

WILLIAM L. MATHES

N. I. Pirogov and the Reform of University Government, 1856–1866

The opinions of Nikolai Ivanovich Pirogov (1810–81) provided the basis for much of the widespread debate on the “university problem” which preceded the adoption in 1863 of the General Statute of Russian Universities. Though Pirogov’s equally important views on primary and secondary education and his general pedagogical philosophy have been examined in some detail,¹ there is no systematic treatment of his views on university reform.² The purpose of this article is to help elucidate those views, to demonstrate the relationship of Pirogov’s ideas on university government to his activities as curator of the Odessa and Kiev school districts, to define the limits within which Pirogov’s ideas were acceptable to the government of Alexander II and to a majority of the professorial community, and to compare his recommendations for reform with the statute of 1863 and with events which immediately followed its implementation. University autonomy was the tie beam to which were pinned many of Pirogov’s hopes for university reform, and it also provides the focal point of this study.

The appointment of Pirogov by Alexander II as curator of the Odessa school district in September 1856 was one measure of the government’s alarm over the political and social consequences of the defeat in the Crimean War. The appointment was like earnest money, a pledge to make good on accumu-

1. The most important are A. P. Afonsky, *N. I. Pirogov, ego zhizn' i pedagogicheskaja propoved'* (Moscow, 1911); A. A. Krasnovsky, *Pedagogicheskie idei N. I. Pirogova* (Moscow, 1949); A. S. Rozhdestvin, *N. I. Pirogov kak pedagog* (Kazan, 1902); P. N. Sakulin, *N. I. Pirogov kak pedagog* (Moscow, 1907); and S. Ia. Shtraikh, *N. I. Pirogov* (Berlin, 1923). The best bibliography on Pirogov’s work is A. M. Geselevich, *Nauchnoe, literaturnoe i epistoliarnoe nasledie N. I. Pirogova* (Moscow, 1956).

2. For what is generally known regarding those views see P. A. Alston, *Education and the State in Tsarist Russia* (Stanford, 1969), pp. 46–48, 53–55; Nicholas Hans, *The Russian Tradition in Education* (London, 1963), pp. 58–61; and William H. E. Johnson, *Russia’s Educational Heritage* (Pittsburgh, 1950; reprint, New York, 1969), pp. 233–34.

The author wishes to thank the Inter-University Committee on Travel Grants, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the American Philosophical Society for travel grants, and the officers and staff of the Central State Historical Archives in Leningrad (TsGIAL), the Library of the Academy of Sciences (BAN), and the Saltykov-Shchedrin State Public Library (GPB) for assistance in researching archival material and periodical literature used in this article.

lated domestic debt. Pirogov was an unexpected choice for the job, for Nicholas I had been wont to pick district curators from among his military officers.

Pirogov's long exposure to the German university system—two years at Berlin University and ten years at Dorpat, first as a student and then as a teacher—was in itself exceptional. The experience permanently shaped his image of what a university should be. In the 1840s he had earned a world-wide reputation as an authority on ether narcotization, application of fixed plaster casts, and military surgery. Pirogov was also known as an outspoken critic of nepotism and favoritism in academic appointments, evidence of which he had clearly displayed in sharp altercations with some of his colleagues at the Medical and Surgical Academy in St. Petersburg (1841–54). During the Crimean War, while supervising the treatment of wounded soldiers at Sevastopol, he had simultaneously waged a campaign against the embezzlers, speculators, and incompetents who were disgracing Russia's military hospitals.³

In addition, Pirogov's article entitled "Questions of Life," which circulated in manuscript form for two years before its publication in July 1856,⁴ was a repudiation of the class-oriented and utilitarian educational system of Nicholas I. In it Pirogov stated that pursuit of profits, service ranks, and bureaucratic preference could not satisfy man's inner need for purpose or provide him with answers to life's questions. Consequently schools should not yield to the materialism and egoism of the day or simply process careerists and pseudo specialists, but rather should produce true men and citizens. Though he admitted specialization as "a necessary requirement of society," he was convinced that it should be preceded by a general humanitarian education available to all.⁵

Although this humanitarian ideal was not new,⁶ there had been little opportunity to air it publicly before 1855. The article created a sensation among educated Russians, and its publication was taken as a sign of the government's intention to reform the educational system. Amid the accolades of the publicists⁷

3. *Sevastopol'skie pis'ma N. I. Pirogova, 1854–1855 gg.* (St. Petersburg, 1907), pp. 58–59, 130–34; *Sochineniia N. I. Pirogova* (Kiev, 1910), 1:7–8, 722–23, 727–30; V. Volkovich, "Narodnoe obrazovanie: Drug chelovechestva—N. I. Pirogov," *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnago prosveshcheniia* (hereafter *ZhMNP*), vol. 21, n.s. (June 1909), sec. 3, pp. 115–18; G. M. Gertsenshtein, "N. I. Pirogov," *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'* (St. Petersburg, 1898), 23:651–52.

4. "Voprosy zhizni," *Morskoii sbornik*, vol. 23 (July 1856), sec. 3, pp. 559–97.

5. *Ibid.*, pp. 564–65, 580 (quotation).

6. Nicholas Hans suggests that the ideal was perhaps better expressed by Belinsky (*Russian Tradition in Education*, p. 52).

7. See [N. I. Chernyshevsky], "Zametki o zhurnalakh," *Sovremennik*, 58 (July 1856): 215–22; N. A. Dobroliubov, "Neskol'ko slov o vospitanii," *Sovremennik*, 63 (May 1857): 43–64; K. D. Ushinsky, "Pedagogicheskie sochineniia N. I. Pirogova," *ZhMNP*, vol. 113 (March 1862), sec. 3, pp. 179–80.

and with the support of liberal friends at court, Pirogov was asked by A. S. Norov, minister of education (1854–58), to accept the post of curator of the Odessa school district. Alexander II, though wary of the doctor who had raised such a storm over the mismanagement of medical services in the Crimea, yielded to the liberals and approved the appointment on September 3, 1856.⁸

It is probable that Alexander II and Norov viewed this appointment as one means of placating an aroused public opinion and that they did not believe that Pirogov, in adapting his humanitarian educational philosophy to the local schools, would require radical changes. But Pirogov, who viewed his task as that of a “missionary,” embarked on an ambitious project to renovate the Odessa school district. He at once recommended that the Richelieu Lyceum in Odessa be transformed into a university. As envisioned by Pirogov the university should serve the local needs of a multinational district and become at the same time a Russian cultural center to which Balkan Slavs might be attracted. It was not until 1865, seven years after his removal from the district, that the transformation was finally effected and Novorossiisk University opened in Odessa.⁹

More controversial were Pirogov’s moves to democratize the secondary schools and to provide Jewish and Tatar schools with better facilities and somewhat greater independence. He also encouraged the presentation of student concerts and theatricals for mutual assistance, and he brought about the transfer of the editorship of the local newspaper, *Odesskii vestnik*, to the Richelieu Lyceum.¹⁰ The newspaper was then opened for debate on the most pressing issues of the time, including peasant reform. Alarmed by these activities, Governor General A. G. Stroganov and several members of the local Russian gentry complained to St. Petersburg that Pirogov was undermining the local authorities, giving comfort to nonbelievers and non-Christians, and contributing to peasant unrest. In what constituted an official reprimand, Alexander II authorized the transfer of Pirogov to Kiev on July 18, 1858.¹¹

In Kiev students soon hailed Pirogov’s management of the district as

8. “Avtobiografiia Pirogova: Pis'ma k I. V. Betensonu,” in *Sochineniia*, 1:10.

9. Pirogov, “O preobrazovanii odesskago litseia v universitet,” in *Sochineniia*, 1:651–55; A. V. Markevich, “Dvadsatipiatiletia Imperatorskago novorossiiskago universiteta,” *Zapiski Imperatorskago novorossiiskago universiteta*, 53 (1890):14–50; S. Ia. Shtraikh, “Materialy k biografii N. I. Pirogova,” *Russkaia shkola*, 1910, no. 7–8, pp. 61–68.

10. Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv Leningrada (TsGIAL), fond 733, opis' 78, delo 817, Pirogov, “O deistviiakh popechitelia po odesskomu uchebnomu okrugu s 24 oktiabria 1856 po 1 ianvaria 1858 goda,” pp. 2, 3a–19 (a lower-case *a* is used to indicate the reverse side of folio leaves); “Tsirkuliary po odesskomu okrugu,” in *Sochineniia*, 1:291–306.

11. Pirogov, “Pis'ma o pechati i tsenzure,” in *Sochineniia*, 1:797–810; S. Ia. Shtraikh, “N. I. Pirogov kak sozdatel' nezavisimoi pressy v Odesse,” *Odesskiiia novosti*, no. 7088 (Nov. 23, 1906), pp. 2–3.

the “golden age” in the history of Kiev University,¹² but some of his close associates expressed privately their anxiety over his innovations. “His administration,” wrote N. M. Murzakevich, “consisted of deviation from all rules and procedures. This pleased the young people very much. Aiming for progress, he often abandoned common sense. . . . As an administrator, Pirogov is a poor man under the influence of newspapers and journals. His extreme impracticality and unbounded craving for progress forced me to disagree with him.”¹³

Pirogov favored the principle of collegiality in the adoption of educational policies, but he was charged, especially during his first months in Kiev, with highhandedness and “excessive meddling” in university affairs.¹⁴ In his efforts to improve the teaching staff of Kiev University he sometimes resorted to tactics which were at odds with his stated views on autonomy. In 1859, for example, when the law faculty was unwilling to admit to its ranks two recent recipients of the master’s degree, Pirogov ordered the university council to schedule trial lectures for them. After the lectures, when the law faculty still demurred, he pushed through the faculty assembly their appointments as adjuncts.¹⁵ Such tactics hardly endeared him to the “old guard” at the university.

However, it was Pirogov’s progressive views on methods of student control and his attitude toward student activities which got him into trouble in Kiev. Pirogov believed that students could be diverted from extralegal activities and made amenable to control by democratization of the university and by introduction of an internal disciplinary regime based on the moral influence of professors over students. He encouraged the creation of student courts, under faculty guidance, to settle differences between students and to serve as agencies of group discipline.¹⁶ He encouraged the formation of Sunday and evening schools for the education of adults, and the formation of “literary colloquies”—organizations which were especially suspect by the police. He proposed unrestricted admission, without entrance examinations, of youths from the tax-paying classes—a scheme about which Alexander II quipped, “Then there will be as many universities as taverns.”¹⁷

Pirogov knew that the Sunday schools, literary circles, and student courts,

12. A. V. Romanovich-Slavatinsky, “Moia zhizn' i akademicheskaja deiatel'nost' (1832–1884),” *Vestnik Evropy*, March 1903, p. 186.

13. Murzakevich to Pogodin, in N. P. Barsukov, *Zhizn' i trudy M. P. Pogodina* (St. Petersburg, 1888–1910), 18:227.

14. N. N., “Popechitel'stvo Pirogova,” *Severnaia pchela*, no. 134 (May 23, 1863), p. 536.

15. Romanovich-Slavatinsky, “Moia zhizn',” p. 191.

16. TsGIAL, fond 733, op. 88, d. 213 (g. 1859), “O priniatii mer k otrashcheniiu bezporiadkov mezhdru studentami universitetov,” pp. 35–36.

17. Quoted in Krasnovsky, *Pedagogicheskie idei Pirogova*, p. 85.

which he patronized, included some students who were engaged in propagandistic activities.¹⁸ He attempted unsuccessfully to convince Governor General I. I. Vasilchikov that the slogan "to take liberal ideas to the masses" was harmless and that the youths arrested for airing it "merely wished to express their desire for the moral development of the simple people."¹⁹ Far from being persuaded by these arguments, Prince Vasilchikov sent repeated, bitter complaints regarding the curator to Norov's successor, E. P. Kovalevsky (1858–61), and to the chief of the Third Section. Specifically, Vasilchikov demanded that Pirogov purge the Sunday schools and literary circles of friends of students already arrested, that the student courts be abolished, and that reliable students be picked secretly to spy out the activities of illegal student societies. Pirogov resisted these demands, and the ministers sided with the governor general. Several more students were arrested, and in July 1860 the student courts were closed. Writing to Kovalevsky on October 15, Vasilchikov stressed the "dangerous consequences" of leaving Pirogov at his post.²⁰

At court Pirogov's views were both misrepresented and exaggerated. The tsar finally was persuaded that Pirogov's usefulness as a symbol of the government's liberal intentions was outweighed by the danger of his permissiveness as curator. On March 13, 1861, Pirogov was dismissed on the pretext of ill health.²¹ Though he wrote his best articles on university reform after March 1861, their practical influence was reduced by Alexander's repudiation of his policies as applied in the Kiev school district. On the other hand, Pirogov's reputation as a university administrator was neither tested nor tarnished by exposure to the serious student disorders that rocked Russian universities during the brief ministry of Admiral E. V. Putiatin (June–December 1861). Pirogov was sent to Europe early in 1862 to supervise a program of advanced training abroad for graduates of Russian universities.²² The project, similar to the one in which he had participated as a student thirty years before, was arranged by A. V. Golovnin, minister of education (1861–66). From the government's point of view the project had the double advantage of providing excellent supervision for the Russian students and of removing the controversial pedagogue from the actual business of running a school district.

As a result of these politically motivated changes Pirogov was out of

18. A. Z. Baraboy, "O prichinakh uvol'neniia Pirogova s posta popechitelia kievskogo uchebnogo okruga," *Istoriia SSSR*, September–October 1959, pp. 108–13.

19. *Ibid.*, p. 110.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 112.

21. "Pis'ma A. V. Golovnina k kniazuiu A. I. Bariatinskomu," *Russkii arkhiv*, June 1889, p. 267; A. V. Nikitenko, *Dnevnik* (Leningrad, 1955), 2:169.

22. Pirogov, "Po povodu zaniatii russkikh uchenykh za granitseiu . . .," *ZhMNP*, vol. 120 (October–December 1863), sec. 3, pp. 109–28; "Kandidaty v zvanie professorov," *Sanktpeterburgskiiia vedomosti*, no. 64 (Mar. 23, 1862), pp. 283–84; *Nashe vremia*, no. 68 (Mar. 28, 1862), p. 268.

Russia at the very moment when the new statute for Russian universities was being drafted and revised. Though still officially attached to the Ministry of Education, Pirogov was not a member of the fourteen-man commission which, under E. F. von Bradke, prepared the draft statute in December 1861. He was in Europe during the deliberations of the Learned Committee of the Main School Board, chaired by A. S. Voronov, which codified the responses to the draft and then issued a liberalized, revised version in October 1862. Finally, he was excluded—as were all educators except Golovnin—from the special conference, chaired by Count S. G. Stroganov, which in November 1862 altered the Voronov version in many essentials. The conclusions of the Stroganov conference were incorporated in the final version of the General Statute, signed by the tsar on June 18, 1863.²³

Pirogov worked abroad until the middle of 1866. In the deepening reaction which followed the attempted assassination of Alexander II he was relieved of his educational duties after the appointment of D. A. Tolstoy as minister of education. Having been deprived even of the state pension promised him by Golovnin, Pirogov was forced to retire to Vishnia, his estate in Podolia. Though he made significant contributions in the field of medicine after 1866, his pedagogical career was over. He died at Vishnia in 1881.

Pirogov's most important articles on the university reform were "An Opinion on the General Statute of Our Universities," written in March 1861,²⁴ "Observations on the Draft of the General Statute of Imperial Russian Universities," written in March 1862 and published the following month in *Sanktpeterburgskiiia vedomosti*,²⁵ and *The University Question*, completed in December 1862 and published in 1863.²⁶ We gain additional understanding of his views on university government from reports written during his tenure

23. The von Bradke draft, the Voronov version, and the final statute used in this paper are given, respectively, in *Zamechaniia na proekt obshchago ustava imperatorskikh rossiskikh universitetov* (St. Petersburg, 1862), 1:1–50; *Zhurnaly zasedanii uchenago komiteta glavnago pravleniia uchilishch po proektu obshchago ustava imperatorskikh rossiskikh universitetov* (St. Petersburg, 1862), pp. 3, 4, and passim (hereafter *ZhZUK*); and *Universitetskii ustav* (St. Petersburg, 1863), pp. 1–55 (hereafter *Ustav 1863*). The statute applied to the Universities of St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kazan, Kharkov, and Kiev, but not to the Universities of Helsingfors and Dorpat, which operated under separate charters.

24. "Vzgliad na obshchii ustav nashikh universitetov," *Tsirkuliar po upravleniiu kievskim uchebnym okrugom*, March 1861, pp. 40–50.

25. "Zamechaniia N. I. Pirogova na proekt obshchago ustava imperatorskikh rossiskikh universitetov," *Sanktpeterburgskiiia vedomosti*, nos. 75 and 76 (Apr. 5 and 6, 1862), pp. 339–40, 346.

26. *Dopolnenie k zamechaniiam na proekt obshchago ustava imperatorskikh rossiskikh universitetov: Universitetskii vopros. N. I. Pirogova* (St. Petersburg, 1863). I have used the edition by V. Z. Smirnov: *N. I. Pirogov: Izbrannnye pedagogicheskie sochineniia* (Moscow, 1952), pp. 380–463 (hereafter *Univ. vopros*).

as curator in Odessa and Kiev, an article, "What Do We Want?" (1859),²⁷ and his "Letters from Heidelberg," published in the St. Petersburg *Golos* during his sojourn abroad in 1863–64.²⁸

We shall discuss first Pirogov's ideas on the relationship between the Russian university and the state and on the corporate rights and duties of the faculty, and then turn to his views on the student problem.

According to Pirogov, the West European ideal of the university as a self-constituted community of teachers and students dedicated to purely scholarly pursuits had been distorted historically by church dogma, nationalism, and bureaucratism. Universities had become more utilitarian, occupying the highest rungs in school systems, while simultaneously losing to national academies of science their purely scholarly, as distinct from educative, function. All of this had happened in Western Europe before the establishment of the Universities of Moscow (1755), Kazan and Kharkov (1804), St. Petersburg (1819), and Kiev (1834). Created by the tsarist state "at a time when education was still in need of outside encouragement from above, the Russian university was bound, necessarily, to take on the bureaucratic principle." The Russian university, in Pirogov's opinion, resembled the French university only in the fact that the bureaucratic element had put down deep roots, but it was "even less like the German, which served as its model, because it lacked the most characteristic element of the latter—full *Lehr- und Lernfreiheit* and the inclination for the scholarly principle to prevail over the applied and the utilitarian."²⁹ Pirogov was convinced that many of the conditions which forced the government to initiate yet another university reform resulted from past failure of the state, the public, and the universities themselves to keep foremost the scholarly purpose of the university.

Student disorders, overcrowded lecture halls, insufficient laboratories, inadequate salaries, and numerous vacancies were evidence of the need for reform. Russian professors had never been successful in preparing sufficient replacements for those retiring, and the government from time to time had quixotically replenished faculties from the outside. Until the practice was forbidden by Nicholas I in 1852, foreign scholars, mostly from Germany and the Baltic provinces, had been invited to fill vacancies. Also, some Russian post-graduates had been sent to Dorpat and then to the West for advanced training. Neither method of replenishment had provided sufficient candidates for all of

27. "Chego my zhelaem?" *Novorossiiskii literaturnyi sbornik*, no. 45 (Odessa, 1859), pp. 185–236.

28. "Iz Geidel'berga," *Golos*, nos. 77 and 78 (Apr. 3 and 4, 1863), pp. 307–8, 311–12; "Po povodu zaniatii russkikh uchenykh za granitseiu," *Golos*, nos. 281–83 (Oct. 24–26, 1863), pp. 1110, 1113–14, 1117–18; "Iz Geidel'berga," *Golos*, nos. 317–19 (Nov. 29 and 30 and Dec. 1, 1863), pp. 1255–56, 1259–60, 1263–64; nos. 25 and 26 (Jan. 29 and 30, 1864), pp. 90, 94.

29. *Univ. vopros*, pp. 380–84, 385 (quotation).

the vacant positions, and both methods were extremely vulnerable to the political vicissitudes of Russian foreign policy. These were useful palliatives, but they had had the negative effects of keeping the Russian university dependent on governmental initiative and of rendering it incapable of self-renewal. "In the formation of the university *collegium*," Pirogov wrote, "there was no internal source from which to draw fresh forces, nor was it trained for independence; its sickly body was carefully protected from contagions and infections. For a full fifty years stimulants have been administered in order to sustain vital processes, and they have become so necessary that now, when the university is leaving its infancy, it is feared that their withdrawal may jeopardize its life. Meanwhile, the university has developed ailments such as are peculiar to old age."³⁰ These ailments, everywhere apparent, were "nepotism, apathy, and bureaucratic formalism." Pirogov considered nepotism to be the common affliction of all corporations, apathy to be "embedded in Slavic nature," and bureaucratic formalism to have derived from the absence of any higher aspirations. He believed that palliatives would no longer work and that another reorganization of the university statute, the fourth in less than sixty years, was in order.³¹

Pirogov prescribed university autonomy, although inadequately tested in Russia, as the necessary medicine. Russian universities had enjoyed a measure of autonomy under the statutes of 1804, but this had been systematically reduced in the 1820s by Magnitsky and Shishkov, and further constricted in 1835 and 1849. Pirogov used "autonomy" in the sense of faculty participation. Full autonomy, which did not conform to the principle of centralism in the state, was not the issue. He was not pleading for the medieval *status in statu*: "Today in a centralized state *the sum of university autonomy must consist only in that it makes the university as little bureaucratic as possible and as little dependent on the bureaucrats as possible.*" Autonomy seemed idealistic, because it did not conform to Russian concepts of state institutions. But the university, he reasoned, was entitled to an exclusive, nonbureaucratic position within the state apparatus, because the fulfillment of its educational goal depended upon freedom.³²

Among other things, university autonomy necessitated the restoration to the university council and faculty assemblies of the right—taken from them in 1849—to elect their own rector, deans, and subordinate officials, subject to confirmation by the authorities. In 1863 this right was restored to the universities.³³

30. *Ibid.*, pp. 387–88, 391–92 (quotation, p. 392).

31. *Ibid.*, p. 396. The universities had been reorganized twice by general statutes in 1804 and 1835, and by ministerial fiat in 1849.

32. *Ibid.*, pp. 397 (quotation, italics mine), 407.

33. *Ustav 1863*, arts. 8, 23-B, 27, 42-B, 42-C, 56, 61, 64.

Beyond this, Pirogov argued unsuccessfully for regional decentralization of the entire university system. In his opinion, the fallacy of a *general* university statute lay in the assumption that customs and traditions were everywhere uniform. Consequently, every instance of local discontent threw the whole system into question and raised the specter of yet another “reform” of the universities. The statute, he asserted, should be general only in the sense of setting up guidelines within which the five Russian universities might operate with greater flexibility than in the past. The universities varied greatly in size, in ethnic composition, and in local practices. To strengthen autonomy and to maintain order the university council and its elected executive board should be as free as possible to meet circumstances resulting from this diversity.³⁴ Similarly, Pirogov argued that the new statute should not contain a uniform list of all subjects (or chairs) to be required at each university (in provincial universities some of these would remain vacant under any circumstances); rather, it should specify only those subjects deemed essential to each faculty, with supplementary courses to be added by each university in accord with local requirements and available faculty.³⁵

Pirogov sought also greater faculty participation in budgetary decisions, as well as in the determination of educational policies. He contended that the state should provide, in addition to statutory salaries designated uniformly for basic courses, a special reserve fund from which the university could open new courses as the demands of science dictated and could disburse *variable* merit remunerations to junior faculty.³⁶ Pirogov asked: “What constitutes the very essence of autonomy? Is it not the right of the university to arrange the budget at its discretion, to distribute it according to various needs, to see to its proper use, to choose managers from its own ranks, to have under its supervision all administrative departments of the university, to manage its educational activities in the interests of science and for the enlightenment of all, and, finally, to answer for the legality and correctness of its actions directly to the highest academic-administrative instance?” He acknowledged, however, that Russian universities were most unwilling to avail themselves of “the rights to manage fully the budget and educational activities”—two rights acquired by autonomy—either because they considered these rights “not too important” or because they “feared confusion or did not trust themselves.”³⁷

Consistent with his view of what a university should be, Pirogov further argued that the university should be removed from the Table of Ranks and

34. *Univ. vopros*, pp. 387, 397–99, 407, 411, 446–47, 459–61.

35. “Vzgliad na obshchii ustav,” p. 48; “Zamechaniia Pirogova na proekt” (Apr. 5, 1862), p. 340; *Univ. vopros*, p. 404.

36. “Zamechaniia Pirogova na proekt” (Apr. 5, 1862), p. 340; *Univ. vopros*, pp. 403–4, 436.

37. *Univ. vopros*, pp. 400–401.

that degrees should not automatically entail receipt of prescribed service ranks or *chiniy*. Though he admitted that the special privileges awarded by the Table of Ranks had served initially as useful stimuli, he believed that in the long run they had placed the university and the professor in a false position. In December 1862 he wrote: "A scholar striving for independence is a very common phenomenon; a *chinovnik* with this aspiration is inconceivable." Autonomy and *chinovnichestvo* would not mix. If both teachers and students continued to chase after government service ranks, the university would become only a bureau.³⁸

Russian professors wanted a somewhat larger role in the determination of academic policies, but for many of them budgetary duties and differential salaries based on merit had little appeal. The majority also disagreed with Pirogov regarding the desirability of listing in the statute only a few basic courses; professors who participated in the deliberations of the Learned Committee predictably defended their separate specialties as "essential." Subsequently, the government included in the statute the required number of professors and chairs for each faculty.³⁹ Regarding the proposal to rid the university of service ranks, only Golovnin and a few St. Petersburg "radicals" agreed with Pirogov.⁴⁰ Most professors felt that so long as service privileges of university employees and graduates remained important in terms of social mobility, they could not be abolished for the university alone.⁴¹ In 1863 the statute emerged from the debate on university reform with a full complement of upgraded service ranks, to the satisfaction of clear majorities at the Universities of Moscow, Kazan, and Kharkov.⁴²

As regards the composition of the Ministry of Education, Pirogov held the uncommon opinion that the elective principle should apply to all officials except the minister. He recommended the creation of a permanent committee of scholars elected by the university councils. The committee would be a deliberative body that could settle disputes between universities, help fill vacancies, and act as a liaison between the minister and the universities.⁴³ The Ministry and the universities were reorganized simultaneously, but Pirogov's recommendations were not included in the new statute governing the Ministry.⁴⁴

38. *Ibid.*, pp. 397 (quotation), 398–99, 413–14.

39. *ZhZUK*, no. 4, pp. 1–5; *Ustav 1863*, arts. 13–17.

40. The minority who did share Pirogov's view on this issue included Professors K. D. Kavelin, N. I. Kostomarov, V. D. Spasovich, M. M. Stasiulevich, B. I. Utin, and Minister Golovnin. *Zamechaniia na proekt*, 1:135, 182; 2:109, 111, 113–14, 232–33.

41. This point of view was best articulated by Boris Chicherin, *Neskol'ko sovremennykh voprosov* (Moscow, 1862), pp. 57–60. See also *ZhZUK*, app., pp. 400–401.

42. *Zamechaniia na proekt*, 1:266, 312–13, 398–99; *Ustav 1863*, arts. 136–38.

43. "Zamechaniia Pirogova na proekt" (Apr. 6, 1862), p. 346; *Univ. vopros*, pp. 399, 408–10, 445.

44. The elective principle was nowhere applied. Individual professors and rectors

His own record of leadership in Kiev notwithstanding, Pirogov urged that the powers of the district curator be reduced, for the curator was not required by law to be an educator or a scholar. Pirogov held that the curator should not interfere in university affairs, but rather should act as an inspector, seeing to it that the council and board operated within the limits of existing ordinances and referring disputed cases to the Ministry.⁴⁵ Along with Kavelin, B. Utin, and most of the professors at Kazan, Kharkov, and St. Petersburg Universities, Pirogov argued that the draft article which gave the curator the right to preside at sessions of the council at his own discretion should be dropped.⁴⁶ By using this article, Pirogov noted, "the curator could temporarily take upon himself the duties of the rector and . . . meddle in the affairs of the collegial body; this cannot be allowed without harmful consequences for the autonomy of the council." He attributed to the council's former weakness, its subservient position, and its consequent low esteem among students the disorders which constituted the *causa prima* of university reform.⁴⁷

The article in question was deleted from the final version of the statute. However, since the confirmation of the curator was required in twenty-two distinct categories of business, including confirmation of council appointees from docent to gardener and of every supernumerary expenditure over three hundred rubles, there was little likelihood that either the council or board would run amuck. By article 26 of the statute the curator retained broad discretionary powers. In fact, his powers remained in 1863 essentially what they had been in 1835—the results of public debate and recommendations of professorial majorities notwithstanding.⁴⁸ The university council could not remove, bypass, or ignore the curator. There was nothing except his own political sense to prevent his interference in the internal affairs of the university.

The prereform university system did little to stimulate healthy competition

could participate in the Ministry's major consultative bodies only upon invitation. Any suggestion the local university council might make would continue to reach the minister through the curator, over whose appointment the university had no control. "Uchrezhdenie Ministerstva narodnago prosveshchëniia," *Sobranie uzakonenii i rasporiashenii pravitel'stva*, no. 65 (July 3, 1863), no. 448, pp. 724–27.

45. "Vzgliad na obshchii ustav," pp. 43–44; "Zamechaniia Pirogova na proekt" (Apr. 5, 1862), pp. 339–40; *Univ. vopros*, pp. 407–8.

46. Article 54 of the von Bradke draft had simply been carried over from the statute of 1835. See *Vtoroe polnoe sobranie zakonov rossiiskoi imperii* (St. Petersburg, 1830–84), vol. 10, sec. 1, no. 8337, art. 8 (hereafter *II PSZ*) and *Proekt in Zamechaniia na proekt*, vol. 1, art. 54 (hereafter *Proekt*), and pp. 10, 85, 134, 300, 392.

47. "Zamechaniia Pirogova na proekt" (Apr. 5, 1862), p. 340 (quotation); *Univ. vopros*, p. 407.

48. Compare these provisions in the statute of 1835, the von Bradke draft, and the statute of 1863, respectively, *II PSZ*, vol. 10, sec. 1, no. 8337, arts. 47–60; *Proekt*, arts. 50–60; and *Ustav 1863*, arts. 32–33, 51, 56, 59, 66, 72–73, 75–77, 79, 82, 84–85, 89–90, 99–100, 105, 109, 118.

among professors or to encourage talented youth to seek careers within the system. State salary schedules set up in 1835 and amended in 1842 were, by reason of inflation, completely inadequate by the beginning of the 1860s.⁴⁹ The practice of awarding chairs for twenty-five years without a probationary period, and of subsequent five-year reappointments with pension and salary, hardly encouraged continuing interest in scholarship. Though the statute of 1835 gave the university council the right to recommend to the minister the removal of a teacher of any rank for reasons of “negligence,”⁵⁰ the right was never exercised.

Pirogov did not dwell at length on the need for substantial pay increases, because the government had already declared its intention of raising salaries. Moreover, he was convinced that correct initial appointments and subsequent competition for retention of chairs were more important than salary increases in building a strong faculty.⁵¹ There were three methods of selecting full-time teachers for Russian universities, that is, those whose jobs were listed in the university statute: (1) invitation by the university council, (2) placement competition before the council based on written works and trial lectures, and (3) direct appointment by the minister. All three types of appointment were subject to confirmation by the tsar. Pirogov preferred the second method and rejected the third (introduced by S. S. Uvarov in 1835)⁵² as deleterious to university self-government. Though he admitted that some cases of favoritism and nepotism had existed when the councils had chosen professors on their own and that these abuses had given Uvarov grounds for changing the law, Pirogov contended that a general influx of teachers in the 1830s, and not ministerial appointments, had helped reduce this problem. “In order for our universities to flourish,” he concluded, “it is necessary to restore to the councils the autonomy which—perhaps prematurely—they once enjoyed.”⁵³

When it had been allowed to fill vacancies on its own, the university council had historically used invitation as the general method. Pirogov hoped to make public competition the rule and invitation the exception, but the success of this system depended upon the establishment of privatdocentships, travel grants, and stipends to provide the necessary competitors. He recommended that invitation be used only to recruit professors whose scholarly reputations were well established, and that it never be used to select docents. On the ability of the corporation of professors to pick the right men, primarily through competition, largely depended the success of university self-govern-

49. *II PSZ*, vol. 8, sec. 2, app. to no. 6670, p. 395; vol. 10, sec. 2, app. to no. 8337, p. 283; *Ustav 1863*, app., p. 81.

50. *II PSZ*, vol. 10, sec. 1, no. 8337, arts. 83, 84, 138.

51. “Vzgliad na obshchii ustav,” pp. 40–41; *Univ. vopros*, pp. 388–89, 462.

52. *II PSZ*, vol. 10, sec. 1, no. 8337, art. 80.

53. “Zamechaniia Pirogova na proekt” (Apr. 6, 1862), p. 346.

ment. If the faculty failed in this task, he argued, it would lose its moral right to autonomous action.⁵⁴

Despite his belief that public competition was the best method for recruitment, Pirogov was vague on the questions of what the *konkurs* should consist and how it should be conducted. At one point he said that it should include “more obvious proofs” of the candidate’s scholarly ability than those provided by trial lectures and dissertation—for example, additional experimental research for the physical sciences.⁵⁵ However, if the M.A. degree provided no guarantee of scholarly worth and the trial lectures were, as he put it, “simply worthless formalities,” how would laboratory experiments provide any better guarantee?⁵⁶ In *The University Question* (1863) Pirogov added excellence of teaching and the size of classes to his list of criteria for judging teachers, but noted that taken individually they would not prove a candidate’s worth.⁵⁷ Most reviewers of the draft statute agreed that the competition should be retained, but not as the primary method of selecting teachers. The final version of the statute reflected this position.⁵⁸

Pirogov hoped that the *privatdocentship*, one of the glories of German higher education, could be made workable in Russia. *Privatdozenten* had been introduced in 1842, under the name of *dotsenty*, but they had not prospered in Russia. To remedy this, Pirogov recommended that the noncompetitive adjunctship be abolished and that the docentship be made open and competitive for all holders of undergraduate degrees. The successful competitor should be appointed by the faculty for two or three years, then be subject to a new competition before the council. Docents should not be given professorial chairs until they had twice survived a free competition. Finally, Pirogov urged that docents receive variable remunerations based on the council’s evaluation of their abilities, and be given rights similar to those enjoyed by their German counterparts—to collect honoraria for their teaching services, to use lecture halls and equipment in their teaching, to participate in the oral examination

54. *Ibid.* (Apr. 5, 1862), p. 340; *Univ. vopros*, pp. 396, 412, 421–23, 439.

55. “Zamechaniia Pirogova na proekt” (Apr. 5, 1862), p. 340.

56. The rector of Kiev University, N. Kh. Bunge, raised this question in his criticism of Pirogov’s “polemical defense” of competition. “Otvét na stat’iu Pirogova ‘zamechaniia na proekt . . .,’” *Sanktpeterburgskiiia vedomosti*, no. 95 (May 4, 1862), pp. 433–34.

57. Pirogov wrote this eight months after the appearance of articles by P. L. Lavrov and O. Milchevsky, in which they contended that student evaluation of teaching ability should be the major consideration in appointments. In a proposal similar to those aimed at later professorial “establishments,” Milchevsky concluded: “Let anyone who wants to be a faculty professor give lectures, along with other competitors, for one semester; then let the number of students he attracts determine whether he is professorial material.” “Neskol’ko zametok starago studenta po povodu ‘zamechaniia Pirogova . . .,’” *Sanktpeterburgskiiia vedomosti*, no. 87 (Apr. 25, 1862), p. 396. See also Lavrov, “Zametka na zamechaniia g. Pirogova,” *Sanktpeterburgskiiia vedomosti*, no. 84 (Apr. 21, 1862), p. 383.

58. *ZhZUK*, app., p. 268; *Ustav 1863*, art. 71.

for degrees, and to teach the same courses as professors—the students being given freedom to choose between them.⁵⁹

Similarly, Pirogov argued that tenure and reappointment should be based on competition. In criticizing the practice of twenty-five-year appointments, Pirogov consistently asserted the need for re-evaluation of a professor's work at mid-career. He recommended that a professor be retired at half-pension at the end of thirteen or fifteen years if he had failed to publish at least one serious monograph and to prepare at least one docent in his field of specialization.⁶⁰ To objections that the Germans had no such system, he replied, "True, in the West a chair is for life. . . . But we have some who wear out and expire more quickly than anywhere else. In our universities twenty-five years is a century."⁶¹ Those who wished to continue teaching beyond their twenty-fifth year and to receive, in addition to full pension, a salary for this work, ought to be required to "compete on a level with other candidates in a public contest, submitting for the competition written works produced recently or within the last ten years." Re-election of a professor after twenty-five years of service and at five-year intervals thereafter should require a three-fourths majority of the council. The one concession he was willing to allow a professor blackballed at fifteen or twenty-five years was the right to appeal the adverse decision "to all the councils of our universities; [these councils] might also give their opinion and participate in the elections, if the scholarly merits of the appellant are well known to them."⁶² Pirogov did not elaborate the mechanics of such a system of appeals, nor did he attempt to reconcile this apparent contradiction with his belief in the autonomy of each university council.

On the statutory provision authorizing the council to recommend dismissal of teachers for negligence, Pirogov noted that neither the incompetent nor the lazy had any cause to worry. They might even count on re-election by

59. TsGIAL, fond 733, op. 88, d. 236, Pirogov, "O dotsentakh (Jan. 2, 1860)," in "Protokol zasedaniia komissii v sostave dekanov fakul'tetov po rasmotreniiu i obsuzhdeniiu predstavlenykh . . . popechitelem Pirogovym zapisok . . .," pp. 1–4.

60. "Vzgliad na obshchii ustav," p. 44; "Zamechaniia Pirogova na proekt" (Apr. 6, 1862), p. 346; *Univ. vopros*, pp. 374, 438. There was no shortage of complaints against this proposal. See, for example, N. Kh. Bunge, "Otvét na stat'iu Pirogova . . .," *Sanktpeterburgskiiia vedomosti*, no. 95 (May 4, 1862), p. 434; Russkii professor [anonymous], "O proekte novago ustava . . . po povodu zamechanii Pirogova," *Sanktpeterburgskiiia vedomosti*, no. 119 (June 5, 1862), p. 531; G. Tsunk, "Neskol'ko slov po povodu zamechanii Pirogova . . .," *Severnaia pchela*, no. 186 (July 12, 1862), p. 742.

61. *Univ. vopros*, p. 438.

62. "Vzgliad na obshchii ustav," p. 45 (quotations). Pirogov's proposal that re-election be based on a three-fourths majority was the most draconian suggestion offered. Majorities at all universities favored use of a simple majority vote for retention of a professor in service. *Zamechaniia na proekt*, 1:80, 113, 168–69, 249, 257, 305, 383–84; *Kievskii universitet*, "Protokoly soveta marta 6–13," *Univ. izvestiia*, March 1862, sec. 1, pp. 23–25, 31.

indulgent colleagues at the end of each five-year period because of the self-protective nature of the corporation. "The council," he noted, "never excluded any of its members for negligence."⁶³ However, neither Pirogov nor anyone else suggested a realistic alternative, and the provision was included in the new statute with little change.⁶⁴ Basically, Pirogov was more interested in determining the methods of correct recruitment and reappointments than in defining the procedures for correcting mistakes already made, especially since these touched so closely on the question of individual academic freedom.

By the end of 1861 the "student problem" and the "university problem" had become synonymous expressions. The revision of Russia's university statute occurred during a period of increased student activism and politicalization, the causes of which were numerous and cannot be detailed in this study. It must suffice here to note that from 1855 the government relaxed Nicholas's restrictions on university enrollment and on access to lecture halls by auditors and women without adopting an overall plan to control the resultant influx of students and spectators. Simultaneously, buoyed by a mood of rising expectations and a sense of social responsibility, students began to organize associations and fund-raising projects, which, though officially "illegal," had the tacit encouragement of Kovalevsky and several curators, including Pirogov. Students became conscious of their collective power and of the relative powerlessness of the university inspector and his assistants—functionaries who could neither comprehend nor cope with the new activism. Spontaneous direct action evolved as a feature of student life in the late 1850s. The student boycott, used initially against incompetent or derelict professors, became political and gave way in 1858 to student strikes and street demonstrations. After five years of indecision and temporizing, the government authorized a general crackdown in the summer of 1861, whose major features were the extension of the fifty-ruble tuition fee to all incoming students and the adoption of Putiatin's regulations forbidding public lectures, student meetings, or any collective act by students. The fall semester opened at all universities, except Dorpat, to the accompaniment of student rallies and demonstrations to defend what the students had by then come to consider their "rights." Violent clashes with the police and the military followed, and St. Petersburg University was shut down. The student disorders were, of course, terminated, but by means which further embarrassed the "tsar liberator."⁶⁵

Pirogov, like most of his contemporaries, agonized over the origins and

63. "Zamechaniia Pirogova na proekt" (Apr. 6, 1862), p. 346; "Vzgliad na obshchii ustav," pp. 43 (quotation), 46.

64. *Ustav 1863*, art. 81.

65. Mathes, "The Origins of Confrontation Politics in Russian Universities: Student Activism, 1855–1861," *Canadian Slavic Studies*, 2, no. 1 (Spring 1968): 28–45.

nature of student unrest, but unlike the majority of his professional colleagues he offered solutions that were aimed at giving students still more freedom—solutions which had no chance of being adopted while student activism was moving steadily toward student disruptiveness.

In February 1859, in a report to Kovalevsky, Pirogov noted that corporatism was a characteristic of any student body, everywhere maintained by group interest in science (still comparatively weak in Russia), by special privileges granted by the government, and by nationalism: “So long as one or more of these conditions maintains the corporative spirit of students, clashes of students with other persons not belonging to the university and with other classes which are also more or less corporative (for example, the military) are inevitable.” In his opinion there were only two methods of preventing, or at least minimizing, such clashes. One would be to organize the student corporation in such a way that students would help to maintain corporate discipline through self-government, student proctors, university courts, and philanthropic and cultural clubs. The second method would be to eliminate, insofar as possible, corporatism by abolishing those outward forms that tended to give students a sense of class-consciousness but did nothing to improve scholarship. This would involve, in short, the creation of an open university with no entrance examinations or time limitations, the abolition of required courses, prescribed dress, and *chin*, the complete freedom of choice in selection of courses and teachers, and the subordination of all those attending lectures at the university to general police regulations. He preferred the second method, believing that it would free the university of the unenforceable obligation to oversee the behavior of an ever-increasing student population and that “the very name of student would in time be replaced by *visitor or auditor of public lectures*.”⁶⁶ Since the desire to eliminate class privilege was everywhere apparent, why, he asked, should the university lag behind? If the university were to exercise any moral influence over students, it could only be through scholarly pursuits and not by relying on beaules and inspectors. Above all, the worst method would be to adopt half measures and attempt to combine both systems—for example, simply to abolish the university police but retain tuition fees, entrance examinations, and restricted access to the university. These were measures that perpetuated among young people the corporate spirit and “a medieval sense of immunity” from local and military police.⁶⁷

66. TsGIAL, fond 733, op. 88, d. 213 (g. 1859), pp. 34a, 40a (quotations).

67. *Ibid.*, pp. 41a, 45–49. The government chose, however, to adopt half measures. In this particular case Kovalevsky issued an ordinance in May 1859 that placed students under the authority of the city police when outside the walls of the university, but left disciplinary control within the university to the demoralized inspectors. In approving the ordinance Alexander ordered that governors see to it that “the local police deal leniently

Pirogov was among Russia's most vocal champions of *Lernfreiheit*, or freedom of the student in the matter of studies, and his educational philosophy was *laissez faire*. His proposals for the selection of professors and docents by open competition, the introduction of a system of honoraria, and the creation of a thriving privatdocentship rested on two propositions—freedom for the teacher and freedom for the student. He opposed setting any age requirement for admission to the university and rejected the entrance examination as a waste of time.⁶⁸ Although he conceded that unqualified persons would at first pour into the university, he believed that rigorous examinations for degrees would soon force them to drop out.⁶⁹

Pirogov's preference for seminars over lectures and his opposition to repetitive, end-of-term tests aimed also at giving students greater academic freedom.⁷⁰ He objected to required courses in general and to compulsory attendance at theology lectures in particular.⁷¹ "In the past," he wrote, "they compelled students by coercion to appear at lectures, they shouted at them, locked them in with the professor, but this moved no one. They then subjected students to examinations several times a year. This forced them to study for the examinations, but they still were not educated."⁷² He was opposed to the tuition fee as a "tax on the right to study," but added that if the government felt obliged for reasons of economy to retain it, a fractional fee would be fairer—a fee based on the number of courses a student could afford and wished to attend. The fee for a given course should be uniform whether the course was taught by a professor or by a docent.⁷³

In the right of students to voice their opinion Pirogov saw one corrective to professorial stagnation and mediocrity. "An autonomous university," he wrote in December 1862, "is inconceivable without the public opinion of students." Admittedly, the relaxation under the new tsar had created a situation in which students had begun to evaluate professors according to their political views. But he saw this as only a transitional phenomenon. "The university," he asserted, "is obliged to lend an ear to the voice of students, in which, despite all the passion, it will always hear enough truth to be able

with university students." *Ibid.*, p. 51 (A. Sukovkin to Kovalevsky); *Sbornik postanovlenii po Ministerstvu narodnago prosveshcheniia* (St. Petersburg, 1866–67), vol. 3, no. 206, pp. 419–20.

68. *Univ. vopros*, pp. 380, 416, 444; "Zamechaniia Pirogova na proekt" (Apr. 6, 1862), p. 346.

69. "Chego my zhelaem?" pp. 233–34.

70. *Ibid.*, pp. 229–36; "Vzgliad na obshchii ustav," pp. 49–50; "Iz Geidel'berga," *Golos*, nos. 282 and 283 (Oct. 25 and 26, 1863), pp. 1114, 1117.

71. TsGIAL, fond 733, op. 70, d. 966, "Ob osvobozhdenii medinskikh [sic] studentov . . . ot obiazannosti slushat' leksii iz bogosloviia," pp. 1–2; "Zamechaniia Pirogova na proekt" (Apr. 5, 1862), p. 340; *Univ. vopros*, pp. 444, 451–52, 461–62.

72. *Univ. vopros*, p. 416.

73. *Ibid.*, pp. 434–35. The annual fee was fifty rubles in the capitals, forty elsewhere.

to evaluate the worth of its teachers, and this voice will always be one of the very best safeguards against backwardness and stagnation." Continued suppression of student opinion would only lead "to illegal manifestations of that opinion, to renewed outbursts of disorders."⁷⁴

The paternalistic attitude which Pirogov opposed was reflected in a decision by the von Bradke commission to include in the draft statute Nicholas's ban on "expressions of approval or disapproval of lectures."⁷⁵ Regarding this article Pirogov asked, "How can you prohibit students from pleasantly and courteously expressing their approval to a teacher after a lecture?"⁷⁶ French students applauded and German students rapped their fingers on the desk as a sign of approval. These were permitted; whereas catcalls, stamping of feet, and hissing were everywhere taken as signs of disrespect. "However," Pirogov added, "the so-called '*heraustrommeln*' [the hooting out] of a professor from class is not taken seriously in some German universities, and the matter is usually settled by reconciliation." Instead of a formal law he suggested that the whole matter be left up to the teacher, because "a ban will impart to fits of simple animation—sometimes spontaneous and quite innocent—the serious character of insubordination to the law." Even if one viewed the lecture hall as a quiet, intellectual sanctuary, "one could not repudiate the right of a reflective audience to voice its opinion."⁷⁷

When it became clear in 1861 that the government would not abandon the traditional forms of student control for an "open university," Pirogov worked to help define the proper organization of the student corporation by which the traditional system might be salvaged. This required the adoption by the university of only those rules for student conduct which could actually be enforced, and the legalization of the prohibited but *de facto* student rights to form loan banks, libraries, and benefit concerts, and to hold meetings to organize such agencies of mutual assistance. It would be more realistic, in his opinion, to authorize the establishment of student associations and circles, but under the supervision of elected university authorities.⁷⁸

The von Bradke commission included in its draft version of the statute a graduated list of disciplinary penalties, ranging from admonition to expulsion from all Russian universities.⁷⁹ Pirogov found the list archaic and poorly reasoned—noting, for example, that university arrest or lock-up was no longer feasible as a disciplinary measure. According to Pirogov, university authorities could realistically commit themselves only to prosecute violators of discipline

74. *Ibid.*, pp. 415, 417, 418–19 (quotations).

75. *Proekt*, art. 122.

76. "Zamechaniia Pirogova na proekt" (Apr. 6, 1862), p. 346.

77. *Univ. vopros*, pp. 417–18 (quotations).

78. TsGIAL, fond 733, op. 88, d. 213 (g. 1859), p. 44a; *Univ. vopros*, pp. 455–59.

79. *Proekt*, art. 123.

within the university and not to the unenforceable responsibility “to supervise students” as stated in the draft.⁸⁰ Yet, in seeming contradiction, he agreed at another point with a proposal to extend university jurisdiction over student conduct outside the university in order to avoid the greater evil of subjecting students to one set of disciplinary standards within the university and another beyond its walls. He asserted that a dual system of discipline would only further weaken the moral-training function of the university, the function frequently mentioned by opponents of an open, noncorporative university.⁸¹ The final version of the statute left to the university council the task of adopting regulations governing student conduct within the university and procedures for prosecuting the violators of those rules.⁸²

The statute of 1835 had relieved the faculty of any responsibility in disciplinary matters and had entrusted those duties to the inspector of students. When this system broke down completely during the first years of Alexander’s reign, some professors—Kavelin, Spasovich, Kalinovskiy—urged the creation of university courts on the German model as one means of restoring order, at least within the walls of the university.

Pirogov associated himself with this view. At Kiev University he had encouraged students, as has been noted, to set up a “conscience court.” Though preferring the “open university,” Pirogov felt that such a court might help restore confidence in the traditional disciplinary system. In his report to Kovalevskiy in 1859 he explained that the conscience court, patterned after the German model, should be chaired by a judge elected by the professors; it should hear all cases involving infractions of rules governing morality and honor. A higher “university court”—such as existed in the Russian Empire only at Dorpat—should be created to handle all serious misdemeanors except criminal cases subject to tribunals outside the university.⁸³

The statute of 1863 authorized a university court with jurisdiction over internal disciplinary cases. Pirogov was not sanguine about what the university court could accomplish, and he was certain that it would not work unless it was allowed to develop in accordance with regional customs and unless the professor-judges elected by the university council enjoyed great confidence among students for fairness and moral authority.⁸⁴

Pirogov also felt that it was essential to allow the university to select the official primarily responsible for enforcement of discipline. There were,

80. “Zamechaniia Pirogova na proekt” (Apr. 6, 1862), p. 346.

81. *Univ. vopros*, pp. 459–60. See also *ZhZUK*, app., p. 148; *Zamechaniia na proekt*, 1:139, 182; N. L. [N. A. Liubimov], “Zamechaniia o russkikh universitetakh,” *Moskovskie vedomosti*, no. 280 (Dec. 21, 1861), pp. 2278–79.

82. *Ustav 1863*, arts. 42-B(8), 59, 99–100.

83. TsGIAL, fond 733, op. 88, d. 213 (g. 1859), pp. 35a–36.

84. *Univ. vopros*, pp. 452–53, 458–60.

according to Pirogov, only two alternatives: “either to leave the supervision over compliance with university rules to the university itself while it has not yet entirely lost moral influence over the minds of young people or to open the university, the same as other public institutions, to general police surveillance.” Although the second method was incompatible with university autonomy, it would be better than to attempt to combine the two, as in the past, in the person of an outside appointee.⁸⁵

The government adopted an awkward compromise which authorized each university council to pick an official to superintend the fulfillment of disciplinary regulations—either a prorector, elected for a three-year term from among the professors themselves, or an inspector, elected for an indefinite term from among outside *chinovniki*, both subject to confirmation by the minister.⁸⁶ The consistent emphasis by Pirogov on the recourse to “moral influence” in disciplining young people sprang from the realization that the alternative—physical force—was no longer feasible. Consequently, he placed considerable hope in the stabilizing effect of a duly elected, responsible disciplinarian. The moral bond between professors and students had been broken by repeated disorders from 1858 on, and it could not be easily restored. Much depended on the ability of the council to compose reasonable regulations, the ability of the men elected to enforce them, and the willingness of the curator and other extra-university authorities to keep their hands off university affairs.⁸⁷

Disciplinary and academic regulations adopted in the months immediately after the introduction of the new statute demonstrated how little justification there was for such hope on Pirogov’s part. As a result of the disruptions of 1861, the fires of 1862 (which some attributed to students), and the Polish rebellion of 1863, student credit was at a new low. The Ministry and the councils adopted regulations which combined the two approaches toward student corporationism against which Pirogov had warned. Golovnin, criticized as Kovalevsky had been in 1861 for being too lenient with students, issued a directive to the university councils in July 1863 which forbade corporate student activities. The councils were instructed to draft disciplinary rules forbidding the “presenting of addresses, dispatching of so-called deputations, or exhibiting any kind of declarations in the name of students.” All student meetings, concerts, smoking rooms, theatricals, or loan banks on university

85. “Zamechaniia Pirogova na proekt” (Apr. 6, 1862), p. 346. See also TsGIAL, fond 733, op. 88, d. 240, “Po proektu novago poriadka izbraniia i podchineniia inspektora studentov v universitetakh,” pp. 26–28a (Pirogov’s proposals, Nov. 22, 1860).

86. *Ustav 1863*, arts. 63–64. This wording was necessitated by the fact that no professor at St. Petersburg University, closed during the riots of 1861, would agree to serve as prorector.

87. TsGIAL, fond 733, op. 88, d. 240, p. 27a.

premises were strictly forbidden, as were any expressions of approval or disapproval of lectures. Strict degree examinations were called for, and sessions of the university court were to be held behind closed doors.⁸⁸

In addition to adopting the minister's directive, the university councils reintroduced the matriculation booklets and restored the hierarchical list of penalties provided in the von Bradke draft but dropped from the Voronov version of the statute. The councils restored course examinations, mid-year and final examinations, required courses, attendance records (at Kiev), age restrictions on admissions, and the ban on female students and auditors.⁸⁹ Measures which had been adopted under Putiatin as "provisional" rules became permanent regulations by the end of 1863, and this time with the sanction of the university councils.

Writing from Heidelberg at the end of 1863, Pirogov did not conceal his anger over the newly adopted student regulations, especially those governing strictly academic matters: "When I read these rules the words of Napoleon regarding the Bourbons suddenly came to mind. Clearly, the Bourbons are not alone in being unable to forget the past." If increased faculty participation resulted simply in the perpetuation of old restrictions, what would happen to Russian higher education? "Here," he ironically exclaimed, "are the first signs of the university autonomy in which I, an old dreamer, so ardently seek the salvation of our universities from routine and formalism!"⁹⁰

Pirogov was neither a revolutionary nor a radical, yet from the very outset his public career was an embarrassment to the government of Alexander II. Forever goading the new regime to make good on its progressive promises, the "miraculous doctor" of Sevastopol was shifted from Odessa to Kiev, then to St. Petersburg, and finally to Heidelberg by the tsar and ministers of education who were not at all certain what to do with him. There was always a bit of the "missionary" about Pirogov, whose crusading zeal was lavished at Odessa and Kiev on educational experiments that alarmed the local hierarchy and then the court. Valued by the educated public as much for his applied pedagogics as for his pedagogical theories, Pirogov was too famous to silence and too "dangerous" to leave in one place. While his views on university government were being debated in Russia, he was kept in semi-exile

88. *Sbornik raspriazhenii po Ministerstvu narodnago prosveshcheniia* (St. Petersburg, 1866–67), vol. 3, no. 577, pp. 562–63 (quotation), 563–64.

89. "Pravila i instruktsii, sostavlennyya sovetami universitetov: S.-peterburgskago, sv. Vladimira, Kazanskago i Khar'kovskago . . ." *ZhMNP*, vol. 120 (October–December 1863), app., pp. 1–94; "Pravila moskovskago universiteta," *Golos*, no. 107 (Apr. 17, 1864).

90. "Iz Geidel'berga," *Golos*, no. 317 (Nov. 29, 1863), p. 1255.

in the West. Three years after the adoption of the university statute, to which his views had contributed significantly, he was dropped from the Ministry's roster.

In some areas he was almost as embarrassing to the Russian professorial establishment. The principle of university autonomy, which he eloquently espoused, was accepted by the great majority of professors as the necessary foundation for any university reform. But the majority did not share his views on the need to decentralize the university system, to remove the university from the civil service hierarchy, to enlarge the area of the university's budgetary duties, and to increase competitiveness for faculty appointments.

Conversely, Russia's chief advocate of university autonomy had serious reservations about the collective ability of the professors of his day to make selfless, correct decisions for the good of the university and of scholarship, especially in the determination of faculty membership. In principle, he opposed interference in university affairs by the curator; in practice, he overruled majority opinion in the law faculty of Kiev University in matters of recruitment. Similarly, his insistence on repeated competition at every level reflected the fear that existing university councils might not be able to discipline and renew themselves. He constantly urged that a professor's work be re-evaluated at mid-career, that re-election beyond twenty-five years be based on a three-fourths majority, and that the positions of privatdocent and docent be made truly competitive with that of professor. These proposals, to none of which a majority agreed, resulted from his belief that autonomy alone could not prevent stagnation and nepotism.

The final version of the statute maintained the unitary, centralized university system, with a uniform curriculum prescribed by law. Especially after the Polish rebellion, the plural, regional experiment which Pirogov proposed had no chance of being revived. The statute of 1863 did restore to the universities a measure of the self-government they had enjoyed before 1835, relative to the election of their own officials, the determination of faculty membership, and the formulation of educational policies. All such activities were, however, subject to control by the curator or the minister. Professors received higher salaries and upgraded service ranks. In terms of Pirogov's recommendations the statute failed to give the universities a deliberative voice at the ministerial level, it left too much power in the hands of the curator, and it rendered the public competition for academic posts meaningless, because it failed to make the privatdocentship attractive and because the system of tenure and reappointments was overwhelmingly weighted to favor incumbents.

Pirogov's plea for academic and social rights for students was completely disregarded. Alarmed by student disorders, administrators and faculty were by 1861 reluctant even to distinguish, as Pirogov did, between expressions of

student opinion and demonstrations. His ideas were not put into practice in 1863, but they were to serve as points of reference during the subsequent fifty-year debate on the “student problem.” Perhaps his utter rejection of the paternal principle in Russian higher education was unrealistic, given the educational legacy of Nicholas I and the confusion arising from the quixotic policy of Alexander II. In any event, he best presented the case for relaxation of tutelary control over students, at least in purely academic matters.