

Professionals or Bureaucrats? Pedagogues and the State during Russia's Great Reforms

AOSHIMA YOKO

INTRODUCTION: A TANGLED RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROFESSIONALS AND THE BUREAUCRACY IN RUSSIA

Riasanovsky argued that the monolithic unity between the modernizing state and educated Russian society in the "Age of Reason" since the reforms of Peter the Great was broken off in the 1840s and 1850s, and was never restored after the split.¹ Is it not possible, however, to say that the alliance between them might have lasted longer, just in another form? The harmonic relationship between enlightened despots and refined nobility was already going through changes as a result of the emergence of professional officialdom by the eve of the Great Reforms (in the second quarter of the nineteenth century).² It is well known that it was these emerging bureaucrats that led the Great Reforms, taking advantage of the changing atmosphere after the death of Nicholas I and Russia's defeat in the Crimean war.³ These "enlightened bureaucrats," as Lincoln pointed out, could not obtain the stable support of educated society outside the bureaucracy in the Great Reforms.⁴ Instead of cooperating with the educated society outside the bureaucracy, the bureaucrats created their own support network made up of professional groups, who were all close to, or

-
- 1 Nicholas V. Riasanovsky, *A Parting of Ways: Government and the Educated Public in Russia, 1801-1855* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976).
 - 2 Walter M. Pintner, "The Social Characteristics of the Early Nineteenth-Century Russian Bureaucracy," *Slavic Review* 29:3 (1970), pp. 429-443; W. Bruce Lincoln, "The Genesis of an 'Enlightened' Bureaucracy in Russia, 1825-1856," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 20:3 (1972), pp. 321-330; Idem, "The Ministers of Nicholas I: A Brief Inquiry into Their Backgrounds and Service Careers," *Russian Review* 34:3 (1975), pp. 308-323; Зайончковский П.А. Правительственный аппарат самодержавной России. М., 1978; Walter M. Pintner and Don K. Rowney, *Russian Officialdom: The Bureaucratization of Russian Society from the Seventeenth to the Twentieth Century* (London: Macmillan Press, 1980).
 - 3 W. Bruce Lincoln, "Russia's 'Enlightened' Bureaucrats and the Problem of State Reform, 1848-1856," *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique* 12:4 (1971), pp. 410-421; Idem, *In the Vanguard of Reform: Russia's Enlightened Bureaucrats 1825-1861* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1982); Idem, *The Great Reforms: Autocracy, Bureaucracy, and the Politics of Change in Imperial Russia* (DeKalb, Ill.: Northern Illinois University Press, 1990).
 - 4 Lincoln, *In the Vanguard of Reform*. Also see Hans J. Torke, "Continuity and Change in the Relations between Bureaucracy and Society in Russia, 1613-1861," *Canadian Slavic Studies* 4 (1971), pp. 457-476; M. Raeff, "The Bureaucratic Phenomena of Imperial Russia, 1700-1905," *American Historical Review* 84:2 (1979), pp. 399-411.

even inside the bureaucracy. In other words, a new alliance between bureaucrats and professionals emerged in the Great Reforms.

An alliance between bureaucrats and professionals itself was not peculiar to Russia, but rather common in Western countries. In recent years, academic concern with professionals has been growing because professionalization is one of the main factors that influenced the modernizing process, and is also one of the crucial elements that constitute the middle class in modern society. A notable finding of the new studies on professionals is that the ideology of "free professions" has been revised and state control has begun to be thought of not as contradictory to the development of professions, but possibly even as a crucial factor in it, especially in the Continental nations.⁵ This new perspective on professionals has shed light on a different aspect of Russian history.⁶ The traditional view underlined the overwhelming power of the Russian state and the weakness or absence of a middle class in Russian society, which gave rise to the revolutions. In contrast, recent studies of Russian professions have shown that professionals actually developed and expanded in late tsarist Russia, accompanied by strong state initiative and control.

Yet there were some differences between Russia and Western countries. According to Bailes, while professionals in other European countries made use of state intervention to fight against "the laissez-faire ideology of free markets and nonstate intervention," Russian professionals, though they made use of state power to advance their own ends, still suffered somewhat from this state intervention itself.⁷ In other words, the bureaucracy did not so much function as a mediator for Russian professionals from the outside, like it did for their Western counterparts, but rather patronized and even assimilated the professionals inside the bureaucracy. On the other hand, this swollen bureaucracy model choked the autonomous activities of professionals, but on the other hand, it worked very effectively as a modernizing agent and "a dynamic historical counterpart to the structures of capitalism in the West."⁸

5 For example, Magali S. Larson, *The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977); Gerald L. Geison, ed., *Professions and the French State, 1700-1900* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984); Konrad H. Jarausch, *The Unfree Professions: German Lawyers, Teachers, and Engineers, 1900-1950* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990); Charles E. McClelland, *The German Experience of Professionalization: Modern Learned Professions and Their Organizations from the Early Nineteenth Century to the Hitler Era* (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

6 Edith W. Clowes, Samuel D. Kassow, and James L. West, eds., *Between Tsar and People: Educated Society and the Quest for Public Identity in Late Imperial Russia* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991); Harley D. Balzer, ed., *Russia's Missing Middle Class: The Professions in Russian History* (Armonk: M.E. Sharpe, 1996).

7 Kendal E. Bailes, "Reflections on Russian Professions," in *Russia's Missing Middle Class*, pp. 44-46. Also, see: Harley D. Balzer, "Introduction," in *Russia's Missing Middle Class*, pp. 3-8.

8 Daniel T. Orlovsky, "Professionalism in the Ministerial Bureaucracy on the Eve of the February Revolution of 1917," in *Russia's Missing Middle Class*, pp. 268-269.

The Russian bureaucracy swallowed professionals, however, not merely because it wanted to do so from the fear of professionals' independent activities, but rather because professionals themselves hoped to be inside the bureaucracy. This is the main focus of this paper. The tendency of social groups to connect with state institutions was one of the crucial characteristics of the state-society structure in Russian history. According to G.L. Freeze, in nineteenth-century Russia, a particular social group gathered spontaneously, and tended to establish close ties with a particular state bureau, in order to have their interests reflected in policies. Freeze refers to such a social group as *soslovie* [estate], which he says implied not a fixed and closed hereditary "caste," but a relatively new social group (at the beginning of nineteenth century), including a professional group.⁹ Such a group, says Freeze, "in contrast to Western estates, may have lacked autonomous social organization, but its close ties to the state provided a legal and serviceable substitute."¹⁰ But having said that, as these social groups – especially professional groups – grew, they came to hope to have their own independent activities. As a result, they faced a difficult dilemma: "to free themselves from the tutelage of the state, while still using the state for their own ends."¹¹

Such a tangled relationship between the bureaucracy and social groups, including professionals, not only accelerated the modernization of Russia, but also generated an important dynamism, born out of relationship structure's innate contradictions and the tension between those involved in the relationship and those outside of it. Earlier studies have explained sufficiently well the characteristics of the relationship between the state and professionals in late tsarist Russia, but they have not fully shown how the relationship emerged. As mentioned above, Russian professionals started to emerge around the time of the Great Reforms. At this embryonic stage, they aspired to be protected in-

9 Gregory L. Freeze, "The *Soslovie* (Estate) Paradigm and Russian Social History," *American Historical Review* 91:1 (1986), pp. 11-36. Reiber argued that occupational or opinion groups started to influence the government in the Great Reforms. While Freeze explained this kind of social group by using the historical term *soslovie*, Reiber called this group a "political interest group." Alfred J. Reiber, "Interest-group Politics in the Era of the Great Reforms," in Ben Eklof, John Bushnell, and Larissa Zakharova, eds., *Russia's Great Reforms, 1855-1881* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994), pp. 58-83. About the relationship between Russian professionals and *soslovie*, see also Charles E. Timberlake, "Higher Learning, the State, and the Professions in Russia," in Konrad H. Jarausch, ed., *The Transformation of Higher Learning, 1860-1930* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), pp. 321-344. Mironov also argued that, referring to the Russian state as "the leader of modernization," at the same time, many social groups, which influenced governmental policies, were emerging in the second half of the nineteenth century. This interaction between the state and society led to creating a civil society. Миронов Б.Н. Социальная история России периода империи (XVIII-начало XX в.): генезис личности, демократической семьи, гражданского общества и правового государства. Т. 2. СПб., 2000. Гл. X.

10 Freeze, "The *Soslovie* (Estate) Paradigm," p. 25.

11 Bailes, "Reflections on Russian Professions," p. 45.

side the state and by the state. Influenced by this aspiration, the framework for their status and activities was formed, and it was this framework that caused the tangled relationship and the aforementioned dilemma. This paper will attempt to describe this process, that is, how Russian professionals got into the tangled relationship with the state during the Great Reforms, using the example of Russian pedagogues, focusing on those under the Ministry of Public Instruction (MNP) in particular.

WERE RUSSIAN PEDAGOGUES PROFESSIONALS OR BUREAUCRATS?

Pedagogues under the MNP were trained early on by the government, in order to manage the new general education system that Alexander I introduced in the early nineteenth century, the last years of the Age of Reason. During the first half of the nineteenth century, however, this system remained small scale, because the main educational system was shifted to specialized education for each specialized occupation (officers, the clergy, legal officials, and so on).¹² Yet after Russia's defeat in the Crimean war, the necessity of educating Russian society as a whole was recognized by everybody, including the new tsar, the enlightened bureaucrats, opinion leaders, and educated society in general. In this atmosphere, the MNP started to reorganize and expand the general education system, holding up N.I. Pirogov's slogan "education common to all mankind."¹³ At the same time, the professional teaching corps for managing this new system also started to be expanded. As a result of the educational reforms of the Great Reforms, the social and economic status of pedagogues under the MNP was heightened and guaranteed by the state, and an academic background was strictly required for those wishing to be pedagogues. Delineating this process of pedagogues becoming professionals is interesting in understanding the whole process of modernization and professionalization in Russia, if we consider the fact that pedagogues under the MNP were themselves a leading group of the enlightenment, and also that the educational system would regulate the formation of other professionals.

Prominent studies of the educational reforms in the Great Reforms or teacher groups of the second half of the nineteenth century have already been published. There are, however, some weak points in the previous historiography. First, this earlier body of studies often examined Russian schools and pedagogues in the Great Reforms separately by educational level, that is, el-

12 About specialized education in Russia, see *Владимирский-Буданов М.Ф. Государство и народное образование в России XVIII века*. Ярославль. 1874; Hashimoto, Nobuya, "19 seiki zenhan Rossia ni okeru kyouiku no mibunsei-genri to elite gakkou [The Estate Principle in Education and Schools for Elites in Russia in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century]," *Kyoto-furitsu daigaku gakujutsu hokoku, jinbun-syakai* 51 (1999), pp. 185-218.

13 Пирогов Н.И. Вопросы Жизни // Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения (ЖМНП). 1856. Ч. 91. С. 339-380.

elementary, secondary, and higher education.¹⁴ Such an analytical framework tends to overlook a certain type of uniformity of Russian pedagogues, who shared characteristics as a vanguard of enlightenment from above. Originally, the educational system under the MNP had been a single system (universities, gymnasia, county schools, and parish schools, all treated as a whole), and there was not really a concept of such a clear division among “higher,” “secondary,” and “elementary.”¹⁵ It should be noted that elementary schools were included into the same system as universities. In Russian society, the Russian Orthodox Church did not traditionally conduct popular education very much; thus, when the state approached enlightening society, it had to create elementary-level education from the first as well as higher education. Therefore, in contrast to Western countries, where elite education (higher education) and popular education (elementary education) had different historical roots, in Russia, both of them were introduced by the state as one system of enlightenment from above, and all pedagogues under the system were supposed to be state officials. During the Great Reforms, the separation between elite education and popular education was finally introduced following the Emancipation

14 *Эймонтова Р.Г.* Университетская реформа 1863 г. // Исторические записки. 70. 1965. С. 163-196; *ее же.* Русские университеты на грани двух эпох. М., 1985; *ее же.* Русские университеты на путях реформы шестидесятые годы XIX века. М., 1993; *Смирнов В.З.* Реформа начальной и средней школы в 60-х годах XIX в. М., 1954; *Ганелин Ш.И.* Очерки по истории средней школы в России второй половины XIX века. Второе изд. М., 1954; William L. Mathes, “The Struggle for University Autonomy in the Russian Empire during the First Decade of the Reign of Alexander II (1855-1866),” Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in political science (Columbia University, 1966); Winfried A. Kohls, “The State-sponsored Russian Secondary School in the Reign of Alexander II: The First Phase: Search for a New Formula, 1855-1864,” Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in history (University of California, 1967); Joachim Krumbholz, *Die Elementarbildung in Russland bis zum Jahre 1864: ein Beitrag zur Entstehung des Volksschulstatuts vom 14. Juli 1864* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1982); Ben Eklof, *Russian Peasant Schools: Officialdom, Village Culture, and Popular Pedagogy, 1861-1914* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986); Scott J. Seregny, *Russian Teachers and Peasant Revolution: The Politics of Education in 1905* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989); Samuel D. Kassow, *Students, Professors, and the State in Tsarist Russia* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989); Christine Ruane, *Gender, Class, and the Professionalization of Russian City Teachers, 1860-1914* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1994); Trude Maurer, *Hochschullehrer im Zarenreich: Ein Beitrag zur Russischen Sozial- und Bildungsgeschichte* (Köln: Böhlau Verlag, 1998).

15 The office under the MNP was divided according not to educational level, but educational district by the middle of the nineteenth century. At the time of the reform of the MNP in 1863, the office started to be organized by educational level. In fact, the border between higher, secondary, and elementary education was changeable. For example, the gymnasium was thought to be higher education before the Great Reforms, but since then, began to be regarded as secondary. Российская Национальная Библиотека, Рукописный отдел (РНБ ОР) ф. 531 [Норов А.С.], д. 46, л. 99-104; *Министерство Народного Просвещения. Обзор деятельности отчета Министерства Народного Просвещения.* СПб., 1865. С. 8-15.

Reform of 1861. In spite of this division, elementary school teachers hoped to still be officials and shared with professors the mentality as a member of one whole enlightenment group.

Besides that, earlier studies tend to see Russian educational history through the traditional prism of the stubbornness of the autocracy and its strong desire to control education. Not only Soviet scholars, such as L.G. Eimontva, Sh.I. Ganelin, V.Z. Smirnov, who considered the Russian government to be an opponent of enlightenment, but also studies in English often emphasized the attempts of the government to control every corner of education and suppress teachers' freedom and creativity.¹⁶ Yet if MNP policies are closely examined, it becomes noticeable that the MNP mainly adopted measures for the encouragement of education. The government was not monolithic. Russian ministries did not have cabinets, and were each directly responsible to the Tsar. That upper-level decision-making system encouraged conflicts between ministries. On this account, the ministries tended to depend on or connect with specialists or social groups under them to have greater power in the political arena.¹⁷ The MNP was not immune to these conflicts either: it consistently fostered the general education system, except for the years from 1848 to 1855, when it was excluded from the decision-making process of educational policy.¹⁸ After the death of Nicholas I, the MNP successfully persuaded the new tsar of the necessity of general education. Consequently, the MNP gained stronger power in the government, and eagerly constructed their own system. For these reasons, we will pay more attention to MNP measures for encouragement than to the limited achievements of the government as a whole.

16 Studies in English focused on the dilemma of the government, which attempted at once to utilize education and control its development process. See, for example, Patrick L. Alston, *Education and the State in Tsarist Russia* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969); Allen Sinel, *The Classroom and the Chancellery: State Educational Reform in Russia under Count Dmitry Tolstoy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973); James C. MacClelland, *Autocrats and Academics: Education, Culture, and Society in Tsarist Russia* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979).

17 George L. Yaney, *The Systematization of Russian Government: Social Evolution in the Domestic Administration of Imperial Russia, 1711-1905* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1973); Daniel T. Orlovsky, *The Limit of Reform: The Ministry of Internal Affairs in Imperial Russia, 1802-1881* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981); Thomas S. Pearson, *Russian Officialdom in Crisis: Autocracy and Local Self-government, 1861-1900* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989). They call this governmental system the "ministerial system" or "ministerial government." See also Jacob W. Kipp and W. Bruce Lincoln, "Autocracy and Reform: Bureaucratic Absolutism and Political Modernization in Nineteenth-Century Russia," *Russian History* 6:1 (1979), pp. 1-21.

18 MacClelland discusses the effort of the Russian government towards expanding education, and "a fundamental agreement" between "autocratic officials and the academic intelligentsia." MacClelland, *Autocrats and Academics*, p. xiii. As for the period from 1848-1855, see *Рождественский С.В. Последняя страница из истории политики народного просвещения императора Николая I (Комитет графа Блудова 1849-1856 г.г.) // Русский исторический журнал. 3-4. 1917. С. 37-59.*

The attitudes of pedagogues as professionals at the time of the Great Reforms are also not fully revealed in these earlier studies. Traditional studies on educational reforms in the Great Reforms have focused on the legal reform process, and have analyzed how the Russian educational system became closer to the modern educational system, for example, how much university autonomy was achieved, the democratization of higher learning, the creation of a united elementary school system, the institution of compulsory education, and so on.¹⁹ In this conventional analysis, opinions of teachers were at times examined, but mainly interpreted in terms of educational or political ideas to explain the aforementioned concepts; teachers' power strategies as professionals is usually ignored. On the other hand, Eklof, Seregny, Kassow, Ruane, and Maurer have investigated the attitudes and activities of teachers around 1905, but they mention the Great Reforms only in passing.²⁰

With the above-mentioned issues in mind, we will focus on the measures for the encouragement of the MNP and teachers' attitude as professionals in the Great Reforms, and show that it was pedagogues' demands that caused the tangled relationship between pedagogues and bureaucracy. Pedagogues were heavily dependent on the state during the Great Reforms. The main strategy shared by all levels of pedagogues was, above all, to have their social status and salary from the state guaranteed, and create their basic framework for professional activities, even within the state administration. This was because as there was so little acceptance of the general education system within general society or the government, and there could be little expectation of support from the traditional estate groups and local officials, who were outsiders to education. In addition to that, they believed they were performing the significant task of enlightening Russian society, as mandated by the state. Pedagogues, therefore, as they became aware of their professional consciousness, demanded a guarantee of their firm status as part of this important corps of the state.

When the Russian professorate requested that the state authorize this quasi-professional corporation, they did not support their petition with modern ideas, such as academic freedom or free professions. Rather, they articulated their status as *soslovie*, based on the charter from Alexander I, and attempted to

19 Эймонта. Университетская реформа 1863 г.; *ее же*. Русские университеты на путях реформы; Алешинцев И.А. Гимназическое образование в России. СПб., 1911. Ч. 3; Смирнов. Реформа начальной и средней школы; Ганелин. Очерки по истории средней школы в России; Nicholas Hans, *History of Russian Educational Policy (1701-1917)* (New York: Russell&Russell Inc, 1964), pp. 92-109; Mathes, "The Struggle for University Autonomy"; Kohls, "The State-sponsored Russian Secondary School"; Willian H.E. Johnson, *Russia's Educational Heritage* (New York: Ostagon books, 1969); Krumbholz, *Die Elementarbildung in Russland bis zum Jahre 1864*.

20 Eklof, *Russian Peasant Schools*; Seregny, *Russian Teachers and Peasant Revolution*; Kassow, *Students, Professors, and the State*; Ruane, *Gender, Class, and the Professionalization*; Maurer, *Hochschullehrer im Zarenreich*. Maurer elucidated the legal and social status of the professorate across the nineteenth century in detail as well.

secure this status for themselves. Moreover, gymnasium teachers tried to gain privileged status, following the example of the professorate. Considering “the *soslovie* paradigm” in Freeze’s argument, the case of teachers will give us an interesting example of professionals having privileged status though the *soslovie*, and then getting into a tangled relationship with the state.²¹

The following sections will examine how university professors and gymnasium teachers obtained their professional status by being inside the bureaucracy, and in addition, to clarify and contextualize these two professional groups, the last chapter will refer to elementary school teachers, who did not get privileged professional status. Pedagogues, the object of this paper, were not large in number. In 1865, there were 285 professors (including administrators), and in 1863, 2337 gymnasium teachers. The number of elementary school teachers was unknown, but the number of schools under the MNP was 692 in 1862-1863 and usually, each school had one teacher. Teachers were a small social group and did not have enough power in society at that time. The important point, however, is that, even though they were a small group in number, they had influence on the reform process by commenting on governmental bills regarding new educational laws, which settled their professional status.²² Meanwhile, we do not have enough information about the social background of teachers. However, we can assume that their origins were neither noble nor uniform. According to Eimontva, among 423 university teachers in 1854-1862, there were only 149 (35 percent) sons of nobility. Others came evenly from the clergy, merchants, soldiers, foreigners, tax burden estates, and so on. Also, Ruane’s data of the social background of secondary school teachers in St. Petersburg and Moscow from 1840 to 1889 show that sons of nobles were not predominant at all. In fact, an equally high percentage was occupied by the clergy, merchants, soldiers, and foreigners. More importantly was that they made remarks about reforms from an occupational standpoint. Therefore, it is possible to assume that teachers were a group who lived exclusively on

21 Freeze, “The *Soslovie* (Estate) Paradigm.” In view of the closeness with bureaucracy and the linkage with “the formerly feudal idea of Stand,” Russian professions were similar to German professions. Timberlake, “Higher Learning, the State, and the Professions”; McClelland, *The German Experience of Professionalization*; Jarausch, *The Unfree Professions*, p. 4.

22 Приложения // Обзор деятельности министерства народного просвещения и подведомственных ему учреждений в 1862, 63, и 64 годах. СПб., 1865. С. 227-229; Материалы для истории и статистики наших гимназий. СПб., 1864. С. 16-23, 74-75; Таблица, показывающая число начальных народных училищ разных наименований и ведомств и число учащихся в оных в 1862-1863 г. в тех губерниях, на которые предполагено распространить новое положение о сих училищах // Государственный совет, департамент законов. Материалы. Т. 24: Дело по проекту положения о начальных народных училищах. СПб., 1863. The documents of the MNP showed that there were 1846 elementary schools under the MNP in 1865. Обзор деятельности министерства народного просвещения. С. 320-327.

their knowledge and education, not their origins, and were dependent on their occupation.²³

UNIVERSITY TEACHERS AS “THE SCHOLARLY ESTATE”

What professors in the Great Reforms sought was initial official recognition of the Russian university system in 1804. Following two laws that reorganized old historic universities in Derpt (1802) and Vil’no (1803), the general university system was established by laws in 1804, through which new universities were founded at Khar’kov and Kazan (later in St. Petersburg in 1819), and Moscow University was reorganized.²⁴ At the same time as the new laws, special charters for the universities were promulgated by Alexander I. There, the universities were defined as “an estate of scholarly men (*soslovie uchenykh myzhei*)” under the direct auspices of the emperor. The charters gave rights and privileges to this “estate,” such as the right to elect their rectors, to decide personnel affairs and internal rules, and rights of publication and censorship. The main organizational element of this “estate” was collegiate university councils made up of all the teachers in a given university. This council had a right to choose their colleagues by themselves. And, as members of the council, both professors and assistant professors were regarded as state servants of seventh- and eighth-level rank, respectively.²⁵

These autonomous rights of the universities were based on the German university model, but were also closely connected with their administrative role in the newly introduced general educational system.²⁶ Each university was built in the central city of a given educational district (originally six), and in addition to the management of its own affairs, was supposed to manage educational and administrative matters concerning all secondary and elementary schools in the district.²⁷ In other words, the Russian university was established not only as a privileged estate to spread the new general education, but also as an administrative organization under the MNP.

In practice, the management of a whole district was next to impossible for the professorate, both because the number of professors was not nearly great

23 *Эймонтва*. Русские университеты на грани двух эпох. С. 220-222; Ruane, *Gender, Class, and the Professionalization*, p. 202. About village teachers after the 1880s, see Eklof, *Russian Peasant Schools*, chap. 7.

24 Полное собрание Законов (ПСЗ). Собр. I. № 20551 (1802/12/12), № 20701 (1804/4/4), № 20765 (1803/5/13), № 21497, № 21498, № 21499, № 21500 (1804/11/5); № 27675 (1819/2/8).

25 ПСЗ. I. № 21502, № 21503, № 21504 (1804/11/5).

26 As for the borrowing of the German university model for Russia, see James T. Flynn, *The University Reform of Tsar Alexander I, 1802-1835* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1988), pp. 16-21.

27 ПСЗ. I. № 20407 (1802/9/8), № 20597 (1803/1/26), № 21501 (1804/11/5). About the details of this university establishment, see; *Петров Ф.А.* Формирование системы университетского образования в России. Т. 1. М., 2002.

enough and many of them were non-Russian. The MNP, therefore, started to install its own administrators – curators of educational districts – and undertook the management of given districts without help from the professorate beginning in the 1830s. This “bureaucratic centralization” freed university teachers from the heavy burden of district management, but partially reduced their autonomous rights concerning internal university problems, as well.²⁸ In addition, in the 1830s and 1840s, the MNP set a strict educational requirement (a doctor’s degree) for a person who wished to be a professor, and at the same time, promoted the training of new Russian professors. Consequently, the number of professors gradually increased. By the eve of the Great Reforms, the professorate started to become a substantial group in terms of being able to perform autonomous activities.²⁹

It was the MNP that stimulated the awakening of the professional consciousness of the professorate. In the first years of the Great Reforms, the MNP called for the professorate to play an active role in the educational administration. In this period, the MNP set about uniting all educational institutions under the jurisdiction of the ministry. Minister A.S. Norov explained that the unification of all educational systems was critical for bridging a multiplicity of gaps between “the moral and social beliefs and interests, [as well as] all local and territorial patriotisms and attachments” in the Russian state.³⁰ For this reconstruction of the education system, the MNP needed the help and participation of professors. In fact, the MNP invited professors to be part of the inquiry commission in the ministry, which was charged with the revision of the existing educational laws. Also, the elected professors from the university councils

28 Traditional historiography considered this reduction of university autonomy as “reactionary” politics, but Whittaker and Flynn revised this view and reevaluated the 1830s educational reforms. Cynthia H. Whittaker, *The Origins of Modern Russian Education: An Intellectual Biography of Count Sergei Uvarov, 1786-1855* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1984), pp. 156-160; Flynn, *The University Reform of Tsar Alexander I*, pp. 217-241; ПСЗ. Собр. II. № 8262 (1835/6/25), № 8337 (1835/6/26). Recently, F.A. Petrov revised the formation of the university system in the first half of the nineteenth century and reached the conclusion that the 1830s university reforms preserved the core part of university autonomy and under the new system, Russian universities developed well, which is the same conclusion as Whittaker and Flynn. *Петров Ф.А. Формирование системы университетского образования в России. Т. 3. М., 2003.*

29 There were 285 teachers and administrators in universities (Moscow, St. Petersburg, Kazan, Khar’kov, St. Vladimir [Kiev]) in 1865, but 222 posts were still vacant. In this sense, the professorate was still in the making. *Приложения // Обзор деятельности министерства народного просвещения. С. 227-229.* Petrov explained that in the 1840s, reform-minded (not revolutionary) professors developed, which paved the way to the reform of the 1860s. *Петров Ф.А. Формирование системы университетского образования в России. Т. 4. Ч. 1. М., 2003.*

30 Российский государственный исторический архив (РГИА), ф. 733 [Министерство народного просвещения], оп. 37, д. 69, л. 8-12.

came to participate in the district council under the curator of each educational district.³¹

The need for partnership with the professorate grew stronger as a result of the university student riots in 1861.³² The MNP thought that the cause of the student riots lay in the inactivity of the professors and their lack of sense of responsibility regarding university matters. For the purpose of improving university conditions, the 1862 bill aimed “to strengthen the autonomous activity (*samodeiatel’nost’*) of the scholarly university estate.” According to the MNP, this principal was meant to impose on universities “more positive duties,” that is, not only “all purely scholastic activity” but also “administrative” activity, closely related to university matters. For, “to impose new duties on the universities will doubtlessly encourage increasing enthusiasm of their respective members.” Consequently, the increasing enthusiasm of teachers would have a desirable influence on students.³³ The MNP intended to generate awareness of the responsibility borne by the professorate regarding university matters. To this end, it tried to widen the authority of the university council by calling it a “scholarly estate.”

The professorate, in turn, welcomed the policy change that arose from the 1862 bill. They took advantage of the offer by the MNP, and tried to further enlarge the authority of the university council. Above all, they insisted on the nonintervention of educational district curators in university matters. They complained that intervention of the curators was the main obstacle to universities charting the right course. The professorate, conceding that it was inactive, ascribed its inactivity to bureaucratization of educational administration after the 1830s. This was not necessarily to say, however, that they demanded independence from the state and the ministry itself. For example, Moscow University and St. Petersburg University professors suggested that the university council be permitted to make proposals directly to the minister as their “chief superior,” passing through the curator as an intermediary administrative power. To put it another way, their goal was to have “a voice of their own” as a collegiate body within the educational administration.³⁴

Khar’kov University professors justified these opinions by referring to the 1804 laws. They argued that the 1804 laws defined the university as an estate, which was “a collegium, that is to say, a corporative body,” authorized by the state and pursuing a “definite civic purpose.” It was thought, therefore, that

31 ПСЗ. II. № 30594 (1856/6/15), № 35578 (1860/3/20).

32 Милютин Д.А. Воспоминания: генерал-фельдмаршала графа Дмитрия Алексеевича Милютин 1860-1862. М., 1999. С. 157-170.

33 The main change in the existing law in this bill was to set the inspector of students under the university council from under the curator. Замечания на проект общего устава императорских Российских университетов (Замечания на проект устава унив.). Ч. I. СПб., 1862. С. 45-50.

34 Замечания на проект устава унив. Ч. I. С. 83-87, 98-99, 244, 251-252, 392-393.

the government should return to this guiding principal for the Russian university system, and protect "the scholarly collegium and its dignity" by weakening the bureaucratic power of the curators.³⁵

D.I. Kachenovskii from Khar'kov University gave one of the most comprehensive arguments on this issue. According to him, the Russian university was established as an "autonomous organization for offering civic education," and therefore, given plentiful rights and privileges from Alexander I. "The university in Russian society has been the institution of the state, and at the same time, of *narod*." Because the university was a state institution, it could have had "civic meaning," different from an "estate spirit." This "civic spirit" in universities implied an entity "in front of which all classes were equal, and in which talent could find defense and support." He insisted, therefore, that the government should restore the autonomy and dignity of "the scholarly estate" and protect it from "alien influence from outside," in order that Russian universities could offer proper "civic education." On the other hand, he pointed out that "the scholarly estate" would not be "states within a state" as in the medieval age. Russian universities "had received capital, laws, and privileges exclusively from the government; the tie between them and the supreme power has not been cut off." Hence, it was quite natural for Russian universities to be placed under a certain amount of governmental control.³⁶ Such ideas as Kachenovskii's became an ideology connecting governmental policy and the demands of the professorate.

The MNP principally accepted requests from the professorate and protected it as a legitimate corporation.³⁷ Minister of Internal Affairs P.A. Valuev was strongly opposed to this policy of the MNP. He suggested reducing state support of the professorate, and opening universities to society by introducing a system in which professors would receive payment from students for each lecture.³⁸ In spite of his opposition, the MNP insisted on protecting the professorate, and allowed professors to be independent from society. The new law in 1863 actually gave back ample rights to the university council, such as decision-making authority over financial problems and student matters. The salary of professors was doubled and the state service rank was raised from seventh to fifth rank. Also, the law confirmed again the necessity of a doctor's degree for candidates for the position of professor.³⁹ Moreover, in the commentary attached to the 1862 bill, the MNP, borrowing from Kachenovskii, affirmed that Russian universities were autonomous corporations, based on the 1804 law.

35 Замечания на проект устава унив. Ч. I. С. 281, 297-300.

36 Замечания на проект устава унив. Ч. I. С. 345-361.

37 The term "scholarly estate" was not used in the new law of 1863. ПСЗ. II. № 39572 (1863/6/18).

38 Замечание на проект университетского устава, представленный министром народного просвещения при всеподданнейшем докладе 15 декабря 1862 г. // Проект общего устава императорских российских университетов. СПб., 1862-1863. С. 4-10.

39 ПСЗ. II. № 39572.

The MNP explained that universities should “be the resource of enlightenment in the state.” In order to accomplish this task, universities should be permitted to develop “according to motives of their own,” not “as a result of alien influences from outside.” At the same time, the ministry used Kachenovskii’s words and stated that it was not society, but the government that made Russian universities, and that the university should be under “certain governmental control.”⁴⁰ Although, due to government criticism, the MNP changed the text and accompanying commentary of the new 1863 law to some degree, the MNP preserved the basic status of the university, which was privileged in society by state patronage and granted certain autonomous rights within officialdom.

The new law, however, did not give the professorate complete independence from the curators or the right to make propositions directly to the minister. This was, to some degree, an inevitable consequence of the professors’ desire to be under state patronage. While the university councils remained an administrative body inside the educational administration, by doing so, the professorate was allowed to secure itself as a corporative body that was independent and privileged within society and officialdom.

SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS – SEARCHING FOR THE UNIVERSITY MODEL

The ideal model for secondary school teachers in the Great Reforms was the Russian university. They tried to obtain autonomous collegiate power for the pedagogical councils in gymnasia, similar to that of the university councils.

There was no tradition in Russian gymnasia of having autonomous councils like those of universities. When the gymnasium system was established in 1804, teachers were supposed to have a meeting once a month per school under the director. These groups, however, were not regarded as collegiate bodies with decision-making authority of their own. In 1828, these bodies were raised to the status of “council of gymnasium,” which consisted of a director and senior teachers. But a council still did not have the right to elect its chairperson and members by itself; the teachers and the directors were nominated by the universities that supervised each gymnasium. In 1835, the right to select directors and teachers shifted from the universities to the curators. As a result, bureaucratic centralization was strengthened.⁴¹

When the Great Reforms started, the MNP tried to foster vigorous support for secondary education in teachers, local administrators, and society. In this period, the most urgent issue for the MNP was reform of the secondary educa-

40 Объяснительная записка к проекту общего устава императорских Российских университетов // Проект общего устава императорских российских университетов. С. 1-32; С проектами общего устава и штатов императорских Российских университетов // Проект общего устава императорских российских университетов. С. 1-22; По поводу нового университетского устава // ЖМНП. 1863. Ч. 119. С. 333-404.

41 ПСЗ. I. № 21501 (1804/11/5); ПСЗ. II. № 2502 (1828/12/8), № 8262 (1835/6/25).

tion system. Because the university system was thought to be relatively well developed, the ministry focused on secondary education as the next stage.⁴² In order to revitalize secondary schools, the MNP gave a great deal of weight to teachers and petitioned Alexander II to reinstate former pension privileges to teachers as early as 1855. Also, in 1859, the MNP obtained a considerably higher budget for the salaries of gymnasium teachers.⁴³

Decentralization of educational administration was also viewed as a means of eliciting the active participation of teachers, local administrators, and society in secondary education. As early as the first bill of 1860, the MNP changed the councils of gymnasium to the "pedagogical council." These new councils were composed of all the teachers at each gymnasium and given decision-making rights including selecting school books, as well as all other decisions regarding student-related issues, etc.⁴⁴ According to the commentary attached to the bill of 1862, the previous system, in which the councils consisted only of senior teachers under the strong control of a director, was against the fundamental educational principal that "all teachers and tutors of educational institutions should work collectively and seek one goal harmoniously."⁴⁵ As a result, the previous system caused teachers to feel apathetic toward their work and perpetuated intellectual stagnation, which, in turn, had a harmful influence on students. In order to change this passive attitude on the part of teachers, the 1862 bill gave the pedagogical councils "the possibility to develop freely, [and] autonomously."⁴⁶ The rights that the 1862 bill granted the councils were greater than those of the 1860 bill: the rights to make teaching plans, to give peer evaluations, and reprimand to teachers, and to decide whether a teacher should stay in the post after twenty-five years of service, to name but a few. The power to appoint and dismiss teachers was also transferred from the curators to the directors in line with the decentralization policy.⁴⁷

42 The ministry thought that the reintroduction of classicism into gymnasias was especially important for creating a firm general education system. Извлечение из отчета министерства народного просвещения за 1857 год // ЖМНП. 1858. Ч. 98. С. 141-145; Извлечение из отчета министерства народного просвещения за 1858 год // ЖМНП. 1859. Ч. 103. С. 138-139. There were 409 teachers and administrators (54 schools) in 1808, 775 (56 schools) in 1825, and 2337 (86 schools) in 1863. Материалы для истории и статистики наших гимназий. С. 16-23, 74-75.

43 ПСЗ. II. № 29195 (1855/4/5); Господину министру народного просвещения // Государственный совет, департамент законов. Материалы. Т. 27: Дело по проекту устава и штатов гимназии и прогимназии 1864 г. СПб., 1864.

44 Проект устава низших и средних училищ, состоящих в ведомстве министерства народного просвещения // ЖМНП. 1860. Ч. 105. С. 129-132.

45 Замечания на проект устава общеобразовательных учебных заведений и на проект общего плана устройства народных училищ (Замечания на проект устава общеобраз. учеб. завед.). Ч. I. СПб., 1862. С. 136.

46 Замечания на проект устава общеобраз. учеб. завед. Ч. I. С. 134.

47 Замечания на проект устава общеобраз. учеб. завед. Ч. I. С. 39, 47-50.

In addition, the 1860 bill created a new organization, *popechitel'nyi sovet* [the trustees' council], composed of representatives from each estate group, "for bringing schools closer to society."⁴⁸ The 1862 bill gave these councils substantial power, such as the right to inspect financial matters of gymnasia and to select the students to be exempted from fees. What the MNP hoped for from this council was to establish a "moral relationship between educational institutions and communities." This was meant to be accomplished by allowing "direct participation of representatives from society in the management of educational institutions" through this council.⁴⁹

At the same time, the 1862 bill suggested one more type of organization to breathe new life into teachers: the provincial school council (*gubernskii uchilishchnii sovet*), after the model of the teachers' congress in Germany. Meetings of these provincial school councils were supposed to be held in each provincial city once a month, gathering all administrators and elected teachers of the secondary schools (including girls' schools) from the entire province. Moreover, any people who wanted to participate were able to take part in the council, even if they were "outsiders."⁵⁰ The aim of these councils was to maintain the "relationship and unification of educational principals among individual educational institutions" in each province, in view of the widening decision-making power of each pedagogical council. The MNP also hoped to develop "healthy pedagogical ideas among people dealing with nurturing the young, or generally people sympathizing with educational work."⁵¹

Judging from these measures, it seems safe to conclude that the MNP tried to distribute administrative powers equally among teachers, local administrators, and society so as to encourage their interest and cooperation in the success of secondary schools. Teachers, however, were interested only in the pedagogical council. What they demanded most was recognition of the pedagogical councils as collegiate organizations, similar to the university councils. The pedagogical councils of Volyn' Gymnasium and Kazan Gymnasium, for example, strongly insisted that managerial positions such as "director" should be mutually elected in the pedagogical council. Otherwise, they said, the pedagogical council would not be "a genuine entity of collegium as a legal organization," but rather just "a sewing factory, where a chief cutter gives out each fixed work, demanding it be executed without any thinking."⁵² What is more, Nemirov Gymnasium criticized the 1862 bill, saying that it did not grant them the power to select their own colleagues. As long as the director had an arbitrary influence on the fate of teachers, there would be division and confrontation among them, and they would not be able to work as a body in soci-

48 Проект устава низших и средних училищ. С. 103.

49 Замечания на проект устава общеобраз. учеб. завед. Ч. 1. С. 143-144

50 Замечания на проект устава общеобраз. учеб. завед. Ч. I. С. 78.

51 Замечания на проект устава общеобраз. учеб. завед. Ч. I. С. 141.

52 Замечания на проект устава общеобраз. учеб. завед. Ч. 1. С. 290-296, Ч. 6. С. 5.

ety. For that reason, they hoped to entrust personnel affairs to the pedagogical council, following the university model. Failing that, they favored restoring the curator's rights, rather than giving rights to the director, who was their direct superior.⁵³ In response to these requests, some local administrators condemned them, remarking that there was no precedent in Russia or abroad for the elective system in secondary schools: "This desire comes from a less than correct comparison between the rights of the gymnasium council and those of the university."⁵⁴

Teachers, along with administrators, thought that the trustees' council was an organization that would violate their rights. The director of the Second Moscow Gymnasium asked why "representatives of various estates" were necessary just because gymnasias were open to all estates and offered general education.⁵⁵ Teachers also felt that the trustees' council "inflicted a loss of importance and significance of the pedagogical council," and "infringed even the autonomy of the pedagogical council."⁵⁶ Some councils insisted that the inviting of outside powers into schools brought conflicts between various powers and disorder into educational institutions, and that therefore, the government would do well to trust in the goodwill and honor of teachers, and rely on their education and pride. They maintained that financial inspection rights and authority over student fee exemption decisions should be returned to the pedagogical council, and that the trustees' council should focus strictly on the raising of school funds.⁵⁷

Meanwhile, teachers generally showed little interest in the provincial councils. Some expressed their approval and added that more teachers should be able to participate in the councils, while others pessimistically predicted that the provincial council system would be just a bureaucratic or formalistic organization.⁵⁸ In general, they rarely mentioned the councils. A Dinaburg Gymnasium teacher asked if Russian pedagogues showed an aspiration to come together and to exchange observations and experiences. He concluded that "this aspiration, which is totally natural among other pedagogues, does not exist among us."⁵⁹

The new law of 1864 resolved these problems in keeping with the views of the teachers. Firstly, the range of autonomous activity of the pedagogical councils was expanded. Secondly, the trustees' councils were discontinued and the only remaining position was that of "honorable trustee," whose duty was simply to provide funds for schools. Thirdly and finally, the provincial

53 Замечания на проект устава общеобраз. учеб. завед. Ч. 3. С. 518-524.

54 Замечания на проект устава общеобраз. учеб. завед. Ч. 1. С. 166-168, 320-331.

55 Замечания на проект устава общеобраз. учеб. завед. Ч. 3. С. 372.

56 Замечания на проект устава общеобраз. учеб. завед. Ч. 2. С. 279.

57 Замечания на проект устава общеобраз. учеб. завед. Ч. 2. С. 279, Ч. 3. С. 429-430.

58 Замечания на проект устава общеобраз. учеб. завед. Ч. 1. С. 377, Ч. 2. С. 113-114, 160, 179, 326, Ч. 5. С. 71.

59 Замечания на проект уст. общеобраз. учеб. завед. Ч. 4. С. 284-285.

councils were dissolved completely.⁶⁰ In the end, the interest of gymnasium teachers was in keeping their status within the administrative organization. In response to their desires, the MNP raised the teachers' salary, heightened their status as state servants (from ninth rank to eighth), and strictly required university-level education for people who wished to be gymnasium teachers. Besides that, the MNP protected the pedagogical councils' authority and its independence from estate groups. The MNP did not, however, grant corporate status to the pedagogical council, not wanting to weaken the directors' authority over teachers. In this sense, their autonomous rights were fewer than those of the professorate, and the pedagogical councils became mere agglomerations of officials. For all that, they still achieved higher status as well as broader and more numerous autonomous rights as professionals than they had previously had.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS – INDEPENDENCE FROM THE STATE

Having examined the cases of the two teacher groups above, we will turn our attention to the case of elementary school teachers, who lost the direct patronage of the state in the Great Reforms.

The schools, which can be categorized as elementary schools under the MNP in the pre-reform period, were parish schools and county schools. These schools, however, were very few and almost exclusively concentrated in and around cities.⁶¹ The main reason for the underdevelopment of elementary schools was, as mentioned at the beginning of this paper, the weakness of the educational tradition provided by the Orthodox Church. At first, the government did not have the idea of taking direct charge of elementary schools and just tried to leave the work to parish priests and landlords.⁶² However, already as early as 1820s, the MNP started to take the initiative in reorganizing elementary schools.

Regarding elementary school teachers, the government from the first considered them as professionals. The new educational laws of 1804 stated county school teachers to be twelfth-rank state servants, also required elementary school teachers to take an examination under county school teachers or gymnasium teachers. In the 1828 law, parish school teachers also were given the rank

60 С проектом устава гимназий и прогимназий // Материалы. Т. 27; ПСЗ. II. № 41472 (1864/11/19).

61 С проектом положения о начальных народных училищах // Материалы. Т. 24. С. 1. In 1862-1863, there were only 692 elementary schools under the MNP. There were 16,907 ecclesiastical elementary schools, the Ministry of Internal Affairs had 4,961 schools, the Ministry of State Domains had 5,492, and the Ministry of the Imperial Household had 2,127. Compared with other state institutions, the MNP had only about a 2 percent share of all elementary schools. Таблица, показывающая число начальных народных училищ разных наименований и ведомств // Материалы. Т. 24.

62 ПСЗ, I. № 20597. С. 4.

of fourteenth-level state servants, and they had to as before take an examination at a county school. And county school teachers were also required to take an examination at a gymnasium.⁶³ In addition, in 1846, educational requirements were clearly stated by a separate regulation for county teachers, and city and village parish school teachers. According to that regulation, in the case of county school teachers, when there was no possibility of finding candidates who had completed all courses of higher education, or at least gymnasium or other secondary education, a special examination as well as teaching practice was to be held. Also, regarding city and village parish school teachers, if there was no possibility of finding candidates who had completed all courses of secondary education, or at least county school education, people who wished to be teachers had to take a special examination as well as teaching practice.⁶⁴ The effectiveness of this regulation was doubtful, but at any rate, it was certain that the MNP considered all levels of educational institutions from parish schools to universities as one whole system, and all levels of teachers from elementary school pedagogues to professors as one continuous hierarchy.⁶⁵ However, in creating the educational system beginning with university level, which was supposed to manage schools of all other levels; elementary schools were the last project to be undertaken. Regarding village schools, they developed in the 1830s but only under other ministries, which had access to rural areas. Teachers in these schools were not professionals; teaching was a side job for priests, retired local officials, widows or daughters of local officials, or other literate area residents.⁶⁶

In the first years of the Great Reforms, the MNP still supposed the elementary school to be somehow connected with secondary schools. At first, the Ministry did not change the basic framework of educational laws, but just tried to extend elementary schools under the previous system.⁶⁷ The situation changed, however, after the emancipation of 1861, which presented the government with the challenge of educating a sudden influx of peasants. The government asked the MNP to create a plan for confronting the issue. In response to this request, though the MNP did not fully develop a clear policy on this issue, it insisted that all elementary schools under various ministries should be integrated under the MNP.⁶⁸ The government agreed with this policy because, given the unification of various categories of peasants into “one vil-

63 ПСЗ. I. № 21501; ПСЗ. II. № 2502.

64 Положение о специальных испытаниях по министерству народного просвещения (1 марта) // ЖМНП. Ч. 50. 1846. С. 116-124.

65 С проектом положения о начальных народных училищах. С. 15, 20.

66 С проектом положения о начальных народных училищах. С. 13, 37. See also Eklof, *Russian Peasant Schools*, chap. 1.

67 Извлечение из отчета министерства народного просвещения за 1858 год. С. 141-142; Проект устава низших и средних училищ. С. 85-116.

68 Замечания на проект устава общеобраз. учеб. завед. Ч. 1. С. 18-19; С проектом положения о начальных народных училищах. С. 2-3.

lage-estates," the corresponding unification of schools was seen as necessary.⁶⁹ Although all schools were not transferred immediately to the authority of the MNP, the range of the elementary schools that the MNP would manage in the future increased considerably. In addition, the task of preparing elementary school teachers was entrusted exclusively to the MNP.⁷⁰

The MNP would have to manage numerous elementary schools, but the budget allocated to the MNP was still far from sufficient even for its existing responsibilities to the university and secondary school systems, much less all three. Also, the MNP did not have effective administrative tools in villages at all. The ministry, therefore, adopted the following policies: the MNP legally abolished the intermediate level of schools – county schools –, and polarized them into pro-gymnasia and *narod* schools. Furthermore, the ministry united the all types of elementary schools under various organizations into *narod* schools. Moreover, the MNP created new administrative organizations, consisting of representatives from various bureaus. On the other hand, the MNP imposed a financial burden mainly on the *zemstvos* (the newly established local governments) and city government.⁷¹ These policies were the first step to uniting all elementary school systems in the Empire, and creating a national education system.⁷²

Elementary school teachers under the MNP, however, were unhappy about the new system. According to the change of elementary school system, the ministry deprived *narod* school teachers of the state service right, which had been granted by the 1828 law. The justification for this measure was the same as that for abolishing county schools: the need to decrease the number of *chinovniki* [officials] in order to reduce the burden on the Treasury. According to the MNP, county schools had become merely a specialized educational institution for producing *chinovniki*, and had thus lost society's trust. The ministry emphasized the burden of elementary school teachers on the Treasury as well. The ministry explained that, though the state service right could be used as "bait" to attract people of talent, their sons were destined, like their fathers, to be *chinovniki*, which would further increase the burden on the Treasury.⁷³ The MNP had created a united legal framework for elementary schools, by which

69 Замечания на проект устава общеобраз. учеб. завед. Ч. 1. С. 119, 21.

70 Объяснительная записка к проекту общего плана устройства народного училищ // Замечания на проект устава общеобраз. учеб. завед. Ч. 1. С. 18-25; ПСЗ. II. №41068 (1864/6/14).

71 ПСЗ. II. № 41086 (1864/7/14), Krumbholz, *Die Elementarbildung in Russland bis zum Jahre 1864*, chap. V; Eklof, *Russian Peasant Schools*, chap. 2.

72 See Krumbholz, *Die Elementarbildung in Russland bis zum Jahre 1864*; Tsukamoto, Tomohiro, "Russia noudo kaiho-ki ni okeru sonraku gakkou seido no saihen to 'kokumin gakkou' [Reorganization of the village school system and 'people's schools' in the period of the peasant reform in Russia]," *Hokkaido-daigaku kyouiku-gakubu kiyou* 42 (1983), pp. 45-69.

73 Замечания на проект устава общеобраз. учеб. завед. Ч. 1. С. 98-100, 130-133.

any private person or group could open a school freely.⁷⁴ At the same time, the ministry decided not to support elementary schools legally and financially.

This low status of elementary schools and their teachers was not rare in other Western countries, but the notable point here was the reaction from teachers to this policy. The elementary school problem attracted a great deal of attention from teachers and administrators. In the discussion regarding the 1862 bill, the debate over the problem was quite spirited. In general, many people insisted that the MNP's policy on elementary school teachers was deeply flawed and that teachers needed greater guarantees from the state. As one might imagine, in the chorus demanding state patronage, some of the loudest (and most persistent) voices were those of the elementary school teachers themselves.

County school teachers hoped to change their county schools into pro-gymnasia, which were closely connected with gymnasia. If they became pro-gymnasium teachers, they could receive almost the same level of privilege as that of gymnasium teachers. Although one teacher said he was anxious about being accepted as a pro-gymnasium teacher as he did not have a good enough educational background, most teachers seemed optimistic about reorganizing their county schools into pro-gymnasia.⁷⁵

Parish school teachers, on the other hand, were offended by the policy. One teacher from Novgorodsever Parish School implored that the MNP to give state service rank to elementary school teachers as "a reward." He insisted that elementary school teachers should be classified as officials, and that such standing was already in their blood. He was particularly concerned about the hereditary rights of state servants. If he lost his status as a state servant, even if the government compensated him with practical rights such as the status of personally honorable citizen, these new rights would not apply to his children. He worried that he would lose the trust of his family.⁷⁶

A Sergiev Lancaster Parish School teacher regarded the loss of state service rank as an "insult" to elementary school teachers. He angrily asked what the reason was that the government regarded the elementary school teacher, who was essential to the state, as "a petty official, who is a burden to the Treasury." He insisted that teachers of elementary schools should be protected by the state in order to heighten their status and authority in the eyes of students' parents. Because elementary school teachers were so humbled and vulnerable, there was no interest in trying to be a teacher other than from a person of lower class such as a townsman. But "a townsman-teacher" could not be accepted and trusted in society. The government, therefore, had to change them from

74 Обзор деятельности министерства народного просвещения. С. 204-214.

75 Замечания на проект устава общеобраз. учеб. завед. Ч. 4. С. 358-360, 437; Замечания на проект устава общеобраз. учеб. завед. Ч. 5. С. 414-416, 420, 429, 440-442, 443-444, 446-447.

76 Замечания на проект устава общеобраз. учеб. завед. Ч. 4. С. 199.

“townsman-teachers” into “official-teachers.” According to this teacher, “society in our country has not had independence that constructs self-consciousness apart from the rewards and titles endowed by the state.”⁷⁷ For these reasons, he claimed that support from the state was indispensable.

In spite of their desperate demands, the new law of 1864 did not guarantee the status of elementary school teachers at all, not even mentioning a minimum wage or educational requirements. Although the MNP widely touted the importance of elementary schools and insisted that all elementary schools should be under the jurisdiction of the MNP, the ministry refused to help elementary schools. The ministry responded coldly to reports from local administrators requesting financial support for elementary schools. The MNP said that it could not afford to offer such support, and added that to maintain elementary schools was the work of the *zemstvo*.⁷⁸

The MNP made a legal framework, and started gradual efforts to train professional elementary school teachers by establishing teachers’ seminaries.⁷⁹ These attempts finally began to bear fruit in the 1890s, and in the early twentieth century, the number of teachers and their activities were rapidly expanded. This was partially because the MNP and other state bureaus did not, or could not, intervene as much as before in school affairs, due to a lack of power, a lack of will, or the conflicts between the many different bureaus.⁸⁰ Moreover, the lack of support from the state led elementary school teachers to seek other ways to protect themselves and develop their professional activities. As the number of elementary school teachers increased, they started to create their own mutual-aid associations at the local level. These organizations nurtured their professional consciousness and developed into the basis of the nationwide teachers’ movement in the first years of the twentieth century.⁸¹ For all that, the lack of direct patronage from the state, and the lack of recognition as a collegiate body was seen by elementary school teachers as an insulting sign of abandonment. Elementary school teachers still belonged to the general education system under the MNP, and shared with higher and secondary education teachers the feeling that they were on a mission to enlighten estate society from above. They were regarded as members of “a divine brotherhood for devoting

77 Замечания на проект устава общеобраз. учеб. завед. Ч. 4. С. 98-101, 455-466; Замечания на проект устава общеобраз. учеб. завед. Ч. 5. С. 375-390.

78 Обзор деятельности министерства народного просвещения. С. 230-263.

79 Панаичин, Ф.Г. Педагогическое образование в России: историко-педагогические очерки. М., 1979; Sinel, *The Classroom and the Chancellery*, pp. 239-252.

80 Eklof explained that “the rivalry between departments worked to the benefit of the *zemstvo*, as no one institution was able to exert control” over the elementary school administration. Eklof, *Russian Peasant Schools*, p. 55.

81 Золотарев С. Очерк по истории учительского объединения в России // Профессиональные учительские организации на Западе и в России. Петроград, 1915. С. 231-293.

one's self to the great task of educating the *narod*."⁸² Despite this strong sense of mission, they felt abandoned by the state, and severely humbled and vulnerable within society.

CONCLUSION

During the Great Reforms, Russian pedagogues started being transformed into professionals, following the incentive plan of the MNP. In the Great Reforms, when the framework of professionals was being made, they aspired to be protected inside the state administration, because they wanted to gain state patronage in order to be independent and privileged within society. That is, they tried to become professionals by way of being bureaucrats.

Pedagogues under the MNP traditionally took on a unified character as a vanguard of the enlightenment entrusted with a mission to educate society from above. Therefore, even elementary school teachers were required to have a certain level of education and were considered as petty but state officials. This is the background to them preferring to remain inside the state bureaucracy. But when the MNP took the first step toward the full development of the elementary schools, they decided to separate elite schools and popular schools, and upgrade elite schools and downgrade popular schools. On the one hand, the professorate and gymnasium teachers successfully gained state patronage and high status in the state bureaucracy; on the other hand, the elementary school teachers were kicked out from the bureaucracy and were vulnerable in society. This dismal situation of elementary school teachers was not surprising in view of Western countries' teachers of the same period. But the important point is the attitude of the elementary school teachers at the time of the Great Reforms. They also thought they could be professionals and have independence as professionals only because they were officials. However, in the end, they could not keep their status as state officials, and did not have a stable basis inside the state bureaucracy. Despite this, they still aimed to recapture the status of official for a long time, and for all that time, still shared educational philosophies and goals with the MNP and other elite school pedagogues.

Meanwhile, elite school pedagogues did not settle for just being inside the bureaucracy, though they were guaranteed the status of state official. They tried to organize a collegiate organization, not a top-down hierarchical organization, in order to secure their autonomy and voice inside the bureaucracy. It is noteworthy that the professorate, who aimed to gain this autonomy inside the bureaucracy, utilized the concept of *soslovie*. In Russian society, as Freeze already indicated, *soslovie* was used as an instrument for communication and ties between the state and social groups. Moreover, in this context, attaining the status of *soslovie* was completely consistent with having a firm basis within the bureaucracy. "*Soslovie*" meant a special group that was chartered by the

82 Замечания на проект устава общеобраз. учеб. завед. Ч. 5. С. 397.

state in order to perform a state mission, and *soslovie* status was pursued by the professorate to get additional privilege beyond the status of mere official. Gymnasium teachers did not directly seek *soslovie* status, but they tried to attain similar status by following the professorate and desiring the same rights as the professorate had.

In the Great Reforms, the MNP endeavored to integrate, reorganize, and expand the general education system. For this purpose, the MNP had a keen need of teaching professionals. For this reason, the ministry, of its own accord, attempted to boost professional consciousness among teachers. Teachers, in turn, having had an opportunity to express their collective voice for the first time in Russian history, aimed to form a foundation to maintain their professional status. Russian professionals were being born inside the bureaucracy, and expected to function as a strong partner for the state bureaucracy. In fact, the professorate and gymnasium teachers attained high status, which led them to a fruitful partnership with the state. But, at the same time, they were faced with the serious dilemma of being both professionals and bureaucrats. Furthermore, the fact that elementary school teachers did not get privileged status and were forced to be independent from the state added further layers of complexity to the relationships between the state and professionals in late tsarist Russia. Such a structure was formed because the state remained functioning as the leading modernizer in Russian society in the middle and even by the end of the nineteenth century. The emerging teaching professionals did not expect to get much support from society, but instead hoped to be half-officials and protected inside the state. These complicated relationships, which emerged in the process of the Great Reforms, became an element of dynamic social and political transformation in late imperial Russian society.