Intelligentsia conservatism in the Emancipation period

The intellectual and political atmosphere in the wake of the Crimean War was especially hospitable to the philosophy of reconciliation that had taken shape in the previous decade. The government's decision to emancipate the serfs and to undertake a far-reaching program of related social and political reforms briefly fostered among the intelligentsia a sense of common cause and cooperation and reinforced the tendency of a segment of the intelligentsy to seek a reconciliatory solution to social and intellectual conflicts. In the post-war period, the intelligentsia as a whole came into its own as a political force, and its conservatively minded component grew in proportion to the total. During the reform era, the avenues to history and social thought, which Grigor'ev's organic criticism had opened, were explored to their fullest extent, and the implications of his theory of nationality were worked out and forged into a comprehensive conservative ideology. Among the leaders of this transformation was the novelist and publicist F.M. Dostoevsky. Dostoevsky contributed little that was new to Grigor'ev's view of art and theory of nationality, but he was instrumental in removing the latter from the rarefied atmosphere of literary criticism onto the plane of social theory.

In exile in the remote fastness of central Asia even the genius of Dostoevsky would have been hard put to imagine a greater contrast than actually existed between the St Petersburg from which he had been escorted into exile late in 1849 and the city to which he eagerly returned ten years later. The death of Nicholas I, the humiliating defeat on Russian soil in the Crimean War, and the alarming increase in the frequency and violence of peasant disturbances had set Russia on a new course of social and political development. A half-century of prestige, won in the exploits of the Napoleonic wars, and the carefully fostered...
The myth of the might of the Russian state were shattered in a single campaign. Nicholas's funeral in 1855 signalled the passing of an era. The new emperor, Alexander II, though by instinct nearly as conservative and by nature only half as resolute as his father, was compelled by circumstances to recognize both the external and internal dangers threatening Russia. He embarked on a series of reforms designed to strengthen the country and to secure the autocracy against growing revolutionary pressures from below. The immediate results were momentous.

Apart from the defeat itself, the most alarming feature of the Crimean War to bureaucratic officials had been the widespread indifference of the public to the outcome of what it regarded as the government's war. In the face of almost universal apathy towards its fate the autocracy realized that it had little choice but to attempt to restore its legitimacy and popularity by permitting some limited forms of public participation in the administration of the country. The unsettling task of such a major and rapid reform could not be carried out effectively without some measure of public consultation, and public opinion could no longer be completely muzzled. Pending the creation of formal institutions for public debate, however, a period of near chaos could be expected as censorship controls were loosened and pent-up public frustrations were released. It was to this heady climate that Dostoevsky returned at the end of 1859.

The half-hearted encouragement by the government of a public discussion of the concerns of the day inaugurated an exchange of ideas on a scale unprecedented in Russia. The trickle of Western political, social, and philosophical tracts which had animated the salons and circles of the 1830s and 1840s turned into a flood at the end of the 1850s. The trend away from aesthetics and philosophy to science and social thought, which had already begun in the 1840s, acquired new impetus among the intelligentsia after 1856. Debate was removed from the privacy of the salons to the publicity of the 'thick' journals. Approximately 150 new newspapers and journals were launched between 1856 and 1860. For the first time in Russian history a broadly based body of public opinion came into being, not only in the cities but also in the countryside, where the establishment of the guberniia committees for the detailed working out of the emancipation reform forced a reluctant gentry to take an interest in public affairs.

The real or anticipated changes in the internal arrangements of Russia naturally had important consequences for the evolution of the Russian intelligentsia. In the new age of 'publicity' the function of the intelligentsia adjusted from that of private to public critic of government policy. A feeling of relief and excitement seized intelligentsia opinion. After years of cloistered and, what seemed to the new generation, barren debate the opportunity to act had finally presented itself. The emancipation of the peasants only reinforced the consciousness among the intelligentsia of a new departure. For the first time millions of peasants were entering Russian public life. The peasantry remained an enigma, feared by many, viewed hopefully as a revolutionary force by some, idolized by others, and patronized by most.

Initially, the reforms awoke a feeling of common cause among the educated. N.G. Chernyshevsky's fraternal greeting towards the end of 1856 to the newly founded Slavophile journal, Russkaia beseda, symbolized the early sense of unanimity among rival factions in matters that counted: 'Agreement on aims is in essence so strong that it is possible to argue only about abstract and. therefore, obscure questions. As soon as the discourse turns to the firm soil of reality, and touches on something practical in science or life, there is no place for fundamental disagreements; only incidental errors on one or the other side are possible ...because here there is no disunity among educated Russians; everybody wants one and the same thing.'

From London, Herzen turned the as yet unsullied prestige of his Kolokol to encouraging the development of a broad reformist front and to accelerating the growth of a united public opinion in Russia.

Since the impetus for the reform had come from above, many educated Russians were at first hopeful that their most cherished aims would be realized by the autocracy itself. The state had traditionally performed a progressive role in Russia, and, in the early years of the reform period at least, few were willing to turn their backs on the emperor entirely. In spite of frequent disappointments as the limitations of the autocracy's reforming zeal became apparent, the mood of cooperation among the intelligentsia persisted until well into 1862. The real or anticipated changes in the internal arrangements of Russia naturally had important consequences for the evolution of the Russian intelligentsia. In the new age of 'publicity' the function of the intelligentsia adjusted from that of private to public critic of government policy. A feeling of relief and excitement seized intelligentsia opinion. After years of cloistered and, what seemed to the new generation, barren debate the opportunity to act had finally presented itself. The emancipation of the peasants only reinforced the consciousness among the intelligentsia of a new departure. For the first time millions of peasants were entering Russian public life. The peasantry remained an enigma, feared by many, viewed hopefully as a revolutionary force by some, idolized by others, and patronized by most.
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Since the impetus for the reform had come from above, many educated Russians were at first hopeful that their most cherished aims would be realized by the autocracy itself. The state had traditionally performed a progressive role in Russia, and, in the early years of the reform period at least, few were willing to turn their backs on the emperor entirely. In spite of frequent disappointments as the limitations of the autocracy's reforming zeal became apparent, the mood of cooperation among the intelligentsia persisted until well into 1862. It reached its zenith early in the spring of that year with a literary and musical evening, ostensibly in celebration of the one thousandth anniversary of the founding of the Russian state. Most of the 'progressives,' Dostoevsky among them, were present.

It is true that well before 1860 Chernyshevsky had privately concluded that the regime was incapable of reforming itself in any significant way and that the peasants stood to gain nothing tangible from the emancipation. He, therefore, broke with such 'liberal conservatives' as B.N. Chicherin and K.D. Kavelin whose cautious gradualism, Chernyshevsky believed, served only to strengthen the conservatism of the autocracy.
Herzen, too, openly disagreed with Chicherin's view of Russian history and institutions, especially the peasant commune, as early as 1858. He did not, however, formally sever his links with other Russian moderates until 1863. Neither he nor Chernyshevsky was averse to applying added pressure on the autocracy by creating an illusion of broad agreement among the educated on general principles if not on specific issues.

On the Slavophile side of the Russian intellectual scene, I.S. Aksakov began in 1859 to criticize the autocracy with as much verve and more radicalism than the nihilist journal *Sovremennik* had ever dared to exhibit. The censors responded predictably by suppressing Aksakov's new journal, *Parus*, after only two numbers.5 Whatever their point of view, practically all members of the intelligentsia were agreed that a radical transformation of society was necessary. Moreover, most Russian publicists of the right and left, who shared an abhorrence of western bourgeois and capitalist social and economic organization, were convinced that the peasant commune should be the basis of the transformation and found common cause in their opposition to even such cautious liberals as Chicherin. In such a climate of apparent concord it was not hard for Dostoevsky and others to persuade themselves that the time of ideological disagreements among Russians was nearing an end.

It was, of course, an illusion. Neither the co-operative spirit of the moment nor a certain level of agreement concerning ends could paper over for long the great theoretical and practical differences that divided the intelligentsia. At the root of the discord were vast differences in philosophical outlook. The radical *intelligentia* of the 1860s were materialists or positivists who were inspired by Western scientism and utilitarianism. They rejected traditional Russian society and its mores outright and hoped ultimately to realize in Russia the most advanced social ideals emanating from the West. They had committed themselves wholeheartedly to the cause of the peasantry and were prepared to sweep the boards of society clean in order to liberate the peasants from their downtrodden condition.

The enthusiasm of the nihilists for the extremes of Western social philosophy was not, however, universally shared by the intelligentsia. Defeat at the hands of the Western alliance in the Crimean War had given birth among elements within the intelligentsia to a new patriotism which served not as an excuse for conservative retrenchment but as a goad to conservative innovation and reconstruction. The intelligentsia conservatives looked for the sources of reconstruction not outside but within the Russian tradition. There they found all the elements, including the benefits of Western knowledge, that they believed were required in order to renew Russian life. These elements had been created throughout the whole process of Russian history. The process would remain incomplete, however, until all the parts coalesced into a harmonious whole. The conservatives believed that Emancipation and its attendant reforms represented the culmination of the process and presented an historic opportunity to reconcile all the social, intellectual, and moral elements that would constitute the new Russia.

The opportunities presented by the Emancipation reforms and by the entrance of the peasantry into the public sphere, the changing role of the intelligentsia and the temporary concord (strained as it was) among them, and the reforming patriotism of a segment of the educated public facilitated to a remarkable degree the growth of the reconciliatory and evolutionary ideal of nationality that had originated among the young editors and was deepened and propagated by Grigor'ev. All the conditions necessary for a synthetic nationality embracing all classes and based on the living traditions of the country appeared to be falling into place. It is not surprising, therefore, to find Grigor'ev's theory making considerable headway among the conservative intelligentsia in the late 1850s and early 1860s.

While Grigor'ev was formulating the principles of organic criticism in St Petersburg, Fedor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky (1821-1881) was atoning for his role in the Petrashevsky affair by exile in Semipalatinsk, an isolated military settlement near the Chinese border. He had spent the first four years of his sentence, from January 1850 to February 1854, at hard labour in the fortress at Omsk. Here he was almost totally cut off from changes on the Russian cultural scene. A measure of relief came in 1854, when he was released from penal servitude and enlisted in the army. As a political exile, he was at least permitted to receive and write letters and to read books and journals. But the remoteness of his enforced place of residence frustrated any hopes he might have had of re-entering the mainstream of contemporary thought. Books that he requested from his brother, Mikhail, and from friends did not arrive, and in his letters he often chafed at his involuntary seclusion.5

Separation from the centres of Russian culture could not, of course, halt Dostoevsky's personal evolution. His arrest, the ordeal of his mock execution, penal servitude, and exile proved not unnaturally to be a watershed in his moral and artistic development. Dostoevsky's biographers have pointed out that even during his most radical period in the 1840s he had remained a utopian and not a revolutionary socialist.
Socialism represented to Dostoevsky and his contemporaries an idealistic humanitarianism which they hailed as the natural successor to Christianity. It was a universalistic doctrine which had as its ultimate goal the brotherhood of all men irrespective of their social and national origins. In the broadest sense, Dostoevsky had never repudiated the Christianity of his childhood, but during his prison years his faith had deepened and become more sure. In spite of the unveiled hostility with which his fellow prisoners greeted him, a hereditary noble, and the revulsion he felt for the depths of their depravity, he nevertheless discovered in these simple people an underlying nobility. In prison he became aware for the first time that the cosmopolitan, socialist dreams of his youth were remote from and even contrary to the nationality newly revealed to him through his contacts with the oppressed Russian people. Dostoevsky did not jettison his faith in universal humanitarianism, but now combined it with the patriotic notion of 'one's own place' (svoe mesto). He began to think in terms of the primacy of national cultures in the advancement of universal culture.

The shift in his thinking from the universal to the national focused Dostoevsky's attention on the specific problems of Russian nationality. The alienation of the educated and the uneducated, of the upper and lower classes, had already been painfully impressed on him during his years of penal servitude. The idea of overcoming this alienation in a higher national synthesis, which would liberate Russia and prepare it for its special role in world history, became an obsession with him from this time. The concept of a 'synthetic culture' could hardly have been new to him; it had been advocated by Belinsky in 1841 and by many others before Dostoevsky's arrest; and like Grigor'ev, Dostoevsky turned to Belinsky for inspiration but, again like Grigor'ev, to only one side of Belinsky, the side that stressed the organic nation and Russian nationality in literature and life. It was this common allegiance to Belinsky's patriotic idealism that was soon to draw Dostoevsky and Grigor'ev together.

Dostoevsky's transformation from the socialist cosmopolitanism of his youth to the Christian humanism of his last years was a gradual process. Throughout his life, he clung to some form of universalism. When, therefore, in exile he rejected cosmopolitanism for nationality, he did not relinquish the idea of pan-human unity. In the 1860s, the middle phase of his intellectual development, he was the advocate of a romantic humanism which aimed at the unity of mankind in the name of a single ideal without at the same time sacrificing national individuality. In the years immediately following his return from exile, he had not yet begun to identify Russian nationality exclusively with Orthodoxy or to ascribe to the Orthodox faith a universal mission as he was to do during his final creative period. In the early 1860s Russian nationality meant to Dostoevsky an emerging synthesis of the ideas of Russia and the West, a synthesis in which Orthodoxy played a part as a manifestation of the Russian spirit but not its sole determinant. It is illustrative that he was once accused by Grigor'ev of underestimating the importance of Orthodoxy in Russian nationality and history. The time had not yet come when Dostoevsky was convinced that Russian unity was impossible outside of the universal triumph of Orthodoxy.

There is little evidence to suggest that during his term of exile Dostoevsky's thoughts along these lines had progressed beyond a number of vaguely defined sentiments. But even these few vague thoughts made him receptive to Grigor'ev's ideas about reconciliation when at last he encountered them. Grigor'ev's interpretation of the universalizing effect of the Petrine reforms on Russia's educated stratum and of Pushkin as the artistic embodiment of that universality provided Dostoevsky with the framework he was already seeking to attach universal significance to Russian nationality.

The novelist and the critic approached one another on other points as well. As a necessary corollary to the idea of a synthetic national culture, Dostoevsky was also convinced, as he wrote to A.N. Maikov in 1856, that Russia's destiny was to complete the tasks begun by Europe. Perhaps even more important for his future relationship with Grigor'ev was his acceptance, expressed in the same letter to Maikov, of the 'great political ideal of Peter the Great.' Their respective views on art were also beginning to coincide. Dostoevsky had long believed that the aesthetic idea formed the basis not just of all creative thought but also of the entire historical process. In an article written in exile, but not now preserved, on the place of Christianity in art, Dostoevsky argued that tendencies in literature were useless and even detrimental to art, a theme also likely to endear him to Grigor'ev. Strangely enough, he was not enthusiastic about Ostrovsky's plays which, he felt, lacked an ideal. Under the influence of Grigor'ev, he was later to revise his opinion drastically.

It is unlikely that Dostoevsky came across Grigor'ev's organic criticism before the middle of 1859. He complained in March that he had not yet seen a copy of Russkoe slovo, and it was there that Grigor'ev's 'course' in organic criticism was going forward. In the following month, A.N. Pleshcheev, a poet, a veteran of the Petrashevsky circle and friend of Dostoevsky since the 1840s, wrote to him that
Grigor'ev was speaking of Dostoevsky 'with great sympathy.' The news should have piqued Dostoevsky's curiosity sufficiently to ensure that he read Grigor'ev's articles with attention when they finally fell into his hands.

Pleshcheev was also the first to suggest to Dostoevsky the idea of publishing a literary journal with Dostoevsky himself as its central personality. The plan came to nothing, but the idea was not lost on Dostoevsky's older brother, Mikhail, to whom Fedor had reported the suggestion. On 19 July 1858, Mikhail applied to the authorities for permission to publish a weekly political and literary journal called Vremia (Time). Apparently he did not inform Fedor of his intention until after the application had been submitted. Only on 13 September did Fedor record his enthusiastic approbation, and it is evident that he was astonished. 'Can it really be,' he exclaimed, 'that you will publish a newspaper?' By early November Mikhail had received the permission of the censorship committee to proceed with his new enterprise.

In August 1859, Dostoevsky was allowed to return to European Russia, though permission to live in the capitals was denied. He temporarily settled at Tver from which he worked feverishly to obtain authorization to move to St Petersburg.

Another event in August further conspired to bring Grigor'ev and Dostoevsky together. Russkoe slovo had not long remained open to Grigor'ev as a medium for his ideas. When the journal had begun publication in January 1859, its editor had been the poet P. Polonsky, while Grigor'ev was put in charge of literary criticism. Polonsky, it soon transpired, did not agree with many of Grigor'ev's critical ideas, and in the ensuing clash Polonsky resigned in April 1859. On Grigor'ev's recommendation a major reorganization of Russkoe slovo took place, and in July, A. Khmel'nitsky became the new editor. Unfortunately for Grigor'ev, Khmel'nitsky soon exhibited a mind of his own and, in an attempt to make the journal more radical, began to excise the names of the Slavophiles from Grigor'ev's articles. In August Grigor'ev, too, resigned in anger and once more found himself without an outlet for his ideas. Both a plan by A.F. Pisemsky to take over Biblioteka dlia chteniia on behalf of the former 'young editors' and Grigor'ev's own repeated efforts to revive Moskvitianin also failed.

It was during this hiatus in his mercurial career that Grigor'ev drifted into the Miliukov circle. A.P. Miliukov, a teacher and literary historian, had been a close friend of Dostoevsky in the 1840s when both had been involved in the radical Durov circle. On his return from exile in Siberia at the end of 1859, Dostoevsky naturally re-established his friendship with Miliukov and so entered into close contact with the group Miliukov headed. The members of the circle were all writers and journalists who for the most part could be numbered among the socially unattached intelligentsia. N.N. Strakhov (1828-1896), a budding philosopher, who was introduced into the circle early in 1860, recalled that the majority of its members were interested primarily in political and social questions. Most of the active members of the Miliukov circle were also contributors to the journal Svetoch which was published from 1860 to 1862. The publisher was the printer D.I. Kalinovsky and the editors were Miliukov himself and D.D. Minaev.

Svetoch almost perfectly embodied the broad movement of cooperation among the intelligentsia that flowered after the succession of Alexander II, and its contributors were exemplars of the movement of social reconciliation within the intelligentsia. The editors of Svetoch were committed to forging from a wide range of publicists and intellectuals of diverse views a broad alliance with progressive and humanitarian aims. In his 'introductory word' to the first issue, Kalinovsky deeply regretted the 'adolescent quarreling of various journals which restricted the advance of truth and hindered national development.' Svetoch stood for the reconciliation of East and West, Slavophiles and westernizers, old and new. The two main camps in Russian intellectual life, which had been necessary aspects of the national evolution, Kalinovsky explained, had by now outlived their usefulness. By encouraging the free clash of ideas on the pages of their journal, the editors hoped to effect the reconciliation of the Slavophile principle of love for the people with the westernizers' concept of progress.

Literature, which had always taken the leading role in solving the problems raised by Russian life, was upheld in Svetoch as the principal instrument for national reconciliation. The editors of the journal adopted Grigor'ev's contention that literature was linked by internal ties to society and so responded to the most pressing social needs. They went beyond Grigor'ev, however, and moved nearer the utilitarians, in arguing that literature should consciously serve social ends. The task of the artist was to demonstrate the influence of the social milieu on various character types. Strakhov later pointed out that Dostoevsky did not fully agree with the view of art propounded in Svetoch because he refused to place service to society ahead of artistic integrity as the criterion of literary creativity. There can be little doubt that on this point Grigor'ev must have sympathized with Dostoevsky.

In a comment on Slavophilism in Svetoch, Miliukov remarked that...
It may be argued that Mikhail wrote this Intelligentsia conservatism in the Emancipation period. Dostoevsky, Grigor'ev, and Native Soil conservatism older Dostoevsky agreed with Grigor'ev that Ostrovsky was neither a westernizer nor a Slavophile but an artist who, in his dramatic creations, expressed the plenitude of Russian life. Adopting Grigor'ev's terminology, he argued that Ostrovsky had said a 'new word' - 'nationality.' It consisted of the recognition of the many-sidedness of Russians, their capacity to grasp and absorb all ideas and to see full and not merely partial truth. It may be argued that Mikhail wrote this review in 1860 under the direct influence of his younger brother. It is, however, more probable that he was expressing the general feeling of the Svetoch group, a feeling that in turn owed a great deal to Grigor'ev's conception of the universal synthesizing qualities of the Russian personality.

The Miliukov circle and the journal to which it gave birth continued the work begun by the young editors and Grigor'ev but under much different circumstances. Like the previous group, the socially unattached intelligency of the Miliukov circle were responding, in a more open climate, to the intellectual and social tensions of the period and to their own uncertainty about their place in the new order. In Svetoch may be seen the same impulse that had been at work in Moskvitian: the desire to discover a principle or set of principles that transcended class or ideological loyalties and to speak for the whole nation rather than for particular social or sectional interests. Certain elements were added in Svetoch to Grigor'ev's original conception. Grigor'ev had not, for example, stressed as did the Svetoch group the need for universal education or turned his attention to the economic future of the country. The weakness of Grigor'ev's thought was, and remained, his failure to awaken from a heavy, lasting and lethargic sleep and has set out on a new path, the path of national... life and progress.

Svetoch stood for the introduction of such Western, technological advances as the railway into Russia and spoke of adopting certain Western fiscal practices; but its editors nevertheless insisted that the proletarianization that had resulted from industrialization in the West should be avoided in Russia by the retention of the communal system or land tenure. In spite of their self-proclaimed role as mediators between Slavophile arid westernizer tendencies, the supporters of Svetoch viewed the peasant commune primarily as an economic and not as a moral entity. This position drew them closer to Chernyshevsky than it did to the Slavophiles. Svetoch also championed the artel', or industrial commune, as the most rational method of industrial production in Russia. It is evident that in its view Russia's economic and social future lay primarily with associationism and not with private ownership.

One of the more interesting articles to appear in Svetoch was Mikhail Dostoevsky's review of Ostrovsky's play Groza (The Storm). It was the first expression in print by one of the Dostoevsky brothers of ideas that were to take on fundamental importance in Vremia a year later. The

history had shown that Russia could not live in isolation from the advantages of Western knowledge and science. Recent history had just as clearly exposed, however, the inadequacy of Western principles alone to produce a full and satisfying life. With the coming of Emancipation, the period of transition begun by Peter the Great had ended. For the first time, the peasantry was entering into full participation in the nation's affairs, bringing with it the age-old principles of Russian nationality. As education advanced among the peasants, and as they came into closer contact with the educated upper classes, a synthesis of Western science with the national principles would occur, which would effect a transformation of Russian social life. The manifesto for 1862 declared: 'Svetoch was founded with the purpose of promoting that tendency which began in Russia in recent years when people began to understand that if much yet remains to be learned by us from educated Europe, much, on the other hand, should be developed from our own national and purely Russian principles. The joining of Russian elements [with] the fruits of western civilization -here is the basis of our future.'

The gradualist and humanistic optimism of Svetoch was buttressed by the hopes its supporters placed in education, which they looked on as a panacea for most of Russia's ills. 'With the introduction of the great reform,' wrote one contributor, 'with the opening of schools for women and with the universal extension of the Sunday Schools, our society has awakened from a heavy, lasting and lethargic sleep and has set out on a new path, the path of national... life and progress.'

Svetoch stood for the introduction of such Western, technological advances as the railway into Russia and spoke of adopting certain Western fiscal practices; but its editors nevertheless insisted that the proletarianization that had resulted from industrialization in the West should be avoided in Russia by the retention of the communal system or land tenure. In spite of their self-proclaimed role as mediators between Slavophile and westernizer tendencies, the supporters of Svetoch viewed the peasant commune primarily as an economic and not as a moral entity. This position drew them closer to Chernyshevsky than it did to the Slavophiles. Svetoch also championed the artel', or industrial commune, as the most rational method of industrial production in Russia. It is evident that in its view Russia's economic and social future lay primarily with associationism and not with private ownership.

One of the more interesting articles to appear in Svetoch was Mikhail Dostoevsky's review of Ostrovsky's play Groza (The Storm). It was the first expression in print by one of the Dostoevsky brothers of ideas that were to take on fundamental importance in Vremia a year later. The
Miliukov who was teaching literature at the school where Strakhov was an instructor of natural history. Dostoevsky had already shown an interest in Strakhov's articles on natural philosophy and asked him to take part in the new journal. Strakhov, along with a circle of young friends, had for some time past greatly admired Grigor'ev's work, and Grigor'ev reciprocated by his interest in one of Strakhov's early articles. They met in the fall of 1859 and became fast friends.

It was not entirely clear how Grigor'ev and Dostoevsky were finally brought together. Evidently, they did not meet in the Miliukov circle since Grigor'ev at the time was in Moscow trying, unsuccessfully it proved, to win a position on Katkov's Russkii vestnik. A number of entries in the diary of Prince V.F. Odoevsky indicate that on his return from Moscow, Grigor'ev visited Odoevsky in a horribly impoverished state and presented him imploringly with one of his articles. Odoevsky, impressed by the article and moved to pity by Grigor'ev's plight, recommended him to Mikhail Dostoevsky, who hired him as Vremia's chief literary critic. Strakhov, however, maintained that when the editors of Vremia tried to enlist Strakhov as literary critic, he suggested that Grigor'ev be approached instead. Dostoevsky apparently replied that 'he, himself, very much loved Grigor'ev and very much desired his participation.' In any event, the invitation was extended though too late for one of Grigor'ev's articles to appear in the first number of the new journal.

These four men, the Dostoevsky brothers, Strakhov, and Grigor'ev, made up the central core of the editorial board. The rest of Vremia's contributors were, for the most part, pirated away from Svetochn. Of this unlucky journal's principal contributors only D.D. Minaev refrained from publishing in Vremia.

Mikhail Dostoevsky's original request had envisaged a weekly publication. On 18 June 1860, he asked for permission to publish instead a political and literary monthly with the same name and program that he had proposed in 1858. His petition was again granted, and in September 1860 Vremia's first manifesto appeared in a number of St. Petersburg and Moscow journals. Strakhov later testified that to the best of his knowledge the manifesto was written by Fedor Dostoevsky himself. He went on to deny, somewhat disingenuously, that he personally had much to do with the formulation of questions of tendency in the journal. His interest in the idea of a 'new direction,' he claimed, arose only because of Grigor'ev's enthusiasm for it.

Although Fedor Dostoevsky was without a doubt the leading personality in Vremia, he was much influenced by those around him. It has been suggested that his older brother's part in the formulation of editorial policy was much more important than has previously been supposed. Mikhail had first raised the idea of Vremia, had sold his cigarette factory to finance it, and was not, moreover, a man without definite views of his own. His letters indicate that, apart from management decisions, which he handled alone, he dealt also with matters concerning content on his own initiative, although he tried to consult his brother whenever possible. There is also a good deal of evidence that he disapproved of many of the ideas of Strakhov and Grigor'ev. Of the two brothers, Mikhail was the more liberal, and his influence constantly pulled Vremia towards a greater tolerance for, though not complete agreement with, such radical journals as Sovremennik. Other habitual contributors reinforced Mikhail's more liberal inclinations. A.E. Razin, for example, who wrote the political review section of Vremia, was the constant butt of Grigor'ev's mordant outbursts against the journal's minuet with Chernyshevsky. Grigor'ev was implacably hostile to Sovremennik, and the emphatic nature of his views tended to counteract Mikhail's more liberal influence on Fedor. The tensions within the editorial board accounted at least in part for a certain ambiguity that plagued Vremia from its very inception. Such disagreements should not, however, be exaggerated. Mikhail had almost certainly arrived at his 'native soil' convictions before Fedor's return from exile. On most questions the brothers were in near perfect accord. Strakhov also asserted that on literary questions and matters of tendency in general, Grigor'ev's opinions were solicited and listened to by Fedor with attention and sympathy. In most instances, sincere efforts were made to conform to the testy critic's wishes.

Pochvenichestvo, as it emerged in Vremia, was the product not only of the able minds of Dostoevsky, Grigor'ev, and Strakhov, but also of a group of men who produced anonymously the regular monthly features of the journal. Of these contributors, Razin who wrote the political review, A.U. Poretsky who was in charge of the home affairs section, and I.G. Dolgomost'ev who concerned himself principally with questions of education were the most important. They shared Dostoevsky's interest in social and political concerns to a greater extent than did Grigor'ev or Strakhov. Grigor'ev was frequently critical of parts of the program of Vremia, although he agreed with its general tendency and later commented that Dostoevsky's journal had 'completely correct beliefs.' Strakhov, in contrast, did not specifically identify himself with the 'men of the soil.' Though he accepted many of the specific tenets of pochvenichestvo, and gave some of them their clearest formulations, he never
theless preferred to concentrate on the more general task of creating a broad nationalistic and idealistic front in order to counter the growing forces of materialism and utilitarianism in Russia.

The original tensions within the editorial board were to surface in the subsequent careers of its members. For the moment, however, their differences were concealed, and all was optimism and harmony when, in January 1861, the first number of *Vremia* appeared under the banner of universal reconciliation.