineers to build a railroad through southern Manchuria to the Russian border, not far from Vladivostok. Regarding the stalled Ussuri line Alexander III replied to Korff's report, "We must start building this railroad as quickly as possible." The tsar also envisaged new horizons in trade between Russia and Europe, on the one hand, and America and Asia, on the other.[116] Finance Minister Vyshnegradsky, however, opposed the concentration of efforts on the Ussuri line at the expense of the more centrally located sections. Construction in the Far East alone would not only fail to consolidate ties between Russia and Siberia but would bring in greater American economic penetration and influence in Eastern Siberia as well. The Finance Minister downgraded the Chinese threat in Manchuria and argued that an Ussuri line unconnected by rail with the rest of Siberia and Russia was militarily worthless. In objection, Minister of Communications Hubbenet then proposed the simultaneous construction of both western and eastern ends of the line toward the center. He also recommended that the western link of the Siberian railroad run through Chelyabinsk and Zlatoust, instead of through Tyumen to the north.

In February 1891 the Committee of Ministers unanimously accepted Hub-

---

115 Sabler and Sosnovskii, Sibirskaia zheleznaia doroga, p. 78, 81-85, 104.

116 Ibid., p. 86; and Tupper, To the Great Ocean, p. 79. In a report of November 6, 1892, the new Finance Minister Sergei Witte held that the railroad would eventually replace the Suez Canal as the chief European trade route to China.

benet's proposals — to approve construction of a connecting railroad east through Chelyabinsk, and to build a continuous railroad running from the Urals to the Pacific.[117] After thirty-five years of sporadic discussion, the work of building a railroad through Siberia was to commence later that same year. Alexander III thereupon gave instructions to begin construction. The Heir Apparent, Nicholas Alexandrovich, was just returning home from a tour of Asian countries when the tsar asked him to participate in the ceremonial opening of the Trans-Siberian Railroad project in Vladivostok. In the rescript given to his son, the Emperor stressed that the railroad would "unite the Siberian regions so abundant in the fruits of nature with the network of domestic railway communications." He hoped the railroad would "facilitate relations between Siberia and the other parts of the Empire and thereby bring to this land, so near to My heart, My most active concern for its peaceful prosperity."[118] Consequently, the Tsarevich Nicholas helped lay the foundation stone for the Ussuri section of the Trans-Siberian Railroad on May 19, 1891. Actual construction began the following year.

All these developments indicate that the main reasons for building the Trans-Siberian Railroad were considerations of state. Military and strategic interests were an important factor, as was international trade and commerce. With respect to Siberia proper, economic motives were again considerable: vast natural resources should not be left untapped, but should be exploited for the good of Russia as a whole. Moreover, Siberia should be become more integrated politically and administratively into the Russian

---

117 Sabler and Sosnovskii, Sibirskaia zheleznaia doroga, p. 91; Tupper, To the Great Ocean, pp. 80-81; and Sobolev, "Puti soobshcheniia," p. 26.

118 Quoted in Sabler and Sosnovskii, op. cit., p. 106; also see, Tupper, op. cit., pp. 82-83.

Empire.

Other factors justifying construction soon presented themselves. The famine of 1891-92 showed the need to transport grain rapidly across the empire. Moreover, the question of peasant migration to Siberia gave added weight to building the railway. Despite the law of 1889, which encouraged legal migration to Siberia, migration did not at first constitute a major consideration in the decision to build the railroad. However, this attitude changed with the formation of the Siberian Railway Committee in 1893, which strongly supported peasant colonization, especially in areas through which the railroad would pass.

Certain sectors of Siberian public opinion generally supported the government's views. One example of the centralist position regarding the railroad specifically can be found in a brochure put out in Irkutsk by Colonel N. A. Voloshinov. Among other things, he wrote:

> For three hundred years Siberia has been considered as conquered by Russians, but does Russia possess it? Does Siberia indeed belong to the Russian people and to the Russian state? Do the Russian people, one hundred million strong, enjoy this vast expanse of their possessions, or are profits to be extracted from it by several thousand neglected local inhabitants who call themselves "Siberians" and are ready to forget that they are Russians? . . .
>
> A Siberian railroad will become the great fulfillment of Yermak's work. It will constitute the actual and final subjugation and annexation of Siberia for the benefit and good of the Russian people and the Russian state.[119]

In contrast to the interest groups and entrepreneurs in the Volga and Ural areas who in the 1880's had brought their preferences to bear on the

---

119 M. V— (N. A. Voloshinov), Nieskol'ko slov o Sibirskoi zheleznoi dorogie (A Few Remarks on the Trans-Siberian Railroad), (Irkutsk, 1889); quoted in S. G. Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 81.

government decision to build a railroad along the "middle" route to the Urals, Siberian interests groups were less vocal and influential. Somewhere in between the positions taken by centralists and regionalists were Siberians who welcomed the railroad as a spur to the local economy. The mayor of Irkutsk Sukachov, for instance, felt that both a railroad and a canal connecting the Ob and Yenisei-Angara basins would constitute "the future of Eastern Siberia and the future of Irkutsk besides." He hoped that with a railroad and a canal Irkutsk would become less dependent on the ups and downs of the gold industry and on small trade, moving into the area of "broad and healthy industrial and commercial enterprises for the region and for the state." Sukachov banked (as of 1891) on a railroad to help remedy the present "unsatisfactory condition" of the economy.[120] In the long run his hopes were justified.

Opposed to the suppositions of both Voloshinov and Sukachov were Potanin and Yadrintsev. In short, they felt that building a railroad in a Siberia still subject to Russia as an economic colony could only perpetuate or worsen Siberia's colonial status. For Siberia and Siberians really to benefit from a railroad, the region first had to attain a sufficient level of economic autonomy to allow it to hold its own vis-à-vis Russia and the outside world. Thus, Potanin wrote as early as 1873: "Building a railway into Siberia means beginning the matter from the tail-end first."[121] That same

---

120 V. P. Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 138. In 1882 work was begun on a canal between the tributaries of the Ob and the Yenisei, but the completion of the Trans-Siberian Railroad rendered the whole canal project well nigh useless (Golovachev, Sibir', p. 257).

121 Potanin, "Syr'evaia doroga," Kamsko-Volzhkaia Gazeta, (1873); quoted in Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 219; and in Iakushev, "Potanin," Vol'naia Sibir', I: 36. In contrast to such Soviet writers as V. I. Nikolaev who view regionalists as little more than Siberian populists that banked on the peasant commune and feared industrialization and westernization, Yakushev points out that Potanin's economic program gave Siberia's industrial development first priority, so as best to secure Siberia's economic autonomy (p. 36). See Nikolaev, "Sibirskaia ssylka," p. 112; and

year Yadrintsev also had written:

> Means other than a railroad should be advanced for defending the country from exploitation and for encouraging local industry. The nature of these measures can be discussed only by a local institution such as a zemstvo, without which the country will be flung into economic anarchy and subject to all possible fortuities. Therefore, we would like to see the first ceremonial train into Siberia be met by a zemstvo. [122]

Yadrintsev's dire predictions were partially borne out in the short run. Though Siberia lacked a zemstvo in the late 1890's, the jarring economic and social dislocations that arose from the railroad were indeed far too deep for zemstvos to rectify.

As mentioned earlier, the Eastern Review carried over forty articles on the railroad issue during the 1880's and early 1890's. Taking no part in the controversy over which route to and through the Urals was most suitable, Yadrintsev stated that "none of the competitors gave any thought to Siberia and its well-being on this matter." [123] He did urge, however, that the railroad be called "Trans-Siberian," and not "Siberian," because he felt so little account was taken of Siberia's own interests in the plans. [124] Yadrintsev continued to doubt the value of a railroad unaccompanied by other modern institutions in a backward environment such as Siberia's.

> Railroads are one of the ways to build civilization, but they are not the only one. Moreover, this is one of the instruments and means of trade and speculation, as money and as credit. It is well known that these means of civilization can serve differently in differ-

---

Istoriia Sibiri, III: 169.

122 Iadrintsev, "Sud'by Sibiri (po povodu stat'i g. Avesova)" (Siberia's Fate), Nedielia, (1873) no. 5; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 139 n.

123 Iadrintsev, in Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1885) no. 4; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, p. 138; and in Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 82.

124 In Russian: cherez Sibir' instead of sibirskaia. In this respect the English rendition "Trans-Siberian" accords more with Yadrintsev's wishes than the Russian sibirskaia zheleznaia doroga.

> entlands. We are not opponents of civilizing means, and thus the facilitation of communication routes, but we understand civilization not as this alone. We ask why is only a "railroad" such a panacea against all evils? Why do people who wish to do good for Siberia and to raise its cultural level, and who speak so fervently of millions for a railroad, not turn to other equivalent instruments of civilization which have perhaps even greater significance? Why not say: litter this country with public schools and technical institutions, lavishing millions on this? But this goes unmentioned. Why is there no mention of the development of education, the improvement of popular culture, etc., which are worth railroads and to which Europe is indebted no less, and perhaps more, than to these railroads . . . ? Uplift this culture and the country's industry, allow room for the development of life and enlightenment with all its blessings, and railroads themselves will be the result of this higher level, whereby the efforts and fictions regarding the important question of building a railroad to the East need not be used in the name of practical and abstract goals. Since the question of a railroad into Siberia is not considered from the viewpoint of a comparative evaluation of the various blessings of civilization, then we will keep persistently repeating the question: "How necessary is a railroad for Siberia?" [125]

The reservations expressed in the Eastern Review were of little or no influence in determining the actions and decisions of the Committee of Ministers. As plans slowly progressed, Yadrintsev began to sense the coming victory of forces and developments he had long opposed. In March 1893, with railroad construction already well underway, he wrote to his friend V. I. Semidalov regarding Siberia's reception of the event: "Kudryavtsev's Yenisei Inquirer is gloating and reproaching the Eastern Review and the Siberian Gazette for their having been against the railroad. Our enemies celebrate, but is Siberia celebrating?" Six months later (in September 1893) he added somewhat pessimistically:

---

125 Iadrintsev, in Vostochnoe Obozrienie, (1884) no. 28; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 138-39.

> The construction of a railroad, with all its transient elements, will produce a revolution in attitudes, morals, and tastes. This is an invasion of a railroad civilization, grasping and greedy . . . Siberians will have to show great stoicism, civic courage, and patriotism in order to defend themselves and uphold a healthy course of life. . . . The railroad people will join up with Kartamyshev and Company, with lawyers, contractors, kulaks, and transient officials. An entire party of culture-bearers will gain momentum. And ours, unorganized, unco-ordinated, and concentrating on local details, will be unfit for anything. [126]

And so, in the last full year of his life, Yadrintsev acknowledged wistfully the coming of a revolutionary social and economic transformation in Siberia. This transformation threatened to bring with it a death blow to Siberian regional interests and sentiments, and indeed to the regionalist idea in general. [127]

Meanwhile, the construction of the Trans-Siberian Railroad, spurred on by the new Finance Minister Sergei Witte (1892-1903), proceeded apace. By 1894 the first section of the railroad had been completed — the line linking Vladivostok with Iman, on the Ussuri River. That same year witnessed the deaths of the Emperor Alexander III, the energetic champion of the whole undertaking, and of Yadrintsev, the foremost Siberian to express his skepticism regarding the circumstances and timing of the railroad's construction. Two years later, in 1896, track extended from Chelyabinsk all the way to Krasnoyarsk, and by 1898, clear to Irkutsk. By 1903 the Chinese Eastern Railroad was finished, connecting Vladivostok with Transbaikalia by rail. The connection across Lake Baikal was temporarily served either by steamer or, in winter, by sleds and light track. The final link in the transconti-

---

126 Letters to V. I. Semidalov, dated March 17 and September 6, 1893; quoted in Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 139-40.

127 See Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 82; and Gins, "Sibirskoe oblastnichestvo," p. 148.

nental railroad, the Circum-Baikal route, was completed only during the Russo-Japanese War in late 1904. Including branch lines to Khabarovsk and Tomsk, 8,180 versts (about 5,000 miles) of track had been laid across Siberia, northern Manchuria, and the Maritime territory by 1904.[128] The cost of the line from the Urals to the Pacific ran 635 million rubles.[129]

The overall effect of the Trans-Siberian Railroad on Siberia's real needs has remained an open question. Professor Guins, in challenging Yadrintsev's view that a zemstvo should come first in priority, tended to take a position just the opposite. In 1950 he wrote,

> It is moreover clear that the introduction of a zemstvo by itself would not have been enough for its successful development. Siberia needed an influx of fresh, human forces, the replenishment of its population by agriculturalists and workers, the creation of new centers and seedbeds of culture, civilization, technical means, and capital. And all this could be obtained only after construction of new railroad lines and by a very close bond with Russia.[130]

Against the temptation to regard the railroad as the best cure-all, Bogolepov attested in 1908 to the incompleteness of Siberia's transformation: "The railroad crushed Siberia's numbness, conquered its expanses, overcame the corruption of old forms of economic life, but failed to bring with it living forces and a ferment needed to revive the country." The railroad alone could not transform Siberia for the better; a "whole system of measures" was needed.[131] Despite disagreement as to the impact of the railroad, Guins, Bogolepov, and Yadrintsev all to some extent still considered Russia, the mother country, as the proper base to provide an economic, institutional,

---

128 Istoriia Sibiri, III: 179.
129 M. Sobolev, "Puti soobshcheniia," p. 26.
130 G. K. Gins, "Sibirskoe oblastnichestvo," p. 148.
131 M. Bogolepov, "Torgovlia Sibiri" (Siberia's Commerce), in Mel'nik, ed., Sibir': eia sovremennoe sostoianie i eia nuzhdy (St. Petersburg, 1908), p. 171.

and cultural regeneration of Siberia.

On the negative side, in 1900 a French observer, who had just crossed Siberia by rail, seemed to confirm Yadrintsev's gloomy prophecy regarding the changes that a "railroad civilization" would bring. "The grand old Siberian hospitality," he wrote, "is disappearing rapidly, and there are not wanting, even in Siberia, old-fashioned people who curse the Trans-Siberian Railway, which is destined sooner or later to revolutionize the manners and customs of Northern Asia." [132]

Perhaps more immediately recognized than the changes in attitude wrought by the railroad was the economic transformation of the vast eastern borderland. The natural, self-sufficient, and non-monetary economy that predominated in much of Siberia began to crumble, as motivation to sell and purchase goods reached distant corners of the land. Not only was local self-sufficiency broken down, but the regional economy, which depended on Russian goods purchased at the fairs of Nizhny Novgorod and Irbit, was greatly dislocated. With construction of a railroad binding Russia and Europe with the Pacific and the Orient, Siberia became not only more closely enmeshed in the Russian market but in the world market too. The cost of transporting both goods and people became so much cheaper that imports and exports in and out of Siberia increased considerably. Enterprising Siberians began to export grain, butter, wool, and other animal products to Russia and even Europe. In return the region increased its importation of sugar, iron, kerosene, luxury items, and finished manufactured goods. From the Orient tea and silk traversed the railroad, in exchange for textiles and metal goods. All this, of course, increased the amount of money entering and circulating inside

---

132 Pierre Leroy-Beaulieu, Awakening of the East, p. 42.

Siberia.[133]

Construction of the railroad had important social consequences too. As importation and circulation of goods was increased and facilitated, the monopolies which a few large entrepreneurs had established, controlling both supply and price, broke down. The result was a growth in the number of small tradesmen. Thus, the railroad brought into being an economy that permitted more free enterprise and competition, giving the lower middle classes a boost.[134] Moreover, the railroad completely eliminated the highway "carrying trade" and those occupations connected with it. Coachmen, harness and coach makers, innkeepers, and others in related activities were soon squeezed out of business. Between Tomsk and Irkutsk an estimated 16,000 coachmen and 80,000 horses lost their jobs. Indeed, the "carrying trade" had employed as much as 11% of the population in certain areas of Irkutsk province.[135] Steamship transport along the Ob River system was reduced, though not eliminated, by the more efficient railroad.

While reinforcing one social group and eliminating others, the railroad all but created a new social element: the wage-earning, industrial workingman (previously only miners had fallen into this category). With the railroad many thousands, from both Siberia and Russia, found temporary or permanent employment. With the impetus that the railroad gave to forest products, coal mining, etc., working-class elements increased in Siberia, providing a fertile field for revolutionary propaganda, especially of the Marxist variety.[136] Indeed, it was in the mid-1890's that the first Marxist exiles

---

133 Sobolev, "Puti soobshcheniia," p. 27; "Ot redaktsii" (From the Editors), Sibirskie Voprosy, (1905) no. 1, pp. i-ii; and Golovachev, Sibir', pp. 246-47, 264.

134 Golovachev, Sibir', pp. 262-63.

135 Ibid., p. 261.

136 Sobolev, "Puti soobshcheniia," p. 30; and Shvetsov, "Kul'turnoe znachenie," Katorga i Ssylka, no. 47, p. 99.

began to arrive in Siberia (the most prominent of whom were Lev Deutsch, L. B. Krasin, and in 1897 Lenin himself). These Marxists made much of the fact that an industrial, capitalist stage of economic development was penetrating Siberia, abetted especially by the Trans-Siberian Railroad. The region suddenly found itself with an advanced form of transportation, a more competitive economy dependent on outside markets, a disintegration of the agriculturally self-sufficient village economy, a growing working class of wage earners, and several booming urban, commercial centers.

As for the last of these, such towns were located along the transcontinental main line: Omsk, Novo-Nikolaevsk (now Novosibirsk), Krasnoyarsk, Irkutsk, Khabarovsk, and Vladivostok. These cities, sooner or later, pushed towns some distance away from the main trunk — Tobolsk, Tyumen, Tomsk, Yeniseisk, and Nerchinsk — into the background in many respects. Though Tomsk and Tyumen, connected by branch lines, managed to hold their own, others sank more and more into veritable backwaters. Besides such outlying towns, many more villages found themselves totally unable to meet the demands of the new economic age. Only by successfully marketing butter, grain, or other agricultural products did parts of rural Siberia adjust well to the transition.[137] Villages and peasants unable to make the switch were often left with neither money nor grain and were consequently impoverished and more susceptible to famine, usurers, and "commune-eaters" than ever.[138]

Another enormous consequence of the Trans-Siberian Railroad concerned

---

137 Iakushev, "K trekhsotpiatidesiatiletiiu Sibiri," p. 152; "Ot rdektsii," Sibirskie Voprosy, p. ii; and Golovachev, Sibir', p. 242. Before construction of the railroad, Novo-Nikolaevsk (on the Ob river crossing) had a population of 3000; by 1908 it increased to 30,000, and by 1917 to almost 70,000. On the decision to bypass Tomsk with the main line see Tupper, To the Great Ocean, pp. 97-99.

138 D. Zaitsev, "Zemstvo v Sibiri," p. 59. "Commune-eaters" (miroedy) were wealthier peasants who exacted tributes of gifts from poorer peasants in return for favors.

passenger traffic: the increased opportunity for people to travel to and through Siberia. For the select few to whom it mattered, the trip from London to Vladivostok was now reduced to twelve days, instead of several months. One traveler, Leroy-Beaulieu, speculated that the influence of foreign visitors from "the highly civilized nations of the West" would have an "incalculable" effect on Siberia's social transformation.[140] But far more important in transforming the face of Siberia was the impetus the railroad was to give to one of the greatest migrations in world history. With permission officially given in 1889 to migrate legally beyond the Urals, the railroad, in the two decades after 1894, became an indispensable means of transporting millions of Russian peasant settlers eastward to what was hopefully the "land of the future."

* * *

The Migration Question

In the eyes of Siberian regionalists all Siberian society needed to be aroused and awakened, especially by means of education and cultural improvement. For the good of Siberian society as a whole, however, regionalists also felt that problems concerning specific elements of the Siberian population also had to be answered. The three groups of most concern to regionalists (and ultimately to all Siberian society) were recent settlers from European Russia, criminal exiles, and non-Russian, indigenous peoples. Government action was seen as necessary to improve the situation regarding all three groups. Regionalists felt it was up to the government to legalize

---

140 P. Leroy-Beaulieu, Awakening of the East, pp. 79-80.

migration to Siberia and to provide assistance to settlers en route and land at their destination. Only the government could abolish criminal exile to Siberia and provide some other means of punishment or rehabilitation less detrimental to the population at large. Only through governmental legislation could civil rights and effective aid and protection be given to languishing native peoples of Siberia.

The migration of settlers across the Urals, which was beginning to increase greatly in the last years of Alexander III's reign, did as much to change the face of Siberia demographically as the Trans-Siberian Railroad did commercially and economically. Indeed, by far the greatest influx of settlers was to come to Siberia via the railway. Even before construction of the railroad, though, the migratory situation was changing in the 1880's and early 1890's both legislatively and demographically. On the other hand, during this period there were no notable policy changes regarding criminal exiles or natives. Improvements in these two areas came only in the following reign of Nicholas II.

With respect to the migration question, the demands of regionalists that colonization be facilitated and assisted were in part realized. Yet hundreds of thousands of migrants streaming into Siberia, especially after completion of the Trans-Siberian Railroad, in time began to inundate the older, more rooted and established Sibiryaks, with their more distinctively regional outlook, customs, and manners of speech. Thus, by allowing relatively free and legal colonization, the government was able to link the distant borderland more closely to European Russia in one more way.[141] This

---

141 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 220.

same motive can be seen, of course, in the Siberian administrative reforms and in the decision to build the Trans-Siberian Railroad. In contrast to these latter two problems, which were settled in St. Petersburg alone, the nature of the migration question was such that it offered room for the opinions and contributions of Siberian society, especially in the area of philanthropy. Thus, migration not only was a factor in arousing Siberian society to action and awareness, but also was a factor in breaking down localism, particularism, and regionalism to a point.

The beginnings of a government policy regulating voluntary migration to Siberia date back to the early 19th century; previous attempts at compulsory colonization had failed, and officials had been unable to control illegal flight to Siberia. Alexander I enacted legislation in 1806 and 1822 that permitted state peasants to migrate if certain conditions were satisfied. Not only did few wish to migrate according to these rules, but those who did were often treated like criminal exiles by local Siberian authorities. The situation was improved by the legislation of Count P. D. Kiselyov, Nicholas I's Minister of State Domains. Kiselyov in 1843 allowed state peasants who were exceptionally short on land to migrate and to obtain a sufficient amount of land, monetary aid, and exemption from certain state obligations. Under these conditions about 350,000 state peasants migrated to Siberia in the 1840's and 1850's. According to some sources, the number of involuntary migrants (i.e. exiles) to Siberia between 1823 and 1863 was as high as 356,000, and during the period 1831-66 another 320,000 unauthorized settlers (without government aid or permission) went east across the Urals.[142]

---

142 Treadgold, Great Siberian Migration, p. 27, 29; and Anatole V. Baikalov, "The Conquest and Colonisation of Siberia," Slavonic Review, (April 1932), p. 569. The most thorough western study of this early period

In the years following the emancipation of serfs in 1861 migration to Siberia increased little. Both landed gentry and peasant communes had an interest in keeping ex-serfs at home in the village. The gentry opposed emigration because they needed peasant wage-laborers to work their estates, whereas the commune opposed emigration because it reduced the number of working hands able to contribute to the commune's redemption payments to the government. In these years a former serf could legally migrate only if financially solvent and qualified in the eyes of official authorities — an extremely rare circumstance. In 1866 Kiselyov's earlier legislation was revised as the government cut off all state benefits to settlers. Despite restoration of tax exemptions in 1870, this did little to make up for the lack of state aid and assistance.[143] Moreover, at this time the only areas to which migration was legally permitted were the newly acquired Amur Valley (since 1863) and the Altai lands of the Imperial Cabinet (opened to limited colonization in 1865). Until roughly 1883, approximately 7,000 legal migrants settled in the Amur area, and in the Altai about 18,000, reflecting the government's general opposition to Siberian migration.[144]

According to Potanin, with the emancipation of serfs in 1861,

> Siberian patriots joyfully greeted the beginning of a new colonization. But the government began to take measures toward restraining the peasant waves . . . Siberians did not sympathize with this government policy, which was carried out in the interests of landowners, and they even protested in newspapers.[145]

---

and of the rest of the century is Fr.-X. Coquin, La Sibèrie. Peuplement et immigration paysanne au XIX^e siècle (Paris: Institute d'Études slaves, 1969), which I have not yet been able to consult to my satisfaction.

143 Treadgold, Great Siberian Migration, p. 69; Iadrintsev, "Polozhenie pereselentsev v Sibiri" (The Status of Migrants in Siberia), Viestnik Evropy, (August 1881) bk. 8, pp. 615-16.

144 Treadgold, Great Siberian Migration, pp. 69-71.

145 Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," p. 277. Also see above, p. 423.

Even with the small influx of settlers in the 1870's, Siberia, almost the only voice of Siberian public opinion at the time, expressed itself positively on the colonization question. In 1880 the Irkutsk newspaper asked: "Who does not know what disasters and deprivations the peasantry is subjected to during migration into Siberia, and who has not seen these carts with sick children, old men, with women and peasant migrants enfeebled by the long journey?" After urging that shelter stations for them be constructed along the main route, the paper struck out at local public apathy: "No one should have more interest in the fate of migrants and their organization than should Siberian society. These are the country's gold mines, and its future strength, wealth, and power. Just remember this, Siberians!" [146] Thus, not only an awareness that Siberians should become more actively involved in aiding migrant settlers was developing, but also the recognition that Siberia's future greatness depended on a larger population.

By the early 1880's Yadrintsev had become the staunchest advocate of free colonization to Siberia and of appropriate measures to encourage this. In his first major article on the problem he described in 1881 the plight of settlers in Siberia and suggested ways of resolving it. "Misery and deprivation among migrants is evidenced everywhere. Some, who have exhausted their supply of money, unable to buy fodder for their cattle, sell both cattle and carts, and drag along without any property at all, living on around agricultural artels." He decried the absence of both governmental and local public assistance for settlers. "The impoverishment and ruin of migrants not only fails to benefit the treasury and the state, but it also

---

146 Sibir', (1880) no. 7; quoted in Koz'min, "Zagoskin," p. 224, and in "Nachalo pechati," p. 394.

promotes the growth of an existing proletariat, turning proprietors and agriculturalists to vagabondage and into a homeless class in a new location."[147]

Yadrintsev proposed the following general principles as guidelines for improving the situation: the removal of obstacles to free settlement, thereby giving the the poorest peasants in Russia a chance to migrate; the obligation of both local society and central government to provide assistance and nourishment for migrants en route at various way-stations; the efficient distribution of information regarding lands specifically available for settlement, and the speedy transfer of such lands to migrants; and the founding of a credit institution to provide loans to needy settlers. Yadrintsev also began to advocate about this time the founding of a "central settlement administration" to co-ordinate the government's policy (eventually set up in 1897). With such outspoken proposals and later efforts to put them into action, it was no wonder that Yadrintsev earned the name "the settlers' friend." Indeed, as mentioned above, a migrant settlement founded in 1792 in Tobolsk province was even named Yadrintsevskoe.[148]

In his work, Siberia as a Colony, Yadrintsev showed that he placed the interests of Siberia's future far above any narrow desire to keep "non-Siberians" out and to preserve better the "regional" character of the population. Indeed, in the Russian context, he viewed colonization as a unifying, not a divisive factor. Among the absolutely necessary conditions for Siberia's future development and prosperity Yadrintsev listed colonization and settlement; the right of each new arrival to use of the soil without

---

147 Iadrintsev, "Polozhenie pereselentsev," p. 604, 606, 613.
148 Ibid., pp. 616-19; Glinskii, "Iadrintsev," pp. 448-49; and Lemke, Iadrintsev, pp. 182-83. Also see above, p. 504.

charge; and the freedom to engage in agricultural work and industry.[149]

Yadrintsev was well aware of the great historical role of colonization in the world. "Apportioning part of the population in various locations, it creates new cells of life in the form of colonies, promotes a more even distribution of population throughout the earth, spreads life and culture, and often creates new governmental systems in the wilderness." In the Russian Empire, however, the situation was somewhat different. "Bureaucratic self-assurance and the habit of interfering darkens a healthy policy of state and retards the cultural, historical work of colonization. This is why our colonization and the very renovation of our colonies often have not had the success and progress that /colonies/ have had in the West."[150]

The pros and cons of migration to Siberia had long been discussed in European Russia, and especially since the 1860's. The government's policy after the emancipation of serfs Potanin described thusly:

> The government earlier /in the 1860's/ placed obstacles on the migratory movement, was stingy in allocating money in grants to settlers, and made a secret of these allocations so as not to encourage peasants to migrate; moreover, they published books on Siberia which attempted to describe the country tendentiously so as to dampen the ardor of peasants who sought to go to Siberia.[151]

The major rationale behind this policy was to assure large landowners in Russia an ample supply of cheap peasant labor.

Yet some of those opposed to colonizing Siberia with Russian peasants were both informed and intelligent. In 1862 Baron Meyendorff, influenced

---

149 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 708, 711.
150 Ibid., p. 212, 220. As Western examples Yadrintsev had chiefly the United States, Canada, and Australia in mind.
151 Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," p. 277.

by the American precedent, argued against migration in a public debate. The government should not encourage colonization and colonies, he asserted, for upon reaching maturity these possessions would naturally separate from the mother country. [152] And even into the early 1890's the viewpoint persisted that the more spread out and less dense the agricultural population, the more this situation would constitute a brake on economic progress and development. [153] The Minister of Interior I. N. Durnovo (1889-95) professed seeing political unrest in the mass migration of settlers eastward, along with depletion of cheap labor reserves and depreciation of land values in European Russia. By the turn of the century, however, the views of the landowning interests were changing. This is illustrated by Potanin's remark in 1908 that "the mother country's policy, conducted by landed proprietors, considers using Siberian lands to find a solution to the land shortage in the mother country." [154]

By the end of the century those who were pessimistic about the possibilities of a Siberian "safety valve" began to stress the fact that Siberia simply lacked further good agricultural land. This argument flew in the face of migration advocates who saw in Siberia an unlimited supply of land for agriculture. In fact, areas close to the Trans-Siberian Railway were becoming either unfit for settlement or were already filled up. According to Kaufman, a specialist on the migration question,

> these skeptical views were regarded with disbelief and ridicule, and fanatics of Siberian colonization

---

152 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 708 n., and Sibirien, p. 427.
153 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 212.
154 Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," p. 277.

> maintained quite definitely that all doubt regarding the possibility of its unlimited development "should be ascribed to an insufficient acquaintance with Siberia." Government circles did not attribute significance to these voices. . . . after the first few years of systematic colonization the government came face to face with "the fact that the available supply of lands was not enough to satisfy all those who desired to settle in new locations." [155]

Whatever the merits of the arguments for or against large-scale colonization of Siberia, the government itself had begun to reverse its previous exclusionist attitude in the last years of Alexander II's reign. The first evidence of this change appeared in 1880 with the new Minister of Interior, Count M. T. Loris-Melikov. The Count favored easing opportunities for peasant migration out of thickly-settled regions of Russia into Siberia. His successor in 1881, Count N. P. Ignatiev, in fact issued "Temporary Regulations" whereby the migrant to Siberia no longer needed to show evidence that the commune of his destination approved of his arrival. Moreover, the migrant's obligations to the state were now deferred for several years, and agencies were to be established to assist the movement of settlers eastward. These were to provide material and medical aid, travel information, etc. Migration without a permit was now specifically prohibited. [156] Two years later, in 1883, a Peasants' Land Bank was established, which provided loans to individuals or to communes. Nevertheless, permission to migrate was not easy to obtain, and the regulations were not publicized.

On July 13, 1889, a general migration law was publicly issued for the empire as a whole. Any peasant could now petition to the Ministries of In-

---

155 A. Kaufman, "Kolonizatsiia Sibiri v nastoiashchem i budushchem" (The Colonization of Siberia: Present and Future), Sibirskie Voprosy, (1905) no. 1, pp. 172-73.

156 Treadgold, Great Siberian Migration, pp. 75-76; Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 727; Baikalov, "Conquest and Colonisation of Siberia," p. 570; and Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 226.

terior and State Domains for permission to migrate. Fifteen desiatiny of land in Siberia (about 40 acres) were to be granted immediately to whomever received permission. A settler could either enroll in a previously established community or set himself and his family up in a new settlement with forty or more adult males. Temporary exemptions from state taxes and military service were allowed. Indeed, the government would now provide 30 rubles or more per migrant family. The new law was applied immediately to Western Siberia and the Steppe territory, and by 1892 was extended to Yeniseisk and Irkutsk provinces. Large-scale, voluntary migration to Siberia was now established and permitted by law.[157] It was not until 1906, however, that the need for official permission to migrate to Siberia was removed altogether by law.

During the first fifty years of the 19th century an average of 7,500 new arrivals came to Siberia each year. Among these about 2/3 were exiles, and the rest voluntary settlers. In the two decades following the emancipation of serfs (1861-1880), the average annual number of new arrivals had increased to 25,000. Of this twenty-year total (roughly 500,000), migrant peasants still constituted one-third. During the 1880's, however, the number of settlers exceeded 400,000, with peasant migrants for the first time outnumbering exiles at a ratio of 2:1.[158] Through the government migration bureau set up in Simbirsk province in 1881 over 55,000 new settlers passed on their way to Siberia during its first six years of existence. During the same period, 1881-86, 15,000 settlers passed through a similar

---

157 For discussions in English, see Treadgold, Great Siberian Migration, pp. 78-79; Baikalov, "Conquest and Colonisation of Siberia," p. 570; and A. I. Dmitriev-Mamonov and A. F. Zdziarski, eds., Guide to the Great Siberian Railway, trans. by L. Kukol-Yasnopolsky (St. Petersburg, 1900), p. 38.

158 Cited in Treadgold, Great Siberian Migration, p. 33.

bureau in Tyumen. In 1889, the year the new legislation was enacted, a total of 37,000 migrants came to Siberia. Many settlers headed for the Altai area and the lands around Minusinsk and Biisk (roughly 18,500 passed through Tomsk alone in 1889).[159] As for the settlers' destination, 17,206 came to the Altai in just 1889, whereas in the Far Eastern Amur area only 19,240 peasants had settled during the ten years, 1880-89.[160] Between 1885 and 1893, 75% of the known migrants settled in Tomsk province, and of these 4/5 went to the Imperial Cabinet lands in the Altai.[161]

Even after 1889, a great number of migrants were "irregular," entering Siberia without governmental permission. While over 17,000 families had been officially allowed to emigrate between 1889 and 1892, various data indicate that as many as 28,911 families crossed the Urals then. The total number per annum increased from about 40,000 settlers in 1889 to approximately 90,000 by 1892.[162] This was the first significant jump in numbers since the early 1880's.

The construction of the Trans-Siberian Railroad necessitated new attitudes and policies toward migration. Travel costs were now reduced, travel time was shortened, the mortality rate en route decreased, and lands farther to the east were more accessible. The government realized that for the railroad to be a profitable venture, the adjoining land should be as populated as feasible. Peasant migrants increasingly began to make use of

---

159 Adrianov, Tomsk, p. 113; and Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), pp. 226-27, 230.

160 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 233, 235; and Coquin, La Sibèrie, p. 747. Between 1865 and 1889, 143,751 colonists settled in the Imperial Cabinet lands (Dmitriev-Mamonov and Zdziarski, eds., Guide, p. 234).

161 Treadgold, Great Siberian Migration, p. 100. Between 1894 and 1899, however, only 51% of the migrants settled in Tomsk province.

162 These figures correspond to Treadgold's (p. 34); Coquin's run a bit higher (p. 747).

railroad facilities. In 1893, about 1/10 of them utilized the railroad as far east as Kurgan. With the extension of the railroad eastward the number of migrants soared from roughly 65,000 in the years 1893 and 1894 to 120,000 in 1895, and to 190,000 in 1896.[163] Indeed, during the period 1894-1903 as a whole, new settlers crossed the Urals at an average annual rate of 115,000, three times that of the 1880's.[164] In part, the big influx of migrants beginning in 1894 can be attributed to the Great Famine of 1891-92, which struck central Russia quite severely (as well as affecting Western Siberia).[165]

In contrast to the question of a Siberian railroad, and more in common with the university question, the migration problem attracted the attention of the Siberian public. Various groups in Siberian society took positive steps to ameliorate conditions among new settlers. In 1883 the first "migrant committee" in Siberia was formed in Tyumen. It soon became quite active in rendering medical, material, and monetary help to needy settlers. Public efforts were also undertaken that same year in Irkutsk and Blagoveshchensk to raise money and clothes for migrants, but nothing formal was established. In 1884 a second "migrant committee" was formed in Krasnoyarsk, which aided hundreds of impoverished families. Tomsk, however, appeared to be relatively apathetic toward this problem during most of the 1880's; only in 1888 was an unofficial philanthropic committee formed. An official "migrant committee" was founded the following year. In connection

---

163 See Treadgold, Great Siberian Migration, p. 34, 81, 97; Coquin, La Sibérie, p. 747; and Florinsky, Russia, II: 1218.

164 G. T. Robinson, Rural Russia under the Old Regime (New York: Macmillan, 1932), p. 109; and Treadgold, Great Siberian Migration, p. 34.

165 Anatole Baikalov, "Siberia since 1894," Slavonic Review, (January 1933) XI: 328.

with the government's migrant bureau in Tomsk temporary housing barracks and a hospital were built. University professors even gave benefit lectures whose proceeds went to aiding settlers, and, as Yadrintsev put it, "here the humanizing influence of the university was already taking effect." [166] An influx of settlers headed overland for the Amur Valley began to affect Eastern Siberia in the late 1880's. In Irkutsk Governor-General Ignatiev collected donations and organized a philanthropic committee in 1888; a similar committee was also founded in Chita. Even in St. Petersburg a committee to assist migrants was formed in 1890. [167]

While many Siberians welcomed the infusion of new settlers into their country, new problems arose and the issue assumed a more complex character. Avcording to Potanin, as the number of migrants began to reach unprecedented heights, "the relationship of Siberian publicists to the migrant movement changed, conflicts arose between old-settlers /starozhily/ and new settlers /novosëly/, complaints were made about land-crowding, the question of rights and claims to Siberia's supply of land degenerated." [168] Such problems were even discussed at the St. Petersburg Free Economic Society. Here Yadrintsev defended old-settlers against attacks leveled against them by certain officials connected with the colonizing movement. [169]

Though some "new-settlers" occupied state lands outside the villages of "old-settlers," many new arrivals elected to enroll in these villages. As Yadrintsev described it, old-settlers did not always willingly accept the

---

166 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 230. Also see pp. 228-31.
167 Ibid., pp. 231-32, 241.
168 Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," p. 277. M. A. Czaplicka considers the true Sibiryaks or "old-settlers" as those who came or whose ancestors came to Siberia before 1885; (My Siberian Year (London: Mills and Boon, 1916), p. 243.
169 Potanin, Oblastnicheskaia tendentsiia, pp. 46-47.

migrants; sometimes they demanded a payment of 10 to 30 rubles per male upon acceptance, as a kind of guarantee for future obligations. These demands often evoked grumbles and complaints among new-settlers, who had imagined that land in Siberia was completely free and that they could settle wherever they pleased. Consequently, some colonists demanded lands that were already occupied and seized strips belonging to old-settlers. Yadrintsev ascribed much of this misunderstanding to the absence of proper surveying beforehand. [170] Once a new-settler enrolled in an old-settler village, he often ended up paying between 50 and 100 rubles in overall expenses. By the 1890's some villages began to stop formal enrollment and even expel new-settlers not officially enrolled. [171]

Until the early 1890's about 4% of the migrant families decided to return to European Russia; with the construction of the Trans-Siberian Railway and the massive colonization of the mid- and late-1890's a much larger percentage returned. As an English observer in the early 20th century put it,

> there are often to be seen whole caravans of novosioly, destitute and infirm, drifting from place to place, without permanent homes or belongings, getting odd jobs from the traders or starojily, who give them bread on credit, until finally the survivors drift back to their old homes in Russia. In 1910, as many as 36 per cent. of the immigrants of that year returned to Europe. Many of them sink almost from the beginning into a condition of practical serfdom to their creditors. [172]

On the other hand, many migrants did well in their new village communes, and some were able to detach themselves eventually from old-settler villages altogether and establish new settlements in the vicinity. Those

---

170 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 236.
171 Treadgold, Great Siberian Migration, pp. 99-100.
172 M. A. Czaplicka, My Siberian Year, p. 254.

who fared best of all had usually received permission to migrate, along with subsidies and assistance en route and at their destination. In the late 1880's and early 1890's the majority of new arrivals not only exhausted their funds on the way, but also lacked any financial or material aid. Yadrintsev wrote, however, that such penniless settlers could "re-establish themselves quite quickly, thanks to the abundance of land, space, and fertile soil. Under favorable conditions the settler builds himself a house in a year and is sowing the field." In certain instances colonists even outpaced their more established neighbors in horses, sheep, and cattle per family. In the 1880's migrant families also appeared to be more solid and less prone to breaking up than old-settler families.[173]

"In such ways," concluded Yadrintsev in 1892, "the visibly beneficial consequences of colonization for the settlers, in the sense of improving the economic life of agriculturalists, plus the advantageous results for the borderland, which is settled and revived by new infusions, along with rather important consequences for the state, all compel one to regard migration as an important step in the life of the people, the economy, and the state." He hoped that "Castle Gardens" could be instituted, following the American example, to aid migrants to Siberia more efficiently.[174] Looking further toward the United State model, he hoped that the Trans-Siberian Railway would enable Siberian migration and colonization to proceed as had America's. If this should be, then "in less than a century's time /sic/ the country would become unrecognizable."[175] Though he realized at the time that change

---

173 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 239.

174 Castle Garden was a controlled landing place for immigrants, set up in New York City in 1855, which aided immigrants in finding transportation, lodging, and general information.

175 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 240, 242.

was in the winds, it was little more than a decade before the railroad and the tremendous inundation of settlers substantially altered the old Siberia of the 19th century almost beyond recognition in many ways.

While the total population of Siberia in 1858 had been 3,430,930, by 1880 it had increased to 4,869,365. By 1897, with mass migration to Siberia well underway, the population reached 7,091,244 — more than doubling in only forty years.[176] By World War I Siberia's population had roughly doubled its size again. Where roughly 400,000 colonists had gone to Siberia in the 1880's, and 1.2 million had done so in the 1890's, in the first decade and a half of the 20th century (1901-14) about 3 million new migrants crossed the Urals and settled in Siberia.[177] This last infusion almost equaled Siberia's entire population in the mid-nineteenth century.

* * *

The Exile Question

Not only migration and its great possibilities made Siberia a unique region in the Russian Empire, but institutionalized exile also gave it a singularly distinctive character. In fact, the system of exile to Siberia had traditionally been linked with the colonization of the area. As far back as 1590 the first known forced deportation of settlers to Siberia, 30 peasant families in all, was ordered by Tsar Fyodor. Through the following

---

176 These figures are taken from Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 589, 713; and Dmitriev-Mamonov, eds., Guide, pp. 40-41. The provinces and territories included in these figures are Tobolsk, Tomsk, Yeniseisk, Irkutsk, Akmolinsk, Semipalatinsk, Transbaikalia, Yakutsk, Amur, Sakhalin, and the Maritime area.

177 See Treadgold, Great Siberian Migration, pp. 32-33; Coquin, La Sibérie, pp. 747-48; and Florinsky, Russia, II: 1218-19.

centuries the government resorted to compulsory colonization in order to boost agricultural productivity in Siberia (especially around mines and factories). A step in this direction, for example, was the decree of December 13, 1760, permitting serf owners to meet their obligation to provide army recruits by sending the requisite number of delinquent male serfs to settle in Siberia instead. The custom of sentencing political "offenders" to Siberia began in 1593, when witnesses to the murder of the Tsarevich Dmitry (in Uglich) were banished to Pelym.[178] From this time on, political offenders, from outspoken intellectuals and fallen statesmen to participants in peasant uprisings and upper-class conspiracies, suffered deportation to Siberia.

Thus, Siberia served European Russia as a penal colony until the close of the 19th century, just as North America, Australia, New Caledonia, and the Caribbean area had served Britain and France until mid-nineteenth century (and in some cases, even beyond). Though convicts and political "criminals" have in the past been imprisoned and confined in cities and provinces of European Russia and the Caucasus, Siberia has been the major destination of forced settlers, criminals, and political dissidents for most of modern Russian history.

The reforms of Governor-General Speransky in 1822 ended forced colonization of Siberia by means of administrative fiat. Moreover, landlords could no longer send their serfs to Siberia in lieu of their recruitment quota. From this point on, exile to Siberia became a means of punishment alone. From the 1820's to the early 1860's, only criminal, political, and

---

178 Dmitriev-Mamonov and Zdziarski, eds., Guide, p. 37.

religious exiles were used for purposes of agricultural settlement. Such exiles, of course, would also continue to supply the backbone of hard labor in mines and factories. Rehabilitation was the original rationale behind Speransky's new system. For minor offenses criminal exiles would begin their term in an agricultural settlement (poselenie) with the rights of a state peasant. For more serious crimes they would be sentenced first to hard labor in a state-run enterprise (katorga), followed by transference to a settlement with peasant rights (as many Decembrists experienced). Altogether, five categories of punishment were spelled out by the Bureau of Exiles, set up in Tobolsk in 1823: forced labor in mines and factories (katorga), work in highway chain gangs, agricultural settlement (poselenie), workhouse labor, and non-productive labor.[179] This division proved to be short-lived lived, though, as several of the categories were abolished in the 1830's.

In accordance with the hoped-for rehabilitating effect that Siberian exile was supposed to have upon criminals, the average number of exiles increased from about 2000 per year before Speransky's reform to around 8,500 per year during the three decades prior to 1852. Altogether, about 40,000 exiles entered Siberia between 1801 and 1822, and about 356,000 in the period 1823-62 (through the abolition of serfdom).[180] In the second half of the 19th century the annual average number of exiles sent to Siberia reached an all-time peak: roughly 18,000 per year in the period 1873-1887.[181]

---

179 Raeff, Siberia and the Reforms of 1822, pp. 59-60; and M. Gubskii, "Ssylka" (Exile), Entsiklopedicheskii slovar', vol. 31 (St. Petersburg: Brokgaus-Efron, 1900), p. 378.

180 Kennan, Siberia and the Exile System, I: 78; and Treadgold, Great Siberian Migration, p. 33.

181 Kennan's yearly totals from 1878 through 1887 diverge from the yearly averages for the entire decade of the 1880's cited on p. 701.

During the latter half of Alexander III's reign and through the 1890's the number of exiles began to decrease slowly. Moreover, voluntary peasant settlers were already beginning to outnumber deportees for the first time. The following set of figures illustrates the approximate average annual influx of both voluntary migrants and involuntary exiles: [182]

Decade	Peasant Settlers	Exiles
1851-1860	9,100	10,000
1861-1870	11,400	14,000
1871-1880	6,800	18,000
1881-1890	27,900	14,000
1891-1900	107,800	13,000
1901-1910	225,700	2,500

During the 75-year period 1823-1898, the Bureau of Exiles calculated a total of 908,266 exiles entering Siberia, over half of them having been deported to Eastern Siberia. [183]

In the second half of the 19th century Siberians commonly divided exiles into two major classes: criminal and political. Political exiles were generally Russian revolutionaries and radicals (constituting less than 1% of all exiles in the 1880's) and Polish nationalists and rebels. A third group consisted of religious exiles: Old Believers, Skoptsy, and other sectarians. Exiles were also grouped according to the nature of their sentences. According to Kennan's classification, in the 1880's katorzhniki (hard labor convicts) and poselentsy (penal settlers) were both deprived of all civil rights and banished for life. Exiles confined to residence (ssyl'nye na zhit'ë) retained some civil rights as "peasants" and could return to Euro-

---

182 V. V. Obolenskii (Osinskii), Mezhdunarodnye i mezhdukontinental'nye migratsii v dovoennoi Rossii i SSSR (International and Intercontinental Migrations in Pre-war Russia and the USSR), (Moscow, 1928), p. 84; adapted from Treadgold, Great Siberian Migration, p. 33.

183 Dmitriev-Mamonov and Zdziarski, eds., Guide, p. 124, 253.

pean Russia when their term expired. "Administrative" exiles were banished either by court order, by peasant communes, or by order of the Minister of Interior (who sent them without trial to Siberia for no more than five years). A large proportion of "exiles" also consisted of voluntary dobrovol'nye: wives and children who willingly accompanied or followed their husbands and fathers. Altogether, less than half of the exiles were banished without trial. [184]

Siberians made a sharp distinction between criminal and political exiles. Though the former, the overwhelming majority, were viewed as a scourge on the country, there were few complaints about the latter. As one Siberian told the exiled writer V. G. Korolenko: "Yes, our Siberia is becoming enlightened. First the Decembrists, and now you 'politicals' are here. Russia banishes you, while Siberia accepts you for her own benefit." [185] Religious exiles, who as non-Orthodox dissidents generally formed self-sufficient agricultural communities, were among the most economically productive and morally stable groups in Siberia. They exerted neither the baneful influence of criminal exiles nor the positive cultural and educational influence of the "politicals," however.

The drawbacks in using exiles, either as penal colonists or as former convicts, to bolster Siberia's agricultural output were many. Such exiles were not usually settled on unoccupied lands, but were attached to villages of old-settlers. This, to most Siberians, was the most distasteful aspect of criminal exile. A general absence of domesticity among criminal exiles

---

184 Kennan, Siberia, I: 79-80; Dmitriev-Mamonov and Zdziarski, eds., Guide, pp. 252-53; Gubskii, "Ssylka," pp. 379-81; and Leroy-Beaulieu, Awakening of the East, p. 53.

185 V. G. Korolenko, "Istoriia moego sovremennika" (My Autobiography), Golos Minuvshego, (1920-21) no. 9, p. 8. Korolenko was exiled to Yakutia from 1879 to 1885.

did not often make for settling down, marrying, or establishing an orderly family life.[186] Among the 110,000 exiles living in Eastern Siberia in 1885, for example, no more than 10% took up farming with any success. Over 40% were classed as "homeless," that is, wandering vagrants. And in 1900, the residency of one-third the exiles in Transbaikalia was unknown to authorities.[187] During summer months gangs of these wandering brigands would often descend on villages, robbing homes and driving off cattle. Hard-labor convicts (about 10% of the total exiles in the 1880's), however, did promote the economic welfare of the "mother country" through their work in gold, salt, and iron mines, on steamships and barges, and, in the 1890's, on construction of the Trans-Siberian Railroad.[188]

Eastern Siberia suffered relatively more from criminal exiles than did Western Siberia. As a visiting observer noted, "The graver the charge and the heavier the sentence, the farther they are sent eastward . . ."[189] Most of the hard-labor camps were located in Eastern Siberia and Sakhalin. On this remote island exiles (including hard-labor convicts) constituted 53% of the population in the 1890's. The proportion of exiles, excluding hard-labor convicts, for the various parts of Siberia can be illustrated by the following figures for 1897:[190]

---

186 Dmitriev-Mamonov and Zdziarski, eds., Guide, p. 38. In the 1880's, about 80% of the male exiles were single.

187 Ibid., p. 355; and Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 315.

188 In the 1880's and 1890's whatever hard-labor prisons had existed in the European part of the empire (such as Sveaborg) were closed; see Gubskii, "Ssylka," p. 379.

189 Pierre Leroy-Beaulieu, Awakening of the East, p. 54.

190 M. Gubskii, "Ssylka," p. 384. Hard-labor convicts constituted only about 0.5% of the total population of Siberia. For a detailed study of convict life on Sakhalin see Anton Chekhov's work of 1891, Sakhalin Island.

Locality	% Exiles in Total Population	Number of Exiles
Sakhalin	31.8	8,963
Irkutsk province	14.2	71,800
Yeniseisk province	9.1	51,019
Tobolsk province	7.4	106,093
Tomsk province	6.4	38,334
Transbaikalia	2.2	14,395
Yakutia	2.0	5,177
Maritime territory	1.0	2,117
Amur territory	0.6	679
All Siberia	5.2	298,577

All in all, contributions of criminal exiles to Siberia's welfare were minimal at best. The hard facts indicated that penal colonization was neither an economic success nor successful in terms of human rehabilitation. Criminal exiles were found quite prone to retain criminal propensities vis-à-vis the local population. Because of this adverse "moral" effect, the issue of criminal exile began to be raised by Siberian regionalists in the 1860's, and especially when a number of them experienced prison and exile directly. By the 1880's and 1890's, regionalists that advocated total abolition of criminal exile from Siberia had been joined by numerous other opponents of the system. Even criminologists who argued that exile in settlement was preferable to solitary confinement in prison now found themselves on the defensive.[191]

Despite the swelling chorus of reform advocates, nothing substantial was achieved during the 13-year reign of Alexander III to alleviate the problem in practice. Whereas both local government officials and local Siberian society took positive steps to improve conditions among migrants at this time, very little could be done with exiles or the exile system as it

---

191 G. N. Potanin, Oblastnicheskaia tendentsiia, pp. 48-49.

stood, short of an imperial decree. Thus, proponents of a reformed criminal code relating to exile had to limit themselves largely to official recommendations, scholarly works and lectures, and newspaper editorials and articles.

Though imprisonment and political exile were not foreign to European Russia, criminal exile in the forms of penal settlement and hard labor was almost exclusively a Siberian phenomenon. Because of deleterious effects upon the local population, Potanin could refer to the exile system as Siberia's "most acute problem." [192] Indeed, this issue probably attracted a wider range of opinion pressing for change than did any other of Siberia's chief problems of the 1880's. Not only did Siberians and local authorities urge revision of the system, but so too did such Russian criminologists and legal scholars as Professors Foinitsky, Sergeevsky, and Spasovich. [193] Moreover, Russian and Polish political exiles in Siberia (Korolenko, Chudnovsky, Szymański, and Sieroszewski) wrote significant articles on the problem. The noted American journalist and traveler, George Kennan, in his own indictment of the institution, Siberia and the Exile System (1891), summed up the forces opposed to exile and their predicament as follows:

> the town councils of Yalutorfsk /sic/, Turinsk, Tara, Ishim, Kurgan, Yeniseisk, and Tomsk, half a dozen burghers' societies, and almost as many special delegations of Siberian merchants . . . have protested, formally and vehemently, against the continuance of criminal colonization. But the Siberian people have not been alone in their protest. Nearly all the

---

192 Potanin, Oblastnicheskaia tendentsiia, p. 51.

193 I. Ya. Foinitsky, for instance, stressed how penal exile to Australia had been discontinued as a result of the colony's public protests, and how Western countries in general were resorting less and less to exile as a means of punishment;(see Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 301, 310.

> governors of the Siberian provinces and territories have called attention repeatedly in their official reports to the disastrous consequences of criminal deportation as now practised; the governor of the Trans-Baikal has expressly asked that no more forced colonists be sent there, since the territory is full of them already; Vice-admiral Possiot and four Siberian governors-general (Kaznakof, Anuchin, Ignatief, and Korf) have urged that the exile system be radically modified or abolished; the Siberian newspapers have been hammering away at the subject for almost a quarter of a century; three or four specially appointed commissions have condemned penal colonization and have suggested other methods of dealing with criminals — and yet, nothing whatever has been done. [194]

In circles of the central government itself, thoughts of revising the exile system had been stirring. As early as 1835 Nicholas I had discussed the idea of abolishing exile to settlements, but had met resistance within the State Council. In the 1870's the Ministry of Justice and its special investigatory committee on exile came out in favor of abolishing exile as a punishment and replacing it by corresponding forms of detention. On this point, the Senate's committee on prison reform, headed by Count Sollogub, had concurred. The Senate itself, however, preferred to procrastinate, and the situation remained unchanged throughout the remainder of Alexander II's reign. [195] The emancipator of serfs was unable to emancipate Siberia from the exile system.

In 1881 the head of the Prison Administration, Galkin-Vrasskoy, was instructed to go to Siberia personally to inspect conditions of hard labor and exile on the spot. Prodded by rising complaints of Siberian authorities regarding the exile system and by recommendations that the question be re-

---

194 Kennan, Siberia and the Exile System, II: 464-65.
195 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 311.

viewed, Galkin-Vrasskoy subsequently dfafted a reform plan. This plan, falling far short of complete abolition, was presented to the Ministry of Interior in late 1886. Among the measures suggested were: substituting lifetime exile to agricultural settlements by imprisonment in European Russia, retaining exile to settlements only in exceptional cases and for certain offenses; increasing punishment for vagrancy by sending all vagrants to hard labor on Sakhalin; and making village communes in Russia pay the upkeep of each person banished by communal orders for a two-year period. Not only was this plan attacked by the Siberian Gazette as inadequate, but it was also defeated in the Committee of Ministers, where it was opposed especially by key ministers, Finance and Justice. [196] In their eyes, the financial requirements of building more prisons in European Russia were too great; moreover, exile was still deemed as essential for punishing crime.

Indeed, if anything, imperial legislation regarding exile hardened instead of softened. A statute of March 12, 1888, for instance, prohibited political exiles from participating in government or public service, in private societies or companies, in formal educational activity, in public lectures or sessions of learned societies, and in maintenance of lithograph presses and public libraries. [197] Such a statute seemed to indicate more governmental concern with the potentially "subversive" activities of political exiles than with real adverse effects wrought by criminal exiles on the civilian population. However, such a prohibitionsdid little in practice to prevent such politifal exiles as Klements from presenting public lectures

---

196 Ibid., p. 312; Kennan, Siberia, II: 467-70; and Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 728.

197 See V. I. Nikolaev, "Sibirskaia politicheskaia ssylka," p. 88.

and serving as museum curator, or Popov from editing the Eastern Review.

Among high officials in Siberia who expressed themselves forcefully on the exile question was Baron Andrei N. Korff, governor-general of the newly created Amur territory from 1884 to 1893. In reports to Petersburg and in on-the-spot discussions with the council on prison affairs, Korff testified to the complete disorder of the exile system. Conditions were not only disastrous for exiles themselves, but the system menaced the interests of the whole country. Relatively few exiles were productive agriculturally, while many of the rest became wandering brigands and thieves. Korff concluded that if exile had ever been harmless for Siberia, this time had long passed; the region's civil and economic development demanded a total end to inundation by criminals without delay.[198]

The governor-general of Eastern Siberia, Count Ignatiev, also strongly favored abolition of the exile system. First, he felt that abolition would help restore "punitive importance" to major criminal punishments. Secondly, exile exerted a pernicious influence on Siberia. In his first annual report to St. Petersburg, Ignatiev wrote in 1885:

> An intimate acquaintance with the present condition of the exile system in Siberia leads to very melancholy conclusions. It goes without saying that exile constitutes a very sore spot in the life of Eastern Siberia's population; as a criminal punishment it fully contradicts the demands of justice in its present form: for some it is a special form of slow capital punishment, while to others it opens up a new, wider field for criminal activity, and only in rare, exceptional cases does it achieve its correctional purpose.[199]

---

198 Korff's recommendations are summarized in Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), pp. 312-13.

199 Quoted in Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), pp. 314-15.

The governor-general related that 110,000 exiles then lived in Eastern Siberia, and an average of 8,500 new deportees arrived each year. In another annual report of 1885, submitted by the governor of Yakutia, "homeless" exiles were described as not only harming the local population, but even as rousing "the more industrious class of exiles to defend itself against them." [200]

With such opinions, descriptions, and recommendations coming from government circles in Petersburg and from high authorities in Siberia, Yadrintsev was quick to point to the "unity of views expressed on exile, which have left no more doubt as to its bad sides and its having outlived its time." He also felt justified in pinning hopes on the Emperor Alexander III. The tsar had stated his wish that the question of exile be reviewed and that its harmful aspects be abolished. This in turn had prompted the Prison Administration to prepare a new draft plan in 1889-90 for revising the exile system. This plan was presented to the State Council, where, however, it bogged down, and nothing substantial came of it. [201]

Nevertheless, the optimistic Yadrintsev viewed these tentative, halting steps forward as in line with the tsar's declaration (honoring Siberia's 300th jubilee in 1881) of his concern for Siberia's development and well-being. Of this and of the more recent developments he concluded in 1892:

> All this gives rise to hopes that the exile system in Siberia will soon be discontinued. The whole problem boils down to <u>when</u> it will be abolished and to the financial and practical means that will enable it to be replaced by another form of punishment which a new criminal code will find more suitable.

---

200 See Iadrintsev, <u>Sibir' kak koloniia</u> (1892), pp. 315-16.
201 <u>Ibid</u>., p. 316, 316 n.; and Kennan, <u>Siberia</u>, II: 471.

> . . . we are convinced that the state will find the means and that reforms will be accomplished. We can only wish that this change will come as soon as possible, since life in the borderland is becoming harder and less endurable with each year's additional contingent of exiles and their harmful influences.

Emancipating Siberia from criminal exile, along with opening up Siberia to free immigration, would, in Yadrintsev's opinion, constitute a "blessing for the whole country, a cleansing of society, and an opening of new, normal, and healthy pathways toward its civil development." [202]

Yadrintsev's goals were essentially at one with many officials at various provincial and central government levels: to remove all aspects of Siberia's "colonial" status and to make its institutions at one with those existing in European Russia. Both Alexander III and Yadrintsev tended to see eye to eye in at least one respect: Siberia had to be brought more into line with the rest of the empire. The region had to become more integrated with European Russia and should no longer remain a penal or economic colony. Yet, to whatever extent Alexander III really wanted to abolish the worst aspects of exile, his sudden death in November 1894 cut short any plans he might have had.

During his reign the exile question was probably the most important issue for Siberia upon which the government failed to act decisively. Because of this lack of action, Potanin considered in retrospect the exile question to have been "the most glaring problem in Yadrintsev's time." [203] Instead, the government, in its attempts to make Siberia a more integral part of the empire, enacted changes that were mainly in its own immediate interest: administrative reforms, railroad construction, eased migration,

---

202 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), pp. 316-17.
203 Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," p. 275.

and, grudgingly, opening of the university.

The long-awaited reform of the exile system, piece-meal though it was, came by imperial decree on June 10, 1900. One major feature of this legislation was the abolition of exile to confined residence (zhit'ë), now replaced by correctional prison. Moreover, vagrants would henceforth be confined to work in convict gangs, followed by settlement on Sakhalin. Exile to settlements (poselenie) was now limited to just political and religious exiles. [204] As indicated in the figures cited above (p. 701), the number of exiles in the period 1901-1910 fell sharply, comprising only 20% of what it had been in the previous decade, the 1890's.

Opinions varied as to the significance of the new legislation. The former criminal exile, Yevgeny Korsh, for example, stated outright: "The goal of Yadrintsev and his fellow thinkers has now been attained . . ." [205] Yet just such a "fellow thinker" as Potanin had strong reservations about the new changes. Thus, he wrote in 1908:

> The exile system has now been abolished, but not root and branch; it has remained for crimes against the faith and for political crimes. As the demoralizing activity of people subjected to this limited exile is directed only on the population's /political and religious/ convictions, and cannot corrupt Siberian morals, Siberia might then reconcile herself to this exile system. However, for Siberia this might set a dangerous precedent which could tempt the government to broaden the system again. The possibility that the government could partially expand restricted exile has hitherto not been removed once and for all.

Potanin felt that prisons built for hard labor afforded a potential loophole in the law. If the government should expand the number of "correctional prisoners" in Siberia, these exiles too would settle there when their prison

---

204 M. Gubskii, "Ssylka," p. 383.
205 E. V. Korsh, "Vosem' liet v Sibiri," CXX: 423.

terms expired. Thus, exile still hung "over Siberia like a sword of Damocles." [206]

Just as with the Siberian university, on the issue of exile the imperial government undertook only halfway measures toward realizing the full demands and wishes of regionalists and their "allies" — scholars, officials, and Siberian citizens. Indeed, Potanin's suspicions were in part realized, as political exile to Siberia increased substantially during the years just preceding and during World War I. The central government still did not want to integrate Siberia fully into the empire; Siberia still remained a convenient dumping-ground for exiles. The institution which Kennan termed "one of the darkest blots upon the civilization of the nineteenth century" came crashing down only with the final collapse of the monarchy in February 1917, and indeed only temporarily at that.

* * *

The Native Question

Besides "new-settlers" and criminal exiles, the native peoples of Siberia constituted another distinctive social element of much concern to Siberian regionalists. If the Sibiryaks felt themselves slighted, underdeveloped, or even oppressed at the expense of European Russia, most Siberian natives (inorodtsy) saw themselves in a similar inferior position vis-à-vis the Sibiryaks. Though natives had been given a certain degree of administrative and judicial autonomy by Speransky's legislation of 1822, many

206 Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," pp. 275-76. V. Seroshevskii (W. Sieroszewski) tends to agree with Potanin's conclusions in his study on hard labor and exile published also in 1908; "Ssylka i katorga v Sibiri" (Exile and Hard Labor in Siberia), in Mel'nik, ed., Sibir': eia sovremennoe sostoianie i eia nuzhdy (St. Petersburg, 1908), pp. 232-33.

problems (especially economic and cultural) remained that demanded rectification as the century progressed.

Among the major issues affecting Siberia in the late 19th century, the so-called "native question" was the one least acted upon and seemingly farthest from solution. This was in part probably due to its predominantly cultural, ethnic, and non-institutional character. The problem remained constant, a continuous sore-spot, with few positive steps taken toward curing it. As for the 1880's, a decade which witnessed governmental changes, reforms, and proposals relating to important aspects of Siberian life, Yadrintsev reported absolutely no essential change in the position of native ethnic groups.[207]

In these circumstances, concerned Siberians, led chiefly by Yadrintsev, undertook to improve conditions among natives, especially the worst-off peoples. Neither local nor central government authorities did much in this area, nor were they especially exhorted by Siberian public opinion to do so. In contrast to other pressing issues of the day, government proposals, policies, and changes were few and far between. Indeed, rousing the Siberian public and the natives themselves to awareness and action became the chief aim of the leading writers on the subject. Thus, to understand the outlines of the native question it is necessary to gain a cursory acquaintance with the natives themselves and with the attitudes held by government authorities and by regionalists regarding them.

According to the census of 1897, the native population of Siberia totaled approximately 865,000 out of an overall 5,727,000 inhabitants (exclud-

---

207 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 184.

ing the Steppe Territory). Thus, at this time natives constituted about 15% of the Siberian population. Their concentration was greatest in Eastern Siberia; about half of Siberia's entire indigenous population lived in Yakutia and Transbaikalia alone. In Eastern Siberia the most numerous and culturally advanced peoples were the Buryats and Yakuts (over 200,000 each), and the Tungus (about 60,000).[208] In Western Siberia the largest concentrations of native peoples were found in the Ob basin and in the Altai. Altogether, the census of 1897 showed roughly 180,000 natives inhabiting Tomsk and Tobolsk provinces, with Tatars comprising the largest group (close to 50,000).[209] In the Steppe Territory, Kazakhs (then called Kirgiz) numbered roughly 800,000 in the 1880's.[210] Religious loyalties among natives were divided between Islam (chiefly among Kazakhs and Tatars), lamaist Buddhism (among Buryats), Russian Orthodoxy, and shamanist pagan beliefs (these two predominating amidst the remaining native population).

Concern for the welfare of Siberian natives had been present in government circles since the time of Catherine II. Sympathetic toward the "noble savages" of the Russian East, she instructed Major Shcherbachev to undertake a survey of Siberian natives and their conditions in 1763. More precisely, Shcherbachev determined their numbers, what kind of tribute (iasak) they paid, their tribal organization, and so forth. This information provided a basis for attempts to improve economic and administrative affairs among natives up to the time of Speransky's administration. From the mid-18th century

---

208 M. A. Czaplicka, Aboriginal Siberia: A Study in Social Anthropology (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914), pp. 18-20; P. Leroy-Beaulieu, Awakening of the East, p. 13; and Raeff, Siberia, p. 148.

209 Leroy-Beaulieu, Awakening of the East, p. 13; and Iadrintsev, Sibirskie inorodtsy, p. 267.

210 Iadrintsev, Sibirskie inorodtsy, p. 267.

on Russian investigators increasingly began to observe two trends among natives: first, the deteriorating conditions of life among unsettled hunting and trapping peoples of the Far North and Northeast, and second, the relative prosperity among the better organized and more settled peoples of southern Siberia.[211]

Concern for the cultural, religious, and educational conditions of natives became even more marked upon Speransky's arrival in Siberia. Not only did the new governor-general support missionary activity and the concomitant spread of literacy, but he also promoted the establishment of native schools. For the natives Speransky favored what was subsequently called "organic Russification," a voluntary, non-compulsory absorption of the best material, cultural, and spiritual values of Russian civilization. The government, however, should by no means impose this process mechanically upon natives. Tribes should maintain administrative autonomy and preserve essential customs, if possible, at the same time.[212]

Speransky's chief contribution to improving native conditions was administrative in nature. Customary law was maintained in most cases, more flexible tax arrangements were set up, and native institutions were legalized at various levels, from encampment (ulus) and clan administration to steppe duma at the top. The existing gap between "have" and "have-not" natives, though, was only further accentuated by Speransky's legislation. The Statute of 1822 had little effect on the more primitive and backward peoples who could not easily be fitted into the above-mentioned administrative structure. The Statute, of course, benefited more advanced peoples such as

---

211 Marc Raeff, Siberia and the Reforms of 1822, pp. 104-11.
212 Ibid., pp. 112-14.

Buryats and Yakuts. "For them," writes Raeff, "the law of 1822 was an important landmark in their progress toward fuller integration into Siberian society and more active participation in the economic development of the region." [213]

Even for the more advanced peoples this process was long and usually difficult. Speransky's successors by and large did little toward improving the situation. Self-government and autonomy were not extended for the duration of the century. Despite the promising push given by Speransky's legislation, Raeff rightly concludes that

> by the end of the nineteenth century the circumstances of most Siberian natives were not greatly improved, although the more advanced peoples had slowly transformed their ways of life — economic, social, and cultural — and had moved farther into the orbit of Russian civilization.

At the same time, however, many of the peoples of the north and northeast remained backward "stepchildren," still on the decline. [214]

As government policies toward Siberian natives by and large rigidified or became apathetic in the post-Speransky period, individual Siberians slowly began to become aware of native conditions. Improvement and renewal in this area had been an important concern of the young Siberian regionalists of the early 1860's. In these and the ensuing years several of them delved deeply into past and present condition of their less advantaged Siberian compatriots. Investigation and improvement of their own region were ultimately for the sake of not just Sibiryaks like themselves, but all the inhabitants of Russia's neglected and abused "colony."

---

213 Raeff, Siberia and the Reforms of 1822, p. 128. Also see pp. 116-27 for a more detailed discussion.

214 Ibid., p. 128.

As early as 1858 the young Shashkov, still a bursa student in Irkutsk, published his first such work: on the customs and beliefs of local Buryats.[215] Shashkov followed up with studies on Siberian natives in general, published from the time he was still in St. Petersburg (1863) through his return to Siberia, imprisonment and exile at the end of the 1860's.[216]

While Shashkov's interests turned away from Siberian natives and other regional questions to non-Siberian and non-Russian subjects as his life progressed, Shchapov, on the other hand, acquired an academic interest in Siberian natives only at the end of his life. Of part-Buryat ancestry himself, Shchapov undertook studies on natives during his exile in Eastern Siberia (1864-76). In 1869 he collected data on tribes of the lower Yenisei basin on a scientific expedition and in 1874 conducted similar research among natives of the Baraba Steppe. His chief works on natives, however, published in 1874-75 just before his death, pertained to Buryat social and communal relations.[217]

Taking up about the time that Shchapov left off, Potanin began to investigate native life systematically upon his first Mongolian expedition, in 1876. His interest, however, had been spurred much earlier by his friendship with the Kazakh Chokan Valikhanov in Omsk in the 1850's and by his later explorations in the Altai in 1863-64. From the late 1870's on, Potanin grew intimately acquainted with Mongol and Buryat customs, collecting and writing down many of their tales, beliefs, legends, and details on

---

215 For the full citation, see above, p. 145 n.

216 For complete citations of Shashkov's works on Siberian natives, shamanism, the Russian-American Company, and slavery in Siberia (1863-69), see D. D. Iazykov, "Russkie pisateli," p. 54.

217 Aristov, "Zhizn' Shchapova," pp. 611-12. For citations, see p. 618.

shamanism. Potanin was also intensely concerned with improving conditions of native life and preventing "uncultured" tribes from dying out. He vigorously opposed Russian "Darwinians" and "Malthusians" who wrote that the future belonged only to "higher races," that "lower races" were doomed to extinction, and that it was useless for naive humanists to fight what fate decreed.[218]

Though Yadrintsev had paid attention to the native question in the early 1860's, his deep interest in Siberian natives, like Shchapov's, blossomed in his later years.[219] The immediate stimulant for Yadrintsev was two scientific expeditions which he took into the Altai in 1878 and 1880. In 1881 he wrote a general article on the native question, expressing views he was to hold for the rest of his life.

> We can no longer regard the fate of natives and the native question in Russia and Siberia with indifference. We cannot allow the situation among such people to worsen while side by side one /other/ race prospers; it is of no benefit to have amidst a developing culture . . . a wasteland of savages doomed to a miserable existence; it is unjust to provide education for one part of the population and to exclude the other. Finally, we cannot allow any kind of abasement, slavery, and exploitation of the human personality in an area where civilization and enlightenment are being adopted. This has a harmful effect on society itself. . . . The more we turn our attention to the native's fate, the more we will educate our own hearts and minds, and will learn to love and respect one another; the success of our civic development and the guarantee of our future lie in this.[220]

---

218 G. N. Potanin, Oblastnicheskaia tendentsiia, p. 45, 49-50.

219 Yadrintsev claimed to have written an article on the native question ("Inorodcheskii vopros") before his arrest in 1865; see above, p. 316.

220 Iadrintsev, "Inorodcheskii vopros" (The Native Question), Nedielia, (1881) no. 13; quoted in Glinskii, "Iadrintsev," pp. 437-38.

Yadrintsev thus perceived that the health of a society, in this case Siberian, depended on mutual respect and equal opportunities for all its members.

More so than Shashkov, Shchapov, and even Potanin, Yadrintsev became the standard-bearer and defender of native interests in the eyes of the Russian and Siberian public. His opinions and recommendations on the native question were widely propagated in the two editions of Siberia as a Colony (1882 and 1892) and especially in Siberian Natives (1891), not to mention numerous articles. He could still write in 1892, though, that "up to now the fate of natives in Siberia has received very little attention, and their role in the history of the eastern borderland, along with their present and future in the country's civic life has hardly been ascertained yet." He spoke of a kind of debt that Russians and Sibiryaks owed Siberian natives: "our only task in history has been to displace these peoples and acquire supremacy over them. This task has now been fulfilled." From this point on, Siberia's "civic development" demanded that greater attention be given to native problems. [221]

Yadrintsev specified what he considered vital objectives to be achieved in the future: 1) preventing the possible extinction of some peoples; 2) aiding economic and cultural advancement of these peoples; 3) granting natives full civil rights and guaranteed protection under the law; and 4) encouraging education and spiritual development among natives. Moreover, Yadrintsev felt that Siberian natives might play a special role in Russia's civilizing mission in the Orient. [222] Though much attention has been given

---

221 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 149.
222 Ibid., p. 150.

to these objectives by the Soviet government in the 20th century, in his own day Yadrintsev was pretty much a lone voice crying in the Siberian wilderness. Except for perhaps the civil rights provisions of the October Manifesto of 1905, very little was done along the above-mentioned lines for the duration of the monarchy.

Regarding the problem of decreasing populations and actual extinction of certain ethnic groups, Yadrintsev drew attention to the need for more precise information and data. Not only had half a dozen or more smaller peoples disappeared entirely in past centuries, but others had drastically been reduced in size. Among the latter were Aleuts, Kamchadals, Ostyaks, and Voguls. As Shchapov and Shashkov had already shown, population decrease resulted not only from warfare, disease, and famine, but also through oppressive tax policies, "kulak" exploitation, and even slavery. A further evil, among Yakuts for instance, was the pernicious influence of criminal exiles in the area.[223]

Yadrintsev proved to his satisfaction that population decrease among certain peoples was not some inescapable law hanging over them, or rooted in their racial character (as some Russians believed). On the contrary, extinction or population decrease he considered a result of unfortunate, accidental circumstances which could have been and still could be avoided. He cited the evidence of scattered Ostyak and Vogul groups among whom fatalities had been unevenly distributed, depending upon good or poor living conditions. The plight of peoples and groups decreasing in numbers could indeed be remedied by human, i.e. public, initiative. No longer was there

---

223 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), pp. 151-52, 156, 184; and Sibirskie inorodtsy, pp. 2-3.

an excuse fatalistically to let such tribes die out.[224]

The question of educating Siberian natives properly greatly concerned Yadrintsev, especially in view of the apathetic or negative approach carried out by the central government or local officials. Regarding the means of supporting native schools, government correspondence on the subject had led to the conclusion in 1853 that establishing schools for natives was impossible and unrealizable, since most natives were still savages eking out a bare and miserable existence.[225] Since this time little progress had been made in funding native schools.

A second problem arose where native children did attend schools. Attendance was usually obligatory and enforced. Yadrintsev blamed local officials for this sad state of affairs, which only alienated native parents and children from formal education. This type of compulsory education reflected the attempt to Russify non-Russian peoples not gradually and voluntarily, but rapidly and with force. In contrast, Yadrintsev favored the more organic, evolutionary policies of Russification advocated by Speransky. Yadrintsev urged that native children be taught in their own language at first, especially in cases where historical, linguistic, and religious attachments were strong. Textbooks and Holy Scripture translated into local languages would also serve this end. In such fashion, wrote Yadrintsev,

> Education in the native language and an acquaintance with learning . . . will not at all alienate an educated native from the Russian language and people, but will bring him closer, since a developing curiosity will compel him to get to know not only the life of the educated world in Russia, but in Europe too.[226]

---

224 Iadrintsev, Sibirskie inorodtsy, pp. 88-89.
225 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 179; and Shcheglov, Perechen', p. 570.
226 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 180.

In fact, where instruction was given in the native language and where Scriptures and textbooks had been translated, notable educational progress had taken place: in the Altai, in Transbaikalia among Buryats, at the Tatar school in Tomsk, and among Ostyaks in the north. Failures occurred among Yakuts, where compulsory instruction in Russian had become a kind of torture for Yakut schoolchildren. The same lack of success under a similar system was evident among Kazakhs.[227]

Moreover, natives who did become "Russianized" were not always the most admirable sort. Serving as interpreters, clerks, and in other semi-official jobs, they often constituted the "worst element — exploiters and bribe-takers," who exerted little beneficial influence at all among their non-Russianized brethren. Like Speransky, Yadrintsev felt natives should learn the Russian ways and language, but at the same time should remain attached to their cultural heritage and assist in lifting up their less advantaged tribesmen in a positive sense. There were indeed indications that individual natives from among the more advanced and sophisticated peoples of the southern parts of the region were moving in this direction. Some of them highly educated, these men continued to retain close ties with their own peoples, helping to improve conditions at home. The most prominent among such natives included the Buryat scholars and teachers Dorzhi Banzarov, Galsan Gomboev, Ippolit Pirozhkov, the Kazakh scholar Chokan Valikhanov, and from the Altai, the Khakass N. F. Katanov and the priest Chuvolkov. Yadrintsev hoped that from among such men as these a nucleus for an "Oriental Faculty" at the Siberian university might emerge.[228]

---

227 Ibid., p. 181; Iadrintsev, Sibirskie inorodtsy, p. 240; and Adrianov, Tomsk, p. 65.

228 See above, p. 655; and also Iadrintsev, Sibirskie inorodtsy, p. 242; and Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 182. For a brief discussion in English on Banzarov, Gomboev, and Katanov, see M. G. Levin and L. P. Potapov, eds., The Peoples of Siberia (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), p. 237, 386.

Though individuals who had successfully risen beyond their native milieu were few and far between, Yadrintsev was convinced that "higher European education" would become more accessible to more natives with greater positive end results (through the Siberian University, for example). For the time being, however, he noted that "the spirit of the Siberian native remains humbled, a deep melancholy weighs on him, and a gloomy hopelessness chains his heart; there is neither faith in improvement nor hope in the future." Native abilities and talents could no longer be neglected, but should be developed and realized.[229]

Another dimension to the native question involved enlightening the Russian and Siberian public about natives and their plight, which hopefully would lead toward their better treatment and greater opportunities for them. An awareness of their past and present, along with the future potential of Siberian ethnic minorities, would help promote the advance of the region in general. Indeed, Shashkov had concluded in 1867 that

> The fate of natives can be improved only when true education and human morality become intimately linked with the Sibiryak; without these beneficent factors freedom is a dream and the happiness of a people a wild hope, no matter how zealously the law might protect the interests of the latter.[230]

The moral, civic, and educational awakening and development of Siberia thus constituted, ideally, an emancipating force for all segments of society. Yadrintsev too felt that although the solution of native problems depended in part on legislative measures and cultural acclimatization, it depended even more on the "intellectual development of the Russian population itself

---

229 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 182; and Sibirskie inorodtsy, p. 241.

230 S. S. Shashkov, "Sibirskie inorodtsy v XIX stolietii" (Siberian Natives in the 19th Century), Dielo, (1867); quoted in Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 183 n.

in Siberia." [231]

Also part of the native question was the vision of a Russian "White Man's Burden," or better, mission civilisatrice in the East: both within Siberia and without — to neighboring Asiatic lands. In the 1880's and 1890's, the outset of the "age of imperialism," many Russians assumed that Asiatic "seclusion" would have to crumble soon (in Mongolia and China, for instance), allowing Western "enlightenment" and trade to penetrate more deeply. In neighboring countries Russia and Siberia were to dispense this western influence. "If Siberia is destined to play a role in this worldwide civilizing influence," wrote Yadrintsev, "then Siberian natives, who, thanks to Russians, have assimilated European enlightenment, can become prominent mediators of this civilization and can render great services to human progress in general." [232]

Just as the problem of exiles accentuated native difficulties in some areas, so too did the great increase of Russian settlers in the 1890's and early 20th century. Displacement of natives by agricultural colonists had long been a problem in Siberia, and the former were often pushed back to less fertile, less hospitable areas. Potanin viewed this process as typical in a colony that was settled and exploited by a mother country in its own self-interests. The interests of both old-settlers and natives should be taken into account, Potanin urged. With the influx of settlers, the first to suffer were usually semi-nomadic and nomadic peoples. "Driven to parts of the country unsuitable for culture, natives are growing poor, suffering from diseases and dying out, some silently without protest, and others with

---

231 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 184.
232 Ibid.

cries of despair . . ." A few even went so far as to telegraph the Ministry of Interior that nowhere on earth was there room left for them.[233]

The study and description of native conditions and problems was not only the work of Siberian regionalists and Siberian newspapers. Political exiles were also instrumental in bringing descriptions of native life to the scholarly and reading public in Russia and Siberia. Probably best known in this respect was Vladimir Korolenko's story of 1885, "Makar's Dream," which gives a sympathetic picture of Yakut life and landscape. A few years later another exile in Yakutia, the Siberian-born Ivan Khudyakov, put together and published an informative collection of Yakut tales. Polish exiles, such as Sieroszewski, and Russian exiles, such as Jochelson and Bogoraz-Tan, took active part in anthropological expeditions into northeastern Siberia and published both stories and scholarly accounts of the peoples of the tundra. Many of these anthropological expeditions were sponsored by the East and West Siberian Sections of the Geographical Society, which provided the reading public with monographs resulting from these investigations.

As for the social relevance of these various literary and scientific endeavors, Yadrintsev could state:

> This study of the native world-view opens up new aspects in our native question; they no longer make us see these peoples as lowly savages, for whom only physical life should be preserved; but we discover here the same spiritual life, flights of fancy, fantastic myths, and ancient epics. The wealth of native mythology is being discovered only now, and indigenous peoples are becoming, so to speak, custodians of the most ancient traditions of humanity.[234]

Moreover, the sympathetic study of natives, their traditions, customs, and

---

233 See Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," pp. 279-80.
234 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), p. 186.

beliefs worked toward effacing the long-standing antagonism between many, though not all, Russians and natives.

Beyond descriptions, proposals, and opinions in articles and in scholarly and literary works, mighty little was done by the Siberian public in eighties and early nineties to protect native interests. Yadrintsev had hoped that the Siberian university would help promote the development of public initiative in this area. With only a medical school, however, such a tendency did not quickly develop. Yadrintsev also advocated founding a humanitarian society concerned with spreading education among natives and raising their spiritual and intellectual level. "Concern for improving the life of indigenous peoples," he wrote, "should act as expiation for the sacrifices and exploitation to which these children of nature were subjected in the era of Siberia's conquest." [235] Again, if education was to be the only way to achieve a "native renaissance," it should benefit both natives and Sibiryaks, breaking down the barriers separating them.

In early 1898, several years after Yadrintsev's death, a small group of Russians and Siberians seriously discussed founding a society to protect indigenous peoples, especially those close to extinction. The first private meeting was held in St. Petersburg in February 1898 and included such prominent Siberians as Potanin and Pyotr Golovachev, and the Russian Siberiophiles Nikolai F. Annensky and Longin F. Panteleev. [236] This group sought to spur the introduction of hospitals, nursing homes, schools, supply stores, and credit agencies among native peoples. Both Russian and native

---

235 Iadrintsev, Sibir' kak koloniia (1892), pp. 187-88. This implied a kind of cultural "reparation" to atone for "300 years" of subjugation at the hands of Russian "whotes."

236 On Pyotr Mikhailovich Golovachev (1860-1913), a "younger-generation" regionalist influenced by Yadrintsev and Potanin, see the brief biographical sketch by I. Popov, "P. M. Golovachev," Golos Minuvshago, (October 1913) no. 10, pp. 321-22.

youths were to be recruited to service these facilities. The society was to publish books for natives and to sponsor anthropological expeditions. All in all, this group was taking up the recommendation that Yadrintsev had advocated earlier — the formation of a society to protect native interests. [237] Though this undertaking did not get very far off the ground, its plans and brief existence testify to the awakening public initiative on the native question and its movement toward the organizational stage by the end of the century.

The functions that this society was to offer had long been assumed in much of European Russia by zemstvo institutions, even in non-Russian, native localities. With this example in mind, some Siberians linked demands for a regional zemstvo with the need to improve conditions among natives and to integrate them more gradually into Russian life. [238] This approach, of course, also proved futile, as zemstvos were never introduced in Siberia.

Despite efforts of a small, public-spirited minority, both Siberian society in general and the Russian government in particular seemed quite content to ignore the nagging "native question" and let it drag on toward no real solution for the duration of the monarchy. Moreover, the natives made few positive gains from the economic and demographic transformation of Siberia at the turn of the century. To the extent that Siberia either became integrated into the empire or remained a semi-colony, its natives by and large failed to benefit under either regimen.

---

237 See Iadrintsev, Sibirskie inorodtsy, p. 90; and above, p. 459. On the group formed in St. Petersburg, see N. Mendel'son, "Iz vospominanii o Potanine," p. 151.

238 Sukachev, Irkutsk, p. 154; and V. Grigor'ev, "Zemstvo v Sibiri," p. 64.

EPILOGUE

SIBERIAN REGIONALISM IN PERSPECTIVE: ITS NATURE AND SIGNIFICANCE

Siberian regionalism in the 19th century was a combination of several tendencies. First, a regional patriotism, known at the time as "local patriotism," had been a factor since the days of Slovtsov. This consisted of a love of Siberia and a broad desire to study the country and to improve the life of all its inhabitants. In the 1860's more specific ingredients entered the picture. A quest to have Siberia's semi-colonial status cast aside and to put the country on an equal institutional footing with Russia became a second factor. Moreover, the aspiration for decentralization and autonomy — political, economic, and to some extent cultural — constituted a third tendency. While on one hand regionalists sought to enjoy in Siberia whatever liberties, rights, and opportunities Russians enjoyed — to be more like Russia; on the other, they wished the government to assure them

a more open and autonomous development for Siberia — to be less like Russia, if so desired. Regionalists were hampered by these two somewhat opposing objectives as long as the central government determined to use Siberia for its own ends and interests.

For most of the period examined in this study the term "regionalism" (oblastnichestvo) was not employed by Russians or Siberians. Nor was Shchapov's term oblastnost' (literally: regionalness) utilized. Until the early 1890's the common phrase was "Siberian patriotism" or "local patriotism." [1] Regionalistw referred to themselves as patriots, which illustrates, of course, that patriotism was the basic motive underlying Siberian regionalism. Even if all demands for reform had been realized and some kind of autonomy established, this regional patriotism, encouraged by regional institutions, would have continued to thrive.

Regionalism has been defined as a "consciousness of and loyalty to a distinct sub-national or supra-national area, usually characterized by a common culture, background, or interests." [2] It is, of course, the "sub-national" aspect that characterized Siberian regionalism, in contrast to the largely 20th-century phenomenon of supra-national regional groupings encompassing continents or parts of continents. Indeed, most, if not all, regionalists viewed their loyalty to Siberia as only a part of their broader loyalty to the Russian nation.

Thus, Siberian regionalism was not a variant of nationalism. Most Siberians considered themselves Russian in national origin, spoke the Russian

---

1 In all of Yadrintsev's writings that I have read, the words "regionalist" (oblastnik) and "regional" (oblastnyi) occur only in his autobiography written in early 1894 ("K moei avtobiografii," p. 165, 166, 177); see above, p. 395.

2 Webster's Third New International Dictionary (Springfield, Mass.: Merriam, 1965), p. 1912.

language, and accepted Russian Orthodoxy. Nevertheless, like English and French colonists in the New World, Siberians in North Asia developed different loyalties, dialects, customs, and mental outlooks. They viewed themselves neither as a separate nationality — ethnically or linguistically, nor as a separate nation — culturally or politically. Sibiryaks saw themselves as a regional variant of the Great Russian people, grounded in territorial, social, and historical differences. In contrast to nationalistic movements in such "regions" of the Russian Empire as Finland, Poland, the Ukraine, and Transcaucasia, regionalism in Siberia was not at all rooted in ideas of nation or nationality. As Potanin put it, "The basis of the Siberian idea is purely territorial." [3]

Furthermore, Siberian regionalism was not local patriotism or particularism in the narrow sense of the terms. Loyalties to village and town, or even to district and province, which had often survived for several centuries, were in the 19th century supplemented and at times superseded by a wider regional patriotism. In many parts of the modern world local patriotism has been enveloped or replaced by nationalism, as a consciousness of political and civic unity spread throughout a given country or area. To some extent Siberian regionalism played a role similar to that of nationalism elsewhere, attempting to awaken the country's population to a sense of common identity and an awareness of its place and destiny in history and in the world.

In Central and Eastern Europe (including the Russian Empire's western

---

3 Potanin added, however, that Siberia "by the nature of its social questions stands alongside other border regions that have a foreign population, like the Caucasus, Finland, etc. . . ." ("Iadrintsev," p. 171). In other words, all these borderlands differed significantly from the Great Russian center in some way or other.

borderlands) cultural nationalism in literature and history in the 19th century had helped engender political nationalism, with its aspirations for national unity, autonomy, or independence. The cultural aspect of Siberian regionalism concerned less the creation of a Siberian literary, artistic, or musical idiom than the spread of education, the emergence of a regional press, and the increase of historical and anthropological research and knowledge of the country. Politically, regionalism sought equal civil rights and a measure of autonomy or self-government.

Yet the political tendencies of Siberian regionalism differed somewhat from regionalism and nationalism in both European Russia and Europe. It was Siberia's semi-colonial experience that gave its regionalism so much of its political coloring and, at times, contradictory qualities. To throw off the shackles of Siberia's "colonial" status, various alternatives presented themselves. The most radical, extreme solution was total political secession from Russia, modeled in part after the experience of the thirteen American colonies. A second alternative (quite radical too, in its Russian context) was the establishment of an autonomous (or dominion) status for Siberia within the Russian Empire, or better yet, within a Russian federation of states modeled along the lines of the United States federal Constitution. A third option was large-scale political and institutional integration with the "metropolis" or mother country (somewhat as some small colonial holdings in the former British and French Empires, not to mention United States possessions overseas, have chosen in the mid-twentieth century). Yet whatever direction Siberia could have moved in was strongly influenced by the fact that territorial contiguity with the mother country made Siberia unique among all the colonies of the world — indeed, so much so that many refused

to recognize the region as a colony.

The first alternative — political separation — hardly got off the ground in the 1860's. Not only did government authorities crush the few barely perceptible signs of movement in this direction, but also very few Siberians even for a moment supported the idea. Separation, however, remained a convenient bugaboo among some centralists for the duration of the century, and to such individuals regionalism ipso facto equaled separatism. Even in 1865 Potanin wrote: "Local patriotism should not be confused with separatism; separatism is only a direction of local patriotism under certain conditions; other conditions can bring /local patriotism/ to an idea completely opposed — that of unity." [4]

Hence regionalists were caught between varying concepts of unity which fluctuated between autonomy and federalism on one hand, and integration and centralism on the other. They obviously wanted the best that integration policies had to offer, such as the extension to Siberia of several of the Great Reforms. They also went beyond simple integration, though, calling for self-determination and autonomy at times. Supplanting earlier demands for a regional zemstvo or zemstvos, Siberians in the early 20th century began to call for a Siberian Regional Duma and a federative structure for the empire as a whole. The central government wanted "integration" too, but only on its own terms. This meant continuing the system of political exile and hard labor, the absence of zemstvos, an incomplete university, and further exploitation of Siberia's natural resources for Russia "as a whole." With

---

4 Potanin, "Zapiski" (Notes), Izvestiia Zapadno-Sibirskogo Otdela Russkogo Geograficheskogo Obshchestva, (1924-25) vol. 4, issue 1, p. 101; quoted in S. F. Koval', "Kharakhter obshchestvennogo dvizheniia," p. 42, and in Istoriia Sibiri, III: 142.

only partial integration achieved by the end of the 19th century, the mother country continued to perpetuate Siberia's semi-colonial status in certain respects, thereby reinforcing the regionalist push for autonomy.

Siberian regionalism also helped provide a forum for the question of federalism in the Russian state. Though politically its advocates sought autonomous status for Siberia, the autonomy of one region would best be secured by means of autonomy in other areas of the empire, especially those which differed ethnically, historically, culturally, and territorially from the Great Russian center. Thus, Yadrintsev spoke strongly in favor of the American and Swiss federative experiments, and Potanin hoped for a future Russian state comprised of numerous autonomous territories.[5] And on occasion Russians recognized the significance of Siberian regionalism in the struggle for a freer, more open and developed Russian state and society. Professor Hessen, for example, admitted that, "Equally distinct from separatism and from simple zemstvo self-government, regionalism has advanced the idea of a federative structure of the state, whose basic members would consist of regions that represented relatively independent cultural, geographical, and economic entities."[6] The publicist-historian Pypin told Popov in 1894: "Don't give up on regionalism. The regional question has been the great service of Siberians."[7]

The very name "Siberia" had contributed considerably to the development of Siberian regionalism. A name which in the 16th century referred to the Tatar khanate of Sibir (in the area around Tobolsk) came to designate the

---

5 For Yadrintsev's views on federalism, see above, p. 366; Potanin is quoted in T. Farafontova, "Cherty iz zhizni sibirskago patriota," p. 152.

6 S. I. Gessen (Hessen), as quoted in "Pro domo suo," Vol'naia Sibir', (1927) no. 2, p. 12.

7 Quoted in I. Popov, Minuvshee i perezhitoe, II: 257.

entire expanse from the Urals to the Pacific by mid-17th century. For the most part, the government treated Siberia as a single administrative entity up through the governor-generalship of Speransky. As Svatikov points out, "Areas that were immense in size but quite different in many respects were united through this name." [8] Though the country was split administratively into Eastern and Western Siberia from the 1820's to the 1880's, the continued use of the name symbolized a kind of regional unity. Since the 1880's, however, centralistic governments, both tsarist and Soviet, have avoided the pitfall of using the name administratively. They learned the lesson well that governmental use of the term "Siberia" indirectly encouraged autonomist and even separatist sentiments beyond the Urals.

More than just the unifying force of the name "Siberia," distinct administrative characteristics were also present which ultimately helped engender regionalism. Among these were the sheer administrative remoteness from Moscow and St. Petersburg; a kind of "colonial office" in the form of the Siberian Office (sibirskii prikaz), followed in the 19th century by the Siberian Committee; and local administration in the hands of one or more governors-general (such as in colonial India, Algeria, Canada, Mexico, and Peru) who exercised almost unlimited political control. All this, writes Svatikov, "not only helped develop the idea of uniqueness, but helped instil this very uniqueness into the life of the region." [9] Further traits that resembled many colonies elsewhere before the New Imperialism of the 1870's and 1880's set in consisted of Siberia's relatively open lands for agricultural settlement, the numerous aboriginal peoples — which soon constituted a

---

8 Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 4.
9 Ibid.

minority, and the relatively large proportion of exiles in the country. Social and cultural characteristics which set Siberia off from the Russian mother country were the absence of serfdom and of a landed gentry, the relatively strong position of urban merchants, a relatively prosperous, individualistic, and democratic peasantry, and a detachment from many of the more embedded Russian cultural traditions.[10]

Regionalism, in theory and in practice, stemmed from Great Russian origins, as Shchapov's studies of early Russian regions had testified. Modern Siberian regionalism, drawing inspiration to some extent from the Muscovite and pre-Mongol examples, represented to a much greater extent a "westernizing" phenomenon. Its advocates were all educated, "westernized" Siberians who found little inspiration in the Siberian past, though they loved their country just the same. They banked on the future to bring the progressive cultural and institutional influences of Europe and European Russia into Siberia. With the exception of the American and Swiss federative models, Siberian regionalists had no specific European constitutional model (such as the French republic or the English constitutional monarchy) or social theory (such as Marxism) in mind for their regenerated Siberia of the future.

Though, specifically, they wished to enjoy the best institutions that European Russia had to offer, they were also well aware of similarities Siberia shared with the former thirteen American colonies and the young United States. The relevance of the American experience for Siberia made itself

---

10 A summary of the polemic on the Sibiryak as a "regional type," with his own special, distinct character, is given in D. Zaitsev, "Zemstvo v Sibiri," p. 65; for examples of Potanin's geographical and climatic determinism in this respect, see Popov and Mendel'son, "Iz vospominanii o Potanine," p. 149; and Potanin, Oblastnicheskaia tendentsiia, p. 60; "Nuzhdy Sibiri," p. 267; and below, p. 738.

felt on thinking Siberians since at least the 1830's. Among them Potanin has perhaps analyzed most concisely the comparisons between the two countries:

> Viewing Siberia as a milieu where the creative Russian spirit can freely unfold its wings, unbound by the traditions with which they were tied in the mother country, has often given cause to compare Siberia with the North American states. Indeed, Siberia has played a role in relation to European Russia to some extent similar to the role of the States toward England, — of course, solely in the area of economic conditions. In the field of politics the dissimilarity is enormous. English colonists received good political institutions right away and soon developed a political freedom unprecedented in the world . . .
>
> A similarity also consists of the fact that both English and Russian colonists found a vast expanse of land in new locations. In Siberia, of course, the arable land is much less because a significant part of the land is occupied by tundra. Colonial life made Englishmen more pronounced individualists than they were in the old country; Siberia influenced Russian colonists in the same sense: the Russian communalist became an individualist, though, of course, an individualist in the Russian spirit, with its inclination toward collectivism preserved in latent form; and if certain conditions should emerge it will again become collectivist, as it was back home. [11]

In Svatikov's opinion, "The comparison of the destiny of North Asia with the fate of North America played no small role in the development of regionalism." Though this influence was not overly large, Svatikov holds that another foreign influence was of even greater significance for Siberia — the presence of exiled Poles. Many of these Poles not only dreamt of escaping the bonds of exile and of helping emancipate Poland and even Russia by an uprising in Siberia, but on occasion actively sought to do so.

---

11 Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," p. 292.

Moreover, the uprisings they planned did not preclude the idea of separating Siberia from Russia.[12] Indeed, if separatist sentiments were fairly well weeded out among Siberians after 1865, they continued to crop up among scattered Polish exiles. As late as 1891, for example, a former Polish exile in Siberia, Wikenty Żórawski, published in London a brochure entitled Poland, Siberia, and America, which called for liberating both Poland and Siberia. Żórawski's half-baked scheme urged that 10,000 Polish immigrants in America come join the struggle to wrest Siberia from Russia, and then liberate Poland. Indeed, for perhaps the last time the idea was entertained in this plan that Siberia might become one of the United States of America.[13] This last point, of course, illustrated the continuing appeal in Siberia of the United States federal Constitution and state system. Thus, hopefully, a future Siberia within a federative system of states would provide still one more similarity with the American experience.

The ideas espoused by Żórawski were rather out-dated, of course. Whatever force they may once have had was by the 1890's completely spent. At this time, just as in the preceding decades, the idea that Siberia was brim full of separatists was a myth. As Yadrintsev confirmed in his autobiography (written in early 1894), after the independence affair of 1865,

> the nickname or title of separatist, which they gave me from then on, remained only for me. Having caused me much trouble and unpleasantness, this nickname finally lost all significance for me, and I became indifferent to it. . . . If for my past and my convictions I should be called a separatist, like the last of the Mohicans, then I am reconciled to it; but let the authorities rest calmly, because one single separatist who will soon leave the scene can hardly present any danger to the state.[14]

---

12 S. G. Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 5.
13 Ibid., p. 97; and Gins, "Sibirskoe oblastnichestvo," p. 146.
14 Iadrintsev, "K moei avtobiografii," p. 157.

Later that same year, Potanin characterized Yadrintsev's life and works as being "devoted to destroying whatever separatist elements have been present in Siberia's social life." [15] By this, however, Potanin meant such "negative" separatistic elements as criminal exile, economic exploitation, and the absence of a university, of zemstvos, and of an up-dated judicial system.

After Yadrintsev's death, Potanin became the recognized leader of Siberian regionalism almost by default. Just after the 1905 Revolution he began to redefine to a degree the words "regionalism" and "separatism." In fact, Potanin was now even hailed as the "defender and herald" of Siberian separatism. [16] According to Potanin's revision,

> Regionalism includes separatism within itself not only in the field of culture, but also in the sphere of politics, excluding only a very extreme act (such as encroaching upon the integrity of the state), which in usual, generally accepted language is called political separatism; the latter is intolerable from the state's point of view; but regional separatism does not threaten to dismantle the state, though it may go very far. [17]

In contrast to his thoughts of 1865 on the subject (just cited above), Potanin now felt that separatism did not necessarily imply total political or cultural separation, but only separateness — or a certain degree of distinctly autonomous development.

Elaborating further along this line, Potanin wrote:

> Siberian separatism literally, and not allegorically, "hangs in the air." This is a fully indisputable truth if we mean cultural, and not political, separatism. Each region, however small its size, within the limits of culture, art, and intellectual life has the right to develop its own capacities self-sufficiently and independently of the

---

15 Potanin, "Nikolai Mikhailovich Iadrintsev," (1894), p. 172.

16 See I. S. Mel'nik in the foreword to Sibir': eia sovremennoe sostoianie i eia nuzhdy (1908), p. viii.

17 Quoted in I. Popov, "K 80-ti lietiiu Potanina," pp. 300-301.

remaining parts of the state.

As for the development of this "separatism," he wrote:

> There is nothing surprising in the fact that with the spread of enlightenment in Siberia and the awakening of sentiments of civic duty, separatistic ideas appeared among Siberians of Russian stock; that is, they began to distinguish between their obligations to the Siberian population and their duties to the Russian state. The feeling of isolation, which inevitably had to emerge in the new territory, was to evoke both legitimate and useful aspirations to compete with other Russian regions. A local patriotic press was to emerge, . . . along with the hope that its own poets, artists, musicians, and theatre would be born. Together with this literary and artistic separatism, a separatism in journalism should be included; a discussion of local economic and social needs was to appear; displaying the negative sides of local life, exposing unequal rights as compared with other regions, defending the interests of the local population, seeking to attain the equal rights and cultural achievements enjoyed by other regions, and protesting against all injustice committed with respect to the region. [18]

Thus, the "separatistic ideas" described by Potanin in 1908 fitted into the general framework of regionalism, as the term has been applied in this study and as the movement developed historically. Potanin's redefined "separatism" signified a local, regional patriotism that strove to achieve a degree of cultural, economic, and political self-sufficiency, autonomy, and distinctiveness. Probably only in the relatively open atmosphere of post-1905 Russia could a regionalist, such as Potanin, feel free to express and re-examine the loaded term "separatism" so easily and openly. During the 19th century this term had been all but monopolized by defenders of the centralistic status quo in public usage. Such centralists utilized its inflammatory political connotations to label Siberian patriots, regionalists,

---

18 Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," pp. 267-68.

and autonomists of whatever shade or hue as "separatists."

Potanin was also interested in comparing Siberian regionalism with other regionalisms and nationalisms in the Russian Empire. In his opinion, the closest comparison with the Siberian phenomenon could be found among the Ural Cossacks. Though a relatively small group, they, like Sibiryaks, also shared the same language and faith with Great Russians, but differed in historical traditions, economy, and social structure. However, the Ural Cossacks constituted a real community, knit together by a social homogeneity and by a small territorial base. "In contrast to this," wrote Potanin, "Siberia with its enormous territory is quite disconnected, there is no solidarity between its parts among the popular masses, and unification occurs only among the intelligentsia — not in the popular masses as in the Urals." [19]

Indeed, the fact that Siberian regionalism was rooted largely in a small educated, "westernized" elite points up to its failure to attract the Siberian masses, in contrast to Cossack regionalism, in the Urals, Don, or elsewhere. And because of its more exclusively territorial nature, Siberian regionalism did not have the latent drawing power that nationalism, with its additional ethnic and cultural bonds, might offer to the masses. "Less favorable in the sense of unifying the popular masses," Potanin declared, "Siberia is in a better position to unify the intelligentsia." [20] It should first be noted that the mass character of Cossack regionalism was definitely an exception in 19th-century Russia. The inability of the intellectual elite to relate successfully to the masses was common in all political and social movements in the Russian Empire to the end of the century. This gap began

---

19 Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," p. 291; see too Oblastnicheskaia tendentsiia, pp. 59-60.

20 Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri," p. 292.

to narrow in many ways only at the turn of the century. Though Siberian regionalism, along with other movements, ideologies, and parties in the empire, became much broader and deeper in its social composition, it never unified the Siberian intelligentsia. Indeed, this intelligentsia had been more united in the early 1860's than at any time before or after.

As indicative of its "intelligentsia" nature, Siberian regionalism in the 19th century, according to Potanin, was not closely linked with the local "bourgeoisie." In their campaign against monopolists and exploiters, both local and metropolitan, regionalists exhibited more of a populist approach and fervor in defense of the Siberian masses. Though Yadrintsev, for example, accepted the financial assistance of such merchants as I. M. Sibiryakov and A. K. Trapeznikov on occasion, Potanin (in his polemic with the Bolshevik Vetoshkin) rightly claimed that "there are no grounds for suspecting Siberian patriots of subservience to the local bourgeoisie. Of course, if the Siberian bourgeoisie takes advantage of the regionalist idea and under its guise conducts its own class interests, this should be opposed." [21] As mentioned earlier, the leading regionalists themselves came from quite varied social backgrounds, and hardly the bourgeoisie alone. In this respect they were true raznochintsy.

Based on the concept of Siberia's territorial unity, Siberian regionalism emerged in part as a reaction against the policies of the metropolitan government toward this "colonial" country as a whole. Yet whatever regional unity Siberia did possess was always undermined to some extent by numerous "sub-regional" elements and loyalties. Guins writes, for instance,

---

21 Quoted in Popov, "K 80-ti lietiiu," p. 301. For M. Vetoshkin's comments on Potanin's position, see "Sibirskoe oblastnichestvo"((Siberian Regionalism), Sovremennyi Mir, (1913) III: 122-24.

> The unity of Siberia's interests, in which the ideologists of Siberian regionalism so believed, always evoked doubt. Cossacks, old-settlers, new-settlers, and natives — settled and nomadic: each of these groups had its own interests, which were far from consonant with the interests of the other groups.[22]

True, the regionalists believed in the unitary aspects of Siberia, but they were also the first to recognize the problems and interests of the varying, disparate elements of the population.

Indeed, the regionalist idea and cause did not even attract all of the Siberian intelligentsia. As the century drew to a close, many educated Siberians, both at home and in European Russia, came to attach themselves to the broader currents of liberalism, populism, Marxism, etc. Many looked on regionalism as too narrow and parochial in its outlook, interests, and goals. In the late 19th century "evangelistic" political exiles brought with them alternative ideologies in the form of populism and, after the mid-1890's, Marxism. And in the early 20th century Russian political parties from Far Right to Far Left (most of them centralistic) found considerable followings among all strata of Siberian society.

Moreover, in retrospect, Siberia's ethnic divisions came to split the region's administrative unity even more deeply. Demands for autonomy to ethnic minorities were voiced as early as 1905. After the Bolshevik Revolution the Soviet government began to stress cultural and limited political self-determination for all peoples in the state. Capitalizing on Siberia's ethnic or "nationality" divisions, the Soviet government split up the region's former territorial and administrative units even further. Siberia itself was fully "integrated" into the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist

---

22 G. Gins, "Sibirskoe oblastnichestvo," p. 149.

Republic (RSFSR) and was not an autonomous unit in the federative system. Such administrative entities as Omsk and Irkutsk regions (oblasti) and the Maritime territory (krai), employed since the time of Alexander III, were retained (though reduced in size), and autonomous nationality areas were introduced. Where Siberian natives predominated or formed a considerable proportion of the population, the Soviet government created such units. Only in these nationality areas, scattered across the face of Siberia, was administrative autonomy granted in principle — in an attempt to help solve the "native question." Thus, well over half of Siberia's territory became divided between Yakut, Buryat, and Kazakh Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republics (ASSR's); Chukchi, Koryak, Evenki (i.e. Tungus), and other National Districts (Okrugi); and for the Altai and Khakass peoples, Autonomous Regions (Oblasti).

Whatever the impact of Siberian regionalism on Great Russian political groups and movements in the late 1880's and early 1890's, numerous circles did begin to recognize the need for a federative state structure and regional autonomy. For instance, in 1893 a union of "socialist revolutionary" groups declared its intention to work for the rapid development of regional self-government in parts of the empire where special ethnic, linguistic, religious, or geographical conditions prevailed. Singled out specifically were Poland, Finland, the Caucasus, and Siberia. In 1895 the group "People's Truth" announced that a necessary condition for political liberty in the Russian state was the "recognition of the right to political self-determination for all nationalities and regions." And S. F. Sharapov's "Slavophile" constitutional plan of 1895, despite its retention of the autocracy, divided Russia into 18 regions, each with its own diet. Typical

of many Great Russian projects, though, Siberia was deemed too large as a single region, and Sharapov split up Asiatic Russia into five regions, four of them going to Siberia.[23]

Just before and during the revolutionary year 1905, a number of constitutional plans were drafted or voiced by the newly emerging mass political parties. Despite some recognition of the need for regional autonomy, most of the plans and the parties were centralistic in structure and outlook, in keeping with the tradition of Russian oppositional movements. Various Liberal and Constitutional-Democrat (Kadet) plans of 1904-05 allowed for organs of local self-government, but did not single out Siberia as a whole for regional autonomy. And while Marxist Social-Democrats recognized the right to "regional self-government" in areas with different customs or populations, their adherents in Siberia vigorously combated regionalist manifestations and "bourgeois" federalism. Socialist-Revolutionaries (SR's) in Siberia were more strongly and positively influenced by Siberian regionalism. A number of SR's in Tomsk, for example, belonged to the Siberian Regionalist Union, formed in 1905, and through their local party organization they advocated the establishment of a Siberian Regional Duma. This duma would manage regional affairs, especially those connected with landed property, allowing "no outside interference in superintending the lands of the region." The right-of-center Octobrist Party, though coming out for a Russia "one and indivisible," also stood for "regionalist unions to solve problems that come within the limits of local self-government." Even further to

---

23 For further details, see Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', pp. 101-02. Svatikov lists nine other groups in Russia and abroad, operative between 1887 and 1893, which espoused similar federalistic ideas (p. 101 n.).

the right, monarchist and reactionary parties, in the tradition of Kartamyshev's Siberian Herald two decades earlier, found a considerable following in Siberia with both their stress on Russia "one and indivisible" and their staunch opposition to federalism, regionalism, and local autonomy.[24]

Regarding the question of regional or local autonomy rather superficially or abstractly, none of these parties elaborated on it very fully. Despite lip-service to the principle of local self-government, the constitutional proposals enunciated around 1905 probably contained fewer concrete references to decentralization than did similar plans drafted in the 1820's and 1860's. Preoccupation with the form that the central, all-Russian government would take in the future overrode considerations of political and administrative decentralization for the most part. Indeed, the Moscow conference of November 1905 that drew Potanin and other Siberians to join representatives of Poland and other borderlands in discussions of a federative structure for Russia had few positive repercussions on either the Russian political parties or the imperial government.[25] All in all, Siberian regionalism was no more successful in making a dent on Great Russian political thinking in the long run than were the ideas of nationalistic parties and leaders in Russia's western borderlands.

In a sense, the "golden age" of Siberian regionalism passed with the death of Nikolai Yadrintsev in 1894. Regionalism as an active force in Siberian society and even in Russian public opinion had depended and centered to a great extent on the voice, pen, and spirit of the indefatigable Yadrin-

---

24 Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 107, 109; for details on the positions of Russian political parties and groups, see pp. 104-10. In 1905 the destructive activities of the "fascistic" Black Hundreds were felt in Tomsk especially.

25 I. Popov, "Iz vospominanii o Potanine," p. 146; and Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', p. 113.

tsev for as long as twenty years. Though his death was a great blow to the cause, regionalism certainly did not wither on the vine in the ensuing years. The mantle of leadership was now shouldered by Potanin and some of the younger regionalists — Popov, Golovachev, and others.

By the early 1900's the Eastern Review had ceased to publish and Siberia had lost its regionalist orientation, while several other Siberian newspapers were managed by specifically Russian political groups and parties. Potanin in 1907 could thereby lament the passing of a "golden age of the patriotic press." [26] Yet Siberian regionalism did not wane so much in absolute terms as it did in relative terms. Not only did the well-organized Russian political parties and groups (like the Black Hundreds) offer much stiffer and more varied competition than did the centralists of the 1880's. But the composition of the Siberian public had also changed considerably in these intervening twenty years. Siberia had become linked much more closely to Russia: the peasant migration and the Trans-Siberian Railroad had drawn hundreds of thousands of agricultural settlers and, to a lesser degree, industrial and railroad workers who not only felt little loyalty to the regionalist cause, but knew even less of what it stood for. [27]

Nevertheless, amidst the turbulent events of 1905 Siberian regionalists for the first time established an organization and drew up a specific list of demands and policy statements. In August 1905 the newly formed Siberian Regional Union organized a conference in Tomsk under Potanin's presidency.

---

26 Potanin, Oblastnicheskaia tendentsiia, p. 36. Also see Popov and Mendel'son, "Iz vospominanii o Potanine," p. 152.

27 Apropos of this, cf. Wiegel's prediction (p. 15, above). These arguments run somewhat counter to the assertion that as of 1917-18 "Siberian regionalism had been develcping during the previous decades, spurred by the enormous influx of immigrants from European Russia"; see D. Treadgold, Twentieth Century Russia (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964), p. 171.

The conference drew up a set of "Basic Statutes," which, among other things, stood for Siberian autonomy, but specifically opposed separation. According to Section III, Siberia constituted an "inseparable part of Russia, participating, on a level with the remaining parts of Russia, in the overall system of state government on principles of popular representation." Taking the position that each region should have the right to self-government, the conference declared that a Siberian Regional Duma was needed to resolve all local problems and to manage questions of public education, health, and security; local means of communication; the right to use and dispose of all lands in the region (especially in connection with the migration problem); and the native question.[28] Though these goals remained, the Union did not survive the 1905 Revolution.

In the aftermath of the Revolution, Potanin began to take issue with those who sized up regionalism as a purely negative response, doomed to die when its demands were realized. According to Potanin, this position held that

> the regionalist movement in Siberia has been a temporary phenomenon, rooted only in the negative facts of Siberian life; yet now the legislative activity of the Russian government has removed the conditions that nourished Siberian regionalism, and there is no longer need to support the idea. It made sense to support it while the exile system existed and there was no Siberian university, but now exile has been abolished and the population has been presented with a university. Only one negative factsremains — zemstvo reforms have not been extended to Siberia; as soon as zemstvo institutions are introduced, the dissatisfaction of Siberian society should cease once and for all, and Siberian regionalism will then come to a sudden end.

---

28 See Svatikov, Rossiia i Sibir', pp. 115-16, for the text.

In this view, regionalists were only deluding themselves by believing that what really was now an outlived cause was something permanent instead. The argument was also advanced that the movement had begun to decline when no one stepped in to fill adequately the shoes of the deceased Yadrintsev. [29]

In reply, Potanin pointed out that on the one hand a "regionalist tendency" had existed long before the 1860's, when the injustices Siberia suffered were specifically enumerated and first brought to public attention. A regional patriotism had in fact been stirring since the 1830's in the hearts and minds of Slovtsov, Yershov, and others, and the idea that Siberia's natural wealth belonged to the region itself had emerged in the 1840's. On the other hand, Potanin felt that his contemporary critics were deluding themselves by accepting the "temporary calm and recession as the normal order of things." [30] Moreover, the questions of exile and intellectual absenteeism had still not been solved satisfactorily, and the "economic question" would continue to nourish regionalism as long as economic competition between regions continued. In Potanin's mind there was only one conclusion: "the regionalist tendency will exist as long as Siberia exists." [31] The question still remained, though: What kind of Siberia, existing in what form?

In the short run, Potanin's prognosis was justified. The Siberian Regional Union was short-lived and was just one among many different groups emerging in Siberia's pluralistic political spectrum of 1905 (and after), but the idea of an autonomous Siberia and a federative Russia was far from

---

29 Potanin, Oblastnicheskaia tendentsiia, pp. 36-37.
30 Ibid., pp. 38-39; also see, p. 54, 58.
31 Ibid., p. 52; and K. Dubrovskii, "Veteran sibirskoi obshchestvennosti," p. 242.

dead. Though one of the chief visions of 19th-century regionalism — an awakened Siberian public, acting in its own best interests — was partially realized in 1905, Siberians at this time often placed other interests over regional ones. Nevertheless, twelve years later, in the wake of the Revolutions of 1917, the old, deeply embedded aspiration for Siberian autonomy broke forth suddenly into political and government forms.

Soon after the Bolshevik seizure of power in Petrograd, a provisional Siberian government was established in Tomsk in December 1917. Calling itself the "Provisional Siberian Regional Council," it elected as its first president the 82-year-old Potanin (who resigned shortly thereafter). In February 1918 a Siberian Regional Duma was assembled, elected by universal suffrage. Like its earlier counterpart in European Russia, the Constituent Assembly, the Regional Duma was also broken up by local Bolsheviks.[32] Later, in early June 1918 a West Siberian Commissariat was formed in Omsk, which proclaimed the autonomy of Siberia under a regional flag of green and white, symbolizing forest and snow. This autonomous government was dominated by Socialist Revolutionaries, from the political party most sympathetic to regionalist ideas (since at least 1905). In the ensuing pressures of the Civil War, another, Kadet-dominated Siberian government followed in late June 1918, only to be merged into a "national" Directory, headed by both SR's and Kadets, by October. In November, however, control in Omsk came into the hands of the White Admiral Kolchak, who was in turn defeated by Bolsheviks in late 1919. Despite this rapid turn-over in governments, the short-lived, ill-fated experiment of 1918 in Siberian autonomy indicates that pervading

---

32 The motto of the Siberian Regional Duma, inscribed on its walls, was: "The Regeneration of a Free Russia through an Autonomous Siberia." On Potanin's activities in 1917-18, see I. A. Iakushev, "Potanin," pp. 37-41.

regionalist sentiments were still strong in Siberia. Though reinvigorated in part by the collapse of the centralistic monarchy, and especially by Bolshevik control of central Russia, the roots of this autonomous Siberia lay in the deeper soil cultivated by the regionalists in the late 19th century.

Siberian patriots and regionalists of the 19th century did much more, of course, than just prepare the ground for what would become only a brief flickering of regional autonomy in 1918. Regionalist tendencies in the early part of the century were engendered by the first stirrings of self-awareness among a select few. Slovtsov, Yershov, Dudorovsky, and Alexandrov, for example, reflected patriotic sentiments in their writings, but had little impact on their surrounding social milieu. From the 1860's on, a definite regionalist "movement" got underway, actively concerned with Siberia's welfare and with social, economic, and institutional reforms and changes. In the interests of Siberia's future, the regionalists who emerged in the 1860's sought to awaken their compatriots to a greater awareness of themselves and their needs, and of their homeland and its relationship to "metropolitan" Russia. Besides carrying their message to the Siberian (and Russian) public, they hammered away at governmental authorities to grant badly-needed reforms. This small group of regionalists, led by Shchapov, Yadrintsev, Potanin, Shashkov, Vagin, Zagoskin, and Adrianov, from the 1860's through the 1880's provided the chief impulse and initiative from within the Siberian body politic toward a more westernized, open, and modern Siberia.

Regionalists, of course, were not alone in this broad, general effort. Local government officials — the most eminent of whom were Speransky, Muravyov, Kaznakov, Despot-Zenovich, and Ignatiev — were at times quite instru-

mental in promoting institutional and administrative reform and encouraging the rise of public opinion. An element especially influential in Siberia's cultural and political awakening was the political exiles — from the Decembrists, Poles, and Petrashevtsy, to the populists of the 1880's: Klements, Popov, and many others. Still another small group important in this process consisted of non-regionalist Siberians whose influence was more generally felt on a local level — men such as Makushin, Martyanov, Sukachov, and Shtilke. Even such pronounced anti-regionalists as Kartamyshev and Korsh helped present alternative views in rousing the Siberian public's civic and political consciousness. And last but not least, numerous officials of the central government in St. Petersburg deserve credit for helping establish the Siberian University, for advancing institutional reform plans, and for promoting the transcontinental railraod and the peasant migration which so transformed Siberia after the mid-1890's.

Nevertheless, in the period between 1819 and 1894 it was the Siberian regionalists and patriots who worked most consistently and devotedly for the progress and enlightenment of Siberia, and for a healthier, more self-sufficient homeland in the future. Indeed, their efforts and accomplishments provided a base for much of the prsitive development that has since been achieved in Siberia in the Soviet era — in the areas of culture, scholarship, education, civic-consciousness, equalized institutions, and minority relations, for example. To the extent that slumbering Siberia "awoke" in the 19th century and became part of the modern world community by the 1890's, Siberian regionalism and its advocates deserve the lion's share of the credit.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Works by Leading Siberian Regionalists

Adrianov, A. V. G. Tomsk v proshlom i nastoiashchem (The Town of Tomsk: Past and Present). Tomsk, 1890.

Ershov, P. P. P. P. Ershov: Konek-gorbunok, stikhotvoreniia (P. P. Yershov: The Little Humpbacked Horse and Poems), ed. by M. K. Azadovskii. Leningrad, 1961.

Iadrintsev, N. M. "Chuvstva Speranskago k Sibiri" (Speransky's Sentiments toward Siberia) Sbornik gazety "Sibir'", I (St. Petersburg, 1876), pp. 397-408.

-----. "Istoriia prosvieshcheniia v Sibiri i universitetskii vopros" (The History of Education in Siberia and the University Question). Sibirskii Sbornik, (1886) bk. 3, pp. 128-58.

-----. "K moei avtobiografii" (An Addition to My Autobiography). Russkaia Mysl', (1904) VI: 152-70.

-----. "Nachalo pechati v Sibiri" (The Beginnings of the Press in Siberia). Literaturnyi Sbornik. Izdanie redaktsii "Vostochnago Obozrieniia" (St. Petersburg), (1885), pp. 352-406.

-----. "Ot redaktsii" (From the Editors). Literaturnyi Sbornik, (1885), pp. vii-viii.

Works by Leading Siberian Regionalists (cont.)

Iadrintsev, N. M. "Ot redaktsii" (From the Editors). Sibirskii Sbornik, (1886) bk. 1, pp. v-vii.

-----. "Pervyi sibirskii universitet" (The First Siberian University). Viestnik Evropy, (November 1879) bk. 11, pp. 58-92.

-----. "Pis'ma N. M. Iadrintseva k A. Kh. Khristoforovu" (N. M. Yadrintsev's Letters to A. Kh. Khristoforov), ed. by E. Vagner. Vol'naia Sibir' (Prague), (1927) no. 2, pp. 181-89.

-----. "Dva pis'ma N. M. Iadrintseva k D. I. Zavalishinu" (Two Letters of N. M. Yadrintsev to D. I. Zavalishin). Sbornik starinnykh bumag, khraniashchikhsia v museie P. I. Shchukina, pt. 2 (Moscow, 1902), pp. 271-78.

-----. "Polozhenie pereselentsev v Sibiri" (The Status of Migrants in Siberia). Viestnik Evropy, (August 1881) bk. 8, pp. 601-20.

-----. "Desiatilietie pereselencheskago voprosa" (The Migrant Question in the Last Decade). Viestnik Evropy, (August 1891) bk. 8, 790-826.

-----. Sibir' kak koloniia, k iubileiu trekhsotlietiia. Sovremennoe polozhenie Sibiri. Eia nuzhdy i potrebnosti. Eia proshloe i budushchee (Siberia as a Colony, Commemorating Its Tricentennial Jubilee. Siberia's Present Condition, Its Needs and Requirements, Its Past and Its Future). St. Petersburg, 1882.

-----. Sibir' kak koloniia v geograficheskom, etnograficheskom i istoricheskom otnoshenii (Siberia as a Colony in Its Geographical, Ethnographical, and Historical Respects). 2d edition, St. Petersburg, 1892.

-----. Sibirien. Geographische, ethnographische und historische Studien von N. Jadrinzew, trans. by E. J. Petri. Jena: Hermann Gostennoble, 1886.

-----. Sibirskie inorodtsy, ikh byt' i sovremennor polozhenie (Siberian Natives: Their Way of Life and Present Conditions). St. Petersburg, 1891.

-----. "Sud'ba sibirskoi poezii i starinnye poety Sibiri" (The Destiny of Siberian Poetry and Siberia's Early Poets). Literaturnyi Sbornik, (1885), pp. 407-24.

-----. "Ssylka i ssyl'nye v Sibiri" (Exiles and the Exile System in Siberia). Zhivopisnaia Rossiia. Edited by P. P. Semenov. Vol. XII (St. Petersburg, 1895), pt. 1, pp. 229-60.

-----. "Trekhsotlietie Sibiri s 26 oktiabria 1581 g." (Siberia's Tricentnnial, since October 26,11581). Viestnik Evropy, (December 1881) bk. 12, pp. 834-49.

Works by Leading Siberian Regionalists (cont.)

Potanin, G. N. "Goroda Sibiri" (The Towns of Siberia). Sibir': eia sovremennoe sostoianie i eia nuzhdy. Edited by I. S. Mel'nik. St. Petersburg, 1908, pp. 234-59.

-----. "Iz istorii provintsial'noi pressy" (From the History of the Provincial Press). Otechestvennyia Zapiski, (March 1881) v. 260, no. 3, pp. 30-46.

-----. "Materialy dlia istorii Sibiri" (Materials on the History of Siberia). Chteniia v Imperatorskom Obshchestvie Istorii i Drevnostei rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom Universitetie, (October-December 1866) bk. 4, pp. 1-128; (January-March 1867) bk. 1, pp. 129-230; (April-June 1867) bk. 2, pp. 231-324.

-----. "Nikolai Mikhailovich Iadrintsev. (Nekrolog)." Etnograficheskoe Obozrienie, (1894) IV: 170-75.

-----. "Nuzhdy Sibiri" (Siberia's Needs). Sibir': eia sovremennoe sostoianie i eia nuzhdy. Edited by I. S. Mel'nik. St. Petersburg, 1908, pp. 260-94.

-----. Oblastnicheskaia tendentsiia v Sibiri (The Regionalist Tendency in Siberia). Tomsk, 1907.

-----. "Vstriecha s S. Th. Durovym" (An Encounter with S. F. Durov). Na slavnom postu (1860-1900). Literaturnyi Sbornik posviashchennyi N. K. Mikhailovskomu. St. Petersburg, 1900, pp. 255-65.

Shashkov, S. S. Sobranie sochinenii S. S. Shashkova (A Collection of S. S. Shashkov's Works). 2 vols. St. Petersburg, 1898.

Shchapov, A. P. "Pis'mo A. P. Shchapova Aleksandru II v 1861 g." (A. P. Shchapov's Letter to Alexander II in 1861). Krasnyi Arkhiv, (1926) XIX: 150-65.

-----. "Rech' A. P. Shchapova posle panikhidy po ubitym v s. Bezdne krest'ianam" (A. P. Shchapov's Speech after the Requiem for Peasants Slain in the Village of Bezdna). Krasnyi Arkhiv, (1923) IV: 407-10.

-----. "Sibirskoe obshchestvo do Speranskago" (Siberian Society before Speransky). Sochineniia A. P. Shchapova. Vol. III (St. Petersburg, 1908), pp. 643-717.

-----. "Velikorusskiia oblasti i smutnoe vremia. (1606-1613 g.)" (Great Russian Regions and the Time of Troubles: 1606-13). Otechestvennyia Zapiski, (October 1861), v. 138, pp. 579-616.

Slovtsov, P. A. Istoricheskoe obozrienie Sibiri (An Historical Survey of Siberia). 2 vols. 2d edition, St. Petersburg, 1886.

Works by Leading Siberian Regionalists (cont.)

Vagin, V. I. Istoricheskie sviedeniia o dieiatel'nosti grafa M. M. Speranskago v Sibiri, s 1819 po 1822 god (Historical Information on the Activity of Count M. M. Speransky in Siberia: 1819-1822). 2 vols. St. Petersburg, 1872.

-----. "Sorokovye goda v Irkutskie (Iz vospominanii)" (Irkutsk in the 1840's: Reminiscences). Literaturnyi Sbornik, (1885), pp. 249-80.

* * *

Letters, Memoirs, and Travel Accounts

Argunov, A. A. "Studencheskie gody. (K 175-letiiu Moskovskogo universiteta)" (Student Years: Commemorating the 175th Anniversary of Moscow University). Vol'naia Sibir', (1930) bk. VIII; pp. 18-33.

(Avdeeva, E. A.) Zapiski i zamiechaniia o Sibiri (Notes and Remarks on Siberia). Moscow, 1837.

Bakunin, M. A. Izbrannye sochineniia (Selected Works). Vol. III (Federalizm, Sotsializm, i Antiteologizm). Petrograd and Moscow, 1920.

-----. Mikhail Bakunins sozial-politischer Briefwechsel mit Alexander Iw. Herzen und Ogarjow. Edited by M. Dragomanov. Stuttgart, 1895.

-----. M. A. Bakunin. Sobranie sochinenii i pisem, 1826-1876 (M. A. Bakunin: A Collection of Works and Letters). Edited by Iu. M. Steklov. Vol. III (Period pervogo prebyvaniia za granitsei, 1840-1849); and vol. IV (V tiur'makh i ssylke, 1849-1861). Moscow, 1935.

Basargin, N. V. Zapiski Nikolaia Vasil'evicha Basargina (N. V. Basargin's Notes). Moscow, 1872; and Petrograd, 1917 (two separate editions).

Bervi, V. V. (N. Flerovskii). Tri politicheskiia sistemy: Nikolai 1-yi, Aleksandr II-oi, i Aleksandr III-ii. Vospominaniia N. Flerovskago (Three Political Systems: Nicholas I, Alexander II, and Alexander III. N. Flerovsky's Memoirs). London, 1897.

Bielogolovyi, N. A. "Une élite en exil. Les Décembristes, mémoires du docteur Belogolowy," ed. by H. I. La Revue de Paris, (June 1918) yr. 25, pt. 3, pp. 619-34.

-----. Vospominaniia i drugiia stat'i (Memoirs and Other Articles). 4th edition, St. Petersburg, 1901.

Letters, Memoirs, and Travel Accounts (cont.)

Belokonskii, I. P. Dan' Vremeni: Vospominaniia (The Gift of Time: Memoirs). 2d edition, Moscow, 1928.

Borozdin, A. K., ed. Iz pisem i pokazanii dekabristov. Kritika sovremennago sostoianiia Rossii i plany budushchago ustroistva (From the Letters and Testimonies of Decembrists: Criticism if Russia's Contemporary Status and Plans for Its Future Organization). St. Petersburg, 1906.

Chekhov, Anton. "Across Siberia." The Unknown Chekhov. Stories and Writings Hitherto Untranslated, pp. 267-308. New York: Noonday, 1954.

Cochrane, John. Narrative of a Pedestrian Journey through Russia and Siberian Tartary from the Frontiers of China to the Frozen Sea and Kamtchatka. 2 vols. London, 1825.

Collins, Perry McDonough. Siberian Journey: Down the Amur to the Pacific, 1856-1857. Edited by Charles Vevier. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1962.

Curtin, Jeremiah. A Journey in Southern Siberia. The Mongols, Their Religion and Their Myths. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1909.

Dostoevsky, F. M. Letters of Fyodor Michailovitch Dostoevsky to His Family and Friends. Trans. by Ethel C. Mayne. New York: Horizon Press, 1961.

Diugamel', A. O. "Avtobiografiia A. O. Diugamelia" (A. O. DuHamel's Autobiography). Russkii Arkhiv, (1885) no. 10, pp. 161-224.

Dzabadari, I. S. "Protsess 50-ti. (Vserossiiskaia Sotsial'no-Revoliutsionnaia Organizatsiia, 1874-1877 g.)" (The Trial of the Fifty: The All-Russian Socialist-Revolutionary Organization). Byloe, (September 1907) no. 9/21, pp. 169-92.

Efimov, I. V. "Zamietki na vospominaniia L. Th. L'vova. (Dekabristy, ikh razselenie i zhizn' v Sibiri)" (Comments on L. F. Lvov's Memoirs: Decembrists, Their Settlement and Life in Siberia). Russkii Arkhiv, (1885) no. 12, pp. 553-64.

Fortunatov, F. N. "Pamiatnyia zamietki Vologzhanina" (Recellections of a Man from Vologda). Russkii Arkhiv, (1867) no. 12, pp. 1681-84. (On P. A. Slovtsov).

Gertsen, A. I. (Herzen). Byloe i dumy (My Past and Thoughts). Leningrad, 1946.

-----. My Exile in Siberia. 2 vols. London: Hurst and Blackett, 1855.

Letters, Memoirs, and Travel Accounts (cont.)

Gertsen, A. I. Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem (A Complete Collection of Works and Letters). Edited by M. Lemke. Vols. I (1820-1837) and IX (1857-1859), Petrograd, 1919; and vol. XVI (1863), Petrograd, 1920.

-----. Staryi mir i Rossiia. Pis'ma Iskandera k redaktoru "The English Republic," V. Lintonu (1854 g.) (The Old World and Russia: Iskander's Letters to V. Linton, Editor of the English Republic, 1854). London: Trübner and Co., 1858.

Golodnikov, K. M. "Gosudarstvennye i politicheskoe prestupniki v Ialutorovskie i Kurganie (Otryvok iz vospominanii)" (State and Political Criminals in Yalutorovsk and Kurgan: An Excerpt from Memoirs). Istoricheskii Viestnik, (December 1888) 34: 753-61.

Iakushkin, E., ed., Dekabristy na poselenii: iz arkhiva Iakushkinykh (Decembrists in Exile: From the Yakushkin Archives). Leningrad, 1926.

Iakushkin, I. D. Zapiski, stat'i, pis'ma dekabrista I. D. Iakushkina (Notes, Articles, and Letters of the Decembrist Yakushkin). Edited by S. Ia. Shtraikh. Moscow, 1951.

Kalashnikov, I. T. "Zapiski Irkutskago zhitelia" (Notes of an Irkutsk Resident). Russkaia Starina, vol. 123 (July 1905), pp. 187-251; (August 1905), pp. 384-409; (September 1905), pp. 609-46.

Kennan, George. Siberia and the Exile System. 2 vols. New York: The Century Co., 1891.

Khudiakov, I. A. "Iz vospominanii shestidesiatnika. (Avtobiografiia I. A. Khudiakova)" (From the Recollections of a Man of the Sixties: I. A. Khudyakov's Autobiography). Istoricheskii Viestnik, (December 1906) CVI: 778-809.

Klements, D. A. Iz proshlogo. Vospominaniia (Out of the Past: Memoirs). Leningrad, 1925.

Korsh, E. V. "Vosem' liet v Sibiri" (Eight Years in Siberia). Istoricheskii Viestnik, (1910) CXX: 423-49, 806-34; CXXI: 27-52.

Korolenko, V. G. "Istoriia moego sovremennika" (My Autobiography). Golos Minuvshego, (1920-21) no. 9.

Kostomarov, N. I. "Avtobiografiia Nikolaia Ivanovicha Kostomarova" (N. I. Kostomarov's Autobiography). Russkaia Mysl', (1885) no. 5, pp. 190-223.

Kropotkin, P. A. Dnevnik P. A. Kropotkina (Peter Kropotkin's Diary). Moscow and Petrograd, 1923.

Letters, Memoirs, and Travel Accounts (cont.)

Kropotkin, P. A. Memoirs of a Revolutionist. Edited by J. A. Rogers. New York: Anchor Books, 1962. (Originally published in English in 1899)

Legras, Jules. En Sibèrie. 2d edition, Paris, 1899.

Leroy-Beaulieu, Pierre. The Awakening of the East: Siberia — China — Japan. New York: McClure, Phillips and Co., 1900.

Miliutin, B. A. "General-gubernatorstvo N. N. Murav'eva v Sibiri. (Otryvok iz vospominanii)" (N. N. Muravyov's Governor-Generalship in Siberia: An Excerpt from Memoirs). Istoricheskii Viestnik, (December 1888) 34: 595-635.

Modestov, V. I. "Zagranichnyia vospominaniia" (Reminiscences Abroad). Istoricheskii Viestnik, (April 1883) 12: 103-24.

Omulevskii, I. V. (Fedorov-Omulevskii). Shag za shagom (Step by Step). Moscow, 1957.

O. O. Sibirische Briefe. With an introduction by Paul Kuegelgen. Leipzig, 1894.

"Ob ukraino-slavianskom obshchestvie" (On the Ukrainian-Slavonic Society). Russkii Arkhiv, (1892) no. 7, pp. 334-59.

Panteleev, L. F. Vospominaniia (Memoirs). Moscow, 1958.

Pershin-Karaksarskii, P. P. "Vospominaniia o dekabristakh" (Recollections of Decembrists). Istoricheskii Viestnik, (1908) CXIV: 536-69.

Pestel', P. I. Russkaia Pravda. Nakaz Vremennomu Verkhovnomu Pravleniiu (Russian Truth: Instructions to the Provisional Supreme Government). Edited by P. E. Shchegolev. St. Petersburg, 1906.

Piotrowski, Rufin. Polacy na Syberji. N.p., n.d. Presumably a later edition of a part of Pamiętniki z pobytu na Syberyi Rufina Piotrowskiego. 3 vols. Poznań, 1860.

-----. Recollections of Siberia. The Story of a Siberian Exile. London: Longman, Green, et al., 1863.

Pobedonostsev, K. P. K. P. Pobedonostsev i ego korrespondenty. Pis'ma i zapiski (Konstantin Pobedonostsev and His Correspondents: Letters and Notes). Moscow and Petrograd, 1923.

Popov, I. I. Minuvshee i perezhitoe. Vospominaniia za 50 let (My Past Experiences: Fifty Years of Recollections). 2 vols. Leningrad, 1924.

Letters, Memoirs, and Travel Accounts (cont.)

Pushchin, I. I. Zapiski o Pushkine i pis'ma (Notes on Pushkin and Letters). Moscow and Leningrad, 1927; and Moscow, 1956 (two separate editions).

Ravenstein, E. G. The Russians on the Amur; Its Discovery, Conquest, and Colonisation. London, 1861.

Rozen, A. E. Aus den Memoiren eines russischen Dekabristen. Leipzig, 1869.

-----. Zapiski dekabrista (Notes of a Decembrist). St. Petersburg, 1907.

Sazhin, M. P. "Po Sibiri. (Vospominaniia)" (Through Siberia: Memoirs). Katorga i Ssylka, (1928) no. 49, bk. 12, pp. 94-113.

Shchegolev, P. E., ed. Petrashevtsy v vospominaniiakh sovremennikov (The Petrashevtsy in the Eyes of Contemporaries). Vol. I, pt. 4,(Moscow and Leningrad, 1926.

Shelgunov, N. V., L. P. Shelgunova, and M. L. Mikhailov. Vospominaniia v dvukh tomakh (Memoirs in Two Volumes). Moscow, 1967.

Shvetsov, S. P. "Kul'turnoe znachenie politicheskoi ssylki v Zapadnoi Sibiri" (The Cultural Significance of Political Exile in Western Siberia). Katorga i Ssylka, (1928) no. 41, bk. 4, pp. 90-100; no. 47, bk. 10, pp. 96-112; and no. 48, bk. 11, pp. 88-105.

Sleptsova, M. "Shturmany griadushchei buri" (Helmsmen of the Coming Storm). Zvenia, (1933) II: 433-37.

Speranskii, M. M. "Pis'ma M. M. Speranskago k ego docheri iz Sibiri" (Letters of Michael Speransky to His Daughter from Siberia). Russkii Arkhiv, (1868) no. 11, pp. 1682-1811.

Stogov-Mozhaiskii, E. I. "Ocherki, razskazy i vospominaniia. Speranskii i Treskin v Irkutskie, 1819 g." (Sketches, Stories, and Reminiscences: Speransky and Treskin in Irkutsk in 1819). Russkaia Starina, (November 1878), pp. 499-530.

Struve, B. V. "Nieskol'ko slov o grafie Murav'evie-Amurskom" (A Few Words Regarding Count Muravyov-Amursky). Russkii Viestnik, (July 1884) v. 172, pp. 354-61.

-----. "Vospominaniia o Sibiri" (Recollections of Siberia). Russkii Viestnik, (1888) no. 4, pp. 145-84.

Suvorov, P. P. "Zapiski o proshlom" (Notes on the Past). Russkoe Obozrienie, (1893) no. 12, pp. 683-99.

Letters, Memoirs, and Travel Accounts (cont.)

Svistunov, P. I. "Nieskol'ko zamećechanii po povodu novieishikh knig i statei o sobytii 14 dekabria i o dekabristakh" (A Few Wordsvations Regarding the Latest Books and Articles on the Decembrists and Their Uprising). Russkii Arkhiv, (1870), pp. 1633-1668.

Veniukov, M. I. "Vospominaniia o zaselenii Amura v 1857-1858 gg." (Recollections of the Settlement of the Amur in 1857-58). Russkaia Starina, (January 1879) 24: 81-112.

Vigel', F. F. Zapiski Filipa Filipovicha Vigelia (Notes of Philip Wiegel). Vol. I, 2 pts., Moscow, 1891-92.

Volkonskaia, M. N. Zapiski kniagini M. N. Volkonskoi (Notes of Princess Maria Volkonskaya). Moscow, 1960.

Volkonskii, Sergei. O dekabristakh (Po semeinym vospominaniiam) (The Decembrists, According to Family Reminiscences). Petrograd, 1922.

Vosstanie dekabristov. Materialy (Materials on the Decembrist Uprising). Vol. I (1925), vol. V (1926), and vol. VII (1958), Moscow and Leningrad.

Vrangel', A. E. Vospominaniia o Th. M. Dostoevskom v Sibiri (Recollections of Fyodor Dostoevsky in Siberia). St. Petersburg, 1912.

Watrous, S. D., ed. John Ledyard's Journey through Russia and Siberia: 1787-1788. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1966.

"Zapiska o Sibiri Shteingeilia" (Steinheil's Memorandum on Siberia). Sibir' i russkoe pravitel'stvo. Nieskol'ko ob"iasnitel'nykh zamietok i dokumentov iz proshedshei vremeni, pp. 3-25. 2d edition, Leipzig: E. L. Kasprowicz (1879?).

"Zapiski neizviestnago. Iz Obshchestva Soedinennykh Slavian" (Notes of an Unknown Writer from the Society of United Slavs). Russkii Arkhiv, (1882) bk. 1, pp. 435-554.

Zherebtsov, B., ed. Staraia Sibir' v vospominaniiakh sovremennikov (Old Siberia in the Recollections of Contemporaries). Irkutsk, 1939.

* * *

Miscellaneous Contemporary Articles

"Amurskaia Kaliforniia. (Po razskazam ochevidtsa)" (A California on the Amur: Tales of an Eyewitness). Sibirskii Sbornik, (1886) bk. 1, pp. 138-68.

Miscellaneous Contemporary Articles (cont.)

Iskander (Alexander Herzen). "Amerika i Sibir'" (America and Siberia). Kolokol, (December 1, 1858) no. 29, pp. 233-35. Reprint: Moscow, 1962, pt. 1.

-----. "Russkim ofitseram v Pol'shie" (To Russian Officers in Poland). Kolokol, (October 15, 1862) no. 147, p. 1214. Reprint: Moscow, 1962, pt. 5.

-----. "Ispolin prosypaetsia" (The Giant Is Waking Up). Kolokol, (November 1, 1861) no. 110, p. 918. Reprint: Moscow, 1962, pt. 4.

"Iz Irkutska" (From Irkutsk). Vpered!, (October 15, 1875), p. 598.

"Iz Sibiri. (Otryvki iz pisem k izdateliu Kolokola v 1862 g.)" (From Siberia: Excerpts from Letters to the Editors of the Bell in 1862). Sibir' i russkoe pravitel'stvo, pp. 25-35. 2d edition, Leipzig: E. L. Kasprowicz (1879?).

"K kharakhteristikie Sibiri" (On Characterizing Siberia). Sibir' i russkoe pravitel'stvo, pp. 35-43. 2d edition, Leipzig: Kasprowicz (1879?).

(Kapustin, S. Ia.) "Zerkalo Rossii. (Po povodu knigi g. Iadrintseva: "Sibir' kak koloniia')" (Russia's Mirror: Apropos of Mr. Yadrintsev's Book: Siberia as a Colony). Russkaia Mysl', (1883) I: 1-38.

(Kostomarov, N. I.) "Ukraina. (Pis'mo k izdateliu Kolokola)" (The Ukraine: A Letter to the Editors of the Bell). Kolokol, (January 15, 1860) no. 61, pp. 499-503. Reprint: Moscow, 1962, pt. 3.

Ogarev, N. P. "Na novyi god" (On New Year's Day). Kolokol, (January 1, 1861) no. 89, pp. 745-52. Reprint: Moscow, 1962, pt. 4.

-----. "Universitety zakryvaiut!" (The Universities Are Closing!). Kolokol, (January 15, 1862) no. 115, p. 1002. Reprint: Moscow, 1962, pt. 4.

Semevskii, V. I. "Istoricheskoe obozrienie Sibiri' P. A. Slovtsova" (P. A. Slovtsov's Historical Survey of Siberia). Sibirskii Sbornik, (1886) bk. 3, pp. 159-66.

"Smies'" (Miscellany). Kolokol, (September 15, 1865) no. 204, p. 1676. Reprint: Moscow, 1963, pt. 8. (On the Siberian independence affair)

"Ubiistvo Nekliudova v Irkutskie" (The Murder of Neklyudov in Irkutsk). Sibir' i russkoe pravitel'stvo, pp. 138-90. 2d edition, Leipzig: Kasprowicz (1879?).

* * *

Pre-Revolutionary Research Relating to Siberia

Bogolepov, M. "Torgovlia Sibiri" (Siberia's Trade). Sibir': eia sovremennoe sostoianie i eia nuzhdy. Edited by I. S. Mel'nik. St. Petersburg, 1908, pp. 169-200.

Czaplicka, M. A. Aboriginal Siberia. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914.

-----. My Siberian Year. London: Mills and Boon, Ltd., 1916.

Dmitriev-Mamonov, A. I. and A. F. Zdziarski, eds. Guide to the Great Siberian Railway. Translated by L. Kukol-Yasnopolsky. St. Petersburg: Ministry of Ways of Communication, 1900.

Dragomanov, M. P. Istoricheskaia Pol'sha i velikorusskaia demokratiia (Historical Poland and Great Russian Democracy). Geneva, 1881.

Dubenskii, Mikhail. "Ocherk dieiatel'nosti volostnago suda v Vostochnoi Sibiri. Okrug krasnoiarskii" (A Sketch of the Activities of the Township Court in Krasnoyarsk Okrug, Eastern Siberia). Sibirskii Sbornik, (1892) no. 2, pp. 69-132.

Golovachev, D. M. "Chastnoe zemlevladienie v Sibiri" (Private Landownership in Siberia). Sibirskie Voprosy, (1905) no. 1, pp. 122-70.

Golovachev, P. M. "Ot redaktsii" (From the Editors). Sibirskie Voprosy, (1905) no. 1, pp. i-iv.

-----. Sibir'. Priroda, liudi, zhizn' (Siberia: Its Nature, People, and Life). Moscow, 1902.

Grigor'ev, V. Iu. "Zemstvo v Sibiri i ego miestnyia osobennosti" (A Zemstvo in Siberia and Its Local Peculiarities). Sibirskie Voprosy, (1905) no. 1, pp. 33-65.

Gubskii, M. "Ssylka" (Exile). Entsiklopedicheskii slovar', XXXI: 377-84. St. Petersburg: Brokgaus-Efron, 1900.

Kaufman, A. "Kolonizatsiia Sibiri v eia nastoiashchem i budushchem" (The Colonization of Siberia: Its Present and Future). Sibirskie Voprosy, (1905) no. 1, pp. 172-98.

Klements, D. A. "Miestnye muzei i ikh znachenie v provintsial'noi zhizni. (Publichnaia lektsiia, chitannaia v Kiakhtie 8-go oktiabria 1892 goda)" (Local Museums and Their Significance in Provincial Life: A Public Lecture Delivered in Kyakhta on October 8, 1892). Sibirskii Sbornik, (1892) issue 2, pp. 1-35.

Maksimov, S. V. Sibir' i katorga (Siberia and Hard Labor). Part III (Politicheskie i gosudarstvennye prestupniki). 4th edition, St. Petersburg, (1900?).

Pre-Revolutionary Research Relating to Siberia (cont.)

Otchet Imperatorskago Russkago Geograficheskago Obshchestva za 1877 god (Report of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society for 1877). Edited by V. I. Sreznevskii. St. Petersburg, 1878.

Popov, I. I. "Proshloe i nastoiashchee Sibirskago Universiteta" (The Siberian University's Past and Present). Golos Minuvshago, (1914) no. 1, pp. 291-99.

Prazdnovanie g. Tobol'skom 300-lietnei godovshchiny svoego sushchestvovaniia (Celebration of the Town of Tobolsk on the 300th Anniversary of Its Existence). Tobolsk, 1887.

Pypin, A. N. Istoriia russkoi etnografii (A History of Russian Ethnography). Vol. IV (Bielorussiia i Sibir'). St. Petersburg, 1892.

Sabler, S. V. and I. V. Sosnovskii, eds. Sibirskaia zheleznaia doroga v eia proshlom i nastoiashchem. Istoricheskii ocherk (The Trans-Siberian Railroad: Its Past and Present. An Historical Essay). St. Petersburg, 1903.

Seroshevskii, V. (W. Sieroszewski). "Ssylka i katorga v Sibiri" (Exile and Hard Labor in Siberia). Sibir': eia sovremennoe sostoianie i eia nuzhdy. Edited by I. S. Mel'nik. St. Petersburg, 1908, pp. 201-234.

Semenov, P. P., ed. Istoriia poluviekovoi dieiatel'nosti Imperatorskago Russkago Geograficheskago Obshchestva: 1845-1895 (A History of a Half-Century's Activities of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society). 3 vols. St. Petersburg, 1896.

-----. Rossiia. Polnoe geograficheskoe opisanie nashego otechestva (Russia: A Complete Geographical Description of Our Fatherland). Vol. XVI (Zapadnaia Sibir'). St. Petersburg, 1907.

Shcheglov, I. V. Khronologicheskii perechen' vazhneishikh dannykh iz istorii Sibiri. 1032-1882 g.g. (A Chronological List of the Most Important Facts in Siberian History: 1032-1882). Irkutsk, 1883.

Shtukenberg, A. I. "Iz istorii zheliezno-dorozhnago diela v Rossii" (From the History of Railroads in Russia). Russkaia Starina, (1885) 46; 309-22.

Shumakher, P. V. "K istorii priobrieteniia Amura. Snosheniia s Kitaem s 1848 po 1860 god" (On the History of the Amur Acquisition: Relations with China from 1848 to 1860). Russkii Arkhiv, (1878) bk. 3, pp. 257-342.

Sobolev, M. N. "K voprosu o reformie krest'ianskago upravleniia v Sibiri" (On the Question of Reforming Peasant Administration in Siberia). Sibirskie Voprosy, (1905) no. 1, pp. 86-99.

Pre-Revolutionary Research Relating to Siberia (cont.)

Sobolev, M. N. "Puti soobshcheniia v Sibir" (Communication Routes in Siberia). Sibir': eia sovremennoe sostoianie i eia nuzhdy. Edited by I. S. Mel'nik. St. Petersburg, 1908, pp. 24-35.

Sukachev, V. P. Irkutsk. Ego miesto i znachenie v istorii i kul'turnom razvitii Vostochnoi Sibiri (Irkutsk: Its Place and Significance in the History and Cultural Development of Eastern Siberia). Moscow, 1891.

-----. Programma istoricheskago i statistiko-ekonomicheskago opisaniia goroda Irkutska (A Program for an Historical, Statistical, and Economic Description of Irkutsk). Moscow, 1892.

Zaitsev, D. "Zemstvo v Sibiri" (A Zemstvo in Siberia). Russkaia Mysl', (December 1904) no. 12, pp. 59-68.

* * *

Biographical Studies

Abramov, N. A. "Petr Andreevich Slovtsov," Chteniia v imperatorskom obshchestvie istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitetie, (October-December 1871) V: 84-103.

Aristov, N. Ia. "Zhizn' Athanasiia Prokof'evicha Shchapova" (The Life of Afanasy Prokofievich Shchapov). Istoricheskii Viestnik, (1882) bk. 10, pp. 5-44, 295-336, 576-618.

Araf'ev, V. "M. V. Butashevich-Petrashevskii v Sibiri" (M. V. Butashevich-Petrashevsky in Siberia). Russkaia Starina, (January 1902) v. 109, pp. 177-86.

Barsukov, I. P. Graf Nikolai Nikolaevich Murav'ev-Amurskii, po ego pis'mam, ofitsial'nym dokumentam, razskazam sovremennikov i pechatnym istochnikam (Count Nikolai Nikolaevich Muravyov-Amursky: His Letters, Official Documents, Contemporary Accounts, and Printed Sources). 2 vols. Moscow, 1891.

Bielogolovyi, N. A. "A. V. Podzhio, 1859-1873 gg. Iz zapisok N. A. Bielogolovago" (A. V. Poggio: 1859-1873). Viestnik Evropy, (1896) no. 12, pp. 639-75.

Bielokonskii, I. P. "N. M. Mart'ianov i minusinskii muzei, 1877-1902 g." (N. M. Martyanov and the Minusinsk Museum: 1877-1902). Viestnik Evropy, (April 1902), pp. 750-59.

Biographical Studies (cont.)

Bychkov, A. Th. "M. M. Speranskii general-gubernatorom v Sibiri i vozvrashchenie ego v Peterburg. (Iz bumag akademika A. Th. Bychkova)" (M. M. Speransky as Governor-General in Siberia and His Return to St. Petersburg: From the Papers of Academician A. F. Bychkov). Russkaia Starina, (October 1902) v. 112; pp. 35-56.

Carr, E. H. Dostoevsky, 1821-1881. London: Allen and Unwin, 1949.

-----. Michael Bakunin. New York: Vintage Books, 1961.

Dubrovskii, K. Rozhdennye v stranie izgnaniia (Sons of the Land of Exile). Petrograd, 1916.

Dulov, A. V. "Politicheskaia bor'ba M. V. Petrashevskogo v Sibiri" (M. V. Petrashevsky's Political Struggle in Siberia). Obshchestvenno-politicheskoe dvizhenie v Sibiri v 1861-1917 gg. Novosibirsk, 1967.

"Dvie smerti: Semen Iakovlevich Kapustin, Grigorii Zakharovich Eliseev" (Two Deaths: Semyon Yakovlevich Kapustin and Grigory Zakharovich Yeliseev). Sievernyi Viestnik, (1891) no. 2, pp. 87-89.

Evans, John Lewis. "Petrashevskii and the Petrashevtsy." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1968.

Farafontova, T. "Cherty iz zhizni sibirskago patriota. K 80-ti lietnemu iubileiu G. N. Potanina" (Features from the Life of a Siberian Patriot. On G. N. Potanin's 80th Jubilee). Russkaia Mysl', (1915) no. 9, pp. 144-55.

"Florinskii (Vasilii Markovich)." Entsiklopedicheskii slovar', XXXVI: 169. St. Petersburg: Brokgaus-Efron, 1902.

Glinskii, B. B. "Nikolai Mikhailovich Iadrintsev. (Biograficheskii ocherk)" (Nikolai Mikhailovich Yadrintsev: A Biographical Sketch). Istoricheskii Viestnik, (August 1894), pp. 412-51.

Golodnikov, K. "K biografii P. A. Slovtsova" (Concerning a Biography of P. A. Slovtsov). Sbornik Gazety "Sibir'", (1876) I: 423-31.

Iakushev, I. A. "Grigorii Nikolaevich Potanin. (Ego politicheskie vzgliady i obshchestvenno-politicheskaia deiatel'nost')" (Grigory Nikolaevich Potanin: His Political Views and Socio-Political Activities). Vol'naia Sibir', (1927) I: 15-41.

Iakusheva, E. "P. I. Makushin." Vol'naia Sibir', (1927) I: 191-94.

Biographical Studies (cont.)

Iazykov, D. D. "Russkie pisateli, umershie v 1882 godu" (Russian Writers Who Died in 1882). Istoricheskii Viestnik, (1885) 22: 53-56. (On Shashkov)

"Innokentii Vasil'evich Thedorov-Omulevskii." Sibirskii Sbornik, (1887) bk. 4, pp. 138-41.

Iudin, P. Iu. "A. N. Pleshcheev v ssylkie" (A. N. Pleshcheev in Exile). Istoricheskii Viestnik, (May 1897), pp. 402-22.

"Kaptsevich, Petr Mikhailovich." Russkii biograficheskii slovar', VIII: 483.

"Kapustin, Semen Iakovlevich." Russkii biograficheskii slovar', VIII: 482.

"Kaznakov, Nikolai Gennadievich." Russkii biograficheskii slovar', VIII: 384.

Klements, D. A. "G. N. Potanin." Russkoe Bogatstvo, (1905) no. 9, pp. 183-188.

Koz'min, N. N. "Athanasii Prokof'evich Shchapov." Ocherki proshlago i nastoiashchago Sibiri, pp. 102-60. St. Petersburg, 1910.

-----. "Iz proshlago Sibiri (Byvshii General-Gubernator Vostochnoi Sibiri S. B. Bronevskii i ego memuary)" (From Siberia's Past: The Former Governor-General of Eastern Siberia S. B. Bronevsky and His Memoirs). Ocherki proshlago i nastoiashchago Sibiri, pp. 34-65. St. Petersburg, 1910.

-----. "M. V. Zagoskin i ego znachenie v istorii razvitiia sibirskoi obshchestvennotti. (Iz istorii oblastnago dvizheniia)" (M. V. Zagoskin and His Significance in the History of the Development of Siberian Public Opinion: From the History of the Regionalist Movement). Ocherki proshlago i nastoiashchago Sibiri, pp. 161-228. St. Petersburg, 1910.

Krylov, V. A. "Pamiati N. A. Bielogolovago" (Memories of N. A. Belogolovy). Istoricheskii Viestnik, (November 1895), pp. 573-80.

Kunkl', A. A. Dolgushintsy (Dolgushin and His Circle). Moscow, 1931.

Lemke, M. K. Nikolai Mikhailovich Iadrintsev. Biograficheskii ocherk k desiatilietiiu so dnia konchiny (1894 7/VI 1904) (Nikolai Mikhailovich Iadrintsev: A Biographical Sketch in Commemoration of the Tenth Anniversary of His Death). St. Petersburg, 1904.

Luchinskii, G. A. "Athanasii Prokof'evich Shchapov, biograficheskii ocherk" (A. P. Shchapov: A Biographical Sketch). Sochineniia A. P. Shchapova. Vol. III, St. Petersburg, 1908, pp. i-lxxxviii.

Biographical Studies (cont.)

"Makushin (Petr Ivanovich)." Entsiklopedicheskii slovar', vol. 18, pt. 1, pp. 450-51. St. Petersburg: Brokgaus-Efron, 1896.

Malia, Martin. Alexander Herzen and the Birth of Russian Socialism, 1812-1855. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1961.

Markevich, A. "Kostomarov, Nikolai Ivanovich." Russkii biograficheskii slovar', IX: 308-11. St. Petersburg, 1903.

Miakotin, V. "Pamiati D. A. Klementsa" (Memories of D. A. Klements). Russkoe Bogatstvo, (February 1914) no. 2, pp. 341-44.

Mogilianskii, N. "Pamiati Grigor'ia Nikolaevicha Potanina" (Memories of G. N. Potanin). Rul' (Berlin), April 5, 1927, no. 1930.

Naumova-Shirokikh, V. "Petr Ivanovich Makushin. (Nekrolog)." Sibirskie Ogni, (1926) no. 4, pp. 156-57.

"Nekrolog: A. P. Shchapov." Viestnik Evropy, (1876), pp. 450-51.

Obruchev, V. A. Grigorii Nikolaevich Potanin. Zhizn' i deiatel'nost' (The Life and Deeds of Grigory Nikolaevich Potanin). Mosocw and Leningrad, 1947.

Oldenburg, S. "Ne dovol'no. K vos'midesiatilietiiu Grigor'ia Nikolaevicha Potanina 21 sentiabria 1915 goda" (It's Not Enough. On the Occasion of G. N. Potanin's 80th Birthday, September 21, 1915). Russkaia Mysl', (November 1915) no. 11, p. 1-11.

Papazian, Dennis. "Nicholas Ivanovich Kostomarov: Russian Historian, Ukrainian Nationalist, Slavic Federalist." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1966.

Podol'skaia, L. Ia. "Dnevnik V. I. Vagina kak istoricheskii istochnik" (V. I. Vagin's Diary as an Historical Source). Obshchestvenno-politicheskoe dvizhenie v Sibiri v 1861-1917 gg. Novosibirsk: Akademiia nauk SSSR, Sibirskoe Otdelenie, 1967.

Popov, I. I. "D. A. Klements. (Nekrolog)." Golos Minuvshago, (1914) II: 290-300.

-----. "K 80-ti lietiiu G. N. Potanina. (Potanin i oblastnichestvo)" (On the Occasion of G. N. Potanin's 80th Birthday: Potanin and Regionalism). Golos Minuvshago, (1915) no. 1, pp. 289-302.

-----. "P. M. Golovachev." Golos Minuvshago, (October 1913) no. 10, pp. 321-22.

Biographical Studies (cont.)

Popov, I. I. "Vagin, Vsevolod Ivanovich." Entsiklopedicheskii slovar', VII: 452. St. Petersburg: Granat, n.d.

-----. "Vospominaniia G. N. Potanina" (G. N. Potanin's Reminiscences). Golos Minuvshago, (1913) no. 9, pp. 274-78.

-----. "Zagoskin, Mikhail Vasil'evich." Entsiklopedicheskii slovar', XX: 399-400. St. Petersburg: Granat, n.d.

Popov, I. I. and N. M. Mendel'son. "Iz vospominanii o G. N. Potanine" (From Recollections of G. N. Potanin). Golos Minuvshego, (June 1922) no. 1, pp. 138-57.

Pypin, A. N. "Nekrolog: Nikolai Mikhailovich Iadrintsev." Viestnik Evropy, (1894) 7: 445-48.

Raeff, Marc. Michael Speransky: Statesman of Imperial Russia, 1772-1839. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1957.

Romanenko, V. I. Mirovozzrenie N. A. Serno-Solov'evicha (The World-View of N. A. Serno-Solovyovich). Moscow, 1954.

"Sel'skii, Ilarion Sergieevich." Russkii biograficheskii slovar', XVIII: 293. St. Petersburg, 1904.

Semenov, P. P. "G. N. Potanin." Niva, (1888) no. 5, pp. 117-18.

Semevskii, V. I. "Adelaida Thedorovna Iadrintseva." Russkaia Mysl', (September 1888), pp. 695-96.

-----. "M. V. Butashevich-Petrashevskii." Golos Minuvshago, (August 1913) no. 8.

Semevskii, V. I. M. V. Butashevich-Petrashevskii i Petrashevtsy. Moscow, 1922.

-----. "M. V. Butashevich-Petrashevskii v Sibiri." Golos Minuvshago, (March 1915) no. 3, pp. 18-57; and (May 1915) no. 5, pp. 43-84.

-----. "Nikolai Ivanovich Kostomarov, 1817-1885." Russkaia Starina, (January 1886), pp. 181-212.

-----. "Nieskol'ko slov v pamiat' Nikolaia Mikhailovicha Iadrintseva" (A Few Words in Memory of Nikolai Mikhailovich Yadrintsev). Russkaia Mysl', (1895) I: 29-37.

"Shchapov, Athanasii Prokof'evich." Russkii biograficheskii slovar', XXIV: 1-10. St. Petersburg, 1912.

Biographical Studies (cont.)

Shchegolev, P. E. "Shashkov, Serafim Serafimovich." Entsiklopedicheskii slovar', v. 39, pt. 1, pp. 236-37. St. Petersburg; Brokgaus-Efron, 1903.

-----. "Tainstvennyi uznik. Glava iz knigi ob Aleksieevskom ravelinie" (A Secret Prisoner: A Chapter from the Book on the Alexeev Ravelin). Byloe, (1919) no. 14, pp. 152-207.

"Shestunov, Mikhail Prokop'evich." Russkii biograficheskii slovar', XXIII: 245. St. Petersburg, 1911.

"Shumakher, Petr Vasil'evich." Russkii biograficheskii slovar', XXIII: 536. St. Petersburg, 1911.

"Slovtsov, Petr Andreevich." Russkii biograficheskii slovar', XVIII: 634-37.

"Smies': Minusinskii muzei i N. M. Mart'ianov" (Miscellany: The Minusinsk Museum and N. M. Martyanov). Istoricheskii Viestnik, (1902) 87: 1196-1199.

Sullivan, Joseph L. "Count N. N. Muraviev-Amursky." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1955.

Sulotskii, A. "Petr Andreevich Slovtsov." Chteniia v Imperatorskom Obshchestvie istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitetie, (1873) no. 3, pp. 130-40.

Sventitskaia, M. "Vospominanie o G. N. Potanine" (A Recollection of G. N. Potanin). Severnaia Aziia, (1927) bks. 5-6, pp. 114-22.

Terent'ev, A. "N. M. Iadrintsev. (K sorokaletiiu so dnia smerti)" (N. M. Yadrintsev: On the Fortieth Anniversary of His Death). Sibirskie Ogni, (1934) no. 6, pp. 132-43.

Vegman, V. "Episod iz zhizni A. Shchapova. (Po neopublikovannym materialam)" (An Episode from the Life of A. Shchapov: According to Unpublished Sources). Sibirskie Ogni, (January-April 1926) nos. 1-2, pp. 137-46.

Vengerov, S. A. "Abramov, Nikolai Aleksandrovich." Kritiko-bibliograficheskii slovar', I: 18-21. St. Petersburg, 1889.

-----. "Adrianov, Aleksandr Vasil'evich." Kritiko-bibliograficheskii slovar', I: 127-28. St. Petersburg, 1889.

-----. "Agathonov, Nikolai Iakovlevich." Kritiko-bibliograficheskii slovar', I: 108, 911-14. St. Petersburg, 1889.

Biographical Studies (cont.)

Vengerov, S. A. "Vagin, Vsevolod Ivanovich." Kritiko-bibliograficheskii slovar', IV: 4-12. St. Petersburg, 1895.

-----. "Zagoskin, Mikhail Vasil'evich." Kritiko-bibliograficheskii slovar', VI: 243-44. St. Petersburg, 1904.

"Veniukov, Mikhail Ivanovich." Entsiklopedicheskii slovar', VI: 4. St. Petersburg: Brokgaus: Efron, 1895.

Venturi, Franco. Il moto decabrista e i fratelli Poggio. Turin: Einaudi, 1956.

Zdobnov, N. "P. I. Makushin (Nekrolog)." Severnaia Aziia, (1926) bk. 4, pp. 103-05.

* * *

Secondary Studies That Pertain to Regionalism

En-Pe. "Proshloe Sibiri. (Potrebnost' v izuchenii ego)" (Siberia's Past and the Need to Study It). Russkaia Starina, (June 1912), pp. 546-54.

"Fevral'skaia revoliutsiia i oblastnichestvo. (Ot redaktsii)" (The February Revolution and Regionalism: An Editorial Comment). Vol'naia Sibir', (1927) no. 2, pp. 1-10.

Gins, G. K. (Guins). "Sibirskoe oblastnichestvo" (Siberian Regionalism). Vozrozhdenie (Paris), (September-October 1950) pt. 11, pp. 144-51.

Izgoev, A. S. "Oblastnichestvo" (Regionalism). Rul', February 10, 1927, no. 1884.

Koval', S. F. "Kharakhter obshchestvennogo dvizheniia 60-kh godov XIX v. v Sibiri" (The Character of the Social Movement in Siberia of the 1860's). Obshchestvenno-politicheskoe dvizhenie v Sibiri v 1861-1917 gg. Novosibirsk: Akademiia nauk SSRR, Sibirskoe Otdelenie, 1967.

Iakushev, I. A. "Ot redaktsii" (From the Editors). Vol'naia Sibir', (1927) no. 1, pp. 1-14.

Svatikov, S. G. Rossiia i Sibir'. (K istorii sibirskogo oblastnichestva v XIX v.) (Russia and Siberia: On the History of Siberian Regionalism in the 19th Century). Prague, 1930.

Utechin, S. V. "Regionalism." Everyman's Concise Encyclopaedia of Russia, pp. 452-53. London: J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1961.

Secondary Studies That Pertain to Regionalism (cont.)

Utechin, S. V. Russian Political Thought: A Concise History, ch. 8 (Regionalism, Anarchism, and Syndicalism). New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1964.

Venturi, Franco. Il populismo russo. 2 vols. Turin: Einaudi, 1952.

-----. Roots of Revolution: A History of the Populist and Socialist Movement in Nineteenth Century Russia, esp. chs. 6 and 13. Translated by Francis Haskell. New York: Universal Library, Grosset & Dunlap, 1966.

Vetoshkin, M. "Sibirskoe oblastnichestvo" (Siberian Regionalism). Sovremennyi Mir, (1913) 3: 119-39.

* * *

Other Secondary Sources

Armstrong, Terence. Russian Settlement in the North. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.

Baikalov, Anatole V. "The Conquest and Colonisation of Siberia," Slavonic and East European Review, vol. X (April 1932), pp. 557-71.

-----. "Siberia since 1894." Slavonic and East European Review, vol. XI (January 1933), pp. 328-40.

Bazilevich, V. "Oblastnoe delenie Sibiri v proekhtakh dekabristov" (The Regional Division of Siberia in Decembrist Draft Plans). Sibir' i dekabristy. Stat'i, materialy, neizdannye pis'ma, bibliografiia. Edited by M. K. Azadovskii, M. E. Zolotarev, and B. G. Kubalov. Irkutsk, 1925, pp. 41-46.

Billington, James. The Icon and the Axe: An Interpretive History of Russian History. New York: Knopf, 1965.

Binkley, Robert C. Realism and Nationalism, 1852-1871. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1963.

Coquin, Fr.-X. La Sibérie. Peuplement et immigration paysanne au XIXe siècle. Paris: Institut d'Études Slaves, 1969.

Erlich, Victor. "Images of Siberia." Reprint from the Slavic and East European Journal, n.d., pp. 243-50.

Firsov, N. N. Chteniia po istorii Sibiri. (Readings in Siberian History). Pt. 2, Moscow, 1921.

Other Secondary Sources (cont,)

Gurevich, A. V. "Dekabristy v sibirskoi ssylke i Pushkin" (Pushkin and the Decembrists in Siberian Exile). A. S. Pushkin i Sibir', pp. 23-43. Moscow and Irkutsk, 1937.

-----. "Staraia Sibir' i Pushkin" (Early Siberia and Pushkin). A. S. Pushkin i Sibir', pp. 44-62. Moscow and Irkutsk, 1937.

Hans, Nicholas. History of Russian Educational Policy, 1701-1917. New York: Russell and Russell, 1964.

Haskett, Jeanne M. "The Decembrists in Siberian Exile." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1962.

Hecht, David. Russian Radicals Look to America, 1825-1894. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1947.

Iakushev, I. A. "Sem'desiat piat' let nauchnoi raboty. (K iubileiu V.-Sib. otdela russkogo geograficheskogo obshchestva). 1851-1926" (Seventy-five Years of Scholarly Work: In Commemoration of the Jubilee of the East Siberian Section of the Russian Geographical Society, 1851-1926). Vol'naia Sibir', (1927) no. 2, pp. 161-65.

-----. Sibir' v tsifrakh (po sovremennym dannym) (Siberia in Figures: According to Recent Data). Prague, 1931.

-----. "K trekhsotpiatidesiatiletiiu Sibiri" (On Siberia's 350th Anniversary). Sibirskii Arkhiv (Prague), (1932) IV: 145-54.

Istoriia Sibiri s drevneishikh vremen do nashikh dnei v piati tomakh (A History of Siberia from Earliest Times to the Present in Five Volumes). Vol. II (Sibir' v sostave feodal'noi Rossii), and vol. III (Sibir' v epokhu kapitalizma). Leningrad, 1968.

Janik, Michał. Dzieje polaków na Syberji. Cracow, 1928.

Jewsiewicki, Wacław, Na syberyskim zesłaniu. Warsaw, 1959.

Johnson, William H. E. Russia's Educational Heritage. Pittsburgh: Carnegie Press, 1950.

Koval', S. F. "Revoliutsionnaia deiatel'nost' pol'skikh politicheskikh ssyl'nykh v Sibiri v 60-e gody XIX v." (Revolutionary Activity of Polish Political Exiles in Siberia in the 1860's). Ekonomicheskoe i obshchestvenno-politicheskoe razvitie Sibiri v 1861-1917 gg. Novosibirsk, 1965.

Kubalov, B. G. "Sibirskoe obshchestvo i dekabristy" (Siberian Society and the Decembrists). Katorga i Ssylka, (1925) no. 21, bk. 8, pp. 139-71.

Other Secondary Sources (cont.)

Leikina-Svirskaia, V. R. "O kharakhtere vosstaniia ssyl'nykh poliakov na Baikal'e v 1866 g." (The Nature of the Uprising of Exiled Poles along Lake Baikal in 1866). Istoricheskie Zapiski, (1962) 72; 229-45.

Leslie, R. F. Polish Politics and the Revolution of November 1830. London: Athlone Press, 1956.

Mazour, Anatole G. The First Russian Revolution, 1825: The Decembrist Movement, Its Origins, Development and Significance. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1937.

-----. Modern Russian Historiography. Princeton, N. J.: Van Nostrand Co., 1958.

Mirsky, D. S. A History of Russian Literature from Its Beginnings to 1900. New York: Vintage Books, 1958.

Nikolaev, V. I. "Sibirskaia periodicheskaia pechat' i politicheskaia ssylka" (The Siberian Periodical Press and Political Exile). Katorga i Ssylka, (1928) no. 41, bk. 4, pp. 101-19; and no. 43, bk. 6, pp. 96-122.

-----. "Sibirskaia politicheskaia ssylka i izuchenie mestnogo kraia" (Siberian Political Exile and the Study of Local Areas). Katorga i Ssylka, (1927) no. 34, bk. 5, pp. 87-116.

Ol'shanskii, P. Dekabristy i pol'skoe natsional'no-osvoboditel'noe dvizhenie (Decembrists and the Polish National Liberation Movement). Moscow, 1959.

P--v, Ia. "Spisok periodicheskikh izdanii (na russkom iazykie) poiavivshikh s 1856 po 1880 god" (A List of Periodicals in Russian Published between 1856 and 1880). Istoricheskii Viestnik, (April 1880), pp. 897-904.

Postnov, Iu. S. "Gazeta 'Sibir'' i irkutskii teatr 70-kh godov XIX v." (The Newspaper Siberia and Irkutsk Theater in the 1870's). Obshchestvenno-politicheskoe dvizhenie v Sibiri v 1861-1917 gg., pp. 116-120. Novosibirsk, 1967.

Raeff, Marc. The Decembrist Movement. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1966.

-----. Siberia and the Reforms of 1822. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1956.

Semyonov, Y. N. Siberia: Its Conquest and Development. Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1963.

Other Secondary Sources (cont.)

Semevskii, V. I. "Iz istorii obshchestvennykh idei v Rossii v kontsie 40-kh godov" (From the History of Social Ideas in Russia in the Late 1840's). Na slavnom postu.(1860-1900). Literaturnyi Sbornik posviashchennyi N. K. Mikhailovskomu. St. Petersburg, 1900.

Treadgold, Donald W. The Great Siberian Migration: Government and Peasant in Resettlement from Emancipation to the First World War. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1957.

Tsetlin, Mikhail. Dekabristy (The Decembrists). Paris: Sovremennyia Zapiski, 1933.

Tupper, Harmon. To the Great Ocean: Siberia and the Trans-Siberian Railroad. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1965.

Yarmolinsky, Avrahm. Road to Revolution. A Century of Russian Radicalism. New York: Collier Books, 1962.