

# Schiller, Joanna

---

## Imperial University of Warsaw - Russification or Rapprochement of the Two Slav Nations?

---

Organon 34, 181-193

---

2005

Artykuł umieszczony jest w kolekcji cyfrowej Bazhum, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych tworzonej przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego.

Artykuł został zdigitalizowany i opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie ze środków specjalnych MNiSW dzięki Wydziałowi Historycznemu Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.



Joanna Schiller (Warsaw, Poland)

## IMPERIAL UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW – RUSSIFICATION OR RAPPROCHEMENT OF THE TWO SLAV NATIONS?

A subject matter included in the title is so much extensive and multidimensional that the present essay is scarcely to emphasize some chosen issues.

It is worth reminding of the fact that Russia was the multinational monarchy, and in course of time the disproportion was increasing to aboriginal Russians' disadvantage. In the years 1718–1719 (a date of the first revision), the Russians composed 70% within the whole population consisting of 15,7 millions of habitants in number. Towards the close of the eighteenth century, the Russians composed only 53% of Empire population inhabited by 37 millions of people. Heinrich Storch, one of the German scholars living in Russia in that time, perceived Russia to be extremely different from other countries in respect of its miscellaneous and heterogeneous population, differing in appearance, language, confession, lifestyle, and customs in the highest degree<sup>1</sup>. In 1834 the Russians already composed less than a half of the population settled on the territory of Russia together with the self-governing Kingdom of Poland and Finland. Polish people composed 7%, and Finnish people – 1,8%.

Within 8 universities that existed till 1830, there were more foreign professors and students than these of Russian ancestry. Moreover, within these 8 universities there existed 2 speaking Polish – in Vilnius and Warsaw, 1 speaking German – in Dorpat, and 1 speaking Swedish – in Helsingfors (Helsinki, moved from Turku in 1828<sup>2</sup>).

In consequence of the continuous territorial expansion to the west, south and east, and in the light of the First Directory Data from the year 1897, percentage of the Russians in the Empire decreased by 44,3% (and some of the researchers even underestimate – between 43 and 40%). The Ukrainians came second – 17,8%, and the Poles were third – 6,3% (a probably reduced number). On the subsequent positions there were Muslim nations of the Middle Asia (5,8%), the Belorussians (4,68%), Caucasian nations (4,6%), Jews (4%), the Estonians, Latvians and Lithuanians (3,3%), the Germans (1,4%), and many others<sup>3</sup>. In general, one can count up to about 67 national and ethnical

<sup>1</sup> A. Kappeler, *The Russian Empire: A Multiethnic History*, Harlow 2001, p. 116 & p. 141.

<sup>2</sup> For more see: M. Klinge, *Eine nordische Universität. Die Universität Helsinki 1640–1990*, Helsinki 1992, pp. 287–290.

<sup>3</sup> A. Kappeler, *The Russian Empire*, p. 285 & pp. 397–399.

groups inhabiting Russian Empire<sup>1</sup>.

It is no wonder that nationalistic policy was considered to be one of the most important elements in a way forming home affairs' policy of the state. A so called *Polish affair* (polskij wopros) was one of the many *nationalistic matters*. However, one must admit that at the same time it was one of the most difficult and thoroughly discussed issues, drawing both authorities' and Russian public opinion's attention. One can even ascertain that in some measure the general principles of the Russian nationalistic policy were just determined with *Polish affair*.

To simplify, till about the half of the nineteenth century, the main aim of the Government was to keep territorial, political and social *status quo*. As long as non-Russian elites stayed loyal to tsar, and the social and political stability was kept on their territories, the Russians made efforts to cooperate with them and put into practice pragmatic and flexible policy of tolerance. National movements, in the first place the Polish ones – the oldest and of considerable extent – were perceived to be imminent over state's stability and its dynastic, political and social system. The result was an increasing with time tendency to the administrative, social and cultural integration that reached its culminating point towards the close of the nineteenth century as russification policy.

A significant *catalyst* of the changes in Russian nationalistic policy were Polish uprisings, and, in particular, January Uprising. In order to put everything straight and hold sway over a rebellious nation, the much more rigorous solutions than after November Uprising were observed. Since then, the Russian policy's aim was to reach the final dissolution of the *Polish affair* through repressions and forced integration.

The undertaken tactics met with approval and assistance of the part of Russian public opinion. Whereas the previous concessions for the Kingdom of Poland – repeal of the occupancy, amnesty for the participants of November Uprising, reconstruction of the Polish educational system (with emphasis on higher education), and restoration of many Polish government institutions – met in majority with a favourable estimation of the Russian elite<sup>2</sup>, after the uprising there appeared a rapid revulsion towards anti-Polish atmosphere that was additionally warmed up by Russian journalism. Panslavists and nationalists – Iwan Aksakow, Jurij Samarin, and particularly – Michaił Katkow – represented Polish national movement with its foreign, latin culture as a significant threat for Russia, and Katkow was exhorting to taking radical steps hostile to Polish people, joining dignity, stability and power of Russia with in-

<sup>1</sup> It is worth pointing out that an Imperial Warsaw University professor – an ardent Great-Russian nationalist Platon Kulakowskij – in his journalism that was mainly published in the columns of *Nowoje Wriemia*, decidedly tried to depreciate the merit of the non-Russian nationalities in the Empire. In 1906 he wrote that these nationalities composed hardly about 40 millions that were scattered around the whole state, which was composed by over 125 millions of inhabitants towards the century close. P. Kulakovskij, *Vopros' o Varšavskom universitete* [A Matter of Warsaw University] in: P. Kulakovskij, *Russkij russkim* [The Russian for the Russians], vol. 5: *Vopros' o Varšavskom universitete i pol'skij školnyj zakonoproekt 1907 g.* [A Matter of Warsaw University and Project of the Polish School Statute from 1907], S. Peterburg 1913, p. 3 & p. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Otto von Bismarck – a Prussian legate in Petersburg in that time – used to think that the main reason of those public feelings was the Russians' hope for that a tsar would not refuse the Russians what he did for the Poles.

violability of its territorial cohesion. Even a liberal historian Sergiej Sołowiow, in his *History of Poland's Decline*, took partitions to have been a just punishment inflicted by history for deceiving *Slav affair* by Polish people<sup>1</sup>.

Because of the dislike, and even hatred, the Government began a gradual suppression of the separate law status of the Kingdom of Poland, together with its name. One started using a new term *Land by the Vistula*, though it was never coined formally. And the administrative integration was additionally enriched with a new aim of cultural russification.

A revulsion in Russian nationalistic policy, initiated by January Uprising, and partly caused by the Russian national press, from the sixties began to comprise other nationalities inhabiting borderland of the Empire. At first a special status of Baltic Germans, and its particular prerogatives were attacked. One demanded the suppression of these prerogatives, and promoting Russian language, culture and religion as a kind of equipoise for germanizing impact of the Germans on the local Estonian and Latvian population. The eighties and nineties brought a partial accomplishment of the requirements. Russian language became official language of the administration and teaching on all the levels aside from two lowest standards of primary schools. Moreover, Russian judicatory and police system was introduced, and in 1893 a German University in Dorpat became a Russian University in Jurjew. In Finland the uniformization appeared much later than in the Kingdom of Poland and Baltic provinces. Nevertheless, from the nineties, again under pressure of the Russian nationalistic press, one started to restrict Finland's autonomous laws through dissolution of the Finnish army, and the postal service, and conferment of the almost dictatorial power to governor – general.

Within the process of drifting to the forced integration and uniformization towards each of these nationalities, in all instances one can observe tangible differences as far as both the time (in Finland almost seventy years later than in the Kingdom of Poland), and the methods, proportions and intensity of policy of assimilation or russification are concerned. Also, according to both internal and external conditions, the policy – regarding the concrete nation – in the period of reign of the three last tsars used to have more or less a repressive nature<sup>2</sup>.

Up till now we have used the notions: assimilation, uniformization, integration and russification. However, one should explain what these notions meant in general, and in particular regarding the Imperial University of Warsaw that originated in 1869 as the result of General School's transformation.

In 1864 there was called the Organizing Committee that existed to enforce

<sup>1</sup> K. Zernack, *Polska i Rosja. Dwie drogi w dziejach Europy [Poland and Russia. Two Ways in the History of Europe]*, Warszawa 2000, pp. 413–420. Cf. also H. Głębocki, *Fatalna sprawa. Kwestia polska w rosyjskiej myśli politycznej (1856–1866)* [*Vital Matter. Polish Affair in the Russian Political Thought (1856–1866)*], Kraków 2000, pp. 261 ff.

<sup>2</sup> A. Kappeler, *The Russian Empire*, pp. 256–261; A. J. Bahturina, *Okrajiny rossijskoi imperii: gosudarstvennoje upravlenie i nacionalnaia politika v gody Piervoi mirovoi voiny (1914 – 1917 gg)* [*Borderland of the Russian Empire: State Control and Nationalistic Policy in the Years of the First World War (1914 – 1917)*], Moskva 2004, pp. 78–81 & pp. 225–234.



particular changes in the administrative system of the Kingdom of Poland. Nikołaĵ Milutin – a Russian liberal politician unhesitatingly malevolent, and even hostile towards Poland – was one of its members. As a pragmatic and provident politician, in his conceptions concerning the further political tactics towards the Kingdom of Poland, he wrote that the whole hitherto existing education policy in the Kingdom of Poland, seemed to be a big mistake. Limitations on access to the higher education, or giving priority to speaking Russian over Polish (and, what important, he is talking about the times when at schools an official language was still Polish), brought about the Poles' malevolence solely, and none of the significant political aims was reached in this way. He says: *my nie obrusili ni odnago polaka, a w to że wriemia jaw-lialis' kak by posiagajuszczimi na pol'skuju nacjonalnost* [None of the Poles was russified by us. On the other hand, however, we just gave the impression of attempting against liberty of the Polish nation]<sup>1</sup>. Shortly after 1856, the particular and still developed steps were taken in order that they would eliminate *the previous system lacks*. Among other things, he included restoration of the higher education in the Kingdom. Unfortunately, a practical fulfilment of Aleksander Wielopolski's reform undertaken by the local authorities, went on in a strain void of the real solicitude of the education, and became the *political instrument* again. However, pointing out all the anti-Russian resolutions included in *Public Education Statute*, he recognized its suppression only to give the reason for appearing the Poles' riots directed against the Government. Therefore he appreciated the importance of keeping *Public Education Statute*, and expurgating just some of its settlements having explicitly anti-Russian political nature.

A represented by Milutin plan of further works, and connected with higher education, was to turn General School into *aleksandrowskij uniwersitet* [emphasis – J. S.] together with an incorporation of the theological faculty that would exist instead of Roman Catholic Ecclesiastical Academy. An usage of the term *aleksandrowskij* reveals that Milutin propagated in a way a kind of reversion to the preinsurrectional structure of the Polish Warsaw University. It was important for him to expurgate the name *General School*, usually associated with Academy of Cracow that was transformed in 1810 *according to the spirit of national exclusivity*. Within all his programme first of all he advised to do away with the conception of using the educational system as a kind of *political weapon*. He was writing – we will never succeed in making use of teaching, and endearing Polish people to ourselves. We will not be able to merge them with Russia, either change the way of their thinking or the political aspirations<sup>2</sup>. As far as the official language was concerned, he thought that it would have been pointless introducing Russian as the official language to the Polish schools, because it would have been enough if the Poles had learnt Russian as one of the obligatory subjects included in general

<sup>1</sup> N. A. Milutin, *Obščaja ob'iasnitelnaia zapiska ob ustroistwie učebnoi časti v Carstvie Pol'skom (leto 1864 g.)* [Memorial Regarding the Organization of Education in the Kingdom of Poland (in Summer of 1864)] in: *Slavianskoe Obozrenie. Istoriko-literaturnyj i političeskij žurnal* 1892, vol. 2: mai – avgust, pp. 303–304.

<sup>2</sup> N. A. Milutin, *Obščaja ob'iasnitelnaia zapiska ...*, p. 313.

study programme<sup>1</sup>. He perceived it much more advantageous, and first of all, much more secure for Russia, keeping the language and the national laws of the Poles by the simultaneous political and state uniformization.

Within Milutin's note one can observe a subtle difference between uniformization and russification – all that concerns law and administrative unification of the Kingdom of Poland with the Empire, belongs to the uniformization sphere; going further – limitation or reduction in the mother tongue at school and in the university, or repressive legislation towards the Poles – was just a russification. He was writing that one should have accepted an entire equality of rights principle concerning all the nationalities and languages in the Kingdom of Poland.

As we know, shortly after the attempt on Aleksander's II life in 1866 carried out by Dmitrij Karakozow, the situation in Russia began to change radically. There appeared a gradual backward trend of the reformatory politics. A new education minister – Dmitrij Tołstoj – began to realize this russifying policy Milutin was earlier warning against. Within the several years' discussion over lawful and organizational shape of Warsaw University, there was never used, of course, a word *russification*. Within the government rhetoric one used to talk about a rapprochement of the Polish and Russian science, about giving the Polish youth the same job and career chances in the whole Empire thanks to graduating from the Russian academy<sup>2</sup>.

The final purport of *Imperial Warsaw University Statute* from the 8th of June 1869 included many elements of uniformization, for instance, the settlements identical with a being in force in Russia university legislation, and many other elements caused – as they were described – by *local conditions' needs*. In this context one can say that the policy that was taken up towards Warsaw University was a resultant of the Russian policy comprising all the aspects of university life, and nationalistic policy. Among the elements of *unification* the Russians included, for instance, an introduced into *Imperial Warsaw University Statute* duty to take a doctor's degree within three years in one of the Russian universities by the Polish professors possessing the doctor's degrees, and obtained in the foreign universities. Such regulations were obligatory in Russia from 1837 towards the foreigners tending to take over the departments in the Russian universities. In the Russian University

<sup>1</sup> N. A. Milutin, *Obščaja ob'iasnitelnaia zapiska ...*, p. 319. A veracity of this statement was questioned by above mentioned Platon Kulakowski, who thought that such state worker as Milutin could not write that Russian had to be one of the teaching subjects only. In Kulakowski's opinion, these words were just inserted to Milutin's note, and came from completely another document. He writes: *At the multilingual secondary schools in the Kingdom of Poland according to Milutin's system, the only possible language for the high school could be Russian as the official language*, P. Kulakovskij, *Kak byr' s Varšavskim universitetom?* [What about Warsaw University?] in: P. Kulakovskij, *Russkij russkim* [The Russian for the Russians], vol. 5, p. 12. Kulakovskij is wrong in this moment, because these words are included in: *Obščaja obiasnitelnaia zapiska ...* [Memorial Regarding the Organization of Education ...] that in the whole was published in 1892 by another Imperial Warsaw University professor – Anton S. Budilowicz – who as Kulakovskij also presented the nationalistic outlooks, and published them in the self-edited paper *Slavianskoe Obozrenie*.

<sup>2</sup> See J. Schiller, *Powstanie Cesarskiego Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego w świetle badań archiwalnych* [Rise of the Imperial University of Warsaw in the Light of Archival Study] in: *Rozprawy z Dziejów Oświaty* 41, 2002, pp. 93–127.

Statute from 1863, a doctor's degree of the foreign university gave only the law to be admitted to the final examination<sup>1</sup>. So in the case of Warsaw University the general principles were lowered in order that a doctorate could be obtained immediately, and even without taking any exams. An exception to these regulations could have been conferring the honorary doctorates. They were few in the Russian universities – within the whole of the nineteenth century till 1917, a total number of the admitted honorary doctorates kept within the limits of 100<sup>2</sup>. In the Warsaw University there was made one exception to these regulations. According to a decision made by on duty full professor of anatomy on the 5th of November 1871, Ludwik Hirszfeld – a doctor of medicine of University of Paris – was exempted from a duty of representing and *proving* a doctorate<sup>3</sup> on account of his scientific and practical merits.

It is pointless explaining what impressions on the Polish society made such Statute's regulations as above. And, moreover, introducing Russian as the official language within two years from the beginning of activity of Warsaw University, reduction of the departments' number to 46 in comparison with 53 in Russia including a suppression of the *Polish* departments, considerable limitation on self – governing of the university in relation to the regulations of the Russian *General Statute for the Russian Imperial Universities* from 1863, and reducing the level of the scientific requirements towards the lecturers. However, it is worth adding that in a later period, the Russian *General Statute for the Russian Imperial Universities* from 1884 verged upon the purport and meaning of *Imperial Warsaw University Statute* immensely. In this interpretation *Imperial Warsaw University Statute* can be perceived as its antecedent<sup>4</sup>.

There was no even a word in the *Imperial Warsaw University Statute* about the fact that rectors and inspectors of Warsaw University should have been the native Russians, and only the Russians would have been engaged in work in departments earlier abandoned by the Poles. These facts were finally revealed by life, and the Poles perceived all these events to be purely russifying strokes. In the result, an affluence of the students to Warsaw University began to decrease systematically: in 1869/70 there were 1036 of them (including 836 of those that turned up from General School); 7 years later they just composed a group of 445<sup>5</sup>.

On May 1880 Piotr Albedynskij was made a governor – general of Warsaw. Recognized and known as a liberal, within few months after taking up a post, he brought on a project for particular reforms, among others including:

<sup>1</sup> A. E. Ivanov: *Učėnyie stiepieni v Rossiiskoi imperii XVIII v. – 1917 g.* [University Degrees in the Russian Empire from the Eighteenth Century to 1917], Moskva 1994, p. 66.

<sup>2</sup> A. E. Ivanov: *Učėnyie stiepieni v Rossiiskoi imperii XVIII v. – 1917 g.*, p. 63.

<sup>3</sup> Rossiiskii Gosudarstviennyi Istoričeskii Arhiv Sankt Peterburg [RGIA], f. 733, op. 147, i. hr. 759, pp. 373–374.

<sup>4</sup> A. E. Ivanov, *Russkii universitet v Carstvie Pol'skom. Iz istorii universitetskoi politiki samodėrėzavija: nacionalnyi aspekt* [The Russian University in the Kingdom of Poland. From the History of University Policy of Autocracy: National Aspect] in: *Otečestviennaia Istorija* 6/1998, p. 23.

<sup>5</sup> RGIA, f. 733, op. 147, i. hr. 758, p. 370.

introduction of the municipal government with a procedure in Polish, admittance of Polish to the courts of peace together with an eligibility of their judges, and establishment of the Polish Literature Department in Warsaw University with Polish as the official language<sup>1</sup>. This programme was intensively observed within both the Polish and the Russian press as well, and brought about a heated polemics among others concerning the University. Towards the end of February 1881, in the newspaper *Golos*, there appeared an extensive article written by a Polish publicist (Erazm Piltz), and significantly entitled: *Obrusienie ili ob'iedinienie (Russification or Unification)*. The author – an indubitable representative of the positivistic ideology – began his reasoning from the statement that the Polish society after last uprising's experience with a bitterness realized the *futility of the revolutionary experiments*, because then there had come the time of the peaceful, persistent and organized work over the economic and social development. Being conscious of the benefits – mainly these of an economic nature – resulting from the relationship with Russia, he thought that an employed system directed against the language and the nationality was not only uncongenial, but also seemed to paralyse the intellectual and economic development of the country. The main and the only aim of this system – russification – turns out to be unavailable, and after 12 years of its application one can see that it is disastrous not only for the country, but also for the Empire as well. Further, he is writing about the necessity as a result of the applied system that called for bringing the Russian teachers, professors and civil servants, and about their privileged position, wages and pension privileges. He is also making mention of breaking the law (particularly it concerned the *ukases* from the 30th of August 1864 and the 5th of January 1866 – they included among others a ban on exploiting the schools for political aims, and propagated the law of teaching in Polish. What interesting, these *ukases* were never suppressed formally). This fact makes the Poles aware of being excluded from the law protection, and the fact that between the regulations and their realization there exists an essential difference. In his summary he says: we realize that the Government does not want and is not able to abandon the uniformization in its acting. But this notion can be explained in many ways. The main principle of our programme is also uniformization, but in such form that makes the country's and the Empire's interests come together. This programme is lodging: a complete law and factual equality of rights for the Russian and the Polish nationality, establishing the administrative, judicial and self – governed institutions that exist in the Empire as speaking Polish, teaching in Polish in all schools of the Kingdom of Poland, and, finally, unification of the Polish and the Russian press law<sup>2</sup>.

This article met with a vivid and positive response within the journalism of Warsaw University professor in the years 1879–1884 – an eminent histor-

<sup>1</sup> This programme among others was presented to the Russian reading public by the paper *Golos* no. 18, 18/30 of January 1881, p. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Obrusienie ili ob'iedinienie (zamietki pol'skogo publicista) [Russification or Reconciliation (Remarks of the Polish Publicist)]* in: *Golos* no. 56, 25 of February / 9 of March 1881; no. 57, 26 of February / 10 of March 1881; no. 58, 27 of February / 11 of March 1881.

ian Nikołaĵ Kariejew. Among others, in the years 1881–1885, he published in the columns of *Russkaja Mysl* & *Polish Letters*. As he wrote, it was the period, in which he deluded himself expecting that it would be possible to make Warsaw University a kind of the centre existing for cultural rapprochement of the two nations<sup>1</sup>. It is worth adding that these articles were published under a secret name in order that, as he thought, he could express his opinions freely. A great deal of the scientific and journalistic output of Kariejew concerned the *Polish affairs*, and among others it resulted from the opinion that a mutual malevolence is remarkably a result of remembering the negative historical events, and the complete lack of interest and knowledge of the present problems concerning the two nations' existence. All of that was additionally strengthened by a destructive activity that was taken up by the press organs as, for instance, *Moskowskije Wiedomosti*, or *Nowoje Wriemja* that with a real hatred commented upon everything what was connected with the Polish issues. Moreover, the Warsaw censorship did not give any access to publishing within the Polish press any information about the Russian society's life and opinions. As far as the inability of the rapprochement is concerned, one has to admit that both sides bear the blame – the Poles do not want and cannot tell the difference between the Russian power and the Russian society, and, in Kariejew's opinion, the Poles reciprocate the Russian chauvinism<sup>2</sup>.

The *Fifth Letter* in the whole was dedicated by Kariejew to Warsaw University. In this letter he wrote that the university could have played a significant role in the spiritual rapprochement of the two nations but for the ultra-nationalistic attitude presented by the both nations' professors. Moreover, this spiritual rapprochement would have been possible to reach, if the Russian professors had not wanted to instill in the Polish youth the typically Russian opinions what was equal to misleading it as far as the general quality of the Russian social thought is concerned. The Russian science in Warsaw would not play its role, if it did not introduce such principles that in a way could revive life in each European country, and what is equal – as he wrote picturesquely – to taking off the nationalistic clothes and putting on the embracing the whole of mankind costume<sup>3</sup>.

For within the earlier *Polish Letters* Kariejew was hinting at the possibility of playing by Warsaw University a significant role in the two nations' rapprochement, one of his readers – the Pole remaining anonymous and using the initials J. L. – asked him within the open letter, how it was possible that the Russian university, established only to russify the Poles, was perceived to work on the rapprochement with them? Kariejew answered – if the University had left the idea of russification, if it had only focused on presenting to the society a stream of the renewed Russian science, then it could have become the area of such rapprochement. In our surrounding there are – he wrote – the

<sup>1</sup> N. Kareev, *Polonica. Sbornik statei po pol'skim delam (1881–1905)* [*Polonica. Assemblage of the Articles about Polish Affairs (1881–1905)*], S. Peterburg 1905, p. VI.

<sup>2</sup> N. Kareev, *Niečo o russko–pol'skom voprose v našej žurnalistike* [*A Couple of Words about the Russian and Polish Relationships within Our Press*] in: *Russkaja Mysl* 1881, mart in: N. Kareev, *Polonica*, pp. 1–19.

<sup>3</sup> N. Kareev, *Niečo o russko–pol'skom ...*, pp. 64–76.



scholars that are able to act according to such programme, the scholars who – remaining the Russians – do not tend to change the Poles for the Russians, and do not think that the ground of the rapprochement is making the Poles use the Cyrillic alphabet, and attend Orthodox Church. He even thought that the Russian professors were much better prepared to take up this conciliatory mission, because among the Poles there are few who – remaining the Poles – do not treat the Russians with hostility, and, moreover, are able to *go up* – also in the scientific field – over the national aims. In general, Kariejew was backing up the law for having right to possess a national university by the Poles, because each nation has got a right to learn in one's mother tongue. But, as he wrote, it does not depend on us, whether there exists the Polish or the Russian university in Warsaw. And, if there exists the Russian one, it is up to us, whether it propagates the malevolence, or the reconciliation, whether it brings about more benefits, or the drawbacks<sup>1</sup>.

A proposed by Kariejew form of the rapprochement and scientific partnership to a high degree was broken by the atmosphere of the mutual suspiciousness and distrust, showed both by the authorities, and the society. In 1901 Kariejew made mention that outside the university surrounding, in which he worked, a Polish social life practically remained beyond its reach<sup>2</sup>. He acquainted himself better and entered into friendly relations with the Polish students, whereto he appealed after years: ... *let them know I kept the best memories of them, and our meetings always result in aggravating my belief that they have a pleasant memory of me*<sup>3</sup>.

But, what important, the closer relations between the Russian professors and the Polish students were impeded, because many representatives of these two nationalities perceived them to be at least dubious and ambiguous. Also, Boris Cziczerin – a lawyer, philosopher, historian, and a liberal social worker, in the sixties professor of Moscow University – payed his attention to the problem of the difficult Polish and Russian relations – who in his work entitled *Polskij i ewrejskij woprosy (Polish and Jewish Affair)* published in Berlin in 1901 (the work could not be published in Russia because of the censorship regulations) – wrote: *In the Kingdom of Poland and the western provinces the Poles remain deprived of all rights, and a lawlessness of the police seems to be infinite. [...] When there appears an administrator, who treats the Poles with leniency, right away there appears the exclamation of surprise that the administrator has become Polonized [opoliaczył], has searched for the popularity and that women have influenced him. A majority – mainly in the influential spheres – still perceives the Poles to be a malevolent nationality, which should be oppressed. As far as the teaching is concerned, he wrote – in the Kingdom of Poland, where aside from the civil servants there is no even one Russian – the whole teaching across is carried on in Russian. It is an increasing russification, isn't it? One does not take into account that for each*

<sup>1</sup> N. Kareev, *Niečo o rusko-pol'skom ...*, p. 70.

<sup>2</sup> N. Kareev, *Moi otnošenja k polakam [My Attitude towards the Poles]* in: *Polonica*, pp. 208–210.

<sup>3</sup> N. Kareev, *Moi otnošenja k polakam*, pp. VIII–IX.



*nation there is nothing more important than – after religion – its mother tongue, in which one is used to expressing a spirit of the nation, and even more than in religion, because the last one has got the universal nature. Instead of the rapprochement, one brings about the hatred [...]*<sup>1</sup>.

Not before the outbreak of a revolution in 1905, and liberalization of the censorship, there was enabled an open, outspoken and comprehensive discussion. The press was filled with the articles and statements that sharply criticized on both the Russian policy concerning the university in general and its nationalistic policy. The paper *Rus* created even a separate column that concerned Polish affairs. Even the reactionary and anti-Polish *Moskowskije Wiedomosti* and *Nowoje Wriemia* changed the tone of their statements. On March 1905 *Nowoje Wriemia* submitted to a critical examination a policy that was undertaken by Aleksandr Apuchtin – curator of the Warsaw Scientific District – and his co-workers. It was said that his persecution of many years directed against the language and Polish culture brought about enormous damages only<sup>2</sup>. In the columns of a weekly magazine *Pravo* there appeared an article entitled *Polityka obrusienia w Carstwie Polskom (Russification Policy in the Kingdom of Poland)*, in which among others there were reported the fragments of governor general's statements – Josif Hurko – from 1890. An anonymous author of the article writes that Hurko – who with his fanatical and anticultural regime much worsened the situation in the Kingdom and was noxious to Russia – admitted that russification policy applied in the Kingdom gave the results completely different from these that were previously intended, and brought about the hatred to everything what in any way was connected with Russia<sup>3</sup>. Also in the columns of *Pravo* Kariejew published his next 3 articles, criticizing on the hitherto existing Russian nationalistic and educational policy, and in the paper *Nowosti* he published *Pis'mo k znakomym Polakom (Letter to the Acquainted Poles)*, which was ended with the following words: ... *I have always considered that the university in Warsaw should be Polish, but if it is Russian, one should act in this way so as not to make the university a russification instrument. The university should be a limb of the rapprochement and reconciliation of both intellectuals that are predestined for living in one state*<sup>4</sup>.

The situation of Warsaw University also became a matter of interest of the all-Russian Academic Union that originated in the beginnings of 1905, and united professors and lecturers of the academies. During the Assembly of the Academic Union members that had place in Petersburg in the days 25–28 March 1905, there appeared an enormous disgust concerning the relegation of

<sup>1</sup> B. Čičerin, *Polskii i evreiskii voprosy. Otviet na otkrytyia pis'ma Nikolaia Karloviča Rennenkampfa [Polish and Jewish Affair. Answer to the Open Letters of Nikolai Karlovič Rennenkampf]*, Berlin 1901, p. 23 & p. 25.

<sup>2</sup> N. Kareev, *K voprosu o rusko-pol'skikh otnošeniah [Regarding the Russian and Polish Relationships]* in: *Pravo* no. 10, 13 of March 1905, pp. 720–721.

<sup>3</sup> *Politika obrusienia v Carstvie Pol'skom [Russification Policy in the Kingdom of Poland]* in: *Pravo* no. 3, 23 of January 1905, pp. 126–127.

<sup>4</sup> N. Kareev, *Polonica*, p. 259.

Warsaw University students. It was perceived to have been a succeeding manifestation of the bureaucratic and police lawlessness. Within the resolutions of the Assembly there was written: *A hitherto practised towards the non-Russians a principle of degrading and eliminating the national differences not only denies the fundamental justice principles, but also brings about an evident harm to the moral, cultural and economic development, both of whole Russia and the nations composing its structure. The Assembly is perceiving it to be its moral obligation to clamour against such policy and is tending to express its conviction of the necessity for giving all the nations living on the area of Russia a law to self-determination and speaking their mother's tongue at school. In particular, Government policy in the Kingdom of Poland is absolutely out of accordance with the above principle*<sup>1</sup>. In this way, the Assembly backed up the obligatory polonization of the Warsaw University.

At the same time, a part of the Russian professorship of Warsaw University stipulated for polonization of the academy. The professors – Dmitrij Pietruszewskij (who was recalled by Marceli Handelsmann with respect and fondness), Grigorij Wulf (a president of the Warsaw department of Academic Union), Aleksandr Szczerbak, Aleksandr Pogodin, Aleksandr Pridik, Nikołaj Nasonow – during the Council session declared that there is no admission to the Russian university without possessing the skill of speaking Polish<sup>2</sup>. In the memories published in 1915, Wulf wrote that the mentioned group of the Russian professors, who stipulated for introducing Polish to the academy, was absolutely conscious of the fact that it is equal to the necessity of leaving Warsaw University by them because of the weak ability of speaking Polish. Then, a youth asked them for relinquishing the thoughts of leaving and further lecturing in Russian<sup>3</sup>. Another of the professors – Aleksandr Pogodin – presented his opinion in the article published in the paper *Riecz*, where he wrote that one should appoint the professors to the departments without paying attention to the nationality, introduce an institution of the Polish private assistant professors, and create the history, literature, language and Polish law departments<sup>4</sup>.

Last of all, one is to answer one question – to what extent in everyday university life was there realized a stipulated by Kariejew solution – solution of overtopping the national partitionings, and searching for the rapprochement in the scientific field and intellectual partnership? Diaries kept by the students reveal that though a great number of the Russian professors – of course, taking into account the difficult external conditions – did not treat the students kindly

---

<sup>1</sup> *Postanowlenia s'ezda professorow i prepodawatelei wysših učebnyh zavedenii 25–28 marta 1905 g., priinatyia na obščih sobraniah* [Provisions of the Professors and Lecturers of the Academies Assembly from the Days 25–28 of March 1905, assumed during the Comprehensive Sessions] in: *Pravo* no. 15, 15 of April 1905, p. 1197.

<sup>2</sup> J. Bardach, *Udział uczonych rosyjskich w walce o repolonizację Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego w latach 1905–1906* [Russian Scholars' Particpance in the Strife for Re-Polonization of Warsaw University in the Years 1905–1906] in: *Studia i Materiały do Dziejów Wielkopolski i Pomorza* 13, 1979, p. 40.

<sup>3</sup> G. Wulf, *Poslednie mesacy v varšavskom universitete* [Closing Months in the Warsaw University] in: *Golos Minuvshego* 1915, no. 12, p. 195.

<sup>4</sup> Discussion in: *Kronika Miesięczna* [Monthly Chronicle] in: *Biblioteka Warszawska* 2/1908, pp. 195–197.

enough, one has to admit that they worked hard not to hurt their national feelings. From the midst of those, who deserve positive memories of the Polish students – aside from those that were mentioned above – one can recall the professors Jewfimij Karskij and Mitrofan Ganin, last of whom Józef Nusbaum–Hilarowicz<sup>1</sup> left unusually warm memories, and who abandoned Warsaw department as a sign of the protest directed against arousing political consciousness in scientific issues. One can also recall other professors – Aleksandr Lagorio, Iwan Wostokow, Paweł Mitrofanow, Aleksandr Mordwiłko, Dmitrij Sinicyn, Michaił Cwiet, Jegor Wagner, Iwan Bewad and others. These were the professors, who treated – and at least were trying to treat – the university as a scientific and teaching institution, and not as an area of political and nationalistic propaganda. However, one should state that an opinion about the moral attitude presented by the Russian professors, additionally analysed from the Polish point of view, is extremely difficult. The same professors were judged by the students, and the contemporaries both positively – with respect, appreciation of the scientific level presented by them, and a fancy to their personality; and negatively – with illwill, and even hostility. An utmost example in this context might be Michaił Zieniec – a professor of the diagnostics and comprehensive therapy department from 1892. Zieniec was a doctor of medicine in the Medical and Surgical Academy in Petersburg, and the holder of the St. Stanisław Order of the 3rd class<sup>2</sup>. Andrzej Śródka writes about him that contemporarily he was perceived to be an eminent expert at contagious disease, and was also an author of many scientific works telling about pathology, diagnostics and contagious disease<sup>3</sup>. Stanisław Krzemiński describes the person of professor Zieniec quite differently. In his *Letters from the Russian Invaders' Territories* he wrote: *Zieniec is an inborn son of Apuchtin. At first as a surgeon's assistant with secondary education, later he was made by his father – who in that time was a principal of the survey institute – a measurer, a surveyor, and later a teacher in one of the schools. Inconceivably he moved up from the surgeon's assistant to the Master of Medicine, and later also acted in this capacity in the Deaf – Mutism Institute thanks to Apuchtin. He was sneering at the vocation's obligations, the morality, and even the decency. [...] He was grabbing both at the Institute's money and its deposits. In the very beginning of his clerical duties he lost somewhere and could not find anywhere the pawn letters worth 3000 roubles. He was still committing thefts through doubling the prices. These facts did not result in any investigation. But other facts did – both the university professor's ignorance, and sordidness and the deeds of Zieniec that determin-*

<sup>1</sup> J. Nusbaum–Hilarowicz, *Pamiętniki przyrodnika. Autobiografia* [Naturalist's Diaries. Autobiography], Łwów [no date], pp. 25–44.

<sup>2</sup> *Pamiętnaia Kniżka Varšavskogo Učebnogo Okruga* [Visitors' Book of the Warsaw Scientific District] 1897, p. 36.

<sup>3</sup> A. Śródka, *Wydział Lekarski Cesarzowskiego Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego* [Faculty of Medicine of the Imperial University of Warsaw] in: M. Łyskanowski, A. Stapiński, A. Śródka (ed.), *Dzieje nauczania medycyny i farmacji w Warszawie (1789–1950)* [History of the Medicine and Pharmacy Teaching in Warsaw (1789–1950)], Warszawa 1990, pp. 247–248.

*ed the main subject of the trial [it concerned the assault on a woman]. And further: Ignorance of Zieniec in the university was unfathomable. The brought to the verge of despair students – within diagnostics at the patient's bed as the most important medical branch – got along with humour and irony, because they realized they would not learn anything. They almost did not attend clinic, and helped themselves with a private attendance at the hospitals<sup>1</sup>.*

This is one of many examples – maybe most drastic one – showing that the emotions, illwill, and even hatred of both sides made them express the extreme and unjustified opinions. It is never easy to ascertain who is right in one's opinions, and even arduous and based on authority research works are not able to reveal the truth about human attitudes.

*translated by Natalia Lietz*

---

<sup>1</sup> Narrans [S. Krzemiński], *Listy z zaboru rosyjskiego, Seria XII [Letters from the Russian Invaders' Territories, Set XII]*, Kraków 1901, pp. 79–84.