Russian Studies in History, vol. 46, no. 1, Summer 2007, pp. 62–75.

ISSN 1061–1983/2007 $9.50 + 0.00.
DOI 10.2753/RSH1061-1983460104

A.V. Mamonov

The Autocracy in Reformist Policy and Plans, 1880–1881

It is impossible to imagine Russian or foreign historiography of the political struggle in the reform period minus the works of Petr Andreevich Zaionchkovskii. *The Russian Autocracy in Crisis, 1878–1882* [title of Russian original: Krizis samoderzhaviia na rubezhe 1870–1880 godov],* deservedly considered his best monograph, offered a careful review of the basic government measures taken during that period, with particular attention to the policy of Count Mikhail Tarielovich Loris-Melikov and uncovered an extensive set of previously unknown sources, both official and private, without which, one now imagines, the events of 1878–82 would be largely unintelligible.

Another distinctive feature of Professor Zaionchkovskii's works was that, for all the thoroughness and detail of the picture they painted, they did not "close the book" on research into any topic but, on the contrary, "opened it up," as it were, for further study. In creating his own "school," Zaionchkovskii also presented his students and successors with a broad sphere of activity. Relative to the events of the late 1870s, that activity primarily involves an analysis of the motivations behind governmental policy, the way that the policy's goals and methods were conceptualized by the ruling bureaucracy, and the manner in which those goals and

English translation © 2007 M.E. Sharpe, Inc., from the Russian text "Samoderzhavie v politike i zamyslakh reformatorov 1880–1881 godov." The Russian version of this article will appear in a forthcoming volume *Rossiiskaia imperiia XIX–nachala XX vekov,* ed. L.G. Zakharova, S.V. Mironenko, and Terence Emmons (Moscow: Rosspen, 2007). Translated by Liv Bliss.

*See note 1 for bibliographic information.—Ed.

methods were linked with the policy pursued during the Era of the Great Reforms of 1860–70 and with the measures taken in 1881–1905.

On 28 January 1881, as we know, Minister of the Interior Loris-Melikov submitted a report to Alexander II in which he laid out his vision of the mechanism to be used in effecting the proposed changes. Proceeding by the normal bureaucratic route would have automatically ruined the whole undertaking, since virtually every issue that Loris-Melikov broached in 1880 and 1881 had been repeatedly raised throughout the 1860s and 1870s, only to be scuttled in various committees and commissions. A mechanism was needed that would, on the one hand, ensure that the reforms would respond to society's needs and expectations and, on the other, avoid the emasculation and prolonged delays that the schemes would suffer while various departments worked endlessly toward agreement. The 28 January report suggested a solution for that dual challenge.

While the report is more than famous and has been meticulously elucidated by professors Zaionchkovskii, Zakharova, and Chernukha and by an array of other scholars, several circumstances associated with its preparation and its intent have thus far been overlooked.[1] Those circumstances are partially revealed in a letter written by Vladimir Mikhailovich Iuzefovich, vice director of the Department of Police, to Senator Mikhail Evgrafovich Kovalevskii, who enjoyed Loris-Melikov's particular trust. The letter's original, dated 31 January 1881, is held in the Manuscript Division of the Russian National Library (f. 1004, d. 42).

"The major event of the current moment," Iuzefovich writes, rather inelegantly,

> is the memorandum presented by the count to the sovereign, in which he, with reference to the method adopted to resolve the peasant issue, proposes, on conclusion of the Senate inspection, to begin by forming two commissions, one administrative and the other financial, summoning to them both officials in service and representatives of public institutions, by invitation of the government, and then, those commissions having prepared schemes for the necessary transformations, to invite between three hundred and four hundred people elected by zemstvo assemblies and urban dumas to discuss the drafts and submit them, after having made all the necessary changes and additions, to the State Council. In his memorandum, the count advised that a certain number of representatives of society should also be invited to serve on the State Council, but the sovereign asked him to yield to him on that and, while expressing his full agreement to all the

> rest, forewarned of his assumption there would be a preliminary discussion of the details involving the heir apparent, the count and Miliutin, and then in the Council of Ministers with himself presiding. The assumption is that it will all come off and that the decree itself will be promulgated in short order. . . . Had the count's scheme not been accepted, he was bound and determined promptly to quit the stage.[2]

This news was conveyed as a great secret, "for your eyes only" (the letter was not sent by mail), with the stipulation that "scarcely five or six people" knew about it.[3]

The work on the report had, to all appearances, begun in late 1880 (which was, incidentally, the very dating that Loris-Melikov put on his scheme in a letter to Apollon Aleksandrovich Skal′kovskii).[4] In any event, Ivan Loginovich Goremykin, who was sent to St. Petersburg in December 1880 by Senator Ivan Ivanovich Shamshin (who was at the time conducting his inspection of Saratov and Samara provinces) and returned to the Volga on 12 January 1881, said that "C[oun]t M.T. L[oris]-M[elikov] is planning to form a commission to discuss the issue of the necessary reforms even before the senators complete their inspections."[5] On 26 February 1881, in a letter to Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Polovtsov (who was inspecting Kiev and Chernigov provinces), Shamshin set forth the content of Goremykin's "protracted conversation" with Loris-Melikov in greater detail: "From that conversation he learned," Shamshin wrote, "that a report has already been compiled on the commission or committee that was being spoken of when we left and it is scheduled to be set up on 19 February. G[oremykin] objected to the latter recommendation, saying that it was necessary to wait until we had finished our work. The objection was accepted, accompanied by the expression of a desire that the work should result in *positive recommendations* that will provide material for the commission's work."[6] "The organized work will begin on your return," Mikhail Semenovich Kakhanov informed Mikhail Evgrafovich Kovalevskii on 30 January 1881, "by which time, the working method will have been readied in the most satisfactory form possible."[7]

All this prompts us to surmise that the underlying premise of the 28 January report had taken its overall form back in August 1880, when Loris-Melikov, in his new capacity as minister of the interior, had persuaded the emperor to dispatch senatorial inspection teams into several provinces, with the aim of "discerning the general incommodities of our provincial governmental order." The inspectors were authorized to inspect all official domains except the military and the ecclesiastical and

were otherwise limited only by time constraints. They were supplied with a voluminous set of instructions that reflected the issues on which they were to collect their data.[8] The four senators handpicked by Loris-Melikov as inspectors were experienced, energetic, and ambitious men of more or less liberal views who belonged to the generation of civil servants that had come of age prior to the era of the Great Reforms. Two of them—Kovalevskii and Shamshin—Loris-Melikov knew well and respected for the work they had done on the Supreme Executive Commission,* and the other two—Polovtsov and S.A. Mordvinov—had been referred by Kakhanov and Kovalevskii.[9]

The idea for the senatorial inspections had apparently come from Kakhanov, who, Polovtsov wrote after speaking with him in early August, "deems it useful in regenerating the complement of governors to appoint senatorial inspection teams that will dismiss governors based not on rumors and innuendo but on thoroughgoing and affirmative data."[10] Loris-Melikov, however, decided to present the inspectors with a broader mandate. "Your inspection," he explained to them on 17 August, "will not be a simple Senate inspection, such as has been held hitherto. Here the matter in hand is not to prosecute and remove from their positions individuals who have perpetrated some malfeasance. No, here you must look at ways to eliminate the general incommodities of our provincial order, to bring into unity, into agreement everything wherein the legislative power may not have pursued a single direction in recent times."[11] Loris-Melikov gave them unambiguously to understand that he looked on the Senate inspections as an instrument of his internal political program.

In his opinion, "not only must the reforms of the 1860s be cleansed of the latter-day scanting and accretions of legislation by circular but there must also be further development of the principles whereon those reforms were founded."[12] "The Great Reforms of Your Majesty's reign," he observed later, in the 28 January report, "remain until now in part incomplete and in part mutually discrepant."[13] He constantly emphasized that, unless they were accepted as having descended from the Great Reforms, the initiatives of 1880 and 1881 would surely be misunderstood, while at the same time he warned against confusing the "founding principles with the inevitable shortcomings" of the reforms.

---

*Alexander II created the Supreme Executive Commission in February 1880 to repress the revolutionary movement. It was abolished six months later.—Ed.

Loris-Melikov was convinced that the first step in eliminating the shortcomings must be an "immediate review of the entire Zemstvo Statute, of municipal self-government, and even of the provincial institutions." "On them," he surmised, "the whole matter rests, and to their correct configuration all our future well-being and tranquillity is bound."[14] The provincial reform, which was predicated on the reorganization of local administrative and social institutions on all levels, was the central link in Loris-Melikov's program.

His idea was "to reduce the number of officials in the various provincial departments and combine the administration into one United Assembly with the additional participation of elected representatives."[15] The involvement of zemstvo representatives in the decision making of a United Assembly (or a "central provincial administration") was intended to breach the insularity of the zemstvo institutions, which, while retaining their independence, would thus become part of a single system of local government. Yet the United Assembly was conceived not as an institutionalized way of subordinating the zemstvos to the provincial administration but as a form of cooperation that would end the face-off between social and state institutions. Looking forward, it would also prevent the zemstvos from becoming a center of antigovernmental opposition.

But for that to happen, zemstvo and municipal self-government would have to be transformed. "When I was [governor-]gen[eral] in Kharkov," Loris-Melikov told the four senators, "I became convinced that the populace was displeased with the zemstvos, which cost it dear and did little, and there too I saw that the zemstvo was an object of mere contempt in the eyes of the chief organs of power." The senators' job would be to establish "whether the zemstvo had deservedly earned that reputation and whether its activity could not be rendered more fruitful."[16]

The instruction that Kakhanov compiled for the senators spoke of the "discerned variance between the results of the zemstvo institutions' activity and the expectations of government and society that had attended their inauguration." The senators were advised to "direct their attention to the causes of that phenomenon," to study the advisability of modifying the procedures of election to zemstvo institutions, of widening their range of activity, of offering the zemstvos in the various provinces the option of coordinating their actions, and so forth. Here also was broached the issue of revising the Municipal Statute of 1870.[17]

The goal of the reform of local self-government was seen as "reinvigorating its activity and positioning it appropriately in the ranks of local

institutions." It was a matter not of curtailing but of further developing the "all-estate zemstvo" [*vsesoslovnoe zemstvo*] that had been created during the Great Reforms. That, however, was possible only if it were to interact, closely and constantly, with the central governmental organs. Such was the mission of the provincial reform.

As the reform progressed, the Corps of Gendarmes, which had been in limbo since the abolition [in 1880—Ed.] of the Third Section of His Imperial Majesty's Own Chancellery, was to be placed in the "appropriate position" in the provincial administration. "At present," Loris-Melikov said in the autumn of 1880, "the gendarmes, feeling that their days are numbered, have become entirely inactive." As part of his drive to unify the provincial administration he wanted to have the gendarme field officers report to the governors, promoting them to the position of provincial chiefs of police and concentrating in their hands all the power to police the provinces, while the rank-and-file gendarmes would supervise the rural constables. He expected this to result in a qualitative rejuvenation of the police force and its activity, since, as he told the senators, "no one has ever called the gendarmes corruptible."[18] Thus would the Corps of Gendarmes become firmly entrenched in the state's administrative system. Meanwhile, though, as of the fall of 1880, the heads of the provincial gendarme directorates were being instructed to forward their reports to the Department of the State Police via the governors.

The consolidation of governmental power in the localities and the systematic cooperation of that power with the zemstvo and municipal self-government would, in the reformers' minds, enable a certain degree of administrative decentralization, which would free the central government from oversight of a multitude of cases that were of exclusively local interest. Loris-Melikov was additionally pondering the "degree of necessity and usefulness that would attach to reviving the post of procurator from Catherine's time." The procurator would monitor the "legality" of the administration's actions and their conformity to the aspects of government.[19] He viewed the senatorial inspection, too, as a means of consolidating power in the localities. "The solicited inspection," he wrote to Skal′kovskii in the autumn of 1881, "has served as a clear expression of the government's intent henceforth to superintend and coordinate the actions of local institutions and individuals."[20]

Even before Loris-Melikov's promotion in the government, a bill for provincial reform had been drawn up by Kakhanov, who had developed the idea of uniting the provincial administration in a "most loyal"

[*vsepoddanneishii*] report submitted by Aleksandr Ageevich Abaza (chairman of the Commission to Reduce Expenditures) to Alexander II on 11 June 1879.[21] In 1880 Polovtsov had called provincial reform Kakhanov's "pet idea."[22] During the compilation and discussion of the instruction to the four inspectors (which took a whole two months), Kakhanov, as Polovtsov tells us, "emphatically posed the question of the need to set up a single provincial institution capable of replacing the institutions of various types and various vintages that have accumulated in the hinterland." He also mooted the "need for that institution to include an elected element."[23]

Anatolii Nikolaevich Kulomzin, deputy minister for state domains, who knew Kakhanov well from his service on the Committee of Ministers, informed his superior, Prince A.N. Liven, as early as August 1880, "The scheme to transform local institutions in the provinces will probably be inaugurated very soon. I have grounds for that assumption. Kakhanov has long had that scheme ready."[24] Kulomzin also took it on himself to advise his minister "to embrace the transformation of provincial institutions."[25]

Loris-Melikov, though, saw a need to refine the reform premise, in consideration of the data gathered during the inspections. He was well familiar with the apparatus of local administration from his time as governor of Tver Province, where he had introduced certain province-wide institutions. Also, as interim governor-general in Astrakhan and in Kharkov, he had pointed out the shortcomings of their provincial administrations and the "disharmony of authority" that existed in them. Being well apprised of the complexity of the task, he was insisting on a comprehensive approach and enjoined the senators to present their ideas and what would essentially be their own schemes for provincial reform. In the winter of 1880–81 he reminded them again that his desire "that the work should ultimately lead to positive recommendations" was non-negotiable.

The senators were given a free hand in meeting the tasks before them. Yet, judging from their correspondence, their grasp of those tasks fell neatly in line with Loris-Melikov's expectations. Kovalevskii, whose influence over Loris-Melikov accorded him particular authority among the senators, sent out a circular letter to tell his fellow inspectors that his primary intention was "to deliberate on the chief issues stipulated by the program (i.e., the transformation of the province and district [*uezd*] administrations), to evaluate the activity of the zemstvo institutions, and to determine the extent to which the peasant institutions are achieving

their goals under present conditions." He saw these questions as a single whole and intended to tackle other matters only insofar as they did not distract him from his chief concern.[26]

Semen Aleksandrovich Mordvinov described his own inspection in a circular letter to the other senators: "Attention has been centered mainly on the nature and quantity of correspondence in order to effect a detailed study of the composition and boundaries of the jurisdiction exercised respectively by the Provincial Council and the head of the provincial police. The constables have been studied thoroughly, and intelligence on the police has been verified from responses gathered from peasants, township officials, examining magistrates, and justices of the peace." Mordvinov focused particularly on the zemstvo, not only studying relevant petitions and questioning zemstvo executives but also attending all the meetings of the zemstvo assembly held in the winter of 1880–81. There was, by contrast, "no inspection whatever in the sense of the investigation and punishment of evildoing and irregularities," although Mordvinov did emphasize that "no complaints against the zemstvo had been received."[27]

By the end of 1880 Mordvinov was already dispatching to the other senators his "hastily" drafted "recommendations for the future provincial apparatus, the unification of zemstvo and administration." "An entire system has taken shape most harmoniously in my mind," Mordvinov asserted, apologizing that in the memorandum "much remains unsaid and undeveloped."[28] "From S.A. Mordvinov's memorandum, in which there is much with which I sympathize," Kovalevskii wrote,

> I conclude that he has reached a conclusion on the possibility and utility of appointing a chief of the provincial police. This I can no way seem to get through my head. What that gentleman will do and what the governor will do with that gentleman, if all the governor's personal power relative to administrative matters is transferred to the council and he is left with the police, I absolutely fail to understand. It is impossible to speak of this now because there it too much to be said, but in view of the fact that this issue is being presented as having been ostensibly predetermined, I would deem it exceedingly useful for us to confer in some way, lest our disagreements confound the matter.[29]

Evidently the underlying conception of the reform was still in its formative stages. The senators, far from finalizing it, were not even able to "confer" during Alexander II's reign. They were to return to the issue

of provincial reform under circumstances that differed completely from those of 1880, as members of the Kakhanov Commission.*

But none of the inspectors except Mordvinov found time to compile any recommendations in the winter of 1880–81. Kovalevskii was only in the data-collection phase and shortly thereafter was dispatched on an inspection of Ufa Province, where his job would be to investigate the scandalous misappropriation of Bashkir lands, which impinged on the interests of a whole array of highly placed dignitaries. Polovtsov was embroiled in a conflict with Mikhail Ivanovich Chertkov, governor-general of Kiev, who perceived the inspection as a personal insult and was hedging it about with obstacles of every kind. Shamshin had been obliged to concentrate on finding solutions for the food supply issue, which the famine in the provinces he was inspecting had rendered especially acute. Even so, though, he never forgot the inspection's main goal. "I think," he wrote, sharing his hopes with the other senators in late February 1881, "that in my work I will arrive at recommendations of an exceedingly radical nature relative to the zemstvo, the office of justice of the peace, and the police. I shall not write of those recommendations at this time, since they are only ranging around in my mind . . . I shall say only that I see no way out unless changes are made in the office of justice of the peace."[30] Those recommendations "of an exceedingly radical nature" were already being developed on Shamshin's behalf in 1880 by Ivan Goremykin and Konstantin Arsen′ev.

For all his concern about the political significance of the inspections, Loris-Melikov was also worried about the scope of their final results. "Count Mikh[ail] Tar[ielovich] is ever apprehensive that that inspections may become immersed in minutiae," Kakhanov warned in the autumn of 1880, adding in an aside, "but there are as yet no grounds for such apprehensions."[31] In his diary, Polovtsov made veiled references to Loris-Melikov's view of the inspections' outcome: "He began to express to me his assumptions relative to how, on our return, he would gather all of us senatorial inspectors in conference and would summarize the information we had brought. 'And then,' he said, 'I shall present those conclusions to the sovereign, for his exacting scrutiny. If that is not what you wish, then release me. I shall serve the sovereign and society only for such time as I believe I can be of use.'"[32]

*Created in 1881 to reform provincial administration and disbanded in 1885.—Ed.

What, then, were the essential proposals of Loris-Melikov's 28 January report? In 1881, basing themselves on the senators' "positive recommendations," preparatory commissions were to draft legislation on the "transformation of the local provincial administration," on supplements to the Statutes of 19 February 1861, on a review of the situation in the zemstvos and municipalities, on organizing a national food-supply system, and so forth.[33] January (1882?) was the scheduled time for the convening of a General Commission, which, importantly, was to be given the opportunity to amend the plans, which would then be forwarded to the State Council.[34] The General Commission was to be chaired by the tsesarevich, assisted by Dmitrii Alekseevich Miliutin and Loris-Melikov, who acknowledged that he "feared entrusting anyone with the chairmanship and actually wanted to assume it himself."[35] But even the nominal chairmanship of the heir to the throne (not to mention that the minister of the interior was the actual chairman) divested the commission of any constitutional overtones and equated its opinion to that of the State Council.

"The sovereign [Alexander II—A.M.]," Loris-Melikov told Longin Fedorovich Panteleev, "said to me that this would be deemed insufficient, and I replied, 'Believe me, Sire, there is enough occupation here for three years. This experiment will show the extent to which Russia possesses a class that is sufficiently politically developed.'"[36] Loris-Melikov was therefore reckoning on pushing through in three years the proposals that he had advanced on 28 January 1881 (within a year of his arrival from Kharkov). But did he intend to carry out a more radical or even a constitutional reform in those three years? That is hardly likely, since on more than one occasion, and not only in official reports, he had expressed his conviction that any constitutional venture in Russia would be without foundation. "Both orally and in writing, C[oun]t Lor[is]-Mel[ikov] was always opposed to a constitution and the limitation of autocratic power," Vladimir Mikhailovich Iuzefovich wrote in a confidential letter to his brother Boris after Loris-Melikov's resignation in May 1881.[37]

"I know," he told the senators being sent to perform the inspections, "that there are people who dream of parliaments, of a central duma of the land, but I am not one of them. That task shall fall to our sons and grandsons, while we need only prepare the ground for it."[38] On 1 March 1881, while approving the draft of a governmental communiqué to inform his subjects of the reforms that were in preparation, Alexander II also told his sons (the Grand Dukes Aleksandr and Vladimir), "I have

given my consent to this submission, although I do not hide from myself that we are now on the road to a constitution." However, the ease with which the tsar approved Loris-Melikov's plan, having consented to it in principle as early as January of that year, compels us to think that he, too, was counting on it being a long road, to be traveled not by only his sons but also by his grandsons. Tellingly, Miliutin, noting in his diary Grand Duke Vladimir's account of what his father had said, was puzzled: "I have difficulty explaining what exactly in Loris-Melikov's proposals could appear to the tsar as the germ of a constitution."[39]

Indeed, Loris-Melikov's scheme, with its signal aim of continuing the reforms of the 1860s, was less reminiscent of a constitution than of the autocracy's return to the notion of a monarchy with initiative.[40] The link between Loris-Melikov's proposals and the policy of the 1860s was particularly evident in a draft of the 28 January report, which refers straightforwardly to the need to "execute the general plan of reform" adopted at the beginning of Alexander II's reign. Note was also made that "reforms of such enormous importance as the emancipation of the peasants and the zemstvo, municipal, and judiciary reforms stand in need of mutual harmonization and of continuous improvement in conformity with nascent requirements and manifest shortcomings."[41]

Had the extensive reforms outlined in Loris-Melikov's program been developed and implemented, on government initiative and under government supervision, this would have ruled out, and for a long time, further discussion of the very issue of placing any limitations on the autocracy. "I shall state further," Loris-Melikov wrote to Skal′kovskii as late as October 1881,

> that the more firmly and clearly is posed the issue of an all-estate zemstvo that will be in line with the contemporary conditions of our life, and the sooner zemstvo institutions are established in the rest of the empire's provinces, the greater shall be our guarantee against the strivings of a certain, albeit exceedingly insignificant, portion of society toward a constitutional order that is so unserviceable for Russia. The broad employment of zemstvo institutions will also shield us from the utopian dreams of the devotees of Moscow's days of yore (Aksakov and his adherents), whose desire is to treat the fatherland to an assembly of the land [*zemskii sobor*], with all its appurtenances.[42]

Yet, although viewing the support and cooperation of "society" as a sine qua non for the success of government policy, Loris-Melikov was not at all inclined to review his assessment of social "forces." He remarked

on the ineffectiveness of social institutions both in a report of 11 April 1880 and in the instruction for the senate inspections that were launched on his initiative in August 1880.[43] In the dissatisfaction of society and in the intelligentsia's oppositionist sentiments he saw not the pretensions to power displayed by given social force but, rather, evidence of society's inner weakness and troubled state. That is why Loris-Melikov's reports spoke not of striking a deal with a given segment of society, not of relying on the zemstvos in the campaign against the revolutionary moods of the young but of correcting the shortcomings of postreform arrangements, which had weakened the country and had roused oppositionist sentiments and of surmounting those sentiments, through demonstrating the government's desire and readiness to improve its subjects' situation and to involve "society" itself, in the person of its representatives, in government policy making.

The establishment of a General Commission as suggested by Loris-Melikov would have facilitated the emergence of a "politically developed" class that was loyal to the power structure (which, as a result, never did emerge). The 28 January report actually proposed a solution of that task, which had been articulated by Nikolai Alekseevich Miliutin in late 1861. Miliutin had spoken of the need to create from above and centered on a program of reforms that were far from constitutional in intent, a "government party" capable of balancing the opposition "of the extreme right and the extreme left." "That opposition," Miliutin warned, "is impotent in positive terms but can indisputably make of itself a negative force."[44]

The reform program developed by Loris-Melikov demanded not the limitation of the autocracy's power but, rather, the intensification of its efforts, and Mikhail Tarielovich was fully aware of that. There was, to him, no other force that was capable of making the country safe and effecting the transformations necessary to keep it so. From retirement in Ems, he declared to Ivan Alekseevich Shestakov, "None of the Romanovs is worth a rap, but they are essential to Russia."[45] That characterization, scathing as it was, did indeed reflect the state of affairs in the country and the standard of statesmanship displayed by members of the royal family at that time.

Loris-Melikov expounded his vision for Russia's political development to Anatolii Ivanovich Faresov:

> I take a practical view of the matter, without reference to science or to Europe. To my unmediated intellect it is clear that under Nikolai Pavlovich [Tsar Nicholas I—Trans.], society consisted of Famusovs [a staunchly

> conservative, character in Griboedov's *Woe from Wit*—Trans.], not of Decembrists, that even in 1861 the reforms found us no respecters of the law and were therefore easy to repeal, and that, whatever government there may be at the present time, we must perforce make Russian history with that government, instead of sending away to England for another.[46]

Loris-Melikov's report was endorsed in early February 1881 by a Special Convention under the chairmanship of Count Petr Aleksandrovich Valuev. On 17 February (the very day on which, in 1859, an imperial command had been issued regarding the formation of editing commissions on peasant affairs), Alexander II ratified the Special Convention's report and on 1 March [the day of his assassination—Trans.] approved the draft "government communiqué" on the proposed reforms. The first public announcement was to have been made at a meeting of the Council of Ministers on 4 March 1881, and the communiqué was probably scheduled for publication in the press on 5 March, marking the anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation.

Notes

1. See P. A. Zaionchkovskii, *Krizis samoderzhaviia na rubezhe 1870–1880 godov* (Moscow, 1964), pp. 283–95 [translated by Gary Hamburg as Peter A. Zaionchkovsky, *The Russian Autocracy in Crisis, 1878–1882* (Gulf Breeze, FL: Academic International Press, 1979)—Trans.]; L.G. Zakharova, *Zemskaia kontrreforma 1890 g*. (Moscow, 1968), pp. 64–68; and V.G. Chernukha, *Vnutrenniaia politika tsarizma s serediny 50-kh do nachala 80-kh godov XIX v*. (Leningrad, 1978), pp. 128–30.

2. Manuscript Division, Russian National Library (OR RNB), f. 1004 (M.E. i P.M. Kovalevskie), op. 1, d. 42, ll. 1–2.

3. Ibid.

4. " 'Ispoved′ grafa Loris-Melikova' (pis′mo Loris-Melikova k A.A. Skal′kovskomu 14 oktiabria 1881 g.," *Katorga i ssylka,* 1925, no. 2, p. 121.

5. Institute of Russian Literature [of the Russian Academy of Sciences], Pushkinskii dom (IRLI), f. 359 (K.K. Arsen′ev), d. 525, l. 12.

6. OR RNB, f. 600 (Reviziia senatora A.A. Polovtsova), op. 1, d. 198, l. 7.

7. OR RNB, f. 1004 (M.E. i P.M. Kovalevskie), op. 1, d. 19, ll. 2–3.

8. "Senatorskie revizii 1880 goda," *Russkii arkhiv,* 1912, no. 11, pp. 417–29.

9. The senators divided the provinces up among themselves. Kovalevskii went to Kazan and Kostroma provinces (the latter he later exchanged for Ufa Province), Polovtsov went to Kiev and Chernigov provinces, and Mordvinov went to Voronezh and Tambov provinces. [As previously mentioned, Shamshin went to Saratov and Samara provinces.—Trans.]

10. State Archive of the Russian Federation (GARF), f. 583 (A.A. Polovstov), op. 1, d. 15, ll. 237–41.

11. Ibid., d. 17, ll. 12–17.

12. L.F. Panteleev, "Moi vstrechi s gr. M.T. Loris-Melikovym," *Golos minuvshego,* 1914, no. 8, p. 102.

13. "Konstitutsiia gr. M.T. Loris-Melikova. Materialy dlia ee istorii," *Byloe,* 1918, nos. 4–5, p. 163.
14. "Ispoved′ grafa Loris-Melikova," pp. 119–21.
15. GARF, f. 583 (A.A. Polovstov), op. 1, d. 17, ll. 14–17.
16. Ibid., ll. 16–17.
17. "Senatorskie revizii 1880 goda," pp. 422–23.
18. GARF, f. 583 (A.A. Polovstov), op. 1, d. 17, ll. 183–86.
19. OR RNB, f. 600 (Reviziia senatora A.A. Polovtsova), op. 1, d. 198, ll. 1–2.
20. "Ispoved′ grafa Loris-Melikova," p. 123.
21. Russian State Historical Archive (RGIA), f. 1250 (Bumagi predsedatelei i chlenov Gosudarstvennogo soveta), op. 2, d. 37, ll. 51–52.
22. GARF, f. 583 (A.A. Polovstov), op. 1, d. 17, l. 187.
23. Ibid., ll. 73–75.
24. RGIA, f. 1642 (A.N. Kulomzin), op. 1, d. 17, ll. 16–17.
25. Ibid.
26. OR RNB, f. 600 (Reviziia senatora A.A. Polovtsova), op. 1, d. 4, ll. 6–7.
27. Ibid., d. 180, ll. 1–3.
28. Ibid., d. 198, l. 4. The draft itself was not found.
29. Ibid., d. 4, ll. 6–7.
30. Ibid., d. 254, ll. 6–8.
31. OR RNB, f. 1004 (M.E. i P.M. Kovalevskie), op. 1, d. 17, ll. 7–8.
32. GARF, f. 583 (A.A. Polovstov), op. 1, d. 17, l. 137.
33. "Konstitutsiia gr. M.T. Loris-Melikova," p. 164.
34. Panteleev, "Moi vstrechi s gr. M.T. Loris-Melikovym," pp. 101–2.
35. A.F. Koni, *Sobranie sochinenii* (Moscow, 1968), vol. 5, p. 197.
36. Panteleev, "Moi vstrechi s gr. M.T. Loris-Melikovym," p. 102.
37. OR RNB, f. 1004 (M.E. i P.M. Kovalevskie), op. 1, d. 17, l. 5.
38. GARF, f. 583 (A.A. Polovstov), op. 1, d. 17, ll. 12–17.
39. D.A. Miliutin, *Dnevnik (1881–1882)* (Moscow, 1950), vol. 4, p. 62.
40. For more details, see L.G. Zakharova, "Samoderzhavie i reformy v Rossii, 1861–1874 (K voprosu o vybore puti razvitiia)," in *Velikie reformy v Rossii, 1856–1874* (Moscow, 1992), pp. 24–43 [translated by Daniel Field as "Autocracy and the Reforms of 1861–74 in Russia: Choosing Paths of Development," in *Russia's Great Reforms, 1855–1881,* ed. Ben Eklof, John Bushnell, and Larissa Zakharova (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994), pp. 19–39—Ed.].
41. GARF, f. 589 (M.T. Loris-Melikov), op. 1, d. 96, ll. 20–21.
42. "Ispoved′ grafa Loris-Melikova," p. 120.
43. "Konstitutsiia gr. M.T. Loris-Melikova," p. 157; "Senatorskie revizii 1880 goda," pp. 421–22.
44. "Pis′mo N.A. Miliutina k D.A. Miliutinu (publ. L.G. Zakharovoi)," in *Rossiiskii arkhiv. Istoriia Otechestva v svidetel′stvakh i dokumentakh XVIII–XX vv.,* no. 1, p. 97.
45. OR RNB, f. 856 (I.A. Shestakov), op. 1, d. 7, l. 101.
46. A.I. Faresov, "Dve vstrechi s grafom M.T. Loris-Melikovym," *Istoricheskii vestnik,* 1905, no. 2, p. 500.