THE POLITICAL THOUGHT OF YU. F. SAMARIN, 1840–1864

Loren David Calder

ROUTLEDGE LIBRARY EDITIONS: POLITICAL THOUGHT AND POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

ROUTLEDGE

ROUTLEDGE LIBRARY EDITIONS:
POLITICAL THOUGHT AND POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

Volume 9

THE POLITICAL THOUGHT OF YU. F. SAMARIN, 1840–1864

Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

THE POLITICAL THOUGHT OF YU. F. SAMARIN, 1840–1864

LOREN DAVID CALDER

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published in 1987 by Garland Publishing, Inc.

This edition first published in 2020
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-0-367-21961-1 (Set)
ISBN: 978-0-429-35434-2 (Set) (ebk)
ISBN: 978-0-367-24322-7 (Volume 9) (hbk)
ISBN: 978-0-429-28176-1 (Volume 9) (ebk)

Publisher's Note
The publisher has gone to great lengths to ensure the quality of this reprint but points out that some imperfections in the original copies may be apparent.

Disclaimer
The publisher has made every effort to trace copyright holders and would welcome correspondence from those they have been unable to trace.

The Political Thought of Yu. F. Samarin, 1840–1864

Loren David Calder

Garland Publishing, Inc.
New York and London 1987

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Calder, Loren David, 1929–
The political thought of Yu. F. Samarin, 1840–1864.

(Modern European history)
Originally presented as the author's thesis (Ph. D.—University of London, 1980)
Bibliography: p.
1. Samarin, IÛ. Ḟ. (IÛrīĭ Ḟedorovich), 1819–1876—Contributions in Political science. 2. Conservatism—Soviet Union—History—19th century. 3. Political participation—Soviet Union—History—19th century. I. Title. II. Series.
JC248.S25C34 1987 320.5'092'4 87-7546
ISBN 0-8240-8052-1 (alk. paper)

All volumes in this series are printed on acid-free, 250-year-life paper.

Printed in the United States of America

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The general purpose of this thesis is to examine the political thought of Yu. F. Samarin as set out in his writings from 1840, when he was a student at the University of Moscow engaged in writing a Master's thesis, to 1864 when he completed his work on the Great Peasant Reform. Samarin's status as the most outstanding Slavophil statesman, his life-long preoccupation with political questions and his stellar performance as propagandist, polemicist and reformer establish his political thought as a credible subject for investigation. The fact that no book-length piece has been written on Samarin's political thought in any language, makes it a desirable subject for investigation and the fact that no full-length study of Samarin at all has been written in the English language to date gives it very real potential value for British and North American students of Russian affairs.

The specific purposes of this thesis are: (1) to complete a thorough, comprehensive and systematic summarization of Samarin's political thought; (2) to organize and to explain his political thought; (3) to establish on this basis his position on the broad spectrum of political opinion; and (4) to attempt an assessment of his stature as a political theorist. In short, this thesis is to be a systematic typological enquiry in the classical tradition.

The organizational framework of this study is chronological for two main reasons. On the one hand, Samarin's life and thought divide into neat segments on the basis of his evolving interests. On the other hand, he was not a political thinker in the tradition of great theorists like Plato, Aristotle and Hobbes who analyzed the state and

other political institutions as well as the norms and goals of political activity in the process of creating theoretical systems, but a thinker who analyzed and wrote about current political issues as his interests and experience dictated, scattering his political ideas throughout the whole corpus of his work in a relatively unsystematic way.

The chronological limitations imposed on the investigation are both logical and desirable for the following reasons. First, the objective of being thorough and comprehensive does not mesh well with the scope of Samarin's political activities and the prolific output of his pen. Second, on Samarin's own testimony his theoretical position was firmly established by 1848,[i] and his energies were consciously expended to implement its elements in concrete reform measures altering age-old landlord-peasant relationships. Thus his work on the Great Peasant Reform can be seen as a laboratory test case for his political ideas and a suitable point at which to terminate this study of his political thought.

The adjective "political" is a complex word. It has not had, and does not now have a precise, narrowly definable meaning. The Shorter Oxford Dictionary defines political as "of, belonging or pertaining to, the state, its government and policy; public, civil; of or pertaining to the science or art of politics." For Plato, not only government, but every important relationship in society had political signi-

---

[i]See p. 233 above.

ficance.[ii] Presumably, therefore, almost any concatenation of topics focussing on societal relationships of consequence - demographic shifts, poverty, ideological strife, racial discord, class conflict, governmental structure, freedom of expression, economic equality, religious toleration, public order, law enforcement, transfer of power - identifies political issues. Aristotle argued that every political association involves "authority" or "rule", and his influence has been so pervasive that it has generally been accepted since his time that "a political relationship in some way involves authority, ruling, or power."[iii] Count Metternich, the famous Austrian Chancellor, associated politics with the relationships between states:

> Politics is the science of the vital interests of States, in its widest meaning. Since, however, an isolated State no longer exists and is found only in the annals of the heathen world ... we must always view the Society of States as the essential condition of the modern world. The great axioms of political science proceed from the knowledge of the true political interests of all States; it is upon these general interests that rests the guarantee of their existence. The establishing of international relations on the basis of reciprocity under the guarantee of respect for acquired rights ... constitutes in our time the essence of politics, of which diplomacy is merely the daily application. Between the two there is in my opinion the same difference as between science and art."[iv]

[ii]Sheldon S. Wolin, "Political Theory-Trends and Tools", International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, David L. Sills, ed., (New York: The Macmillan Company and The Free Press, 1968), p. 324.

[iii]Robert Dahl, Modern Political Analysis (Englewood Cliffs: N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1976), pp. 1-2.

[iv]Quoted in Harold Nicolson, The Congress of Vienna, A Study in Allied Unity, 1812-1822 (New York: The Viking Press, 1962), p. 39.

For Bernard Crick, a contemporary British political scientist, political action is the process through which democratic societies work out their differences:

> There is no end to the praises that can be sung of politics. In politics, not in economics, is found the creative dialectic of opposites: for politics is a bold prudence, a diverse unity, an armed conciliation, a natural artifice, a creative compromise, and a serious game in which free civilization depends; it is a reforming conserver, a sceptical believer, and a pluralistic moralist; it is a lively sobriety, a complex simplicity, an untidy elegance, a rough civility, and an everlasting immediacy; it is conflict become discussion; and it sets us a humane task on a human scale. And there is no end to the dangers that it faces: there are so many reasons that sound so plausible for rejecting the responsibility and uncertainty of freedom ... political activity is best seen as only one form of power relationship and political rule as only one form of government.[v]

Harold Lasswell, an outstanding contemporary American political scientist, defines "political science as an empirical discipline", which "studies the shaping and sharing of power", and "a political act, [as] one performed in power perspectives."[vi] Robert Dahl, another contemporary American political scientist, claims, reminiscent of Aristotle, that "a political system [government, state, power, or set of decision-making processes] is any persistent pattern of human relationships that involves to a significant degree, power, rule, or authority."[vii] Finally, David Easton, the father of contemporary systems analysis, says that "political life concerns all those varie-

---

[v]Bernard Crick, In Defence of Politics (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books Ltd., 1976), pp.160-161.

[vi]As quoted in Dahl, Modern Political Analysis, pp.2-3.

[vii]Ibid., p.6.

ties of activity that influence significantly the kind of authoritative policy adopted for a society and the way it is put into practice. We are said to be participating in political life when our activity relates in some way to the making and execution of policy for a society."[viii] The common elements in all of these statements refer to government, the exercise of power and the processes by which communities resolve all issues of general relevance and concern. For the purpose of this study, therefore, every Samarin thought which seems to fall between these limits will be considered to have political significance.

The word "thought" is used in this study in the very broad meaning that has been found best for examining the ideas of political theorists:

> It comprises a thinker's entire teaching on a subject (his lehre), including his description of the facts, his explanations (no matter whether religious, philosophical, or empirical), his conception of history, his value judgements, and his proposals of goals, of policy, and of principles.[ix]

The organizational framework of this thesis is chronological except for Chapter I which provides a biographical sketch highlighting

---

[viii]David Easton, The Political System: An Inquiry into the State of Political Science (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965), p.128. On another occasion Easton defined "a political system as that behavior or set of interactions through which authoritative allocations (or binding decisions) are made and implemented for a society." David Easton, "Political Science", International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, David L. Sills, ed., (New York: the Macmillan Company and the Free Press, 1968), vol. 12, p.285.

[ix]Arnold Brecht, "Political Theory-Approaches", International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, vol. 12, p.307.

the main facts of Samarin's life and thought. Chapter II deals with the development and exposition of Samarin's ideas 1840-1844 when he was a Master's student at the University of Moscow and came under the influence first of Hegel and then of Khomiakov. Chapter III treats the political ideas set out by Samarin in his M.A. thesis "Stefan Yavorsky and Feofan Prokopovich" (June 3, 1844). Chapter IV focuses on Samarin's political thought 1844-1848 when he was a civil servant employed primarily in drafting administrative reforms for the city of Riga. Chapter V deals with Samarin's political thought 1848-1864 as expressed and exemplified by his work on the emancipation problem.

The bibliography is the result of an exhaustive search for every piece, large or small, written by Samarin during his very active career as scholar and polemicist, as well as for every piece written about him up to the present time. It contains a more extensive listing than any other source presently available, and except for listing the contents of approximately two volumes of unpublished letters in the Department of Manuscripts of the Lenin Library in Moscow, appears to be absolutely complete. Of course this claim could not be made if it were not for the great contribution which Samarin's younger brother, Dmitri, made in collecting, organizing and publishing the Sochineniya (Works) in ten volumes between 1877 and 1896. Nor can the contribution of Peter Samarin, a nephew, go unmentioned. He published volume twelve of the Sochineniya, containing Samarin's correspondence 1840-1853, collected two other volumes of correspondence for publication, and also prepared prefaces for an eleventh volume which was to contain most of the ar-

ticles listed on pages 325-326 below. Baron B.E. Nol'de deserves special mention too for the important contribution which the extensive bibliographical notes appended to his excellent study Yuriy Samarin i ego vremya (Yuri Samarin and his times) have made to Samarin scholarship. One last word, the general bibliography contains a selection of books and articles on all of the subjects which were of special interest to Samarin.

The best sources of information about Samarin are the extensive biographical and analytical prefaces to each volume of the Sochineniya. Of these the most important are in volumes five and seven. The best single volume study of Samarin's life and thought is the above-mentioned book by Baron B.E. Nol'de, Yuriy Samarin i ego vremya. The best articles on Samarin's career were written by Peter Struve ["Yuriy Samarin: Opyt Kharakteristiki i otsenki" (A characterization and evaluation)] and Paul Vinogradov ("A Prophetic Career").

Extensive use of quotations has been made in this study, because the flavour and content of the subject's thought is best transmitted in his original statements. In translating these statements, the main concern has been to render the original as accurately and clearly as possible, even when this has meant excessive literalness and awkward English syntax. Quotation marks have not been used for emphasis and therefore, usually mark words, phrases and sentences of Samarin himself. Russian words have been transliterated according to the English-style system as modified by the Slavonic and East European Review. The sole exception to this rule is to transliterate the surnames Herzen and Khomiakov in accordance with current practice.

CHAPTER I

A Biographical Sketch

Yuri Samarin belonged to the same generation of Russians as Leo Tolstoy, Fedor Dostoyevsky, Mikhail Katkov, Alexander Herzen, Nicholas Chernyshevsky, and the Tsar Alexander II. He enjoyed all the advantages of noble birth, being born in St. Petersburg on April 21, 1819 into a family that moved in the highest court circles. Enormous patrimonial estates held near Moscow, Tula and Samara were the basis of the family's affluence, and long associations with the court were the guarantee of its social and political privileges.[1]

In 1826, when Yuri was still only seven years old, his father moved his family to Moscow. In view of the depth of Yuri's future Russian patriotism, it is worth noting that his father's main reason for leaving St. Petersburg was to break his children away from the French atmosphere of its court. As an indicator of how pervasive this atmosphere was, Yuri spoke only French at this stage of his development.

The elder Samarin's main concern when he reached Moscow was to superintend the education of his children. To this end he established a very good household school, setting high standards and employing only the best teachers. Yuri Samarin obtained all of his basic education in this family school. When he entered the University of Moscow, in 1834 at the age of fifteen, he had an excellent knowledge of Russian, French and Latin, and a good grounding in Greek, German, geography and arithmetic.

On entering the university Yuri elected to study in the Faculty of Arts (slovesnoe otdelenie). His favourite subject was history and his

---

[1]Baron B.E. Nol'de, Yuri Samarin i ego vremya (Paris, 1926), pp. 8-9. This is the one full-length biography of Samarin available. It is an excellent work, rich in factual detail and penetrating analysis. Another useful work is Dmitry Samarin, "Biograficheski ocherk Yu. F. Samarina," Sochineniya Yu. F. Samarina, IX (Moscow, 1898), IX-XXIV.

favourite professor, the famous historian and exponent of "official nationalism," M.P. Pogodin. Certainly Samarin was pushed towards Slavophilism by Pogodin's teachings, for he said of him:

> He had an independent direction of thought...warmed by a deep sympathy for Russian life....He brought us to a completely new view of Russian history and Russian life in general. Western formulas were not applicable to us; in Russian life there was some kind of particular beginning foreign to other people; her development proceeded by another law, as yet undetermined by science. Pogodin said this to us fairly awkwardly, without proof, but in such a way that his conviction became a part of us.[2]

These ideas Samarin would express repeatedly as a mature Slavophil politician and polemicist. He finished his course at the university in 1838 at the top of his class.[3]

It was at the university that Samarin met Konstantin Aksakov,[4] his closest and most influential friend of the period. These two young men, their respective courses completed, began to study for the master's degree together. Through diligent study, writing and discussion they gradually consolidated their views on religion, Russia and Europe. One of the immediate consequences of this friendship for Samarin was that it brought him into contact with literary and progressive Moscow. Gogol and Lermontov frequented the Aksakov home,

---

[2]Yu. F. Samarin, "Iz vospominanii ob universitete 1834-1838," Rus', No. 1 (November 15, 1880), p. 19.

[3]Among his classmates was S.M. Solov'ev, the outstanding historian, and M. Katkov, the influential conservative journalist of the 1870's and 1880's. Nol'de, p. 13.

[4]Konstantin S. Aksakov (1817-60) became one of the most prominent Slavophils. A son of the writer S.T. Aksakov, he was the Slavophil historian and philologist. In his work he developed the belief that religious and moral factors determine the historical process, that the true religion was Orthodoxy, and that only on the basis of Orthodoxy could durable political and social forms be created. See K.S. Aksakov, Polnoe sobranie sochineniy, ed. I.S. Aksakov (3 vols.; Moscow, 1861-80).

as did Stankevich, Belinsky, Herzen, Bakunin and Granovsky. It was during this period also that he and Aksakov met and joined the group of people which later became known as the Slavophils. First among them were Aleksey Khomiakov and Ivan Kireyevsky, the principal founders of the Slavophil movement.[5]

In the spring of 1840 Samarin began work on his Master's thesis, a project which had a decisive influence on his future career.[6] His assigned topic was Stefan Yavorsky and Feofan Prokopovich, preachers and administrators of the Russian Orthodox Church during the Petrine era. Already convinced that religious questions were of vital importance and finding them of absorbing interest, he decided that in writing his thesis, he would seek to establish his position on religion and on the religious conflicts that had rent history. On this founda-

---

[5]Alexey S. Khomiakov (1804-60) was a public-man, poet, and philosopher-theologian. He had roots in the old aristocracy, was a wealthy landowner, and was a founding member and leader of the Slavophil movement. In the late thirties he began to enunciate Slavophil doctrine. He proclaimed that Russia had a unique course of development opposed to that of the West with its individualism and materialism. He valued the commune (obshchina) because it embodied the principle of brotherhood, and he was a convinced monarchist and defender of autocracy, even while he favoured political and social reforms. He believed in the superiority of Orthodoxy and in the primacy of faith and religion. See A.S. Khomiakov, Polnoe sobranie sochineniy (8 vols.; Moscow, 1900-1904).

Ivan V. Kireyevsky (1808-56) a prominent philosopher and publicist, was also one of the founders of Slavophilism. As an active propagator of Slavophil ideas he exercised a powerful influence on the movement. He was convinced of the superiority of the Russian experience based on the commune (obshchina) and Orthodoxy. He emphasized the importance of revelation and was sceptical of rationalism. See Polnoe sobranie sochinenii Ivana Vasil'evicha Kireyevskogo, pub. A.I. Koshelev (2 vols.; Moscow, 1861).

[6]The most detailed account of Samarin's life during this period is to be found in D. Samarin, "Dannyya dly a biografii Yu. F. Samarina za 1840-1845 gg.," Sochineniya, V (Moscow, 1880), XXV-XCII: also in Russkiy biograficheskiy slovar', XVIII (St. Petersburg, 1904), 133-46.

tion his thesis took shape. In the first part, "Stefan Yavorsky and Feofan Prokopovich as Theologians," he sought to establish the place of Orthodoxy as a religious teaching. In the second part, "Stefan Yavorsky and Feofan Prokopovich as officials of the Church," he studied the relationship of the Orthodox Church to the Russian state. In the third part, "Stefan Yavorsky and Feofan Prokopovich as Preachers," he examined the literary content of their writings. This third part had little real interest for Samarin, but had to be written to satisfy university requirements.[7]

This period saw the youth pass through a crisis arising from a conflict between faith and reason. Essentially he tried to prove, using Hegel, that Orthodoxy was the only true religious doctrine. His deliberations led him into a morass of confusion and doubt from which Khomiakov extricated him by bringing him to the view that belief cannot, and should not, be demonstrated rationally. Khomiakov's strength lay in his unshakable faith in Orthodoxy and this characteristic Samarin came to share with him. Certainly the mature Samarin was distinguished by a deep and abiding faith in the Russian Orthodox Church as an institution, and as an "organism of truth and love."[8]

The second part of Samarin's thesis--a study of Church-State relationships in Russia--merits special attention for it foreshadows the direction of his future career. In this work he set himself a

---

[7]Sochineniya, V: Stefan Yavorsky i Feofan Prokopovich (Moscow, 1880). Part 3 was published separately by the University of Moscow as Stefan Yavorsky i Feofan Prokopovich, kak propovedniki (Moscow, 1844). Samarin's collected works were published in eleven volumes (I-X,XII) between 1877-1911.

[8]Nol'de, p. 31: see P.K. Christoff, A.S. Xomjakov (The Hague, 1961), p. 56.

political question, thus for the first time entering into a field of thought and action in which he would distinguish himself later. The privileged environment in which Samarin grew up and his family's long tradition of close relations with the court all but guaranteed that he would be a monarchist. In fact, autocracy became, for him, the foundation of Russian society. He would say as late as December, 1867:

> that it is still not time for Russia to think about a change of the existing form of government...autocracy was never so strong morally as now...at this minute no other power could inspire such faith, could dispose so easily of such voluntary, unanimous, and unqualified co-operation from the nation; I conclude from this that the historical calling of autocracy has still not been fulfilled and that it is still destined to do much for Russia.[9]

However, conservative as Samarin's belief in autocracy might seem, he revealed strong liberal tendencies early: while working on this part of his thesis he modified his monarchical principles to argue that "absolute power...must be founded on the acknowledgement of a wide sphere of freedom for the subject."[10] He also argued that a free church in a society recognizing freedom of religious conscience for every one of its members was mandatory for human fulfillment.

Samarin presented his thesis in the fall of 1843, and defended it brilliantly the following spring. He now had to decide on a direction for his future career. While his personal inclination was to pursue a life of scholarship, his father was anxious for him to enter the government service, so that Samarin, accepting his father's wishes, left for St. Petersburg and an appointment in the Ministry of Justice

---

[9]Samarin, Sochineniya, VII (Moscow, 1890), 4.

[10]Nol'de, p. 27.

(August, 1844).[11]

In all he spent two rather depressing years in St. Petersburg, moving to various governmental departments but always doing the same thing--copying and correcting reports. His response to his work and to the deadening bureaucratic atmosphere of the capital was positive, however; for we see him in a letter of this period reproaching Konstantin Aksakov for his "Moscowism," that is, for his tendency to denounce St. Petersburg, and yet make no positive contribution to the improvement of affairs. Samarin himself began a serious study of Russia's history for the purpose of gaining a clearer understanding of her present political, cultural and religious situation.[12] On this basis he would soon be active in defending Russia's traditions, and in reforming her institutions, for he was already convinced that theory must be wedded to practice. Time and again in his career he used theory based on research as an adjunct to practice, and habitually urged others to take an active line. As this period advanced there was a steady growth in his interest in social and political questions. It culminated in two events signalizing active involvement in politics. First, in May, 1846, he was posted to Riga, in the service of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, to work on a commission established to draft a plan for reform of the administrtive structure and economy of the city. Second, his article "On the opinions of 'Sovremennik' (contemporary) - historical and literary" was published in the Slavophil journal Moskvityanin (Muscovite).[13]

---

[11]D. Samarin, "Dannyya dlya biografii Yu. F. Samarina za 1840-1845 gg.," Sochineniya, V (Moscow, 1880), LXXIX-LXXXIII.

[12]Sochineniya, XII, 149-57.

[13]Nol'de, p. 35. Khomiakov and Samarin were the most active Slavophil polemicists during the 1840's. Christoff, p.85.

This article contains Samarin's first clear formulation of some basic Slavophil teachings. To summarize briefly he asserted: (1) that Western individualism leads nowhere; (2) that the idea of man in society under law does not grow out of individualism; (3) that Europe was searching for such an idea; (4) that the Russian experience was relevant because it provided such an idea in the "commune"; (5) that Christianity had brought "consciousness and freedom" to Russian life; (6) that the problem of Russia's "internal history" had been "to enlighten the national communal principle by the communal principle of the Church"; and (7) that the aim of Russia's "external history" had been "to defend and to protect" this enterprise "by the creation of a strong state structure" in harmony with it.[14]

Samarin's work in Riga involved writing a history of that city's institutions as part of a series of steps towards far-reaching administrative reforms.[15] With the scholarly thoroughness which so typified him, he examined Russia's relatons with the whole Baltic area in the process. His finished work, "an excellent, undated, historical and juridical monograph,"[16] was published by the Ministry of the

---

[14]Sochineniya, I (Moscow, 1877), 63-64.

[15]Riga, located at the mouth of the Western Dvina river, was for centuries the chief commercial and administrative centre of Livonia, the indigenous homeland of Latvians and Estonians. Russia has had a long involvement with the region, going back at least to Kievan times when Vladimir (980-1015) tried to establish his authority there. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, settlement and conquest under the auspices of the Livonian and Teutonic orders established political and economic power in German hands--a situation which continued under successive conquests of the region by Poles (sixteenth centruy), Swedes (seventeenth century), and Russians (eighteenth century). See A. Bilmanis, A History of Latvia (Princeton, New Jersey, 1951); and E. Uustalu, The History of the Estonian People (London, 1952).

[16]Nol'de, pp. 40-41.

Interior for distribution among the highest members of the government. As so often happened the projected reform was dropped: as for the publication, it was subsequently lost or destroyed, probably by fire.[17] His work was not barren, however, for he took a few dominant ideas from his research and experience in Riga. First, he acquired an abiding distrust of constitutionalism because of the way in which the privileged German landholding element had used constitutional guarantees to protect their narrow class interest--insofar, his faith in the virtues of a responsible monarchy were confirmed. Second, he came to an important decision concerning the peasant question, which he already considered of paramount importance in Russia. His work in Latvia convinced him that the abolition of serfdom must be engineered by the government under conditions guaranteeing peasant rights, and especially their right to land.[18]

Samarin's service in Riga ended in turmoil. By the end of it he had become so angered by the direction of Russian policy in the Baltic region that he wrote a long pamphlet, Letters from Riga, denouncing it. Something of his aim and mood is contained in the following quotation from a letter to Konstantin Aksakov (April, 1848):

> The systematic oppression of Russians by Germans is an hourly insult to Russian nationality before the eyes of many of her representatives--this is what stirs the blood in me and I work for only one thing--to bring the fact to people's attention....[19]

Even before his return to St. Petersburg, he began to circulate manuscript copies of his pamphlet. His attack on government policy,

---

[17] Sochineniya, VII, CXXXV.

[18] Nol'de, pp. 42-43.

[19] Sochineniya, XII, 200.

erupting in the hermetically sealed atmosphere of Nicholation Russia, created a small storm in court circles. Its principal effect was to provoke the powerful German party to take reprisals. Nicholas was pressed for action, and Samarin was promptly lodged in the Peter-Paul fortress. After a twenty-day imprisonment he was taken to Nicholas, who administered a sharp rebuke, accusing him of divulging state secrets and of stirring up enmity between Germans and Russians. The affair ended with what was, in effect, banishment from the capital--first to Moscow, and later to the provinces.[20]

After a three-month stay in Moscow, Samarin was posted to Simbirsk on the Volga. From there he was shortly sent to Kiev, where he was placed at the disposal of Governor-General Bibikov. Much of this period, brief as it was, was devoted to the study of the peasant question. As indicated above, he was already convinced that a just solution to this question would have to be enforced and guaranteed by the government.

Fortuitously, Samarin's arrival in Kiev coincided with the introduction in the south-western region of inventories designed to determine the land relationships between landlords and peasants. Samarin did not play an active part in this process, but he studied it closely and wrote about it, gaining thereby a knowledge of the peasant question that he was able to turn to account during the reforms of 1857-1863.

By 1850 Samarin was in charge of Bibikov's chancellery. However, the demands of civil service work seriously impeded his new research and reform interest, so that when the need to manage the family estates

---

[20] Ibid., VII, XC ff. Samarin recorded Nicholas' rebuke verbatim.

because of his father's illness arose, he retired, settling once again in Moscow (1852).[21]

He was now convinced of the need to abolish serfdom. Characteristically he began a full-scale study of peasant-landlord relationships, village agriculture and peasant life in general.[22] The next five years were spent in this pursuit. The summers were passed studying and working on the family estates in the Tula and Samara regions: the winters were passed in Moscow, in study and discussion with his Slavophil friends--Cherkassky,[23] Khomiakov, Koshelev,[24] and Konstantin and Ivan Aksakov.[25]

---

[21]Nol'de, pp. 59-60.

[22]V.N. Bochkarev, "Yuri Fedorovich Samarin," Velikaya reforma, V (Moscow, 1911), 94.

[23]Prince Vladimir A. Cherkassky was a politician and reformer. He played an important role in bringing the peasant reform to fruition and was a key figure in preparing the peasant reform in Poland (1864). He was elected mayor of Moscow in 1869 and was active in preparing the municipal statutes of 1870. See Kniaz' Vladimir Aleksandrovich Cherkassky. Ego stat'i, ego rechi i vospominaniya o nem (Moscow, 1879).

[24]Aleksandr I. Koshelev (1806-83) was a prominent Slavophil and publicist. He issued a number of Slavophil publications including Russkaya beseda (Russian Conversation), 1856-60. He stood for the establishment of representative institutions at the local level and the convoking of a consultative assembly. He played an active role in preparing the peasant reform and wrote extensively on political questions: see, for example, Konstitutsiya, samoderzhavie i zemskaya duma (Leipzig, 1862).

[25]Ivan S. Aksakov (1823-86) was a brother of Konstantin Aksakov, and a prominent Slavophil publicist, especially during the later stages of the movement. His strongly nationalistic political creed was expounded in the Slavophil journals which he published, namely: Den' (1862-65); Moskva (1867-68); Moskvich (1867-68); and Rus' (1880-86). Aksakov was always viewed with suspicion by the government and Den', Moskva and Moskvich were all suppressed by the censor. See I. S. Aksakov, Polnoe sobranie sochineniy (7 vols.; Moscow, 1886-87); and Ivan Sergeevich Aksakov v ego pismakh (4 vols.; Moscow-St. Petersburg, 1888-96).

The articles which he wrote during this period played a decisive role in shaping his future career. In 1853 he began to write a series of papers on the peasant question which, distributed among his friends and in highest court circles, helped to set the stage for emancipation.[26] But recognition did not come as quickly as it might have, because his Slavophilism made him suspect.[27] The situation changed when the reign of Alexander II began, and the Slavophils won permission to publish their own journal, Russkaya beseda, and later Sel'skoe blagoustroystva, devoted exclusively to peasant affairs. While Samarin gave much time to these journals including writing two articles on nationality and science, he concentrated most of his attention on the peasant question, advocating a reform programme which was moderate. His central concern was to find a way to destroy serfdom, and at the same time preserve the communal basis of Russian agriculture.[28] His connections, especially with the Grand Duchess Helen and the Grand Duke Konstantin (influential reform-oriented members of the Royal family), his literary gifts, and scholarly analysis established him as an authority on the peasant question.[29]

Samarin was first and foremost a doer. The Imperial Rescript of November 20, 1857, commanding the nobility to prepare proposals for the

---

[26]Bochkarev, V, 96-97: see M.T. Florinsky, Russia, II (New York, 1961), 885.

[27]Samarin said in a letter to K. Aksakov (1844): "We...have attracted...strong undeserved suspicion from the government side and distrust from the side of society." Sochineniya, XII, 150.

[28]Bochkarev, p. 95.

[29]See ff. 29. (over)

"improvement of peasant life" (a circumlocution for emancipation), gave him the opportunity for which he had been waiting. Under the terms of the Rescript, committees of landlords were formed in every province of the empire. He was asked to represent the government on the Samara provincial committee. With hope and enthusiasm he welcomed the opportunity, and for the next five years worked, almost without interruption, on the peasant reform. This would prove to be the most difficult, and perhaps the most successful, period of his life.[30]

From the very beginning, the provincial committees were rent with disputes between a large majority defending the interests of the landlords, and a small minority working for the well-being of the peasants. Samarin was among the small minority. He rejected unconditionally the proposal that every peasant should be given freedom without land. He stood for a moderate programme of reform, maintaining communal land ownership, and guaranteeing each peasant a land allotment sufficient to support himself and his family. He held a key position on the Samara committee; in fact, as a literary man and a theoretician with a clearly

---

[29]The Grand Duchess Helen Pavlovna (1806-73) was born Frederika-Charlotte-Maria Princess of Wurtemberg. In 1823 she married the Grand Duke Michael Pavlovich and settled in Russia where she played a prominent role as a patron of the arts and as a creator of welfare and educational institutions. During the Crimean War she helped to lay the foundations for the Red Cross. In the late 1850's she was a passionate and enlightened proponent of peasant reform.

The Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolaevich (1827-92) was a brother of Alexander II. For many years he was commander of the fleet and chairman of the state council. An able man with an eye for reform, he was a key factor in bringing the peasant, judicial and censorship reforms to fruition. After the Crimean War, he was a powerful force in modernizing the Russian fleet and in re-establishing Russian sea power on the Black Sea.

[30]Bochkarev, p. 98.

articulated programme, he did the bulk of the work. It is interesting to note that relations on the committee were so strained and the opposition of the landlords so impassioned that Samarin never went out of the house unless he was armed and accompanied by a bodyguard.[31]

In the spring of 1859, an Editing Commission, headed by Ya. I. Rostovtsev, was established in St. Petersburg to examine the proposals of the various provincial committees and to draft the emancipation statute. As an expert Samarin was invited to participate in the work of this Commission. By mid-summer he was working in St. Petersburg, where he quickly discovered that he was in disagreement with the basic principles of the reform as set out by his more conservative colleagues. While he considered resigning, he was prevailed upon to stay, and continued to serve the Commission until its work was completed in October, 1860. He worked mainly on the question of obligations, but also played an active part in compiling the proposals of the south-western region. There was a brief interruption of three months in his service because of a nervous breakdown, brought on by the heavy strain of his work, for this was a very difficult period for the members of the Commission--not only was there great social animosity, but the work was very strenuous, especially for someone like Samarin whose great writing capacity was exploited.[32]

After the preliminary drafting of the Emancipation Statute, Samarin remained in St. Petersburg for consultation with the Grand Duke

---

[31] Ibid., p. 100.

[32] Nol'de, pp. 112-31.

Konstantin, while it was being discussed by the Main Committee. During this period he wrote several notes refuting arguments against the proposals of the Editing Commission. He also wrote a first draft of the Emancipation Manifesto. The planning and drafting of the Emancipation Statute was over: Samarin was certainly one of its "principal authors."[33]

Samarin's work on the peasant question did not end with the publication of the Emancipation Manifesto (February 19, 1861). The reform still had to be implemented, and Samarin, even though he had some reservations about its final form, worked hard to put its measures into effect. In March, he was again in Samara, this time serving the government as a Member (chlen) on the provincial commission responsible for introducing the reform. During this period agreements were drawn up between the landlords and their peasants, fixing land allotments and obligations. Samarin's task was to verify these agreements. Because of the illiteracy of his assistants, however, a much greater volume of work fell on his shoulders. He was, in fact, a "leading executor"[34] of the reform, and his impartial and diligent service did much to improve the government office's standing among the peasants.[35]

---

[33]Nicholas V. Riasanovsky, Russia and the West in the Teaching of the Slavophils (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1952), p. 57. V. I. Semevski, Krest'ianskii vopros v Rossii v pervoi polovine XIX veka, II (St. Petersburg, 1888), 417, credits Samarin with making a "significant" contribution to the reform.

[34]Riasanovsky, p. 57.

[35]Bochkarev, p. 103.

When most of the agreements were completed, Samarin considered his task done, and retired for a second time (summer, 1863). The nobility of Samara who had followed his career closely and had come, despite earlier differences, to value his sterling qualities, feted him.[36]

Samarin was not, however, destined to take his ease, at least not for a while yet. Revolt had broken out in Poland in January, and he was soon caught up in government attempts to deal with it. In October he was asked by Nicholas Miliutin[37] to take part in a commission being established to work out a solution for the peasant question in Poland. Miliutin, who was head of the commission and who had worked with Samarin on the Emancipation Statute, chose him because of his theoretical knowledge.[38] Samarin, who had already revealed his deep concern over the borderlands in his Riga days, accepted. Then he, Miliutin and Cherkassky, the third member of the Commission, spent six weeks in Warsaw and a few days in a lightning tour of south-western Poland. Samarin's observations and impressions were expounded in a comprehensive note to the Tsar and contributed to a new programme for the reconstruction of Polish peasant life and village government. This programme, based on the Slavophil point of view, was ratified by Alexander (February 19, 1864) and remained the government programme for Poland over the next half-century.[39]

---

[36]Nol'de, p. 145.

[37]Nicholas A. Miliutin (1818-1972), a prominent statesman of Alexander II's reign, was close to the Slavophils. He was an exponent of enlightened absolutism and played a leading role in preparing the peasant and administrative reforms of the reign.

[38]Bochkarev, p. 104.

[39]Florinsky, II, 916.

Samarin's attitude to Poland was complex. He was sympathetically inclined towards the Poles as members of a Slavic nation, but he hated Polonism which he viewed as the "armed propaganda of Latinism [Catholicism]...a sharp wedge...driven into the heart of the Slavonic world...."[40] To Polonism he opposed Eastern Slavonic Orthodoxy. While anxious to irradicate Polonism, he did not advocate Russification, including the imposition of Orthodoxy, because he believed that the Poles had a right to cultural and national self-determination, in other words, freedom of religious instruction, a national language, and independent civil government. His final aim was to achieve, through a gradual mingling of Poles and Russians, complete reconciliation in a greater Slavic unity. His method of achieving this objective was to suppress the revolt, and then to win the support of the Polish peasantry by emancipating them on favourable terms. In all fairness it should be pointed out that Samarin's programme, eschewing Russification, was implemented more harshly than he envisaged.[41]

When, at forty-five, he returned from Poland, Samarin found his health broken. However, he was far from despairing for he felt he could still look forward to useful work. In fact, he was to live another twelve years and to accomplish an outstanding amount of work in that period. These last years of his life were devoted to public and literary activity, following a uniform pattern. Almost every year he went abroad, both for reasons of health and for the publishing of his literary work. The fall usually found him on the Volga where he

---

[40]Quoted from Bochkarev, p. 105.

[41]Bochkarev, p. 105.

saw to the management of his estates and the schools which he had founded on them. He also hunted for he was a passionate hunter. The winters he spent in Moscow working in duma and zemstvo councils. As this period coincided with the sterile second half of Alexander's reign, Samarin became increasingly estranged from governmental circles. He was remembered only once, being entrusted with the presidency of the Samara Provincial Zemstvo conference (December, 1865).[42]

As suggested above, Samarin's public activities were concentrated in Moscow. The laziness, the sloth, and the ignorance, which he had encountered in the provinces after the reform of 1861 had brought him to the point of despair, but it had been instructive. It had convinced him that the proper task for the moment was, eschewing constitutional reform projects like those of Koshelev and other liberals, to concentrate on creating efficient organs of local self-government, i.e., on the Zemstvo programme.[43] It is not strange then, that from 1866 onward, he should serve as an elected representative on both the Moscow City Duma and Moscow Provincial Zemstvo Council. He was a very active representative and his clear, logical exposition was both impressive and effective. He served on various commissions, frequently as chairman, and drafted many reports. His most noteworthy work went into drafting a reform of the poll-tax. Samarin proved to be a reliable leader and a diligent worker, accepting all manner of assignments--whether locating cemeteries or planning for the removal of garbage, no task was too humble. "It was a time," he said, "for stonemasons, not

---

[42]Nol'de, p. 193.

[43]Bochkarev, p. 106.

architects."[44]

Samarin's literary activity during this final twelve-year period was impressive. To this period are related his best-known works. In 1865 he began to publish a long, hard-hitting attack on the Jesuits--The Jesuits and their Relation to Russia[45]--which won him considerable notoriety. In 1867 he edited and published the first Russian edition of Khomiakov's philosophical writings. For this work he wrote a long preface evaluating the role of Khomiakov as philosopher and theologian. It was "superb...expressing the character of the teaching and the point of view of Khomiakov...."[46] Samarin was ambitious to continue the philosophical work of Khomiakov (his friends, especially Ivan Aksakov, hoped that he would), but he became convinced that he lacked the philosophical depth required. Apropos Peter Struve has remarked: "as distinct from Kireyevsky and Khomiakov...the mind of Samarin was not a philosophical-constructing, but a civil-servant arranging and regulating [one]...the mind of Samarin was the mind of a statesman and political thinker."[47] There are two other examples of Samarin's philosophical writing from this period: an analysis of K.D. Kavelin's book, The Problems of Psychology, and a brief study of Max Mueller's History of Religion.

Samarin was a great Russian publicist--some of his Russian

---

[44]Nol'de, p. 145.

[45]Samarin, Sochineniya, VI (Moscow, 1887), 1-326.

[46]Prince V. Odoevski, an outstanding Schellingist, as quoted in Christoff, p. 37 n.

[47]Peter Struve, "Yuri Samarin. Opyt kharateristiki i otsenki," Vozrozhdenie, No. 376 (June 13, 1926). Sochineniya VI, XI.

contemporaries called him the greatest publicist of all times. While this latter opinion is exaggerated, there is no doubt at all that Samarin was among the best. His publicist work is distinguished by scholarly analysis, precision, lucidity and power. Certainly his most important work of this kind was Borderlands of Russia, an extensive publication stretching into three volumes, which began to appear in 1867, and continued to appear regularly until his death in 1876. In Borderlands, he returned to the study of Russia and the Baltic states, which had occupied his attention during his stay in Riga twenty years earlier. It was written to combat the autocratic, class character of Russian policy in the 1860's, which Samarin feared would provoke a centrifugal or separatist movement in the borderlands--in Finland, the Baltic states, Poland, and even in the Ukraine and the Caucasus.[48] It was published abroad as was almost everything written during this period. The first two issues of Borderlands provoked the Tsar's displeasure, leading Samarin to write a personal explanation of his position. It provoked a heated debate in Germany and made the author famous in Europe. It received a mixed response in Russia: nationlists, who favoured a strongly pro-Russian policy, welcomed it; while less committed Russians accused him of chauvinism. It is a measure of his influence that his programme was adopted by Alexander III.

One of Samarin's last publications was the booklet, Revolutionary Conservatism (Berlin, 1875). This booklet was a long letter to General Fadeev, attacking his constitutionalism. Samarin still regarded

---

[48]Nol'de, pp. 202-204.

constitutionalism as a gentry device for the perpetuation of their class interests. When General Fadeev, who had roots in the highest government and court circles, appeared as the exponent of a new constitutionalism and at the same time disparaged the basic foundations of the Great Reforms, Samarin felt compelled to speak out against him.[49]

Samarin enjoyed an enormous reputation, and the signs of it took a tangible form during these last years. Among the distinctions bestowed on him was the creation of five scholarships bearing his name, and his enrolment as an honorary member of both the University of Moscow and the Moscow Ecclesiastical Academy. After his death, the University created a special prize to be granted in his name to the best composition on peasant and Zemstvo affairs.

During this period his health was generally poor, partly because he was troubled by a chronic nervous condition. Over the summer and fall of 1875, however, his health seemed sound and his energy unabated, so that his death came quite unexpectedly from a minor cause. Late in December, he went to Berlin to have the sixth issue of Borderlands published, as well as to study the institutions of local government and the tax system in Prussia. Early in March, he insisted on having a small swelling about the size of a hazelnut removed from his right arm. As a result of this minor operation, he contracted blood poisoning and died on March 19, 1876.

In summary, a few very basic ideas emerge as the under-pinning of Yuri Samarin's Slavophilism. First, he believed in Christianity, and

---

[49]Bochkarev, p. 106.