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ABSTRACT

This paper examines constructions of gender pertinent to the British analysis of Russia, as emerges through major periodicals across the late nineteenth century. It begins by laying out the methodology and core thematic questions to be undertaken, then proceeds in summary of some of the core insights of recent postcolonial historiography. It also suggests ways that certain tropes on race, gender and the imperial culture can apply beyond the traditional parameters of imperial metropole or colonial periphery. My work then proceeds to analysis of the British strategic situation in this era, focusing on ways in which long-term tension with rival imperial powers was crucial to the British perspective and behavior on their own empire. In a final appraisal of the secondary historiography, this work examines major structures of the Victorian periodicals, their significance at their time, their importance in historical analysis, and the ways these connected to British gender and the British empire. Turning to primary sources, I look for indications of gender signifiers employed by British authors to frame specific perceptions and evaluations of Russian society. My work proceeds first through examination of a group of dissimilar articles sharing a general hostile stance towards Russia, then a collection that argues for Russia as a more friendly and beneficial polity. Subsequently I look at a gender dynamic in several ostensibly neutral articles, those that avoid a direct evaluative stance on Russia either way. Finally, by way of conclusion I bring the thread of gendered perceptions of imperial rivals through to the present, arguing for the relevance of studying this process for contemporary politics as well as postcolonial analysis.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION: OVERVIEW AND METHODOLOGY

This work examines the gendered (re)presentation of Russia in British sources, and the way these fit into an imperial paradigm. The geographical focus provides an opportunity to perceive gender construction in the depiction of a rival nationality through major periodicals of the late nineteenth century. Diverse British perceptions heavily involved women and feminine signifiers in their accounts, using their positions to reflect on the wider male power structures. These perceptions also express an awareness of Russia as a gendered national community. They re-enforce their evaluations through focus on how Russian men regarded foreign women, and treated their own. Women had political relevance in this discourse through roles of both passivity and agency.\[1\] Russian women could serve as dangerously active political agents, members of a prosperous cosmopolitan elite or passive indicators of their husbands’ positions. The Russian nation itself could appear as aggressively masculine, wittily feminine or some intermediate position. Moreover, Russian interest in British femininity excited comment by British authors, and helped them form their own judgments on Russian men and women. British periodicals evaluated both Russian women and Russian men as they appeared to regard femininity.

The core function of this project is to suggest ways that the gendered imperial gaze can be more widely applied than is currently the case in historiography. While it shared a wide imperial context, the British view towards Russia involved collective ambiguity, variation and
tension. British authors often closely linked a specific depiction of Russia with a proposed stance towards them. Dissatisfied with the ambivalent status quo, numerous British authors sought to open greater understanding with Russia, while others wished to increase opposition towards it. Authors used different formulas to characterize both the essential Russian character and the appropriate British interaction with it. Such formulas frequently involved positioning women in ways that reflected on the core elements of Russian society. Writers used Russian women to signify the essential laxity, oppression, refinement or hypocrisy of the dominant socio-political structure. Whether authors took an overall hostile, favorable or ostensibly non-judgemental stance towards Russia had a significant impact on the ways they represented gender in their piece. No stance towards Russia or Russian gender was all encompassing. British authors frequently differed as to the nature by which this society was moral or evil, effective or corrupt. Nevertheless, gender made a difference in the way contemporary British authors presented their arguments. If a given article didn’t utilize femininity that article’s resonance would be different. The same motif would apply if it represented femininity in a different way. In their own time these authors emphasized gender at different points to make a stronger case and build a more effective text. At no point does this study attempt to explore what Russian women were actually like. The question is not how nineteenth century Russia gendered itself, but rather how contemporary British authors argued that it was gendered. Increased awareness of the British awareness of gender in Russia can expand understanding of British imperial identity.

This paper employs much of the structure and methodology of colonial study in the separate venue of imperial nationalist competition. Conceptually it examines how gendered depictions of the Other functioned in a relationship in which the British did not possess impe-
rial sovereignty. The Russian empire alternatively menaced and re-enforced British claims in their chosen domain. A common border and fear of Russian expansion towards India exerted major influence in expanding the scope of British imperialism. British views towards Russia frequently had as much impact on Victorian imperialism as the perception of colonial subjects did. Similar concerns applied to every rival empire, yet across the 1870s and 1880s Russia was the most crucial perceived external challenger. The British representation of Russia differed in crucial ways from its understanding of continental European rivals. Russia almost always had associations with Oriental qualities, and only in the most Russophile productions did they appear in truly equal stature with the civilized world. Gender functioned as a major subtext of these characterizations, absent which historiographical investigation of partisan nuance is more problematic. Where periodicals portray Russian women as cosmopolitan, sophisticated and peaceful there commonly exists optimism towards Russia’s development. Where they show Russian women to be marginal or violent, the dominant evaluation usually characterizes Russians as backward, Asiatic and immoral. These rhetorical patterns closely connect to constructions of class, race and nation.

At issue are a series of core questions on Russia as British imperialist society it. One major ambiguity was Russia’s locale, in geography, race and culture. Different authors could characterize it as European or Asian, Occidental or Oriental. Even wider diversity appeared in the evaluation of Russian internal society, whether it was civilized or savage, prosperous or poor, knowledgeable or ignorant. Most authors argued Russia’s position as somewhere between extremes, and tied their evaluations to policy recommendations. The endorsement of allying, opposing or remaining unattached to Russia identifies specific authors’ views as well as the underlying nebulousness. In the time period covered, Russia existed in a basically
ambiguous strategic space, never a direct opponent or a secure ally. There was also heavy uncertainty within British perception as to what future awaited Russia, whether it would move towards reform, stagnation or nihilist disintegration. This questioning response touched major concerns of British strategy and politics. More fundamentally, it impacted how the British defined themselves. Within the wide partisan variety of late nineteenth century British periodical writings, a major subset incorporated female roles inside Russia. Motifs of feminine representation and masculine power appeared in distinct, specific and relevant ways.
CHAPTER II

THE COLONIAL PRECEDENT

The work that diverse authors have done to date in the study of colonialism is potent. Descriptive studies and methodologies have emerged, particularly since the Saidean watershed and the cultural turn in historiography. This study carries the main accomplishments of the historiography further. In order to do so, it is first necessary to evaluate postcolonial criticism, particularly the connections it explores between gender, race, empire, culture, sexuality and power. The primary focus is on works pertaining to nineteenth century British imperialism, but this overview also incorporates relevant insights from adjacent regions and eras.

Such postcolonial analysis provides insight into the fluid cultural nature of empire. Britain and other powers possessed underlying social forms which tied into and re-enforced the politics of difference. Imperial mentality emerged through linguistics, education and media. The nineteenth century served as Britain’s major period of imperial expansion; and this process tended also to strengthen signifiers of class, race and gender. Whiteness became a major trope in the justification and consolidation of overseas power. The racial discourse proved multi-faceted and unstable, requiring continual refinement in the depiction of both colonizers and colonized. Empire primarily operated through military and economic means, yet it also depended on mental constructs. Many in the British metropole self-identified as non-imperialists, distant from the operation of imperial authority. However, empire was a wider project than the bureaucracy that directly controlled power. Social forces exerted themselves
throughout the imperial discourse, operating processes of expansion and maintaining the status quo. Highlighting the nature of these patterns and their connection to systems of power has been a central task of writers from Said to Stoler.

One of the central accomplishments of colonial historiography has been to prioritize analysis of “the other,” the term used to characterize outsiders and their relation to the self. The depiction of colonized peoples became crucial in the functioning of national and imperial identity. Yet this term is problematic; like everything else it’s shot through with situational context. As Laura Tabili observes in the context of her analysis of internal British racial conditions, the notion of “the other” developed first from an anthropological analysis of gender. It was subsequent to such definition that the term became a linchpin of postcolonial analysis. As Tabili writes: “This should caution us that dehumanizing ’otherness’ remains relational rather than essential, inering in the eyes of the beholder rather than in the ‚othered’. [5] The writings of imperial scholars might or might not describe something authentic in the lives of external subjects. They certainly show something significant about the scholars. Where motifs are persistent and relevant to major power structures, they may serve to illustrate elements of the imperial culture. Motifs can also help define such a culture’s complex interaction with its annexed subjects. This relationship is persistently fluid, touching a measure of uncertainty even in its terminology. Gender is particularly problematic for any form of straightforward analysis, bound up so closely as it is with other constructs of identity and power. As Catherine Hall observes:

Given the privileges and power that whiteness carried in the colonial world, questions of racial mixing and sexual control were crucial to the maintenance of imperial authority. Those of mixed race could challenge the distinction between colonizer and colonized and act as sources of subversion, threats to white prestige.[6]
Imperial identity involved presuppositions and imposed roles for both gender and race. Dominant masculinity imposed certain sexual norms, which acted to restrict inappropriate racial contact in reproduction and erotics. In its most general form gender constructs involved prohibition against female whites interacting sexuality with native males, while white males gained sexual privileges over the colonized. Specific examples show the operation of simultaneous networks of race, gender, sexuality and power that functioned to imperial ends. Hall provides a particular gendered application of this general motif: “The degradation of Hindu women was symbolized for the British by their seclusion and a life of idleness associated with over-sexualized bodies. By rescuing them, the British could both reinforce their own masculinity and legitimate their rule.”[7] Such a focus acted to define the native women but also the norms expected of the British. Defining oneself as superior imposed its own obligations.

The dominant pattern of language that colonial missionaries, officials and planters used asserted the existence of strong boundaries. At different points such boundaries could consist of either a racial or cultural case. In whichever case, the perception of instrumental difference formed a major factor in imperial life. Across the nineteenth century the notion of British female respectability became increasingly crucial in marking the bounds of racial authority against the colonized in the empire. In a reflection on this period, Hall evaluates the gender connections of imperial power:

Empire was about the political, military, economic, and cultural exploitation and domination of the British over subject peoples. Britain’s colonial projects were always in relation to those of other empires, as French, Dutch, or German planters, or slave-holders, or traders intersected, whether in the Caribbean, Africa, or South-East Asia. In this chapter, however, the focus is on the specificities of the British Empire, mapping it as a field of gender relations. Metropolitan discourses claimed power across nation and Empire, and the emphasis here is on the ways in which Britons tried to shape their own lives, and those of subject peoples, in varied sites of Empire.[8]
Hall posits a division that is suggestive, but ultimately needs to be overcome. Productive as the analysis of gendered imperial authority is, there is no necessity to stop there. If knowledge and power are linked, culture and geo-political concerns taken as symbiotic, than there is every reason to suspect that gendered significance extended to the British perception of other empires. The British perception of other imperial spaces invites gendered analysis towards their perceptions of the French, the Dutch and, particularly in the late nineteenth century, the Russians. Such analysis could allow for more comprehensive evaluation of the causality of empire. Study into the gender depictions of colonized societies yields profound insight into the operation of British imperialism. However, in many cases this approach does not explain why Britain possessed an empire over such areas. To a large extent the British became interested in colonized societies after they gained dominance over them. The cultural motivations for empire frequently consisted more of the British perceiving rival empires than viewing the colonized. It is certainly far from irrelevant that India was part of the British Empire while France and Russia were independent rivals, yet there are grounds for exploring whether elements of constructed gender perceptions operated in a similar manner beyond the expanse of British control. The core question is whether Victorian imperial analysis applied to areas that had their own system of imperial domination. As referenced above, the concept of othering applied to relations inside ‘Western’ society before it became a tool for postcolonial criticism. Perhaps new ground may be covered in exploring how othering applied to generate the British empire through its perceptions of European rivals. This technique should re-enforce awareness of the connections between political authority and cultural norms. The relevant methodology entails studying similar tactics by which the British metropole related to different peripheries. Such an approach makes the case that perceptions of autonomous rival empires had relevance in
generating and sustaining imperial Britain. The current approach should not reduce apprecia-
tion of native agency, but it may overcome the schism between imperial analysis and diplo-
matic history.

This account must now return to the prevalent themes in the former category. Recent
work in imperial study reveals diverse cultural nuances underlying the operation of masculin-
ized norms. Colonial gendering operated through referents to culture and the body. Alison
Bashford explores such connections in her analysis of British medicine, gender and biopower.

It was not just indigenous people and white women who came to be objects of a con-
flated imperial and medical gaze. The malleability and limits of the male body which made
up the British Army, or the capacities of a white male labour force, were equally part of the
colonial business of tropical medicine.[9]

The production of distinct gender motifs and their colonial deployment established conditions
of acceptability for colonizing males. Symbiosis is key to all masculine-feminine relations,
even dominating ones. Imperial sovereignty imposed another level of symbiotic interrelation-
ship through its establishment of standards for identity. Imperialism fit the colonizers to a cer-
tain archetype, while the main burdens of empire continued to re-define those outside the
masculine-imperial structure. The centrality of gender for imperial authority finds continuing
relevance in its explanation of a wide set of social conditions. As Philippa Levine explores:

We cannot, for example, understand why particular policies or laws were enacted, or
why Empire developed as it did and in the areas it did, without seeing at work the hand of
gender: why men were politically dominant; what role women were supposed to play and
what roles they actually claimed for themselves.[10]

This element is bound up with additional discursive factors such as class and race. In any lived
context masculinity and femininity were experienced differently based on distinctions in
socio-racial status. Awareness of gender tropes also expands rather than precludes understand-
ing the role created by race, class and the nation. The fact that imperialism was a widespread
cultural project should not obscure the influence of state power and its directly coercive agencies. Naked exercise of power, explicitly gendered and otherwise, existed alongside the more diffused social networks covered here. Indeed, the exercise of this soft power was reciprocal with out-and-out domination. Removing awareness of either component weakens overall understanding of the context. Gender stands not as a static ideal for exploring history. Rather it’s a historically contingent factor that can shed nuance on the wider forms by which power operated. Analysis, like history, should be ongoing. Gender operated in a highly fluid as well as powerful manner. Levine comments on the use of gender for the British in both establishing their own masculinity and chastising external groups.

The British found equally faulty societies—such as some communities in north India and in Chinese-populated areas—where they saw women, as they understood it, caged and isolated and those, as in some Pacific Islands, where women displayed what the British regarded as excessive independence.\[^{11}\]

The British self-perception of their civilization was linked to tropes of both gender and balance. These tropes operated to define and re-enforce the societal attire of masculinity. Gender signifiers also provided convenient grounds for condemning alien societies, or re-enforcing the righteousness of pre-existing condemnations. The philosophically arbitrary nature of these judgments is revealed to the extent that opposite models of gender interaction could both be inappropriate.\[^{12}\] Zine Magubane makes a similar observation in the context of racial categories within the metropole. “Paradoxically, indigenous people were often accused of failing to measure up to the standards of ’human nature’ that were developed from observations about their own societies.”\[^{13}\]

The internal causality that justified imperial hierarchy was complex, and linked to sometimes contradictory tropes. Accordingly, gender exercised potency as a direct, powerful and “natural” standard of macro-level comparison. As Levine states: “Women became an index and a measure less of themselves than of men and of societies.\[^{14}\] Gender
was a major element of empire both in how British society functioned and how it interacted with others. Perception was a key component of empire, placing other groups and peoples within an artificially formed world view. While this mentality was not always explicitly pro-empire, it functioned as a fundamentally imperial discourse. It contrasted subjects outside the metropole with the ostensibly more ideal conditions inside it. Discriminatory in perception, the British ultimately coerced those under their power based on such judgements. At times British policies involved efforts to force native societies to ameliorate themselves according to British standards. In other circumstances the same premise of native inferiority justified ruling them in a brutal manner.[15] This process proved ultimately reenforcing. British perceptions generated imperial policies that served to define further viewpoints towards the colonized. Gender was persistently important for such a process. The status of women within colonized societies became a major benchmark for ethical and political evaluation. The extent of gender’s evaluative significance appears in how such judgements imposed even upon colonized subjects. As Thomas Metcalf observes: “Educated Indians often accepted the British insistence upon a connection between the ’status of women and that of the country in general’.”[16] This measure can also apply to the British perception of major societies that were recognizably different and external to them.[17] Antoinette Burton comments on the relevance of the metropole in the formation of such categories: “Commodity capitalism helped to reorder metropolitan culture for the display of imperial power, [and] London was one of the primary spaces in which, and sexuality one of the technologies through which, this refiguration occurred.”[18] Burton cautions against accepting spatial remoteness in the imperial discourse. Historians should not portray the imperial process as distant from the daily life of the capital. Even and especially societal elements that appeared to be outside the direct functioning of empire played a major role in
supporting it. The cultural infrastructure of empire worked through capitalism, spectacle and conversation. The empire depended on and re-enforced cultural patterns of masculinized dominance. One form in which such power operated was the formulation and deployment of linguistics. Language denoted race through gender, and vice versa, as appears in Magubane’s analysis. “Figurative language, whatever form it takes and although it is frequently used unthinkingly and imprecisely, matters—particularly when we are speaking about race and blackness.”[19] Whiteness and its privileges developed against a backdrop of education and imperial culture. Politics of the body operated in both corporeal and social forms. British society expressed tension between different classes and gender over who would have the authority to deploy tropes of racial health.[20] Significant as these disputes were, they were equally important in showing the potency of underlying cultural patterns. Metcalf traces the role of linguistic and educational influence in imperial assumptions:

The British drew upon a range of ideas that had for a long time shaped their views of themselves and, more generally, of the world outside their island home...These ideas included settled expectations of how a ‘proper’ society ought to be organized, and the values, above all those of the right to property and the rule of law, that for the English defined a ‘civilized’ people.[21]

Social values were potent forces in the operation of empire. Yet these were not fixed cultural constants. Rather, they were historically contingent elements derived from patterns of language and association. For the elite in particular, such socialization emerged from early and secondary education. More than formal ideology, or even politics, these “natural” assumptions played a significant causal role in determining British behavior. As Magubane argues: “All economic relations have an ideological dimension, and issues of language and meaning are not simply ephemeral or secondary.”[22] While education stresses acceptance of one’s native language as natural, the most fixed element of linguistics is its fluidity. Changes in power both
reflect and impact upon alterations in language. The power of speech is central to the relationship between colonized and colonizers. Language also impacts on divisions within each group, showing certain tensions within British imperialism.[23] These develop in both cross-cultural hybridity and more conventional internal divisions. Amidst these tensions rooted in language and corporeal identity, femininity again features as crucial to imperial construction. By Magubane’s analysis, gendered metaphors of the body operated more to obscure than to reveal, and need to be read against themselves. Magubane’s approach reveals underlying themes of power and racial construction within British society. Yet imperialism was not “merely” a matter of cultural perception, it had a major impact on the operational lives and behavior of both men and women the British empire. While the work of missionaries and other religious institutions allowed expansion of female roles in the context of empire, there were effective limits to this process.[24] Imperial empowerment was never a static absolute, and scholarship has taken account of how fluid gender norms are.[25] Furthermore, as Magubane writes, “the utility of historical case studies lies less in their ability to generate a totalizing theory than in their ability to suggest ways of looking at the world.”[26] In studying how gender impacted on the imperial world-view, historians may broaden their own perceptions.

While gender changed the format of empire, the reverse process also occurred. Masculine and feminine values took on different roles amidst the imperial context. While women had no official position in the British imperial order they were ultimately of central significance. It developed because of the specific socio-political and economic circumstances with which British imperialism co-existed in the late nineteenth century. Victorian ideology and its elaborate theories of masculine-feminine opposition made women a central factor in asserting British moral superiority. [27] Women specifically and gender generally became increasingly
necessary to consolidate the British empire against native unrest, rival empires and partisan tension within Britain. Men had a lively imperial concern in portraying both native and British women. Gender became increasingly important as the British more explicitly provided colonized subjects with the prospect of future equality inside their empire.\[28\] To an extent such colonized pressure was merely surplus motivation for already deeply embedded values of patriarchy. This emphasis on the crucial role played by empire in underwriting gender stratification must not be taken to imagine a pre-imperial condition of openness. Additionally, and as this account subsequently explores, there were imperial arguments for feminism as well as further patriarchy. The long-normative conditions extended to female exclusion from formal politics or business. The increased circulation of nominally scientific terminology also fueled gender stratification in the nineteenth century, while alternate forces contested this disequilibrium in the same period. According to widespread British perception, innate and measurable biological differences defined women as passive and emotional.\[29\] The same standard regarded men as inherently active and intellectual. Gender inequality drew from the worldly stage of British experience. As Metcalf describes it, the racial perspective incorporates yet was not limited to the Anglo-Indian comparison: “The contrast between India’s degraded sensuality and the masterly redemption of the British nourished a larger, enduring, opposition between an ordering Europe and a feminized ‘Orient’.”\[30\] This study will return to the expression of such themes in writings on Russia. Centrally such themes show the discursive dependence of empire on wider cultural patterns. In addition to these biological assumptions, natalist concerns emerged. Reports of a falling birthrate from 1881 on motivated further regulation of women in their maternal roles. Davin describes: “Middle-class convention of the time took for granted that the proper context of childhood was the family, and the person most responsible
the mother. So if the survival of infants and the health of children was in question...mothers must improve”.[31] TNatalism triggered and justified a state of widespread social concern. National legislation operated to clarify and reinforce motherhood. This was fundamentally an increase in male authority over women, although it also entailed the supremacy of professional and scientific standards.[32] For this time material and cultural health were inescapably linked. Women had a central generational role with both aspects. Far more than just a question of biological care, mothers also had a responsibility to instruct the next generation in moral behavior. [33] Maternity also involved ethics, patriotism, and carefully delineated gender roles. Imperial maternity was simultaneously a major condition of the gendered empire and a central re-enforcer of it. Overall this chapter has explored evidence of a deeply embedded gender significance to empire, both at the imperial metropole and along the frontiers. Understanding each element is crucial for full analysis of the British imperial project in the Victorian era.
CHAPTER III
THE WORLDLY BRITISH STATE

Another major element of this project involves studying how the British empire operated in its overt context. Of particular relevance are the main factors, rivals and tensions that framed the political geography of consolidation. The focus for the discussion is more on the concerns of contemporary imperialists than modern evaluation of these attitudes. The emphasis is on the strategic, diplomatic and military components of empire rather than its cultural infrastructure. A central imperial motif was the perception that the empire’s character was largely defensive. Rather than viewing themselves as hegemonic, many imperialists viewed their empire as an external obligation. This process involved “conquests forced on us” in the evocative phrase provided by Bernard Porter, among others.\[34\] In addition to the colonized populace, the official gaze of the British metropole tended to be fixated on other empires. Fear of external powers helped cause the extension and justification of Britain’s own empire. Fear motivated both formal geo-political calculations and idealized significance. Longley argues that religious influence blurred easily into these calculations: “England felt it had a duty to use its military power in defense of a form of government which the English regarded as ordained by God.”\[35\] Religious rhetoric developed more specifically through social ideals linked to a view of the empire as inherently contested. The Sepoy Rebellion served as a watershed in this regard. Perceptions of the event turned much of the zeitgeist of imperial confidence to paranoia. Consequently, many within administration, the social elite and the public believed it nec-
ecessary to take a more active and combative stance. Emerging doctrines of imperialism across the 1870s and 1880s incorporated and expanded elitist codes of gentry refinement, as well as chivalric ideals. The British populace also mobilized social forces under a rubric of imperial sentiment. In Metcalf’s words:

Jingoism did not imply any particular stance towards the empire, nor did it ever command a universal assent. At its core it was patriotic, not imperial, in its content, expressive of an exuberant sense of nationalism. Nevertheless, by placing that patriotism at the service of empire, jingoism...deepened the hold of empire over the British people.

Although irregular and often linked to situations of crisis, virulent patriotism could support combative trans-imperial projects. Jingoism appealed to sentiments of nationalism and a Manichean perception of international conflict. In some contexts the empire was important precisely because it was in danger, less from indigenous uprisings than rival empires. Imperialism operated through attitudes of both the mass populace and governing elite. More directly this pro-imperial jingoism found direct expression across the rhetoric of the British Empire in the nineteenth century. Walter Arnstein describes Palmerston’s rhetoric in this light, emphasizing the idealistic militancy of his declarations. Palmerston endorsed the Pax Britannia from a standpoint that assumed the self-apparent moral superiority of the English to all alternatives.

Not all figures had as intense rhetoric as Palmerston, yet the motivation behind much of British imperialism was comparative. This rhetoric could at various times refer to the political process, moral character or raw military strength. Many regarded Britain as in the business of empire to prevent itself from being eclipsed by other empires. As Metcalf defines it, among the major motivating forces underlying British imperialism “one was a determination to assert Britain’s equivalence as a major power with her European rivals.” British determination expressed itself in the rhetoric, writings and status of individuals across the British metropole,
including public ceremony for their nominal sovereign. Disraeli’s push for Victoria to gain the new imperial title of Empress of India was a major example of this process. Victoria’s new public role served both as a piece of glamour for a contested monarchy and as a larger ritualistic justification of empire. This mode sought to evoke the grandeur of past empires, but it also referenced contemporary conditions. The problem with the crown’s ceremony in an imperial age wasn’t merely that it was humiliating in its own right.\[41\] The larger issue was that British ceremonial gloss might appear weak by comparison with the ceremony of other empires. At stake was establishing the legitimacy and superiority of the British Empire in contrast with others. Russia, as a Central Asian neighbor with elaborate royal ceremony, was particularly potent in this arena.

The late nineteenth century, despite or because of all its insecurities, witnessed a sizable increase in the territory of imperial Britain. Changes served to substantially alter and complicate Britain’s strategic position. David Powell offers some precise figures: “In 1871 the Empire covered a total area of 7.7 million square miles and had a population of 235 million people. By 1901 the respective figures were 12 million square miles--a quarter of the total land area of the globe--and 400 million people.”\[42\] In a fluid age of global politics, these annexations engendered expansion without delivering firm security. The absence of the latter had much to do with the strategic balance of the British with other Empires as well as internal conditions. Powell continues in his overview: “The growth in size and complexity of the empire posed problems of management for the imperial state in terms of internal relations and responding to external threat.”\[43\] In many conditions the new annexations were compelled by tension more than avarice or paternalism. Despite the growth in power, such measures brought new problems in relation to other empires. That many of these were similarly enlarged exacer-
bate[d certain tensions. The increase of the British empire’s size carried with it new problems in dealing with France, Germany, the Ottomans and Russia.[44]

In many respects Britain was ill-suited to function as a worldly state, yet circumstances forced such a role. A wide strategic consensus regarded at a minimum India as a crucial asset. Guided by a web of circumstantial pragmatism, and shorn of consistent allies or enemies, Britain operated in a relationship of anxiety with many of the neighboring empires. This study referenced late Victorian natalist concerns above; in many ways the comparative population crisis of empire was even more problematic. Porter relates: “Europe’s population was expanding in the nineteenth century, but theirs was expanding even more: North America’s from 6 million in 1800 to 81 million in 1900, Russia from 37 million in 1800 to 111 million in 1900.”[45] Despite or because many of the strategic interests were comparable, paranoia developed about the intent of rivals. Yet Britain’s circumstances were also unique in certain ways by virtue of their scale. Bartlett voices his analysis on this theme of British complications:

Her foreign and defence policy-makers (despite the great resources at their disposal) faced more complicated problems than any of their rivals. There was hardly a corner of the world where she might not find herself in dispute with the local people and--much more seriously--with a rival great power.[46]

Amidst such a backdrop, new and old imperialists could adopt different tactics and antithetical perceptions in their shared context. Distinct cultural currents became dominant across the 1870s and 1880s, including but not limited to the stance of Benjamin Disraeli. Porter identifies a chain of pessimism at work across this new period of imperialism. Coupled to assumptions that Britain needed to expand to survive, a sense of fear drove people towards empire.[47] Such a discourse forms an especially sharp contrast with the celebrated tide of optimism in the mid-nineteenth century, with its assurances of industrial expansion and rational supremacy. The
new position created a distinct lens by which the British could regard their empire, as well as the rival external polities that might take away it away.

Among international rivals in the late nineteenth century Russia was one of the most formidable, particularly in terms of the threat posed to an always-crucial India. The paranoia of an earlier age towards France largely transferred to Russia in this period. Such fear flowed from significant military, political and economic factors. Although there had been no direct conflict since the Crimean War, successive Russian-Ottoman struggles carried with them inherent potential for escalation. Britain made the preservation of the Ottoman empire an ongoing priority across much of the nineteenth century. The Crimean settlement preserved the Ottoman Empire, and in so doing guarded against the possibility of destruction of Britain’s Eastern interests. The situation was in many ways merely a postponement, and uncertainty continued regarding Russian capacities and intentions. Crimea proved to be the last outright conflict between the British and Russian empires, but this reality was far from self-apparent across the 1850s to the end of the century. Different ministries and parties took different stand-points. One symbol of alliance was a marriage between the royal dynasties, yet tensions over the Eastern Question continued to provide military tension, particularly in Disraeli’s administrations.[48] Continuing tensions and diplomacy established that the British had no inherent commitment to safeguarding Ottoman interests in themselves. Rather, their motivation was merely to halt Russia’s expansion.[49] An additional function of the tension-motif on the European stage involved Palmerston’s support by the 1860s of a strong Germanic state to form a buffer against Russia. His flamboyant rhetoric in this circumstance expressed a concern that Russia might achieve an Empire the size of Rome’s.[50] Yet it was more persistently along the Asian frontier that tensions flared. Across the late nineteenth century affairs didn’t inherently
necessitate antagonism, although matters tended ultimately towards conflict. Bartlett describes:

There had been hopes in some quarters until the early 1870s that the Russians might permit the emergence of an effective buffer zone between their Asiatic empire and that of Britain in India. The Gladstone government of 1868 in particular tried to pursue what sceptics characterized as the policy of ‘masterly inactivity’ - a policy designed to give the Russians no excuse to take the offensive themselves. Russian assurances, however, were belied by their own conduct. The advance into Central Asia continued.\[51\]

International standoff generated ongoing tension and near outbreaks of war, from an unstable frontier at Afghanistan to perceived Russian designs upon the Ottomans.\[52\] To an extent this tension impacted on partisan struggles within Britain, tying to Tory fears that Gladstone was excessively lax, leaving Central Asian defenses too weak to guard against the Russians. Even more ominous was the fear that Russian expansion was responsible for generating native uprisings.\[53\]

In the late nineteenth century vague spheres of influence transformed into more direct control. Guarding India and its borders became a main imperial priority as they became menaced by the global positioning of rival empires. Fear of Russia motivated the annexation of Burma and Baluchistan, and acquiring tighter control over existing areas of Empire.\[54\] The impact of this fear transformed the British relationship with colonized subjects. Yet the underlying basis for this change had much to do with perceptions of rival imperial powers. The most prominent Other that motivated expansion of the British imperial self in the mid to late nineteenth century was the Russian Empire. While the anticipated imperial clash over India never materialized, the mere concern of it caused a cascade of colonial change. The Russians played a major role in the expansion and consolidation of British power. At a minimum British perceptions of hostile Russian agency exercised significant influence on imperial policy. To a large extent Britain was a worldly state in the late nineteenth century, but in terms of major
energy and concentration it was a British state with extensive colonial investments over Ireland and India. Consequently, the most central problem seemed to be the power whose every move evidenced menacing designs on India.

There was more involved in this process than the mere self-interest of empire. Societal and emotional forces became drawn up in what Britain associated with them. In the context of the above discussion, it is significant that the very term “jingoism” derived from the celebrated song on the occasion of the 1877 Russo-Turkish war, showing a willingness for belligerency against Russia as needed. The term and sentiment were hardly limited to an anti-Russian trope, yet that it derived initially in this context showed the lines of international tension in the Victorian era. There was more at stake than material advantage. The trope of antagonism to Russian power achieved as well the dimensions of a religious struggle. Clifford Longley analyzes:

Russia, both because it was opposed to British interests worldwide but also because it was thought to be undeveloped and tyrannical, was a favorite bete noire of the British press. The Russian threat to control Palestine, or at least those parts and places in Palestine special to Christians, was regarded as a direct threat to British interests—which were, self-evidently to a mid-nineteenth-century Englishman, the interests of God. Curiously they did not so much mind a Muslim country ruling Palestine; and France, though Catholic, was more acceptable as a guardian of the Holy Places than Russia.

To what extent perceptions of Russia as a sacrilegious and oppressive power existed independently of concern over their foreign policy is hard to assess, certainly the perceived aspects tended to be mutually reenforcing. There was also the context, formed with history, geography, religion and culture that made Russia an Other in a way the French, the Americans and even the Germans generally weren’t. This study will in due course return at length to this perception of the Russians as inherently primitive and oppressive. Another factor underlying such views was a trope of masculinity. Such gendering was particularly expressed in tension across
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the 'Eastern Question', as re-enforced by education, literature and general culture. Metcalf presents this perspective:

The purely male world of the frontier evoked too for the British the days of their boyhood. The Frontier, so they believed, like the public school, 'tested the man'...On a larger scale, involving the Afghans and the Russians, the Frontier was of course the locale of the 'Great Game', of which Kipling wrote so evocatively in *Kim*, and whose ideal Pathan was Mahbub Ali the horsetrader, wild yet tamed to the service of the Raj.[57]

This imperial aspect of British national character emerged from and reenforced specific colonial tropes. Based on rivalry with the Russian Empire, this perception also appealed to extensive social associations. At stake for the British in such competitions, as well as the pressure to shore up a faltering Ottoman polity, was both the British empire and British character. Both administration and defense of a world-wide empire exerted significant impact on the politics, perspectives and institutions of British culture.[58] The context applied as well to the functioning of national politics, with the perspective and integration of the empire enhancing the cohesion of the British "internal" state and society.[59] This situation developed not merely from Russian tension, but such trans-imperial antipathy remained a major influencing factor.

Yet for all the strategy, political calculation and moralistic evaluation invested in wariness towards Russia, this stance proved transitory. After the Russo-Ottoman War of 1877-8 active and consistent support for the Ottoman empire declined, motivated by changing strategy and shift to a more isolationist mentality.[60] This process reduced assistance for the Ottomans, giving birth to Balkan chaos and a geo-political shift. Coupled to a moralistic critique of the Ottoman regime, this new trend was re-enforced by liberal criticism of atrocities such as Armenian suppression. Even more significant was the opening of the Suez Canal and the British occupation of Egypt in 1882. Subsequently the basis of British strategy towards the Near East focused on Egypt as a link to and defense of India. The change in transportation logistics
decreased the importance of the Ottomans, as well as concern over Russian ambitions. Views shifted towards accommodation with Russia, which no longer appeared as dangerous as previously believed. Among the governing elite, Russian interest even in Manchuria excited less anxiety than in the past. The decrease in fear derived less from a general decrease in militancy and more from a changed focus of anxiety. Powell relates: “In the late nineteenth century, France and Russia had been seen as Britain’s most likely enemies. By the early twentieth century, however, Germany, with its unstable Kaiser and its expanding naval fleet, was coming to be seen as a more serious threat.” Shifts in diplomacy became more explicit into the early twentieth century, as with the Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907, although Arnstein reminds that “the pre-1914 tie between Britain and Russia never became more than a polite formality.” Russia was for a time very important to British policy, perception and identity. The strategic concern did not always take the form of overt xenophobia towards Russia. It was possible, as Metcalf described, for the competition to be fairly amiable. Alternatively Russia sometimes seemed dangerous because of its extent rather than its vices. Still, for many British politicians and analysts, antipathy towards Russia was a vital element of sound geo-politics. Such tension formed the strategic backdrop in which late Victorian periodicals described Russia. Another aspect of their context was the prominence of gender divisions, in and beyond the periodicals. It is to this arena that the study now turns.
CHAPTER IV

INSTITUTIONS OF GENDER

An element largely absent from the preceding analysis has been the gender dynamic of the trans-imperial balance. To return to this motif, it is relevant that the British empire’s tension with rivals was largely masculine on both sides, involving male individuals and institutions. The wider culture of empire made significant use of gender through both masculine ideologies and feminine signifiers. The centrality of gender tropes in Imperial Britain appears in a more direct and extensive examination of women’s position in society. This overview also re-enforces gender’s utility as a focal point of analysis. Authors made use of gender signifiers because they formed a major aspect of their cultural background. This approach highlights the way that women were crucial to the functioning of the British metropole and contemporary British periodicals. The task is now to examine how gender balance was significant in the way the British lived, perceived and imperialized.

In the nineteenth century context, male codes defined women in a subservient role. They were to serve as mothers of white sons and be agents of enlightenment. Most women lived according to certain social limitations, gaining both status and restriction from the assumptions of racial nationality. Racialization also provided some women with an opportunity to expand their prominence and social position, claiming equality by anchoring themselves to imperialism. More radically, a few women pursued heterodox social arrangements and challenged the norms of empire. Examining the comparative gender dynamic in the con-
struction and maintenance of imperialism within Britain reveals the instrumentality of matern
al femininity. Empire constituted one of the central motifs by which women could act to
either reenforce or jeopardize masculine imperialism, and it was the dominant standard by
which men judged them.

Intermingled with the expansion of British authority and territorial wealth was an ele-
vation in colonists’ fear of native populations. However confident the British were in their
secure rule over India, there remained an undercurrent of paranoia. Particularly acute was fear
of another native disturbance such as the 1857 “Indian Mutiny”. A dominant theme within the
empire concerned protecting women and children. They were the civilian lifeblood of the
future, and the most traumatic events for imperial Britain concerned violence or threatened
violence towards women and youth. Part of the presentation of the Mutiny included graphic
stories of attack, crucifixion and rape against British women.\textsuperscript{64} Organized violence against
British men was a fearsome political act, but real and imagined atrocities against women
threatened the cornerstone of British supremacy. They weakened at once the future continuity
of the imperial race, and British claims of a secure imperial presence. Both before and espe-
cially after the Sepoy Rebellion, the dominant British assumption was that all male Indians
lusted after their women, and were restrained from rape only by re-education, intimidation and
violence. This essentialized presentation developed a self-motivating portrayal of Indian bar-
barism, justifying the need for further control. The parallel of sexual imagery and paranoid
violence hint at the connection between the two, in the way both facets could define British
power. In its practice and justification, empire was a project formed by British men revolving
around a combative masculinity and a womanhood that needed shelter.
With so much invested in their imperial position, women of the Raj long served as some of its strongest supporters. Their overarching assumption was that British rule was long-standing, benevolent and beneficial. This sentiment convinced many even after rising nationalism ended British sovereignty. Female status in the Empire, however, was reliant on certain assumed behaviors. The most central values were marriage and socio-sexual conformity to male norms. For the same reason that British wives were a bulwark of empire, single British women were highly threatening in a colonial setting. Mixed with these concerns was a cultural anxiety about the very function of the female body. This worry found expression in novels such as *King Solomon’s Mines*, which presented the necessity for controlled reproduction and the danger of independent female life. The colonial discourse of domination depended on repressing alternative presentations, on censuring female sexuality outside of marriage and on restricting autonomous women employees. Conformity by British women was an essential part of preserving colonial control. Since the absence of imperial order would ostensibly enable violence against woman, this philosophy presented such patriarchal norms as women’s best self-interest.

Another movement associated an increased call for gender equality with British imperialism. Campaigns such as the female anti-slavery movement led in some instances to development of a racially-linked feminism. Specific campaigns such as the drive against sati in India frequently had as much to do with enforcing the moral basis for British domination as saving innocent Indian women. Imperialism offered an array of contrasts, in which assumptions of female gentleness and morality could be joined to male domination. Victorian feminists identified their pattern of reform with the interests of the British nation, and subsequently the ruling British race. Empire gave them a central role in the imperial fantasy that feminists
hoped to leverage into increased representational power. Maternal responsibilities were not erased, rather feminists moved to reinforce race preservation and female reproductive central-ity as a way of changing some of the socio-political balance. When British feminists focused on the condition of Indian women, it was generally accompanied by an unfavorable compar-i-son with British refinement. As Burton characterizes this motif: “Indian women appeared, in other words, as a colonial clientele that defined and authorized British feminists’ imperial sav-ing role.”[68] Indian women in themselves were not acceptable role models or social beings. However, the raw material of their debasement and poor self-definition provided valuable fod-der for the arguments of British female emancipation. Many female activists identified the British Empire as righteous and justified, and reform-minded agitation served to legitimate imperial rule. The empire offered new space, cultural as well as political, in which women could assert themselves. Relevant to the context was a brief but intense discussion on female emigration that defined a new role for independent women. Colonized lands offered areas where women’s roles would be more significant, and hence their power could be enhanced. Despite frequent ”humanitarian” campaigns the relation to the female Other was often far from beneficial. Imperial standards varied somewhat by region, with the age and past accomplish-ments of Hindu civilization earning them a certain measure of consideration. Consequently proposals for India included suggestions of forcible enlightenment. For many feminist individ-uals and institutions, the natural and productive approach was to advance claims of racial soli-darity over ones of gender.

In the British Empire there were severe social and political pressures on women to maintain their proper ’dignity’ and maternal role. British society defined female adherence to bourgeois moral codes as necessary for racial integrity and imperial continuity. Nevertheless,
some individuals moved beyond proper conventions. Such behavior could take diverse forms, and was prompted by variances in female occupation, intention and politics. One cultural challenge involved the theosophy societies, in which British women approached past Indian culture in a more appreciative vein. While much imperialism included the appreciation and absorption of past Hindu culture, these literary and cultural reservoirs could also serve to challenge Western values. As Jayawardena asserts, such a tactic involved a greater appeal for Indian ideology and the supposed primordial nature of ancient Asiatic religion. “In dismissing Western society, its ideology, culture, economic structures and class system, many of the women influenced by theosophy became interested in looking to Asian societies for alternative beliefs and ways of life.”[69] In addition to valuing such things for their own sake, theosophy had an appeal for women in offering broader spiritual and secular equality. As well as providing an intellectual and spiritual appeal, theosophist societies provided increased voice and independence for its female members. Promoting increased cultural contact and intellectual exchange between Britain and India, this movement may have helped promote nationalist ideals among later Indian activists. However, this approach by disconnected memsahib could be significant in its own right. Jayawardena discusses: “At a time when white males were dominant and Britannia ruled the waves, white women who rejected their own religion and culture and accepted those of the colonized were a challenge to the ’civilizing mission’ and concepts of the superior ’master race’.”[70] Female Orientalists in nineteenth century India included those who used native texts to endorse a feminist stance, as well as others who romantically embraced tradition in its own right. Hindu traditions could have a variety of contemporary political meanings. Relating to Indian natives in a less hierarchal fashion provided a broader
opening for cross-cultural contact, and for opportunities for British females outside conventional bounds.

Gender was a pivotal component in the emergence, consolidation and justification of European imperialism. Looking at the role of white women in contact with the colonized in the late nineteenth century sheds insight on the increasingly racialized and competitive fashion in which Europeans administered their empires. This era is significant as the last great saga of territorial expansion. It provided the last opportunity for empires to extend and define themselves before the twentieth century cycle of world wars, decolonization and the spectre of global communism. Imperialism allowed empires to gain profits and contrast their societies with apparently inferior barbarians. White women were both privileged and restricted by this process. Feminists frequently embraced the imperial mission and its assumptions. They were marked as superior to millions of native men by virtue of their culture, morality and race. Additionally, as less civilized frontiers could offer certain nuances, ambiguities and even freedoms that were elusive in conventional society. However, the very recognition of racial and cultural superiority often restricted and defined European women. These tensions played themselves out across the scope of empire, and the gender dynamic and contradictions reveal much about the power assumptions of imperialism. Empire tied into how polities perceived and vindicated themselves. It also allows historians to see how gender contributes to an understanding of the British Empire.

Articles from the presses were crucial in building a wider dynamic of evaluation, in and beyond the operation of gender. Periodicals touched on both strategic and moral aspects. At the most blatant level, imperial writing involved a sense of direct nationalism. Such articles contrasted foreignness with English loyalty, civic pride and liberty. More generally periodi-
Periodicals played a major role in both representing and influencing views in the Victorian age. Laurel Brake provides an overview:

The apparently overstated claim of the newspaper editor W. T. Stead in 1886 that journalism not Parliament best represented and served the people of Britain was not simply a boast of a solitary individual subject. It was the outcome of a widely perceived growth of the power of the press throughout the century, spurred in 1855 by abolition of compulsory newspaper taxes, resulting in the development of cheap and numerous titles.\[72\]

The issues that the periodicals addressed are crucial for historical re-construction as much as they were in contemporary social influence. One may at this point echo the judgment of John North statement “that circulation of periodicals and newspapers was larger and more influential in the nineteenth century than printed books, and served a more varied constituency in all walks of life.”\[73\] While analysis of connections and reception will always be tenuous, the articles and authors of this period provide a valuable source for macro-level issues of empire and tension. Brake comments: “Any research on Victorian culture must consider how different newspapers and periodicals mediated key debates within the period.”\[74\] Issues of masculine identity and feminine signifiers connected to the ambiguities of external imperial rivalry through omnipresent news agencies. This backdrop connected frequently and potently to gender motifs within British society. The mentality of the ’politics of home’ exerted major influence in perceived spheres of national and domestic government. Such ideology of the home derived in large part from the Victorian press.\[75\] Gender divisions were artificial creations, and the press provided one of the fulcrums necessary to create them in this form. Gender functioned in an environment of historical fluidity and increasingly direct articulation of masculine ideologies by upper and middle class spheres. Major factors included the height of the cult of domesticity and investment in separate spheres.\[76\]
The significance of imperialist connection to a sense of national identity is difficult to over-emphasize. Similarly, connections between gender and imperial structures were rampant across the structures of Victorian society. Empire proved a potent cultural force, enabling significant gendering through distribution of ideologies in the presses. As Fraser comments: “The periodical press in Victoria’s day had a sustained influence on the gendered assumptions of both the home and the colonial culture over which she presided. Journals and magazines became sites of intensified representations of gender and sexual identity.”[77] Women’s and men’s issues emerged through press articles and arguments. Gendering operated both explicitly and peripherally. Dealing with gender served to heighten various internal tensions and conflicts, both in British power as it operated on the world stage and with internal conflicts on how best to deal with the resultant problems. Such tensions were made all the stronger by a basic insatiability and conflict at work within these representational articles themselves. Brake continues in this theme:

The concept of encounters is important not only because it mediates periodicals’ social functions, but also because it offsets another tendency: a journal title promises a false unity, appearing to present, despite its many articles, topics, and illustrations, a unified policy or set of beliefs, as if the journal itself were a single author.[78]

If nothing else, such concern tends to express the ambiguities at work within periodical texts. Awareness of the press as a site of encounters also draws on their broader societal context. In no sense is this project a study of a monolithic force or coherent agency. The most consistent context involves of tension, ambiguity and fragmentation. Research involves close study of particular texts at every stage of the reconstructive project. That this ambiguity reaches to the very nature of the periodical primary sources is at once complicating and unavoidable. Such ambiguity becomes further problematized due to the operation of other contemporary tensions. Fraser highlights this oppositional tension, which derives from an external contrast.
Englishness is always constructed in opposition to others; European others, indigenous others, colonized others. This opposition, developed as a simplistic superior/inferior dichotomy, is manifest in a wide variety of literary discourses throughout the nineteenth century.\[79\]

Women played a large role in this process, facilitating standards of evaluation. Gender tropes could alleviate both imperial concerns and national anxiety. Periodicals constructed an image of naturally refined English women in contrast with outsiders. The imperial take on foreign feminized subjects showed their transgressive agency. Such women were beyond civilized bonds, at once inappropriate and coarse\[80\]. Class boundaries obviously played a major role in such gender construction. Gender contributed heavily to British ambiguity and debate in the presses of the time. Far from an inherent solidarity on same-sex lines, and as seen previously, British gender was a constructed aspect that in many cases repudiated ties of sympathy or direct compatibility with women of different cultures. Basing themselves around an assumed racial and class context, the most active and influential body of British women often drew direct support from imperial premises to enhance their own position. The intersections of Britishness, femininity, class, race, masculinity, sexuality, religion and morals were both significant and convoluted.

While many of the same tropes of colonial gendering occurred in the British perception of Russia, the fact that Russia remained outside British control forced an additional layer of uncertainty. Confronting an independent political institution, British perception of the Russian empire involved a high measure of uncertainty. Unlike with India there was no assurance of a natural military or political buffer to keep Russia operating according in British interests. The basic alternative required trust in Russia’s leadership and political institutions, and in certain contexts this was a step many British policy-setters and analysts were unprepared to make. Such concerns rarely were characterized explicitly in terms of a gender imbalance, yet gender
provided a major aspect and tool of such evaluation. To turn again to the internal colonial balance, this time in the words of Levine:

British immigration officials saw this imaginary Indian monoculture as more controlling of female sexuality than British society, an assumption highlighting the link between colonialism and sexuality....The more brutal the treatment of women, went colonial thinking, the more primitive the society.[81]

Levine traces how gender emerged through British perceptions towards Asian peoples, both those directly colonized and those that remained external. Although her analysis highlights such apprehensions in the context of immigration, as a general trope of imperial perceptions it also holds validity. As addressed above, one of the central questions of this study is whether the imperial context of Victorian periodicals saw Russia as Asian, European, or a hybrid of both, as well as what if any role gender signifiers might have played in such texts. It is time to turn to such analysis to see what tropes emerge.
CHAPTER V
THE HOSTILE ANALYSIS

In his *Nineteenth Century* article “Russian nihilism”[82] Fritz Conliffe-Owen provides a detailed and condemnatory overview of contemporary Russian radicalism. He depicts the Russian political scene as far more extreme than the rest of Europe. Correspondingly Russia’s dominant revolutionary movement, unlike continental reform efforts, deserves the title of nihilism since it aims that “all existing institutions...be utterly destroyed.”[83] Conliffe-Owen characterizes the movement as nakedly hostile to the state, religion, property and morality. Nihilism’s intent is not to form a new system but instead to institute anarchy and unrestricted individualism. Through specific quotation and general characterizations, Conliffe-Owen’s article describes a love of violence for the sake of violence. His view identifies the Nihilists as appealing to chaos as a new order. This movement involved youthful rejection of the past and an embrace of violence unique to Russia. “To Western Europeans it is almost utterly incomprehensible how thousands of human beings can entertain such notions as have now been quoted; and above all, how they can have been adopted to such an extent as to form a menace to the Government.”[84] This statement distances Russia from not merely British norms, but the wider structure of civilized European society. Whatever the qualities are that Western Europeans possess to provide a measure of political moderation, Russia doesn’t have them. After claiming such a cultural divide Conliffe-Owen seeks to explain it by reference to the natural character of the Russian. He views this character as inherently superficial and prone to sensu-
ality. By his judgement Russian society lacks impulse control, and is instead motivated by transitory feelings. The dominant mentality involves attachment to the shadow of principle rather than its essence. These conditions date back many generations, but a torrent of ill-considered reforms and educational modifications produced a more acute contemporary crisis.

“What we should punish as conceit in England is praised as genius in Russia.” The article also describes the lives and careers of certain specific nihilists. Such intersections of quasi-biography do not remove the focus on both ideology and society. Nihilism exists as a product of discontent and youthful extremism. The immorality, stagnation and oppression of the tsarist state inspire such views. Conliffe-Owen condemns both the insanity of the nihilists and the awkwardly disciplined society that allows them to emerge.

Specific gender coding in this overview includes the descriptions of nihilist women and analysis of what their actions signify for Russia. The standard evaluation of nihilist Russian women includes figures such as Vera, a pawnbroker’s wife of independent character who embraced nihilism as a means of liberation from her parents’ authority. The motivation involved individual self-interest rather than political ideology, and is fundamentally linked to hostility towards family conventions. As the narrative recounts:

A month or two later Vera takes it into her head to earn her own living; accordingly she sets up a dressmaking business under the immediate patronage of Julie and her friends. Twenty young needlewomen belong to this establishment, which is conducted according to Nihilist notions. At the end of every month the net profits are equally divided amongst all the members, Vera merely taking her share with the rest. The young women all live in the same house and take their meals together; in this manner they are able to economize a great deal by buying all their provisions and necessaries at wholesale prices. They appear to have possessed everything in common and to have contented themselves with little, for M. Tschernyschewsky expressly informs us that the twenty young ladies only had five umbrellas amongst them. The financial success of the undertaking is so great that we actually find the girls at a loss how to invest their earnings profitably.
In this description, women’s ability to actualize their ideals is linked with an underlying vanity in approach. More significant than the fact of domestic and financial success is that the motivation occurs abruptly and without deliberation. This motif finds re-enforcement in the lack of recourse by the “girls” in dealing with their success. Conliffe-Owen’s emphasis on diminished intellectual capabilities even in the period of strongest objective success emphasizes the failed humanity of the nihilist venture. This theme is more explicitly seen in continued analysis of one of the article’s “heroines”. Vera becomes the subject of a love triangle, and declines a proposal for a menage a trois, not from “any false feelings of womanly shame” but because of the desire not to be burdened by the presence of the third partner.[88] This alienation from natural mores and disdaining feminine propriety as artificial emerges in this article as one of the main problems of Russian women. Such core “natures” are relevant even beyond the actions which this attitude motivates. The essential vanity of female nihilists also appears in the extent to which they are riveted by gossiping about “orgies in the most licentious of colours”[89]. Even in separation, their personalities revolve around the baser norms of sexuality, and their prominence in the revolutionary movement discredits more than liberates them. A different nihilist wife finds characterization as a drunkard whose first interest on gaining money is to buy a proper outfit.[90] Furthermore, in a description of an 1875 trial and criminal charges, female involvement provides increased concern over the moral chaos of the nihilists.

One of the accused, a girl named Idalia Polheim, acknowledged that she had received orders from the central committee to become the paramour of a wealthy old landed proprietor, and then to poison and rob him of his riches in favor of the cause. On another occasion the same girl had been instructed by the committee to become the mistress of a certain Larinoff, who had threatened to desert the revolutionary party.[91]

Political radicalism blurs easily into sexual immorality and personal crime. Having rejected their society’s values in principle, it is not hard for nihilist women to perform specific and
immoral acts. The matter of fact manner of this narrative traces a clear connection between prostitution, robbery and murder. All spring from the same intention, all help reveal the underlying character of the nihilist. The supposed susceptibility and radical adherence of women makes this point particularly clear. Disembodied as the women appear in these actions their femininity emphasizes the ruthlessness of nihilist policies. More generally, Conliffe-Owen’s account suggests that nihilist women are an extreme forerunner that define the problematic nature of Russia as a whole. The article turns to generalizations:

Some astonishment has been expressed at the large number of young girls implicated in all these Nihilist conspiracies who seek to emulate the conduct of M. Tscherny-schewsky’s Vera. We would, however, remark that in Russia, as elsewhere, women are apt to rush to extremes in politics as well as in religion; with them the heart is stronger than the head.\[92\]

This sentiment links Russian femininity to a global misogynist discourse. It assumes a certain essentialized condition for women, such that intellect cannot balance passion and unrestrained females tend to exceed proper boundaries. This characterization explicitly crosses national boundaries, using women as a type of social constant. Simultaneously, however, Conliffe-Owen argues for a specific kind of Russian political condition. Russian women are at essence no different from women in other societies, but the prominence of their violence and radicalism characterizes their society in a specific way. Feminine identification specifically with nihilist societies suggests a failure of more conventional Russians to attract attention. The self-confidence and determination of the nihilists does not indicate they are morally or politically justified, but it does suggest that the society they are operating in is dysfunctional. The repeated stress on female nihilist agents re-enforces this characterization. Gendering makes explicit Conliffe-Owen’s main description and evaluation. The condemnation stands on its
own, but the appearance of women in the text provides additional force. Russian women serve as a tangible demonstration of Conliffe-Owen’s more abstract depiction.

Another piece working through different authorship, although the same periodical, also highlights the revealing connections between Russian nihilism and Russian femininity. The re-occurrence of this motif evidences not just personal interest by specific writers, but a more general perceptual trend across the analysis of *The Nineteenth Century*. Assessing the impact of such pieces is inherently difficult. It is problematic to assess the readership of specific pieces, as well as estimate how many readers concurred with a given article, how many disagreed, and how many saw it as utterly self-evident. Beyond such evaluations there remains the text itself, one of a series of cautionary tales on Russian radicalism, its underlying political dysfunction and the gendered connotations of this process.

William Ralston Shedden Ralston’s “Russian Revolutionary Literature”[93] describes the contemporary state of Russian nihilist agitation and its social implications. Ralston was a renowned folklorist and Russian scholar, as well as a close friend of Turgenev. Much of his translations involved Turgenev’s work, although he also promoted the British reception of Tolstoy and Lermontov. Additionally, across the 1870s Ralston authored three influential book in the field of Slavonic studies: *The Songs of the Russian People, Russian Folk-Tales* and *Early Russian History*. In the 1880s Ralston became plagued by depression, illness, isolation and narcotics, twice being arrested for disorderly conduct and ultimately committing suicide. Because of medical issues, he canceled successive plans to visit Russia in his last years[94] As such a central figure in the British scholarship on Russian, Ralston merits increased relative quantity and nuance of analysis. In light of his avid interest in Russia, and expressed admiration for its people it may appear odd that Ralston characterizes Russian society and gender so
harshly in the piece “Russian Revolutionary Literature”. The dichotomy may indicate wide reaches of ambiguity at work in specific British authors as well as institutions. It also suggests that the ostensible contrast of ideology with the “friendly” JM piece presented below may be less than it would first appear. The two perceptions may be dual sides of the same coin. Ralston’s lens in this article is a recent trial in St. Petersburg that unveiled political spectacle through dissection of a defeated revolutionary cell. Far from being innocent victims or typical criminals the accused in this case “formed a really secret and political association.”[95] The individuals were persons of culture, who disguised themselves as commoners. Their primary activity was an attempt to spread revolutionary doctrines among the masses. Tsarist seizure of several revolutionary book donors in March 1875 produced a further series of arrests that immobilized the conspirators and revealed many details of their lives. Throughout this work Ralston appears intrinsically to accept the assertions and characterizations obtained at the trial regarding the defendants’ actions and motivation. Given the scepticism Ralston later expresses regarding the oppression of the tsarist state, this sentiment is somewhat paradoxical, yet crucial to his effort at establishing a reliable basis for knowledge of Russia. Without domination over their political process, British authors have to work through existing structures, with their own biases and politics.

Ralston does more than echo details from the trials, he also provides his own evaluation of the group. Throughout this article he evaluates the partisans with a specific mode of disdain, characterizing them as “insanely unwise” in addition to being “romantic by their nature and pathetic by their result.”[96] The ultimate effort was pathetic because, as the article relates it, the Russian masses were not inclined to accept revolutionary doctrines. The measure was doomed from the beginning, unpopular populism that deserved failure. Nevertheless, a
measure of sympathy leaks through the account. Ralston recommends that the authorities find other outlets for Russian youth, as well as abolish continuing abuses. Ralston does not endorse or approve of the secret society, in either their beliefs or actions. Nevertheless he regards them as misguided rather than malevolent, and indicative of the central problems in Russian society.

“It is rather stagnation than over-activity that is to be dreaded in Russia.”[97]

It is not without relevance that, as radical nihilist groups go, the activities of the St. Petersburg cell were relatively benign. The main intent was radical, but through metamorphosis rather than active violence. The group had certain inherent capabilities for violence, as will be shown below, but it is far from the most menacing organization that a cautious British writer could have referenced. Another element in the overview that appears peculiar is the comparative absence of ideology. It would seem that presentation of such a group lends itself to discussion of theory. However Ralston largely bypasses this issue.[98] Ralston’s comments fit with the distinct perspective of Russia his article expresses. Russia appears in this British Othering as essentially backward. It’s legal system is harsh and archaic, its major institutions are unchanging and stupefying, its leaders are reactionary and unintelligent. These characterizations do not apply to the nihilist radicals that the article focuses on, but by its definition these revolutionaries are fundamentally incapable of achieving significant change in the broader conditions of their country.

Gender coding forms another major aspect of this article, emerging in diverse linked characterizations to buttress the core of its argument. Ralston describes both the gentlemen and ladies of the movement as prominent, but in significantly different ways. Women perform a number of major actions in this saga, yet always in a delineated manner. Ralston positions women in relation to men, both husbands and fathers. Ralston lists their male connections
along with class, distinguishing them in dependency by including relatives and overlords. The nihilist men receive a greater depicted share of self-sufficiency throughout the text. For example, Ralston presents an introduction to his account’s women:

Among the women, who all wore the dress of the common people, were a so-called Princess Tsitsianof; the two daughters, Olga and Vera, of an official named Liubatovich; two ladies belonging to the ‘noble’ class, named Sophie Bardine and Lydia Figner; and Betya Kaminsky, a merchant’s daughter, who had studied at Zurich and at Bern.[99]

The first aspect of the female characters that Ralston finds relevant is their attire. Such dress, rather than their names, personal beliefs or backgrounds is the first point of interest. On the most circumstantial level attire across class lines serves to camouflage the female agents, granting a measure of anonymity and protection from tsarist surveillance. It also defines them in this attempt to hide, and insofar as British analysis picks up on its centrality it shows how they were already defined. Women here are the objects of the male gaze, and description in the text indicates that within the narrative they cannot escape it. Russian women might disguise their station and radical intent, but they cannot avoid the status and attention allocated by their gender. Ralston’s depiction puts him, and the reader, in a similar position to the probing masculine eye of the tsarist apparatus, as well as beyond it. His account also gives circumstantial omniscience through reference to after the fact knowledge. Far from being burdened by the methodology of second hand knowledge, this assembly of miniature narratives revels in it. Ralston’s direction of how and in what sequence readers first comprehend the situation of Russian nihilist women speaks directly to broad trans-national networks of gender power through the locus of perception. Ralston further defines and makes dependent his female subjects through the rest of his overview. True class identity and family backgrounds are presented before personal names, suggesting their greater comparative importance. Even in rebellion women are not autonomous agents. Rather, they appear here as manifestations of diverse back-
grounds and societal pressures. The description continues to emphasize ambiguity and duplicity in female identity, with both a “so-called Princess” and the sceptical quotation placed over the noble category of Bardine and Figner. What this depiction provides is nothing resembling full biography, rather it uses women as foci to show a range of intersecting and conflicting masculine identities and power networks.

Continuing with his overview, Ralston describes the actions of these feminine quasi-agents. All the women took common apparel, with false names and forged passports; most working in the factories.[100] The main pattern of activity, disguise and subversion remains in the background of this account. The dominant focus is on dramatic or startling events. Nevertheless the terse descriptive overviews can be unintentionally revealing, as in the characterization of nihilist female habitation and activity. “They lived in the same quarters, their women going barefooted, wearing the dress of the common people, fetching water, and doing all the work of the house for themselves”. [102] Additionally they spread seditious materials to factory workers, also reading to them as necessary. Barefoot women in this context connotes poverty, feigned in this case, rather than the domestic misogyny familiar from other rhetoric. Ralston refers again to the women’s feigned attire. Their labor in such feigned clothing and habitation is direct and perpetual, marking another contrast with the experiences they would have been accustomed to in an upper class existence. If such experiences caused particular burden or complaint, the text does not record it. The article avoids either praise, condemnation or particular comment concerning the ability of these women to perform effective labor. Significantly the overall emphasis still remains on domestic labor and assistance. The one item of concrete action described, fetching water, still emphasizes the supplementary nature of female work. Although in this context they are of higher class, education and political activism, named
female nihilists have less implicit direct agency in daily labor than silent male commoners. Significant as class is here, the present article is not a piece in which the author allows it to overcome gender divisions. Some of this characterization may merely reflect the actual blending activities of the nihilist group, or the patriarchal presentation of them in Ralston’s sources. Nevertheless, the ongoing appearance of female submergence suggests Ralston’s underlying set of assumptions that are simultaneously gendered and transnational. Compare and contrast the overview with Ralston’s characterization of nihilist males:

What the men were like who were associated with these young women we have already seen. They were chiefly restless spirits who had commenced academic, or medical, or military careers, and then turned aside into the more exciting field of revolutionary agitation. Almost all of them the sons of small landed proprietors or of professional men, they represented to some extent the educated youth of Russia.[101]

This description identifies the revolutionary males’ class standing, but not before it gives some description of their collective personalities and motivations. Significantly, this comparative gender focus also emphasizes the women’s higher class connections and makes them more central in the text. The women emerge as a category first. Subsequently the men appear as those linked to the women. Despite this depiction women appear void of agency. Nihilist men feature in this text as ambitious, reckless and attracted to adventure rather than well-reasoned ideology. Still, men show more empowerment in Ralston’s account than their female counterparts. Even en masse men express more individual personality than any of their female counterparts. Despite their thoroughly revolutionary intentions, women act within traditional structures of gender. Ralston implicitly characterizes certain aspects of Russian femininity as natural and unalterable. The text always defines women by their attire and dependency to men. Beyond the relevance of this sentiment to Russian women themselves, it also indicates a way
in which a discourse on foreign politics can link to gendering. Women are crucial to Ralston’s portrayal, even while they are secondary within their organization.

One interlude is revealing with regards to Ralston’s major presuppositions, in suggesting what type of incidents he takes care to describe and emphasize. A major police break against the conspiracy occurs after one of the men is arrested, but true information involves a woman, in the form of an individual that abruptly came forward. “That, as her lover had been imprisoned, she would like to give up the persons who had got him in trouble.”[103] Women inside the conspiracy demonstrate fanatic intensity, but those merely in proximity to it undermine the organization through personal sentiment. This piece shows a connected outsider disrupting the integrity of the conspiracy. Extended attachments prove a particular liability for men insofar as women form a weak link. The male equivalent to this sudden breakdown into heterosexual sympathy and aide to political repression does not occur.

Another agent, Olga Liubatovich, lived with a young man for purposes of efficient revolutionary correspondence. Publicly, however, she adopted the pretense he was her brother. “It would not have seemed right for her as a girl to be keeping house for a stranger.”[104] This passage indicates that even in the effort of treason, maintaining propriety was significant. This code of decorum was one of the ways the society sought to blend in. At the same time, this incident entailed failure to challenge a large aspect of Russian life. The assumed standard is of a popular and widespread moral code, which refers more to an emotional sentiment than any cohesive ethical system. Revolutionary women face not merely the danger of alerting tsarist agencies, but also mass sentiment. That this social taboo against shared domestic arrangements beyond the family would apply in Britain as well as Russia makes the symbol of this narrative encounter even more striking. Observe also the contrast to what Conliffe-Owen cited female
nihilists as doing for their cause. The first piece on Russian revolutionary conspiracy shows
women violating sexual morals to undermine the nation. Here, insidious revolutionary plans
involve conforming to them. Olga’s purported sentiment captures one of the major themes of
this type of Russian gender, as compiled and presented in the British press. Russian women are
revealing subjects by which social policy and context can be read because they are sufficiently
passive to be defined rather than defining. They are connected to fundamental aspects of
power precisely because they do not hold it. Even when the female subject works in revolu-
tionary conspiracy she is forced into an additional charade for the sake of social propriety. The
burden of social deception is on her.

In another section of Ralston’s account an 1875 police raid encounters a cipher in the
purse of a woman at a party. Her efforts to swallow it are unsuccessful, and despite attempted
assistance by other women the police eventually secure the document.[105] This capture subse-
quently allows them to trace the movements of the Moscow society. The resulting sequence of
violence is even more heavily gender-coded:

A police search of a room in the Ukraine Hotel in Moscow encountered a man and
women, subsequently arrested. The man drew a revolver, and twice fired at the officer in
charge, but missed both times. An inspector immediately grappled with him, whereupon
the woman seized the inspector by the throat, and tried to choke him off. But by the aid of
the other policemen the two strangers were overpowered.[106]

The narrative later identities this woman as Vera Liubatovich. She was violent and physically
combative, but responded second, in defense of her male partner. The implication given in
these lines is that her struggle was from personal connections rather than dedication to an
abstract ideals. Even in a struggle to resist arrest, a measure of female passivity endures
throughout this text. The article’s perspective emphasizes the savage, animalistic nature of
female violence. At a pragmatic level Vera was unlikely to mimic the gun antics of her com-
panion because she presumably did not possess one, but Ralston’s text does not provide such context. He rather constructs a narrative in which a woman is by essence a savage irritance rather than a lethal danger. She is personally reactive rather than politically proactive. Gender constructions mute even the imagery of direct physical combat against a police agent of the antagonist regime. The effort does not involve the quick, potentially lethal force of the man. This case is far from standing in isolation, and it reaches into what Ralston himself acknowledges as a core of his social insight.

The most interesting by far of the conspirators are the women. The type of character which they represent is one which is very unfamiliar to us. We find it difficult to believe that young girls, belonging to what we should call the upper middle classes, well educated, and by no means destitute of culture, can leave their homes and go away, of their own free will, to lead a hard life among strange people of a lower class—and all for an idea. We can understand such a sacrifice being made in the cause, let us say, of religion or loyalty. Yet it was just because these young women refused to respect any existing laws, whether claiming to be of divine or of human origin, because they looked upon Church and State as equally obsolete institutions, and because they wished to sweep away all political and social distinctions, and to leave nothing but a common land equally divided among the working classes, that they gave up their homes, and severed themselves from their kith and kin, and went into the wilds of Russian city life as Nihilistic missionaries. They had nothing to gain by the changes which they desired to bring about; they had everything to lose if their efforts should be detected. And yet they worked on, amid discouragement and discomfort, with never-ceasing energy and determination. There must be something radically wrong in the institutions of a country when the good qualities of its inhabitants become enlisted on the side of rebellion.\[107\]

Female involvement in society is limited to counter-productive anti-religious efforts, showing the corruption and dysfunctional nature of Russian society. Class awareness is heavily bound up with gender constructions. The women possess high social position, yet sacrifice natural existence for the sake of radical ideals. Such existence involves repudiation of their family, class, comfort, government and religion; the fact that the subject of such endeavors is female serves to portray the Nihilist challenge as more passionate and fanatic. Yet these women do not emerge from Nihilist cloth, and the basis of their political alienation lies in the mainstream
conditions of their upbringing. While Ralston emphasizes the turn to resistance as a sequence of personal choices by individuals, he also indicates institutional dysfunction. Russia stands condemned by its failure to keep its women in their homes, undercut by the feminine energies its own hypocrisy has engendered. By emphasizing the thoroughness of these women’s idealistic disconnect, Ralston argues for the existence of far-reaching societal problems within Russia. Society forms a symbiosis of both genders, and highlighting female involvement serves to evaluate the total political dynamic. In neither institutional pressure nor Nihilist conspiracy are Russian women shown to have true agency.

The two sisters Liubatovich had been sent abroad by their father, who held the official rank of ‘Collegiate Assessor,’ on account of one of them being in bad health. When they returned to Russia, they were arrested on the frontier, but released on bail. ‘They were valued, one at 1,000 roubles, and the other at 2,000,’ said their father in his evidence, who gave their ages as twenty and twenty-one. It was one of them, Olga, who kept house at Tula for a so-called brother, and had gatherings of workpeople in his rooms with a view to making converts to the cause of revolution: and it was the other sister, Vera, who tried to choke off the police-inspector from her companion, Prince Tsitsianof, after the latter’s attempt to shoot the officer who arrested him. From her earliest years, deposed her father in the course of the trial, Vera was of so fierce a temper that her mother called her ‘the wolf-cub.’[108]

This overview draws more biographical details to the perpetrators of several notable incidents. The upper-class associations of the movement feature more centrally, while prominence in individual character is also significant. Notably Ralston does not draw much attention or specifics to the time spent abroad by the Liubatovich sisters; he treats the causality of Russian Nihilism as a basically internal process. The reference to Vera’s fierceness and determination re-enforces claims of the revolution’s radicalism. It does not merely draw individuals into extremism, it also attracts extreme personalities. The combination of wealth and animalistic passion in these individuals does not reflect kindly on either the Nihilist movement or the soci-
eter that spawned it. Further gendered signifiers of anxiety appear in an analysis of some of the beliefs of these radical women:

Marriage seems to have been looked upon by the female propagandists as an obsolete institution, to which recourse was to be had only for the purpose of obtaining freedom from parental rule or funds for the revolutionary chest. In the rooms occupied by one of them, named Batiushkof, a letter was found in which the writer said that she could not receive a legacy which had been left her until she got married, and therefore entreated her friends Vera and Natasha to busy themselves to find ‘some volunteer or other’ who would consent ‘to act this comedy’ with her. ‘In such a case the end fully justified the means,’ she stated, after which she went on to say that if two of their friends were spoken to on the subject, ‘perhaps one of them will consent, unless they are at present busied with more important affairs’. Two marriages of this kind really did take place between members of the society.¹⁰⁹

While description of this apparent anti-marriage attitude develops without direct affectation, the larger context of Ralston’s evaluations make it a horror-show. These Nihilist women don’t merely reject the prospects of authentic marriage, they also distort it into a revolutionary tactic. The extended description of a pair of such nominal marriages shows an elimination of personal contact. The whole affair is reduced to movement of funds and a powerplay against patriarchal authority. The evident ruthlessness and unemotional calculation of the participants provides a concrete example of the movement rejecting conventional mores as obsolete. It emphasizes once again that the challenge is not merely against the objectionable features of the tsarist regime, it also entails a break with the conventions of church, family and regular social life. Here women are not merely subsumed in larger structures. Through such marriages they gain independence from the family without proceeding to cohabitation with and dependence on the ostensible husband. There are still limitations in this revolutionary technique, as indicated by the barrier to false marriages posed to young women by parental disapproval. Still, it provides an instance in which feminine subversion could become partial feminine autonomy. That this trait emerges in a manner deeply subversive of British values as well as Russian is presumably
not coincidental. Taken with the prior descriptions of the Nihilists’ more confrontational actions, the article presents a pessimistic evaluation of Russian society. Ralston emphasizes the systemic dysfunction that allows such actions to occur. Women play a major role as agents and tools of society. Gendering portrays Russia in both status quo and Nihilist opposition.

The contrast that emerges between Ralston’s piece and Owen’s is significant. Both authors reflect on Russian nihilism, and both highlight the role of their female members as representative of essential traits and intentions. Furthermore each author uses feminine behavior and roles to show underlying problems of tsarist society. Russian women signify their community’s oppression, stagnancy and backwardness compared to Europe. However, Conliffe-Owen’s analysis emphasizes the cultural background of nihilism in greater length. He elaborates on the core defects in Russia’s character that makes such politics appealing. He views nihilism as purely destructive, a collective urge for destruction that is part of a wider systemic context. While long present in the Russian potential, the immediate crisis develops from poorly balanced state-level decisions and quasi-reforms. For Conliffe-Owen the female agents within Russian nihilism are notable for the vanity in their motivation, which in turn shows the basic superficiality of Russian social life. Furthermore, his narrative of specific women’s actions draws more attention to the sexual element, employing seduction as a tactic. His text also elaborates on intra-Nihilist romance and subversive actions operated under feminine space. Ralston’s piece is not devoid of such themes, but it emphasizes more centrally the formal and nominal aspects of Russian nihilist women. Other distinctions emerge from his study of a specific cell that’s been defeated and dissected by tsarist action, filtering his sources through state judicial lens. Ralston also brings more attention to class distinctions among and beyond female Nihilists, particularly in the upper-class backgrounds of certain individuals.
Another unique trait that develops is the emphasis on attire and camouflage by Nihilist women. This motif is linked for Ralston to a continuing female dependency. Another difference in approach is Ralston’s greater attention to the constructive elements of the Nihilist program, as he describes elements of the new society they seek to build. There existed other strategies for delineating Russian society. Not every hostile appraisal towards Russia referenced Nihilism, although it was an easy and common trope. In surveying the operations of Victorian periodical analysis, gendered dynamics developed the perception of Russia as dysfunctional in a variety of ways. The very diversity of critical appraisal signifies the vitality of anti-Russian analysis.

Laurence Oliphant’s “A Russian Philosopher on English Politics” describes a purported dialog with his friend, a Russian military officer named Ivan. Oliphant was a British traveller, lawyer, journalist and diplomatist. His works included numerous articles as a correspondence for the Times as well as several books based on his travel experiences, including The Russian Shores of the Black Sea in the Autumn of 1852 and Minnesota and the Far West. He also served as a Liberal MP from 1865-7, characterized by significant reformist efforts, but proved distracting to his own party. After this time Oliphant became heavily involved in various mystical projects, including promotion of Jewish efforts in Palestine and living in the Brotherhood of the New Life commune. Quirky as his last years were, Oliphant’s wide travels, publications and political connection made him one of the major factors in shaping British views towards Russia. The exchange of “A Russian Philosopher” appears as a personal context, but the tenor of the conversation is nakedly political. The conversation ultimately serves as a device to illuminate certain authorial sentiments and arguments. It presents the statements and views conducive to Oliphant’s partisan vantage points rather than a plausible
natural discussion. He uses the model of Ivan, presenting him as wise and refined, so as to appropriate the imagined view of the Other regarding contemporary Britain. As a rhetorical device, this strives to provide credibility to his viewpoints. On the whole, Oliphant presents Ivan as endorsing British power and authority. Ivan appears to take every chance of wishing British success at the Russian expense. “I cannot conceive a greater disaster befall the human race, than to see the place of England usurped by the nation of which I have the honour of being a humble member.”[112] Assuming the superiority of British moral worth and the right to exercise world power, the article attacks it for inconsistency in maintaining this authority. Much of the piece constitutes a rebuke of Britain’s craven attitude, its presumed inadequacy of strategic focus. Ivan’s purported statements acclaim the benefits of peace, yet advise national vigilance and military readiness as necessary to secure it. By Oliphant’s estimation moral and military vigor are necessary to secure British power, and that power is synonymous with broader human aspirations. All of Russia beyond the government elite and anarchists admire English freedom and morality. They accordingly lament the support the British government gives to Russian state. Beyond evaluating Britain’s foreign policy the article approaches issues of the domestic, arguing for a middle ground between the divine right of kings and the divine right of mobs. Amidst this rhetoric, the text explicitly refers to gender tropes in the delineation of British and Russian status. Ivan refers to a well known countrywoman’s taking the initials O.K. as a literary persona, as a bridge to observe how women are superior to understanding male genius and the genius of a nation.

“The whole incident serves to illustrate the mystery of woman’s true sphere of influence, so little understood by the women themselves who agitate for their rights.”

“I am not disposed to admit,” I answered, “that the incident in question proves your case; for I know none of your own countrymen, to say nothing of the women, who understand the genius of the English people, for to do so implies an apprehension of the genius of their institutions, and it is the incapacity of foreigners generally to appreciate these
which causes them to regard our domestic policy in the light of an unfathomable mystery which it is hopeless to attempt to penetrate, and our foreign policy as a delusion and a snare.”

“When your Government gets into difficulties,” said Ivan, “it certainly goes to work to get out of them in a way exactly the opposite to that which other European Governments, and especially we in Russia, are in the habit of pursuing.”

This argument’s explicit references blur the line between gender perception, national boundaries and the exercise of external state power. Femininity can lie at a crucial junction of male power, allowing the perceptive (British) viewer to understand where political life touches national character. The issue of women’s rights leads to the larger condition of the national community, and hence their essential cultural character. The article follows with a condemnation of British laxity in its foreign policy. Ivan speaks:

“As it is, my own country [Russia] produces upon me the effect of a dashing young woman, still intoxicated with her youthful conquests and greedy for more, while she refuses to admit that a gnawing disease is preying upon her vitals, still less to apply any remedies to it; in yours on the other hand, I seem to see an old woman in her dotage, who makes blatant and canting profession of that virtue which her age and feebleness have imposed on her as a necessity, while she paints, and rouges and pampers herself with luxury, and fritters away the little strength and energy she still possess in absorbing herself with domestic details and the quarrels of her servants, and leaves her vast estates to take care of themselves. Considering the dangers with which both countries are menaced, the great difference which I observe between the Governments of the two countries is, that in one, government takes the form of active insanity—in the other of dwelling imbecility.”

Such description utilizes explicit female terms to contrast Russia and Britain, going far beyond the conventional ‘she’ of nation. The comparison assigns different feminine weaknesses to Britain and Russia, appealing to femininity in the context of irrationality, senility and folly. Female metaphors present opportunities to view where Russia suffers in comparison to Britain, and vice versa. This article arises in a British publication, and despite the nominal character of a dialog the main function is instructive. Assessing their comparative nations in terms of womanhood provides an opportunity for British men to reassert national advantage over Rus-
sia. Gender codings that utilize the venues of prestige and moral character turn out to largely revolve around power.

Ultimately British trade languishes because of this lack of confidence by society and its government. “The commercial stability of England was not built up by a lot of unprotected females, which is the condition the British merchant abroad is rapidly being reduced to by the neglect and apathy and indifference to his interest of his Government.”[115] Again Oliphant unfavorably contrasts modern Britain of the days of yore with female representation. He assumes that female managers would show weakness and vulnerability, and that the contemporary practice of British diplomacy is reprehensible insofar as it imitates this condition. Such presumed laxity and craven attitudes undermine British trade, and leaves the empire vulnerable. Oliphant presents a gendered dialog that evaluates Russia to condemn both it and the inadequate operation of British global power.

A distinct yet analogous appraisal developed through the piece “Russia”,[116] authored by Sir Donald Mackenzie Wallace in 1877 for The Dublin Review. Wallace was a scholar, journalist and the author of both Russia and The Web of Empire. His commentary developed from a five year period of observation in Russia. Subsequent to publication of this article he served as a foreign correspondent for the Times in St. Petersburg.[117] Expressing a general Anglo-Catholic sentiment, this article makes a savage denunciation of Russia with regards to its domestic and foreign affairs. In the context of religious policy this trait emerges for Wallace in oppression at both home and abroad. Through a multitude of details the article forms a continual attack against the morality of the Russian nation.

We have a profound conviction, based upon the concurring testimony of a host of capable witnesses, that Russian religion and policy, which those witnesses will presently describe to us, contribute far more to the degradation of the human species, the suppression
of Christian liberty, and the sustentation of barbarism—it spite of certain promising qualities and the excellent dispositions of the docile Russian people—than Catholics commonly dream.\[118\]

This evaluation emphasizes the author’s moral and political conviction in opposing the status quo in Russia. Their broader national potential may be good, or at least promising, and the populace is passive rather than malevolent. Nevertheless, the institutions of Russian’s government and religion are such as to generate widespread oppression and injustice. These actions threaten not merely individual or collective benefits of those within the tsarist sphere. The Russian polity expresses the worst traits of both autocracy and anarchy.

Peter I. used to speak of his subjects as “my savages,” and Catherine II. told Repnin, the governor of Moscow, “The day that our peasants learn to read, neither you nor I will keep our places.” That astute princess, who was a frightful compound of vice and unbelief, comprehended that the least movement of thought, and the slightest tincture of education would be inevitably fatal to the dark imposture of “tsarodoxy”. The pretence of establishing schools, she admitted, was only to throw dust in the eyes of Europe.\[119\]

The general tenor of this analysis emphasizes the relationship between top tsarist figures and the broader population. Current political institutions necessitate the imposition of ignorance by an aware but duplicitous government. The text makes specific use of Catherine II as a representative even more effective at hypocritical domination than Peter. A variety of potential factors may underlie using a feminine signifier of state power, among them the more dramatic possibility for contrast offered. Far from proving more compassionate, Catherine shows herself to be even more exploitative and hypocritical. The “princess” is calculating and intelligent, yet uses these abilities to enforce unbearable conditions rather than ameliorate them. Additionally, Wallace’s narrative emphasizes the personal “vice and unbelief” of Catherine in manner that it does not apply to her male equivalents. Personal immorality and religious alienation is central in the individual most responsible for maintaining policy. That policy involves infamous levels of immorality cloaked behind layers of false idealism. “It is the union of
unblushing hypocrisy with the adulteration of religion and the decay of virtue, which disinguishes Russian artifice and duplicity from the frank and undisguised wickedness of more candid enemies of the human race."[120] The article argues that the imposition of the Russian state over its church degrades both, causing Russia to act as a hypocritical oppressor of Christianity both home and abroad. They are exceptional in their evil, transcendent in the measure of harm they bring to their own society and the world. Wallace chastises Russia not merely for its abusive actions and attitudes, but for acting under a charade of piety. This dichotomy has severe consequences on the public social order, into and beyond the notorious level of drunkenness of the Russian populace. While power and immorality emanate from the top, they have their greatest and most calamitous effect on the level of the common people. “The universal drunkenness is, however, only part of a general decline in morality ‘Stealing timber is considered no sin.’ ‘Robbery is so developed that a wife robs her husband, the children their parents.’”[121] Citing alleged direct statements on Russian social condition, the text emphasizes robbery, distrust and family breakdown. It is effectively a horror story describing socio-political misapplication of basic standards. This transnational analysis seeks to make Russian iniquity anything but abstract, rooting such misdeeds in direct experiences. To characterize this transgression, tropes of masculine-feminine action again come to the forefront of the account. Women have agency in forms of wickedness, in the manner that they abuse their familial positions. Such a situation indicates a particularly severe level of moral breakdown, greater than the prevalent theft detailed earlier. It is followed by and facilitates the final level of larceny in society, by which children are able and willing to steal from their parents, showing an ethical apocalypse that emerges from Russia problematic political and cultural patterns. Furthermore, as Wallace elaborates on this lamentable context:
Sexual morality seems to have sunk to the same point as social morality. The physical penalty on licentiousness prevails throughout Russia. There are many villages in which no man, woman, or child has escaped its effects; in the province of Poltava alone 100,000 persons were suffering from it in one form or another.\[122\]

The text moves next to the directly gendered sphere of sexual interactions. Wallace sees the tsarist regime as responsible for a state of debauchery and sexual immorality. Rather than provide personal details on this singularly intimate sin the account works to establish macro-scale patterns and statistics. The rhetoric of this denunciation indicts all of the population. Women lack agency, yet they are central in the calamitous social network. This account forms a dynamic by which sexual rather than feminine elements are degraded. Women are ubiquitous, but the chain of consequences is wider than any one population segment. The implications of sexual immorality do not appear in much detail, yet they are clearly intended to form a nadir of daily peasant life. This situation bears directly on elements of religious abuse. As Wallace presents:

He narrates a conversation with a priest, of whom he says, “I was a little shocked at hearing the priest speak of his sacred functions as if they were an ordinary marketable commodity, and talk of the inhibition as a pushing undertaker might talk of sanitary improvements.” The same priest complained to him that “the higher places in the ecclesiastical administration all belong to the black clergy—that is to say, they are all monks—and consequently, cannot understand our wants. How can they, on whom celibacy is imposed by the rules of the Church, understand the position of a parish priest who has to bring up a family and to struggle with domestic cares of every kind?[123]

Citing a chapter on and interview with a village priest, Wallace centers on abuses of the clergy on a lower level. He has consistently maintained that abuse of religion facilitates the particular hypocrisy and degradation of the society. This incident shows exploitative socio-political agency developing at a level of authority beneath the top tsarist autocracy. The core desire, ironically presented as if it were natural, involves systematic accumulation of marriage and familial privilege within the operation of a supposedly priestly life. Women function as facili-
tators of religious abuse. They are companions and effective objects that facilitate priests’ lack of sexual restraint. This cited analysis works to define Russian duplicity as institutional. Not only is such material a factor in the breakdown of social life, it is also linked to perpetuation of a basically perverse family arrangement. In chaos and order the family appears diseased in Russia. As family forms a root of society, this has a direct correlation to Russia’s cultural conditions.

If we add to all this the false certificates which the clergy give to those who do not wish to partake of the Eucharist, the dues illegally extracted from the old ritualists, the conversion of the altar into a source of revenue, the giving of churches to priests’ daughters as a dowry, and similar phenomena, the question as to whether the people can respect the clergy requires no answer.[124]

This section makes the role of women in the misuse of the Russian religious authorities more direct. Priests’ daughters are not the active agents of clerical corruption, but they do benefit from it. Consequently, the dowry attached to them forms a prime evidence of their fathers’ moral failings. Ultimately, by situating his critique of Russia in its hypocrisy, false piety and social abuses, Wallace assaults it as fundamentally flawed. References to women re-enforce the central immorality of a largely male order, with women appearing as complicit with and beneficial from the worst elements of society. Long-term and en masse, however, women suffer as much as the broader populace.

A series of recounted impressions attribute a specific cultural motif to the Russian nation in Moritz Kaufmann’s “The Russian Clergy”[125]. Where Wallace used the clergy as merely one indication of Russia’s corruption, Kaufmann focuses more specifically on the issue. Given Reverend Kaufmann’s religious background this priority is not especially surprising. Kaufmann’s wider career included positions as rector, curate and vicar. He also authored articles regularly for a variety of quarterlies and monthly reviews. His most prominent pieces
covered "Utopias or Social Schemes of Improvement from Sir Thomas More to Karl Marx", "Christian Socialism" and "The Housing of the Working Classes".\[126\] "The Russian Clergy" offers an analysis of social conditions in Russia, with an emphasis on the influence of its organized clergy. In this approach it’s significant that the Russian clergy is considered in close relation to Church of England, rather than on their own basis. Kaufmann finds elements of commonality between Russian Orthodoxy and Anglicanism in “their common protest against Rome, their conflicts with dissent, and their difficulties in relation to State interference”.\[127\] This establishes a common basis for comparison in mutual alienation from the Catholic Church, internal tension and bureaucratic limitation. Beyond distinctions in theology and ritual, the similarity evoked in these opening lines provides a justification for ethical cross currents, in this context laying the justification for an English author to make explicit evaluations. Establishing similar origin points provides transnational comparison as explicitly as Oliphant’s presumed English-Russian dialog. While all these authors rely on basic standards from their home societies, some patterns of writing lend themselves to making the contrast explicit.

This analysis also concerns more than merely the Russian clergy. Kaufmann views Russian religion as closely tied to both state functions and popular nationalism. Of relevance is not merely the existence or routine activities of the clergy, but the zone of interaction between them and the broader Russian populace. A form of crude cultural analysis emerges, yet with a highly selective and condemnatory structure. It is just as the text portrays Russian religion as central and authentic to its national society that its analysis becomes merciless, fixating on Russian failure and immorality. The association between the tsarist state and religion serves to degrade the Russian clergy through enforcement of class boundaries and extortion.\[128\] Once debased and linked to official power, they become morally anemic. Under the guise of reli-
igious edification the institutional organs of Russian society become more and more exploit-
ative. Ultimately this article judges the condition of the Russian clergy harshly, and sees in it a
cautory tale for the Western churches. In particular Kaufmann sees tendencies towards
selfish utilitarianism, harmful state/church division and collective clerical indifference.

This condemnation becomes more specific just at the point that gender positions enter.
In Kaufmann’s overview, gender relations appear as another way of portraying organized reli-
gious dysfunction in the Russian sphere. Femininity works in the text beyond the core narra-
tive to assist in the expression of ridiculous male agency. Kaufmann cites at length an account
of Ralston’s *Russian Folktales*, describing a priest that refused to bury an old man’s wife,
holding out for prompt payment. Following the peasant’s discovery of treasure the priest tries
to beguile his way into the wealth by arranging for his wife to kill a goat and sew it’s skin onto
himself. Succeeding thusly in impersonating the devil, the priest is able to intimidate the man
into giving up his wealth, whereupon:

The story ends with poetic justice.
“Come,” says he to his wife, “the money is in our hands now, put it well out of sight,
and take a sharp knife, cut the thread, and pull the goatskin off me before any one sees it.”
She does so, and blood comes out of the seam, and the [priest] howls—
“Oh! It hurts, mother, it hurts! Don’t cut, mother, don’t cut!”
She tries in another place, the same result, and the goatskin cleaves to the greedy priest
all the days of his life. This shows in what light the parish priest must have been regarded
by his villagers at one time or another to give rise to such a legend at all. It is not the only
one of its kind.

Kaufmann’s commentary portrays the incident as typical of an abusive situation. His approach
towards Russian culture is recognizably imperial, seizing an element of native lore, and repeat-
ing it as representative of a wider trend. In this way, the text essentializes the relationship
between the peasantry and clergy. It uses native referents to establish a hypocritical and coer-
cive backdrop that enables and is re-enforced by vice. To the extent that it uses Ralston’s
viewpoints it may be a reflection more on Ralston than Kaufmann, but if nothing else the echo is significant. The story appeals to a wider body of literature, but insofar as it provides concrete authentication it emphasizes a specific and mythologized situation.[131] That femininity is peripheral to this cultural judgment makes it, paradoxically, all the more significant, the central witness and facilitator of the priest’s ultimate humiliation. However, the tension and dissatisfaction introduced provides a measure of ambivalence, at least in contrast with Wallace, Ralston, or even Oliphant. The peasantry are more than ignorant or totally passive in the calamitous politico-religious conditions, and so the broader moral potential of Russia is not as weak as otherwise depicted. Gender’s role in this process, nevertheless, serves to emphasize the high potential for abuse by male figures of authority within Russia. Women facilitate and witness male hypocrisy, and are sometimes also present for the just retribution. Perhaps the strongest contrast to earlier pieces is that here resistors to authorities and the status quo are not portrayed as criminal radicals.

Moritz Kaufmann continues with another piece in his *Contemporary Review* article “Nihilism in Russia”. [132] In this he continues his criticism of Russian society through the form Conliffe-Owen and Ralston earlier took. For Kaufmann, Russian religion as well as Russian anti-religion shows itself as destructive. Specifically, Kaufmann begins his work by cautioning against the apparent demise of Russian Nihilism. He seeks accordingly to develop an examination of the movement as a social phenomenon.[133] The intent is ultimately to encourage the peaceful development of Russian society, yet this presupposes radical problems and a state of contemporary inferiority. The analysis qualifies as hostile insofar as it dismisses Russian society as inherently and naturally linked with dangerous political emotions. These arrive through an accelerated sequence that itself derives from an unsteady racial balance.
Whilst German Socialism readily takes hold of the Hegelian idea of the dialectic process in history, ending in Social Evolution, Russian Nihilism, owing to the tendency of the Slave mind rigidly to follow up abstract principles to their extreme logical conclusions, goes a step further, and the socialism of evolution becomes the Nihilism of social dissolution.\[134\]

This shows Russia to be logical to the point of fanaticism, tending to dangerous political expedients. The emphasis is on consciousness as a subject in itself, yet such focus does not negate an examination of broader socio-political conditions. This judgment also makes explicit racial generalization, to a more overt level than appears previously. Like Conliffe-Owen, however, Kaufmann uses his discussion of Russian nihilism as a bridge to wider characterization about this primitive Slavic society. While underlying problems are linked to cultural or racial patterns, there are more specific class elements that contribute to the ongoing disaster. Kaufmann writes:

The peculiar stillness and deadly calm which travellers describe as their first impression on entering Russia is owing not only, as is supposed, to the silence of fear, the oppressive sense of an omnipresent despotism, but also to the comparative absence of industrial activity and the turmoil of a busy life. This absence of a large and influential middle-class implies a want of a powerful element, social conservation, the bourgeoisie, which elsewhere forms a most formidable bulwark against the encroachments of Socialistic and Nihilistic agitation.\[135\]

Despite its title this article ultimately uses the theme of Nihilism to investigate and condemn more central societal elements. Radicalism in the Russian form emerges as a desperate flight from political balance, unprofitable at best and potentially quite dangerous, yet the criticism also pertains to the conditions being fled. This account takes care to stress that hardship does not consist merely of tsarist state oppression; economic lethargy and under-industrialization play a major role in weakening Russia’s political balance. Ironically the article indicts Russia for being insufficiently conservative, too backward in its society to form a strong bourgeois rear-guard against major unrest. The large mass of the people has thus remained stationary,
while the aristocracy has undergone rapid transformation; a vast gulf exists between civilized
and savage Russia.[138] The situation tends ultimately to debased standards in Russian politics
and society. The contrast with the better developed, bourgeois-dominated and relatively Nihil-
ist-free Britain is implicit.

The standpoint by which Russia is comparatively reckless is the Victorian self. More
directly than in many equivalent articles, Kaufmann’s condemnation of the conditions of Rus-
sia serves to justify and re-enforce British conditions. In that sense the title “Nihilism in Rus-
sia”, which indirect in its implications, is all too apt, suggesting as it does how strongly and
naturally the two phenomenon are linked. Russia is nothing by comparison to Britain, lacking
strong power, balance and effective politics. Likewise, the radical alternative can lead to noth-
ing. It establishes a utopia that is literally nowhere. Here Kaufmann’s wider analysis of the his-
tory of socialist and utopian thought presumably comes into play. Such an analysis does not
present Russia as originating its own radical doctrines. Yet it defines Russia as the nation most
poised by internal conditions to further radicalize them.

The dreamy, sensitive, and elegiac temperament of the slave mind, easily moved, and
apt in its most exalted moods to run from one extreme to another, has been intensified by
artificial training and superficial foreign culture, producing a debilitating and, at the same
time, irritating effect among the educated and privileged classes. To this must be ascribed
the generous impulsiveness of young men and women belonging to the aristocracy in sup-
porting the Nihilist movement, and becoming in some instances its powerful leaders, and
its most sympathetic abettors.[136]

Later authors[137] take the aspects of mystical abstraction and passion in a more positive vein,
but here it fits into a negative appraisal. Russia is unrestrained not just in its level of industry,
form of government and class structure. Underlying all that is a fateful mentality that com-
bines with class divisions and foreign ideas to produce a growing Nihilist movement. If Hege-
lian ideals are akin to an inherently destabilizing alcohol, it is still Russia’s distinctive character that causes it to seize such doctrines and drink them to excess.

In this account young aristocrats of both sexes participate in Nihilism, with class signifiers serving more than gender to emphasize the reckless inspiration of their country. In this regard Kaufmann serves as the reverse of Ralston, yet his piece still retains a measure of gendering. Insofar as the text mentions young women as well as men embracing radical doctrinal patriotism, it emphasizes the wide-arching and deep-rooted nature of Russia’s Nihilist problems. Implicitly, if it were only a matter of young men of the highest order turning to seditious destruction there might be more hope for Russia’s future. Women could provide upbringing and education to future generations, thus generating a measure of stability. Such prospects are accordingly denied, and the double-sexed extremism threatens even further instability in the future. Gender also appears in description of a different type of foreign influence:

Russia has also had its Gallomania. Katharine II ostentatiously patronized the liberal ideas of the French Revolution, and in the next reign the officers serving in the Napoleonic wars brought back with them from Western Europe a taste for Constitutionalism and individual freedom. Since then, every socialistic and demerical movement which has passed over France has left its impress on Russian society, especially as French manners and fashions have become the standard of high life, which has given rise to the bon mot, that when it rains in Paris they put up an umbrella in St. Petersburg.\[138\]

As Kaufmann presents Russia, one of its major aspects involves imitation. Yet it appears that copying foreign liberal ideals will not be sufficient to save Russia. This evaluation contrasts with the platforms of Oliphant and, below, Kravinchinsky. Lacking a basis of moderation Russia is vulnerable to concepts such as Nihilism, that appeal more fundamentally to aspects of its cultural and racial heritage. Hence Russia finds itself caught between its own internal socio-political dysfunction and fanatical over-commitment to imported extremes. In this context the author already knows the mere presence of more sophisticated neighbors is not sufficient to
save Russia, and its imitations seem feeble and insufficient. The reference to one of Russia’s few female monarchs is largely a matter of chronology, yet it may also be significant that her reign is specifically linked to superficial changes. This transnational imitation, the vacant alteration of manners and effort to ape European patterns may have played more easily when linked to a female ruler. Insofar as this trope relies on imitation, and it puts an emphasis on superficiality that plays with dominant Victorian assumptions of female unsuitability for politics.[139] Yet analysis should not over-reach itself; gender codings re-enforce the central thesis but are not required for the brunt of the criticism. Direct reference to female hardships or agency are absent. Most generic qualifiers lack attention to femininity. In strong contrast to Ralston or Conliffe-Owen, Kaufmann’s portrayal of nihilism largely excludes a focus on women, which is suggestive in its own way. Allowance must be made for variations in author, periodical and specific time. Nevertheless, there remains a distinction between analysis that invokes feminine criminal activism and that which uses general characterization of passivity. It finds no note-worthy female nihilist actions, in a similar manner the general Russian scene appears stifled. In relative absence as well as prominence, female representations play a role in the broader depiction of Russian society.

The Fraser’s Magazine article “Photographs from Russian Life”[140] traces an overview of Russia, aiming always at brevity and emphasizing the dominant characteristics of its society. The assumption for this analysis is that it proceeds on a largely unknown tabula, that the magazine investigates an area that appears distant and unknown to most British citizens. “It might be said, without much exaggeration, that we know as little of the interior life of Russia as of that of Dahomey or Timbuctoo.”[141] The parallel of Russia with overseas colonial territories becomes explicit. The text incorporates a direct colonial comparison, yet also a state of
ignorance hard to envision of an area under British imperial control. The article attributes this ignorance to opposition by the Government, the hostile climate, the language barrier and English egotism. Nevertheless, the author maintains the interest and prominence of the Russian nation, as the article is intended “to supply, as far as our space allows, a few materials for a more correct conception of the true character of Russian interior life” particularly with regards to its provinces.[142] A general evaluation of the Russian nation does not take long to emerge:

Like all semi-civilized nations, they are full of character; the nobles, more especially in the provinces, from the strong and bizarre contrasts between the original barbarism of still recent date and the artificial polish arrived at by a forcing process; the middle classes, from the arts to which they resort in order to sustain themselves in a false and difficult position; the peasantry, whether serfs or enfranchised, from their intense nationality, their mixture of simplicity and cunning, and from a peculiar goodness of heart which not even the detestable institutions under which they live have succeeded in stifling or corrupting.[143]

This declaration seeks to make Russia interesting through a condescending posture. It presents the spectrum of the Russian social spectrum as if it were a zoo creature to be studied by the curious British spectator. Prominent in this delineation are class distinctions, amidst a backdrop in which Russia is not yet fully enlightened. While such distinctions still endured largely as a measure of pride within Britain, in this regard they are exaggerated to the point of melodrama. The descriptor “semi-civilized” is crucial, establishing as it does Russia as close enough to sophisticated Europe to be compared, yet distant enough to be found lacking.

Another major element of this depiction is the hypocrisy of the surface level, superficially refined yet crude in national essence. The hybridity of qualifiers for Russia lowers its overall integrity, while it still fails to achieve a fully civilized condition. These general reflections are supplemented with specific details, particularly citing a recent work by one Ivan Tourghenief,
and its collection of stories as descriptive of a variety of human characters under the Russian social model.

The book of Mr. Tourghenief is full of life-like portraits of men of this stamp, who have ruined themselves and who come to utter destitution. There is one charming little episode of this kind. A proprietor becomes enamoured of a young girl, a serf, the waiting-maid of a lady at some distance. She consents to become his mistress, and he succeeds in hiding her from the lady. She betrays a marvellous aptitude, and learns with facility to sing, to play, to dance. At length, on one unlucky occasion, she cannot resist the temptation to flaunt her greatness in the eyes of her proprietor, who has so often tormented her by her pride and unkindness. The two drive past the domain, but are unfortunate enough to overturn the carriage of the lady on the roadside. This leads to a discovery; the police are called in—are bribed—the girl is still retained. But the lady has recourse to law in all its most vexatious forms, and the lover is harassed in person and in pocket.

Suddenly, the young girl, seeing that ruin will ensue, insists in spite of all remonstrances, on delivering herself up. He is distracted; but she escapes, and effects her generous purpose, although knowing the fate that awaits her from her vindictive mistress. He loses all self-control, wastes his substance in debauchery, even to his last shilling; and when the author again encounters him, it is in a low coffee-house at Moscow; where he is living on his wits, but where, nevertheless, he insists on giving his visitor champagne. If our space permitted we could extract some very touching passages of this kind.

In this brief story, the article adopts and re-distributes a native text for the purpose of essentialized representation. Working from pre-existing and “authentic” material, it selects the author and text that is relevant to re-enforce prior perceptions. For the purposes of representing Russia as a turbulent and quasi-civilized society, Kaufmann colonizes the story as thoroughly as many an Orientalist citation of a native source. The ultimately discriminatory nature of the analysis is re-enforced by the depictions of cruelty, legalistic oppression, corruption, debauchery and impoverishment that occur with the framework of an ostensibly charming narrative. The human characters within this account are not devoid of a certain grace and positive characteristics, but the underlying societal context hardly emerges in favorable light. It is not without significance that gender interactions feature prominently in this account. Two of the three active figures are female, and the male proprietor is motivated by lust. The portrayal of Russian femininity cuts across class lines in a revealing manner; the serf is easily seduced, adapt-
able and self-sacrificing while the lady is proper and vindictive. This reference suggests both strengths and deficits of character that emerge through feminine passions, which serve to illuminate their respective country and divergent classes. Surprisingly, the ethical stress of the story appears to condemn becoming the mistress less than the lady’s harshness in punishment for this liaison. In another gendered consequence the proprietor, unable to maintain access to his beloved, collapses psychologically and financially. Women appear in this story to both hold together personal lives and to undermine them. More generally, women function as a canvas for diverse societal representations to play themselves out. Again, gender emerges not in macro-level portrayal of Russian society, but in smaller details Kaufmann circulates to make the wider characterization persuasive.

Grenville Murray’s *Cornhill Magazine* article "Prince Moleshire’s conspiracy"[145] seeks to present the reality and popular perception of recent events surrounding the person of Moleshire. Beginning with a quotation, it references the announcement in Paris newspapers, repeated frequently elsewhere: “Prince Moleshire, that elegant and accomplished cavalier, with whom more than one of my lady readers has certainly danced at the Court Balls of the Tuileries, is one of the wealthiest landowners of the Muscovite Empire.”[146] Murray contemptuously cites the gushing praise for wealth and aristocracy which accompanies a lament over the reduced French nobility. Feminine readers are positioned in relation to dancing and frivolous luxury spectacle. If their saving grace is that they are not class frauds as Moleshire turns out to be, their association and quick belief is hardly such as to inspire admiration. Accordingly the article traces a link between the titled elite of Russia and their Western equivalent. At stake centrally is a refutation of a false and over-optimistic perception, but this attitude meshes with contempt for those aspects of Western society that proved credulous.
This effusion was much relished by the readers of the paper in question, who almost felt as if they knew the Boyard themselves upon hearing him alluded to so familiarly…A writer whose occupations take him constantly into the Grant Monde is naturally too well bred to draw any distinction between the houses where he has actually dined and those where he would like to dine…His account of the Russian prince was read by a countless number of good-natured folk, who imbibed it all as gospel truth, and fell to wondering naively whether the Prince’s estate was as big as Yorkshire or as big as Yorkshire and Lancashire both together. The women opined that it must be in size and beauty something like the principality of Whales, and, though some of them marveled that the high-toned journalist should call Paris a city of clean restaurants, yet they thought it quite natural that a man who had such a prodigiously fine property as the Prince should be in a hurry to get home again.[147]

Readers prone to naive acquiescence are easily awed by Murray’s claims. The women appear particularly prone to estimate the high size, wealth and grandeur of the Russian prince’s estate. In actuality, as Murray describes it, the Prince departed because he’d run out of money.[148] Furthermore his “grand estate” was in actuality wretched, and Moleshire possessed more debts than assets. The article subsequently describes his involvement with a poorly-considered plot, which ends in a humiliating and unprofitable fashion. The main lesson that emerges from this piece is an evaluation of Russia, through the form of one recently well-known man, as far more bleak and treacherous than generally believed. Surprisingly and intriguingly, the feminine signifiers that appear are of French and British women. They are not the only ones taken in by this scam, yet their presence in the text serves a crucial role in re-enforcing the chimeric style in which Moleshire operated. The analogy cautioning against Western seduction by the rash and seemingly impressive masculine Russia is not presented very subtly. Whether this stance proceeds into a more general recommendation of antagonism towards Russian society in general is unclear from the article, but insofar as it does present the meeting of British and Russian societies, it’s appraisal towards their friendly exchange is not approving. Perhaps the most intriguing aspect of this piece is the way it’s presentation of gendered subjects blurs the national lines between Britain and France, through a mode of emphasizing the greater exter-
nality of the visiting Russian. While far from the only indicator that British writers regarded Russia as far more foreign than France, it constitutes a potent one.

Sergey Mikhailovich Kravchinsky’s *Contemporary Review* article “Russia after the Coronation”[149] consists of a description of Russian society in the reign of Tsar Alexander III, with an eye to its tensions, oppressions and dysfunctional nature. Kravchinsky himself was a Russian political radical and author who later emigrated to Britain. A Russian artillery officer, Kravchinsky became involved in the populist movement, was arrested and escaped abroad. He later return to Russia several times, authoring revolutionary pamphlets and assassinating a general in the Russian third department. Kravchinsky gradually moderated his beliefs, turning to an advocacy of reform and literary impact rather than violence. His books include *The Career of a Nihilist*, *Russia under the Tzars* and *The Russian Peasantry*. Given his background, grouping Kravchinsky’s analysis with the likes of Conliffe-Owen and Ralston is ironic. His analysis also frames a greater nuance and historical context to the situation of Russian society. Emerging from his own radicalism and direct experience of the country under description, he appears at first to be a strange company to this grounds of hostile analysis. Yet however ambiguous Kravchinsky’s own life and political affiliations were, in the context of this article he operates as a native informant to re-enforce British suspicions. Describing the nation as a form of Caesarean democracy, Kravchinsky emphasizes the dangerous and oppressive sentiment operating across its socio-political life.

The Terror was nothing else than a fuller and deeper expression of the indignation felt by the new race of men, fashioned by the spirit of the West out a meek and flexible Russian world, which in its patriarchal family system, in its village community, and in the whole secular formation of the state, exhibited an eternal sacrifice of the individual to society at large, and of the personal will to that of the public.[151]
Kravchinsky describes Russia as backward, intrinsically passive and dominated by an oppressive socio-political system. One of the major examples he uses in support of this thesis is the patriarchal nature of its family life. By prioritizing elevation of men over women and fathers over children, Russia forms an exploitative society. At a lower level the family structure contributes to the perpetual annulling of individual autonomy. This characterization shows a broad similarity to Wallace’s view of the Russian family. The classic artificial dialectic forms in this discourse between East and West, civilization and barbarism.\[152\] Despite this criticism, Kravchinsky posits a partial elevation of Russia, a rise of the country above itself that produces further tension. In speaking of Russian affairs the article makes it clear that official policy and opposition to it both involve a small subset of the populace. The majority are too occupied by the problem of securing daily bread to fight for liberty or representation. As Kravchinsky bleakly analyzes the political structure, the reduced material conditions that harm the majority of the populace hinder it from offering effective wide scale resistance. Affairs are not static, but even the advent of a comparatively reformist tsar has failed to ameliorate conditions. Alexander III sought to relieve tension by reducing the measure of austerity on the people, by imperial fiat rather than popular involvement. The impetus of reform to prevent revolution obvious, and echoes British economic change. However, as a consequence of entrenched aristocratic elites, amelioration was paltry.\[153\] The Russian peasantry continue to suffer under extreme taxation and oppression. “The peasants are not free men, but slaves of the public treasury.”\[154\] Lacking both freedom or material prosperity, the conditions are particularly severe on the bottom-level rural workers.

Save in a few individual cases, the annual balance of the peasant shows an actual deficit, which can be made up only by diminishing the family consumption far below the limited prescriptions by physiology— that is to say, by voluntary famine, more or less acute--or by falling into arrears with the taxes.\[155\]
In this article, the pressure of circumstances forces continual limitations on peasant families, in a faux-voluntary fashion determined by exploitative economics, restrictive legislation and an ultimately indifferent royal authority. The question of women and child dependents is not addressed centrally through this grim lament, although it is implicit to the whole situation. Both this and other calamities emerges directly from the systemic and hypocritical oppression by state authorities.

The political part of the manifesto is, if possible, of a more wretched character than the economical. In this part is presented a characteristic example of the whole policy of the Russian Empire which has always been something between a wolf and a hyena. Incapable of magnanimity, without a spark of noble feeling, timorous like a delinquent who has many sins on his mind, the Government shrinks from granting an open pardon; it offers, with a calm face and graceful gesture, some trifle which it can take back at any moment.\[^{156}\]

True conditions expose the lie of the officially magnanimous rhetoric. This article claims the existence a direct pipeline from the practical impact of society to the moral character and utilitarian impact of its high authorities. In the gap between intention and promise lies the essential and destructive character of Russian autocracy. The bestial metaphor is prominent throughout this article. More structurally, Russian despots have a tendency to serve the nation’s upper classes, sacrificing the common people. At their most benevolent, tsarist rulers are still incapable of overturning the central economic problem of their society.\[^{157}\] Instead, such policies demonstrate only the “organic sterility of the autocracy”.\[^{158}\] Kravinchinsky suggests that the autocrats of Russia are blocked from normal biological continuity, just as their impact functions on the bulk of their people. The average family-head in Russia is by the rubric of this piece forced into reducing the food for his own family’s table, while the highest authorities generate corruption and domination rather than prosperity. Male familial dominance over this process is implicit throughout article. The terms of this power are not explicitly delineated or
challenged, but they clearly function as an improper type of male authority. At once too restrictive and insufficiently powered, they have the effect of maintaining dependency and destitution.

Every road leads to Rome; every consideration which shows the incapacity of autocracy to accomplish what the state of the country imposes upon it, will result in the end in political liberty, in communal and providential autonomy, in national representation in place of the bureaucratic regime, in civil liberty, which is the government of progress, security, and the general welfare of the country.\[159\]

Consequently, this piece predicts the eventual agitation and victory of the Liberal Party in Russia. Until this point, foreign powers have an active role in influencing internal events. Just as Russia becomes for Kravchinsky a classic model of the flaws of an autocratic society, so Britain and others offer models of success and supremacy. Much as with Oliphant and Kaufmann, comparison in this argument is explicit. However, as noted above, Kravinchinsky differs from Kaufmann in his confidence regarding the prospects for foreign influence to benefit Russia. Knowledge of outside conditions can in fact show Russia’s essential barbarism.\[160\] In short Russia possessed a political and economic structure well worth doing away with, and such criticism itself has a role to play in encouraging anti-tsarist tendencies.
M.E. Grant’s article “Russia I” begins with an observation on the recent wave of sympathy and interest felt by the British people towards Russia across the 1870s, and carries on with the citation of a number of old and recent works describing Russia. This material ranges from Eckhardt’s *Modern Russia* to Deal Stanley’s *Lectures on the Eastern Church*, consciously covering a variety of authors and specific topics. Grant situates his piece within a wider field of study, building the credibility of his subject matter even while he seeks to re-enforce the favorable perception. Reference to the broader literature of European writings on Russia is relatively rare for British writers of this period. In part this observation fits with the era of production for this article, set towards the end of the nineteenth century when more analysis of Russia was available. As a piece of rhetoric it also serves to expand the authority of Russia as an extensive and influential field. In an indirect fashion Grant’s quick references to a multitude of other writers enhance his individual significance even when it becomes collective. By making this article the latest in a chain of research to which others have devoted time and energy, Grant implicitly argues for the relevance of his subject matter, and the significance of his own writing. More specifically he presents background and studied praise for specific authors working in analysis of Russia. The first national generalizations occur not in analysis of Russia but in description of another British commentator. “It is quite in harmony with the good sense and self-possession which the Scottish people as a whole showed
during the passionate days of last autumn, that this singularly fair and sober contribution to the Eastern Question should be the work of a Scotchman.”[164] This positive evaluation makes clear from the onset Grant’s perception of essential national difference. If it so within Britain, presumably the difference in national character would be far greater when taken between East and West. This brief comment also reveals the way in which analysis of a foreign polity can exert an influence on the perception of difference and Otherness closer to home. Barriers between known and strange, inside and the external, citizen and foreigner break down even as they are applied. This praise towards Mackenzie Wallace’s work is also relevant insofar as Grant earlier mentioned among his strategies of successful research that Wallace had traveled extensively through Russia—"going into almost every corner of the country and seeing all manner of men and women, from the highest society of St. Petersburg and Moscow to the tents of the Bashkirs and the Khirgis of the Inner Horde."[165] It is also significant that Grant incorporates a writer that, as seen above, makes antithetical generalizations about Russia. Far from denouncing Russia as corrupt and oppressive, Grant takes a largely positive stance. From the start Grant’s article assumes that Russia is a large and diverse nation, with manifold distinctions in race, class, region and gender. Females are a part of the Russian nation, and successful analysis of the country must envelop the whole of it. From the first pages of his essay Grant’s historiographical musings implicitly involves a standard of gendered difference within Russia. Grant subsequently build up in direct and indirect fashion to his direct description of the “Eastern country”.

Grant’s generally laudatory overview of the Russian nation begins equally with its people and its geography.[166] He defines the exact area and population of Russia as unknown even to him, but he approximates eighty three million inhabitants, with most of that located within
European Russia. He further notes that such numbers constitute a tiny human presence against a vast continental background, very much unlike the high home population and colonial expanse of Britain. Britain has a dense center and a collection of thinly populated colonies, but Russia has a low population density throughout. For all their numbers, in view of density the Russians are behind the British. For other authors this observation might provide an easy source of delineation and scorn towards Russia, an unfavorable reflection on their fertility and racial vigor. Grant avoids such evaluations, and instead moves to climate and physical factors to provide an explanation, and in a way a justification. Russia is fundamentally different from Britain, but this seems to be appropriate for the people, in their distinctive position. Grant presents to the reader an impression of a vast civilization spread across a continent, in which the balance of humans to nature is low. In contrast to hostile writers who often describe Russia as little more than Muscovy and satellites, Grant’s more favorable evaluation emphasizes the vast expanse of Russian territory, the way its geography promotes farming and industrial development. At this point in the description Grant rather suspiciously leaves out any consideration of women or gender. Apparently demography and reproduction rates have nothing relevant to say about women. Their sexual interactions do not form a relevant part of population increase as this article describes it. This absence is in itself rather telling. Grant does make significant use of gender tropes but not in this vein. The sensual and biological aspects of Russian women are not part of the discourse that Grant seeks to craft.

In one particularly striking evaluation of geography, Grant characterizes Siberia as bountiful and fruitful. Unlike those who use Siberia as a symbol of cold, suffering, bureaucracy and imprisonment, he reaches to an opposite extreme. Acknowledging that he’s being
deliberately provocative, Grant crafts a strongly partisan case through apparent de-politicization, mediated through a central gender trope.

Those who read such statements...will understand the regrets of the young Russian lady, daughter of the most illustrious victim of the conspiracy of 1825, who, on being asked if she did not admire Naples, admitted that it was very beautiful, but added, to the amusement of her friends, ‘Mais ce ne’est pas la Siberie.’

We merely use that province of ominously sounding name as an extreme illustration of our proposition that Russia contains vast extent of territory eminently fitted for the use of man which has not yet attracted any attention.[169]

This lady appears as periphery to tragedy, loss and political violence. At the same time she links to accomplishment, wealth and status. The woman is identified not by her name or profession, but by reference to her class and father. More generally she connects with accurate and learned opinion as to the true value and worth of a commonly-disdained area. Grant dips into a casual comment from earlier in the century to prove his geographical characterization. She is accepted as a sufficient authority to dramatize his point, and with one sentence lifts Siberia from a cold, remote and Oriental land of oppression to a domain far more benign and approachable. While vague in specific description the related anecdote clearly conveys an atmosphere that is intended to be radical to a British audience. Significantly, this analysis presumes that the landscape can easily suggest a rhetorical presence, and it might be said that “the esthetic qualities of the landscape constitute the social and material value of the discovery to the explorers’ home culture”.[170] At the same time, however, geography does not lead naturally or inevitably to a sense of deficiency that would justify British imposition. Rather it points to one of the ways there are parallels between colonized and foreign imperial land. While the analogy remains inexact it is both suggestive and distinct from the hostile overview provided by Ralston, Wallace and others.
Although the analysis does not stress the feminine status of the speaker at length, gendering of the subject is intrinsic to the impact of the sentiment. Far from independent or powerful, the ’young Russian lady’ nevertheless serves as an oracle of authorial significance. Prior to this incident Grant quotes a variety of foreign authors regarding Siberia’s fertility and production.[171] Subsequently he expands this sentiment through a native supporter that is inevitably female. A man making such a claim in such a context might be less trusted by Grant’s intended audience, he might invite suspicion as to his reliability and integrity. If he were prominent, wealthy and well informed he might be suspected of complicity in the status quo, and support for the tsarist regime. Consequently he would be in danger of nationalistic falsification, calculating misdirection in any claims at a foreign context. If the man were poor, politically radical and hostile to the status quo, he might have his own reasons for distortion, and in any case would be less privileged and wealthy, and consequently would serve as a less knowledgeable informant.[172] A woman, provided she be upper class, may be assumed to be traveled yet apolitical, too naturally sincere for calculated duplicity. Such gender expectations in Victorian society may have influenced Grant’s work in this vein, and they should inform contemporary analysis of it.

Additional discursive constructions of class and age operate with regards to the unnamed female speaker. Building on implicit backgrounds in the statement, Grant’s mini-narrative defines the woman even as she helps to define her native country. She is well travelled enough to make a comparison between Siberia and Naples. She is apparently cosmopolitan and bilingual to an unknown extent. Contemporary readers are invited to identify a witty perception, both in the contrast of the comment itself and in the amusement it subsequently garners. It is also possible to discern projection of a somewhat vacant attitude, focused on wit
and charming observations rather than discussions of substantive geographical analysis. In this vein the mention of a 'young lady' is presumably relevant. The unnamed praiser of Siberia contains other aspects beyond gender, but none are as central or analytically important as her feminine status. Gendering allows Grant to make his ultimate, politicized, argument. He uses the image of a specific Russian woman, and more generally the aura of cosmopolitan femininity thus evoked, to present the Russian man as less threatening. Gender is the fulcrum through which the article identifies national worth and deflates conventional British perceptions. The image of a woman serves to transform grim oppression into sophistication, beauty and laughter. Grant seeks to define Russia not in terms of its army, its peasants or its state, but rather in its climate and geographical potential. Subsequently he makes the political impact of this association direct, as he draws a number of direct conclusions from analysis of Russian size, population and climate:

1. That Russia is as far as possible from being a hive of nations ready to swarm over the civilized West.

2. That her policy ought to be directed rather to utilizing what she has than to making fresh annexations, unless indeed she has some absorbing interest in acquiring this or that particular piece of territory.\[173\]

This article clearly demonstrates awareness of negative British perceptions, which it seeks to challenge. The selective referencing of women becomes critical to this end. Rather than deal with women as wife or mother, as the wombs for future generations of soldiers and peasants, Grant forms an image of women tied Russian land in a cosmopolitan sense. Specifically delineated by age and class the woman is also in a sense timeless, connected to the deep past and climatic potential. Grant’s depiction does not present Russia in such a way that makes war inevitable, or inherently profitable to either side. Rather his whole portrayal reveals a bias towards showing a warmer, friendlier Russia, positioned to be a friendly influence. One of the
major devices by which Grant crafts this portrayal is a selective presentation of Russian gender. Inevitably this refers back to himself as a masculinized subject and commentator on foreign empires, but it is particularly relevant in this context in showing how gender can facilitate British partisan argument.

In another sphere, the British evaluation emerges favorably through praise of Russia’s cultural accomplishments. Rather than a positive evaluation of Russia’s magnitude, geography and physical extent, such an article offers praise for quality of its literature. This highlights and ambiguous aspect of British perceptions toward Russia, and a contrast with colonial tropes that are in places highly analogous. However contemptuous British authors might be towards the Russian state and society, common ties in religion, race, technology and culture ensured that condemnation would rarely reach the level of cultural dismissiveness frequently seen towards Indian or other ‘Asiatic’ literature. However much the Russians could be seen as barbaric and quasi-Oriental in politics, religion or foreign policy it was harder, or at least less common, to emphasize these aspects with regards to their literature. Consequently, pieces that prioritized and focused on such venues tended towards a more favorable evaluation of Russian capacity, if not all aspects of their lives. This stance appears in JM’s “Characteristics of Russia Literature”[174], written for Temple Bar. In so doing, his work prioritizes this cultural aspect of Russian analysis. Far from merely analyzing literature in itself, this attitude sees in literature a manifestation of societal and national merit. It sees a certain brand of intellect as central and distinctive to Russian society, moving beyond individual authors to a perception of collective attitudes and capabilities.

From the beginning of this century dates the sudden dawn and marvellous expansion of the singular literature which exerts over some minds so powerful a fascination. It requires very little insight to foresee that it is certain to exercise a still greater influence when all the significance of this manifestation of Russian thought is more generally felt and appreci-
ated. To-day the Russians are our masters in a new school—we can sit at their feet and learn.[175]

JM seeks to expand awareness of Russia, in aspects beyond oppression, violence and nihilism. Significantly he prioritizes the study of Russian literature not merely for the insight into study of its society but as instruction to British writers. JM’s argument also prioritizes his own role in spreading awareness of Russian nineteenth century literary accomplishments. His own prose becomes significant through its role as commentary and transmitter of foreign culture, re-enforcing his insight as it comments on an outside polity. Once again, what appears at stake in the depiction of Russian society is a specific grounds of contestation within British opinion. For the future, JM predicts expanding mental horizons, and uses as examples certain recent great voices in Russia’s literature.[177] The article frames a narrative of aesthetic progression in Russia, albeit amid a darker political and racial backdrop.

In Russia, owing to the rigid and brutal censorship exercised over the country—it [the novel] was the only channel not open to suspicion. Autocracies are proverbially stupid, and this one was no exception. Thus veiled, it allowed to pass unchallenged those barbed words which were the sting the conscience of a great and oppressed race deprived for centuries of its birthright, and arouse it to attention, but not to immediate action. Therein at present lies the weakness of the Slav temperament; with an immense capacity for reflection, Russians have as yet manifested but a limited power for action.[178]

This analysis combines appreciation with a measure of contempt; transcendent literature emerges against and despite the political reality. While JM advocates attention to a perceived strength in Russian culture, it also defines the backdrop as oppressive and dysfunction. The very emphasis on Russian novels as a viable exception to this tendency points to the deeper problems, re-enforced by generic description of an essentialized Slavic condition. In contrast to writers who identified Russia as dangerously expansionist and vigorous, here it is arching laxity that is condemned. Nevertheless, despite limitations in Russia’s political society, JM views Russian novels as distinctive in their variety and intensity; such literature probing into
the essence of the human condition. This form of novel stands favorably both in its own right and with comparison to the field international literature, particularly the French. Indeed, JM credits Russian authors with developing the naturalistic mode of novel without sinking to the “inartistic enormities which we owe to the pen of the French father of naturalism.” This comparative analysis of literature easily transitions to a more exhaustive overview on culture and long-term prospects.

In the enthusiastic opinion of some admirers, the intellectual, if not material, empire of the world will some day be divided between the Anglo-Saxon and the Slavonic races, two people as diverse in their aims and natures as it is possible to conceive. The Russian, dreamy, poetical, subtle, wonderfully receptive, and naturally devoid of prejudice, absorbing all learning with ease, possessing talents of a highly artistic order, ardent, though indolent, profoundly melancholy and religious. The Anglo-Saxon, straightforward, practical, energetic, prejudiced; not given to dreams, much more materialistic than mystical, with a passion rather for justice than for ideal goodness; a dominating, aggressive race, with talents not running in the artistic direction, taking a joyous if somewhat limited view of existence, and little tormented by conceptions of the Infinite. It is true that these two races contrast with, and complete each other, and typify themselves some of the best attributes of humanity. A mighty harmony would arise from their collaboration in the work of progress.

This suggestion makes the connection between literary analysis and potential diplomacy clear. Drawing heavily on racial generalities and idealizations, it suggests the possibility for societal difference proving complementary rather than competitive. Moreover, it ties literature to strategic politics through an optimistic assessment of mutual commonalities in potential. Ironically the British perspective characterizes itself as more cynical, aggressive and materialistic, a line that plays with conventional associations of the East with abstraction, mysticism and passivity. From this vantage point the emphasis on cultural as opposed to political connections is significant, tying with the earlier emphasis on Russian governmental oppression and incompetence, the default assumption is that the direct global empire will be British. Russian participation in this process is prioritized, but accordingly limited to certain specific areas. JM’s piece
reveals more nakedly how even a favorable article, one whose compliments towards the Russians exceeds its criticism significantly, acts to delineate and define Russia as a pragmatically limited Other. In JM’s idealized description of Russia’s greatest future, it will exist for British perception.

Gender troping emerges in this article through a direct analysis of literature, tying insight into Russian femininity to broader social essentialities. The deployment of specific female characters serves to enforce the broader power of literature, and allows the optimistic potential JM perceives in trans-national connections. Male Russian authors achieve insight through successful portrayal of Russian women, allowing them to move their society closer to that of the British. With regards specifically to ‘Tourgenief’:

He paints with rare skill the interesting physiognomies of his countrywomen. Gogol was perfectly incapable of portraying a woman. His women are mere shadows, none have the breadth of life. But with what characters has not Tourgenief presented us! Indeed all critics concur in finding Tourgenief’s heroines far superior to his male creations. They possess the courage, the determination, the fire, the practical ability wanting in these latter. They initiate and carry out the boldest designs without faltering, without repenting, without repining. And we should remember that these are not the mere creations of a poet’s fancy—they are real, living portraits.[181]

This overview of Turgenev assigns him particular literary and psychological skill because of his ability to portray women. Connecting these figures to both idealism and the future within Russia, it represents them as vigorous and culturally significant. By this account women in Russia are centrally important, yet tend to be marginalized or invisible due to inferior skill of representation. The valid response, then, lies for JM in authorship like Turgenev’s, a fuller representation of a vital population segment. Deployment of gender codings shows the connections between literature and social conditions, the way novels can speak to essential underlying realities. Through prioritizing this insight as setting Turgenev even above Gogol,
JM connects gender subtext directly to the literary representations of power. A similar motif appears in the analysis of Dostoevsky:

The most prominent figures in ‘Crime and Punishment’ are a murderer and a prostitute; in the ‘Idiot’ all the interest of the story centres round an epileptic, and always the poor and the humble and the diseased and the simple and the criminal are exalted, pitied, and uncondemned. And do not think for a moment that the murderer is not an ordinary murderer, or the prostitute any exception to her class. By no means. But by the simple and sublime power of genius, the workings of these minds are laid bare before us, and, comprehending at last these abnormalities, we do for a moment what is not done in real life, we forgive.\[182\]

Particularly acute in this description is the overview on Sofia, the prostitute from Dostoevsky’s novel. By putting her and her trade in the same category as a murderer, she is held to be representative of broader social realities while also serving as an vibrant, authentic human. The lack of direct agency given to women by Dostoevsky or an independent career appears through this analysis as sociological. Drawing upon a socio-economic picture that is by implication bleak and criminal, JM generalizes from Dostoevsky’s political and religious views to a broader essence of the Russian nature. This apparent contrast in feminine representation with Turgenev’s more assertive portrayal could play to the dichotomy of Russia past and future, the difference between a bleak political and racial atmosphere and the broader prospects hoped for them. For Dostoevsky, his skill does not reside only in depiction of women yet that is an aspect of his broader literary skill, and gender elements remained potent, if buried in the analysis. En masse, the commentary offered in “Characteristics of Russian Literature” is optimistic about the prospects for certain spheres of Russian life, praising specific novelists and “proving” their genius in no small part through reference to their effectively deployed portrayal of women and men. Although the sentiment of this piece identifies as favorable and mandates optimistic diplomacy, its overview of broader Russian life is bleak.
and essentializing. Feeding off the politics of literature this text marginalizes as much as it pri-
oritizes, confines as much as it liberates.
CHAPTER VII
THE "NEUTRAL" ANALYSIS

In a final set of primary sources, it may be of use to examine some gendered Victorian periodical pieces that deal with Russia ostensibly without taking a firm stand of praise or condemnation. The relatively small number of such positions that take at once a gendered aspect and a lack of up-front argumentative evaluation is itself a relevant indicator. Another lesson is that frequently apparent neutrality is far from authentic, while these pieces may not have been authored explicitly to advance an evaluation, argument or policy, they are not void of perspective or cultural significance. There is still a distinction that occurs in the less explicit evaluators, occurring either through a highly mixed stance of evaluations or through highlighting ostensibly objective issues.

Archibald Forbes’ Nineteenth Century article “Russians, Turks, and Bulgarians” includes a description of the quintessential Russian character. The main tone towards Russia is laudatory, but with a highly condescending stance. Forbes’ background involved experience in both the military and journalism. He archived success and fame through war coverage across the 1870s, including both the Carlist and Russo-Turkish war. In his commentary, Forbes expressed an ongoing commitment to the military ethos. Later in the nineteenth century he expressed admiration for the Prussian military tradition and became a major promoter of the continentalist doctrine. Consequently, the article "Russians, Turks and Bulgarians" emphasized a particular viewpoint and promoted the career of the author. Perhaps the most signifi-
cant element to take from Forbes background is the extent to which his views were bound up in other beliefs and patterns of thought, and that these insights were sometimes controversial. In his article, Forbes describes Russians as simple, open and of good humor; with their personnel making dedicated soldiers in need of direction. “The Russian has so many charming qualities…He is a delightful comrade his good-humour is inexhaustible, he puts up with hardships with a light heart, he is humane.”[185] In the common citizenry the biggest weakness is their lack of thoroughness, while the upper ranks of tsardom are distinguished by corruption and intrigue. Forbes’s writing treats the Russia in a fixed and essentialized fashion, with strong racial overtones. “The Orientalism of the Russian extraction tends to laissez-faire...Nobody holds himself directly charged with the responsibility of the urgent mending of a bridge, and the bridge is not mended.”[186] Rather than adopting the common feminine descriptor of a nation, this piece consistently utilizes masculine pronouns, even when it forces a contrived sentence structure. The dominant compensating device is to visualize a single Russian man and generalize outwards. This contributes to a focus on an energetic and militant nation, and implicitly erases Russian woman as a relevant social category. In totality this absence of femininity suggests the irrelevance of domestic elements in an evaluation of what it is to be Russian. The lack of female signifiers carries an implication in the evaluation of Russian politics and society. Ignoring the position of Russian wives and civilian infrastructure puts all of Russian in the form of diligent, armed, simplistic children. The overall analysis is far from positive, yet it is not accompanied by suggestions of Russia’s basic hostility or aggressiveness. Neither does it define Russia as naturally inclined towards peaceful co-existence. Yet the Russian nation and military still merits significance, and finds a specific and suggestive overview in this vein.
The anonymously authored article “Russian Ghost Stories” for *The Cornhill Magazine* examines a sampling of Russian stories of the supernatural, with an eye towards contrast with English narrative mythology.

The modern English ghost is usually represented as a dejected and harmless being, with the burden of a secret generally weighing on its conscience, and with spectral chains frequently clanking about its unsubstantial limbs. The terror it inspires appears, as a general rule, somewhat unreasonable, its shadowy semblance being of a nature, it might be supposed, to excite compassion rather than alarm. But the spectre of Slavonic story is too often a really appalling visitor, one by no means framed of such stuff as dreams are made of. A combination of corpse and fiend, it unites with a taste for blood a great capacity for slaying and devouring.

In analyzing the spectrum of an alien society, this account frames an essential contrast between the behavior of Russian as opposed to British societies. It does this through distinguishing between the Russia as opposed to that of Britain through their supernatural reports.

The spectrum of the Other looms in the collective mentality and culture of Eastern superstition, while the British equivalent tends towards passive and ultimately harmless spirits.

As a general rule the ferocious behavior of Slavonic ghosts is quite uncalled for. No excuse can possibly be made for the conduct of so unpleasant a corpse as that which is described in one of the stories as entering a room in which two men lie asleep, tapping them on the back, drawing off their blood in buckets, and swallowing it with indecent satisfaction.

This type of description offers an English vantage point on Russia through its monsters, in addition to showing societal conditions in the reactions of living people to the phantasms. The stories quoted and described here are unanchored to a direct description of their host societies, but taken in commonality with the explicitly political arguments seen above they tend to an overview of Russia as a contentious and violent society. Gender troping appears in several of this recounted narratives.

In a certain village—the story runs—there was a girl who hated work but loved gossip. So she never spun herself, but used to invite the other girls to her house where she feasted
them and they spun for her. During one of these spinning feasts a dispute arose as to which of the party was the boldest.\[190\]

After an argument between the “lazybones” girl and the others, she accepts a dare to retrieve a Holy Picture through a graveyard. In the process, she ends up taking a shroud from a corpse, such behavior hardly reflecting favorably on the intelligence of her sex or her community. Unsurprisingly, given the genre, this motivates the corpse to come alive, whereupon it both stalks and pesters the girl.\[191\] The next major development occurs after the girl relates the story to a local priest.

The priest reflected awhile, and then told the girl to come to mass next day. So in the morning she went to mass. The service began. Numbers of people came to it. But just as they were going to sing the “Cherubim Song,” a terrible whirlwind arose. And it caught up that girl in the air and then flung her down on the ground. And straightaway the girl disappeared from sight; nothing was ever found of her except her back hair.\[192\]

Thus was the problem resolved, after a fashion. Beyond establishing that the dead disapprove of theft and that graveyard-related dares can be reckless, this story tends to reflect negatively on the operating wisdom and moral character of Russia’s female youth, and the inadequacy of its clerical supervision. The account, however, evidences sufficient melodrama as to make prospects of a direct representational analogy unlikely. Still, again the connection between female signifiers and destructive tendencies within a society is expressed.

Even the ghosts of old friends or near relatives sometimes behave with downright brutality, utterly forgetful of their former love. In a Lithuanian story two girls who are going to a dance happen to remember two former sweethearts of theirs who are no longer alive, and are imprudent enough to give them a sort of invitation to come to the party. The Dead listen, and come, and dance with the girls, who, after a time, begin to suspect their ghostly nature, and therefore take the precaution to tread on their toes. Finding that the boots the seeming young men wear are empty, the girls know that their suspicions are well founded, so they fly at once. Fortunately for them they are able to make good their escape, but they are closely pursued by their dead loves, whose intention evidently is to tear them to pieces.\[193\]
Here, lack of caution by two girls produced supernatural provocation and danger. If this
reflects yet again on the unreasonable character of Russian ghosts, it does not show the living
females in an ideal light. Intriguingly, at bottom the story of inflamed passion and homicidal
pursuit could function without the zombie nature of the antagonists, as a reflection of passion
and sensuality. Insofar as it has a lesson, this story cautions against reckless statements and
improper memory of the dead. In this, tropes of distinctive Russian character may or may not
be relevant. In another account, and paraphrasing from a longer story for the point of cosmo-
logical analysis, the article emphasizes the unthinking and casual nature of the stimulus to
supernatural onslaught. In this story, a happy marriage produced a dead wife in the aftermath
of childbirth. Amidst his grief, the man had trouble caring for the baby, and wondered “How
was he to nourish it... how to bring it up without his mother?”[194] At length the infant found
rest and sleep only at midnight, when intimidations eventually uncovered the presence of
someone slipping into the home at midnight. By means of a stakeout, the man and his kinsfolk
uncovered the presence of the intruder at midnight.

They looked—and saw the dead mother, in the clothes in which she had been buried,
kneeling beside the cradle, and bending over it as she suckled the babe at her dead breast.
The moment the candle lighted up the scene she stood up, gazed sadly on her little one, and
then went away without saying a single word to any one. All who saw her stood terror-
struck for a time; and then they found the babe was dead.[195]

The author of this article, choosing this as the story by which to close the overview, describes
this narrative as one of the most striking, worthy of being quoted at length. Unlike certain oth-
ers, it is not let down by an inadequate conclusion.[196] Whatever the situation of male ghouls
may be, living-dead women are particularly horrific and destructive. In Russian femininity as
the account relates Russian ghost stories to articulate it, nurturing women have the potential to
become utterly ghastly in the wrong metaphysical conditions. Such narratives touch on a lot of
powerful motifs on gendered perception of Russia by the British, even while the ostensible second hand authorship make trans-imperial analysis difficult.
CHAPTER VIII
CROSS CURRENTS AND IMPLICATIONS

From the highly limited and selective primary sources presented up to this point, it would be at once arrogant and counterproductive to make sweeping characterizations as to the core Victorian Periodical gendered view towards Russia. Rather, the issue is to bring in patterns of a new methodology that may be applied more widely and extensively. At the present state, the most that can be made is a few connections. Hopefully this approach may open more historiographical doors than it closes. As much as they shared a common context and spoke much of the same language with politics, empire and global strategy, the preceding body of periodical authors are defined by tensions and division more than unity. They wrote for different media sources, occupied different parties, religions, ideologies and aesthetics, some have no attached name to their accounts at all. Not all British articles on Russia incorporated gender motifs to any significant extent, hence from the start this project has been highly selective in its examination. The dominant motif in these collected narratives, news reports, ideological arguments, purported dialog, literary criticism and economic analysis is the deep tension at work in the British discourse on Russia. Many, though not all, of these works record deep pressures and internal tensions at work in Russian society, yet the context of their comparative opinions show major divergences within their own nation. In addition to ongoing, fluid and historically transformative debates within British society, there existed a high quotient of ambiguity attached to the question of Russia in the late nineteenth century. The context of
Russian power was threatening but unclear, and such a backdrop facilitated diversity and ambiguity in British analysis of them.

With all due caveats and consideration to the wider ambiguities, a few observations. Most of the gendered British periodical authorship from these sources pertaining to Russia during this period tended to evaluate it negatively. These tended to contrast Russia unfavorably with British politics and society, and sometimes found it lacking by basic standards of civilization. These were the sources likely to regard Russia as at least a hybrid of Oriental or Asian influences, in race or culture. Various authors condemned Russia for oppression, stagnation, poverty or instability. Across these cases, such authors used gender to re-enforce the core associations and condemnations of their main argument. Feminine signifiers could serve to represent and delineate the society as a whole, or show Western vulnerability to Eastern masculine swagger. More commonly, women in these pieces served as either dangerous radicals or quietly oppressed victims. Gender coding tended to re-enforce the violent and domineering characteristics of the Russian polity, alternatively through violent oppression produced by the tsarist regime or violent Nihilist opposition motivated by the lamentable status quo of the tsarist regime. It made quite a bit of difference whether the ultimately negative figure of Russian womanhood was a hypocritical tyrant, a dominated wife, a violent and unrestrained anarchist or a commodity. This variety helps show not only the significance of femininity in representing British authors’ core emotional appeals and hierarchy analysis, but also the fundamental dissimilarity of many of these projects. “Hostile analysis” is a loose generalization at best, and as British analysts diverged in their portrayal of Russian women so they differed in the exact manner at which the underlying semi-Oriental society was dysfunctional, coercive and dangerous.
The Russophiles likewise diverged as to what in the Eastern Empire was particularly valuable or positive. One motif was the educated, cosmopolitan and insightful Russian women, generally of high class, who promoted the civilization of her country through her very existence. Alternatively Russian women appeared marginalized in a fashion that facilitated male virtue, notably through being the subjects to male Russian literature. Such feminine manifestation emphasized the transcendent cultural value of Russia, while maintaining antipathy towards its diplomacy, government and conventional institutions. A major motif across this “grouping” is to emphasize femininity as a mediator or traveller, carrying a Russian presence across national lines to make it appear less dangerous. Equally importantly, identifiable masculinity in the “friendly” analysis appears in a constructive aspect, emphasizing vigor in non-confrontational manner. Even when linked to amiable evaluation, however, such perceptions do not characteristic Russia as equal and equivalent to Britain. At its most blatant these perceptions can involve a deeply racist vision of Russia as confirming and facilitating global British hegemony. Even in less extreme forms many of these pieces reveal how an amiable evaluation may itself be pejorative in a recognizably imperial manner. Russia remained in core aspects the Other, for all that there was significant variation on what kind of relationship and future it merited. Defining Russia in different forms served to suggest different stances that the British should hold in exercising their world power. While at this point it remains a minor, almost fragmentary collection, the ostensibly neutral pieces also serve a function of contrast, while presenting through their analysis of Russian military and supernatural stories rich grounds for cross comparison and nuanced imperial perception. Among these pieces women are either thoroughly absent or the facilitators of folly and menace, suggesting that some gender tropes
can play in a cautionary or rebuking sense even in the absence of formal politics or social commentary.

For the most part these authors do not explicitly clash. They rarely articulate direct claims that contradict each other. Instead, they start from different premises, explore different sources and emphasize different Russian aspects. They know they are being selective and leaving out much of the available data, yet they largely emphasize their talking-point as essential to understanding Russia. Whether this core element is extremism, mimicry, corruption, hierarchy, inequality or literary talent, the presupposition of an essentialized Russian character carries through this text. In virtually all these cases, women and gender are used to re-enforce presentation of this crucial Russian aspect. The weight of numbers says something about the balance of gendered perceptions of Russia, although at this point the study has been of necessity partial and incomplete. It does not appear averse, however, to suggest that the majority of the perceptions of Russia were unfavorable. Most of these authors viewed Russia as a dysfunctional society, in some manner oppressive, externally dangerous or both. Presumably articles formed at a different period, when strategic tensions were less, would offer fewer levels of antipathy, and different types of gendering. More study in this area is clearly desirable.

Having constructed distinctions of hostility, friendliness and neutrality in evaluation, it is worthwhile at this point to break down such structures. For instance, it is comparatively simple to see how British imperialism involved the writing and perception of pieces denouncing Russian power and endorsing security. Similar motives apply in those that focus only on Russia’s internal policies, working through patterns of contrast to promote acceptance of Britain’s class, political and gender stance. The ‘friendly’ and ‘neutral’ pieces are no less imperial because they fail to condemn Russia. They are still implicitly committed to British identity and
power. They also make wide distinctions of foreignness and otherness regarding Russia. The favorable articles repeat wide bias regarding Russia, and one even echoes description of its oppression and racial inferiority. Likewise, some of the earlier 'hostile' articles make wide generalizations about Russians that are relatively complimentary. However, such attitudes do not prevent them from taking a harsh line overall regarding Russia. Fundamentally these contrasts suggest the arbitrary nature of these categories, or at least their wide fluidity. There variance within each “school” has already been mentioned. Likewise, in many ways they crossed strict evaluative lines. They formed a continuum of perception that both reflected and helped shape imperial perceptions of Russia. The ambiguity and lack of consistent accord was an instrumental part of this legacy. This approach may also have utility for the analysis of British perceptions towards Russia after the nineteenth century, when Bolshevik radicalism gained dominance and further inflamed conservative fears. More generally, it offers a methodology for extending the analysis of imperialism.
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