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Preface

The zemstvo reform of 1864 established in Russia new institutions for the administration of provincial and district economic affairs. For the first time in Russian history gentry, peasants, and city inhabitants sat together in joint assemblies in order to discuss their common economic interests. One purpose of this study has been to define the various matters connected with zemstvo administration. This task has involved the necessity of a brief history of local economic affairs from the reign of Peter the Great to that of Alexander II. During this period of approximately 150 years the tsarist government devised numerous methods of managing provincial and district affairs and also expanded their number as such needs as famine relief became more pressing. These changes and additions resulted in some improvements, but, in general, the government could never decide whether it wanted to administer local affairs from St. Petersburg, or could safely leave them in the hands of the local populace. Actual tsarist policy ineffectively combined both viewpoints. By the mid-nineteenth century the government had failed to solve the troublesome question of local economic administration.

The defeat of Russia in the Crimean War plus existing social and economic conditions forced the new tsar, Alexander II, to take steps toward the emancipation of the Russian serfs. The Emancipation
opened the door to many other necessary reforms, including the zemstvo reform. The main portion of this study deals with the history of the preparation of the zemstvo reform. Special attention is paid to the activity and opinions of the Russian gentry and publicists on local economic reform. Although the government did not often heed their advice, their views are excellent illustrations of Russian "public opinion" on the zemstvo reform, in particular, and on the tsarist government, in general. The zemstvo reform was the end product of the labors of several government bodies in St. Petersburg and especially of three men. The ideas of these men and the government councils with their differences and fundamental similarities are set forth in detail. Finally, there is presented a summary of the zemstvo reform itself and its place among the Great Reforms of Alexander II.

All dates have been given according to the Julian calendar which was in use in Russia during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. According to the "old style" dates of nineteenth-century Russia were twelve days behind those of Western Europe with its Gregorian calendar. As for transliterations from the Russian alphabet into English letters the system of the Library of Congress has been followed. The one exception is the substitution of the single English letter y for the double ii ending of many Russian proper names.
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Chapter I
The Zemstvo: Definitions and Theories

Before undertaking a survey of Russian local government in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries prior to the Great Reforms it is necessary to understand precisely what the word "zemstvo" meant to the Russians of that time. The word "zemstvo" is derived from the Russian word zemlia, which literally means "land." In this sense the word "zemstvo" evokes a feeling of closeness to the land and the local affairs connected with it. A. I. Vasilchikov in his important study of local government in England, France, Prussia, and Russia has defined "zemstvo" as "the organism of internal administration of local authorities and institutions, which in other states is called by the names self-government, ständische Verfassung." Only upon the preparation of the zemstvo reform did the term "zemstvo" in its noun form appear in Russian law. Thus, in this study the word "zemstvo" used as a noun will refer specifically to the provincial and district institutions (gubernskii i uezdnyi uchrezhdeniia) created in 1864 for local government.

The adjectival form of this word, in Russian zemski, and in English "zemstvo," had long been used in Russian history. The most famous example was the Zemski Sabor of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. This assembly of the landed nobility, in theory, represented the leaders of the local landowners who could best advise the tsar.
Although the Zemskii Sobor failed to survive into the reign of Peter the Great, the adjective *zemskii* continued to be associated with local affairs. The laws of Peter I and Catherine II on local administration frequently mention "zemstvo" officials. At first the adjectival form referred to all phases of local government, but gradually it became more and more limited to specific economic and police matters. Unless otherwise stated it will be used in this work with the connotation of local economic affairs both before and after the 1864 reform.

Another essential definition concerns the exact nature of local economic affairs or, as they were called by the tsarist government, *zemstvo duties* (*zemskie povinnosti*). The term "zemstvo duties" was first used in a law of 1805. They were always confined to the provincial and district level and had as their goal the satisfaction of the predominantly local requirements of these administrative units. The view of *zemstvo duties* as local affairs slowly developed precise boundaries, but only the Zemstvo Statute of 1864 defined them exactly in relation to state and public affairs (*gosudarstvennye i obshchestvennye dela*). State affairs, of course, were those administered on an empire-wide basis by the central government, while public affairs were those belonging to the village, city and class corporations such as the nobility and the free peasantry. While some overlapping among these three sets of duties existed, *zemstvo duties* did occupy their own special place in the administrative structure. In general, *zemstvo duties* had two major characteristics: (1) in their scope they were limited to a province or district, and (2) all classes, nobility, city inhabitants, and
peasantry, participated to one degree or another in their financing and administration.

By 1864 zemstvo duties came under seven general headings. One of the most important by the very nature of its relationship to the economy was the road duty (dorozhnaia povinnost). This duty involved the construction and maintenance of roads and bridges under the jurisdiction of provincial or district institutions. All the major roads which crossed provincial boundaries fell to the jurisdiction of the government in St. Petersburg. Included within this duty was the obligation to determine the direction of local roads, their size, and cost of construction. Besides the roads themselves the local authorities had to build and maintain postal stations, provide changes of horses for the postal service, and pay the expenses of the guards at these stations. Control over the postal service itself remained in the hands of the central government; local authorities furnished the means for operating this service. The extent to which the road duty was fulfilled was determined by local conditions of wealth, geography, and talent and, in turn, the economy of a province or district usually depended upon an adequate discharge of this duty.

Another function connected from early times with the local populace was the so-called "duty of supplying and quartering" (kvartirnaia i podvodnaia povinnost). The obligations involved in this duty varied from time to time, but the essentials consisted in feeding and providing quarters for certain military forces passing through the area and in providing these same services for bureaucrats traveling on official government business. In the early nineteenth century another addition
to the supplying and quartering duty required the local inhabitants to furnish food, heat, and light in prisons for transitory exiles and for convicts sentenced by the local courts.

Poor harvests and the subsequent famines were not unique to any period of Russian history. Various efforts were made to alleviate the sufferings arising from these natural catastrophes. From these attempts there eventually emerged the zemstvo duty of public alimentation (narodnoe prodovolstvie). Prior to 1834 no effective program had been established to deal with the problem of food shortage. Then the government called for the building of special grain storehouses, an idea dating back to the legislation of Peter I, and the collection of a tax to be used exclusively for famine relief. These grain storehouses were to be built in each village and major point of water communications. Initially, in order to create a grain reserve, each male peasant contributed the equivalent of one bushel of wheat and one bushel of oats. Thereafter, his annual contribution in kind amounted to one-half bushel of winter grain and two pecks of spring grain. In addition, the monetary tax ranged from 10 kopecks to 1 ruble and 60 kopecks, depending on agricultural conditions. These obligations fell exclusively on the peasantry and in pre-emancipation days local bureaucrats assisted by the landowning gentry managed this duty. Despite many shortcomings, such as arrears in payments, the government persisted in viewing this matter as a purely local affair.

In 1775 Catherine II established Boards of Public Welfare (prikazy obshchestvenogo prizreniia) in each province. Henceforth,
the administration of general public welfare measures came under the control of these Boards which had the provincial governor as chairman and representatives from the gentry, city inhabitants, and free peasantry.

The Boards of Public Welfare had various institutions under their jurisdiction. In the field of medicine they administered general hospitals, insane asylums, hospitals for foundlings, and several schools for doctors' aids (feldshery). Some provinces established orphanages and poorhouses for the infirm and aged. Work and corrective houses (rabochie i smiritelnie domy) for unemployed persons and for people, especially youths, who were sentenced for minor offenses were another form of public welfare. Individuals in these houses who had skills worked for private concerns; others, the majority, worked on the Board's projects. The Boards also had the obligation of educating the children of poor nobles, bureaucrats and chancellory workers in various state institutions. Thus, it can be seen that the area of public welfare and charity was quite extensive, though the actual number of welfare establishments was relatively small considering the population of Russia.

The remaining zemstvo duties prior to 1864 existed not so much as formal parts of government administration, but as affairs which should be handled by local authorities. The duty of safeguarding public health through such practices as vaccinations and prevention of diseases to cattle was never directly included in the law; nevertheless, doctors who in turn came under the control of the Boards of Public Welfare were expected to be active in this matter. Measures for the development of local trade and industry had always been the responsibility of the
central government, but in the 1850's the authorities in St. Petersburg decreed that strictly local institutions could contribute to the economic progress of the country. Particularly was this true in regard to the opening and closing of markets and trade fairs and the collection of information on local economic conditions. The last zemstvo duty was fire insurance. Before 1861 regulations on fire insurance had been non-existent for individual peasants. The gentry could in case of a fire apply to the State Treasury for a loan of 300 rubles and fire-ravished villages could receive state financial assistance upon the approval of the tsar. The last three matters discussed did not become official zemstvo duties until 1864. The government while formulating the zemstvo reform had no difficulty in fitting them into the scheme of local affairs.

The financial means for administering zemstvo duties resulted in several distinctive categories of these duties. The very character of some zemstvo affairs coupled with the system of serfdom led to the development of so-called natural zemstvo duties (natural'nye zem'skie povinnosti). As in the French system of corvées, the Russian peasantry was obliged to repair and maintain all provincial and district roads by their own personal labor. In some areas the peasantry had the possibility of paying for this obligation, but this was the exception. Another duty under the general heading of natural duties was that of supplying and quartering. The peasants furnished food and similar supplies for both transitory government officials and military troops. Also this duty involved the construction of living quarters for all
those entitled to this service by law, but without compensation for the peasants who performed the labor. In short, natural zemstvo duties rested directly on the shoulders of the peasants.

All other zemstvo duties were called monetary duties (денежные повинности). The designation "monetary duties" implied the participation of all classes by means of taxation. Over the years the government devised various means to finance these duties. Prior to 1851 monetary zemstvo duties had been financed from two major sources: general state taxes and the "soul" tax (подушная подать). This latter tax Peter the Great had introduced in 1718 as a tax on all males not in the service of the state. Because all the nobility at this time served the state in one capacity or another, the soul tax in reality fell exclusively on the peasantry. After Catherine II freed the nobility from its obligation of state service, the soul tax remained in effect only for the peasantry. From 1724 to 1861 this tax fluctuated between 70 kopecks to 1 ruble a year.

The Ordinance of 1851 on zemstvo duties attempted to place the financing of these obligations on a more secure basis and to divorce local taxation from general state revenues. To accomplish this purpose two new types of taxation were added to the "soul" tax. Henceforth, all new commercial or industrial enterprise applying for a license to operate had to pay a fee of 10 per cent of the license cost to those in charge of zemstvo administration. The second new source of taxation was a limited tax on land. The following table shows the division of tax revenues in rubles for zemstvo monetary duties from 1853 to 1862:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Taxes from business licenses</th>
<th>Taxes from land</th>
<th>The &quot;soul&quot; tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1853-1856</td>
<td>3,44,962</td>
<td>1,718,806</td>
<td>2,958,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857-1859</td>
<td>363,661</td>
<td>1,818,897</td>
<td>4,502,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860-1862</td>
<td>389,178</td>
<td>1,878,522</td>
<td>4,233,173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under Nicholas I three categories of zemstvo monetary duties were established: (1) state zemstvo duties, (2) provincial zemstvo duties, and (3) private zemstvo duties. There would be no particular value in detailing the difference between the first two. In general, a nebulous division of jurisdiction in regard to the road duty and the quartering and supply duties separated them. The nature of the financial structure connected with zemstvo duties tended to confuse the relationship between local and state affairs. Private duties included the special affairs relating to one class, such as the assemblies of the nobility. The government failed to distinguish clearly between the affairs it wished to control itself and those it wished to turn over to local officials. This problem will be elaborated upon in the chapter on the historical development of zemstvo administration.

The tsarist government up to 1864 never evolved a well-defined policy on the matter of local affairs. Were they to be completely under local control or were they to be administered and financed by bureaucrats directly dependent on the provincial governor and St. Petersburg? Although not until the passage of the zemstvo reform were general theories on the nature of the zemstvo and its relationship to the central authorities fully elaborated, two basic theories already existed in embryo form. A brief survey of these theories will prove beneficial.
in understanding the actual formulation of the zemstvo statute.

The first of these two theories to be unfolded was the social theory (obshchestvenno-khozialistvennaia teoriia) of local self-government. In part, this theory permeated the deliberations of the lawmakers who composed the zemstvo reform. Such writers as A. I. Vasilchikov, V. N. Leskhov, and A. A. Golovachev gave it a fuller explanation in the years immediately after 1861.26 Supporters of the social theory maintained that a definite distinction could be made between local and state affairs. Once this division had been made, then the people on the provincial and district levels could determine how they wished to manage their local economic affairs.27 Society had its own demands and functions which it best knew how to satisfy. Special emphasis was laid on the fulfillment of these matters outside the bureaucratic framework of the government.28 In this way genuine local self-government in economic affairs could be inaugurated. The Russian jurist Korkunov has described the prevailing theory of the 1860's among bureaucrats and publicists:

At the time of the preparation of the 1864 Statute the social theory of self-government was still completely dominant in our country. They thought that by establishing self-government they were leaving to district and provincial society the management of their own interests and that all these interests have an exclusively economic character. In self-government, therefore, they did not see a special organ of the state administration, but only the refusal of the state to manage the economic affairs of the district and province, which were alien to it.29

The practical shortcomings of this theory were evidenced in the zemstvo reform itself, but not until the 1880's was a new and radically different theory presented and accepted.
The state theory (gosudarstvennaiia teoriia) of self-government represented a more realistic view of the zemstvo. This theory stated that truly local affairs did not exist. So-called "local duties" only came under local control at the behest of the central government. The government believed it more convenient and practical to permit the people in a province or district to have a hand in managing certain economic affairs. By fulfilling the tasks of the state administration local society merely became a section of the whole bureaucratic establishment. The state theorist refused to accept the assertion that the local populace could direct its own economic affairs independently of decisive bureaucratic control. The state and social theories on the administration of local affairs, although not yet fully elaborated by 1864, formed the unconscious philosophical basis for the formulators of the zemstvo reform and for those individuals outside of the government who were interested in this problem.
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Chapter II

Historical Survey of Local Economic Administration (1708-1855)

Local government in Russia is as old as the meetings and decisions of its primitive clans and tribes. The logical starting, however, for an historical survey of local administration as far as the zemstvo reform of 1864 is concerned is the reign of Peter the Great. Under this tsar one can discern the initial outlines of the future zemstvo institutions. Only from the eighteenth century did the Russian government gradually distinguish between local affairs and those of the central government. This distinction was one of the principal points of debate in the bureaucratic circles which formulated the zemstvo reform. Thus, a survey of the historical precedents will serve as a valuable background to the actual composition of zemstvo institutions.

The Law of December 18, 1708, which divided Peter the Great's Russia into provinces and districts, marked the beginning of provincial and district administration as such in Russia. Peter by instituting this basic reform sought to accomplish three things. He desired, first of all, to place local government under the direct supervision of the central state institutions which he had just created; secondly, to entrust to local authority entirely new concerns, and, thirdly, to
organize the local populace in the most profitable manner for his military and diplomatic purposes. In accordance with this threefold purpose Peter introduced several different provincial administrative schemes in the years after 1708. The division of provinces into various administrative units and the establishment of new titles for the government officials in charge of them failed to produce the desired results. In theory, Peter created a powerful centralized bureaucracy whose purpose was to maintain a close surveillance over all levels of administration; in reality, the authority of local officials was often unchecked and abused. Local administration under Peter suffered not so much from neglect, as from a lack of capable officials and hastily conceived laws. The Russia of this time was unprepared to accept and to operate the centralized bureaucratic system imposed by St. Petersburg. Despite all of its many shortcomings, however, local administration was strengthened and its structural foundations were laid for the remaining period of tsarist history. Furthermore, local economic affairs received more attention from the government than ever before.

Peter's attitude toward local economic administration is well exemplified by a consideration of those affairs which in the nineteenth century came to be called zemstvo duties. The most important local duty for Peter was that of satisfying military needs and for the people this duty took the form of feeding and quartering soldiers. It was primarily the responsibility of the provincial governor and the chief official in the district (voevoda) to insure the fulfillment of this
task. Other government appointed officials directed such duties as the building of roads, maintenance of prisons, and public construction. Peter attempted to guarantee better execution only of those obligations essential to his military operations. The sole example of local representation was the office of zemstvo commissar (zemskii kommissar) who was elected by the nobility of each district. His main function was to collect taxes.

In two areas Peter introduced significant changes, at least on paper—public welfare and famine relief. Prior to his reign public welfare depended solely on the activity of the church and the monasteries. Now the tsar charged his provincial governors with the supervision of this duty. The problem of famine relief received some attention due to the famine of 1723. As a result of this famine the provincial governors and the district chiefs were ordered to construct grain storehouses and to collect a certain amount of grain from those who had a surplus for the benefit of famine victims. Nothing was done to implement the tsar's order and famine relief remained inoperative until 1834.

Although the Petersburg bureaucrats continued to formulate laws for local administration after the death of Peter in 1725, not until 1775 was another major piece of legislation in this area produced. The Law of 1775 on the administration of the provinces of the Russian empire is a landmark in Russian legislation. Its primary purpose was to serve as a remedy for the oversized provinces with their insufficient number of trained officials and the confusion resulting from too varied functions being controlled by one agency. The problem
of a province's size was solved in one way by theory and another by practice. According to the Law of 1775 each province would have 300,000 to 400,000 inhabitants, but in practice this provision was never fully adhered to. From fifteen provinces in 1762 the number was increased to forty and by the end of Catherine II's reign to fifty provinces.13

The Law of 1775 also set forth a detailed outline of provincial administration. The provincial governor with the assistance of a provincial board (gubernskoe pravlenie) consisting of himself and two advisors controlled all phases of activity on this level.14 Final decisions on economic affairs found their way to the provincial governor and, with one exception, no special organs were created to deal exclusively with zemstvo duties. This one exception was the Board of Public Welfare. This Board, composed of the provincial governor and representatives from the three main classes, was ultimately subordinate to the Economic Department of the Ministry of Interior which had the right of absolute supervision over its enactments.15 The establishment of the Boards of Public Welfare marked the beginning of all-class representation in an affair having interest for all segments of society, but the stringent control exercised by the provincial governor and the Ministry of Interior precluded genuine development of local self-government in this matter.

One of the basic aims of the Law of 1775 in the mind of Catherine II was to implant in the nobility, who had so recently been released from obligatory state service, a sense of responsibility for local affairs. As the only educated class the gentry alone could furnish the
personnel for truly effective local administration. Hence, on the
district level the gentry, thanks to this reform, exercised wide power. The most important district official was the zemstvo captain (zemskii ispravnik). The nobility of each district, where their numbers were sufficient, elected one of themselves to this post for a three year period. The zemstvo captain by virtue of his office was head of the local courts, chairman of the lower zemstvo court (nizhnii zemskii sud), the chief police official in the district, and the man in charge of maintaining public order.

The lower zemstvo court included, besides the zemstvo captain, two assessors (zasedateli) who also came from the gentry and were elected for a three year period. Its major obligation was to watch over the fulfillment of the law. It combined with this duty responsibility for certain economic affairs, such as the construction and repair of roads and bridges, the quartering and feeding of troops, and measures to protect public health and to prevent fires. In all its tasks it came directly under the supervision of the provincial board and eventually the Senate in St. Petersburg. On paper the structure of local administration seemed to guarantee a fair measure of gentry participation, but the ensuing years witnessed only distrust and apathy on the part of the nobility. Another feature of the Law of 1775 was that it set a pattern for local administration which was not altered until 1864—the union of police activity with district economic affairs.

The newly created provincial financial boards (gubernskie kazennye palati) handled the financial side of zemstvo duties.
Their members were appointed directly by the Senate. In each province the financial committee controlled the collection of all taxes and the expenditure of funds. This system hampered independent action by either the provincial board or the lower zemstvo court.

Catherine II further influenced the future zemstvo institutions through the Charter to the Nobility (Zhalovannia gramota dvorianstvu). Among other privileges the Charter granted to the nobility the right to form assemblies of the nobility (dvorianskie sobrania) on the provincial and district level. These assemblies met once every three years. All male noblemen could attend the district assemblies, but only those older than twenty-five years of age and who owned land could vote. The district assemblies elected delegates to the provincial assembly, as well as their own marshal of the nobility (predvoditel dvorianstva). On the provincial level the gentry delegates only nominated two candidates to the post of provincial marshal of the nobility. The provincial governor then selected one of the two candidates. These assemblies elected the gentry representatives to government posts as provided for by the Law of 1775. In general, the gentry in assemblies discussed the common interests and needs of their class and reported their considerations to the provincial governor. The assemblies of the nobility proved to be a partial prototype of zemstvo institutions nearly ninety years later.

Except for legislation establishing a weak form of local self-government among the free peasantry the reign of Paul I produced no change in the local administrative structure. On the other hand,
Alexander I continually had to deal with the complicated problems of local economic affairs. Major action was concentrated in two periods. In the first, 1802 to 1805, monetary zemstvo duties received their first specific mention as such in tsarist legislation. Twice in the summer of 1802 the tsar expressed his concern with zemstvo duties. On June 3, 1802, an imperial directive called the attention of the State Council to the fact that the whole system of taxes and zemstvo duties was in a state of disorder. Along this same line the Decree of July 24, 1802, marked the most serious effort by the government thus far to place zemstvo duties "on the way to being well-regulated." Alexander pointed out that the taxes for road construction, for the building of postal stations, and for other zemstvo duties were not evenly divided among the peasantry, city inhabitants, and landowners. The Senate was ordered to gather exact information on all duties, to draw up an equitable system of tax apportionment, and, finally, to compose a new statute on these duties.

The result of this decree was the Preliminary Statute on Zemstvo Duties of May 2, 1805. The new law affected only monetary duties, while leaving the administration of natural duties unchanged. It primarily concerned the collection of taxes for monetary duties and the composition of their budget. For the first time there existed concrete guidelines for the division of taxes among the monetary duties. Of great significance on the administrative side was the creation of the special provincial council (osoboe gubernskoe prisutstvie) composed of the provincial governor, the vice-provincial governor, the provincial
marshal of the nobility, and, if the matter affected a city, a city delegate. The provincial council every three years compiled estimates for the expenditure of taxes on zemstvo duties. Upon the completion of this task the estimates were examined by the provincial assembly of the nobility and then sent to the Ministry of Interior for final approval. This reform formed the basis of provincial zemstvo administration until 1851.

Minister of Interior, P. A. Valuev, in a note to the State Council in May 1863 termed this statute "a resolute step toward the recognition of provinces as independent economic units in regard to zemstvo duties and toward the addition of the participation of the representatives of the local population in the structure of provincial economic affairs." His rather optimistic interpretation was contradicted by reality. The Statute of 1805 failed to make a positive distinction between zemstvo duties and state duties. By not defining the exact extent of monetary and natural duties the Statute created much confusion which several succeeding legislative efforts did not alter. Talk of local representation is also questionable because the peasantry enjoyed no voice in the composition of the three year estimates. Even the provincial assemblies of the nobility only commented upon the estimates and real control over zemstvo expenditures remained in the hands of the provincial governor and his bureaucratic forces.

The second period of major concern for local administration during the reign of Alexander I came between 1816 and 1820. The Decree of June 14, 1816 attempted to remedy the weaknesses of previous legislation
by defining in greater detail the limits of monetary zemstvo duties and
by placing the confirmation of zemstvo estimates more securely under
the central government, specifically the Ministry of Finance and the
State Council. The actual fulfillment of zemstvo duties rested on
the local police with the supervision of the provincial governor. An
effort to separate private class duties from general zemstvo duties
was a commendable step, but the Decree did not clarify the vital dis-
tinction between purely local affairs and those controlled and admin-
istered by the central bureaucracy.

In the same year of 1816 Alexander formed a committee of Senators
to work out still another statute on the management of all zemstvo
duties throughout the empire. After a 3½ year period of deliberations
the committee reached three main conclusions. First of all, the taxes
for zemstvo duties should be divided fairly among all the classes.
Secondly, a significant number of natural duties would be better served
by being transferred into monetary duties. The third conclusion was
typical of all government pronouncements on this subject. Ultimate
control of zemstvo affairs should be with the Ministry of Interior, but
in each province special committees composed of the local populace should
aid the government. These proposals formed important points in the
discussions on the zemstvo reform of 1864, but for the time being they
were completely ignored. On January 2, 1820, the Senate ordered an end
to the work of this committee and abandoned any move to implement its
suggestions. Thus, the pattern of the government's attitude and
policy on zemstvo administration for nearly forty years was fixed in
the period 1816-1820. First, a special committee to study zemstvo affairs would be created and then its advise would be almost totally disregarded.

An excellent illustration of this point is the fate of the Committee of 1826, established to deal with the reform of provincial administration. The man most intimately connected with the deliberations of the Committee of 1826 was Michael Speransky. As a tsarist bureaucrat of long standing Speransky had for many years concerned himself with government reforms. The project which he introduced as the basis of the Committee's discussions was the result of many years' thought and labor.

In his early service under Alexander I Speransky concentrated on the central administration and tended to overlook local affairs. The Plan of 1809 was his first venture at formulating a new structure both for central and local (in sketchy outline) government. Here are to be found the outlines of local administration as it eventually evolved under Nicholas I and even some features of the zemstvo reform itself. Each district and province according to Speransky's scheme was to have its own duly elected duma composed of people who enjoyed their voting right on the basis of an unspecified amount of property ownership. The provincial duma, meeting once every three years, audited the accounts of taxes collected and spent and drafted petitions to the central government on the needs of the province. Without the right to legislate or issue regulations these provincial dumas would have been mere advisory bodies.
After having served as a provincial governor Speransky came to realize more clearly the deficiencies of local administration. He wrote to Count V. P. Kochubei on September 21, 1818:

If they now ask, what institutions we think the most necessary for the internal organization of Russia, it would be possible to answer without losing oneself in airy heights; most necessary is an organization or statute on provincial administration. The present organization is not compatible with the times, the extent of affairs, the people or the intelligence of the governed... The idea of a better provincial statute will of itself lead to other institutions necessary for internal civil order.42

Speransky was able to act on these ideas when he became a member of the Committee of 1826. His project on the organization of provincial administration formed an important segment of the committee's deliberations during the next four years.43

According to his project the administrative divisions of local government were the province, the district, and the volost. This division already existed, but Speransky advocated a real change in the division of administrative affairs. He proposed to delineate sharply police, economic, and judicial affairs.44 The Law of 1775 had entrusted many of the economic and judicial functions on the local level to the police. Thus, since 1775 the police had fulfilled not only the role of lawkeeper and enforcer, but also that of judge and economic director.45 This situation, Speransky believed, had resulted in confusion and widespread corruption. His remedy was to form a provincial council consisting of the provincial governor, the vice-provincial governor, four councilors from the treasury department, and representatives from various
government offices on matters directly affecting them. In this way the provincial governor, aided by several advisers, would coordinate all the activities of the province, including zemstvo affairs.

It was on the district level that Speransky's project most closely foreshadowed later developments. He urged the creation of a district zemstvo board made up of the zemstvo captain, three assistants elected by the district noble assembly, and two assessors appointed by the provincial council. The local police under the direction of this zemstvo board would collect the taxes necessary for carrying out zemstvo duties. In this scheme the gentry had some voice in the management of zemstvo affairs, but their participation in the long run would have been minimal. Actual control was to remain in the provincial capital and ultimately in St. Petersburg. Speransky's project suffered the fate of many such plans under Nicholas I. The tsarist government, distracted by the revolutionary events of 1830 in western Europe and Poland, abandoned any idea of general administrative reform. The Committee of 1826 was dissolved with nothing concrete to show for its efforts.

The next two decades witnessed the passage of piecemeal legislation in regard to zemstvo affairs and the formation of special committees to deal with specific zemstvo duties. Nicholas I, when he ascended the throne, expressed his policy on local affairs in these words, "The best judges of the successful fulfillment of zemstvo duties are the local people." In the eyes of Nicholas the term "local people" meant bureaucrats and representatives from the gentry. His
reign was an active one for the breeding of zemstvo commissions. On the provincial and district levels Road Commissions were established in 1833. The provincial road commission had the provincial governor as its chairman and included the provincial marshal of the nobility, the mayor of the provincial capital, and several engineers and architects. The only difference on the district level was that the district marshal of the nobility held the post of chairman and the local police were represented. In 1840 committees for the supervision of quartering and feeding troops and travelling officials were created for the districts. Their composition corresponded to that of other such bodies dealing with zemstvo affairs, namely representatives from the bureaucracy, gentry, and pertinent experts. The most important of such commissions was that for public alimentation. This commission, created in 1834, existed only on the provincial level. It represented a revival of a similar idea of Peter the Great in that its major tasks involved the construction of storage houses for grain to be used in time of famine and the collection of monetary taxes for this same purpose. These commissions are examples of the piecemeal attempt of Nicholas's government to solve the complex problems of local administration.

Count Kiselev, Minister of State Property, submitted a report to the tsar in January, 1842 on the need for reforming natural duties. Spurred on by the desire of Nicholas for immediate consideration of this question, the chairman of the State Council advised the formation of a committee composed of the relevant government ministers to consider possible reforms in this area. For the next nine years government
committees prepared projects aimed at reforming the organization of zemstvo duties. Finally, Nicholas gave his approval to the Ordinance on Zemstvo Duties at his summer palace at Peterhof on July 13, 1851. The history of the preparation of the Ordinance of 1851 highlighted the bureaucratic red-tape prevalent under Nicholas I.

Although this Ordinance introduced no new principles on the administration of zemstvo duties, it did bring together the numerous decrees on these duties which had been passed since the Preliminary Statute of 1805. Basically, it attempted to establish a more equitable distribution of taxes on zemstvo duties among the various classes. This was accomplished through a reclassification of zemstvo duties. State zemstvo duties were those whose satisfaction was deemed necessary for all parts of the Russian empire. They included (1) the maintenance of postal stations with their horses and rooms for travelers, (2) the construction of roads between provinces, (3) the building and maintenance of halting stations for prisoners on their way to Siberia, and (4) the furnishing of shelter and provisions for soldiers. All classes were bound to pay taxes for these state duties. Provincial zemstvo duties generally touched only provincial matters such as roads exclusively within the province, maintenance of local civil administration, and measures for vaccinations. Private duties were those directly involving a particular class, and the funds for their satisfaction came from that class. The distinction between monetary and natural duties was left unchanged.
The most significant innovation of the Ordinance of 1851 was the system for drawing up zemstvo budgets and for supervising zemstvo affairs. For this purpose there were created provincial committees on zemstvo duties consisting of the provincial governor as chairman, the provincial and district marshals of the nobility, elected gentry and city representatives, the mayor of the provincial capital, plus various government officials. This combination of elected representatives and government bureaucrats met once every three years for several days to discuss the provincial zemstvo budget and economic questions. The provincial committee on zemstvo duties also had a sort of executive organ, the special council on zemstvo duties (osoboe o zemskikh povinnostakh prisutstvie), which was to supervise the administration of zemstvo expenditures. Besides government officials, only the provincial marshal of the nobility and the provincial capital mayor sat on the council. The districts were given similar institutions composed of gentry representatives and district government officials under the chairmanship of the district marshal. While the tsar was attempting to attract the educated classes of the nobility and cities into participation in zemstvo affairs, the fact that the provincial committee gathered only once every three years indicates how insignificant was its role. In reality, the administration of zemstvo duties remained as before. Zemstvo budgets were composed by government authorities and the expenditure of zemstvo taxes was the work of these same authorities through such bodies as the provincial road commission. City and gentry delegates had scant opportunity or even means of
protesting or amending the proposals of the government. But at least the concept of class participation in zemstvo affairs had been widened and further groundwork for the future zemstvo reform laid.

The Ordinance of 1851 was the last important piece of legislation on local government prior to the Great Reforms of Alexander II. Since the time of Peter the Great the Russian government had sought some way of efficiently administering local affairs. This goal had led to the passage of many pieces of legislation and to the creation of several zemstvo commissions. By 1855 the government had evolved a system whereby the ultimate decisions were in the hands of the provincial governor and the ministers in St. Petersburg. Simultaneously, since the reign of Catherine II decisive efforts by the government had succeeded in giving the nobility and the wealthier elements of the cities a voice, if somewhat limited, in zemstvo administration. Neither these schemes, nor the participation of local representatives had solved the enormous problems of local economic affairs. Before it was possible to do this, the more pressing question of the fate of serfdom had to be settled.
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Chapter III
Zemstvo Affairs and the Emancipation

When Alexander II became tsar in 1855, Russia was on the threshold of profound historical changes. The Crimean War opened the eyes of the conservative bureaucrats to the necessity of reform. More specifically, it has been claimed that the fall of long besieged Sevastopol destroyed the last illusions about the possibility of a complete continuation of the existing order. For example, Peter Valuev, who was to play such an important role in the composition of the zemstvo reform, was moved to declare upon learning of the events in the Crimea, "I am sad... I am sick over Sevastopol." The situation, he believed, required various reforms with special attention to be paid to administration. With this idea Alexander II was only too ready to comply, but the tsar realized that local administration was intimately bound up with serfdom. The destruction of the latter would logically lead to a reform of zemstvo affairs. Moral considerations aside, the practical question of emancipating the serfs needed immediate study. Only upon its solution could all other areas of Russian life be improved.

Even without the obvious failures of zemstvo administration the abolition of serfdom necessitated an entirely new organization on the local level. A government commission dealing with this very question in 1860 admitted the truth of this idea in these words, "On account of the
fundamental changes, set in motion by the tsar, in the position of the
large class of private serfs the necessity of (zemstvo) reform has
become still stronger and more urgent. Under Nicholas I St. Peters-
burg had attempted to regulate strictly zemstvo affairs, while permitting
a minimum of gentry participation, but, as stated in a report of March,
1862, "now with the promulgation of the Statute of February 19, 1861,
legislation has ceased to desire the subordination of the activity of
society to government tutelage."

The basic change for zemstvo affairs brought about by Emancipation
was an end to the nearly total domination of the peasantry by the
nobility. Before 1861 the peasantry had paid zemstvo taxes and ful-
filled natural duties, but only under the control of the zemstvo police
and the local gentry. The Emancipation Act had abolished the legal
power of these two groups over the peasantry. Such a profound alter-
ation in the social structure made it impossible to maintain the
existing system of zemstvo administration. Alexander Koshelev, one of
the most outspoken commentators on the momentous events of the 1860's
summed up this concept in this way, "The peasants who participate in
the payment for zemstvo obligations cannot now but participate through
their own delegates both in the examination of estimates and in the
accounting of expenditures for these duties. This obviously does not
require any proof." He argued that emancipation of the serfs had
destroyed any exclusive rights the gentry had possessed; henceforth,
gentry, city, and peasant delegates should sit together and decide the
fate of local economic matters. Thus, the most immediate reason for
zemstvo reform was the liberation of the peasantry from serfdom.

The Ordinance of 1851 on zemstvo duties fared no better than its predecessors in solving the problems of local economic administration. Even the government admitted this point in a report of the Minister of Interior, "...experience has shown that the existing order of local economic administration, according to the judgement of local authorities, public opinion and the Government itself, is still far from satisfying the most necessary and legal demands." The attitude of public opinion on this subject will be discussed in the chapters dealing with the nobility and the zemstvo reform and with publicists outside the government. The complaints of government officials both in St. Petersburg and in the provinces can be divided into several categories: (1) those dealing with general provincial and district zemstvo administration, (2) those involving specific zemstvo duties, and (3) those concerning zemstvo finances, especially as they touched monetary and natural duties.

After 1851 the administration of zemstvo duties came under four major jurisdictions. On the national level the Ministries of Interior, Finance, State Property, and War all had a function, often the determining one, in the management of economic affairs throughout the empire. The principal authorities in charge of zemstvo affairs on the provincial level were the provincial governor, the provincial board, provincial finance officials, the exchequer of state property, the provincial assembly of the nobility, the committee on provincial duties with its special council, and the various commissions and committees on roads, public welfare, public alimentation and quartering of soldiers.
District officials connected with zemstvo affairs included the district marshal of the nobility, the zemstvo police, the district council on zemstvo duties, and the district road commission. Finally, there should be mentioned the city institutions of the city council, the city police and the city quartering commission. Of these four divisions that of the city certainly was the least important.

Such a vast organization created complex problems for zemstvo administration. As Minister of Interior Valuev admitted, the intermingling of conflicting interests characterized the management of zemstvo duties. In a note of May, 1863 entitled "Present shortcomings of the law on zemstvo duties" he pointed out that zemstvo administration indiscriminately mixed up government officials and elected class representatives. The combination of these two resulted in no clear lines of authority. The gentry representatives fought only for their own interests, while the provincial bureaucrats always needed the confirmation of their decisions by St. Petersburg. As long as no definite distinction was made between the roles of government officials and class representatives the administration of local economic affairs was bound to drift from one improvised plan to another.

The commissions established by Alexander II beginning in 1859 for an examination of zemstvo administration have presented the best insight into its shortcomings. None of the bodies dealing with zemstvo affairs on the provincial or district level managed to escape serious criticism. The provincial committees on zemstvo duties were the picture of ineptitude. Meeting only once every three years a provincial
committee found it physically impossible in a few days to compose a sensible budget and, furthermore, the central authorities almost always changed the zemstvo budget. Even the observations made by members of the committee were largely disregarded; naturally these members lost all interest, especially the non-government members. Provincial governors complained that marshals of the nobility thought only of returning home as soon as possible and that many elected representatives did not trouble themselves to appear at all. City delegates were usually silent; some were even known to sign blank sheets of paper beforehand so that they could more quickly depart. Any lengthy examination of zemstvo estimates was deemed out of order by the majority which reproached any member who caused a delay in the proceedings. Such a dismal account is convincing proof of the utter farce of talk about cooperation of gentry and city classes with the local bureaucracy.

The other provincial bodies in charge of zemstvo affairs were different only in that bureaucrats had absolute control and brooked no opposition from the occasional class representative. The provincial governor sat as chairman on most of the zemstvo commissions and committees. This task coupled with his numerous other duties led to ineffective control over zemstvo administration. The special council of the committee on zemstvo duties was composed of officials who believed that they had more pressing matters to supervise. This situation left zemstvo affairs adrift in a sea of unconcern and general neglect.

Administration became even more chaotic on the district level. The district council on zemstvo duties, if it did meet, which was an
infrequent occurrence, failed to compile the necessary information on economic affairs or, even worse, acted only in the interests of the local gentry. The management of district zemstvo affairs depended exclusively on the zemstvo captain and the police. All too often the zemstvo captain desired to indulge those of the gentry landowners on whom his election depended. Another example of the general corruption of these officials was their attempt to force the fulfillment of natural duties on private serfs who could not be protected from unjust police demands by their owners either because of the latter's absence, illness, or some other reason. The first Commission on provincial and district institutions heard a report listing fourteen separate complaints made by provincial governors against the district police. These complaints included charges that the police lacked the necessary knowledge to administer the laws, acted arbitrarily, and sought only their own personal profit. Even from the purely bureaucratic viewpoint of the provincial governors the obvious need for district zemstvo institutions with precisely defined jurisdiction was not unobserved.

The administration of individual zemstvo duties perfectly reflected the state of zemstvo affairs in general. On the district level the road commission often remained a paper organization. The rare exception occurred when the district marshal was an especially active person or a special order from provincial authorities put a brief spark of life into a district road commission. Provincial road commissions, while active in pursuing their duty, often did so solely
for the profits of their members. Sir D. M. Wallace, the noted nine-
teenth century English traveler in Russia, has described road
conditions in this way:

Now in Russia roads are nearly all of the unmake, natural
kind, and are so conservative in their nature that they
have at the present day precisely the same appearance as
they had many centuries ago... . The only perceptible change
that takes place in them during a series of generations is
that the ruts shift from their position... . How the old ones
get filled up I cannot explain; but as I have rarely seen
in any part of the country, except perhaps in the immediate
vicinity of towns, a human being engaged in road repairing,
I assume that beneficent Nature somehow accomplishes the
task without human assistance, either by means of alluvial
deposits, or by some other cosmical action only known to
physical geographers.20

This description was written in the 1870's, but road conditions were
certainly no better in the 1850's. They reflected the huge size of
the country and its harsh winters coupled with a thin population. The
efforts of the road commissions to offset these factors enjoyed minimal
success.

The duty of public alimentation had been a concern of zemstvo
administration since the time of Peter the Great. By 1861 the history
of this zemstvo duty revealed one disaster after another. Between 1775
and 1851 the government created four different bodies in an effort to
solve the problem.21 Count Lev Perovsky in 1842 bluntly declared in a
report to the Ministry of Interior:

The condition of the grain and monetary reserves for the
guaranteeing of public alimentation in the state is highly
unsatisfactory. This important function is in disarray;
general unconcern in years of good harvests is the reason
that each new poor harvest has, so to speak, taken everyone
unexpectedly, and a poor harvest of long duration can place
Government and people in a very difficult position.22
Even when the peasants were prompt in their payments, they did not always receive back in years of bad harvests what they had put in during good ones. Figures published by the government in 1840 show how far apart were the payments required by law and those actually on hand. In twenty-one provinces the arrears for the grain tax was over 50 per cent. Monetary reserves totaled 4,728,777 rubles, but arrears amounted to over one-fifth of this figure.

This picture had not changed by the 1860's. Some provincial governors charged that the commissions for public alimentation were "utterly superfluous" and that their administration was "tied to useless formality." The illiterate peasants in charge of the storehouses for reserve grain were incapable of preventing their exploitation by local landowners. Charges of corruption and poor administration extended from the village storehouse guardians up to the provincial governors. "Too little and too late" might well have served as the descriptive phrase for the actions of the bureaucracy in this matter. Prince Cherkassky in a letter to a government official described a circular of the Ministry of Interior in June 1861 asking for exact information on the collection of grain reserves as "impractical and unjust" because of the inability of the peasantry to fill the storehouses. Simple justice, let alone the emancipation of the serfs, required that the government try once more to formulate an improved system for feeding the people in time of dire shortage.

The function of the Boards of Public Welfare had remained essentially unchanged since 1775. In this area of medical assistance and
education the woeful inadequacy of the existing facilities was very
evident. The Economic Department of the Ministry of Interior in its
frank report of March, 1862, "Structure of Public Welfare in Russia,"
has presented a valuable picture. 26 For a population of almost
70,000,000 the Boards of Public Welfare administered 519 general hos-
pitals with a total of 17,351 beds of which 496 hospitals had less than
100 beds. 27 These hospitals were to be found almost exclusively in
cities. The provincial governors unanimously stated that the councils
set up in 1851 to manage these hospitals were ineffective. When one
considers the obstacles facing them, hospital administrators would have
had to perform miracles to please their critics. Besides the pitiable
shortage of facilities and funds the hospitals faced two other hind-
rances—the attitude of the peasantry and the small number of trained
medical personnel.

Isolated in their own small world the Russian peasantry was often
suspicous of outsiders. A trained doctor was a rare visitor prior to
the Emancipation and the peasants were reluctant to submit to modern
medical treatment. 28 More contact with doctors and general improvements
in the life of the peasantry could and did alter the attitude of the
Russian peasant, but the far greater obstacle of a lack of trained
doctors blocked immediate progress. Medicine as a profession did not
attract many Russians with a higher education and even the expedient
of encouraging foreign doctors to move to Russia failed to sufficiently
raise their number. 29 The result was that many hospitals had no doctors,
but only feldshers. These latter were medical assistants who learned
their profession usually by work and observation in a hospital; however,
the Boards of Public Welfare had established special schools for feldshers in Moscow, Kazan, Kharkov, Kiev, Odessa, and St. Petersburg. In 1861 these Boards were financially supporting 215 future feldshers at an annual cost of 122 rubles per pupil. Upon completion of their course the feldshers were obliged to work for ten years wherever the Board which had paid for their education wished. The inadequate training of such men and their meager pay did little to improve hospital standards.

The Boards of Public Welfare had other institutions under their jurisdiction. If possible, the standards for these were lower than for general hospitals. Lunatic asylums numbered thirty-three separate ones and six connected with some other institution. The government ascertained in 1861 that 2,417 patients passed through 1,233 beds in all 39 asylums. The general conclusion was extremely dismal:

These institutions are in a state of extreme disorder and are completely unsuited for the case of the insane; those who are confined in them are left almost without any medicine, both on account of the fact that these institutions do not have any means and also because of a shortage of doctors.

The incurably sick had only two special hospitals set aside for them in all Russia, but the Boards did provide poor houses in all provinces.

The fate of foundling babies and orphans was perfectly in line with the conditions described above. In 1861 eight separate hospitals and fourteen others took care of 2,218 children. Of these babies the government admitted that approximately sixty per cent died each year because of negligent supervision and the impossibility of obtaining a
sufficient number of good wet-nurses. Life in one of the twenty-three orphanages managed by the Boards was not characterized by such a high death rate, but the figure of 1,826 orphans for 1860 reveals how few orphans were sent to public institutions. In nearly all cases these orphans were children of either merchants or local bureaucrats. At the age of twelve they were taught a trade with the expectancy that soon after they would become self-supporting. The Boards of Public Welfare also spent funds for public education. The regulations covering these expenditures varied from one area of Russia to another. Schools were to be found only in cities, leaving the peasants to the whims of the gentry. Special aid for education went exclusively to children of nobles and officials with insufficient means.

The vast field of medical and educational concerns manifestly required immediate reform. A free peasantry would naturally demand improvements in rudimentary medical services and a start on primary education. It was not a question of St. Petersburg being blind to the shortcomings of the Boards of Public Welfare, but one of how best to reform the whole range of local affairs.

At the time of the Emancipation the Russian peasantry still held sole responsibility for fulfilling natural zemstvo duties. These duties involving road repairs and supplying food and lodging had remained basically the same up to 1861. Under serfdom this system had a certain logic to it; however, once the peasantry were raised to the rank of citizens they could not be expected to be the only class to have these duties imposed on them. Besides the question of justice, the ineffective
administration of natural duties demanded drastic changes. The government readily admitted the existence of some defects and misunderstandings on this subject. The Committee on provincial and district institutions reported to the tsar in 1862 after a study of the problem that while the administration of natural duties was by law chiefly the task of provincial institutions, it often became the obligation of the district police. Provincial bodies had neither the desire nor opportunity to supervise natural duties. Usually the local police fulfilled these duties only in the nominal sense of dispatching written reports to the provincial governor. Furthermore, they were frequently arbitrary in their decisions. A common complaint was the unequal distribution of these natural duties among the districts of a province and among the peasants themselves. Because of the lack of efficient administration the government could not obtain precise information on just what was accomplished. Thus, the situation was deplorable for both the peasants and the central government.

Throughout the nineteenth century taxes for zemstvo expenditures increased at a very rapid rate. For example, between 1829 and 1847 the sum of zemstvo expenditures rose 3 2 times from 4,155,347 rubles to 11,264,830 rubles. It is interesting to note that the areas which experienced the largest increase in this period were the road duty (80%) and the maintenance of the zemstvo police (68%). The basic problem with the taxation from the local viewpoint was that approximately three-fourths of the so-called zemstvo budget was allotted to state duties. In short, the government made no distinction between purely
local economic concerns (i.e., zemstvo duties) and economic affairs broader in nature, especially expenditures for military purposes. The soul tax, the land tax, and taxes from commercial licenses were lumped together, irrespective of how they were to be divided. District treasury officials collected both state and zemstvo taxes without making any differentiation between them. Before the tax system, which weighed heavily on the peasantry, could be reformed the government needed to define exactly the distinction between state affairs and those of a zemstvo nature.

The condition of monetary zemstvo duties was inseparably tied to the zemstvo financial structure. The process for composing the zemstvo budget for monetary duties was complicated and cumbersome. First of all, the provincial council on zemstvo duties drew up three year estimates for state and zemstvo duties; however, the council had to formulate its estimates within the limits set forth by the central government. Next the estimates went before the full provincial committee on zemstvo duties. Within seven days this committee was expected to examine and approve all the estimates for the following three years. Upon completion of its work the committee dispatched its conclusions to the capital. There a long process began whereby the Ministry of Finance, the State Treasury, the governor generals, and the relevant ministries all added their observations. Finally, the State Council and the tsar gave their approval to each provincial three year budget. St. Petersburg admitted that the composition of the zemstvo budget was chaotic and depended too much on the caprices of local bureaucrats.
The central government quietly passed over its own failures in this regard.

The emancipation reform of 1861 destroyed the basis of the prevailing method of local administration. The gentry lost its dominant power over the peasantry who now became, at least in name, full and equal citizens. With the abolition of the serf-owning class the impracticality of the administrative and economic mechanism became unavoidable. All the numerous reorganizations which the government had introduced in the first half of the nineteenth century with the aim of adjusting the old mechanism to the new requirements of the state proved to be failures. A summary of imperfections in zemstvo administration would reveal (1) confusion and inconsistency in the very idea of zemstvo duties through the intermingling of duties satisfying state requirements with duties that were the obligations of a province, district, or class; (2) the absence of organs of administration for zemstvo duties in the districts where a largely incompetent zemstvo police supervised these affairs; (3) the lack of a clear distinction between the roles of elected class representatives and government officials; (4) the arbitrary administration of natural duties; and (5) the complex formulation of the zemstvo budget with the ensuing ill effects on monetary duties. A government report of 1862 summed up the situation in these words, "Actual experience has shown that the shortcomings of the administration of zemstvo duties leads to so unfavorable a result that it is impossible to delay a total reform.
Thus, the combination of emancipation and extensive failure in local administration compelled the tsarist government to turn to reform of zemstvo affairs.
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Chapter IV
The Nobility and the Zemstvo Reform

Because of the vital importance of local administration, the Russian nobility tried to exert a powerful influence on the preparation of the zemstvo reform. From the projects of individual nobles and the Addresses of noble assemblies it is possible to construct an outline of the major, although divergent, views of the nobility on this matter. P. A. Valuev, who, as Minister of Interior from 1861 to 1867, was so intimately connected with this whole affair, has well described the attitude of the nobility toward the idea of local reform.

The opinions which have been expressed concerning the proposals for zemstvo institutions...in the deliberations of the noble assemblies were, as one might expect, highly diverse, frequently diametrically opposed. Some reproached the reform in an attempt to safeguard class divisions and privileges; others in an attempt to establish in bourgeois fashion an artificial equality among the local population, despite historical conditions. One side expressed a desire to give an almost unfettered autonomy to local assemblies; the other considered the direct participation of government authority in zemstvo affairs necessary. The area of these affairs some deemed it useful to limit to the objects of the zemstvo duty; others thought it right to broaden zemstvo limits beyond local interests and to introduce into it a political element, objects of state interest.

This apparent disparity of opinion ought not to obscure the fact that there did exist a certain consensus among the nobles. They all generally agreed on the need for the reform of local economic institutions and the introduction of a new system based on these points: (1) the independence of zemstvo institutions from government interference, (2) the inclusion
in the sphere of zemstvo activity of only questions of an economic character, (3) the need for an electoral system which would provide for representatives from the nobility, city inhabitants and peasants, and (4) the representatives of the nobility to exercise the predominant role in the zemstvo.

Prior to the announcement of the Emancipation in February 1861, the nobility was not overly concerned with local reform. The overriding question was the abolition of serfdom. To this end the major portion of legislative proposals by the gentry was directed; nevertheless, evidence of the attitude of the nobility toward provincial and district administration is available. Under orders from St. Petersburg the nobility in 1858 formed provincial committees to advise the government on the impending peasant reform. These provincial committees of landowning nobles set about drawing up their own projects and proposals which were to be presented to the Editing Commission. In order to facilitate such a presentation the Editing Commission in August 1859 summoned to the Russian capital two noble delegates from twenty-one provinces. These delegates, one representing the majority view of his province and the other, the minority view, were members of the so-called First Invitation. Although the main consideration was the peasant question, these noble representatives did devote some attention to local administration. It has been customary to speak of a conservative and liberal viewpoint among the noble delegates, but a thorough examination of their Replies to the government reveals that the use
of such terms must be clearly defined. The essential difference between
the two groups is one of degree, not of radically opposed ideas.

The conservative viewpoint as expressed by gentry delegates from
the provinces of St. Petersburg, Poltava, Pskov, Novgorod, Voronezh,
Simbirsk, and Chernigov favored the retention of local administration
in the hands of the large landowners. An integral part of their demands
was opposition to bureaucratic interference in local affairs. For
the conservative delegates an end to bureaucratic meddling and absolute
noble domination comprised the two sides of the same coin. A closely
related feature of their program, largely the result of English in-
fluence, was the creation of a national assembly comprised almost, if
not exclusively, of nobles. Outside of these vaguely proposed ideas
the conservatives offered no concrete projects for administrative
reform. In a bitterly critical note to Alexander II in August 1859
the then Minister of Interior, S. S. Lanskoi, succinctly described
the view of this group whom he called "the aristocratic and oligarchial
nobles." He said:

They attack the whole administration, the growth of the
bureaucracy, government appointment of the police, and
especially the authority of provincial governor. Hence,
they find it necessary to entrust administration to the
nobility and also to grant it permanent representatives in
the central administration.

The First Invitation produced its most vocal and positive re-
solutions from the liberal nobility who were best represented in the
provinces of Yaroslav, Kostroma, Vladimir, Tver, Novgorod, Voronezh,
Kharkov, and Riazan. The main reason that the liberal nobles were more
explicit than the conservatives in their demands for local reform was
due to the fact that they saw an intimate connection between the ending of serfdom and the future course of local government. Typical of this view was Nicolas Kosagovsky who represented the majority opinion from Novgorod province. In his Reply to the Editing Commission he declared that with the abolition of serfdom "the interests of the nobility are to be found in an unbreakable tie with the interests of the other village inhabitants." To implement this union economic administration was to be based on an assembly elected by all classes and accountable only to the local courts and public opinion. Like the conservatives he attacked the arbitrary interference of the police and bureaucracy in rural administration.

Besides these ideas as expressed in his Reply Kosagovsky joined three other delegates of the First Invitation, I. S. Bezobrazov, D. A. Khrushchev, and A. G. Shreter, in presenting to the government a "Project of village, district and provincial administration." According to their proposal, which was very broad in that it also covered judicial reform, district administration was to consist of the district assembly, the police, and the local courts. In the district assembly there were to participate all hereditary nobles who owned immovable property in the district, merchants of the first and second guilds, notable citizens, one representative from all other classes in the cities for each 200 males, and an unspecified number of delegates from the peasant villages. It was to meet once a year unless the government should request a special session. Under the jurisdiction of these district assemblies there belonged (1) the election of the district marshal of the nobility,
(2) examination and confirmation of the monetary budget, (3) apportionment of zemstvo duties among the volosts, (4) confirmation of the actions of the district marshal and other officials, and (5) election of deputies to the provincial executive board. The task of fulfilling the district assembly's orders was given to the district marshal of the nobility who, thus, in this project became the chief executive official in the district. On the provincial level the administrative structure for economic affairs was very similar to that in the district. The provincial assembly, however, met only once every three years. Finally, the provincial executive board included the provincial marshal of the nobility and one deputy from each district. This body was the executive arm of the provincial assembly and included among its tasks the assessment of duties for the whole province and the presentation of its schedule of assessment to the provincial assembly. It should be noted that the provincial governor was to retain ultimate supervisory power. The structural resemblance to the already existing noble assemblies is a striking feature of this project. Such a project can hardly be called liberal. While it did allow for some representation from classes formerly excluded from zemstvo affairs, the nobility maintained the predominant position. Liberal delegates were in no way inimical to their own class interests, but were primarily seeking to wrest control of local affairs from the bureaucracy.

Undoubtedly the most outspoken critic of the government in the First Invitation was the provincial marshal of Tver, A. M. Unkovsky. Although he was only thirty-one years old, Unkovsky was the leader of
the most liberal group of nobles in Russia. In his Reply to the Editing Commission he delivered a lashing attack on arbitrary bureaucratic control of local government. While commenting on the projected reforms of the Editing Commission Unkovsky asserted that noble class elections were of no value because the officials elected by the noble assemblies had to be confirmed by the government; that the bureaucracy ultimately controlled all the actions of those elected, and that the government paid no attention to the private petitions of the nobles or city inhabitants. Further, he charged that under the existing system "if one meets in the service well-intentioned individuals, they can do nothing. The one and the same condition with insignificant exceptions prevails under a good and a bad provincial governor. The evil is in the system, not in its application." Unkovsky's insight into the cause for the unhappy administrative situation was brilliant. "Up to this time the people have lived their lives and have been silent,"--the landowner and bureaucrats, because the current system was to their advantage and the peasants, because they were ignorant of any other order and, in any case, were powerless. The remedy in his opinion was a new structure of administration, "the first and main requirement in Russia." This new structure was to include an independent judicial system, the strict separation of executive, legislative and judicial functions, and self-government for society in economic matters. Unkovsky also attempted to answer some of the objections to administrative reform which were even then being expressed. The most frequently voiced word of caution was that the proposed peasant reform
was so important and broad in scope that to introduce any other reform would be unwise. The Tver delegate replied that this argument was a mere pretext on the part of those nobles and bureaucrats who were opposed to any reform. As for the objection that the existing alienation of the classes made impractical the establishment of institutions in which all classes participated the answer was that "a common administration alone can unite the interests of the people and create the hoped for organs." In contrast to these objectors he pictured a nobility armed with education, experience in public affairs, and moral influence willingly joined by a liberated peasantry in the management of their common economic affairs. Unkovsky concluded his Reply by stating that once an independently elected local economic administration was established, subject only to the courts and public opinion, nothing more was necessary. Beyond the expression of these hopes the Tver Marshal did not venture due, in part, to the attitude of the Editing Commission.

The noble delegates of the First Invitation had assumed that they would meet as a body with the Editing Commission. But the latter had no intention of permitting what it termed "obstructive opposition" from the nobility to interfere with the emancipation reform. Hence, the Editing Commission consulted with each provincial delegation separately and in this fashion discussed the Replies of the noble representatives. In protest Unkovsky joined by Alexander Shreter, Dmitri Krushchev, Demosoen Vailey, and Pavel Eubrovich signed the so-called Address of the Five. They petitioned Alexander II to institute, among other things, an economic administration, open to all classes, based on the
elective principle. This final gesture of the liberal nobles of the First Invitation resulted in a severe reprimand for Unkovsky and his removal from the post of Provincial Marshal of Tver. To all the demands for local self-government the Editing Commission unfailingly answered that although this was certainly a matter worthy of consideration, administrative reform was not under its jurisdiction and that the government had already established a special commission in the Ministry of Interior which was formulating a project for the reform of provincial and district institutions. The Second Invitation of noble delegates which was called in February 1860 more closely hued to government wishes and there was virtually no repetition of the scenes of the previous year.

The major conclusions to be drawn from these early manifestations of opinion by the nobility are twofold. First of all, the government demonstrated its determination to keep the composition of zemstvo reform grasped firmly in its own hands. This was especially true of the Minister of Interior and his assistant, S. S. Lanskoii and N. Miliutin, who were unalterably resolved on fending off any effort by the nobility to participate in the reforms deemed necessary by the government. Secondly, despite the unwillingness of the majority of the delegates of the First Invitation to sign Unkovsky's Address, all the delegates agreed on the need for administrative reform, the crushing of bureaucratic control, and the granting of the dominant position in local affairs to the noble class. The major point of difference between the liberal and conservative nobility centered around the question of what role the peasantry was to play. Men like Unkovsky and Kosagovsky
wanted the peasants represented on the basis of the elective principle; conservatives like Prince Ivan Gagarin and the Bezobrazov brothers wanted full authority in local affairs left solely to the local gentry, preferably the large landowners. The views of both noble groups were similar in that ultimate control of provincial administration was to be in the hands of the nobility. A realization of this fact is mandatory for understanding the attitude of the nobility toward the zemstvo reform throughout the years of its preparation.

Meetings of noble assemblies from 1859 to 1863 progressively devoted more attention to local economic questions and their administration. As previously explained, the primary interest and energies of the nobility before 1861 were expended in deciding on the provisions for the emancipation of the Russian peasantry. The only notable examples of gentry opinion on local administration as expressed in a noble assembly prior to the Great Reform are to be found in the provinces of Tver and Vladimir. These two provinces are located in what has been defined as the central industrial provinces of European Russia. Because of poor soil conditions peasant and landowner alike had to seek other sources of income besides profits from agriculture. Here nascent Russian capitalism and industrialism had a firm foundation in the widespread cottage industry of the peasants. Hence, the natural concern of these provinces for the rapidly developing industrial expansion in which the nobility had more and more financial involvement led them to make known their desires on post-emancipation administration.

Early in 1859 the Tver noble assembly under its Marshal, A. M. Unkovsky, approved by majority vote a plan for local self-government.
In its "Survey of Principles and Separate Opinions" the Tver nobility observed that the abolition of serfdom would deprive landowners of all moral basis for exclusively controlling local administration. For the nobility to retain such control only dissatisfaction on the part of the peasantry and, in general, disastrous consequences could result. On the other hand, the Tver nobles vigorously objected to allowing the peasants to fall under the rigorous vigilance of "100,000 police officials." As long as serfdom existed the landowners afforded the peasants some protection from the bureaucracy. Their liberation would mean an end to this already fragile defense. In short, to give bureaucrats and police control over local administration would signify "not the destruction of serfdom, but its transfer from the hands of the landowners to the hands of bureaucrats and a broadening of its limits." To bolster their plea for local self-government Unkovsky and his fellow nobles employed an argument destined to be frequently echoed in government circles during the preparation of the zemstvo reform. This assertion held that the more interest a man showed and was able to show in local affairs, the more peaceful and stable the whole of society would become.

At the basis of its system of self-government the Tver province Survey placed the all-class (vse-soslovnoe) principle together with a certain predominance of the gentry element. The concrete expression of this idea was the district assembly in which nobles, city inhabitants, and peasants participated. Each of the three constituent groups would elect its own delegates to the district assembly. In turn this assembly
was to have authority over all local economic matters and to elect its chairman from among its own members. This latter proposal placed the Tver nobility in a minority view on this point, as the overwhelming majority of the Russian gentry favored giving the chairmanship of all zemstvo institutions to the appropriate district or provincial marshals. The organization of local administration on this basis would unite the various layers of society and allow public opinion to exercise its proper function. The justification for his proposal is fairly unique for the Russia of Alexander II. The Survey stated:

One of the laws of human society is, on the one hand, the gradual elevation of the lower stratum of society and the acquisition by it of rights of which earlier it was deprived as a result of the imperfection of mankind;—on the other hand, a gradual destruction of all privileges which some people have enjoyed. This fusion of the rights of the classes is a universal historical law, for whose benefit people act, independent of their will.

Obviously this declaration of the Tver nobility was approved by Unkovsky; in fact, he was its primary instigator. Later in 1859 at the First Invitation he was to put forward these same views to his own detriment.

In 1860 the noble assembly of Vladimir continued the call for reform, especially on the local level. Led by Ivan Bezobrazov and P. V. Parnachev, Vladimir province had been among the more liberal delegations to the First Invitation. The address of the Vladimir noble assembly of January 1860 was in no way as radical as the Survey of Tver province. It began with a typical attack on a bureaucracy termed alien to the interests of society and unaccountable to the law. The remedy for this unhealthy situation was an eight point program of reform after, of course, the prime prerequisite—the liberation of the
serfs. These points included the strict separation of administrative, police and judicial power, direct accountability of all officials before the courts for the non-fulfillment of their responsibilities, and, most important, a common economic administration for all classes including the peasantry. This local administration was to be subject only to the judicial courts and public opinion with its members confirmed not by bureaucratic authority but by the natural right of election. The eight point program of the Vladimir gentry is an illustrative example of the general principles held by the liberal gentry in regard to local self-government.

The noble delegates to the First Invitation had attempted to exercise an effective part in the formulation of the peasant and other reforms. On their part the bureaucrats of St. Petersburg had carefully avoided giving the nobles more than an insignificant role, but finally in December of 1860 pressure from the nobility forced the government to make a concession. This concession took the form of five specific items on which the provincial noble assemblies were to advise the government. The Five Points (Piat Punkty), as they are called, were (1) consideration and proposals of the nobility in regard to a re-examination of the existing statute on elective offices, (2) provincial zemstvo duties, the structure of their administration and the means for carrying them out, (3) the structure of land credit, (4) the structure of medical facilities with the aim of increasing the number of doctors and of improving local health standards, and (5) the rights of farm laborers who do not belong to village communities. At first
glance it would appear that the government was opening the door to a broad area for gentry deliberation and proposals. The instructions which accompanied these Five Points prove that the government had not changed its attitude toward the participation of the nobility in the preparation of reforms. An order from Minister of Interior Lanskoi informed provincial marshals of the nobility that the sessions of their provincial assemblies were not to last longer than the dates fixed by law and that the customary business of the assemblies had to be attended to first. Also the noble assemblies were not to draw up detailed projects, but rather to present only their general observations. P. A. Valuev, who succeeded Lanskoi in 1861, was even more explicit in explaining the government's attitude toward the Five Points:

The idea of granting to provincial noble assemblies the right to discuss several administrative questions, as indicated and determined by the government, was originally motivated by the usefulness of the information contained in the addresses from the various localities. This measure was undertaken with the aim of deflecting, if possible, declarations of proposals and claims which did not correspond to the views of the government.

Because of his experience in the First Invitation Alexander Koshelev tried to warn the nobility of repeating the fruitless experiences of the Provincial Committees for projects on the peasant reform. In his opinion the Five Points were a smoke screen behind which the bureaucracy planned to forge ahead, unhindered, with its own reform plans. During the next two and a half years noble assemblies disregarded both Koshelev's pleas and government hopes. Province after province set forth its ideas and even composed projects which were presented to the government in the form of Addresses.
On December 15, 1860, the Nizhny Novgorod nobles established a committee to draw up a project for local administration. The final result was the most detailed plan for zemstvo reform yet conceived by the gentry. This project called for the creation of district and provincial assemblies each with their own executive boards. The provincial and district marshals of the nobility presided as chairman over their respective assemblies in their annual meetings. While thus giving the gentry a decided advantage the Nizhny Novgorod project also provided for peasant and city representation. The peasants elected one delegate to the provincial assembly for each thirty households; nobles and town inhabitants in separate electoral assemblies selected one representative for each 2,000 ruble tax payment. The total number of delegates was determined according to the amount of the provincial zemstvo tax paid by each of the three classes. Under the jurisdiction of these institutions belonged virtually all of the monetary and natural zemstvo duties. In regard to the all important question of the relationship of the government to these new institutions the project declared that they were to be subordinate to the Ministry of Interior which handled all complaints against them. Peasants represented, nobility at the head and government control ultimately left in tact—this was the essence of the project for zemstvo administration worked out by the nobles of Nizhny Novgorod. Its outline was not too different from that of the final provisions of the 1864 Zemstvo Statute.

By taking full advantage of the opportunity offered them by the Five Points, especially Point Two, the 1861 noble assemblies of Kharkov,
Pskov, Smolensk and Tula bombarded St. Petersburg with advice on the administration of zemstvo duties. Although they had no detailed projects such as that of Nizhny Novgorod, these provincial assemblies centered their attention on the financial aspects of administering zemstvo duties. All four provincial assemblies in their Addresses maintained that the assessment and spending of taxes for local needs should be left to provincial and district assemblies elected by the three major classes. In the opinion of the Tula and Pskov assemblies the only possible solution for the hampering control of the central government was a transfer to zemstvo institutions of all local economic affairs. The nobles of Kharkov pointed out the weaknesses of a system whereby financial budgets were compiled for three years in advance. The most telling argument against the government, however, Smolensk province delivered when it spotlighted one of the main evils. Through an examination of zemstvo duties it is evident that from the three year zemstvo tax in Smolensk province, six-sevenths is deducted for state needs and only one-seventh is left for the satisfaction of local wants. The committee thinks that under such conditions Smolensk province cannot but advance toward perpetual ruin and destruction.

During the two years after 1861 the Russian gentry continued to discuss, debate, and formulate projects for local economic reform. Three dominant themes stand out in a reading of extracts from these assemblies. They are (1) the need to transfer the management of many economic affairs to local assemblies, (2) the dominant position of the nobility in the zemstvo, and (3) the necessity of peasant representation
and its relation to the elective principle. For the nobility of all provinces it was self-evident that the three-year tax assessment for zemstvo duties failed to satisfy the economic needs of the people. The Kursk nobility claiming to speak not only in its own name but also in that of every Russian nobleman "believed it necessary to recognize the transfer of all strictly provincial duties to the direct control of the zemstvo." A strict separation between state and provincial duties, declared the Moscow assembly, was mandatory if local self-government was to guarantee the legal and beneficial expenditure of zemstvo funds. The government had failed in its efforts to control and administer zemstvo duties; this fact coupled with the granting of civil rights to the peasantry obviously required a new scheme of local government. The solution offered by the nobility was to entrust the composition of zemstvo budgets, their confirmation and administration to those persons who paid taxes for these duties.

What role was the nobility as a class to exercise in the proposed zemstvo institutions? The answer to this question varied from province to province, but ultimately the gentry voted in favor of a dominant position for themselves. Again in the forefront of liberal opinion was the gentry of Tver province strongly influenced by the spirit of its former Marshal, A. M. Unkovsky. In the 1862 Tver noble assembly 112 nobles signed an address to Alexander II in which they stated:

We are convinced that all reforms will remain ineffectual because they are undertaken without the consent of the will of the people. The calling together of persons elected from all parts of Russia represents the natural means toward a satisfactory solution of the questions which have arisen, but which have not been solved by the Statute of February 19.
In order to demonstrate their good-will and to bank the antagonism among the classes the Tver gentry took the radical step of renouncing all its class privileges. No other provincial assembly went this far in the attempt to join peasant and noble landowner together. The nobles of Vladimir thought it reasonable that in the zemstvo institutions the number of representatives from the peasantry be equal to those from the nobility. More typical of gentry opinion on this subject were the views of Novgorod and Riazan provinces. While agreeing that all classes should participate in zemstvo assemblies, the Novgorod nobles argued that the gentry should be given "more freedom for participation in the affairs of the assembly than other classes which are inferior in their degree of development." The majority of the Commission in Riazan established to draw up a report on the Five Points believed that the nobility was obligated to retain its class character in the new zemstvo institutions, because not only was the nobility a landowning class and thus eligible to participate in zemstvo affairs, but it had its own class interests, needs and obligations to protect. Under these circumstances the Riazan Commission voted in favor of granting gentry delegates half of the votes in zemstvo assemblies. Finally, it was the expectation of most noblemen that the provincial and district marshals of the nobility would be chairmen of their respective zemstvo assemblies.

This emphasis on the importance of the nobility in local affairs was partially balanced by the general willingness to permit the peasantry to elect delegates through its own electoral assembly. The general
feeling of the noble provincial assemblies is exemplified by these words of the Tambov noble assembly: "Both the provincial and district institutions ought to be composed of elected persons from all classes which take part in zemstvo duties." The Novgorod gentry proposed that each volost elect one representative to the district assembly. Significantly, no province voiced the hope of excluding peasants from participation in the administration of zemstvo affairs. Due to the fact that the Emancipation had placed approximately fifty percent of the land under peasant ownership of one form or another, practical consideration made it mandatory that the peasantry be given some opportunity to administer those duties which their taxes financed. The Kursk assembly reflecting this idea stated:

Recognizing the local landowners of all classes, without distinction, as being the most trustworthy and best representatives of local order and well-being and more than others interested in the correct expenditure of zemstvo funds, the Kursk nobility believes it would be feasible to entrust the management and control of all monetary and natural duties to the owners of real estate in the province, who have been selected through the elective principle.

On this basis the elective principle and peasant representation did not conflict with gentry control of zemstvo affairs.

The last noble provincial assembly to deal significantly with Point Two prior to the actual promulgation of the 1864 zemstvo reform was that of St. Petersburg. The project which this assembly eventually approved embodies the best example of gentry opinion on local administration. Upon the publication of the Five Points the St. Petersburg nobility determined to call a special noble assembly to consider the matter. After the tsar consented to such an assembly the nobles of
St. Petersburg elected a Commission with the following members: Count P. P. Shuvalov, Prince G. Shcherbatov, N. Bezak, F. Depp, A. Talia-kovsky, I. Brant, A. Platonov, P. Orlov, and A. Biziukin. The deliberations of this Commission resulted in two projects being composed—one supported by a majority of the Commission members and the other by Orlov, Platonov, and Biziukin.

The project of the majority placed all zemstvo duties, provincial and district, monetary and natural, under the administrative control of zemstvo institutions. These institutions were divided into three categories: (1) district electoral assemblies, (2) district and provincial zemstvo assemblies, and (3) district and provincial zemstvo executive boards. A property qualification of 15,000 rubles entitled a private landowner or a peasant commune to one vote in the district electoral assembly. Those individual persons or communes whose land was valued at not less than 750 rubles combined together to meet the required sum of 15,000 rubles which in this way gave them indirect representation. Those persons eligible to vote in the electoral assembly selected the delegates to the district zemstvo assembly. According to the majority project this body whose chairman was the district marshal of the nobility met yearly and acted as a collector of information for the provincial zemstvo assembly. Each district assembly elected fifteen representatives to the provincial assembly. As the highest zemstvo organ the provincial assembly under a chairman elected from its own members considered and voted on the budget for zemstvo duties. The actual task of administering this budget was that of the provincial and district
executive boards, each consisting of five members. Ultimate supervisory power remained in the hands of the provincial governor who could offer suggestions to the provincial institutions or suspend what he deemed illegal orders. This brief survey reveals that the majority of the St. Petersburg Commission supported zemstvo institutions in which the nobility was the dominant element thanks to the high qualification for voting and the position of the district marshal of the nobility as chairman of the district assembly.

Orlov, Platonov, and Biziukin thought that the majority project made too many concessions to the peasantry. The basis for this idea was the contrast which the minority saw between nobleman and peasant. The former occupied a special place of honor and trust in the state organization while the latter were frequently uneducated and even immoral. In order to prevent any possibility of peasant domination—a most unlikely prospect—Orlov and his associates wanted to raise the property qualification higher than 15,000 rubles and to place a nobleman at the head of the provincial assembly. These proposals could only lead to a situation in which representatives from the peasantry, cities, and even from the poorer nobility, were entirely subject to the wishes of the largest and most powerful noble landowners.

In the St. Petersburg noble assembly of March 1863 which considered both reports of its commission the only notable change in the majority project was the provision that the provincial marshal of the nobility by right of his office became chairman of the provincial zemstvo assembly. The vote on the amended majority project was 152 in
favor and 67 against. Acceptance of the minority view would have meant the exclusion from direct participation in zemstvo affairs of many of the St. Petersburg nobility. Realization of this fact contributed much to the defeat of the minority proposals. The central point of difference between the two projects involved the degree of dominance to be exercised by the nobility. The solution supported by the 152 St. Petersburg nobles closely matched the attitude of the majority of the noble assemblies convened between 1858 and 1863.

During these years the Russian nobility both in the First Invitation and in its assemblies declared emphatically in favor of transferring to local elective organs the administration of all zemstvo duties. Simultaneously with this demand went the gentry's contempt for the local bureaucracy and the resolute intention of restricting its activities. The weaknesses and disorders of local administration when coupled with the liberation of the serfs made reform mandatory in the eyes of the nobility. The motives, however, which compelled the nobility to express its ideas on zemstvo affairs stemmed from two entirely divergent sources. On the one side, a small, but vocal, group of Russian gentry enthusiastically promoted political reform at all levels of government in the name of justice and liberty. The outstanding example of thinking of this type was, of course, A. M. Unkovsky. For men like Unkovsky there could be no doubt that the future of Russia depended on the equal union of nobleman and peasant in zemstvo institutions. This equal union did not imply peasant preponderance because of its numerical superiority; on the contrary, the liberals expected the
peasantry to recognize the educational and even moral superiority of his powerful neighbor. In return for this trust the local nobility would work in behalf of the common interest. But these idealistic hopes were not shared by the majority of the gentry landowners. Their urge for local reform sprang primarily from concern for their own class and economic interests. No other conclusion can be drawn from an examination of the projects and views which they addressed to the Petersburg government.

The question of what influence the nobility as a whole actually exercised on the formulation of the 1864 zemstvo reform merits attention. V. P. Meshchersky, the future arch-conservative and close associate of Nicholas II, recalling the events of the 1860's in his memoirs wrote: "I do not say that the aristocratic liberal party was numerous, on the contrary, it represented but a handful of people. But also I am completely convinced that because of its ideas we were forced soon after the Emancipation to introduce zemstvo institutions." If this statement is true, the treatment of Unkovsky by the government remains something of a mystery. In reality, there is no proof that the nobility succeeded in any significant degree to guide the government formulations of the zemstvo reform. As previously cited, Lanskoi, N. Miliutin, and Valuev, the chiefs of the bureaucratic commission which composed this reform, were determined to keep the nobility at arms length. There was no attempt to repeat the experience of the First and Second Invitations. The nearest thing to a concession made by the government, the Five Points, proved to be a weak substitute for consultation with a representative assembly of
nobles from all the provinces. The similarity between the final zemstvo statute and any provincial project was the result of the very nature of the existing administrative order rather than of pressure by the nobility. An elaboration of the preparation of the zemstvo reform will clarify this statement. Suffice it to say that bureaucratic distrust of much of the local gentry ruled out any effective co-operation of the two despite the necessity of eventual accommodation.
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Chapter V

Publicists and the Zemstvo Reform

While the nobility conferred in its committees and assemblies, individuals within Russia expounded their views on local administration in newspapers, periodicals, pamphlets, and books. With one notable exception these men can be called publicists, for they directed the attention of educated Russians to one of their country's most pressing problems. An examination of their works will reveal the wide disparity of opinion which battled for attention and acceptance in the 1860's. Slavophiles, defenders of the nobility, creators of reform projects, and revolutionary instigators all had their organs in which they attacked and defended the bureaucracy, called for and decried a high property qualification and also vigorously debated and supported one another. As a means of obtaining a sharp portrait of Russian public opinion as opposed to the official declarations of the tsarist government, a study of the publicists offers an even more rewarding subject than an examination of the provincial nobility. It should be noted that only after the February Manifesto of 1861 did the publicists turn their pens, filled with ideas and plans, to the government sponsored zemstvo project.

Few among the Russian nobility were as active in public affairs as Prince Vladimir Cherkassky. During the 1850's he had been one of the leading exponents for ending serfdom. First as a member of the Tula
Provincial Committee and then in 1859-1860 of the Editing Commission Cherkassky, spurred on by his slavophile beliefs, toiled diligently on behalf of the peasantry. After the Emancipation his work as a mir arbitrator won him the respect of noblemen and peasants. Upon the outbreak of the 1863 Polish Revolt Cherkassky joined his long time friends and associates in the Editing Commission, Iurii Samarin and Nicholas Miilutin, in the task of settling the peasant question in Poland. Nobleman, slavophile, reformer, government worker—all these roles Cherkassky played during the reign of Alexander II.

More by accident than by design this Tula nobleman formulated his ideas on zemstvo reform even to the extent of drawing up a detailed project. Grand Duchess Elena Pavlovna, herself a liberal thinker and the widow of Alexander's uncle Grand Duke Michael, in February of 1862 sent four questions to Cherkassky through the intermediary of his wife who happened to be in the capital at that time. These questions reveal a keen awareness of the difficulties involved in any transformation of local administration. She asked: (1) Is it advisable to introduce new provincial institutions? (2) Should all classes participate in them through their own representatives and what should be the objects of their discussions? (3) Is Russia sufficiently civilized so that good results can be expected from such a reform? and (4) What measures ought to be adopted to ensure a purely administrative character, and not a political one, for these assemblies? In reply Cherkassky wrote to the Princess on March 30, 1862, dividing his answer into two parts, an Explanatory Note and a project of 33 articles. Guided by an
awareness of the practical difficulties entailed in the introduction of such a reform, the needs of society, and "finally the dynastic interests so strongly tied to the well-being of society," Cherkassky set forth his views. 1

The basic principles and essentials of local government Cherkassky set forth in his Explanatory Note. His answer to Princess Elena's first question was a ringing affirmative. He declared, "If the institution of zemstvo assemblies has been at any time and anywhere desirable, necessary or indispensable, then there is no doubt that this is the case in Russia today." 5 But this positive statement he immediately counterbalanced with a characteristic piece of pessimism. Because of the government's failure to introduce zemstvo institutions concurrently with the peasant reform, in his opinion the opportune moment had been allowed to slip away and the longer their introduction was delayed the greater would be public distrust of them. If it appeared that these new institutions were merely "a necessary stage of the revolutionary movement" and not "a conservative, powerful safeguard," there would be virtually no hope for their success. 6 Thus, Cherkassky believed that the tsarist government had delayed too long in initiating zemstvo assemblies and this delay only served to increase skepticism toward them among Russian society.

Turning next to the matter of class relations in zemstvo institutions the Prince revealed his deep-rooted despondency and his belief in the necessity of the fatherly guidance of the government. In part due to his experiences in the Editing Commission, Cherkassky
pictured the nobility as finding itself isolated from the rest of the country, hated by a hostile peasantry and savagely upbraided by the press. Under these circumstances the gentry had an eventful choice: either to battle against the natural course of events by fighting to preserve all its class privileges or to renounce voluntarily its unique position and take the lead in the zemstvo institutions. For Cherkassky the only valid answer the nobility could make was to agree to close their class assemblies, form one district electoral assembly with all the classes, and to elect delegates to the zemstvo institutions without class distinctions. Except for a minority of the gentry, however, acceptance of this radically new status in relation to the other classes was not very probable in his opinion. Obviously he had lost all illusions about the capacity of noble assemblies as such to reconcile the interests of all the people.

This belief did not mean that Cherkassky sought to grant equal representation to the peasants and city inhabitants. In order that they might not be torn away from their daily pursuits these two groups were to elect nobles who would conscientiously look after their interests. Such a system would thwart reactionary noblemen and still ensure the numerically small, but enlightened gentry of "a preponderant influence in the district assemblies." To guarantee further moderate and efficient zemstvo institutions the Tula nobleman proposed that the government nominate the chairmen of the zemstvo assemblies and appoint two members armed with extensive powers to the provincial executive boards. Only through close supervision by the government did Cherkassky think that the
interests of the peasants could be protected from a reactionary nobility hostile to any new reform or concession. Full of bitterness toward the majority of the gentry, he placed all his hope in the union of a few well-disposed noblemen and a paternalistic bureaucracy.

Cherkassky's zemstvo project divided zemstvo institutions into provincial and district assemblies and executive boards. The annual district zemstvo assemblies consisted of delegates from the peasant volosts, private landowners of all classes, and the cities under a chairman appointed by the provincial governor. After considering the budgetary proposals of its own executive committee, the district assembly then elected three to five of its members as representatives to the provincial assembly. In this latter assembly only those economic matters which were paid for by zemstvo taxes were to be considered. With its chairmen named by the tsar and its executive committee "advised" by two government representatives, provincial zemstvo institutions would be little more than an infusion of a few liberal nobles into the existing administrative system, although introducing certain technical improvements such as annual zemstvo budgets instead of one every three years. Cherkassky, well aware of this fact, but despairing of any change of heart in the nobility, revealed his misgivings in a letter to his close friend, Iurii Samarin:

Against this proposal it is possible, I know, to say much from the liberal point of view; but it seems to me, under present circumstances that the powerful influence of the government on local assemblies...is absolutely necessary, provided that the government knows how to utilize this influence. I know that if this proposal were made public there would arise a cry especially against the introduction into
the local assemblies of state bureaucrats. All the same, however, because of the inexperience of our public in administrative affairs, I think that the presence of this element is absolutely necessary.  

There is no record of Princess Elena's reaction to Cherkassky's reply or of any influence being exerted by this project. Its primary value lies in its use as an example of a slavophile who foresaw success for future reform only if the government energetically supported it. This type of conservatism quite naturally found few adherents in Russia among the gentry. Rather, its champions were government officials like Lanskoï and Nikolai Miliutin.

In many respects the life of Iurii Samarin paralleled that of Prince Cherkassky. Born in 1819, Samarin, as a young man, became one of the most active members of the slavophile circle. He too supported emancipation of the serfs, and participated in the Editing Commission and the Polish peasant reforms. But while Cherkassky made known his thought on local economic administration to only a few persons, Samarin assumed the role of a publicist, particularly through his articles in the slavophile organ Den. Commenting on his associate's project in a letter dated April 26, 1862, Samarin disclosed that he too was composing a zemstvo project with the limited assistance of L. B. Turgenev, a district marshal of the nobility in the province of Samara.

In regard to the election of delegates to the district zemstvo assembly Samarin thought that each class, noblemen, city dwellers, and peasants, should have their own electoral assemblies. Any disregard of class lines for this function could only create quarrels; nevertheless, he had no hesitation in forming the general district
assembly "without distinction of classes" from the three class elec-
toral assemblies. Why the three principal Russian classes would co-
operate on one level and not on the other Samarin never explained. In
all likelihood he assumed that the peasant and city delegates would
defer to the greater experience and education of the gentry represent-
atives. A meeting of the district assembly once every three years was
sufficient in his opinion to consider the zemstvo budget. The only
other major difference between the two men's projects involved the
question of government control. On this point Samarin retained the out-
look of the typical nobleman. He recognized the inevitability of govern-
ment checks on zemstvo institutions, but he opposed bureaucratic par-
ticipation.\(^{19}\)

In the summer of 1863 Samarin was occupied with the special com-
mission under Nikolai Miliutin in settling the peasant problem in
Poland, but he still found time to present his detailed observations on
the proposed zemstvo reform. 20 Thanks to the Emancipation, a whole new
era had opened in Russia. For the first time village inhabitants were
endowed with certain civil rights including that of participation in
zemstvo affairs. 21 A corollary to a free peasantry was the destruction
of the absolute power in local administration formerly held by the
landowners and various bureaucratic departments, whom history had proven
incapable of fulfilling this task. Finally the Emancipation, said
Samarin, had curtailed the class antagonism between the peasants and
gentry "which for so long hindered the development of local life in
our country" and had thus given Russian society the possibility of
peacefully and jointly arranging affairs of mutual interest. 22
Having established the validity of new zemstvo institutions, Samarin turned his attention to the relationship of district and provincial bodies. Any project which granted equal authority to the district and the province he vigorously opposed for several reasons. He declared, "...our districts, even those in Great Russia, are far from being equal in size, comforts and accessibility of communications, local physical conditions, density of population, predominance of this or that class, as well as the level of education and the degree of development of public life." Conditions varied greatly even in districts within the same province. To remedy this situation Samarin proposed a novel troika plan. Each district assembly was to be allowed to choose one of three stages. On the lowest level the district assembly would act as an agent of the provincial assembly and executive board and all its actions would have to be conformed by the provincial institutions. A commissar and two assistants appointed by the provincial executive board would form the district executive board. In the second stage the district assembly would be obliged to send only very important matters for the confirmation of the provincial assembly and would name its own commissars and his assistants subject to provincial approval. In the highest level of development the district assembly would become a miniature replica of the provincial assembly with full authority over its own economic affairs. While it might be argued that this plan demonstrated Samarin's realistic appraisal of Russian society, the pessimistic note sounded by Cherkassky was repeated through the doubts cast on the creative powers of the district.
In his third *Den* article on zemstvo reform Samarin explained his attitude toward the class relationships in the zemstvo assemblies. His slavophile philosophy logically led him to demand that property qualifications be abolished and that representation for nobleman and peasant be equal. These two demands followed one from the other, for if property was not a valid criterion in fixing the number of zemstvo delegates from each class, then there could be no just differentiation. Samarin attacked with three arguments the conservative assertion that property qualification was a fair measure of a person's interest in local affairs. First of all, the peasant who was assessed only 5 rubles a year tax frequently paid a higher percentage of his income than the landowner whose tax was 100 rubles. Secondly, the peasant bore the full load of natural duties and, consequently, his interest in them was greater than that of his former master. In the third place, many of the zemstvo affairs, such as alimentation and public welfare, held more importance for the peasant than for the powerful landowner. On this basis equal representation for peasantry and gentry would be the logical solution in determining the number of district representatives. Another example of his slavophile beliefs is Samarin's insistence that the Russian Orthodox clergy regardless of property qualification be represented in the zemstvo. Their presence would serve to offset the influence of the Polish gentry in the western provinces and to better protect peasant interests.

In the final analysis Samarin's views on the zemstvo were a combination of his slavophilism and his realistic appraisal of the ability
of Russians to manage their local affairs. Given time and the assistance of the Orthodox clergy the peasant who had a vital interest in the zemstvo could exert a beneficial influence. The role of the government was more of a referee than that of a participant. On the other hand, Samarin believed the inexperience of Russians in administrative matters made his troika plan for district zemstvo assemblies mandatory. In many respects he stood midway between the pessimism of Cherkassky and the buoyant hope of Ivan Aksakov.

During the 1860's the outstanding spokesman for the slavophile cause was the publicist Ivan Aksakov. One of the basic ideas of the zemstvo reform—the participation of all classes in the administration of local economic concerns—appealed strongly to Aksakov's imagination. Through numerous articles in several journals he not only expressed his own ideas on this matter, but tried to imprint these views on the final formation of the reform itself. Particularly in regard to the place of property qualification in determining zemstvo representation Aksakov found himself at odds with both tsarist bureaucrats and other publicists. The views of the slavophiles on this matter as exemplified by Ivan Aksakov and Iurii Samarin were unique in the Russia of their day. Using his weekly newspaper Den as his platform, Aksakov brilliantly evolved a detailed criticism of the whole concept of property qualification.

He began his attack by pointing out that property qualification as a principle and practice originated in Western Europe (a fact which almost automatically disqualified the possibility of its approval in the
eyes of an ardent slavophile). On the extent of property owned or taxes paid on such property, it entitled a man to participate in local government either by means of the election of representatives or as a representative himself. Although Aksakov admitted that this principle had been used to determine voting rights in the Russian noble assemblies, he argued that the Emancipation had destroyed any pretext for its continued utilization in Russia. With bitter scorn he ridiculed the defenders of property qualification who maintained that people of property had more interest in the safeguarding of order and in peaceful development. "In other words, egoism, material interest serve as a pledge that nothing contrary to the views of this egoism will be undertaken."

A second frequently voiced defense of property qualification was that it preserved a class which by land ownership had proven its ability to administer local affairs. To this statement Aksakov replied that a high property qualification could only result in the rule of a materially rich minority over the majority. Such a situation he believed to be morally unjust and also impractical in light of the property division in Russia between private landowner and peasant village. Contrasting the system of landownership in England, France, and Prussia with that in Russia, Aksakov found that in the Russian system a peasantry without land was unthinkable, because the peasant commune frequently possessed more land than the private landlord. Unwilling even to accept a low property qualification on the grounds that those given electoral rights in this fashion would tend to cultivate a false sense of superiority over their less fortunate brothers, the editor of Den placed himself in opposition
to property qualification in any form or degree which raised one group of landowners above another. In his opinion zemstvo institutions should be the union of two types of property ownership, the private landowner and the commune landowner.  

This view, contrary to the popularly accepted one, naturally angered the proponents of property qualification, especially Alexander Koshelev. In accord with the Slavophile demand for free speech and a free press Aksakov opened the columns of Den to a rebuttal by Koshelev, who in years past had been a close associate. Koshelev in a "Letter to the editor" argued against any rejection of property qualification on moral grounds. Basing his opinion on what he thought to be a logical and practical viewpoint, he maintained that property qualification fell under the general heading of what in Russia was termed "general usefulness and general convenience" (obshchaia polza, obshchee udobstvo) and in English is covered by the word "pragmatic." On the one hand, Koshelev supported civil rights for all classes, but, on the other, pointed out that just as such conditions as age and sex were legally established conditions for voting, so also was property qualification which was not utilized for the exclusive benefit of one class. This electoral requirement in Koshelev's words should be constructed "on the basis that the management of general affairs ought to be entrusted to the best people, and that the acquiring of personal property or even the possession of it is to some degree the sign of a man capable of directing his own business and consequently able also to consider public affairs."  

This energetic justification of property qualification had as its primary object the maintenance of the landowning class as the leading
element in zemstvo institutions. Koshelev completely rejected the slavophile's glorification of the peasant commune; instead, he believed that only private landowners could effectively guide the administration of local affairs. Without property qualification the inexperienced peasant delegates would introduce chaos and confusion into zemstvo institutions. Only its adoption would guarantee that "the huge majority of non-property owners will not squeeze, will not crush the minority of property owners."

Because of the importance of the final decision on property qualification for the relationship of the classes in the zemstvo institutions Aksakov felt compelled to attack and demolish his antagonist's arguments. In the following issue of Den he set forth three major replies to Koshelev. After recalling the latter's assertion that property qualification did not have as its goal the benefit of one class to the detriment of others, the slavophile leader declared that the facts did not support this view. Any property qualification which granted the right to vote to a property owner of 100 dessiatinas and not to one of 50 dessiatinas created in Aksakov's words a situation "for the benefit of one class and for the prejudice of the other." Secondly, while he too favored entrusting the administration of zemstvo affairs to the most capable persons, Aksakov did not think that ownership of a large amount of property automatically guaranteed such competence; on the contrary, "This definition of talents on the basis of a material and quantitative measure, the so-called property qualification, ... is absolutely arbitrary, untrue and in fact is beneficial to a few rich
people to the detriment of others less wealthy." The most reprehensible point against property qualification was its variance with Russian history and tradition.

Despite the apparently irreconcilable differences between the two publicists on this matter they eventually reached a compromise. Koshelev proposed to divide the district into three sections of landowners on the basis of property qualification. Each section was to elect five or six delegates to the district zemstvo assembly. The first section had the twenty to thirty largest property owners; the second section of smaller landowners included forty to fifty members, and a peasant commune of 200 to 300 male peasants formed the third group. Aksakov's only answer to this proposal was a statement to the effect that the two men had settled their dispute over property qualification. Other publicists, like Michael Katkov and Boris Chicherin, also voiced their opinions on this subject, but with no significant variations from the thoughts of Koshelev. The slavophile position as stated by Aksakov won few allies both among the publicists and within the government.

The question of property qualification was closely connected with that of the fate of the Russian nobility. All persons concerned with zemstvo institutions had to consider the relationship of the gentry to them, especially since the Emancipation. Ivan Aksakov using Points One and Two of the Five Points as a guide discussed the future course of the Russian gentry in the January 6, 1862, edition of Den. Formulating his viewpoint in the context of an imaginary provincial noble assembly's petition to the tsar, Aksakov envisaged a nobility which proclaimed:
The nobility, convinced that the Emancipation immutably and logically will lead to the abolition of all artificial class divisions and that the dissemination of the remaining gentry privileges to the other classes is entirely necessary, consider it a duty to express to the Government their unanimous and resolute desires. The nobility should be permitted to solemnly draw up a great act for the destruction of itself as a class before the whole of Russia and gentry privileges should be modified and granted to all classes in Russia.

Such a renunciation of class privileges which would naturally affect the composition of zemstvo institutions he termed "a necessary historical step for social development, fundamental for the future historical structure." After the acceptance of the petition the former gentry landowners and the peasant landowners from the commune were to form common assemblies by means of elections. The equal status of both landowners would permit them to direct zemstvo affairs in a spirit of mutual cooperation and trust. It is only necessary to read the petitions of most of the gentry assemblies on this subject to realize how optimistic Aksakov was on this point.

In certainly one of the most ingenious discussions on zemstvo self-government as it was understood in the 1860's Aksakov proved to his own satisfaction that what the liberals and bureaucrats called "self-government" simply did not apply in Russia. The slavophile leader termed the use of local inhabitants, both gentry and peasantry, as zemstvo captains, police and volost chiefs not real self-government, but rather an affront to the true zemstvo spirit. The zemstvo spirit he defined as "a moral and life-giving element," while the proposed incorporation of the local populace into the management of zemstvo affairs "has the significance of an administrative convenience, just a special
system of government administration. The mechanism of the state might be thus improved, but simultaneously bureaucratic control would flourish. If the government insisted on establishing zemstvo institutions as a mere extension of itself, it would destroy the zemstvo element. The only solution Aksakov could offer was to keep the zemstvo element free of bureaucratic overtones by granting complete freedom of speech and press. "The zemstvo," he declared, "ought to have the right to express freely its opinions about the State,—not the right of exile in Siberia for its members, nor of their imprisonment."

The slavophile attitude on zemstvo administration as set forth by Aksakov emphasized the necessity of complete equality of gentry and commune landowners. Only in an atmosphere of justice and an end of class privileges could the moral force of the local populace inspire good administration. On the question of what shape zemstvo institutions should take Aksakov was nebulous. Instead, he hammered away at the notion that freedom for all people to speak out on local affairs would alone guarantee success. Later, of course, he significantly modified his ideas; however, among the publicists concerned with the zemstvo reform in the 1860's he occupied a progressive, if somewhat naive, position.

Of a radically different school of thought on zemstvo reform was the well-known editor of the newspaper Moskovskie Vedomosti, Michael Katkov. As a university student and lecturer on philosophy at Moscow University in the 1840's Katkov had been something of a westerner, but once he became editor of Moskovskie Vedomosti in 1863 his views grew
decidedly more conservative. Katkov offers a sharp contrast in opinion with the slavophiles just presented.

In connection with the proposed zemstvo reform he poured out columns of type. Theoretical ideas on self-government, on the role of the nobility, and on class distinctions and practical considerations on the form of zemstvo institutions comprise a major portion of Katkov's writings in 1862 and 1863. He could not visualize zemstvo institutions as purely economic bodies; by their very nature they would include political characteristics. Zemstvo self-government by his definition meant control of local economic affairs in the hands of those people whose personal interests were undividedly tied to the local interests. Local organs would be free to administer pertinent economic affairs, but not to formulate general policies on them. This would be the function of the central government. Katkov defined the zemstvo in these words:

The Government will call into being in our country not a new category of bureaucratic offices or assemblies drawn up for noise and effect, but a true zemstvo, i.e. the union of the inhabitants of one locality for the satisfaction of common wants. The Government, desiring to relieve itself of the responsibilities of administration of the economy of local zemstvo communities, does this for the benefit of the zemstvo and for this reason there is no doubt that it will transfer the administration of the economy of the zemstvo to the zemstvo itself and its natural representatives, and not to any artificial institutions which do not depend on the government...

When it came to establishing the precise form of zemstvo institutions, Katkov held very definite ideas about who would be their members and leaders. In his opinion the peasantry should be given a voice in zemstvo administration, "which ought to be heard along with the
voice of the nobility." But this voice would be heard only on those matters of immediate concern to the peasantry because this same peasantry "by its mode of life cannot yet consider as its own business general district business. Their horizon is limited; they only know what happens in their immediate environment." In short, the Russian peasant was incapable of full participation in zemstvo affairs and, moreover, he was just beginning to see his true well-wisher and representative in the gentry according to Katkov.

The real directors of local affairs were to be the gentry in the guise of local landowners. These individuals, said Katkov, were the only ones able to manage the zemstvo. Although he did not advocate entrusting zemstvo affairs to the noble assemblies as they existed, he recognized that, "In fact, the district noble assemblies contain all or almost all the significant people of the district." Katkov was essentially correct in this statement, at least for the time being, but it was unrealistic to expect the peasants to subordinate themselves completely to the gentry. The average peasant failed to draw any distinction between his former master and the same man in the form of private landowner. Katkov's claim that a wise conservatism should destroy the exclusive class character of the nobility, but retain the dominant political position of the landowning gentry as a "social group" was theoretically possible; in reality, it failed to take into account not only the Emancipation, but, more importantly, the possibility of radical changes within the peasantry.

To implement his concept of the zemstvo Katkov proposed his own scheme for zemstvo elections. He objected to the plans of the government
which called for the election of separate zemstvo delegates from the
district landowners, peasant officials, and city inhabitants. These
delegates, he argued, would necessarily consider themselves representa­tives not of the zemstvo, but of their separate classes. His own
zemstvo project combined the utilization of property qualification plus
the special role to be played by the gentry landowners. The noble assemblies were to be changed into zemstvo assemblies with the addition
of new elements. Because direct participation in the gentry organ­izations already required a high property qualification, those land­owners who met this requirement and thus, claimed Katkov, had a deep interest in local affairs should automatically become members of the new zemstvo assemblies. A second group of representatives would come from
those landowners whose estates were valued at lower than 50,000 rubles, but more than 2,000 rubles. Twenty such landowners would be entitled
to send one delegate. Peasants would send one delegate for each 240,000 to 300,000 rubles worth of land. Katkov frankly admitted that this system favored the nobility inasmuch as it owned the most land and the property qualification for the peasantry was so high. This electoral system again illustrates the failure of Katkov to distinguish realistically between private landowners and the gentry. He was right to see in the gentry class those most likely to lead the zemstvo, but to disguise them as private landowners and to ensure their absolute right
to rule regardless of local conditions or future changes reflects the growing reactionary strain in his thinking which was to become more evident in the succeeding years.
Another outstanding commentator on the projected zemstvo reform was Boris Chicherin. His views, while not widely accepted, were presented in a less passionate and in a more objective fashion than those of Katkov. Chicherin's comments on the zemstvo project in 1862 centered on two points. These were the relationship of the district zemstvo assemblies with the provincial and the role of the nobility. "It is obvious that the district will become the main center of zemstvo administration," he wrote in a newspaper article.

Both the district zemstvo assembly and its executive organ, the zemstvo board, had the closest possible ties to the electorate. This situation, he believed, was injurious to the zemstvo in the long run, because the district lacked a sufficient number of capable administrators. On the other hand, the province as a whole contained the necessary administrative talent. Furthermore, most zemstvo affairs could be handled only on the provincial level and the province alone maintained the necessary ties with the state administration, "not a small advantage." Chicherin's ideas followed closely the state theory of self-government.

Unlike Katkov, Chicherin did not wish to do away with class distinctions. Under the prevailing conditions he thought such a thing unthinkable. In order that the province be made the center of zemstvo administration, the various classes would elect delegates directly to the provincial zemstvo assembly. Peasant, merchant, nobleman were to have their own representatives; however, Chicherin did not try to claim that the landowners were anybody else but the local gentry, the people closest to the interests of the province and the state. It would be
misleading to accuse Chicherin of being a reactionary and a champion of exclusive class privilege. Although he conceded a special position to the gentry, he did this on a solid historical basis and with no effort to camouflage his ideas behind the all-class principle.

Alexander Koshelev was one of the most active publicists during these years. Despite his earlier Slavophile leanings, he quarrelled with Ivan Aksakov over the question of property qualification. This dispute reflects only a part of Koshelev's profound interest in the zemstvo project. An obvious consideration was the role of government officials in zemstvo institutions. Few publicists, if any, matched his deep-seated dislike for the Russian bureaucracy. "I consider the greatest evil in Russia to be bureaucracy, officialdom," he wrote in a letter to Cherkassky. Like many commentators he viewed the bureaucracy as a group full of disrespect toward the people and one which came between the tsar and his subjects. Even though the tsar picked the bureaucracy almost exclusively from the ranks of the nobility, it had in Koshelev's eyes become dangerous to the tsar, Russia, and the noble class alike. In its love for the status quo paper work had replaced any real desire to help the people. To be held unaccountable to sovereign and citizens, to look on Russia as its own inheritance seemed to be officialdom's ultimate goal.

To combat this pernicious evil Koshelev as a first step urged the creation of independent provincial and district institutions. All classes were to send their representatives who would be accountable to the people and not to the local bureaucracy. The government, having
nothing to fear from such bodies, would permit these assemblies to elect their own chairmen who could call meetings at their discretion. In contrast to Cherkassky, Koshelev expected good from below, not from above, provided all classes could formulate plans for zemstvo needs.\textsuperscript{74} By giving these assemblies a free hand he admitted that progress might be slowed, but he was willing to pay this price in order to bar bureaucratic interference. In one of his two pamphlets published in Leipzig in 1862 he asked the tsar to permit the immediate election of provincial and district assemblies to discuss local needs.\textsuperscript{75}

Attacks on the bureaucracy and the formation of local elective assemblies were merely the prelude to Koshelev's major proposal. "The creation of a Zemstvo Duma in Russia is, it seems to us, the natural outcome of the critical, intolerable situation in which we now find ourselves."\textsuperscript{76} Koshelev advised the tsar to issue a manifesto which would bring to life a national consultive assembly, the Zemstvo Duma. Careful to make it clear that such a body would not be a parliament nor imply the introduction of a constitution, Koshelev defined it as an advisory body.\textsuperscript{77} Its primary purpose would be to break through the shield of bureaucracy surrounding the tsar and, thus, place him in direct contact with his subjects, "face to face." The Zemstvo Duma would examine all law projects, discuss the government's budget, and express its views in the form of petitions to the tsar.\textsuperscript{78} Between sessions the tsar would select various of the Duma's members to serve as a sort of special ministry. Koshelev rejected any suggestion that the calling of a Zemstvo Duma was the same as convening an \textit{États Généraux} and, thus, lead to a
revolution. His answer was that not to do so would bring a revolution. Any conflict between Duma and government he dismissed on the grounds that the Duma's strength "will consist of its good sense, moderation, and knowledge."  

The system which he devised for electing the members of the Zemstvo Duma revealed the importance he attached to local assemblies. On the district level peasants, landowners, and city inhabitants elected from fifty to sixty representatives. The result would be the selection of those individuals best suited to understand local affairs and to express their opinions on this subject. The next step would be the sending of three to six delegates from each district to the provincial assembly. Finally, the provincial assembly, depending on the population of the province, would elect from its members three to six delegates to the Zemstvo Assembly, giving this body a total of about 270 members. It should be noted that elections on the last two levels would be free of any class connotation. Koshelev firmly expected the gentry to take a leading role in the Zemstvo Duma, not as members of a particular class nor even as landowners, but as the most talented representatives of all the Russian people.

From a theoretical viewpoint Koshelev's ideas exert a definite appeal. In the long run, however, he was like so many other publicists—a voice crying in the wilderness. The fact that he had to publish his two most important pamphlets outlining his scheme abroad indicates the small possibility of its being accepted in St. Petersburg. Koshelev no longer could obtain the agreement of his slavophile friends and found himself and his project with no foundation of support in any Russian group.
Among the most vocal critics of the tsarist regime was P. V. Dolgorukov. Member of one of the most illustrious families in Russia, Peter Dolgorukov lived in exile from 1859 to his death in 1868 and was forced to hurl his spears of protest from Paris. The Russian government by exiling Dolgorukov placed him in the category of revolutionaries, whereas he remained more an extremely harsh critic than a confirmed radical. One reason why Dolgorukov found himself in Paris after 1859 was because of his outspoken criticism of the bureaucracy. He claimed that if current abuses were allowed to go unchecked, Russia would soon be in the midst of a political cataclysm. The solution the exiled nobleman offered was, in part, decentralization. He wrote:

It is absolutely necessary to decentralize the Russian administration; it is necessary to reserve for the exclusive examination of the Ministers and of the central authority all the affairs relative either to the general interests of the empire or to the common interests of several provinces. But it is necessary to leave to each province the right to decide on all local questions, on all affairs which touch the interests of the province alone.

The first step to be taken was to transform district and provincial assemblies of the nobility into assemblies of landowners. Each district zemstvo assembly would be formed from all the landowners, regardless of class or religion. This did not mean that Dolgorukov saw no distinction between gentry and peasantry. The latter would be elected by the peasant commune, while the former, more capable of directing local affairs in Dolgorukov's opinion would be eligible to participate upon the ownership of a minimal amount of land. City inhabitants also needed to own land or a business of a certain value. The district assembly would meet once every three years to survey the
state of local administration. Its most important tasks were the
election of a district marshal who would be in charge of district ad-
ministration, the district police chief, a council of ten men to aid the
marshal in his work, and the district delegates to the provincial assembly.
On the provincial level the assembly, also gathering once every three
years, listened to and approved the accounts of the provincial council.
This body of twenty-five men was directly elected by the provincial
assembly and, under the chairmanship of the provincial governor, gov-
erned the province almost as an autonomous fief. Any conflict between
governor and council was to be settled in St. Petersburg by the Council
of Ministers. Dolgorukov's project was topped off with a Zemstvo Duma
in the capital, which was in reality a national parliament.

In many respects Peter Dolgorukov conjured up a scheme worthy of
a Russian bureaucrat in its intricate planning for each level of govern-
ment. Even granting the possibility of its being accepted, his project,
like all other non-government proposals, faced the insurmountable ob-
stacle of bureaucratic hostility. Dolgorukov himself stated that the
central government would not permit any effective, independent political
organization on the local level. His proposals were truly radical for
the Russia of the 1860's, but this was precisely why the government
determined to control the preparation of the zemstvo reform.

Soviet historiography rests its interpretation of the formation
of the zemstvo reform on these words of Lenin, "And so, the zemstvo
reform was one of those concessions which the will of public opinion
and revolutionary attack enticed from the autocratic government." The
value of the pressure exerted by revolutionaries like Chernyshevsky and Mikhailov is open to question.\footnote{92} The most obvious conclusion is that with a few exceptions the outright opponents of tsardom had no concern with local reform. Their attention was focused on the overthrow of the entire regime, not on bureaucratic reforms. Thus, a reading of the works of Chernyshevsky, M. F. Mikhailov, and Alexander Herzen's liberal journal, Kolokol, reveals no pertinent ideas on zemstvo reform. In his famous proclamation, "To the Young Generation," Mikhailov demanded in the most general way the development of self-government in Russia.\footnote{94} To credit without any proof this vague proclamation with forcing the hand of the government in the zemstvo affair is difficult to understand.

N. P. Ogarev, a close associate of Herzen and his collaborator on Kolokol, vigorously condemned the Russian bureaucracy.\footnote{95} Its sole purpose was to oppress and exploit, he claimed. In view of this fact he believed that the efforts of Alexander II to introduce various reforms was just. Among the reforms Ogarev deemed necessary were self-government for the peasant commune and the autonomy of the provinces.\footnote{96} He omitted any elaboration on this subject. Like most other Russians forced to live in exile, Ogarev placed local reform near the bottom of affairs requiring the comments of his pen.

The vehicle for radical thought within Russia at this time was the journal Otechestvennye Zapiski. On two occasions in 1862 this journal focused its attention on the projected zemstvo reform. K. Arsenev in the first issue of 1862 wrote an article on the role of
property qualification, largely as a rebuttal to Ivan Aksakov's and Koshelev's views in Den. He rejected the idea of property qualification being the sole determinant for voting in zemstvo elections. To argue that ownership of a certain amount of property or the payment of a certain amount of taxes guaranteed a man's right to enjoy the voting privilege Arsenev rebutted with these words, "To presume capability only in wealthy people and to presume it in them always is to bestow on wealth such a significance which, happily it does not have." For Arsenev the distinctive feature of property qualification was inequality.

Although he did not support the idea of universal suffrage, Arsenev proposed a plan almost as radical, at least for Russia—qualification to vote on the basis of education. This system would be preferable to universal suffrage because it conditioned the right to vote by a certain preparation for public activity; it would be preferable to property qualification because the arguments to support its use more reasonably justified voting qualification based on education. Also, Arsenev pointed out, under this plan a man could not be deprived of his vote. Due to the condition of education in Russia he proposed to make literacy a sufficient test of education, "the ability to read and write without any other conditions." To overcome the obvious detriment to peasant participation in zemstvo elections such a system would raise, Arsenev called for a two step process whereby all the peasants would first vote for electors who in turn would select peasant representatives. The idea to base election rights on a person's ability to read and write was both novel and radical in this period; it represented a viewpoint few Russians were willing to follow.
Words from other pages of Otechestvennye Zapiski in 1862 succinctly summarize the effect of the publicists on the preparation of the zemstvo reform. They were part of an editorial attacking the views of Aksakov and Chicherin.

The project of zemstvo reforms is being composed, as it is well known, not by private individuals, nor by the zemstvo itself, but by the Ministry of Interior. This circumstance alone ought to quiet our conservatives. There will be no basis to fear a too profuse liberalism.

Outside of the government buildings of St. Petersburg noblemen and publicists, conservatives, liberals and radical (to a very limited degree) trumpeted their ideas and projects, but all to no avail. Tsarist officials were performing the real work on the preparation of the zemstvo reform.
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Chapter VI
Nikolai Miliutin's Commission and the Zemstvo Reform, 1859-1861

The bureaucrats of St. Petersburg spent almost six years preparing the zemstvo reform of 1864. The first few years witnessed halting steps toward local economic reform, largely because of the overriding issue of the abolition of serfdom. In the beginning work on these two reforms followed parallel lines in that the same government committees formulated principles and projects for both reforms. On March 11, 1858, Alexander II ordered the creation of the Zemstvo Division (zemskii otdel) in the Ministry of Interior. Its task, said the imperial command, was to discuss and compose projects for all questions affecting the economic structure of the Russian empire. Members of the Zemstvo Division were Ia. A. Solevev, N. A. Miliutin, Major-General Iskov, Court A. A. Bobrinsky, and its chairman, A. I. Levshin. The Zemstvo Division soon turned into a funnel for channeling the reports of gentry provincial committees on the question of emancipation to the Ministry of Interior and the Editing Commission.

The connection of the Zemstvo Division with the final zemstvo reform was rather tenuous despite its supposed concern with zemstvo affairs and its very name. Its main contribution came after Minister of Interior Lanskoï's circular of May 16, 1858, on the proposed principles for the reform of district administration, had been subjected to
severe criticism. This circular laid down the following principles for district affairs and for ending the many disputes between landowners and peasants: (1) the union of the district zemstvo and city police, (2) the naming by the government of a district chief who was to be in complete control of all administrative matters, and (3) an increase in the salary of district bureaucrats. When the nobility heard of these proposals, it was entirely opposed, seeing in them a lessening of the importance of the district marshal and, thus, the noble class itself. Iurii Samarin termed the circular "a preposterous production" which would place all zemstvo affairs in a "state of siege." Even the provincial governors found nothing constructive in these ideas. The joint opposition of the provincial governors and the nobility forced the government to produce more acceptable principles for the future structure of district administration.

In a meeting of the Main Committee on January 29, 1859, Tsar Alexander indicated his wishes in a rare instance of a direct expression of his ideas on this subject. "After the demarcation of the rights of the two classes, landowners and peasantry, the administration of the district police cannot remain in the hands of a person elected by only the gentry class alone; the Government must choose this person." He then ordered the question of district administration to be resolved on the basis of the foregoing statement. The task of formulating the new principles fell to the Zemstvo Division. Within two months the Zemstvo Division completed this work and faded from the picture as far as the preparation of the zemstvo reform was concerned.
It is difficult to say precisely what principles were drawn up by the Zemstvo Division and what modifications or additions the Main Committee made on them in its session of March 25, 1859. The difference between these principles and those in Lanskoï's circular were minor. But Alexander II officially confirmed them as the guide line for the new district administrative institutions. Mainly the government was concerned with the reform of the district police and the judicial system; however, because zemstvo affairs were so intimately linked with the police, by sheer necessity special attention had to be paid them in these reform proposals. As a general principle the district economic administration was to receive "greater unity, more independence, and greater confidence." Also it was necessary to determine exactly the extent of each class's participation in the economic affairs of the district. Until the final decision on provincial institutions had been reached, the Main Committee urged the unification of all district zemstvo committees in one council under the chairmanship of the district marshal of the nobility. The district marshal would hold this post as the chief representative of the class "which stood at the head of the economy and, in general, of the administration of affairs for the common district well-being." Thus, in 1859 Alexander saw the need of special zemstvo institutions and of greater trust being placed in them. Pressure from the nobility throughout 1858 had made the government more compliant to gentry demands for the retention of their place in local affairs.

The tsar on March 27, 1859, appointed a special commission in the Ministry of Interior to compose various projects on the basis of the
principles approved two days earlier.\textsuperscript{13} This special commission soon acquired another task, when on October 23 Alexander extended the jurisdiction of the commission to provincial economic institutions.\textsuperscript{14} Specifically, the Commission on provincial and district institutions was responsible for composing the following legislative reform projects: (1) projects for the police administration of the district and cities, (2) project for the investigating section of the police, (3) project for the settlement of disputes between landowners and the emancipated peasants, (4) project for strengthening the power of the provincial governor in extraordinary cases, and (5) project for district and provincial administration.\textsuperscript{15} The very number of projects to be drawn up by the Commission foretold that some projects would be neglected.

Membership on the Commission on district and provincial institutions varied throughout the period 1859-1861, both in numbers and composition.\textsuperscript{16} Until his dismissal in April of 1861 Lanskoi, as Minister of Interior, had nominal control of the Commission, but the official chairman was his assistant, Nikolai Miliutin.\textsuperscript{17} Other members from the Ministry of Interior were S. R. Zhdanov, A. K. Firs, and Ia. Solovev. The Ministry of Justice contributed Nikolai Stoianovsky and Nikolai Kalmakov. S. Zarudnyi, Peter Muller, and Edward von Lode, all representatives of the central administration, also were members. Like the other government commissions dealing with important reform projects, the Commission on provincial and district institutions included provincial officials as regular members. Provincial governors N. Smirnov (St. Petersburg), K. K. Grot (Samara), Viktor Artsinovich (Kaluch),
vice-provincial governor M. Anisimov (St. Petersburg), and B. P. Shuvalov, police chief of St. Petersburg, filled this role. A few provincial officials were invited from time to time to present their views. Among these were G. Zhukovsky (Tauride), E. Tilicheev (Vladimir), V. N. Muravev (Pskov), N. M. Muravev (Riazan), A. Beklemishev (Mogilev), Count A. Sivers (Ekaterinoslav), and N. Popov (Simbirsk).

A contemporary of these commission members and a man who was active in the preparation of the emancipation reform, N. P. Semenov, described it this way, "This Commission had the true character of all Commissions temporarily instituted by the government; it was composed solely of bureaucrats." The only "outside experts" were provincial authorities who could for the most part be certain to view zemstvo reform from the government's standpoint.

Of all the men involved in the work of the Commission on provincial and district institutions up to 1861 Nikolai Miliutin and Iakov Solovev played the most important roles. Few officials were as active in the preparation of reform projects in the 1860's as Solovev. His earlier career included service under Kiselev, the famous Minister of State Property in the 1840's. A government bureaucrat of the most honorable sort, Solovev labored diligently on the emancipation reform. At the same time he held the post of permanent member of the Zemstvo Division and was original participant in the Commission on provincial and district institutions. The Russian historian Kornilov has described him as "a warm and convinced defender of a radical reform of serfdom, unconditionally devoted to peasant interests, with a strong will and with
a vast supply of information and observations about peasant life and relations. Like N. Miliutin and Lanskoi with whom he was closely associated, Solovev believed the government should regulate local affairs so that no one class, especially the gentry, could abuse other segments of society. He was the principal composer of Lanskoi's circular of May 1858. In this document he demonstrated his belief that central authorities should dominate all aspects of district administration by appointing the all-powerful chief of the district.

Solovev's role in the preparation of the zemstvo reform is difficult to separate from that of Miliutin. Scanty documentation indicates that his labors in the Commission on provincial and district institutions were primarily confined to the project for the district police. P. A. Valuev, who succeeded Lanskoi as Minister of Interior, wrote in his diary for March 9, 1862, that he had studied "the project of the statute on zemstvo-economic institutions which has been composed under the guidance of Solovev." Thus, Solovev helped compose the early drafts of the zemstvo reform, but beyond an awareness of his personal beliefs it is not possible to say exactly what aspects of these drafts are exclusively his.

Overshadowing all other bureaucrats involved in the early work on the zemstvo project was Nikolai Miliutin. As chairman of the Commission on provincial and district institutions, he stamped his own ideas on all its projects. He first came to the fore in St. Petersburg with his contributions to the City Ordinance of 1846, an accomplishment which tagged him with the reputation of a revolutionary innovator.
According to Miliutin's biographer, Leroy-Beaulieu, Alexander II was moved to say in 1858 on account of this innovation, "This Miliutin has had the reputation of a rogue for a long time; he is a man to watch." Early in 1858 the post of assistant to the Minister of Interior became vacant. Besides Miliutin, the other candidates were Prince D. Obolensky and P. A. Valuev, then Director of State Property. At first the tsar refused to appoint Miliutin to this post, choosing instead Obolensky because of the former's reputation as a "liberal" and an opponent of continued gentry domination of the peasantry. When Obolensky refused to accept the position, Alexander bowed to the wishes of Lanskoii and appointed Miliutin as his assistant, but only temporarily. In this role Miliutin was to perform significant labor on the emancipation reform and formulate the first zemstvo reform project.

An examination of Miliutin's ideas on the relationship of the central government to local administration is essential for an understanding of his work on the zemstvo reform. In a note to Alexander II, written in August 1859 on the progress of the emancipation legislation Miliutin outlined the future relations of the government, the nobility, and the peasantry. While Miliutin realized that the gentry were divided among themselves on how or even whether to end the system of serfdom, he wanted the government to cut through all opposition of enacting emancipation and to grant civil rights to the peasants. To secure these rights he advocated an improvement in police institutions and an immediate lightening of the burden of zemstvo duties for the peasantry. In compensation for their losses the gentry was to occupy
first place in local economic administration. This did not mean that
Miliutin wished to hand over the liberated peasantry to gentry super-
vision. He told a meeting of the General Council, "Let the nobility
elect their representative, but it is necessary for the government to
confirm him." The gentry should not expect to make changes on its
own authority at any level of government. To a gathering of similar
minded associates Miliutin stated his views on this subject:

Never, never as long as I am in power will I permit any
claim whatsoever of the Nobility to the role of initiators
in affairs which affect the interests and needs of all the
people. Concern about these belongs to the Government; to
it and to it alone belongs all initiative in all reforms
for the good of the country. Tout pour le peuple—rien par
le peuple.

Bismarck, the Prussian ambassador to St. Petersburg from 1859 to
1862, viewed Miliutin as a very clever and bold man among the progressives,
but also as a man who wanted absolute bureaucratic control of all affairs.31
Only the bureaucracy according to Miliutin was in a position to har-
monize the interests of the government, gentry, and peasantry alike. To
him the possibility of the formation of conflicting parties was un-
thinkable, "disastrous both for the government, as well as for the
people."32 This belief in the unique role of the bureaucracy was not
unusual in the Russia of Alexander II, although in Miliutin's case it
was undoubtedly more altruistic. The presence of such an attitude
assured the preparation of the zemstvo reform exclusively in the hands
of St. Petersburg bureaucrats, especially after their experience with
the gentry committees in 1859 and 1860 and with the hostility of this
same gentry.33
After beginning its tasks on April 22, 1859, the Commission on district institutions had added to its jurisdiction on October 23 "the composition of projects of reform for provincial institutions on those same principles which were Imperially indicated for district institutions." During the first two years of its existence the Commission's attention was mostly devoted to projects which formed an integral part of the Emancipation. On April 20, 1860, the Commission reported to the tsar that it had completed its work on district institutions and in subsequent sessions would formulate provincial projects, the materials for which had already been collected.

The first project to be composed by this Commission was the statute on mir arbitrators and on district mir councils. This project of 103 articles was presented directly to the Editing Commission for its consideration early in April 1860. It aimed at establishing a system for settling disputes over the division of the land between the gentry landowners and the emancipated peasants. An examination of this project reveals the attitude of the Commission and of its chairman toward the relations of the government and the various classes in the new situation.

The candidates for the post of district mir arbitrator had to be landowners of the gentry class, own at least 500 dessiatinas of land, or by virtue of having an education be entitled to the twelfth rank in the table of ranks for the nobility. After the district marshal had composed the list of persons eligible for election as mir arbitrators and both the district assembly of the nobility and the provincial
governor had given their approval, the project provided that peasant electors then make their choice from the list of approved candidates. Miliutin in commenting on this provision declared that in principle he was in agreement with the elective right, but in practice he opposed it because the peasants, unfamiliar with their rights and inexperienced in such affairs, would turn the election into a mere formality. Therefore, he proposed that at least for the first time to have the provincial governors appoint the mir arbitrators. This example of Miliutin's opposition to gentry participation in a matter of grave concern to the government was even rejected by his colleagues by a vote of 18 to 3. It is interesting to note, however, that Alexander and the Editing Commission affirmed Miliutin's assertion on this matter.

The second part of the project dealt with the district mir council which was composed of one mir arbitrator picked from all those in the district by the provincial governor and two assessors, one elected from the nobility and the other from the peasantry. Because these officials had to gain the approval of the provincial governor, the stringent hand of the government was once again manifest. Also a distinction was made in the rights and privileges of the members of the district mir council in that the peasant representative was not accorded all the rights and privileges of his gentry colleagues. The district mir council handled all disputes sent to it by the mir arbitrators, but it was not permitted to consult with other councils on similar problems. Like the future zemstvo institutions the mir councils were strictly confined to a fixed territorial jurisdiction. The central
authorities enjoyed the responsibility for overall policy. Other examples of government restrictions were the provisions that the mir council had to inform the provincial governor of all its actions and any decision by it was executed by the district police. The obvious intent of this project was to protect peasant interests, but at no loss of government power. It is an excellent example of bureaucratic domination of the most minute detail of the settlement of basically a local affair. Although it can be argued with some force that such a solution was mandatory under the conditions of the 1860's, the attitude of the bureaucracy must be seen for what it was—an unshakeable refusal to grant real freedom of action to non-government officials.

In its Note of explanation on the project for district institutions of April 20, 1860, the Miliutin Commission outlined its views on the necessity of local police and economic reform:

With the ending of serfdom the activity of local government institutions acquires a special significance and a more broad dimension. In order to guarantee order and tranquility in so important a transitional epoch of national life, local police authority ought to receive great strength, independence and unity; but at the same time it is necessary to place it in strict legal limits, to abolish arbitrary rule... . The economic and police-judicial obligations of the zemstvo police at the present time are almost exclusively the responsibility of the peasant population, and therefore the acquisition by them of general civil rights enforces the necessity (which has already been recognized) of special institutions for these two branches of local administration.

On the basis of this statement the Commission recognized the need of differentiating between the activities of the police and the administration of economic affairs, but deemed this a most difficult task
because of the absence of guiding legislation and the very nature of the economy.\textsuperscript{45} The Commission thought the character of the economy to be primarily class oriented, rooted in the territorial units of the village or city. Only with the passage of time did the "arbitrarily" established districts take on commonly held economic interests.\textsuperscript{46} The district committees for zemstvo duties were cited as proof of this claim. Actually the creation of these committees was just as "arbitrary" as the establishment of districts. The Commission's Note concluded that the police could not adequately function in the economic sphere as a safeguard for the interests of the local population. The essential question consisted in determining those economic affairs now under police jurisdiction which should be taken from it. The Commission decided that only those affairs were to be removed from police authority "in which the local economic interest predominates and in which the mechanical activity of fulfillment alone is not required, but rather a decision and disposition based on an examination and discussion of the means and the needs of the people."\textsuperscript{47} The category which the Commission believed could be safely turned over to the local district populace was zemstvo duties.

In order for the local populace to manage zemstvo duties the Commission said, "The introduction of a regular economic structure in the district on the elective principle would correspond to public demand and be entirely appropriate."\textsuperscript{48} Such an innovation would require a detailed study of the 1851 Ordinance on zemstvo duties and a reexamination and reform of provincial economic institutions, a chore the
Commission had yet to accomplish. In light of the pressing necessity of reforming the district police and fixing the limits of its jurisdiction the Commission appended to its project on the district police only temporary regulations on district zemstvo institutions.

Miliutin's Commission, "pending the final structure of provincial and district economic administration," proposed the formation of a district zemstvo council which was to replace all existing zemstvo commissions and committees. Under the chairmanship of the district marshal of the nobility the membership of this council included the district police chief, the gentry, city, and village representatives to the district police, the mayor of the district seat, and a representative from the Department of State Property, if such property existed in the district. The council also had the right to call any expert, such as a doctor or private person, whom it wished to consult. In fulfilling its functions the district council was subject to the orders of both the provincial governor and the provincial committee on zemstvo duties. Among the affairs entrusted to the district zemstvo council were those formerly administered by the road commission, the quartering and public health committees, matters relating to public alimentation, the opening of factories and fairs, and natural zemstvo duties. The limits of its jurisdiction were fixed in accordance with existing pertinent legislation.

These temporary regulations are proof that as of April, 1860 the Commission on provincial and district institutions had not yet drawn up projects for the provincial level, did not even propose fundamental
changes in local economic administration, or recognize the principle of local self-government in any form. Bureaucratic control, the dominance of the gentry element over the peasant, a change in structure, but not in substance, characterize the first major pronouncement of Miliutin's Commission on zemstvo reform.

All the projects composed by the Commission in April 1860 were presented by Minister of Interior Lanskoi to the State Council. This body judged the temporary regulations on district zemstvo institutions too restrictive, largely because they failed to meet gentry demands. Therefore, on June 9 Alexander ordered them returned to the Ministry of Interior for reexamination together with the forthcoming project on provincial institutions. When the Emancipation Act was published on February 19, 1861, the government faced by the problem of distributing zemstvo duties among the gentry and the liberated peasants, but not yet prepared to accomplish this change which would involve the reform of the entire tax system as well as a new structure for zemstvo affairs, extended the existing zemstvo budget through 1863.

In April 1861 both Lanskoi and Miliutin were dismissed from their posts in the Ministry of Interior. The government employed the euphemistic term "retirement" to evade the real reason for their dismissal—the bitter opposition which they aroused among the gentry during the preparation of the emancipation reform. Once the peasants had been liberated, Alexander felt obligated to appease the wounded feelings of the gentry. As the symbols of a reform which was not to the liking of many landowners, Lanskoi and Miliutin were convenient scapegoats. Miliutin
summed up the situation in these words, "Both Lanskoï and I left the ministry not on account of any initiative on our part. They explained to us that this was necessary for reconciliation with the nobility, and, it seems, they seriously think that such a modest sacrifice will console the well-born class."\(^57\)

From April 1860 until March 1862 the work of the Commission on provincial and district institutions has been subject to grave misinterpretations as to what projects it actually composed. This is largely due to the absence of published material on the activities of the Commission.\(^58\) The two principal official sources, *Trudy Komissii* and *Materialy po zemskomu*, are virtually silent on the period from April 1860 to March 1862. This silence has helped to give rise to serious misconceptions over the final contributions of Miliutin's Commission to the zemstvo reform. Archival material from the funds of P. A. Valuev and the Council of Ministers in the Central State Historical Archives in Leningrad, however, sheds a bright light on this obscure period of the Commission's history.

The major piece of published information setting forth Miliutin's proposals for zemstvo administration prior to 1861 is a note entitled "Preliminary considerations on the reform of provincial institutions."\(^59\) Upon his dismissal from the Ministry of Interior in April of 1861 Miliutin presented this note to the new Minister of Interior, P. A. Valuev.\(^60\) Most of it is devoted to police, judicial, and general provincial reform. For the management of provincial economic affairs Miliutin outlined a provincial zemstvo council consisting of two parts,
an assembly and an executive committee. The assembly under the chairmanship of the provincial marshal of the nobility was to be composed of an unspecified equal number of delegates elected from the classes of gentry, peasants, and city inhabitants by the district zemstvo council. The assembly also appointed the members of its executive committee for terms of three years. This body concerned itself with composing the zemstvo budget and schedule of taxes, supervision of public welfare and alimentation, and with presenting to the government the needs of the economy. The road and construction duty was to remain under the jurisdiction of the regular provincial administration. The provincial governor according to this plan confirmed the zemstvo budget and, in general, supervised all parts of the provincial economic administration.

To guarantee the ultimate control of these affairs in the hands of government officials Miliutin called for the creation of a provincial council (gubernskii sovet). The provincial governor would head this council; other members would include the vice-provincial governor, the provincial counsellor, the chairman of the exchequer, the director of state property, the provincial marshal of the nobility, and the chairman of the executive committee of the provincial zemstvo. This body would make the final decisions on all zemstvo matters. Thus, according to Miliutin's proposal, the representatives of the various classes would be only advisors to the provincial governor and the last word would belong to the bureaucratic controlled provincial council.

On the basis of this evidence Miliutin's contributions to the zemstvo reform can in no way be called liberal; nevertheless, both
Russian and western historians have insisted on contrasting the "liberal" attitude of Miliutin to the conservative, if not reactionary, policies of his successor, Valuev. A list of Russian historians who have portrayed Miliutin as a liberal promoter of zemstvo reform includes A. A. Kizevetter, Boris Veselovsky, G. Dzhanshiev, A. Trachevsky, and S. S. Zak. All these men presented their interpretation prior to 1914. Kizevetter maintained that Miliutin was not really opposed to local self-government, but only to "the one-sidedness of the class desires of the gentry. He spoke out against these desires not in the name of political absolutism, but in the name of social democracy." There can be no doubt that Miliutin opposed gentry domination of zemstvo affairs, but this did not imply that he therefore favored local self-government. The role of the government in his projects was all pervasive. Kizevetter, like Veselovsky and Zak, mainly deduced his opinion from a note concerning the zemstvo project written by Miliutin in 1862. This note was written for the Council of Ministers which in May 1862 was discussing the proposals of the Commission on provincial and district institutions under the chairmanship of Valuev. Sergei Seredonin in an official history of the Committee of Ministers has presented a section of this note. It is upon the basis of Seredonin's evidence that the above-mentioned historians derived their interpretation. Its use as proof of Miliutin's liberal sentiments toward zemstvo reform is misleading because, in the first place, the note was composed a whole year after Miliutin had ceased to direct the Commission's activity and, secondly, Seredonin reported only a fragment of the note and thus gave
a potentially false impression. Trachevsky would have his readers believe that Lanskoi and Miliutin were solely responsible for the zemstvo reform. He states, "At the same time when the Statute of February 19 was being worked out, Lanskoi and his faithful assistant Miliutin were preparing the fruitful statute on zemstvo institutions." On his part Dzhanshiev, the well-known historian of the Great Reforms, maintains that Miliutin composed the reform "of local institutions on the principles of self-government." Western historians have generally followed the same line. Leroy-Beaulieu, after referring to Miliutin's letter to A. A. Golovin in 1861 which outlined his "liberal" zemstvo institutions, concluded that provincial zemstvo institutions "in fact were introduced three years later in large part corresponding to his views and the projects established by him." More recent supporters of this viewpoint are Bernard Pares, Sidney Harcave, and Warren Walsh. Walsh best summarized this interpretation when he wrote:

The man who conceived the general nature of the reform which established the zemstva was N. A. Miliutin, a liberal reformer and a most able statesman who has played a very important part in the Great Reform. Alexander appointed Miliutin as head of the commission charged with drafting the law, but replaced him with a less liberal person before the draft was completed. The law was presumably somewhat less liberal than Miliutin had intended.

A more critical view of Miliutin's work on the zemstvo project is to be found in the works of pre-revolutionary writers, S. Tseitlin and M. Slobozhanin, and the contemporary Soviet historian, V. V. Garmiza. Because the central government and the provincial governor occupied the dominant positions in all decisions taken by the provincial zemstvo
authorities according to Miliutin's project, Slobozhanin termed it "a project which cannot be characterized in any other way than reactionary." Thanks to rewarding research in the Historical Archives of Leningrad, Garmiza has discovered the full text of Miliutin's note to the Council of Ministers in 1862. On the basis of this piece of evidence, plus a survey of the work of the Commission on provincial and district institutions, it is possible to agree with Garmiza that Miliutin represented the bureaucratic interests of the government against those of the gentry. No western historian has yet taken cognizance of this newly uncovered material.

Nikolai Miliutin on May 22, 1862, presented to the Council of Ministers through Grand Duke Constantin Nikolaevich a note entitled "Considerations concerning the project on zemstvo institutions." The Grand Duke had requested Miliutin, as a man very familiar with the early work on the zemstvo project, to present his reaction to the project drawn up by Valuev. Miliutin in his note attempted to clarify the relationship of the government to the proposed zemstvo institutions by answering two questions. "In the first place, what objects will be given to the jurisdiction of the new institutions? And secondly, what will be their relationship to the other government authorities and especially to the provincial governor?" He continued, "Upon the solution of these two questions will depend the significance, essence and consequently the future of the new institutions."

The full text of this note by Miliutin is of great value, because in it he sets forth his ideas on the theoretical and practical points of
zemstvo reform and because, thanks to the way in which Seredonin re-
ported it in his history of the Committee of Ministers, the note has been
used to support Miliutin as a champion of liberal reform. Before exam-
ining the original "Considerations" it would be best to outline Sere-
donin's brief fragments. He begins by paraphrasing the opening para-
graph of the original text. "A correctly established zemstvo will draw
to itself the best educated people, raise the level of local adminis-
tration, free the government from masses of details, give the younger
generation practical guidance and divert many things from anarchy."78
From this paraphrase Seredonin jumps to two direct quotations from the
end of the first part of the "Considerations" and one from the begin-
nning of the second section.79

Seredonin's text portrays Miliutin as a genuine supporter of local
self-government. Miliutin is quoted as saying that a change in the
elective principle for administration can be of value only when the law
grants to those elected real independence.80 Unless the law succeeds
in creating favorable conditions for local self-government, the result
will be a continuation of arbitrary rule and familiar abuses. Seredonin
concludes the first direct quotation with these words:

The history of our administration presents a multiplicity
of examples of this, to my sorrow, despite very energetic
action on the part of the Government. It will be sad, if
the new zemstvo institutions are subject to the same fate,
but it seems to me this will inevitably happen if the
Government does not succeed in attracting the lively forces
of the populace to participate in zemstvo administration.
In the present condition of Russian society it is possible to
count on the participation of the better and well-intentioned
persons only in such a case when they see that they are called
not for the fulfillment of any mechanized formalities, but
for a reasonable and truly useful activity...81
In Miliutin's original note there is a period after the word activity, but Seredonin continued the sentence and, thus, deleted a qualifying statement. Miliutin wrote, "Let this activity be confined to the narrow limits of local interests," but Seredonin continued the above quotation, "and at the same time the government, while refraining from fruitless efforts to direct and control the smallest details of local administration, requires nothing, but conciliates the new force, as it concentrates all its attention on state interests." Seredonin did not actually change the meaning, but rather emphasized the laissez-faire attitude of the government toward local affairs instead of the narrow limits these affairs were to include.

Next he quoted Miliutin's plea for granting to the zemstvo "the widest possible development of economic activity;" however, Miliutin made it clear that zemstvo institutions were only economic organs. He stated, "The significance of the zemstvo is administrative, and not political and there is no need to base the new law exclusively on distrust or exaggerated dangers." The conclusion of Seredonin's direct quotations from the "Considerations" is a plea to keep zemstvo institutions within the limits indicated by the law in light of existing conditions in Russia in which a full realization of legality did not exist. An examination of the entire note reveals not so much that Seredonin has falsified the ideas of Miliutin, as that he has highlighted one aspect, namely, the desire to give more freedom to local economic institutions.

The full text of Miliutin's "Considerations" is divided into three parts. The first section deals with those affairs which he thought should
come under zemstvo jurisdiction. The purpose of bestowing sufficient freedom of action on zemstvo institutions is to attract the best of the local people. If this is done, Miliutin reasoned:

The central Government, upon discarding the burden of an absent stewardship, which requires so disproportionate means, will be liberated from the moral responsibility for small, distant abuses, obligations so inconsistent with the true dignity and significance of Government Authority.84

In this way the zemstvo will act like the safety valve of a steamship, freeing the government in St. Petersburg to concern itself with more important matters. To safeguard the rights and dominant position of the central government will not be difficult "because zemstvo administration, as a purely local affair, obviously cannot and should not in any way affect state affairs, nor the interests of the state exchequer, the courts and the police, the principal local organ of central institutions."85 These are the thoughts, not of a liberal, but of a well-intentioned bureaucrat.

In regard to specific affairs to be allotted to the zemstvo the only changes Miliutin suggested were in the area of road construction and postal stations.86 He proposed to place under zemstvo control, where feasible, interprovincial roads and postal stations. To confine the zemstvo representatives (Miliutin repeatedly refers to them as "class representatives") to only the compilation of the zemstvo budget without giving them any say in its actual disposition "can sometimes under a certain state of mind not only not pacify them, but on the contrary strengthen irritation and arouse important clashes."87 Another innovation which Miliutin urged was for the government to issue sub-
sides from its own funds to needy provincial zemstvos. This effort to broaden zemstvo affairs and ensure sufficient funds appears at first glance a very generous attitude; however, it is necessary to know the reasons behind this attitude.

For one thing, Miliutin would give the government complete freedom in determining the surplus funds to be dispensed to zemstvo institutions. He added, "This would be the best and most detailed form of control on the part of the central Government over the activities of local institutions, because, while not restraining or limiting it (i.e., zemstvo activity), the central authority would subject it to periodic verification and judgement." By broadening the control of the zemstvo over roads and postal stations Miliutin saw a way of transferring complaints about them from the central government to the shoulders of the class representatives—a situation which in his opinion would be incomparably more rational and just. To ensure the proper administration of these affairs the provincial governor, according to the note, should be empowered to rectify at zemstvo expense any shortcoming in local economic affairs. At one point in his discussion Miliutin referred to the projected zemstvo institutions as "permanent government bodies." No matter how he stressed the social value of the zemstvo reform, it definitely did not contain genuine elements of self-government.

The second section of the note treated more specifically the relationship of the zemstvo to government authority. He fully approved of the proposal to permit the provincial governor to prevent the execution of any decision by a zemstvo institution "contrary to the law, or general
good of the state." Every well-intentioned person, Miliutin claimed, would applaud this regulation which was neither harmful nor superfluous, "because without doubt it will be applied only in rare and extreme cases." In addition to this optimistic view the former Assistant Minister of Interior approved those articles granting the governor the right to open and close zemstvo assemblies and to confirm all monetary decisions taken by the zemstvo. Once again, though, the bureaucratic mind tried to draw a distinction between state control and arbitrary state interference in zemstvo affairs. The zemstvo project of Valuev's Commission would have permitted the provincial governor to attend provincial zemstvo assembly meetings and take part in its deliberations (but without the right to vote) and also to confirm the members of the zemstvo executive board. Miliutin objected to these proposals on the grounds that they "would not only present special inconveniences, but not protect the mutual relations and dignity of both sides." A possible solution would be for the provincial governor upon the request of the zemstvo assembly to appoint special commissars as his personal representatives. On the one hand, Miliutin declared himself in favor of giving the fullest possible freedom in the economic sphere to the zemstvo, but with the other hand he immediately hedged this freedom with such close government supervision that the zemstvo would be like a child always waiting for the arm of discipline the moment it made a "wrong" move.

The final section dealt with the electoral system. In general, Miliutin favored a slight lessening of the restrictions in the project
of Valuev's Commission. For example, he objected to the use of volost peasant officials as electors of the peasant delegates to the district zemstvo assembly as being "extremely unfair." The other two classes were to directly elect their representatives. Miliutin also urged a ten day extension of the sessions of the provincial and district zemstvo assembly sessions in view of the number and importance of the matters to be considered by these assemblies. Of course, the provincial governor would first have to give his consent. Although Miliutin was more liberal on the question of zemstvo elections and assemblies than Valuev, his proposals were a minor broadening of the latter's project. Miliutin concluded his note this way, "The speediest solution of provincial and zemstvo administration, in my opinion, is one of the most pressing requirements for the securing of order in internal administration and for the calming of public expectations, which have been so strongly expressed in recent times." 

A study of Miliutin's "Considerations" proves that he had become somewhat more favorably disposed to the zemstvo since his own projects in 1861. But such an examination does not support the contention of historians, like Kizevetter and Walsh, that Miliutin composed a liberal zemstvo project which Valuev then proceeded to render impotent. The evidence indicates only that in April 1861 a detailed project for provincial zemstvo institutions did not yet exist and that the zemstvo reform envisaged by Miliutin's Commission was far from being liberal either in terms of the authority to be granted zemstvo institutions or of their freedom from government supervision. Just as he worked for the government's interests in the peasant reform, believing that the
government's interests included those of both the gentry and the peasantry, so he did the same in the projected zemstvo reform. Under his direction the changes in the administrative economic structure aimed at first easing the burden of the central government by removing the pressure of public opinion and then securing more efficient local government.
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Chapter VII

P. A. Valuev and the Zemstvo Reform

Any history of the preparation of the zemstvo reform would be incomplete without a study of Peter Valuev and his contributions to it. Valuev, born in 1815, attracted the attention of Nicholas I at a ball in Moscow in the winter of 1831 and, subsequently, entered into the service of the First Section of the tsar's chancellory. In the following years Valuev worked his way up through the ranks of the bureaucracy until in 1859 he became the director of the Third Department of the Ministry of State Property and then on April 23, 1861, the Minister of Interior and the chairman of the Commission on provincial and district institutions. This man was to have more influence on the formation of the zemstvo reform than any other official.

Usually Valuev is pictured as a charming person, ready to bow to the prevailing opinion, and, above all, the champion of gentry privileges. The Russian historian Dzhanshiev has described the successor of Lanskoi as belonging to a new, polished bureaucratic generation, "not as ignorant as the older one, but no less short-sighted, impatient, self-satisfied, and self-righteous than the old one." Dzhanshiev also states that in the fashionable salons of St. Petersburg Valuev had the reputation of being "not only a clever official, who knew how to unite freedom and order, but also an unusually crafty, flexible politician..."
in a word, a magician and sorcerer, capable of embracing the unembraceable, of reconciling all interests, of charming everything.\(^1\) Prince Meshchersky, who was related to Valuev by marriage, presents a more balanced, if still erroneous, portrait. On first glance Meshchersky found him "an impotent, portly type man," but later came to the conclusion that Valuev was just quiet by nature, an attentive listener who honestly respected contrary convictions.\(^5\) Upon Valuev's appointment to the post of Minister of Interior the Russian Prince declared that Valuev was precisely the man for the position because he was free of any factional ties and would act as an involuntary brakeshoe on "rash" reform programs.\(^6\) During the reign of Alexander II he served in several important capacities. This long service indicates that the tsar and his minister were in general agreement on government policies.

Throughout his career as a government official Valuev continually expressed his mind on the shortcomings of the Russian bureaucracy, and even suggested reforms of an interesting nature. The defeat of Russia in the Crimean War compelled Valuev to write down his evaluation of the administration.\(^7\) As long as Russia was at peace the evils of the administration went undetected. The chief culprit in Valuev's eyes was the system of centralization which on paper appeared orderly and reasonable, but in reality created overdependence on the various ministries.\(^8\) The consequence was dependence of provincial authorities on the head clerks of this or that ministry and, in the long run, a multitude of forms guaranteed to stifle administrative activity.

At the same time Valuev confided to his diary the reforms he deemed necessary.\(^9\) Specifically, he wanted changes in the area of
censorship, publication of departmental budgets, and the granting to private enterprise of a greater role in railroad and other construction projects. Of more significance than these mild proposals were the following principles Valuev set forth as the platform for all practical changes:

1) the principle of Christian justice in the affairs of religion,
2) the principle of truth in the forms of administration in general, instead of the existing soulless formalism,
3) the principle of moral dignity in the actions of high government authorities, joined with the principle of respect for the human personality.

Valuev did not confine these expressions to his diary alone. Soon they became public knowledge and their author found himself a welcomed guest in the fashionable salons of St. Petersburg.

During the early 1860's Valuev was in the habit of confiding in Prince V. A. Dolgorukov, a high ranking bureaucrat and chief tsarist police official. Just before he became Minister of Interior, Valuev told his friend of the need "to occupy the minds of the educated classes of the population by granting them some part in local affairs and of the possibility of doing this by means of decentralization at the expense of the ministries, but not at the expense of autocratic authority." Several months later, June 26, 1862, Valuev in a lengthy letter to Dolgorukov analysed the internal condition of Russia. The new Minister of Interior described the Emperor and his most immediate advisers as isolated from the rest of Russia. The nobility, he claimed, failed to grasp its own true interests and had broken into a multitude of currents, unable to effectively support the aristocracy. The merchant class could
not exert any beneficial influence over the masses, while the clergy contained in itself elements of disorder, more likely to produce harm than anything else. Valuev viewed the restless peasantry as under "the influence of dangerous illusions and unfeasible hopes." The press and youth of Russia also came in for their share of criticism, because of their constant opposition to the tsar's reforms. Even the army, the solitary magnet which held the conflicting elements of society together, was evidencing signs of anarchy. One solution to this morass of discontent Valuev proposed was the zemstvo, local economic institutions which would occupy the talents of the best-intentioned individuals in a constructive fashion. Another proposal was the creation of a State Council.

Although he briefly discussed his hopes for a State Council with Dolgorukov, the most detailed exposition of this project Valuev presented in his largely neglected note of April 13, 1863, to Alexander II. He informed the tsar that the desire to have some share in the state's legislative process was widespread throughout Russia and, inasmuch as this right was common to most European nations, the Russian people considered the establishment of this principle "a sign of political coming of age." In Valuev's opinion the proposed zemstvo institutions would invariably request the right to participate in the state legislative process, a request which he fully approved because its fulfillment would increase and solidify popular feelings for the tsar and end any aspirations toward separatism. After outlining the specific proposals for creating the State Council, its composition and powers, the Minister of Interior
concluded by revealing his real feelings toward representative government. He stated the State Council would not be a threat to autocratic authority or even the dominant position of the government. This was to be guaranteed by not permitting the zemstvo representatives to have their own special assembly or ever to outnumber the government representatives on the State Council. Despite little encouragement from Alexander, Valuev proceeded to compose a detailed project, which he presented in November 1863. On December 13 of the same year the tsar completely rejected any further consideration of this idea. In a rather sarcastic tone Valuev commented, "les Bourbons n'ont rien appris et rien oublie." The importance of this proposal, to which he could devote only fleeting moments, for an understanding of his activities in the preparation of the zemstvo reform is twofold. First of all, Valuev cannot be termed a typical bureaucratic representative in the sense that he opposed innovations. More so than most of his colleagues he recognized the unrest prevalent in all sections of Russian society and was willing to press for reform. Not until the last days of his reign did Alexander II finally consent to the suggestion that zemstvo representatives be called to St. Petersburg to discuss legislative proposals and give their advise. Thus, Valuev was almost twenty years in advance of his time. On the other hand, a fundamental conservatism clings to Valuev's ideas. He never abandoned his total devotion to the principle of autocracy and belief in the ultimate authority of the tsar's closest associates. The Russian people should be able to express their views, but the final decision could in Valuev's eyes belong only to the men of St. Petersburg.
Hence, he combined a willingness to introduce a novel institution with his basic conservative outlook on life.

After Valuev became Minister of Interior in April 1861 the Commission on provincial and district institutions composed the outlines on which it intended to work out the statutes on provincial institutions, both administrative and economic. The progress of the Commission was delayed because of the arrangement for the Ministry of Finance to compose new regulations for taxes, including zemstvo duties. The Financial Commission was so slow in its deliberations, at least this was the excuse offered by Valuev's Commission, that it necessitated an inquiry of Alexander to quicken the pace of the preparation of the zemstvo reform. Finally, on February 22, 1862, Valuev submitted a report to the tsar on the history of provincial and district economic institutions. In no way can it be claimed that the Commission on provincial and district institutions tried to whitewash the many obvious shortcomings in local government. In typical bureaucratic fashion the Commission, according to its own statement, believed that an examination and elucidation of the existing institutions and laws and their historical development could alone provide the basis for the formulation of new legislation on this subject. "Only the imperfections of the previous institutions gives a comprehensible, clear, intelligible meaning to new measures and reforms."

Attached to this historical report were the Considerations of the Commission on zemstvo administration. All this material was submitted to the Council of Ministers on March 8. In May 1863 a modified and
slightly condensed version of these Considerations was presented to the
State Council. A comparison of the two Considerations is a good method
of examining the progress of the preparation of the zemstvo reform under
the exclusive control of the Valuev Commission. The Commission in both
instances maintained that the aim of the zemstvo reform ought to be the
bestowing of the management of local economic affairs on self-governing
provincial and district institutions and, secondly, the definition of the
necessary limitations on zemstvo institutions, limitations "inevitably
required by the historical conditions of the national welfare."

The Commission then divided its examination of zemstvo reform into six
categories.

The first one dealt with a determination of those affairs to be
recognized as zemstvo affairs. Beginning with the supposition that
economic affairs which involve the local interests of the province or
district ought to be defined as zemstvo affairs, the Commission admitted
the necessity of a more precise definition. All affairs which affected
a province or district were, to a certain degree, related to local
interests. The degree of interest could, it was argued, be seen at a
glance in some cases; others could be settled only by practical consid-
erations and historical data.

The Commission solved the difficult
question of defining local interests by establishing past legislation
as the principal basis. The very failure of this legislation to dis-
tinguish effectively between predominantly local and state economic
affairs did not augur well for a fruitful solution to the problem. The
May Note of 1863 fixed the determination of zemstvo affairs "on what
interest appeared to be dominant."
Both reports of the Commission agreed on the specific matters to be brought under zemstvo jurisdiction. These included affairs traditionally associated with the zemstvo, construction and maintenance of local roads, support for the civil administration, and the military quartering and feeding duty. The zemstvo was to take over the management of public alimentation and public welfare, affairs largely controlled by local institutions. Matters which had been mostly neglected in the past, such as fire insurance for village structures and measures for the encouragement of local trade and industry, were to be entrusted to the care of the zemstvo. It logically followed that the assessment of taxes for the fulfillment of these duties would fall on zemstvo institutions. Also the Commission proposed two other significant areas for zemstvo activity. One was the collection and sending of information on the state of the province's or district's economy to provincial and central authorities; the other was a loophole for future government use and even exploitation of the zemstvo. To the zemstvo were to be entrusted unspecified affairs at a later date by special statute or legal order. Thus, the government could at any time impose additional burdens on the zemstvo without its consent.

Two questions of fundamental importance to the future zemstvo were its composition and the essence and degree of its authority. The Commission declared in regard to zemstvo independence from government interference that zemstvo institutions as the representatives of local economic interest ought to enjoy "real and independent authority." The bureaucrats in St. Petersburg were cognizant of the fact that local officials
and those of the central authorities had in the past developed a strong sense of mutual antagonism. To remedy this situation the government proposed to grant the zemstvo complete independence within its jurisdiction as provided by law. But no sooner had it expressed this idea, then the Commission curtailed this independence by stating that because zemstvo decisions frequently touch the interests of private persons as well as those of the state, limits to protect the rights of the latter must be established. These limits consisted in "the supervision of the general state authority, as determined by laws, over the action of zemstvo institutions and in their accountability for illegal actions before judicial authority."\(^36\)

The supervision of the government over zemstvo activities was to be the same as that for private persons except in areas very closely tied to state interests. On these matters, for the sake of zemstvo independence and clarity, the zemstvo statute should be specific, the Commission decided; however, the conclusions of the Valuev Commission differed somewhat in 1862 and 1863. The 1862 report placed under direct government supervision the composition of zemstvo budgets, the acquisition of real estate, the use of funds allotted to the zemstvo by the government, loans of a certain size, and failure to perform its duties.\(^37\) The Note of 1863 was both more inclusive and more detailed. A key phrase which was added was that the provincial governor and the Minister of Interior could halt the fulfillment of any zemstvo decision "contrary to the general state welfare."\(^38\) To prevent arbitrary use of this right government officials had to act within a specified period of time, but
ultimately they could prevent the performance of a contested order until the Senate made its decision. Other innovations in the 1863 Note were the power of government authorities to rule on any changes in provincial and district roads and on zemstvo decisions for fairs and exhibitions. The most important change involved the right of the provincial governor with the permission of the Ministry of Interior to fulfill a zemstvo duty at the expense of the zemstvo, when he judged that the zemstvo was not performing its obligations. Zemstvo institutions could complain to the Senate against administrative authorities, but the ruling of the Senate was not likely to be in their favor. The Commission believed itself to be most generous in its attitude when it stated, "As a result of government supervision of zemstvo affairs there can be only a suspension or veto of the orders of zemstvo institutions, but no change or revision of their decrees."

Each report of the Commission concluded with the declaration that the essence of zemstvo authority consisted in being able to discuss and undertake "all legal measures and orders necessary for the correct and successful course of zemstvo affairs"; that, as for the degree of authority, zemstvo institutions act independently within the area fixed by law, subordinate to their special statutes and the indicated supervision of the government; and, finally, that "the actions of zemstvo institutions are limited to the locality (provincial or district) subordinate to them and to the defined circle of objects under their jurisdiction." It can, of course, be argued that the government was perfectly within its rights in establishing these restrictions and was
only protecting national interests. Much depended on how sparingly the government employed its right of interference in zemstvo affairs and how willing it was to acknowledge the existence of effective local self-government.

The actual composition of zemstvo institutions underwent more alterations and adjustments between 1862 and 1863 than any other phase of the zemstvo project. The heart of the entire reform, claimed Valuev's Commission, was that "the management of district and provincial zemstvo affairs ought to be entrusted to the district and provincial population itself, on the same basis as the private economy is left to the private individual, public economy to the disposition of the public."\textsuperscript{142} Carrying this idea one step forward the two notes maintained, "The population of a district or province can act in their zemstvo affairs only by means of their own representatives, i.e. through several persons elected or delegated by this population; the union of these persons forms zemstvo institutions."\textsuperscript{143} But the report of 1863, reflecting a change in the attitude of the Valuev Commission, went on to stress the necessity of correctly limiting the authority of these institutions.\textsuperscript{144}

The provincial and district assemblies were to be composed of persons directly elected by the local population.\textsuperscript{145} In order that all the essential interests of the locality be represented and public opinion be independently expressed, a sufficient number of persons was to be elected. Such an electoral system would guarantee the maintenance of a constant tie between the representatives and their locality. Although the Commission claimed that a zemstvo assembly was not a government body
(prisutstvennoe mesto), but instead a local assembly (mestnoe sobranie), the question of whether it was truly an organ of local self-government or merely an extension of the central government's authority was to plague zemstvo-government relations at least until 1905. Besides the assemblies the zemstvo consisted of executive organs called in 1862 zemstvo committees, and in 1863, and thereafter, zemstvo executive boards (zemskie upravy).

The composition of zemstvo institutions in large part depended on the electoral arrangements. The Valuev Commission asserted that, "All the population of the district, who participate in its general economic interests, has, of course, the right to play a greater or lesser part in the management of affairs affecting these interests." The degree of interest determined the degree of participation. Interest according to the Commission was based on the amount of taxes paid, the amount of property owned, and political capacity which included the age, sex, civil, moral, and intellectual standing of an individual. The fundamental idea of the Commission on this subject was summed up in these words, "The more significant the private property of an individual, the more significant his interest in the general economy of the district." From a purely economic viewpoint this argument carried considerable weight, especially in light of Russia's predominantly rural economy, but it failed to evaluate adequately factors like education and equal representation.

Even after the Emancipation property ownership in Russia still retained a class character. Because the zemstvo was designed to represent
not separate class interests, but the general economic interests of a
certain locality, a solution had to be worked out for this dilemma. The
one adopted seemed more a rationalization than a positive solution. For
the purpose of electing delegates to the district zemstvo assembly the
district was divided into three electoral groups: private landowners
who belonged to neither village nor city society, city property owners,
and village landowners, in other words, the peasantry. This solution
was approved on the grounds that the three electoral assemblies had as
the basis of their differentiation property, not class distinctions.¹⁸
In reality, the class division was very much preserved in that in each
of the three electoral bodies one of the principal, historically formed
classes predominated. In theory class distinctions were being abolished
for district zemstvo elections, but the very nature of landownership
guaranteed their continuance in practice.

As a general principle the Commission proposed to fix high pro-
property qualifications on the private landowners "because to broaden the
electoral right is always possible and easy, but, on the contrary, to
raise a property qualification which seems too low and to remove rights
already given would be extremely unsatisfactory."¹⁹ The adoption of
this principle would confirm the dominant position of the large land-
owning gentry. In the landowners' electoral assembly non-gentry pro-
property owners were required to possess double or more the land necessary
to qualify a member of the gentry. This discrimination was justified on
the dubious grounds that these individuals had not enjoyed the right to
participate in noble assembly elections and were unlikely to enjoy the
same social standing as the gentry or to have as much education.

Other categories included in the private landowners electoral assembly were those who had signed leases of at least six years duration and the Orthodox clergy. The position of the latter changed somewhat thanks to the Polish Revolt of 1863. According to the 1862 Considerations an Orthodox priest could participate in zemstvo elections if he owned real estate valued at not less than 1,000 rubles. On account of the Polish Revolt the Commission was anxious to protect the Russian peasants of the western provinces against the large Polish landlords. Therefore, no longer did the Commission mention any specific amount of property needed for clergy participation in the landowners' elections; rather their participation was taken for granted as a means of protecting morals and faith, i.e. the Russian Orthodox faith. The Note of 1863 omitted any reference to special consideration to be given educated noblemen who lacked the necessary property qualifications, as had been done in the previous year.

The principles for determining those who enjoyed the right to vote in the city electoral assembly remained the same in the two reports. City electoral assemblies were composed of people on the basis of property or personal qualifications. Property qualifications included ownership of real estate in the city of a specified value or of a business with a fixed turnover in sales; personal qualifications were membership in the first or second merchant guilds or in the city administration as elected representatives who "already enjoyed the special confidence of the community." The size of a city also played a role in that the property
qualification or value of a commercial enterprise was higher for cities of a population of 10,000 or more.

The bulk of the Russian people was not included in either of the above two electoral assemblies. Because the peasants owned very little private property, the Commission turned to what it called "the collective right of election" to determine peasant representation. The peasants in the opinion of the Valuev Commission had two possible ways to choose their delegates. One was to allow the volost assembly (volostnyi skhod) to elect district zemstvo representatives; the other method was to leave this choice to the volost elders and village heads (volostnye starshini i selskie starosti). The Commission favored the latter system which gave the government more control over the peasantry.

After the formation of the district electoral system the next question was to fix the number of delegates to be elected to the district zemstvo assembly. While agreeing on the general principle that each electoral group should have a sufficient number of representatives to ensure a hearing for all interests, the two reports varied on the exact number. In 1862 the Commission favored a total figure of thirty to sixty delegates, depending on the population of the district; in 1863 the Commission lowered this figure to between twenty and fifty. As for the number of delegates elected from each electoral assembly, the Commission concluded that because of the novelty of this experience in local representation, "it is necessary to give some preponderance in the composition of the district zemstvo assemblies to the more educated and developed class which has already enjoyed some political rights and some
experience in civil life. In concrete terms this thought was formalized by giving the landowners' electoral assembly the right to elect one delegate to the zemstvo assembly for each 3,000 average peasant sections of land (srednye dushevye nodely); for the peasants this figure was 6,000 sections. The Commission lowered these figures to 2,000 and 1,000 respectively in May 1863 but kept the same requirements for cities, namely one delegate for each 300 homeowners in cities of over 10,000 population and one delegate for each 200 homeowners in cities under 10,000. The difference between electors and electees was one of function, not of essence, in that only electors could be chosen as delegates. An exception, and a very significant one, provided that the city and volost electoral assemblies were permitted to choose their representatives from both their own ranks as well as from the private landowners. Each district zemstvo assembly was elected for a three year term and it alone verified the election results.

An important difference between the two Considerations concerned the chairmanship of the district assembly. The 1862 report called for this post to be filled by the district marshal of the nobility, but in 1863 the Commission urged that the central government pick the district chairman. This change was more in keeping with the supposedly non-class nature of zemstvo composition. The district marshal of the nobility on any account was to be the chairman of the district zemstvo executive board which consisted of at least six members directly elected from and by the district zemstvo assembly. Because the executive board was in more or less continuous session and had frequent dealings with
public and government institutions, the Commission decided that it required the confirmation of the provincial governor.

Then the Commission turned its attention to the provincial level. It was agreed that the best means of ensuring the representation of district interests was to allow the district assembly to elect from its own members delegates to the provincial zemstvo assembly. The number of district delegates to the provincial assembly varied from four to six with a grand total of twenty to ninety on the provincial level in the 1862 report and from two to five district delegates with a total of fifteen to seventy-five provincial delegates in 1863. Under the circumstances the landowning representatives, because of education, free time, and resources, would naturally be in preponderance in the provincial assembly. Another point of difference between 1862 and 1863 revolved around the chairmanship of the provincial zemstvo assembly which was first to be the task of the provincial marshal of the nobility and later was to belong to the man named by the government from among the private landowners. These changes in the thinking of the Valuev Commission were more of a technical nature, except that government control was tightened.

The last three points of the Considerations were not nearly as important as the first three. For example, in regard to the division of authority and responsibilities between the district and provincial zemstvo institutions the theory was that each should be perfectly independent within its own sphere; however, because up to that time the districts had not enjoyed effective zemstvo institutions, the Commission decided to leave uncertain questions of jurisdiction to the provincial assembly and
To the zemstvo executive boards both on the provincial and district level the following affairs were entrusted: (1) the fulfillment of assembly orders, (2) presentation to the assembly of all pertinent economic information, (3) preparatory work on the zemstvo budget and tax assessments, (4) composition each year of an account of the actual course of zemstvo matters, and (5) acting as an intermediary between the zemstvo and government authorities, the zemstvo and the courts, and the zemstvo and private persons.

Still another concern of the Commission was the order and time of meetings for zemstvo institutions. Ordinarily zemstvo assemblies were to meet once a year at a fixed time. The only stipulation for district zemstvo assemblies was that they should all be held before the provincial assembly every year. A quorum was formed when one-third of the total number of delegates was present and all decisions were decided by a simple majority vote. The Commission in 1862 wanted to permit the provincial governor and the district police chief to attend sessions of the appropriate zemstvo assembly, but this feature was dropped in 1863.

The last point of the Consideration discussed the accountability of zemstvo institutions before the courts. In a very limited sense the zemstvo was to be left entirely free. The Commission stated, "Zemstvo assemblies, as independent social institutions, are not subject to any legal accountability." Any opinion expressed or vote cast in a zemstvo assembly, provided they were in connection with affairs subject to zemstvo jurisdiction, were free of censure and government interference. Modification came in the form of the Minister of Interior's or provincial
governor's verification of the legality of all zemstvo assembly and executive board decrees and decisions. Freedom of speech for economic affairs was guaranteed; freedom of action depended on the government. From a legal viewpoint it can be maintained that the government proposed to treat the zemstvo as any other non-government organization which was obliged to obey the law, but much depended on the government's interpretation of zemstvo activities and its willingness to give the zemstvo a free hand. The various restrictions outlined did not augur well for effective local self-government.

On the basis of the Considerations of March, 1862 the Commission on provincial and district institutions composed the first fully detailed zemstvo project. This draft of a statute on provincial and district zemstvo institutions consisted of seventy-eight articles in all. The Considerations and draft served as the focal points for the meetings of the full Commission on March 10 and 12, 1862. On these two days the Valuev Commission dealt with a number of questions concerning the proposed zemstvo reform. In general, the Commission found the draft to be in line with the principles laid down by Alexander II in 1859. The journal of the Commission's sessions reveals discussion of eleven points, most of which touched on the composition and organization of zemstvo institutions. These discussions illustrate the inherently conservative character of the majority of the Valuev Commission at this time.

Some members of the Commission, like K. A. Krzhivitsky, protested that to allow the entire volost assembly to elect district zemstvo delegates would give the peasants more elective rights than the other electoral
assemblies, because the peasants would enjoy the elective right without
the limitation of property qualification. Another extreme view was the
proposal to appoint directly the volost elders as the peasant zemstvo
representatives. Eventually the Commission decided to support the
system of allowing the volost elders and village heads to elect the
peasant zemstvo delegates. On this, as well as several other topics,
the Commission members failed to agree, but this disagreement did not
produce any fundamental alterations in the March draft of the zemstvo
reform. Upon the completion of its meeting on March 12 the Valuev
Commission left it to the discretion of the Minister of Interior to
present the zemstvo draft to the tsar and the Council of Ministers.

Already on March 8 Valuev had reported to the Council of Ministers
that his Commission had completed the composition of a draft zemstvo
statute and was about to examine it. On this occasion he said of the
Council members, "Nobody had firmly fixed convictions on this subject."Exactly a week later the approved draft was officially presented to the
tsar and the Council of Ministers, whereupon the tsar created still
another commission to examine the latest proposals. Grand Duke Kon­
stantin Nikolaevich, a foe of Valuev, headed this new commission com­
posed of members from the Council of Ministers. For three and a half
months this group labored over the zemstvo reform. After one meeting in
April Valuev complained, "At the end of the meeting I had a fever from
the constant tension of ideas and nerves due to the slow work and the
frequently disordered course of the conference." The slow, pains­
taking work of St. Petersburg bureaucrats troubled the preparation of
the zemstvo reform throughout its history.
By utilizing the recommendations of the Commission on provincial and district institutions plus the criticism of the special commission of the Council of Ministers, a new zemstvo draft was composed for the July 2, 1862, meeting of the Council of State. 72 This Council in the presence of the tsar approved the main principles of the zemstvo reform as they had been elaborated up to that time. 73 Then Alexander voiced his opinion by ordering a few minor changes in the wording of the zemstvo draft. 74 The Valuev Commission was next to draw up instructions for introducing zemstvo institutions for the first time. Once the Commission had accomplished this task, it was to send the fully-detailed zemstvo project back to the State Council. All this, the tsar urged, was to be done in a short time. Almost a year was to pass before the State Council examined the proposals of the Valuev Commission.

The period from July 1862 to May 1863 the Commission on provincial and district institutions devoted primarily to the formulation of temporary regulations for the zemstvo institutions upon their introduction. During this time the Russian public received its first official statement of the government's ideas for zemstvo reform. Valuev, using the semi-official organ of the Ministry of Interior, Severnaia Pochta, published the main outlines of the zemstvo project as it then stood. 75 As previously indicated various publicists and the provincial nobility of Nizhny Novgorod, Kharkov, Pskov, Voronezh, Kursk, Smolensk, Moscow, Tula, Tambov, Simbirsk, and St. Petersburg discussed these proposals in their assemblies, but the Valuev Commission turned a deaf ear to their insistence on a share in the preparation of the zemstvo reform.
The regulations for the introduction of zemstvo institutions required eight months to be worked out by a special section of the Valuev Commission. They mainly concerned specific arrangements for zemstvo duties, such as public almentation and public welfare, and zemstvo finances. Discussions on this subject proved to be indicative of the Commission's unwillingness to give financial independence to the zemstvo. Valuev was vigorously opposed to transferring all of the existing funds for famine relief to the zemstvo. He argued that a certain portion should be left under the control of the central government in order that it could aid localities especially hard pressed by famine. Other bureaucrats claimed that such a transfer would require years to effect and unnecessarily tie up almentation capital. Counter arguments held that the zemstvo institutions would be in the best position to judge the use of these funds and that the principle of local self-government demanded a total transfer of almentation capital. In March 1863 the Commission approved the viewpoint of Valuev. The Ministers of Interior and State Property were to make the arrangements for this transfer, but upon completion of this accounting an unspecified part was to remain under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Interior.

The Commission also devoted its efforts to determining the exact criterion for zemstvo representation. It was discovered that the application of the approved figures of one district zemstvo delegate from the landowners' electoral assembly for each 3,000 average peasant sections of land and one delegate from the peasant electoral assembly for each 6,000 sections would lead to impossible discrepancies because
of the many differences in landholdings. The following examples indicate some of the inequalities in representation which would have resulted with the indiscriminate adoption of these figures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Number of delegates from the peasants</th>
<th>Number of delegates from the landowners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bobrinsky</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pinsky</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mozyrsky</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ustiuzhsky</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Iarensky</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Velsky</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Solvychegodsky</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Glazovsky</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Verkhotursky</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Borovichsky</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Belozersky</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After much diligent labor the Commission composed six categories to solve this problem. These categories attempted to equate the average peasant and private land holdings for all parts of Russia. Ultimately these elaborate categories were discarded in favor of property value as the basis for fixing the number of zemstvo delegates. The Commission reached the conclusions that in no instance should the number of elected delegates exceed the number of persons who had the right to participate in the electoral assembly and that the number of delegates from the private landowners should not be more than four times the number of peasant representatives.

By March of 1863 the Commission on provincial and district institutions had largely fulfilled the imperial order of 1862 to complete the composition of the zemstvo project and its temporary regulations.
Valuev had the project and regulations along with the 1863 Note printed and distributed to the members of the State Council; not until May 26, however, did this body meet to discuss the final preparations of the zemstvo reform. Valuev himself was to continue to play an active role in this task, but the Commission passed from the scene.

Many historians have condemned Valuev for his overly zealous concern for protecting the privileged position of the nobility through the zemstvo reform. This interpretation fails to grasp the central idea of Valuev's thinking. He looked on zemstvo institutions as economic organs which would allow the people to take their minds off political dreams and aspirations. The group in Russian society most interested in political activity was, of course, the nobility. Therefore, zemstvo institutions would serve to lessen government expenditures, produce more efficient local administration, and distract the nobility from idle and pernicious thought. Valuev writings fail to indicate any special regard for the gentry as such.

As a part of the material sent to the State Council in May 1863 Valuev concisely outlined the attitude of his Commission toward the zemstvo in this way:

Zemstvo administration is only a special organ of one and the same State authority and from the state it receives its rights and powers; zemstvo institutions, having their place in the state organism, cannot exist outside it, and, on an equal level with other institutions, they are subordinate to those common conditions and to that common guidance which is established by the central state authority. These general considerations have constantly been kept in view during the present work.
Above all Valuev and the majority of his Commission stood for absolute control by St. Petersburg. Thus, the Minister of Interior appears not as the champion of gentry interest, but those of tsarist authority. This belief he succeeded in imposing on the work of the Commission under him. Now it was the task of the State Council to accept or revise the conclusions of the Valuev Commission.
Footnotes


2. Ibid., 22 and 28.


4. Ibid.

5. Meshchersky, Moi vospominaniiia, I, 203-205.

6. Ibid., 206. Valuev in a very succinct aphorism (often a joy to the historian, but to be used with caution) once summed up his philosophy, "The science of life consists in never forgetting the precariousness of fact and the stability of principle."


8. Ibid., 355.


11. Ibid., 341.

12. Zaionchkovsky, I, 100.

13. The text of this letter is in V. V. Garmiza, "Predlozheniiia i proekty P. A. Valueva po voprosam vnutrennei politiki," Istoricheskii Arhiv, III (January-February, 1958), 141-144.

14. Ibid., 144.

15. Ibid.

16. Ibid., 144.

17. K. L. Bermansky, "Konstitutsionnye proekty tsarstvovaniia Aleksandra II," Vestnik Prava, No. 9 (November, 1905), 225-233. Valuev's persistent demand for the formation of a State Council along the lines he proposed has been called his "sacred dream." This proposal for the creation of a State Council should not be confused with the already existing State Council which was composed of St. Peters burg bureaucrats.
18. Ibid., 228.
19. Ibid., 229.
20. Ibid., 234.
21. Ibid., 235-279. The full text of this project is to be found on these pages.
23. Istoricheskaia zapiska, 2.
24. Ibid., 2-3.
25. See Materialy po zemskomu, I, 1-83.
26. Ibid., 2.
27. Ibid., 129-175.
29. This report was entitled "Explanatory Note to the projects of the statute on zemstvo institutions." See Materialy po zemskomu, II, 335-410.
30. Ibid., I, 133.
31. Ibid., 134.
32. Ibid., II, 356.
33. Ibid., I, 135-143 and II, 356-363.
34. See Garmiza, Podgotovka zemskoi reformy, 173. He argues that "the social composition of the future zemstvo was the main question of its organization." For him the zemstvo's composition determined its fate, but it is difficult to understand how the most democratically elected zemstvo could have acted effectively within very narrow and limited confines.
35. Materialy po zemskomu, I, 143 and II, 380.
36. Ibid., II, 381-382.
37. Ibid., I, 145-146.
38. Ibid., II, 382.
39. N. Miliutin had urged the adoption of this point in his Considerations of 1862. See Carmiza, Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta, No. 1 (1958), 1-11.

40. Materialy po zemskomu, II, 383.
41. Ibid., I, 146 and II, 384.
42. Ibid., I, 146-147.
43. Ibid., I, 147 and II, 363.
44. Ibid., II, 364.
45. Ibid., I, 149 and II, 365.
46. Ibid., I, 149.
47. Ibid., 366.
48. Ibid., I, 151. Under the heading of private landowners there were included both gentry and non-gentry individuals. In the 1860's the number of large non-gentry landholders was infinitesimal.

49. Ibid., II, 369.
50. Ibid., I, 155.
51. Ibid., II, 370-371.
52. Ibid., I, 155. The holding of a higher degree did not automatically mean a person could vote. Besides the degree, he needed to own at least 3,000 rubles of real estate.

54. Ibid., I, 157-158 and II, 373-374.
55. Ibid., I, 159 and II, 374.
56. Ibid., I, 159 and II, 375.
57. The so-called "peasant sections" were part of the land division between the gentry and the emancipated serfs in 1861 and following.

58. Materialy po zemskomu, II, 376. Another exception in the 1863 Note provided that the city and volost electoral assemblies were also free to elect representatives from the local Orthodox clergy.

59. Ibid., I, 161 and II, 377.
60. Ibid., I, 161 and II, 378.
61. Ibid., I, 162-164 and II, 384-387.
62. Ibid., I, 167-170 and II, 379.
63. Ibid., II, 388.
64. Ibid., I, 191-204. This is known as the March draft.
65. Ibid., 178-179.
66. Ibid., 179.
67. Ibid., 182. This argument conveniently ignored the fact that the election of each peasant representative was based on twice the amount of land as that for the landowners' elected representatives.
68. Ibid., 182-190 for discussion on other points.
69. Zaionchkovsky, I, 151.
70. Istoricheskaia zapiska, 3.
71. Zaionchkovsky, I, 163.
72. This July draft is on pages 213-227 of Materialy po zemskomu, I.
73. Istoricheskaia zapiska, 3.
74. Materialy po zemskomu, I, 211-212.
75. Severnaia Pochta, No. 212, October 12, 1862. In March, 1863 Valuev used the pages of this newspaper for a more detailed discussion of the proposed zemstvo reform.
76. Materialy po zemskomu, I, 256.
77. Ibid., 265.
78. Ibid., 374-376.
79. Ibid., 309-310. These districts are from widely different provinces and the patterns which they established held true for all European provinces.
80. Ibid., 306.
81. Ibid., 314-315. See Kizevetter, Istoricheskie otkliki, 294-299.
82. *Istoricheskaia zapiska*, 4.

83. See Kornilov, *Krestianskaia reforma*, 177; Zak, *Demokratizatsiia zemstva*, 5-7; Garmiza, *Podgotovka zemskoi reformy*, 203, and Dzhanshiev, 303.

84. Zaionchkovsky, I, 100.


Chapter VIII

Baron Korf's Note and the Zemstvo Reform
in the State Council

The history of the preparation of the zemstvo reform is in many respects the end result of the efforts of three men, Nikolai Miliutin, Peter Valuev and Modest Korf. Baron Korf did not enter into the preparation of the zemstvo reform until 1862 and, on a significant scale, not until March of 1863. His observations on the zemstvo project as it stood at that moment were to have a far reaching influence on the final zemstvo statute. Korf was born in St. Petersburg on September 11, 1800, and at the age of seventeen entered government service. His early career was spent in the Second Section of the Imperial Chancellory where he attracted the approving eye of Speransky and Nicholas I. On December 6, 1861, Alexander II appointed him head of the Second Section, while at the same time he retained his post on the State Council. An historian of the Second Section has described Korf as a humanist devoted to the public welfare.

As chief of the Second Section, the body entrusted with the codification of law in the Russian Empire, Korf in the summer of 1862 had already examined the zemstvo project. Then in March 1863 the Commission on provincial and district institutions sent all of its projects to Korf. The tsar directed him to examine them and to communicate his observations in writing to the Minister of Interior.
regardless of any disagreements with the existing proposals. He completed this task on May 6, 1863. If the Note of Korf had produced no discernible impact on the final zemstvo statute, it might be said that his call for certain changes was only another voice in the wilderness. But its effect was convincing enough to force Valuev to compose immediately his own reply to be presented along with Korf's Note to the State Council at its meeting of May 26. Basically a settlement of the divergent views of these two men occupied the State Council during the last stage of the preparation of the zemstvo reform. A comparison of their ideas will greatly clarify the disputes within the State Council after May 1863.

Korf began his Note with the observation that, although the zemstvo project could not compare in complexity to the Emancipation Edict or the proposed judicial reform, it did rank with these other reforms in importance and uniqueness. He then informed Valuev:

The present project has as its goal to consolidate at a stroke our local self-government on broad principles and to definitely destroy the tie with the old precedents which have come down through the centuries. With the truly enlightened views of the Commission on this subject I am in full and wholehearted accord and many of my changes presented below are aimed only at the goal of a fuller and more significant securing of them.

The Note itself is devoted to two major areas, the composition and structure of zemstvo institutions and, secondly, the extent of zemstvo activity and the degree of zemstvo authority over these affairs.

One of Korf's main concerns was with the electoral system, ranging from the three-fold district electoral assemblies to elections for the
provincial zemstvo assembly. A recurring theme in his observations called attention to what he believed to be the class character of the proposed electoral system, a situation which he found incompatible with the supposedly non-class character of the zemstvo. An obvious class feature appeared in the landowners' electoral assembly where a distinction was drawn between the gentry and non-gentry landowners in the form of higher property qualifications for the latter. Korf objected that the natural outcome of this distinction would be the rise of antagonism between the two groups. Instead, he wanted to end this discrimination by recognizing only property owners who lived on their land or who used it for agricultural purposes irrespective of class origin. In rebuttal Valuev first threw the cloak of authority around this distinction by maintaining that both the tsar and the Council of Ministers had already approved it. On a more practical basis the Minister of Interior argued that the purpose of this distinction was to attract "to the zemstvo affair the preeminently educated class, which has enjoyed until now quite justly important rights of representation." To destroy all remnants of the class principle in the zemstvo would hinder the smooth introduction of these institutions. Finally, Valuev concluded that Korf was chasing an illusion in that the vast portion of privately owned land belonged to the gentry. This double edged argument was later to be used against Valuev.

Besides abolishing the class difference in the landowners' electoral assembly Korf urged an increase in the number of those eligible to vote. He contrasted the limitations on participation in zemstvo elections placed
on the landowners and city inhabitants with those on the peasants, who
despite the amount of land they owned, could vote, even though in-
directly. To remedy this shortcoming he proposed that any person who
owned property valued at 15,000 rubles take part directly in the dis-
trict landowners' elections. Those owning real estate of at least a
1,000 rubles' value would participate in zemstvo elections through
representatives. He dismissed the objection that his proposal would
permit too many people to participate in the electoral assemblies. His
admitted aim was to avoid the danger of the large and medium landowners
completely dominating the small landowners. On his part, Valueev agreed
to the idea of direct participation based on the ownership of 15,000
rubles worth of property, but strongly objected to indirect participa-
tion. He thought the figure of 1,000 rubles too arbitrary and too
difficult to calculate. Rather inconvincingly he argued that experience
with gentry elections had proven that small property owners seldom took
the trouble to appear at preliminary sessions to select their represent-
atives. Valueev gave no credit to the altered conditions the zemstvo
reform would create.

When he undertook a discussion of the city electoral system, the
chief of the Second Section again attacked the class nature of zemstvo
elections, but at the same time he revealed a realistic appraisal of
conditions in Russia. Korf described the likely outcome of the proposed
electoral system. "The delegates thus elected can in the composition
of zemstvo institutions look on themselves as representatives and
defenders, not so much of the zemstvo, as of their own class and, in
place of unity, class views and the aspirations of their constituents enter into the discussions." Therefore, he suggested ending city electoral assemblies. In most cases the development of Russian urban life did not furnish a sufficient city population to justify separate electoral assemblies. Qualified property owners in cities over 4,000 population were to participate in the landowners' assembly and in those under this figure the city voters would participate in the nearest volost assembly. The adoption of this system would have drastically reduced the class nature of zemstvo elections.

Such a widesweeping modification aroused Valuev to a forceful counterattack. He first denied that any class principle was involved in the representation of cities, but this denial, while true for cities, overlooked the whole electoral structure. City and village interests and even administration for them were historically dissimilar, he argued, with the consequence that to send city voters to the volost assembly would prevent the representation of city interests in the zemstvo. From the viewpoint of convenience and past traditions Valuev was correct in his opposition to Korf. The most important fact Valuev neglected was that the smallness of Russia's urban population would lead inevitably to its insignificant participation, as actually happened.

Continuing his criticism of the electoral system, Korf objected to use of the volost elders and village heads to elect the peasant delegates. "The peasants usually do not consider their volost and village officials to be completely independent of the authority placed over them (i.e. mir arbitrators and government officials) and will hardly look on
the delegates elected by these officials as their own representatives.\textsuperscript{15}

As an alternative he suggested that the volost assembly itself elect its own zemstvo delegates or special electors for this purpose. To this proposal Valuev objected that the previously elected volost officials already enjoyed the confidence of their fellow peasants and, hence, could best fulfill the function of electing peasant zemstvo delegates.\textsuperscript{16}

The question of class antagonism and the presence of class distinctions in the zemstvo came to a head in the dispute over the election of delegates to the provincial assembly. Korf said that the selection of these delegates by the members of the district zemstvo assemblies placed an artificial barrier between the original electors and their provincial representatives.\textsuperscript{17} The problem was intensified because of the preponderance the zemstvo project granted to the delegates of the landowning class, a situation to which Korf did not object on the familiar grounds that such persons were best qualified for handling zemstvo affairs. The difficulty stemmed from the fact that this preponderance would be used by the landowners, especially in cases where the struggle between the peasants and landowners was intense, to elect only members of their own group to the provincial assembly. Just as the peasants required only minority representation in the district assembly to protect their interests, Korf maintained the same was true for the provincial assembly. The spirit and intent of the zemstvo project would be violated, if this assembly consisted solely of landowners' representatives.\textsuperscript{18} For this reason he called for an election system whereby the peasants would have some guaranteed representation on the provincial level. While Korf's
The proposal was commendable, it amounted to an admission that the government needed to protect the class interests of the peasants. The gentry could not be trusted to perform this task. Thus, the government should secure a voice for all interests on the most important provincial level.

Valuev's answer was a combination of realistic thinking and artful rationalization. "The existence of class antagonism and even more so of a class struggle in our society can scarcely be permitted; this would mean giving general recognition to a private and occasional phenomenon and artificially difficult situations, which in reality do not exist." Class antagonism by its very nature was inimical to the zemstvo spirit which included the protection of everyone's interests. He pointed out that, if in some localities disputes between landowners and peasants were in progress, these disputes arose not from class enmity but from differences of faith, nationality, or language. Here Valuev was referring to the western provinces with their Russian peasantry and Polish landlords. Specifically in reply to Korf, he asserted that even if the landowners would dominate the provincial assembly, the individual landowner was the representative of his home district and not of a particular class. From a practical viewpoint he objected to any attempt to have all shades of opinion represented on the provincial level because of the ensuing difficulties "in the composition of the provincial assembly where there would appear not the representatives of the economic interests of the whole district, but the representatives of the various opinions and parties of district society." Then in a very rare instance Valuev mentioned the thing most dreaded by the bureaucrats of
St. Petersburg—the formation of political parties. "It is desirable that the zemstvo assemblies in their own interest elect provincial delegates on the basis of confidence in their knowledge and talents in the administration of the local economy, and not on the basis of political or class persuasions and adherence to a particular party." Valuev recognized the potential danger to the autocratic rule of the tsar both from class antagonism and political activity.

On three other points Korf proved to be fundamentally conservative. He urged that each electoral assembly be able to elect delegates from persons in all three electoral assemblies and, secondly, that all delegates be literate. The adoption of these proposals would have drastically reduced peasant participation. Lastly, Korf opposed making the marshals of the nobility chairmen of zemstvo executive boards because the qualities necessary for the two posts were far from being identical and because the nobility would in most cases enjoy a sufficient majority in zemstvo assemblies to elect their own candidate.

In the area of zemstvo activity and competence Korf was very outspoken. Besides proposing an increase of zemstvo authority over roads, public alimentation, public welfare, and various duties, he fervently called attention to the necessity of strictly defining the limits of zemstvo activity and granting the zemstvo absolute control over this area. The decisions taken on this question would determine the essential character of the zemstvo, Korf correctly observed. The essence of the zemstvo consisted in a change "of the very fundamental conditions of our system of local administration, in the destruction of
its old foundations and its construction on a principle, almost comple-
tely alien to it up to this time—decentralization and self-govern-
ment." The first step toward rational decentralization was the
institution of local elective organs. But it must be followed by
defining the activity of these organs so as to give them not fictional,
but real significance in the state structure, to guarantee the total
satisfaction of all local needs, to protect the rights of private in-
dividuals, and not to weaken state unity. The government had the choice
of either letting these organs act as mere extensions of its own authority
or of determining the exact limits over which the local organs have
absolute freedom of action. Because of Russia's huge size, the remoteness
of the capital from many areas, poor roads, numerous differences in local
conditions, language, religion, and customs Korf favored the latter
system. He summed up this idea in these words:

The success of our local self-government is possible only
when it will enjoy general importance, when no one will
hesitate to participate in zemstvo affairs, but on the
contrary each person will wish to participate as an honor.
For this purpose it is necessary that everyone know and
understand that these institutions are not executive chancel-
lories, but institutions with initiative and real influence
over their affairs.

A natural corollary to this view was a strict limitation of
government interference in zemstvo institutions. The provincial governor
and the Minister of Interior according to the zemstvo project had ex-
tensive powers of interference. Korf believed that the activity of the
provincial governor in his relations to local institutions "ought to be
chiefly negative, i.e. to consist in the observation that local institutions
did not go out of the limits of authority indicated for them, and in the
halting of each illegal decree or action of theirs." The provincial governor was not to be allowed to participate in zemstvo assemblies and zemstvo affairs in general. As for the Minister of Interior, he should not be allowed among other things to personally compose regulations for the way in which zemstvo assemblies conducted their business, nor have to approve loans by the zemstvo above a certain value. The government was to pursue a laissez-faire policy toward the zemstvo provided it stayed within the defined boundaries of its jurisdiction.

Valuev's view of local economic organs as branches of the central administration was well-known before the writing of his rebuttal. The Minister of Interior opted for retaining the power to veto certain zemstvo loans because of their possible damaging effect on the government's credit. The only notable concession to his position occurred when Valuev agreed that the participation of provincial governors in zemstvo assemblies would serve no useful purpose. Otherwise, he refused to alter his view of zemstvo institutions as bodies constantly under government supervision.

Korf, because of this Note and his subsequent actions in the State Council, has often been presented as an ardent liberal who attempted to broaden the powers of the zemstvo. His principal opponent in this effort was, of course, Valuev according to this interpretation. The head of the Second Section cannot be accused of favoritism to the nobility as a class, yet he was realistic enough to recognize that because of their education and experience they would play an important role in the zemstvo. The arrangements he was willing to make for
zemstvo elections were not really liberal, because the landowners would still dominate. He simply wanted to guarantee a minimum of peasant representation. Even his plea for zemstvo autonomy within a strictly defined area did not emerge from a belief in its political correctness; rather, he saw in the adoption of such a system the best way to guarantee the administration of local affairs. Their satisfactory fulfillment would be of great value to the central government. No political authority was to be given to the zemstvo according to Korf. Like Valuev, he was a fairly rare bureaucratic type in Russia—an honest man who sincerely sought improvements in Russian society. Korf can be defined as a liberal in the sense that his attitude toward the zemstvo was more generous than Valuev's but it was not fundamentally different.

On May 26, 1863, the State Council met in order to receive the final conclusions of the Commission on provincial and district institutions as well as the Notes of Valuev and Korf. It was decided to turn over the consideration of the zemstvo project to the United Council of the Departments of Law and State Economy, a subdivision of the State Council. Under the chairmanship of Prince P. P. Gagarin the United Council included M. Korf, M. G. Khomutov, N. F. Metlin, E. P. Kovalovsky, and P. A. Mukhanov plus the following who were specially ordered by the tsar to attend its meetings, V. P. Panin, N. I. Bakhtin, V. A. Dolgorukov, I. M. Tolstoi, D. A. Miliutin, A. A. Zelenoi, M. Kh. Reitern, Valuev, and others. Also for its eight meetings throughout July the mayors and provincial marshals of St. Petersburg and Moscow were in attendance. After July the United Department met regularly to discuss
the zemstvo reform, but without reaching any conclusive agreements. In many respects the United Council found itself divided into two camps, those who favored Valuev's view of the zemstvo reform and those who supported Korf's. Highly exasperated by this seemingly interminable delay in the preparation of the reform Alexander II wrote to the State Council on November 1, "I demand that this business be concluded without fail by January 1."\textsuperscript{35} Spurred on by the impatience of the tsar the United Council decided in early December that the zemstvo project was indeed ready for promulgation and that the temporary regulations on the introduction of zemstvo institutions could be easily amended later.\textsuperscript{36} Thus, after the entire State Council in its meetings on December 11, 16, and 19 voted on the last remaining differences, the Governing Senate in accordance with the wishes of the tsar approved the zemstvo statute on January 1, 1864.

The United Council and the State Council in their sessions from July to December 1863 devoted themselves to three major points: (1) the composition of zemstvo institutions, (2) zemstvo executive organs, and (3) the essence and limits of zemstvo authority. The first point revolved around the dual question of whether or not the proposed zemstvo electoral system contained a class character in general and a privileged position for one particular class. Most of the decisions taken on zemstvo composition were based on the solution of these questions.

Zemstvo representation and composition depended above all on the electoral system. The United Council and the full meetings of the State Council continued the debate on this subject, a debate which had been
going on uninterruptedly since the very inception of the preparation of the zemstvo reform in 1859. Prince G. A. Shcherbatov, the St. Petersburg marshal of the nobility, objected that the division of electoral assemblies into landowner, city, and peasant assemblies would give these bodies "a class character." Because zemstvo affairs were local economic affairs, common to all classes who worked together in zemstvo institutions, property interest and not class interests, he argued, should be the deciding factor in these affairs. In line with the previously discussed proposals of the St. Petersburg noble assembly the Prince advocated one electoral assembly in each district. Among other supporters of the effort to abolish all class overtones in the zemstvo electoral assemblies Baron Korf said that class distinctions were not in agreement with the very notion of zemstvo institutions and that their introduction would not satisfy the gentry or public opinion. The main purpose of the zemstvo reform which was to remedy the existing defects of local administration would be circumvented, if class differences and traditions were retained. Thus argued N. I. Baktin, a supporter of Korf on most questions.

The most cogent argument against the class arrangements for district zemstvo elections was the work of the Minister of War, D. A. Miliutin. He outlined the three basic defenses of the curial electoral system as the necessity of preserving historical traditions, one of which was the existence of differences between the classes; secondly, the capability of the gentry to manage zemstvo affairs, and thirdly, an attempt to base elections on anything but a strict proportion of property
owned would be disastrous. Miliutin then answered each of these justifications for class differences in the zemstvo electoral system.

Historically he viewed the nobility not as a privileged class, the case in the West, but as a class intended to help the people by serving the state. Since the time of Catherine the Great the gentry had ceased to perform state obligated service and, hence, lost their right to any special consideration. Therefore, to grant them a dominant position in the new zemstvo institutions would not be beneficial to the state. "If the nobility, on the grounds of a serving class, is to be given privileges in the zemstvo, then it would be closer to the goal to form a special class of bureaucrats." Miliutin somewhat contradicted himself when he declared that people capable of administering zemstvo affairs "are to be found in all classes and if one takes into account the whole mass of the various classes, perhaps the preponderance of such persons will not be on the side of the nobility." Then he concluded by saying that all efforts to favor the gentry were unnecessary because they would be elected in the majority in any electoral system thanks to character and ability—a more realistic argument than the preceding one.

The official chronicle of the State Council's sessions at one point summarizes the ideas of the small faction opposed to the three electoral assemblies. Whereas zemstvo institutions represent all the people of the district without class distinction, this group charged that the electoral system in the zemstvo project did not correspond to this goal. The union of zemstvo interests demanded one general electoral assembly "in which the electors would vote together without distinctions..."
according to positions.\textsuperscript{45} The supporters of this view believed that such a system would have much the same result as the one devised by the Valuev Commission, but the advantage of their idea lay in the fact that the people, especially the peasants, would initially have greater confidence in the new zemstvo.\textsuperscript{46}

The opponents of D. Miliutin, Korf, and Bakhtin answered these charges with the familiar justifications. The principal proponents of the officially proposed electoral scheme, besides Valuev, were V. N. Panin, V. A. Dolgorukov, M. Reitern, and A. A. Zelenoi. Panin, a permanent member of the State Council, pointed out that the government was not attempting to merge the classes in zemstvo institutions, but to form their union. In his view it would be a mistake to equate the nobility with the city and peasant classes because "it alone of all the classes possesses the necessary credentials for the management of these affairs."\textsuperscript{47} Panin, the outspoken champion of gentry domination, on still another occasion stated, "Justice does not require class equality of representation, but only the granting of a share in zemstvo institutions to all interests."\textsuperscript{48} Dolgorukov, Zelenoi, and Reitern all advocated the necessity of a threefold electoral system to prevent the peasantry from dominating the district zemstvo assembly. Although they did not come right out and say this directly, their arguments about the necessity of guaranteeing just zemstvo taxes and the proven ability of the nobility amounted to such a statement.\textsuperscript{49}

Again the outstanding spokesman of what might be termed "the official viewpoint" was Valuev himself. His replies were characterized
by an appealing reasonableness, if a person first accepted their underlying premises. One goal of the zemstvo project he found to be "the limited unity of the elements of the zemstvo." Because there could be no equal sharing of the administration of zemstvo affairs, a determination of the share of each class was essential. "It would be unjust to think that all, who have been called to take part in zemstvo institutions, have identical talent for engaging in all zemstvo affairs and identical interests in these affairs." Valuev maintained that the peasants could not be expected to manage them, let alone fully understand all their implications. To deny the existence of class differences, especially as they were expressed in land ownership, would be impossible, he argued. Valuev admitted that the electoral system was not ideal, but its purpose was to recognize the conditions of Russia's historical development. It was natural, therefore, to organize district zemstvo elections along the lines of the three types of property ownership. Such a system was designed not to ensure gentry domination, but to accord with existing facts. After pointing out that the district and provincial zemstvo assemblies had no class divisions he added, "All this proves that the class element is not the guiding principle of the project, but it is relatively important."

These lengthy debates had few practical results for the final zemstvo reform. After months of discussion the State Council voted forty to four in favor of retaining the three separate electoral assemblies for the selection of district zemstvo delegates. On December 28, 1863, the tsar confirmed the opinion of the forty. Again
by an overwhelming vote, thirty-six to ten, the State Council, supported by the tsar, ruled that each electoral assembly could elect delegates only from its own members. The one exception was to permit the peasant assemblies to elect representatives from among private landowners. Korf and his supporters were also defeated by a decisive vote in their effort to alter the election system for provincial zemstvo assembly delegates. They wanted these delegates to be directly chosen by the district electoral assemblies, rather than the district zemstvo assemblies.

One point on which Korf succeeded in bringing Alexander around to his viewpoint concerned the peasant electoral assembly. Even though the peasants elected the volost elders and village heads, they did not consider these officials independent of government authority and would hardly have looked on them as their true representatives. Therefore, Alexander agreed that the entire volost assembly should select special zemstvo electors who in turn would select zemstvo delegates.

Another arrangement which gave a class tinge to zemstvo institutions involved the chairmanship of the provincial and district assemblies. According to the zemstvo project of May 1863 the Minister of Interior picked all the district chairmen from among the district delegates. The noble marshals of St. Petersburg and Moscow both opposed this provision on the grounds that it deprived the zemstvo assembly of its independence and transformed it into an organ of government authority. They proposed that the district assembly be free to select its own chairman. In the United Council this viewpoint prevailed, but in the State Council the members divided evenly. The tsar decided in favor of those supporting the May project. This same project was modified
when it came to the appointment of the provincial zemstvo assembly chairman. Originally the tsar was to choose this chairman; however, the State Council with the approval of Alexander decided to give this post to the provincial marshal of the nobility. A person appointed by the tsar, argued the majority of the State Council members, would wield too much influence. The efforts of Korf, Bakhtin, Miliutin, and others to uphold the elective principle for these chairmanships failed.

The fate of the zemstvo executive boards did not create quite so many intensive arguments. Valuev was willing to alter the zemstvo project to read that the provincial and district assemblies elect the chairmen of their executive boards, rather than having the noble marshals hold this post. Because the office of chairman of a zemstvo executive board required so much work and time, the noble marshals could not be expected to devote sufficient attention in light of their many obligations and the gentry might object to the use of their marshals in such a fashion. Korf reverted to his standard pleas for the acceptance of the all-class principle in the zemstvo as well as the elective principle. In the long run both factions in the State Council agreed, but for different reasons.

Another question in regard to the executive boards was whether or not their members should be confirmed by the provincial governor. Korf believed that to do so "can give birth only to inevitable conflicts" and that "the public will see again the former bureaucratic system." The majority opinion, approved by Alexander, asserted that because the executive boards dealt with matters of state interest, government
confirmation of board members was indispensable. They cited the confirmation of provincial marshals of the nobility as proof that no antagonism was raised against them because of government confirmation. This decision is still another example of the government's attempt to guarantee its hold over the zemstvo.

The subject of government control over zemstvo institutions as opposed to genuine self-government came to a head in the discussions on the essence and limits of zemstvo authority. Much of the debate sounded fiercer than it actually was, because both factions had no desire to abdicate government authority. The St. Petersburg marshal, Shcherbatov, pointed out that Article 6 of the zemstvo project read, "Within the area of activity entrusted to them zemstvo institutions are to act independently." Unfortunately, other articles completely destroyed the value of Article 6. For example, he cited the necessity of government confirmation of zemstvo budgets, assembly orders, and executive board members. Shcherbatov, therefore, concluded that it was mandatory to define clearly the area of zemstvo activity, limiting it to economic affairs alone. Within this defined area of economic affairs zemstvo institutions would be free to act. Only in this way would "the authority of the Government preserve all its significance and force, and at the same time would zemstvo institutions receive the independence necessary for their existence." Baron Korf summarized his ideas on this subject in this way:

Society first of all desires that zemstvo institutions within the limitations of their circle of activity have genuine independence. It would be extremely dangerous now when there has been aroused a general expectation of the structure of zemstvo institutions on the principle of government trust in society to give too little, not to
satisfy the common desires and to arouse only dis-
satisfaction. Then the people will say that in place
of a true zemstvo administration only some new admin-
istrative departments have been added.65

Valuev had to bear the responsibility of steering the zemstvo
project through the stormy sessions of the State Council.66 Despite
his personal weariness he continued to defend his position in speech
after speech. In one such speech he attacked the ideas of Shcherbatov
on the relationship between the zemstvo and the government.67 Any attempt
to effect a separation of these two he deemed impossible because their
affairs possessed so many points of mutual interest, for example, public
welfare. The government did not intend to divide the zemstvo from
itself by the creation of an artificial boundary. Rather, he declared,
"At the basis of the project there lay the idea that the Government finds
in zemstvo institutions a useful and active organ for the organization
and management of the local zemstvo economy."69 He strongly objected to
any idea of "a state in a state."70 Valuev justifiably pointed out that
the zemstvo would enjoy new rights and that the introduction of zemstvo
representation comprised an important and essential reform. But on the
central question of government supervision over zemstvo affairs he re-
fused to budge. In his opinion any effort to give the zemstvo exclusive
control over local economic affairs would be tantamount to a division
of government authority among forty of fifty separate units.71 Valuev
remained loyal to his idea that the zemstvo was basically a branch of
the central government, created to deal with local problems in a new
fashion, but still under strict government surveillance.

Practical changes produced by all this debate were again re-
latively meager. Thanks to the objections of Korf and his allies
Article 2, point XII, which originally read that to the zemstvo there would be entrusted "all those affairs which by their nature can be subject to the jurisdiction of zemstvo institutions," was altered to read, "affairs, which on the basis of laws, special statutes, and other acts coming from the highest authority, will be entrusted to zemstvo institutions." This was an attempt to protect as much as possible the independence of the zemstvo. The State Council also agreed that zemstvo affairs should include public education and wider jurisdiction over public health. Efforts to change those matters which required government confirmation, such as the zemstvo budget, loans, direction of roads, and zemstvo assembly orders, failed to achieve success.

At the conclusion of nearly six months arduous labor the State Council finished its task. Many of the changes in the final zemstvo statute from the May project had been first foreshadowed in the Note of Baron Korf and were the result of his incessant efforts in the meetings of the United Council and of the State Council. Among these alterations can be mentioned the equalization of property qualification for gentry and non-gentry landowners; the election of peasant representatives rather than their selection from among the volost elders and village heads; the determination that for each 5,000 peasant males there should be one district zemstvo delegate, and various other less significant matters.

Despite all the furor in the State Council over the preparation of the zemstvo reform it is essential to remember that all these people were bureaucrats with the exception of the two gentry representatives.
The very fact that Shcherbatov, the marshal of St. Petersburg, constantly opposed the prevailing opinion is proof that most of these officials wanted above all else to retain control of the newly formed zemstvo institutions and were not primarily the champions of gentry interests. Korf and Valuev represented the widest disparity of viewpoints, but again it should be emphasized that they both advocated the same thing, the improvement of local administration. Their differences rested on means, not ends. The zemstvo reform to which the tsar gave his approval in December 1863 was a compromise between their two interpretations with that of Valuev's being more dominant. All segments of government opinion agreed that the public placed great expectations on the forthcoming zemstvo reform. The only problem was that the majority of the State Council wished to concede as little as possible to local interests and, thus, protect the interests of the central government. As bureaucrats they could not visualize a situation in which the last decision was not made in St. Petersburg. In conclusion, the work of the State Council in most instances lacked a spirit of generosity and a feeling for future developments.
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Chapter IX

The Zemstvo Statute of 1864: Contents, Public Reaction, and Evaluation

On January 1, 1864, Tsar Alexander II in an imperial ukase informed the Senate that the local population through its elected representatives could best administer its own economic affairs. After nearly five years of toil in various bureaucratic bodies of St. Petersburg the zemstvo project emerged ready for ratification. The zemstvo statute and the accompanying temporary regulations were officially published on January 8. Thus, there ended the history of the legislative preparation of the zemstvo reform. This study has traced the historical development of local economic government in Russia up to 1864 and the forces and people involved in the composition of the zemstvo reform. This final chapter will describe zemstvo institutions as they emerged from the hands of the State Council and discuss the contemporary reaction and historical evaluation of this reform.

The first article of the zemstvo statute defined its purpose in these words, "For the administration of affairs relating to local economic interest and the needs of each province and of each district, zemstvo institutions are formed." Decisions on the composition and structure of zemstvo institutions had required much thought and work on the part of the government. According to the project of the members of the Valuev Commission zemstvo institutions were to be introduced into the forty-
four provinces of European Russia and the oblast of Bessarabia. The State Council, however, objected to their introduction in Bessarabia, the provinces of Archangel and Astrakhan, and the nine western provinces of Vilna, Grodno, Kovno, Minsk, Mogilev, Vitebask, Kiev, Podolsk, and Volynia. Local conditions in Bessarabia were judged unsuited for the proposed zemstvo reform; Archangel and Astrakhan lacked a sufficient population, and the nine western provinces could not have zemstvo institutions "on account of the special political position of these provinces," namely, the presence of a majority of Polish landowners and the effect of the Polish Revolt of 1863. The Minister of Interior was to investigate the possibility of installing the zemstvo in these provinces through consultations with their governor-general and then to report to the State Council. These provinces were to wait until after the Revolution of 1905 before zemstvo institutions were introduced. The zemstvo statute of 1864 listed thirty-three provinces of European Russia where these institutions were to be established.

The first step in the formation of zemstvo institutions consisted of the three-fold or curial electoral system for the selection of district zemstvo assembly delegates. The three electoral assemblies were divided among the district private landowners, the city voters, and the peasants in their volost assembly. In order to vote in any of these assemblies a person had to be at least twenty-five years old, a male, a Russian citizen, and not be under a court sentence. Property qualifications for participation in the district landowners' electoral assembly, of which the district marshal of the nobility was chairman,
varied. Direct individual participation was based on ownership of a specified amount of land which differed from district to district depending on local conditions, or on ownership of property of an industrial establishment valued at 15,000 rubles, or on ownership of an enterprise with a yearly turnover of at least 6,000 rubles. Indirect participation through a representative required ownership of land less than the specified amount or value, but not less than a twentieth part of it.

Before the meeting of the regular landowners' electoral assembly the smaller landowners met at a preliminary conference to select their representatives to this electoral assembly by pooling their property to satisfy the legal requirements. Under the chairmanship of the mayor of the district capital city the city electoral assembly held its election. Its participants included those who had trade licenses, owners of city enterprises with a yearly business of 6,000 rubles, owners of property at a specified tax value depending on the size of the city, and agents of institutions or companies which met these requirements. The election of delegates from the peasantry involved two steps. First, the district volost assemblies chose electors from their midst and then the electors from all the district volosts met for the selection of peasant delegates.

For determining the number of delegates from each electoral assembly the amount of privately owned land, the population of the district cities, the number of volosts, the peasant population, and the total of peasant owned land were taken into account. Attached to the zemstvo statute was a schedule for the number of district zemstvo assembly delegates elected from the three electoral assemblies and the
number of delegates to the provincial zemstvo assembly. A survey of these figures reveals that of the total 358 district zemstvo assemblies the landowners' electoral assembly elected the largest number of delegates in 269 cases, the city assembly in 6 cases, and the peasants in 76, mostly in the northern provinces.

The district zemstvo delegates served a three year term for which they received no pay. The number of delegates in each district zemstvo assembly averaged thirty-five. With the district marshal of the nobility as its chairman the district assembly met once a year, no later than the month of September and for no longer than ten days. An indication that zemstvo delegates were viewed in St. Petersburg as being connected with government service was the requirement that they take an oath fixed by the general laws on state service. Each delegate enjoyed the right to vote and express his opinion. Decisions were by simple majority vote.

The provincial zemstvo assembly, composed of delegates elected directly from each district assembly irrespective of class distinctions, also convened once a year, but for twenty days. Unless the tsar indicated otherwise, the provincial marshal presided as chairman. In the provincial assembly a government representative for state property attended and voted. Provincial delegates ranged from one-hundred in Poltava and Tambov provinces to fifteen in Olonets. Again the delegates were unpaid.

The provincial and district executive boards comprised the last two zemstvo institutions. The district zemstvo assembly elected from its own members the chairman and two to six persons to sit on its
The provincial governor had to confirm the elected chairman in his post. The district assembly could also vote a salary for its executive board members in view of the fact that these people were in more or less continuous session. The same procedure and regulations for the selection of the provincial executive board were followed with the exceptions that six members were elected along with the chairman who had to be approved by the Minister of Interior.

Local economic interests which were entrusted to zemstvo institutions were called zemstvo affairs or duties. These included (1) the management of zemstvo property, capital and taxes, (2) the building and maintenance of structures belonging to the zemstvo, of other structures and roads maintained at the expense of the zemstvo, (3) measures for securing public alimentation, (4) administration of charitable institutions, including measures for ending beggary and for the construction of churches, (5) management of funds for property insurance, (6) encouragement of local trade and industry, (7) participation in public health and public education in an economic fashion and strictly within the limits set by law, (8) assistance in protection of cattle and crops, (9) the fulfillment of certain needs of the military and civil administration, (10) apportionment of those state taxes handed over to the zemstvo, (11) the fixing, apportionment, collection, and expenditure on zemstvo duties of local taxes, (12) the presentation through the provincial governor to the central government of information, findings, and petitions on local economic interests and needs, (13) the fulfillment of elections for zemstvo institutions, and (14) affairs which the
government by means of special laws or decrees entrusted to zemstvo jurisdiction. Beyond the establishment of general zemstvo duties the statute further divided the duties along provincial and district lines. Among the special provincial duties were arrangements for fairs, roads, fire insurance, apportionment of state taxes among the districts, and examination of complaints against all executive boards in the province; for the district zemstvo institutions some exclusive duties were presentation to the provincial assembly of information on the district economy and the granting of permission for local markets. The eighty-seven articles of the temporary zemstvo regulations dealt with the administration of monetary and natural duties, plus specific instructions for public alimentation and welfare.

Closely connected with zemstvo affairs were the budget and taxing power of these institutions. The district executive boards undertook the first step in the formation of the zemstvo budget. These bodies on the basis of information which they collected compiled for the district assembly an account of each year's zemstvo expenditures, estimates of the following year's expenditures, and the assessment of zemstvo taxes among the district tax payers. During the meeting of the district zemstvo assembly these reports were either approved or amended in accordance with the wishes of the assembly. On the provincial level the same procedure was followed. The zemstvo statute did not introduce any innovation in the tax system. The objects which were assessed for zemstvo taxes were land, factories, industrial and trade enterprises, and trade licenses. No specific limit was set on the amount of
taxes that the zemstvo assemblies could assess. The government assumed that conflicting interests in the zemstvo would automatically keep the tax rate at a low level.  

The last major part of the reform dealt with the authority of the new zemstvo institutions and their relationship to the government. The area of zemstvo action was strictly confined to the limits of jurisdiction within each province or district. Thus, the government prohibited any official contact between zemstvo institutions in different provinces, even though they might share common problems. Zemstvo issued orders and decrees for the fulfillment of its affairs were binding on all those living under its jurisdiction.

Because zemstvo assemblies met annually and for a relatively short time, they could exercise only a precursory, if final, supervision over the administration of zemstvo duties. This task belonged primarily to the zemstvo executive boards. Although it is customary to refer to the executive boards as the administrative branch of the zemstvo, their powers were circumscribed. Among the duties of these boards was the compiling of the zemstvo tax lists, but they did not have their own agents to collect these taxes. Instead, the district courts of the exchequer fulfilled this function and also kept zemstvo funds under their own safekeeping. The actual carrying out of zemstvo duties was left to individuals or business concerns contracted for this purpose by the zemstvo executive boards. But just as the zemstvo could not guarantee the collection of taxes, so also it could not enforce the fulfillment of zemstvo duties. For this purpose it usually depended on the district police.
The zemstwo statute of 1864 was very explicit on the ties between the zemstvo and the government. In Article 7 the statute declared, "Zemstvo institutions within the circle of affairs entrusted to them act independently," and then proceeded to add, "the law defines the cases and the legal form in which their actions are subject to the approval and observation of the general government authorities." Under no circumstances were zemstvo institutions to infringe on government, class, or private affairs and any zemstvo decision in violation of the law was automatically invalid. Zemstvo institutions were accountable to judicial authority for any such infraction of the law.

The provincial governors and the Minister of Interior were given specific points of jurisdiction over zemstvo affairs. At the opening and closing of the provincial zemstvo assembly the provincial governor presided. Among the matters subject to his approval were confirmation of the zemstvo budget, some decisions on zemstvo roads, establishment of industrial exhibitions, and removal of members of the executive board. Affairs which required the approval of the Minister of Interior included loans which exceeded the two year total of a zemstvo's tax, certain decisions on zemstvo roads and exhibitions, and the transfer of the funds and property of the public welfare institutions to the zemstvo. The statute provided rather elaborate procedures for securing these confirmations in the shortest possible time. For example, the provincial governor had to inform the provincial assembly within seven days after the inception of an assembly order or the budget of his decisions.

Contemporary reaction to the zemstvo reform was, on the whole, favorable. Opinion in the Russian press ranged from enthusiasm to a
rather pessimistic view, but one tinged with a dash of hope. The conservative Moskovskie Vedomosti in its editorial pages found the principal virtue of the reform to be the union of all the classes in one organization. It expressed high hope for the zemstvo as a means of unifying all the people of Russia. Russkii Invalid, the organ of the Ministry of War, could compare the zemstvo reform "in its significance, in its consequences," only to the Emancipation itself. The newspaper judged the fact that the peasant would participate in the decisions on zemstvo affairs as being an extension of the statute of February 19, 1861. Its evaluation of the zemstvo electoral system reflected perfectly the opinion voiced by Minister of War Miliutin in the State Council. The newspaper believed that the three-fold electoral system guaranteed the representation of all viewpoints; therefore, it saw no reason to fear class antagonism. Instead, its criticism was directed at the way in which the provincial zemstvo assembly delegates were chosen. Under the existing system landowners dominated both the district and provincial assemblies, possibly to the total exclusion of the peasantry in the latter assembly. This situation could lead to harmful results to the entire zemstvo reform. As an example, Russkii Invalid cited the likelihood that the provincial zemstvo assembly, being under the landowners' control, would refuse to modify natural duties which fell hardest on the peasantry.

The editors of Golos, a liberal newspaper in St. Petersburg, wrote, "In us there lives a strong conviction that the Statute of January 1 opens a new era for us, that the future social forces of Russia
will recognize this day as the anniversary of their birth." A few days later Golos took a more skeptical line in regard to the zemstvo reform by stating that, while it seemed attractive on paper, only time could prove its effectiveness. In the meantime, the Russian press had a duty to rouse the people to an awareness of the great responsibilities placed on them by the zemstvo statute. The even more liberal Kolokol was less sanguine about the benefits of the zemstvo reform. In a series of articles P. N. Ogarev considered the reform almost point by point. In conclusion he stated that the bureaucracy would be successful in nullifying its benefits. The only ray of hope he could discern was that through the election system the Russian people could raise their voice in protest against the arbitrary rule of the bureaucrats.

Among the publicists who had had so much to say about the proposals for zemstvo reform, Ivan Aksakov, Katkov, and Kavelin were the most outspoken after the statute was published. Konstantin Kavelin welcomed the appearance of the zemstvo reform with an almost naive faith in its efficacy. He scornfully rejected the opinion of those who maintained that the reform was too "western" and conceded too much. On the contrary, he judged the zemstvo reform to be one of the most important of present day requirements. He commended the government for instituting the independent management of local affairs and an organization based on the elective principle. Kavelin had no objections to the fact that the gentry, in the guise of private landowners, would be preponderant in zemstvo institutions. With this system the peasants would gain the necessary time and opportunity to learn their new obligations and
also express their ideas. Kavelin genuinely believed that the statute protected the independence of the zemstvo from government interference. He urged zemstvo institutions to stay within the law at all times, and thus, prevent any possibility of local bureaucrats interfering in their affairs. The self-governing zemstvo in his view would act as an instrument for improving the local economic conditions of all classes. A better presentation of the government's intention in 1864 would be difficult to find.

"Hail to the Russian zemstvo! Glory to the monarch who granted it life!" These were the laudatory words Katkov used to greet the zemstvo reform. He welcomed this reform so enthusiastically because of his belief that the zemstvo was a new, all-powerful social force, free from all class restrictions in accordance with the very physiognomy of Russia. The 1860's were a transitional period for the political and philosophical ideas of Katkov and the zemstvo reform was an excellent illustration of this transition. On the one hand, he thought that the zemstvo destroyed the domination of strictly class institutions over local affairs and the chance of the St. Petersburg bureaucracy controlling these matters; on the other, he placed great stress on the participation of the clergy and private landowners (of whom he realized the gentry were by far the larger part), plus property qualification, as the means best suited to secure good local administration. He castigated as mistaken any opinion that upheld the necessity of the elective principle as necessary for real self-government and pointed to England with its appointed local officials as proof of this assertion. Katkov defined
self-government as the administration of local affairs in the hands of the most preeminent people of the locality. In substance he was in agreement with the formulators of the zemstvo reform.

Just as he had been highly critical of the zemstvo project prior to 1864, Aksakov continued his criticism of the finished product. His first article on the zemstvo reform, which appeared in the pages of Den, objected to its being based on the tradition of Peter the Great's reform and, thus, being cut off from the organic strength of Russian society. The slavophile viewpoint of Aksakov required that zemstvo institutions be rooted in the free actions of the Russian people themselves. The very fact that the government imposed zemstvo institutions from above and in this way transferred a share of its obligations was beneficial only from the bureaucratic viewpoint. As proof of this interpretation, he pointed out that most of the participants in the zemstvo would serve without pay and, secondly, society by undertaking the direction of local economic affairs would be deprived of the right to blame the government for shortcomings in these affairs, as in the past. Aksakov found no provision in the zemstvo statute to guarantee real independence of the zemstvo from government interference.

A second major concern for Aksakov was the relationship of the peasantry to zemstvo institutions. He heartily approved of the recognition of the peasants as full citizens, "but", he declared, "it would be absolutely inappropriate to abandon oneself to any self-delusions, to give Zemstvo Institutions a significance which they do not have and, from the exterior fusion of the classes, expect a genuine, strong internal fusion." For the time being he realized that the
gentry would manage zemstvo affairs as they saw fit with only the minor participation of the peasantry. This did not alter the situation that in Aksakov's opinion ultimately zemstvo power should be resided in the peasants. Past examples, such as the zemstvo courts, led Aksakov to be very cautious in his evaluation of the zemstvo as an instrument for securing the peasants their proper place in Russian society.53 This judgment illustrates the slavophile belief in the primacy of reform coming from within society as opposed to western-type legislation imposed from above.

An interesting interpretation of the zemstvo reform is to view it as the basis for a constitutional order in Russia. This interpretation has more relevance to the years after 1864, but even then it had some vogue. The wife of Alexander II confided to Valuev in August 1863 that the proposed zemstvo institutions were an excellent means of pushing aside demands for a "constitution."54 Valuev commented in his diary:

And here this word like an apparition frightens and leads to a mistake. In reality we do not now have a "constitution," only misrule and disorder under the mask of absolute power... Upon returning I wrote to Prince (V. A.) Dolgorukov that I view the opinions of the empress as flowing from "a semi-realization of the facts."55

As an advocate for the retention of autocratic power along with the necessary reforms, Valuev had little regard for an idea which he thought was based on a misunderstanding of the situation in Russia. The acceptance of his proposal for a consultive assembly would have given greater ground for viewing the zemstvo reform as part of a constitutional order.56 The obvious need for local reform entirely overshadowed any agitation for a constitution, even by the nobility. Government officials recognized the
beneficial effect of zemstvo institutions as a means of focusing the
attention of the gentry on purely local affairs. But to impose on the
zemstvo reform the interpretation that it was a major effort on the part
of the government to forestall demands for a constitution does not co-
incide with the contemporary evidence.

The two outstanding commentators on zemstvo affairs prior to the
dissolution of the zemstvo in 1917 were Vasilii Skalon and B. B. Vesel-
ovsky. In the 1880's Skalon was the chief spokesman for zemstvo interests
and Veselovsky's four volume history of the zemstvo from 1864 to 1904
remains unequalled. They might be expected to be highly critical of the
1864 zemstvo statute on account of the many government restrictions
placed on zemstvo activity; however, they emphasized the positive as-
pects. Skalon wrote in his newspaper, Zemstvo, in 1880, "The publication
of the Statute of January 1, 1864, comprises an important step forward
in the development of the internal administration of Russia." He
praised the reform for allowing the local populace to direct their
economic affairs independently of the bureaucracy. No one can accuse
Sklon of being blind to the shortcomings of the zemstvo, but like most
zemstvo workers he appreciated the possibilities presented by the re-
form.

The historian of the zemstvo, Veselovsky, also called attention
to the more favorable points of the zemstvo reform. He urged his readers
not to undervalue the significance of the zemstvo reform. The most
significant contribution of the zemstvo reform Veselovsky saw in the
power it granted to local inhabitants to manage their own economic
affairs and, thus, attract the best local elements. In his opinion the bureaucracy could never effectively administer local needs. At the same time he was extremely critical of the government's interference in zemstvo affairs. This interference took the form of depriving the zemstvo of its own tax collectors, of allowing the police to oversee the fulfillment of zemstvo duties, of appointing the noble marshals as chairmen of zemstvo assemblies, and so forth. He thought that the zemstvo reform was not a government concession "to dreamy liberal demands, but the consequence of a necessity which the government recognized." Veselovsky has best presented the evaluation of Russian liberals.

Russian scholarly opinion on the zemstvo reform prior to 1917 was not always so balanced. The criticism of commentators like S. Tseitlin and N. Bykhovsky in many ways foreshadowed the viewpoint of present day Soviet historians. Tseitlin described the work of the various government organs on the zemstvo project as "an ugly combination of the elements of the bourgeois legal order, of the police state, and of the pre-reform serf-owning class." The primary purpose of the reform, he declared, was to call forth in the person of the new institutions "a tool for strengthening and consolidating the autocratic-police regime for many years." This viewpoint is more a reflection of a Social Democrat in 1909 than an objective evaluation. Bykhovsky was partially right when he charged that the reforms of the 1860's had been presented as the result of an altruistic impulse on the part of the government. His own evaluation of the reasons for the passage of these reforms is open to question. He allotted full credit for their introduction to the pressure of the
socially and politically conscious elements of society. In particular, the zemstvo reform was a stopgap measure against unrest in Russia.

Present day Soviet historiography is restricted in its interpretation of the 1864 zemstvo reform both by the writings of Lenin and by the necessity of accounting for the Great Reforms as a manifestation of capitalistic development in Russia. Lenin thought the zemstvo reform to be the result of pressure from public opinion and, especially, revolutionary activity. Beseiged as it was by revolutionaries and the gentry, the government was forced to grant the zemstvo reform, but only as a tactical concession because, in reality, zemstvo institutions were instruments of the tsarist government with no independent power of their own. The article in the 1952 edition of Bolshaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopediа fully endorses Lenin's assertions.

The Soviet historian, V. V. Garmiza, recognizes some positive features in the zemstvo statute, such as the all-class principle, the granting of a certain control over local economic affairs to the zemstvo, and the subsequent improvements in these affairs, but his final evaluation remains completely within the accepted Marxian bounds. Garmiza in line with the Soviet periodication of Russian history maintains that the growth of capitalism required the overthrow of the old system of local administration. Also he credits the revolutionary agitation of Herzen, Chernyshevsky, and the students, the massive revolutionary movement of the peasants, and the Polish uprising as the prime reasons for the government's concession of the zemstvo reform; yet, he admits that this same concession favored "the landowning-bourgeois elements of Russian
Garmiza is on more solid ground when he confines himself to a presentation of the facts.

The zemstvo reform of 1864 was only a part of the reform legislation passed during the reign of Alexander II. No final judgment of the zemstvo would be objective without a full realization of this fact. The Emancipation Edict, the judicial, press, educational, army, and zemstvo reforms, no matter how serious their defects might be judged, altered the course of Russian development as only the reforms of Peter the Great had done in the past. Profound changes affected all the major European states of the nineteenth century and in Russia most of these changes stemmed from the Great Reforms of the 1860's. The most indispensable of all these reforms was the liberation of the serfs. Any evaluation of the following legislative acts in terms of a hierarchical value is largely a matter of subjective judgment, but the zemstvo reform would have to stand high on such a hypothetical list.

Over and beyond their place in the reform movement of Alexander II the new zemstvo institutions held out the promise of great improvement in local government and the general welfare of European Russia. After the Emancipation had destroyed the foundations of the existing mode for administering local economic affairs, the government was forced to turn its attention to zemstvo reform solely in terms of practical considerations. The passage of this reform in 1864 signified the possibility of great advances being made in public health, primary education, and agriculture, among others. Veselovsky's history of the zemstvo up to 1904 is an eloquent witness that this promise was fulfilled to a
creditable degree. The point is not that zemstvo institutions completely succeeded where the pre-reform institutions had failed; rather, the zemstvo achieved improvements which the old order gave little hope of ever doing. In short, the zemstvo reform presented major opportunities for a raising of the standard of living in rural Russia.

Besides the economic aspects of the zemstvo statute, it also included political overtones. Now for the first time in Russian history all classes, above all the peasantry, sat together in joint assemblies to discuss matters of local interest. Gentry representation was dominant in most assemblies, but the very idea that the former serfs would be sitting as equals with their former masters would have been ridiculed a few years earlier. Almost all contemporary commentators, whether liberal or conservative, felt compelled to note the importance of the all-class principle. Another aspect of the all-class principle in the zemstvo was the use of elections to chose zemstvo delegates. The assemblies of the nobility had enjoyed this right since the time of Catherine the Great, but now it was extended, albeit in a somewhat indirect fashion, to all three major historical classes. To criticize the electoral system because it did not grant full democracy would be unrealistic. Although a more equitable division of zemstvo representation could have been arranged, the Russian peasantry in 1864 was not prepared to take the leading role in the administration of zemstvo duties. Zemstvo assemblies and their executive boards further offered an excellent training ground for both political and administrative purposes. The lack of experience in these matters for most Russians was crippling to the economic and political growth of the nation and a handicap to the
zemstvo at its inception. Only time would remedy this problem. At least the zemstvo reform presented the opportunity for work in these matters on the local level.

In the final analysis the attitude of the government would play the most decisive role in determining the fate of the zemstvo reform. Any defects which might appear in the functioning of zemstvo institutions could only be improved with the cooperation of St. Petersburg and, to a lesser extent, of the provincial governors. Throughout the years of the preparation of the zemstvo reform government bodies had been divided on many specific points, but at all times a safe majority stood for the retention of ultimate control over zemstvo institutions. This policy made a shambles of the constant repetition by the government of its determination to grant genuine local self-government. Both Korf and Valuev believed that the government should allow zemstvo institutions a free hand within the limits prescribed by law. Korf, as opposed to Valuev, wished to widen the area of zemstvo authority and ensure fuller independence; he never advocated that the government follow a policy of absolute non-interference.

The internal contradiction between the idea of local self-government and a strong central administration, or, to put it another way, between the state and social theories of local government, was not unique to Russia. All modern governments are continuously wrestling with this problem. In the case of the zemstvo reform the Russian government granted a measure of self-government to provincial and district elective institutions. The final stamp of approval on their most important
decisions, though, was left in the hands of St. Petersburg. The restriction on zemstvo taxing power in 1867 clearly indicated that the government was not abandoning an irrevocable portion of its power to the zemstvo. The tsarist government passed the zemstvo reform to improve the local economy and to bring its administration in line with the new social conditions. This same government held in its hands the ultimate decision on the success or failure of this effort.
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<thead>
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