

SAINT PETERSBURG STATE UNIVERSITY

As a manuscript

KRUGLIKOVA OLGA SERGEEVNA

CONSERVATIVE DIRECTION
IN JOURNALISM IN POST-REFORM RUSSIA:
KEY CONCEPTS AND COMMUNICATION PRACTICES

Scientific specialty 5.9.9.

Media communications and journalism

Dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philological Sciences

Translation from Russian

Scientific consultant –
Doctor of Philology,
Professor L. P. Gromova

SAINT PETERSBURG

2024

Table of contents

Introduction	3
Chapter 1. Key concepts of Russian conservatism in the press of post-reform Russia	41
§ 1.1 Ideological dominants of Russian post-reform conservatism.....	49
§ 1.2 Orthodoxy as an ideal of freedom in the interpretation of Russian conservatives	70
§ 1.3. Autocracy as the embodied Equality in the understanding of Russian conservative journalists.....	101
§ 1.4. Nationality as a form of political brotherhood in the discourse of Russian post-reform journalism of a conservative orientation.....	123
Chapter 2. Communicative practices of Russian conservative journalism in the post-reform period.....	156
§ 2.1. M. N. Katkov's communicative strategy: from influencing the reader to influencing the official	158
§ 2.2. Enlightenment and “a certain measure of vulgarity” as the publishing strategy of N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov	194
§ 2.3 V. P. Meshchersky: Patronage and Publishing Innovation in the Communicative Practices of a High-Society Writer.....	214
§ 2.4 Communicative practices of F. M. Dostoevsky: between journalism and preaching	252
§ 2.5 Communicative practices of I. S. Aksakov - to remain on the height of the idea and not to give in to censorship.....	276
§ 2.6 Conservative press in communication processes of post-reform Russia..	300
Conclusion.....	327
Sources and literature	334

Introduction

The designation of the last decade as a specific period of development of world politics, characterized by a global reorganization of the world, has long been on the pages of the press¹, manifested in the speeches of politicians², analyzed by scientists³. This long-term and difficult process currently creates the impression of chaos in world politics, expressed in the "clash of mutually denying logics of medium -term and especially long-term development⁴." In these conditions, all collective subjects of confrontation need a clear awareness of their value guidelines and a clear articulation of the cultural base that can become the basis for consolidation and form a single image of the future for the majority. At the next stage, the awareness that the target image of the future is largely determined by the events of the past leads to the need to form an actual convention of the common past and identify the logical interrelations of the two layers of time.

In Russia, the work of the project "DNA of Russia", the introduction of special courses into the education system at various levels, such as school "Conversations about the Important" and university "Fundamentals of Russian Statehood", as well as a number of laws aimed at securitizing the politics of memory⁵ and preserving

¹" Mutinywar " as a model of transformations: Three scenarios for the future world order // Rambler. Finance. Access mode: https://finance.rambler.ru/economics/45727402/?utm_content=finance_media&utm_medium=read_more&utm_source=copylinkhttps://finance.rambler.ru/economics/45727402-myatezhvoynakak-model-transformatsiy-tri-stsenariya-buduschego-mirovogo-poryadka/. (date of access: date of access: 08.08.2024).

²Putin spoke about the ongoing reformatting of the world // RIA Novosti. Access mode: <https://ria.ru/20240402/pereformatirovanie-1937414841.html>. (date of access: 08.08.2024).

³"New World Order": "Great Reset" or "Global Concert"? // Russtrat . Institute of International Economic and Political Strategies. Access mode: <https://russtrat.ru/reports/30-maya-2021-1406-4444>. (date accessed: 08.08.2024).

⁴Evstafiev D. G. Step Over the Threshold of the Global World // Russia in Global Affairs. 2023. Vol. 21. No. 2. Pp. 8–21.

⁵Federal Law of 05.05.2014 No. 128-FZ "On Amendments to Certain Legislative Acts of the Russian Federation".

traditional values are aimed at ⁶solving this problem. However, it is necessary to note a characteristic feature of this process: formal and institutional measures obviously outpace the substantive reflection of the concepts involved and, even more so, the process of achieving any kind of public consensus regarding their actual meaning.

In this regard, one of the most **pressing** scientific tasks is the analysis of historical periods and events that can contribute to a clear understanding of what exactly traditional values are, what is the specificity of their expression and existence in the cultural context of various historical eras, and what aspects of their meaning do not lose their importance today. In this regard, the study of key concepts of Russian conservatism, essentially aimed at preserving the national tradition and adapting it to current political realities at each historical stage, is of fundamental importance.

The study of the philosophy and socio-political attitudes of Russian conservatism has a certain scientific history. In the Soviet period, in accordance with ideological attitudes, everything related to conservatism was assessed strictly negatively, the activities of Russian conservatives were consigned to oblivion whenever possible, and if they were covered, then only in an accusatory pamphlet style, generally avoiding serious understanding of the content of their philosophy and political practice, limiting themselves to a caricature of conservatives as people suffering from a “utopia of the past” and driven by a constant desire to stop movement and development for their own selfish purposes.

However, one of the paradoxes of the Soviet era is the fact that the Soviet regime in the ideological sphere directed its propaganda efforts to combat the legacy of Russian conservatism, while at the same time in the sphere of political practice it was the direct heir to the traditionalist conservative model. The Soviet Union, built on the ruins of the pre-revolutionary imperial statehood, fully inherited the basic principles of its state organism, adopted the imperial centralization of power,

⁶Decree of the President of the Russian Federation of 09.11.2022 No. 809 "On approval of the Fundamentals of state policy for the preservation and strengthening of traditional Russian spiritual and moral values."

personified in the person of its head (the monarch / secretary general), who possessed almost unlimited powers, adopted, moreover, in a hypertrophied version, the principle of strict ideological control by the state of all spheres of the spiritual life of citizens, inherited the desire for intensive development of the country's military power and political and ideological expansion into areas of geopolitical interest, emphasizing cultural opposition to Western countries, and much more. The Soviet Union was, to a certain extent, a modification of the Russian Empire that emerged after the great upheavals of 1917, based in everyday political life on the same conservative imperial doctrine, although in words Soviet ideologists and scholars disavowed the “retrograde” teachings of Russian conservatives.

This essential closeness of the imperial and Soviet political regimes, which was intuitively felt by the Soviet intelligentsia, determined the surge of interest in the legacy of Russian liberalism of the 19th century, which was noted in the late 1970s and 1980s. Another attempt to liberalize the political regime during the so-called “Kosygin reforms” failed, and the allusions to the imperial past that were too obvious forced society, at the end of L. I. Brezhnev’s rule, to seek answers from the thinkers of the pre-revolutionary era.

At the turn of the century, after another political upheaval that destroyed the Soviet modification of the Russian Empire, the Russian Federation, the new heir to the imperial tradition, began to demonstrate traditional principles of imperial statehood in political practice in the second half of the 2000s. This time, without ideological duality – representatives of power in the public sphere openly positioned themselves as heirs to the ideology of Russian conservatism ⁷.

This period is characterized by two opposing tendencies: on the one hand, on the wave of popularity of the idea of national revival a real fashion for conservatism appears, works of Russian conservatives are published and republished in large editions, including previously banned ones, entire book series appear (for example,

⁷Boris Gryzlov: The ideology of United Russia is Russian conservatism // Vedomosti. 16.10.2009. Access mode: <http://www.vedomosti.ru/politics/news/2009/10/16/boris-gryzlov-ideologiya-edinoj-rossii---rossijskij-konservatizm> . (date accessed: 24.02.2017).

the series "Russian Civilization"), scientific conferences and seminars on Russian conservatives are held; on the other hand, the onslaught of conservative aspirations in the political sphere encourages the champions of the liberal idea to join the struggle for the trampled values of liberalism, which leads to the active publication and popularization of the creative heritage of liberal thinkers. As a result of these activities, both poles of public life find themselves in front of an unexpected problem: in an attempt to divide the thinkers of the past into "ours" and "theirs", both the supporters of political freedom and the champions of state stability feel the inconsistency of the previously arbitrarily used journalistic clichés "conservative" and "liberal". For example, in 2008, the works of I. S. Aksakov were published in the "conservative" series "Russian Civilization" ⁸, and a year earlier his biography was included in the publication of the Liberal Mission Foundation "Russian Liberalism: Ideas and People" ⁹.

In attempts to get out of the definition crisis, interpreters have generated a whole series of oxymoronic terms such as "revolutionary conservatism", "conservative reformism", etc. , as well as a number of conditional binary oppositions used to form false definitions based on the antithesis: "conservatives are all those who are not liberals" and vice versa. Of course, the introduction of terms that mechanically combine in one concept essentially contradictory phenomena not only failed to clarify the question of the boundaries of Russian conservatism, but, on the contrary, further obscured the already complex problem of its definition. In general, it is obvious that at the present moment there is a need, having generalized the rich material of theoretical developments and empirical studies, to clearly formulate the main concepts of Russian conservatism, its substantive features.

Degree of development of the topic

Speaking about the degree of scientific development of the topic under study, it is necessary to note the fact that the multidisciplinary nature of the problems

⁸Aksakov I. S. Our banner is the Russian nationality. Moscow: Institute of Russian Civilization, 2008.

⁹Russian liberalism: ideas and people. Moscow: Liberal Mission Foundation, 2007.

addressed determines a certain complexity of structuring the historiographic review. The specificity of the domestic philosophical tradition is that "the form of Russian philosophical creativity is a freely written article" ¹⁰, usually starting from the current and topical for generalization at the level of the eternal, i.e., in essence, journalism becomes the most organic form of expression of Russian philosophical thought.

This allows us to say that the study of Russian philosophy, journalism as a sphere of its existence and literature as one of its forms of expression are inseparable from each other, since in Russia "it is not special philosophical treatises that reflect the level of development of philosophy, but the entire set of intellectual activity" ¹¹. Therefore, it becomes difficult to distinguish between areas of knowledge that, albeit with different research intentions, address the same material. The work of thinkers of the conservative trend, embodied in the form of journal articles, was studied by philosophers, political scientists, historians of journalism, literary scholars and classical historians whose research was devoted to the history of the social movement of a certain era. At the same time, within the framework of studies formally belonging to different areas of knowledge, synonymous questions were often posed, and all these studies, heterogeneous from the point of view of methodology, ultimately constituted a common array of scientific research on conservative thought in post-reform Russia.

Therefore, it seems the only possible way to divide the scientific literature devoted to the topic under study into two main groups according to the criterion of the scale of the scientific generalization undertaken in them and to single out in the first group works devoted to understanding the philosophy of Russian conservatism as a whole or a significant current related to it (pochvennichestvo, Slavophilism, etc.) etc.), and the second - studies aimed at revealing the ideological originality, the specifics of the individual creative style and the facts of the social activity of individual individuals.

¹⁰Frank S. L. Russian Worldview. St. Petersburg, 1996. P. 151.

¹¹Shaposhnikov L. E. Conservatism, modernism and innovation in Russian Orthodox thought of the 19th – 21st centuries. St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg State University Publishing House, 2006. P. 253.

Speaking about the first group of scientific works, it should be noted that the first post-Soviet decade was marked by opposing tendencies. On the one hand, the deconstruction of the Soviet regime generated a keen interest in imperial Russia and formed a tendency to idealize it excessively within the framework of a historical narrative permeated with a penitential intonation, nostalgic for the “Russia that we lost.” On the other hand, supporters of victorious democracy saw in the growing interest in the imperial legacy an increasingly obvious threat to democratization, so along with such works as those edited by A. I. Bokhanov ¹², numerous publications appeared by authors such as A. Ya. Yanov ¹³ and E. V. Barabanov ¹⁴, who viewed the growing demand for conservatism as a dangerous challenge for Russia and sought to discredit the conservative idea.

One of the first generalizing post-Soviet studies of the topic of Russian conservatism should be considered the collective work edited by V. Ya. Grosul "Russian Conservatism of the XIX Century. Ideology and Practice" ¹⁵. This, undoubtedly, one of the most large-scale generalizing studies was published at the turn of the XX - XXI centuries and, with all the diversity and impressive volume of the presented material, in relation to the interpretation of the phenomena studied, it became a full reflection of that contradictory time. In assessing the positions of conservatism, the authors attempt to step over the boundaries of the requirement to expose the retrograde teaching of conservatives that prevailed at the previous historical stage and at the same time cannot get rid of a number of stereotypes in the perception of conservative doctrine, continuing to say that Russian conservatism was essentially a feudal-serf ideology, that thanks to the support of the government, conservative journalism was dominant in post-reform Russia, etc. The

¹²Russian Conservatives / Bokhanov A. I. (head), Oleynikov D. I., Sekirinsky S. S., and others. Moscow: Russian World, 1997.

¹³Yanov A. Ya. Russia against Russia: Essays on the History of Russian Nationalism. Novosibirsk, 1825–1921. Novosibirsk, 1999.

¹⁴Barabanov E. V. Russian philosophy and the crisis of identity // Questions of Philosophy. 1991. No. 8. P. 102–116.

¹⁵ Grosul V. Ya., Itenberg B. S., Tvardovskaya V. A., Shatsillo K. F., Eymontova R. G. Russian conservatism of the 19th century. Ideology and practice. M., 2000.

terminological problem discussed above was partly reflected in this fundamental work: in an attempt to explain the complex relationship between the conservative and reformist principles in the philosophy of Russian conservatism, the authors use such definitions as “hard-headed conservatism”¹⁶ as opposed to “conservatism with progress”¹⁷.

An important stage in understanding Russian conservatism as an ideology is the work of A. A. Zorin "Feeding the Double-Headed Eagle...: Russian Literature and State Ideology in the Last Third of the 18th – First Third of the 19th Century"¹⁸. Based on the understanding of ideology not as a form of false consciousness, but as a cultural system based on an ideological metaphor and possessing literary properties, the author considers Russian conservative ideology as a set of political metaphors. Despite the fact that his reflections are focused primarily on an earlier period of development of the Russian conservative idea, many of the provisions expressed by A. A. Zorin regarding the initial stage of the existence of the formula "Orthodoxy. Autocracy. Nationality" are of unconditional interest in the context of this study.

The dissertation research¹⁹ and monograph by²⁰ S. V. Lebedev were in many ways the resolution of those most important theoretical problems that faced researchers of Russian conservatism at the previous stage. The author, disagreeing with the position characteristic of the previous stage of studying conservatism that conservatism is “the policy of the circles ruling in a specific historical period, guided by the rule “drag and do not let go”, but not an ideology and certainly not a

¹⁶Ibid. P. 74.

¹⁷Ibid. P. 81, p. 420.

¹⁸Zorin A. A. Feeding the Double-Headed Eagle...: Russian Literature and State Ideology in the Last Third of the 18th – First Third of the 19th Century. Moscow: New Literary Review, 2004.

¹⁹Lebedev S. V. The system of values of the philosophy of Russian conservatism of the second half of the 19th century: author's abstract . diss doctor of philosophical sciences. St. Petersburg, 2004.

²⁰Lebedev S. V. Guardians of the True Russian Principles. Ideals, Ideas, and Policy of Russian Conservatives of the Second Half of the 19th Century. St. Petersburg: Nestor, 2004.

philosophy”²¹, turns to identifying the unifying philosophical foundations of conservative teaching, overcoming the crisis of interpretation of heterogeneous political practices of conservatism at the theoretical level. At the same time, the author “deliberately considers Russian conservatism in corpore , without highlighting the features of the philosophical constructions of its individual representatives”, therefore “he specifically refused to analyze the works of individual philosophers”²².

Another interesting generalizing work has been published relatively recently – the work of G. I. Gerasimov “The Worldview Foundations of History”²³. The main advantage of this study simultaneously determines its key drawback. The author seeks to analyze the worldview foundations of Russian history in relation to all aspects of its internal life (politics, economics, scientific and technological progress, etc.) and from the point of view of all currents of philosophical thought. Turning to this level of generalization, the author, on the one hand, gives a broad picture of the historical process, on the other hand, he detaches himself from details so much that many conclusions begin to sound rather superficial. In particular, the author completely denies Russian conservatism the ability to form an independent political doctrine.

Among the monographic studies of Russian conservatism, the work of M. Yu. Chernavsky should be particularly highlighted²⁴, as he most consistently examines the issue of the unifying philosophical constants of Russian conservatism, while most studies focus on the diversity of its individual manifestations and modifications in the work of its individual representatives.

²¹Lebedev S. V. The system of values of the philosophy of Russian conservatism of the second half of the 19th century: author's abstract . diss doctor of philosophical sciences. St. Petersburg, 2004. P. 4.

²²Ibid. P. 6.

²³Gerasimov G. I. Ideological foundations of the history of Russia (mid-19th – early 20th centuries). Tula: Third Way, 2019.

²⁴Chernavsky M. Yu. Religious and philosophical foundations of conservatism in Russia. Moscow, 2004.

Of course, we cannot ignore the works of foreign researchers of Russian conservatism. Foreign studies of the mid- 20th century devoted to the political biographies of individual representatives of Russian conservatism are well known, but special attention should be paid to the work of R. Pipes "Russian Conservatism and Its Critics" as a more modern work in terms of approaches to interpretation and of a generalizing nature. It is fundamental for a foreign researcher to understand the thesis of Russian conservatives about the possibility of an original historical path for Russia. Among the unconditional merits of this work is the fact that the author, being free from the legacy of ideological limitations of Soviet historiography, justifiably classifies as conservative thinkers whom Russian historiography classifies as belonging to the liberal wing (A.S. Pushkin, B.N. Chicherin, etc.). This allows the researcher to enrich and deepen the ideological spectrum of conservatism. The main drawback of Pipes' work is the interpretative distortions that are traditional for foreign researchers and that inevitably arise when trying to understand Russian culture without being its product and bearer.

An important contribution to the understanding of Slavophilism as a doctrine within the framework of conservative philosophy is made by the work of A. D. Kaplin "Slavophiles, their associates and followers" ²⁵. Despite the fact that in terms of genre the book is more of a series of historical portraits or essays on the social views of various representatives of Slavophilism, some chapters (for example, "Russian Orthodox Thought on the Jesuits and their Attitude to Russia" and "Russian Historical Science of the 19th - Early 20th Centuries and the Slavophiles on Alexander Nevsky"), as well as the author's final essay "To the Inspectors of Slavophilism" demonstrate the desire to comprehensively comprehend the general features of Slavophilism and fit it into the historical and cultural context, which allows, in our opinion, to call this work among works of a generalizing nature.

To understand the specifics of post-reform conservatism, studies devoted to the analysis of its formation and development in the previous stages are certainly

²⁵Kaplin A. D. Slavophiles, their associates and followers / ed. O. A. Platonov. Moscow: Institute of Russian Civilization, 2011.

important. The leading researcher of Russian conservatism of the first quarter of the 19th century is A. Yu. Minakov, whose numerous works ²⁶– and above all the monograph “Russian Conservatism in the First Quarter of the 19th Century” ²⁷– make a significant contribution to the general understanding of the phenomenon of Russian conservative philosophy.

Russian conservatism as a philosophical trend and political doctrine is the subject of thematic scientific collections and collective monographs ²⁸, often representing collections of historical portraits of conservative statesmen ²⁹, as well as publications of materials from numerous conferences ³⁰ and articles ³¹. The constantly growing interest in conservative doctrine has led to the appearance of not only numerous collections, but also specialized scientific journals - for example, since 2014, the journal "Notebooks on Conservatism" has been published four times a year, which systematically develops topics related to the development of conservative philosophy.

²⁶Minakov A. Yu. At the origins of Russian conservatism: the “Russian party” of the first quarter of the 19th century // *Tractus Aevorum : Evolution of Sociocultural and Political Spaces*. 2014. Vol. 1. No. 1. Pp. 67–77. ; *Against the Current: Historical Portraits of Russian Conservatives of the First Third of the 19th Century* / ed. A. Yu. Minakov. Voronezh, 2005; Minakov A. Yu. Russian Conservatism in the First Quarter of the 19th Century // *Orthodoxy*. 2021. No. 3. Pp. 14–41.

²⁷Minakov A. Yu. *Russian conservatism in the first quarter of the 19th century*. Voronezh: Publishing house of the Voronezh State University, 2011.

²⁸Russian conservatism of the mid-18th – early 20th centuries: *Encyclopedia / Institute of Social Thought*. Moscow: Political Encyclopedia, 2010; *Historical metamorphoses of conservatism* / ed. P. Yu. Rakhshmir . Perm, 1998.

²⁹*Russian Conservatives / Rus. Academy of Sciences, Institute of Russian History*. Moscow: Russkiy Mir, 1997 ; *Against the Current: Historical Portraits of Russian Conservatives of the First Third of the 19th Century*. Voronezh: Voronezh State University Publishing House, 2005; *Conservatism: Ideas and People*. Perm: Perm University Publishing House, 1998; *Guardians of Russia: Anthology / S. V. Perevezentsev, A. A. Shirinyants , A. Yu. Minakov [et al.]* Moscow: Publis , 2016.

³⁰*With faith in Russia. Russian conservatism: history, theory, modernity: speeches and reports of participants of scientific-practical conference from December 21, 1998*. Moscow: VOPD "Our Home is Russia", 1999; *Conservatism in political and spiritual dimensions: materials Int . scientific conf .* (Perm, May 12–13, 1994). Perm, 1995.

³¹Vershinin M. S. Russian conservatism: retrospective political analysis // *Clio*. 1998. No. 1. Pp. 25–29; Repnikov V. A. *Russian conservatism: yesterday, today, tomorrow // Conservatism in Russia and the world: past and present*. Voronezh, 2001. Issue 1. Pp. 9–20.

The second group of scientific works is devoted to the study of the ideological specificity and creative originality of individual representatives of Russian conservatism - accordingly, it is advisable to consider it by grouping it according to the individuals studied. It should be noted that the activities of various representatives of conservatism in science are covered unevenly. For example, the figure of M. N. Katkov, who was perhaps the most famous among the representatives of post-reform conservatism, attracted the attention of researchers much more often than the activities of N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov, and the journalistic work of F. M. Dostoevsky was not studied as closely as his biography as a writer, therefore the subsections within this group of scientific studies will inevitably not be entirely symmetrical.

The first attempts to record and comprehend Katkov's role in the socio-political processes of the era were made by his contemporaries. This was the task set by S. Shcheglovitov, who published the book "Katkov and His Time" under the pseudonym "S. Nevedensky " ³², the title of which itself suggests that the author is attempting to consider Katkov's figure as a kind of sign of the era. Nevedensky carefully examines not only the mature period of Katkov's public activity - he seeks the origins of his views in episodes of his student youth, studies various manifestations of his talent, turns to the memoirs of his enemies as well as to the statements of his friends, which gives the work as a whole an objective character. It is no coincidence that all later researchers turned to the book "Katkov and His Time" as the main source of facts about his creative biography and repeatedly referred to it.

R. I. Sementkovsky , who published In 1892, in the series “The Lives of Remarkable People,” the brochure “M. N. Katkov, His Life and Literary Work” took as a basis information from Nevedensky’s work , significantly shortening it and providing weakly reasoned negative characteristics of the character being studied ³³.

³² Nevedensky S. Katkov and his time. St. Petersburg, 1889.

³³ Sementkovsky R. I. Mikhail Nikiforovich Katkov, his life and literary work. St. Petersburg: Popov Publishing House, 1892.

The book by the professor of Moscow University is of significant value for the researcher of Katkov's activities. N. A. Lyubimova "Katkov and His Historical Merit", although it can hardly be considered a study. "There were few people in my life so dear and close," writes N. A. Lyubimov, "as Katkov and Leontyev; I don't think there were many more close to them than me either"³⁴. This vital closeness of the author and the character of the book, on the one hand, gives it special significance for understanding the human qualities and personal motives of Katkov, but is distinguished by a subjective approach, since it primarily implements the author's desire to perpetuate the memory of a person close to him, and not to give an objective assessment of his activities.

Katkov came to the attention of Soviet researchers in the 1920s–1950s primarily as the publisher of the left-liberal *Russkiy Vestnik* of the late 1850s–early 1860s. The works of V. N. Rozental, "The Socio-Political Program of Russian Liberalism in the Mid --1850s (Based on Materials from *Russkiy Vestnik* for 1856–1857)," ³⁵and N. G. Sladkevich, "The Struggle of Social Currents in Russian Journalism in the Late 1850s–Early 1860s , " examine the role of *Russkiy Vestnik* in its early period as the ideological center of the left-liberal front. There are few works devoted to the study of the later stages of Katkov's creative biography. The most significant study in the historical and philological aspect of Katkov's biography and work, undertaken in the Soviet period, is the monograph by V. A. Tvardovskaya "The Ideology of the Post-Reform Autocracy (M. N. Katkov and His Publications)".³⁶The characteristic features of the time when the work was being prepared for publication influenced the author's assessment of Katkov's work - researchers of the pre-perestroika period were generally dominated by Lenin's assessment of Katkov

³⁴Lyubimov N. A. M. N. Katkov and his historical merit. St. Petersburg: Public Benefit, 1889. P. 17.

³⁵Rosenthal V. N. Socio-political program of Russian liberalism in the mid-50s of the XIX century (Based on the materials of the "Russian Bulletin" for 1856-1857) // *Istoricheskie zapiski*. 1961. No. 70. Pp. 197-222; Sladkevich N. G. The struggle of social currents in Russian journalism of the late 50s - early 60s of the XIX century . L., 1979.

³⁶Tvardovskaya V. A. Ideology of post-reform autocracy (M. N. Katkov and his publications). Moscow, 1978.

as a "left-liberal landowner", who over time showed himself to be a "rabid chauvinist and "Black Hundreds" ³⁷.

A significant number of scientific studies concerning the biography and work of M. N. Katkov belong to V. A. Kitaev. In his dissertation "From the History of Social Thought in Russia in the Second Half of the 1850s - Early 1860s (the Political Program of the Journal "Russian Herald" in 1856-1862)" and the monograph "From the Fronde to Conservatism . From the History of Russian Liberal Thought in the 1850s-60s" ³⁸V. A. Kitaev examines the period of the most active work of Katkov's journal "Russian Herald", paying significant attention to the role of not only Katkov, but also prominent theorists of liberalism who collaborated for some time on the publication (B. N. Chicherin, V. F. Korsh). The same period is dedicated to V. A. Kitaev's article "On the Controversy between Katkov and Chicherin in 1862" ³⁹.

The first post-Soviet period saw a surge of interest in representatives of Russian conservatism. For a long time, the work of researchers was aimed primarily at filling the gaps in scientific knowledge about those representatives of conservatism who were not studied at all in the previous stage, as well as at destroying the traditionally negative labeling of those conservatives who were at least briefly mentioned in works of the Soviet period. However, inspired by the task of rehabilitating conservatives "disgraced" in the recent past, researchers sometimes spoke excessively enthusiastically about their characters ⁴⁰.

Among the relatively recent studies of Katkov's work and biography, the scientific monograph by S. M. Sankova "A Statesman without a State Position. M. N. Katkov as an Ideologist of State Nationalism. Historiographical Aspect" is of

³⁷Lenin V. I. Complete Works. Moscow: Gospolitizdat , 1961. Vol. 21. P. 125.

³⁸Kitaev, V. A. From the history of social thought in Russia in the second half of the 1850s – early 1860s (political program of the journal “Russian Bulletin in 1856–1862): author’s abstract of a PhD thesis. Moscow, 1970; Kitaev, V. A. From the Fronde to Conservatism . From the history of Russian liberal thought in the 1850s–60s. Moscow: Mysl, 1972.

³⁹Kitaev V. A. On the issue of the controversy between Katkov and Chicherin in 1862 // Questions of the history of socio-political thought and domestic policy of Russia in the 19th century. Gorky, 1971. Pp. 45–56.

⁴⁰Makarova G. N. Guardian // Slav. 1996. No. 1. P. 11–18; Seleznev F. A., Smolin M. B. The Great Guardian of the Empire // Imperial Word: articles by M. N. Katkov / Comp. M. B. Smolin. M.: Moscow, 2002.

considerable interest ⁴¹. The exceptional value of this study lies in the fact that the author has collected, systematized and summarized all the scientific research material on the work and activities of M. N. Katkov. Despite the fact that the work is historiographical in nature and the author does not set himself the task of actually studying Katkov's work, but only presents a generalization of previous scientific experience, some considerations expressed in the process of systematizing the conclusions of scientific literature also seem undoubtedly interesting.

The attention of researchers was attracted not only by Katkov's personal publishing activities ⁴², but also by the undoubted influence he had on the journalistic, literary and political world of his time, the circle of his students, associates, and the nature of his literary connections. These issues are the subject of A. E. Kotov's dissertation ⁴³, his monograph ⁴⁴ and individual articles ⁴⁵.

E. V. Perevalov examines the activities of Katkov and his immediate circle from different angles: the researcher examines the reflection of individual aspects of Russian public life on the pages of Katkov's publications ⁴⁶, including concentrating her attention on the least studied late period of the publication of the "Russian

⁴¹Sankova S. M. Statesman without a government position. M. N. Katkov as an ideologist of state nationalism. Historiographic aspect. St. Petersburg: Nestor, 2007.

⁴² Shirinyants A. A. Katkov Mikhail Nikiforovich // Social Thought of Russia in the 18th – Early 20th Centuries: Encyclopedia. Moscow: Political Encyclopedia, 2005. Pp. 197–198; Shirinyants A. A. Once Again about M. N. Katkov // Katkov Bulletin: Religious and Philosophical Readings: on the 190th Anniversary of M. N. Katkov's Birth. Moscow: Progress-Pleiades, 2008. Pp. 107–113.

⁴³Kotov A. E. Conservative press in the socio-political life of Russia in the 1860s – 1890s: M. N. Katkov and his entourage: diss . . . doctor of history. sciences. St. Petersburg, 2016.

⁴⁴Kotov A.E. "The Tsar's Path" by Mikhail Katkov: The Ideology of Bureaucratic Nationalism in Political Journalism of the 1860s–1890s. St. Petersburg: Vladimir Dal, 2016.

⁴⁵Kotov, A. E. "A Means of Struggle and a Surrogate for Politics": Political Journalism by M. N. Katkov and His Followers // Questions of the History of Conservatism. 2015. No. 1. pp. 174–193; Kotov, A. E. Bureaucratic Nationalism of Mikhail Katkov // Questions of Nationalism. 2014. No. 1(17). pp. 174–186; Kotov, A. E. Classicism in the Journalism of M. N. Katkov // Cultural Diversity in Education. St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg Institute of Humanitarian Education, 2009. Part 2. pp. 74–78.

⁴⁶Perevalova E. V. Department of Foreign Literature in M. N. Katkov's Journal "Russian Bulletin" // Bulletin of the Ivan Fedorov Moscow State University of Printing Arts. 2011. No. 7. Pp. 81–90; Perevalova E. V. National Policy of Emperor Alexander I (based on materials from M. N. Katkov's journal "Russian Bulletin") // Communication in the Modern World. Voronezh: Voronezh State University, 2022. Part I. Pp. 138–140.

Herald" ⁴⁷; restores the context of literary relations of the era ⁴⁸, based on a wide range of sources that she introduces into scientific circulation; examines the specifics of the reflection of conservative ideas in Katkov's journalism ⁴⁹.

V. P. Meshchersky ⁵⁰ is quite widely represented today. N. V. Chernikova has been conducting long-term and fruitful work on the study of his creative heritage and biography details. Of particular interest is her monograph "Portrait against the backdrop of the era: Prince Vladimir Petrovich Meshchersky", in which the researcher supplements and develops many of the ideas previously expressed by her in her dissertation ⁵¹. The book, declared as the first full biography of Meshchersky, is based on the classical biographical method, pays attention to family traditions and the personal development of the prince, and also tells about the work of his life - the publication of the newspaper-magazine "Grazhdanin". The author sets the goal of correcting in the reader's mind the caricatured image of the prince created by his contemporaries and recorded by Soviet historiography, but on this path, guided by the obvious feeling of ardent sympathy for the character being studied, the author constructs an image of the prince permeated with almost messianic tasks, which in relation to Meshchersky does not seem to be the restoration of justice, but a certain research excess in the opposite direction. At the same time, the researcher's versatile

⁴⁷Perevalova E. V. Agrarian program of M. N. Katkov's magazine "Russian Bulletin" in the 1880s // Media readings of SKFU. Stavropol: Service School, 2017. Pp. 56–63.

⁴⁸Perevalova E. V. Around M. N. Katkov: Authors and Staff of the Russian Bulletin and Moskovskiye Vedomosti. Moscow: Moscow Polytechnic University, 2019; Perevalova E. V.; K. F. Golovin – Employee of M. N. Katkov's Journal "Russian Bulletin" // News of Higher Educational Institutions. Problems of Printing and Publishing. 2020. No. 4. Pp. Bezobrazov – Employee and Correspondent of M. N. Katkov // News of Higher Educational Institutions. Problems of Printing and Publishing. 2015. No. 6. Pp. 79–86; Perevalova E. V. Olga Novikova - employee of "Moskovskie Vedomosti" M. N. Katkova (based on materials from the OR RSL) // Rumyantsev Readings-2017: 500th Anniversary of the Publication of the First Slavic Bible by Francisk Skaryna: the Formation and Development of the Culture of Book Printing / compiled by E. A. Ivanova. Moscow: Pashkov Dom, 2017. Part 2. Pp. 46-51.

⁴⁹Perevalova E. V. The system of conservative values in domestic periodicals: M. N. Katkov and his publications (second half of the 1850s – 1880s): diss. ... doctor of philological sciences. Voronezh, 2023.

⁵⁰Chernikova N.V. Portrait against the backdrop of the era: Prince Vladimir Petrovich Meshchersky. Moscow: Political Encyclopedia, 2017.

⁵¹Chernikova N. V. Prince V. P. Meshchersky in the public life of Russia, the last third of the XIX – beginning of the XX century: diss. ... Cand. of History. Moscow, 2001.

work on the publication of the prince's ego-documents, their systematization and commentary is of unconditional importance and research interest ⁵².

A number of researchers focus their attention on Meshchersky's journalistic activities, examining not only the substantive and ideological aspects, but also the economic, technical and organizational aspects. In this regard, it is necessary to note the works of A. V. Kail ⁵³ and G. S. Shcherbakova ⁵⁴. G. S. Shcherbakova studies not only the publicism, but also the substantive originality of the prince's fiction ⁵⁵, conducting an interesting comparison of the semantic dominants of his journalistic and artistic works, thereby indicating the important role of fiction as an additional instrument of ideological influence in the prince's communicative practices.

Also of significant importance for understanding the communicative practices of the era in general and the publishing experience of Prince Meshchersky in particular are the works of M. M. Leonov ⁵⁶, although the author focuses more on the features of the prince's personal communication, his influence based on his connections in society, his closeness to the royal family and his ability to maneuver

⁵²Chernikova N. V. Prince V. P. Meshchersky and his epistolary legacy // Letters to the Grand Duke Alexander Alexandrovich: 1863–1868 / introduction, commentary by N. V. Chernikova. Moscow: New Literary Review, 2011.

⁵³Kail A. V. "Citizen" of Prince V. P. Meshchersky // Bulletin of the Saratov University, Series: History. International Relations. 2011. Vol. 11. Issue 1. Pp. 8–15.

⁵⁴Shcherbakova G. I. V. Meshchersky's newspaper "Grazhdanin" as an organ of the conservative nobility: towards the formulation of the problem // Bulletin of the Humanitarian Institute of TSU. 2010. No. 3(9). P. 127-134; Shcherbakova G. I. The church question in V. Meshchersky's "Grazhdanin" // Media in the modern world. 63rd St. Petersburg Readings. St. Petersburg, 2024. Vol. 1. P. 50-52; Shcherbakova G. I. Representation of the author's image in V. Meshchersky's journalism // Media in the modern world. 62nd St. Petersburg Readings. St. Petersburg, 2023. P. 135-136; Shcherbakova G. I. New methods of presenting the image of the monarch in the magazine "Grazhdanin" // Age of Information. 2017. No. 2-1. P. 69–70.

⁵⁵Shcherbakova G. I. Pasquinade as an Instrument of Information Warfare (Based on the Comedy by V. Meshchersky "10 Years in the Life of an Editor") // Digital Journalism: Technologies, Meanings, and Features of Creative Activity. Ekaterinburg, 2024. Pp. 131–133; Shcherbakova G. I. The Image of the Author in the Fiction of V. P. Meshchersky // Text: philological, socio-cultural, regional, and methodological aspects. Tolyatti, 2023. Part 1. Pp. 490–498.

⁵⁶Leonov M. M. V. P. Meshchersky: Russian conservatism and government policy in the late 19th – early 20th centuries: author's abstract . diss cand. history. sciences. Samara, 1999 ; Leonov M. M. V. P. Meshchersky's Salon: Patronage and mediation in Russia at the turn of the 19th – 20th centuries. Samara: Publishing House of the Samara Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2009.

in the bureaucratic world rather than on journalism. The works of I. E. Dronov are devoted to the features of Meshchersky's conservative philosophy ⁵⁷.

In 2017–2019, under the leadership of A. V. Matyushkin, a grant project was implemented, within the framework of which researchers systematized and studied the editorial archive of V. P. Meshchersky's newspaper "Grazhdanin"; the research group prepared a series of publications that were of undoubted interest in the context of this study ⁵⁸.

Thanks to numerous studies by A. V. Dmitriev, one of the most interesting and completely forgotten journalists of the previous historical period, N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov, returned to the Russian cultural and historical context. A. V. Dmitriev examined various aspects of his creative biography in his works: the activities of Gilyarov-Platonov as an author and censor of a Slavophile magazine ⁵⁹, the specifics of his literary connections and personal relationships with iconic figures of the socio-political discourse of the era ⁶⁰, and commented on the autobiographical notes of the publisher of *Sovremennye Izvestia* ⁶¹. The substantive specifics of Gilyarov-Platonov's philosophical legacy and the uniqueness of his views in the context of the general principles of Slavophilism are examined in the article by B. V. Mezhev,

⁵⁷ Dronov I. E. *The Path of a Conservative // Meshchersky V. P. Conservative Citizen*. Moscow: Novaya Kniga Rossii, 2005; Dronov I. E. *Development of a Conservative Concept of Russia's Development in the Works of V. P. Meshchersky (second half of the 19th – early 20th centuries): author's abstract . diss Cand. of History*. Moscow, 2007.

⁵⁸F. M. Dostoevsky, V. P. Meshchersky: *Correspondence (1872–1880) // Unknown Dostoevsky*. 2017. Vol. 4. No. 1. Pp. 35–58; "Grazhdanin is published by the Lyceum sick and restless ...": from the letters to M. P. Pogodin in 1873-1874 // *Unknown Dostoevsky*. 2017. Vol. 4. No. 3. Pp. 31-45; Zakharova, O. V. *Editorial tactlessness, or two "Diaries" in "Grazhdanin" in the 1870s // Scientific notes of Petrozavodsk state university*. 2018. No. 1(170). Pp. 24-28.

⁵⁹N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov – author and censor of "Russian Conversation" // "Russian Conversation": *History of the Slavophile Journal: Research. Materials. Article-by-article listing / edited by B. F. Egorov, A. M. Pentkovsky and O. L. Fetisenko*. St. Petersburg: Pushkin House, 2011. Pp. 158–183.

⁶⁰ Dmitriev A. P. "In the Church, Our Main Questions..." (N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov and K. P. Pobedonostsev in their relationships, correspondence, and judgments about each other) // *Understanding by Faith: Correspondence of N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov and K. P. Pobedonostsev (1860–1887)*. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. Pp. 5–26.

⁶¹ Dmitriev A. P. N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov and his memories // *From the experiences: autobiographical memories: In 2 volumes*. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2009. Vol. 2. P. 5–8.

"Vl. Soloviev, N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov and the "decomposition of Slavophilism" ⁶².
"

Just as in the case of M. N. Katkov, the first works aimed at understanding the legacy of Gilyarov-Platonov were carried out by his contemporaries and closest associates, and in this respect they have synonymous advantages and disadvantages, as does the work of N. M. Lyubimov about Katkov: with extreme respect and reverence, N. V. Shakhovskaya collected and systematized materials for the biography of the late teacher ⁶³, S. F. Sharapov highly appreciated his merits, calling his work about Gilyarov-Platonov "Unidentified Genius" ⁶⁴.

The publicists of the Slavophile circle, and first of all I. S. Aksakov, attract close attention of researchers ⁶⁵. In the Soviet period, T. F. Pirozhkova in her work "Revolutionary Democrats on Slavophilism and Slavophile Journalism" ⁶⁶, V. A. Kitaev in his studies "From the History of the Ideological Struggle in Russia during the First Revolutionary Situation (I. S. Aksakov in the Social Movement of the Early 1860s)" ⁶⁷ and "The Polish Question in the Publicism of I. S. Aksakov (First Half of the 1860s)" addressed the study of the socio-political views of I. S. Aksakov. c.)» ⁶⁸. An important feature of the research of this period is a certain ideological

⁶²Mezhuev B. V. Vl. Soloviev, N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov and the "decomposition of Slavophilism" // *History of Philosophy*. 2000. No. 6. P. 33–61.

⁶³ Shakhovskoy N.V. Nikita Petrovich Gilyarov-Platonov: *Krat. publicist. essay*. Revel, 1893; Shakhovskoy N.V. Nikita Petrovich Gilyarov-Platonov // *Gilyarov-Platonov N.P. Collection of works: in 2 volumes / ed. K. P. Pobedonostseva*. M.: Synod. typ., 1899. T. 1; Shakhovskoy N.V. *Materials for the biography of N.P. Gilyarov-Platonov // Russian Review*. M.: Univ. typ., 1896. Book. 6 (vol. 42). pp. 454–470.

⁶⁴Sharapov S. F. *Unidentified genius: In memory of Nikita Petrovich Gilyarov-Platonov: Articles, notes, letters and excerpts, collected. and prored . Sergei Sharapov*. M.: tipo -lit. A. V. Vasilyeva and Co., 1903.

⁶⁵ Kruglikova O. S. *Publications of Russian post-reform conservatism in the assessment of modern researchers // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 10: Journalism*. 2017. No. 6. P. 191–199.

⁶⁶Pirozhkova T. F. *Revolutionary Democrats on Slavophilism and Slavophile Journalism*. Moscow: Moscow State University Publishing House, 1984.

⁶⁷Kitaev V. A. *From the history of the ideological struggle in Russia during the first revolutionary situation (I. S. Aksakov in the social movement of the early 60s of the XIX century)*. Gorky, 1974.

⁶⁸Kitaev V. A. *The Polish question in the journalism of I. S. Aksakov (first half of the 60s of the XIX century) // Issues of the economic and socio-political history of Russia in the XVIII-XIX centuries*. Gorky, 1975. Issue 1.

determination not only of the conclusions, but also of the very formulation of the research task, which largely assumed the consideration of Aksakov's activities through their reflection in the journalism of his political opponents. This feature is to some extent characteristic of the fundamental work of N. I. Tsimbaev, dedicated to Aksakov, "I. S. Aksakov in the public life of post-reform Russia" ⁶⁹.

Having mentioned the earlier research works of T. F. Pirozhkova, it is impossible not to mention the colossal work that the researcher carried out as part of the authors' collective that prepared the book series "Slavophile Archive" for publication. The editorial board of the series, headed by B. F. Egorov, has already published five books to date, devoted to the history of various aspects of Slavophile journal and public activity. In the first book, devoted to "Russian Conversation" ⁷⁰, not only the facts illustrating the publishing strategies of the Slavophiles as a whole are fundamentally important for our topic, but also individual chapters devoted to I. S. Aksakov ⁷¹ and N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov ⁷². The following books in the series are annotated editions of the correspondence and memoirs of people who were active participants in, or who were associated with, the Slavophile movement. Among these, for us, in terms of clarifying the communicative practices of I. S. Aksakov, the third book, containing his correspondence with Yu. F. Samarin ⁷³, is of fundamental importance, and although this material primarily pertains to the category of sources rather than scientific research, the extensive scientific commentary with which the

⁶⁹ Tsimbaev N.I.I.S. Aksakov in the public life of post-reform Russia. M., 1978.

⁷⁰"Russian Conversation": History of a Slavophile Journal: Research. Materials. Article-by-article listing / ed. by B. F. Egorov, A. M. Pentkovsky and O. L. Fetisenko . St. Petersburg: Pushkin House, 2011.

⁷¹Grekov V. N. Ivan Aksakov – employee and editor of “Russkaya Beseda” // “Russkaya Beseda”: history of the Slavophile journal: Research. Materials. Article-by-article listing / ed. by B. F. Egorov, A. M. Pentkovsky and O. L. Fetisenko . St. Petersburg: Pushkin House, 2011. Pp. 124–158.

⁷²Dmitriev A. P. N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov – author and censor of “Russian Conversation” // “Russian Conversation”: History of the Slavophile Journal: Research. Materials. Article-by-article listing / ed. by B. F. Egorov, A. M. Pentkovsky and O. L. Fetisenko . St. Petersburg: Pushkin House, 2011. Pp. 158–183.

⁷³Correspondence of I. S. Aksakov and Yu. F. Samarin (1848–1876) / prepared by T. F. Pirozhkova, O. L. Fetisenko and V. Yu. St. Petersburg: Pushkin House, 2016.

sources are provided allows us to classify all the books in the series equally as scientific literature.

The public activity of I. S. Aksakov was very diverse and was not limited to the journal field. S. V. Motin, who studies the historical aspects of the civil service system, examines in the monograph “Russian Slavophile in the Law Enforcement Service. I. S. Aksakov – Employee of the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Russian Empire”⁷⁴ the period of Aksakov’s biography associated with his official career. However, since it was at this time that Aksakov undertook his first publishing projects, S. V. Motin pays attention to the circumstances that accompanied the beginning of his publishing career⁷⁵.

Of fundamental importance for understanding Aksakov's creative biography and principles of social activity are the works of A. A. Tesli. In particular, the most important is the researcher's thought, expressed in the work "The Last of the "Fathers": the biography of Ivan Aksakov"⁷⁶, about Aksakov's dual position as the heir to the ideas of the elder Slavophiles, which partly obliged him, especially at the first stage of his work, not so much to rely on his own thoughts and judgments, as to strive to match the heights of the inherited teaching. The need to be a "Slavophile on the outside"⁷⁷, i.e. in the opinion of people who were not part of the Slavophile circle, and at the same time the desire to maintain an internal polemical approach in relation to his comrades in the direction largely determined the contradictory nature of Aksakov's publishing strategy.

The study of the mature period of the publicist's creative biography is the subject of a fundamental study by D. A. Badalyan⁷⁸, who also wrote studies of

⁷⁴Motin S. V. Russian Slavophile in Law Enforcement Service. I. S. Aksakov – employee of the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Russian Empire. Ufa: Ufa Law Institute of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia, 2017.

⁷⁵Motin S. V. “I will still publish Parus until it is banned...” (on the history of the newspaper’s publication by I. S. Aksakov) // MediaAlmanac . 2013. No. 2.

⁷⁶Teslya A. A. “The Last of the “Fathers””: Biography of Ivan Aksakov. St. Petersburg: Vladimir Dal, 2015.

⁷⁷Ibid. P. 88.

⁷⁸Badalyan D. A. "The Calling Bell": Ivan Aksakov in Russian Journalism of the Late 1870s – First Half of the 1880s. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2016.

various aspects of Aksakov's publishing activities ⁷⁹. Of particular interest in the context of this work is the analysis of Aksakov's legacy through the prism of the history of concepts ⁸⁰.

Despite the fundamental and comprehensive study of the phenomenon of F. M. Dostoevsky in Russian literary criticism, the journalistic activity of the writer, as well as his conservative convictions, still represent a field that leaves some space and prospects for researchers. Without denying the importance of fundamental classical works, such as the works of G. M. Friedlander ⁸¹, M. M. Bakhtin ⁸² and G. K. Shchennikov ⁸³, for understanding the ideological foundations of Dostoevsky's worldview, it is also important to clearly understand that the entire colossal volume of Dostoevsky studies available today cannot and should not be presented in the structure of this section of the historiographical review. If we focus specifically on Dostoevsky's journalistic and editorial work, it turns out that the volume of his scientific study is not so large-scale. Dostoevsky's journalistic works and editorial activities were examined by a group of researchers in the thematic collection "Dostoevsky and Journalism" ⁸⁴, although many publications in the collection were devoted to a greater extent to the initial period of his journal activity, i.e. the magazines "Vremya" and "Epokha". These same first publishing experiences of Dostoevsky as an editor are also examined in the works of V. S. Nechaeva ⁸⁵. The

⁷⁹Badalyan D. A. Ivan Aksakov in 1862: The Choice between the Law and Journalistic Honor // Modern Mass Media in the Context of Information Technology. SPb.: St. Petersburg State University of Industrial Technology and Design, 2017. Pp. Badalyan D. A. I. S. Aksakov's Newspaper "Rus" and Censorship // Russian Literature. 2006. No. 1. Pp.

⁸⁰Badalyan D. A. Zemsky Sobor: the history of the concept from Karamzin to Ivan Aksakov // Russian Idea : a website of conservative political thought. Access mode: <https://politconservatism.ru/experiences/zemskij-sobor-istoriya-ponyatiya-ot-karamzina-dovivana-aksakova> . (date of access: 06/23/2023).

⁸¹ Friedlander G. M. Dostoevsky's Realism. M.; L.: Nauka, 1964.

⁸²Bakhtin M. M. Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics. 2nd ed., revised and enlarged . Moscow: Sov. pisatel, 1963.

⁸³Shchennikov G.K. The Integrity of Dostoevsky. Ekaterinburg: Publishing House of the Ural University, 2001.

⁸⁴Dostoevsky and journalism / ed. Vladimir Zakharov, Karen Stepanyan, Boris Tikhomirov. St. Petersburg: Dmitry Bulanin, 2013.

⁸⁵Nechaeva V. S. Journal of M. M. and F. M. Dostoevsky "Epoch". 1864-1865. Moscow: Nauka, 1975; Nechaeva V. S. Journal of M. M. and F. M. Dostoevsky "Time". 1861-1863. Moscow: Nauka, 1972.

period of Dostoevsky's journalistic activity that interests us is analyzed in certain aspects in the works of V. N. Zakharov ⁸⁶and V. A. Viktorovich ⁸⁷.

In addition, it is necessary to note the multifaceted long-term research work of I. L. Volgin, who revealed many unknown pages of the journalistic activity of the great writer ⁸⁸. I. L. Volgin was the first to draw attention to the similarity of Dostoevsky's journalistic manner with modern speech strategies, in particular, those implemented in the blogosphere.

Research issues

Turning to the historical and philological side of the intellectual picture of a certain period of the past, it is important to understand that the key to understanding the essence of the historical process and the phenomena that comprise it lies in the most accurate interpretation of the basic philosophical and socio-political concepts that determine the character of the era. In this case, the main requirement is to identify precisely that conceptual load of the concept that was characteristic of a certain era, i.e. the meaning with which the concept was endowed at a local historical moment.

This aspect acquires a particularly important significance in relation to the study of Russian socio-political discourse, reflected in the pages of journalism of the 19th century. Journalism in Russia was born during the period of Peter the Great's reforms, which is for Russia, in the terminology of the German school of the history of concepts, a "time of transition", i.e. a time when the semantic context of familiar concepts changes completely, new concepts are born, and public consciousness

⁸⁶Zakharov V. N. Thesaurus analysis and the problem of attribution of editorial articles in Dostoevsky's "Citizen" (1873-1874) // Horizons of humanitarian knowledge. 2019. No. 5. P. 104–116; Zakharov V. N. The System of Dostoevsky's Genres: Typology and Poetics. L.: Leningrad State University named after A.S. Pushkin, 1985.

⁸⁷Viktorovich V. A. Dostoevsky. Collective. "Citizen" as the Editor's Work // Unknown Dostoevsky. 2015. No. 4. P. 11–20.

⁸⁸Volgin I. L. Metamorphoses of "writer's journalism" Dostoevsky - Gogol - Tolstoy // Russian literature and journalism in the movement of time. 2015. No. 1. Pp. 103-115; Volgin I. L. "A Writer's Diary" as a world-creating project // Questions of Philosophy. 2014. No. 5. Pp. 116-122.

changes radically. The abundance of borrowings, the not always successful assimilation of neologisms, the blurred boundaries between truly new concepts and fashionable names of old concepts - all these socio-cultural processes of the era had a significant influence on the emerging journalism.

During the reign of Catherine the Great, Russian culture experienced another large-scale wave of borrowings. Having barely managed to get used to the legacy of Peter the Great during Elizabeth's reign, it was forced to adopt, as a result of the cultural transmission of the Enlightenment, the established Western European language for designating concepts in the socio-political sphere, and researchers rightly note the enormous role in this process of the literary activity of the empress herself and, above all, her famous "Instruction" of the Legislative Commission ⁸⁹. However, the words and concepts adopted in the Russian language had a certain artificiality for a long time, since they were not born organically from the practice of socio-political life, but were calqued. Often, in the system of concepts, there arose what seemed to be signifiers without a signified, i.e. words that were not associated with any real phenomena in the Russian socio-political context, but were filled with meaning arbitrarily. The forties of the XIX century. It is no coincidence that they went down in history as the “era of consciousness” – this is a very capacious metaphor, showing the main vector of the intellectual process of this time: the formation of a more or less common conceptual apparatus for all participants in the public dialogue, suitable for understanding socio-political reality.

However, this process was very protracted, so that even in 1862 one of the leading journalists of post-reform Russia, M. N. Katkov, considered this problem to be extremely acute: “In our literature there are all sorts of words that exist in all literatures in the world; we are familiar with all the terms... we throw around terms, sort, classify... we have philosophers of all sorts: materialists, idealists, and all sorts of *ists* , although we have never had philosophy. We have political parties of all shades: conservatives, moderate liberals, progressives, constitutionalists... and

⁸⁹ Durinova G. V. Russian socio-political language: “Instruction” of Catherine II // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 21: Management (state and society). 2015. No. 1. P. 3–13.

democrats, and demagogues, and socialists and communists; but we have nothing resembling political life. We have words and no deeds, and all our *ists* are imaginary creatures, phantoms, words, and words to which nothing in reality corresponds ⁹⁰. ” Another famous journalist of that period, I. S. Aksakov, agreed with him, noting in a publication of 1867 that “the names borrowed from foreigners to express the phenomena of Russian life are of no use at all. Such terms of Western science and life as “aristocracy,” “democracy,” “democratic tendencies” – express nothing in our country. But these terms are not good only because they express nothing; they are bad because, by introducing concepts alien to your way of life, they also frighten and confuse people, even very respectable ones ⁹¹. ”

Thus, realizing that “as a result of numerous and multidirectional semantic shifts, semantic tracing and subsequent semantic regrouping, a Russian version of... ‘metaphysical language’ gradually emerges” ⁹², it is still difficult to fully agree with the position that “in the second half of the 19th century, the restructuring of the conceptual system of the Russian language caused by such processes is basically completed, so that it becomes possible to speak of a period of stability, albeit a very short one” ⁹³. The conceptual system of socio-political discourse does not have time to settle down, since the dynamics of social processes at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries are extremely high. In particular, with regard to the concept of “conservatism”, a terminological confusion has arisen that has lasted for a century and a half, requiring some clarification.

In the first decades after the reforms, the use of designations in the press of belonging to a certain political trend, both one's own and that of one's opponent, was at the whim of the writer, who considered himself entitled to fill the concepts of

⁹⁰Katkov M. N. Collected works: in 6 volumes. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. Vol. 2. P. 30.

⁹¹ Works of I. S. Aksakov. Slavophilism and Westernism (1860–1886). Articles from “Day,” “Moskva,” “Moskvich,” and “Rus.” Vol. 2. 2nd ed. St. Petersburg. A. S. Suvorin Printing House, 1891, p. 46.

⁹²Zhivov IN. M. History of concepts, history of culture, history of society // Essays on the historical semantics of the Russian language of the early modern period. M.: Languages of Slavic cultures, 2009. P. 14.

⁹³Ibid.

"democrat" or "conservative" with his own meaning. For example, the newspaper "Vest", which called itself an organ of conservatism, attacked the conservative "Moskovskie Vedomosti" for its "democratic" course, the revolutionary-democratic "Russkoye Slovo" attacked the "retrograde" "Sovremennik", which rightly considered itself the leader of the progressive reformers, and the pochvennik magazine "Epokha" called both of the latter organs of the nihilist party. The brief history of Russian parliamentarism at the beginning of the 20th century, rather chaotic and fleeting, also did not develop clear definitions in relation to the concept of "conservatism", since the concepts of "right", "left", "centrists", etc. were more often used.

In Soviet society there were rather rigid ideological frameworks that dictated strictly defined assessments of various phenomena of social life to thinkers and researchers. This led to an attempt to overcome terminological confusion, since it was necessary to clearly separate "our own" in the assessment and study of figures of the past, i.e. those who professed the ideas of revolutionary democracy and socialism from those who were ideologically alien – liberals and conservatives. Probably driven by the desire to preserve the legacy of as many 19th century thinkers as possible for the general public, Soviet scholars, basing themselves on early youthful works and correctly selected moments of their biographies, skillfully substantiated the affiliation with moderate liberalism of many representatives of the conservative-statist wing (for example, N. M. Karamzin, A. S. Pushkin, the Slavophiles I. S. Aksakov and Yu. F. Samarin, F. M. Dostoevsky, etc.), which also created certain contradictions in subsequent assessments of their work.

Thus, Karamzin's biography began to deliberately emphasize his literary polemics with the "old Russian" party, headed by A. S. Shishkov, with whom Karamzin was much more of a like-minded person in his political convictions than an opponent; Dostoevsky was presented mainly as a participant in the Petrashevsky circle, the ideas of which he himself disavowed in the journalism of his mature period; in Pushkin's work, the central role was given to his youthful ode "Liberty", while conservative-monarchist works like "Journey from Moscow to Petersburg"

were hushed up. Thus, in the interpretation of Soviet historiography, the liberal camp of Russian political thought was significantly replenished, and the ranks of conservatives, already small in number, lost many of their representatives, but thanks to this ideological maneuver, the brilliant names of Russian literature and journalism were preserved both for scientific discourse and for study within the educational system. Only the most ardent supporters of unlimited autocracy and opponents of revolutionary methods of struggle in any of their manifestations were recognized as belonging to conservatism proper: M. N. Katkov, N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov, V. P. Meshchersky, V. V. Rozanov, L. A. Tikhomirov, K. S. Leontyev, and others.

It is also important to understand that, when studying social movements of the past, we often deal with specific linguistic units: not only do they not have a subject signified, it is important that many of them belong simultaneously to the sphere of the concepts being studied and to the sphere of scientific terminology. This fully applies to such words as "conservatism" and "liberalism". As units of natural language, they were used by publicists and public figures in different eras with different semantic meanings, and during the period of institutionalization of the sciences of society, they were understood as terms with a more or less clearly formulated conventional meaning, common to researchers, theorists and practitioners in the political sphere, but adequate to the era that formulated them. The irrelevance of using them in the modern terminological sense for nominating social phenomena of the past very quickly became obvious, and researchers were eventually forced to admit their helplessness in doctrinal definition of publicists of the past as conservatives, liberals, moderate or revolutionary democrats, etc. Modern political science terms have often come into conflict with the realities of the past.

M. V. Kalashnikov, who has been working intensively in the direction of developing approaches to the history of concepts, notes the relevance of the task facing researchers to "distinguish, within the framework of new scientific directions, concepts of natural language as a unit of analysis from instrumentalized concepts

(terms)”⁹⁴. This need has given rise to such definitions as “ideologeme” and “concept”, which denote concepts of natural language in their non-terminological meaning, conditioned either by the political intention of the author (ideologeme) or by the cultural and historical context (concept). At the same time, the term “concept” is actively used today within the framework of cognitive studies to denote a unit of cognition and thinking, which in the field of interdisciplinary studies hardly clarifies research practice. Therefore, it is necessary to clearly indicate that in this study, *the concept* is used in the context of the methodology of historical and semantic analysis and is understood as closely as possible to the word “concept”, i.e. “as a minimally significant (meaningful) unit, the form of which, in turn, is the corresponding ... word”⁹⁵.

The difficulty of interpreting intellectual processes in Russia in the second half of the 19th century is also aggravated by the instability of conceptual meanings, which, due to historical features, is characteristic of Russian public consciousness. The extremely dynamic changes in the Russian semantic context lead to the following situation: if, within the framework of Western European studies, one can say that key concepts have a distinct, stable meaning over entire eras (the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, and the Modern era have their own set of concepts), then in the Russian context one can encounter a complete reconceptualization of the concept over several decades. The concept of “progress,” as understood, for example, by N. M. Karamzin and his contemporaries, and “progress” as interpreted by A. I. Herzen’s contemporaries are already difficult to compare. "There was a time," Katkov notes in the already mentioned article of 1862, "(it has not yet passed) when the word *conservative* was used instead of a swear word... a conservative is an obscurantist, a serf owner, a hater of the human race, an enemy of his lesser brothers, a scoundrel and a son of a dog. A progressive is a friend of humanity, ready for great feats, for

⁹⁴Kalashnikov M. V. Ideologeme. Concept? Notion! (On the issue of the minimum significant unit of research within the framework of historical-semantic analysis) // Walls and Bridges – III: the history of the emergence and development of the idea of interdisciplinarity . Moscow: Academic project; Gaudeamus, 2015. P. 131.

⁹⁵Ibid.

all kinds of sacrifices in the interests of education, freedom, and the well-being of each and every one." However, by the end of the first post-reform decade, "the nickname conservatives gradually lost its abusive meaning, it is beginning to become an honor, and it is very no wonder that one fine morning everyone will wake up as excellent conservatives, and the title of progressive, once so glorious, will become, in turn, a swear word, offensive and shameful ⁹⁶. "

It is also important to note that the specific organization of the censorship apparatus in Russia contributed to the deep euphemization of socio-political discourse in journalism, making its interpretation out of context even more difficult for the researcher.

In addition to the high dynamics of semantic shifts, it is also necessary to take into account the emotional connotations of the words used, which are largely determined by the professional journalistic context. Journalism in Russia in the 19th century was both a reflection of the phenomena of public consciousness and an instrument for its formation, acting as the basis of social existence. However, an integral feature of the professional journalistic context is the high intensity of polemical competition, emotionality and figurative expression of thought. It can be said that all participants in magazine polemics, to one degree or another, strive to consolidate in the public consciousness the dominance of those interpretations of concepts and those shades of meaning that correlate with their ideological attitudes, i.e. each political philosopher and publicist, speaking on the pages of the press, strives, to paraphrase the famous statement of B. L. Pasternak, "to impose himself on the era as much as possible." Success in consolidating the dominant position of certain interpretations of concepts in the public consciousness is directly related to the effectiveness of the communicative practices that the public figure who broadcasts them chooses. Therefore, a full analysis of the existence of certain concepts in the socio-political discourse of the era is impossible without studying the sets of techniques of practical activity in the sphere of public communication

⁹⁶Katkov M. N. Collected works: in 6 volumes. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. Vol. 2. Pp. 31–32.

(communication practices), with the help of which they penetrated into public consciousness and were consolidated in it.

In modern scientific discourse, despite some differences in the interpretation of this term, *communicative practices* are understood as "methods of organized interactions between senders and receivers of communicative messages in the process of social activity, aimed at receiving and transmitting important and relevant information for society" ⁹⁷or, in a shorter formulation, as "a set of examples of rational activity aimed at transmitting / receiving socially significant information" ⁹⁸. Although this term is relatively new and is more often used to analyze modern phenomena, in its meaning it appeals to the designation of rather abstract timeless components of social communication, therefore, with appropriate clarification, it can be successfully applied to designate social practices of the past.

Communicative practices as applied to the realities of the studied era , i.e. the second half of the 19th century, include established models of reader expectations and authorial approaches to working with the audience, the specifics of the audience itself, forms of economic organization of the press and the technologies available to it, interaction with the government and the state through the institution of censorship, and forms of competition in the publishing sphere. The listed aspects of communicative practices in the context of classification research approaches can also be interpreted as type-forming features, but the fundamental difference lies in the nature of the assessment of these aspects: if in classification approaches they are designated for the purpose of a nominative description of the properties of an object to identify its place in the typological system, then from the point of view of communication theory approaches, these same aspects are studied in order to identify their comprehensive effectiveness, namely in the designated combination, for solving the communicative tasks set by the publisher. It is in this regard that the

⁹⁷ Zaynalabdiev V.Kh. Communicative practices in the regional blogosphere // The world of linguistics and communication: electronic scientific journal. 2015. No. 38. P. 63.

⁹⁸Zotov V. V., Lysenko V. A. Communicative practices as a theoretical construct for studying society. // Theory and practice of social development. 2010. No. 3. Access mode: http://www.teoria-practica.ru/rus/files/arhiv_zhurnala/2010/3/sociologiya/zotov-lysenko.pdf (date of access: 01.05.2023).

importance of understanding the realities of the journalistic profession and the specifics of the communication practices of individual publishers of a conservative orientation for the analysis of the conceptualization of the socio-political concepts they convey is very high.

The novelty of the undertaken study is mainly due to the desire to identify the generalizing meaning of the key concepts of conservatism formed and broadcast in journalism of the second half of the 19th century through methodological approaches to the history of concepts, i.e. in their maximum immersion in the context of the era in order to avoid interpretative distortions. Such an approach can also contribute to a clearer understanding of the existence of these concepts in modern socio-political practice. In addition, the fundamental characteristic of the novelty of the study is the formulation of the question of the mutual influence of the substantive side of journalistic discourse and the communicative practices of the era.

The aim of the study is to identify and analyze key concepts of the socio-philosophical doctrine of Russian conservatism in the texts of post-reform Russian journalism of the conservative direction and to study communication practices aimed at their consolidation in the socio-political discourse.

Achieving this goal involves solving the following research **problems** :

- disclosure of the basic philosophical principles underlying conservative philosophy in general and the doctrine of Russian conservatism in particular;
- identification of key concepts relevant to the socio-philosophical doctrine of Russian conservatism in the second half of the 19th century based on a comprehensive review of journalistic publications by prominent representatives of Russian conservative thought in the period under study;
- analysis of the communication practices of the most significant conservative journalists of the period under study (concepts of publishing projects, their audience focus, genre and thematic specifics, principles of interaction with the audience, experience of building relationships with the authorities and censorship, economic models);

– interpretation of key concepts of Russian conservatism in the context of the socio-political discourse of the era.

The solution of the set tasks requires an appeal to classical historical methodology in the aspect of studying the communicative practices of conservative journalism and to the method of historical-semantic analysis for interpreting the concepts of Russian conservatism. The publishing projects of conservatives are studied on the basis of **historical-comparative and historical-genetic methods** .

The methodology of **historical-semantic analysis** involves the following research procedures:

– establishing a unit of historical-semantic analysis, which can be a concept expressed in a word that does not have an objective essence, but is a metaphorically formed abstraction, either completely virtual, or possessing the so-called imaginary objectivity, but grammatically categorized as objectivity. Examples of such concepts can be "freedom", "civic consciousness", "equality", "justice", "law", "sovereignty", etc. Taking into account that "the meaning of any concept, due to its original metaphorical nature and abstractness, can be understood only with the help of a contextual analysis of the meaning of the word, which is a form of this concept" ⁹⁹, it seems most productive to analyze not only key concepts, but also semantic series of concepts associated with them, instrumentally used by the authors of texts to reveal the semantic content of key concepts;

– establishing the framework of the context and describing the historical events and phenomena that make up this context;

– comparative analysis of the identified interpretations of the concepts studied.

In relation to the tasks of a specific study, it seems important to designate not only the chronological and geographical boundaries of the context (Russia in the second half of the 19th century), but also its ideological framework (conservatism)

⁹⁹Kalashnikov M. V. Ideologeme. Concept? Notion! (On the issue of the minimum significant unit of research within the framework of historical-semantic analysis) // Walls and Bridges – III: the history of the emergence and development of the idea of interdisciplinarity . Moscow: Academic project; Gaudeamus, 2015. P. 131.

and sphere of existence (journalism). Despite the fact that in its ideal model, proposed by theorists of the history of concepts and historical-semantic analysis, the study of certain concepts presupposes the search for their integral, general meaning, common to representatives of all ideological groups, in research practice, solving problems of such a scale does not seem possible within the framework of an individual scientific work, even of a large genre form.

This is especially true for the study of historical periods in which the intensity of communication in the social sphere increased (growth in the number of publications, publishers and readers), ideological polarization was significant, and the state's restrictive mechanisms were relatively flexible, allowing for broad pluralism. The material of study in such periods becomes excessively extensive, and it becomes impossible to examine it in its entirety in the course of individual studies; rather, we can talk about the preliminary development of fragments of socio-political discourse by individual researchers, with an eye to the forthcoming generalization of a wide range of research results in the future. Therefore, within the framework of this study, it is the conservative direction that is studied.

Also, the classical model does not imply historical-semantic research and limitations of the studied channels and forms of communication, on the contrary, it denotes the researcher's desire to identify all the diversity of interpretations of a particular concept in sources of various types and origins. However, in this case, it is important to designate the disciplinary affiliation of the conducted research to the field of history of journalism, and not linguistics. As in any multidisciplinary field of research, in the history of concepts, the dispute between representatives of various disciplines does not subside regarding whose approaches in this multidisciplinary space should be considered dominant. Historians who proposed basic approaches to the history of concepts were interested primarily in the prospect of a deeper understanding of history, achieved through the limited use of linguistic tools to solve the problems of historical science, while linguists sometimes call for “turning the question around and instead of linguistics in the service of history, talking about

history in the service of linguistics ¹⁰⁰,” putting the focus not on historical events (changes of power, technological breakthroughs, etc.), but on linguistic events proper (language reforms, transformation of the alphabet, etc.).

It is necessary to stipulate that this study relies to a greater extent on the historical component, aiming to deepen and clarify the interpretation of certain concepts for understanding the cause-and-effect relationships of the historical process. Therefore, focusing on the material of journalistic texts as a priority group of sources representing the socio-political discourse of the era in a concentrated form seems possible and justified in this case.

The theoretical basis of the study was formed by the works within which theoretical approaches to the study of the history of journalism were developed: A. I. Stanko ¹⁰¹, B. I. Esin ¹⁰², E. V. Akhmadullina ¹⁰³, A. Sh. Bik -Bulatov ¹⁰⁴, V. S. Varakina ¹⁰⁵ and others, as well as research in the field of linguoconceptology and the history of concepts by V. V. Vinogradov ¹⁰⁶, V. I. Karasik ¹⁰⁷, G. V. Durinova ¹⁰⁸, N.

¹⁰⁰Revzina O. V. Temporal structure of the concept // Language parameters of modern civilization. Moscow, 2013. P. 188.

¹⁰¹Stanko A. I. Theoretical aspects of studying the history of Russian journalism // Methods of researching journalism / edited by Ya. R. Simkin. Rostov, 1979.

¹⁰²Esin B. I. Russian newspaper and newspaper business in Russia: tasks and theoretical and methodological foundations of study. Moscow, 1981; Esin B. I. Once again about typology // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 10. Journalism. 2005. No. 6. P. 65–70.

¹⁰³Akhmadullin E. V. Problems and methodology of systemic research of the history of domestic journalism // Izvestiya SFedU. Philological sciences. 2009. No. 1. P. 118–129.

¹⁰⁴Bik -Bulatov A. Sh. Conceptualization of the history of domestic journalism at the present stage // Scientific notes of Kazan University. Humanities. 2012. Vol. 154. Book 6. Pp. 169–178.

¹⁰⁵Varakin V. S. Genesis of Journalism in Russia: Problems of Establishing Initial Coordinates // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 10. Journalism. 2021. No. 1. P. 100–123.

¹⁰⁶Vinogradov V. V. History of words / ed. Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences N. Yu. Shvedova. Moscow, 1999; Vinogradov V. V. Word and meaning as a subject of historical and lexicological research // Voprosy yazykoznaniiya (Problems of Linguistics). 1995. No. 1. P. 5–34.

¹⁰⁷Karasik V. I. Linguistic and Cultural Concepts: Approaches to Study // Sociolinguistics Yesterday and Today. 2nd ed., suppl. Moscow, 2008. Pp. 127–155; Karasik V. I. Linguistic and Cultural Concepts: Approaches to Study // Sociolinguistics Yesterday and Today. Moscow: Institute of Scientific Information on Social Sciences, Russian Academy of Sciences, 2004. Pp. 130–159.

¹⁰⁸Durinova G. V. Word as an object of historical semantics: “citizen” and “society” in the Russian language of the second half of the 18th century – first third of the 19th century: diss. ... Cand. Philological Sciences. Moscow, 2015.

E. Kuposov ¹⁰⁹, D. V. Timofeev ¹¹⁰, M. V. Kalashnikov ¹¹¹, V. M. Zhivova.¹¹² and others, thematic scientific collections devoted to the theoretical foundations of the study of socio-political discourse in historical retrospect ¹¹³, works on the history of the philosophy of Russian conservatism by M. Yu. Chernavsky ¹¹⁴, A. Yu. Minakov ¹¹⁵, V. Ya. Grosul ¹¹⁶, L. E. Shaposhnikov ¹¹⁷ and others.

The chronological framework of the study corresponds to the post-reform period of Russian history (1861–1905).

The empirical basis of the study consists of the following groups of sources:

1) office materials of the censorship department and institutions whose activities were associated with the events of the socio-political context of journalistic discourse of the period under study;

¹⁰⁹Kuposov N. E. Basic historical concepts and terms of the basic level: towards the semantics of social categories // *Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology*. 1998. Vol. 1. No. 4. P. 31–39.

¹¹⁰Timofeev D. V. Principles of instrumentalization of the methodology of the "history of concepts" in studies on the history of public consciousness of Russia in the 18th - first quarter of the 19th century // *Bulletin of Tomsk State University*. 2018. No. 436. P. 184-191.

¹¹¹Kalashnikov M. V. Ideologeme. Concept? Notion! (On the issue of the minimum significant unit of research within the framework of historical-semantic analysis) // *Walls and Bridges – III: the history of the emergence and development of the idea of interdisciplinarity*. Moscow: Academic project; Gaudeamus, 2015. P. 124–133.

¹¹²Zhivov V. M. History of concepts, history of culture, history of society // *Essays on the historical semantics of the Russian language of the early modern period*. Moscow: Languages of Slavic cultures, 2009, pp. 10-19.

¹¹³"Concepts of Russia": Towards the Historical Semantics of the Imperial Period. Vol. 1–2. Moscow: NLO, 2012; *Essays on the Historical Semantics of the Russian Language of the Early Modern Time*. Moscow: Languages of Slavic Cultures, 2009; *Historical Concepts and Political Ideas in Russia of the 16th–20th Centuries: Collection of Scientific Works*. St. Petersburg: Aletea, 2006; *Language Parameters of Modern Civilization. Collection of Papers of the First Scientific Conference in Memory of Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences Yu. S. Stepanov* / Edited by V. Z. Demyankov, N. M. Azarova, V. V. Feshchenko, S. Yu. . Moscow: Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences, IP Shilin I. V. ("Eidos"), 2013; *Anthology of Concepts*. Edited by V. I. Karasik, I. A. Sternin. Volume 1. Volgograd: Paradigm, 2005.

¹¹⁴Chernavsky M. Yu. *Religious and philosophical foundations of conservatism in Russia*. Moscow, 2004.

¹¹⁵Minakov A. Yu. *Russian conservatism in the first quarter of the 19th century*. Voronezh: Voronezh University Publishing House, 2011.

¹¹⁶Grosul V. Ya., Itenberg B. S., Tvardovskaya V. A., Shatsillo K. F., Eymontova R. G. *Russian conservatism of the 19th century. Ideology and practice*. M., 2000.

¹¹⁷Shaposhnikov L. E. *Conservatism, modernism and innovation in Russian Orthodox thought of the XIX - XXI centuries*. St. Petersburg, Publishing House of St. Petersburg State University, 2006.

2) publications of the most influential publicists and editions of the conservative trend in journalism in post-reform Russia. The formation of this section of the empirical base requires special discussion of the correlation of certain publications and publicists with the conservative trend in socio-political thought. The complexity of the doctrinal definition of the ideological platform of publications and publishers is associated with two aspects: firstly, with the above-mentioned terminological ambiguity of the boundaries of conservative teaching and ideologically conditioned aberrations of Soviet historiography; secondly, with the course of individual ideological evolution of the publicists under study. M. N. Katkov began as a moderate liberal and only with time came to conservative views, the youthful liberalism of I. S. Aksakov was even more pronounced than Katkov's, and even the first periodicals of the nachvenniki are difficult to confidently attribute to the conservative trend.

In the course of this study, we used as a basic criterion for belonging to the conservative trend the adherence to the main ideological formula of conservatives "Orthodoxy. Autocracy. Nationality", therefore we classified as conservative those who designated their religion as Orthodox and, therefore, relied on Orthodox dogma as the basis of philosophical views, supported monarchical rule in Russia and were supporters of state development in line with national tradition, and not orientation towards foreign cultural models of public life. It should be noted that the general focus on following the listed conservative postulates did not mean complete unity in matters of their practical implementation. The studied publicists diverged in many details of understanding specific political practice, however, the conceptual core of their worldview was common. It should also be noted that the emphasis in the study was placed only on those publications that related to the mature period of the work of the studied authors, when the system of conservative views was clearly and consistently manifested by them. Thus, our focus is primarily on the "Russky Vestnik" and "Moskovskie Vedomosti" by M. N. Katkov (after 1863), "Den", "Moskva" ("Moskvich" during the period of suspension of "Moskva") and "Rus" by I. S. Aksakov, "Grazhdanin" and "Dobryak" by V. P. Meshchersky, "Pisatel's Diary"

by F. M. Dostoevsky, "Sovremennye Izvestia" by N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov. To clarify certain aspects of the evolution of the views of the studied authors, individual publications of an earlier period were used as auxiliary material.

It should also be noted separately that, due to the formulation of the question of the influence of communication practices on the dissemination and consolidation of broadcast concepts, the focus of the study is only on those journalists of a conservative orientation who were publishers, i.e., who independently formed and implemented communication strategies and did not depend on the editorial policy determined by other persons in the choice of the form of expression of their ideas.

3) sources of personal origin: the epistolary legacy of key figures in Russian conservative journalism, public and political figures of the period under study, their memoirs and recollections.

The compilation of the empirical base for the study required access to the following archival funds:

– State Archives of the Russian Federation (GARF): collection 109 (Third Department of SEIVK), collection 1718 (M.N. Katkov), collection 1162 (Ministry of Internal Affairs);

– Central Historical Archive of Moscow (CIAM): collection 418 (Moscow Imperial University), collection 31 (Moscow Censorship Committee);

– Department of Manuscripts of the Institute of Russian Literature of the Russian Academy of Sciences "Pushkin House": collection 318 (E. M. Feoktistov).

Testing the research results

The main provisions of the study were presented to the scientific community and discussed at international and all-Russian scientific conferences:

1. The illustrated weekly newspaper "Raduga" (1883) in the system of conservative-monarchist press // International scientific and practical conference "Mass media in the modern world. St. Petersburg readings" (St. Petersburg, April 23–25, 2014).

2. The First World War as a Premonition: Providential Motifs in Russian Journalism of the Late 19th Century // International Scientific Conference "Russia

in the First World War: Analysis of the Event through the Prism of Written Sources and Works of Art” (Nice, November 11–16, 2014).

3. Publicism of N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov and F. M. Dostoevsky in the public dialogue on the issue of judicial reform (1860–70s) // International scientific and practical conference “Journalism in 2014” (Moscow, February 9–11, 2015).

4. "Worldwide Revolution" and "Polish Intrigue" in the Journalism of M. N. Katkov // "Media in the Modern World. 55th St. Petersburg Readings" (St. Petersburg, April 21-22, 2016)

5. On the censorship history of “Notes on Ancient and New Russia” // Round table “N. M. Karamzin And traditions Russian journalism" (St. Petersburg, October 18, 2016).

6. "Moskovskie Vedomosti" in 1887: how the fate of the newspaper was decided after the death of M.N. Katkov // International scientific and practical conference "Journalism in 2016: creativity, profession, industry" (Moscow, February 7, 2017).

7. “To remain completely calm in assessing the activities of the late publicist...” (The censored fate of the biography of M.N. Katkov in the Biographical Library of F. Pavlenkov). // Journalism in 2017: creativity, profession, industry: international scientific and practical conference (Moscow, February 5–7, 2018).

8. Liberal and conservative publications of the late 19th century in the controversy over Darwinism // Media in the modern world: 57th St. Petersburg readings (St. Petersburg, April 19–20, 2018).

9. “Controversy in the Russian Press of the Second Half of the 19th Century on the State Activities of Count M.N. Muravyov-Vilensky” // The Era of Great Reforms: History and Documentary Heritage (on the 200th Anniversary of the Birth of Alexander II) (St. Petersburg, May 24–25, 2018).

10. Problems of religious tolerance in the journalism of M. N. Katkov // Meeting of the “Byzantine Cabinet” of the Orthodox Theological Academy (St. Petersburg, November 9, 2018).

11. “Between the Tsar and the People” – the Phenomenon of Bureaucracy in the Assessment of Russian Conservative Journalism of the Second Half of the 19th Century // Strategic Communications in Business and Politics: VI International Scientific and Practical Conference (St. Petersburg, November 22–23, 2018).

12. Problems of Economics as Understood by Russian Conservative Publicists of the Second Half of the 19th Century // Journalism in 2018: Creativity, Profession, Industry (Moscow, February 6–8, 2019).

13. Motifs of the “Decline of Europe” in the journalism of N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov // Media in the modern world: 58th St. Petersburg readings (St. Petersburg, April 16–19, 2019).

14. The Image of Peter the Great in the Journalism of F. M. Dostoevsky // XLII International Scientific Readings “N. G. Chernyshevsky and His Era”: (for the 100th Anniversary of the N. G. Chernyshevsky Estate Museum) (Saratov, October 23–24, 2020).

15. "The Image of Peter the Great on the Pages of Russian Journalism during the Napoleonic Wars (Based on the Example of S. N. Glinka's "Russian Messenger") // Media in the Modern World. 59th St. Petersburg Readings (St. Petersburg, November 9–12, 2020).

16. Reforms of Peter the Great and Russian Bureaucracy as Interpreted by M.N. Katkov // Media in the Modern World: 60th St. Petersburg Readings (St. Petersburg, June 30 – July 2, 2021).

17. “...Since Peter himself, we, the bureaucracy, have made up everything in the state...” – Russian conservative journalism on bureaucracy as the brainchild of Peter the Great’s reform // II International Scientific Conference “Russian Literature and National Statehood of the 18th – 19th Centuries”: (On the 500th Anniversary of the Moscow Novodevichy Convent and the 300th Anniversary of the Proclamation of the Russian Empire) (Moscow, October 5–6, 2021).

18. V. P. Meshchersky's magazine "Dobryak" - on the characteristics of the format. // Journalism in 2021: creativity, profession, industry: on the 70th

anniversary of the Faculty of Journalism and the 75th anniversary of journalism education at Moscow State University (Moscow, February 3-5, 2022).

19. “The Negative Direction” of Russian Literature as a Result of Peter the Great’s Reforms – Interpretation by N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov // “Media in the Modern World. 61st St. Petersburg Readings” (St. Petersburg, April 21–22, 2022).

The results of the study are reflected in the publications:

A) in journals included in the list of the Higher Attestation Commission in the specialty 5.9.9. " Media communications and journalism" (previously - 10.01.10 "Journalism") and in the Scopus and Web databases of Science Core Collection :

1. Kruglikova O. S. “Moskovskie Vedomosti” M. N. Katkova in the controversy about the education reform in the 1860-1870s // Bulletin of the Ural State University: Series 1: Problems of education, science and culture. 2008. Vol. 56. No. 23. P. 205–209.

2. Kruglikova O. S. Discussion of the issue of Russification of foreign ethnic outskirts Russian Empire in the Moscow conservative press of the 1860s // Mediascope . 2016. No. 4. P. 13–18.

3. Kruglikova O. S. N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov as a journalist and publisher // Scientific notes of Kazan University. Series: Humanities. 2016. Vol. 158. No. 4. P. 1015–1030.

4. Kruglikova O. S. Publications of Russian post-reform conservatism in the assessment of modern researchers // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 10: Journalism. 2017. No. 6. P. 191–199.

5. Kruglikova O. S. The Question of the Judicial Reform of 1864 in the Journalism of N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov and F. M. Dostoevsky // Bulletin of St. Petersburg University. Language and Literature. 2017. Vol. 14. No. 4. P. 664–675

6. Kruglikova O. S. Darwin's Evolutionary Theory in Reflection Russian conservative and liberal press of the second half of the 19th century // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 10: Journalism. 2018. No. 5. P. 101–118.

7. Kruglikova O. S. “Moskovskie Vedomosti” after the death of M. N. Katkov: competition for the right to publish the newspaper // Bulletin of St. Petersburg University. Language and Literature. 2018. Vol. 15. No. 2. Pp. 252–264.
8. Kruglikova O. S. “To Maintain Complete Calm in Assessing the Activities of the Deceased Publicist”: Towards a Characteristic of M. N. Katkov’s Pre-Revolutionary Historiography // Medi@lmanakh . 2018. No. 3(86). P. 100–105.
9. Kruglikova O. S. M. N. Muravyov-Vilensky in the assessment of the Russian conservative and liberal press of the second half of the 19th century // Mediascope . 2019. No. 1. P. 10.
10. Kruglikova O. S., Sonina E. S. Specifics of the verbal and visual existence of the metaphor "window to Europe" in Russian journalism of the XIX - early XX centuries // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 10: Journalism. 2020. No. 4. P. 53-79.
11. Kruglikova ABOUT. S. The Image of Peter I on the Pages of the Sovremennik Magazine in the Era of Great Reforms // Bulletin of the Voronezh State University. Series: Philology. Journalism. 2020. No. 4. P. 111–115
12. Kruglikova O. S., Marchenko A. N., Sonina E. S., Shcherbakova G. I. Reforms of Peter the Great as a Precedent Phenomenon for Russian Digital Modernization // Proceedings of the 2021 Communication Strategies in Digital Society Seminar, ComSDS 2021, St. Petersburg, April 14 , 2021 . St. Petersburg , 2021. P. 177–180.
13. Kruglikova O. S. “To interpret the phenomenon of Peter from the laws of the development of the idea...” – reflections on Peter the Great in the journalism of A. I. Herzen // Bulletin of the Southern Federal University. Philological sciences. 2021. Vol. 25. No. 1. Pp. 218–228.
14. Kruglikova O. S. Illustrated magazine of Prince V. P. Meshchersky "Dobryak" in the context of the development of conservative journalism of the second half of the 19th century // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 10. Journalism. 2022. No. 3. P. 132–151.

15. Kruglikova O. S., Silantyev K. V. "The Weekly "Life and Court" (1911–1917) in the Context of Typological Transformations of the Press at the Beginning of the 20th Century." *Moscow University Bulletin. Series 10. Journalism*. 2024. No. 5. pp. 115–138.

16. Kruglikova O. S. The journalistic world of St. Petersburg in caricatures magazine "Dobryak" (1882) // *Bulletin of the Voronezh State University. Series: Philology. Journalism*. 2022. No. 2. P. 137–142.

B) in journals included in the list of the Higher Attestation Commission for other related specialties:

1. Kruglikova O. S. Newspaper of M. N. Katkov "Moscow News" (1863–1887): On the Origins and Nature of Political Influence // *Notebooks on Conservatism*. 2018. No. 3. P. 71–88.

2. Kruglikova O. S., Shapovalova K. A. F. M. Dostoevsky and A. I. Solzhenitsyn: Continuity of Ideas in Journalism // *Notebooks on Conservatism*. 2019. No. 1. P. 103 – 117.

3. Kruglikova ABOUT. S. "The Herald of Europe" by N. M. Karamzin and "The Russian Herald" by S. N. Glinka about Peter the Great: consonances and dissonances // *Notebooks on conservatism*. 2022. No. 3. pp. 123–131.

4. Kruglikova O. S. Russian bureaucracy as the brainchild of Peter the Great modernization as interpreted by Russian conservative publicists post-reform era // *Notebooks on conservatism*. 2022. No. 3. P. 150–169.

5. Kruglikova O. S. The Image of Peter the Great in the Journalism of F. M. Dostoevsky // *Russian-Byzantine Bulletin*. 2022. No. 3(10). P. 119–128.

6. Kruglikova O. S., Bityutskaya V. V. Religious and moral meanings of A. I. Solzhenitsyn's journalism // *Orthodoxy*. 2023. No. 1. P. 132–155 .

The structure of the work is determined by the objectives of the study and consists of an introduction, two chapters and a conclusion. The first chapter examines the philosophical foundations of Russian conservatism, identifies and

interprets key concepts of Russian conservative journalism in the context of the socio-political processes of the second half of the 19th century. The second chapter analyzes the communicative practices of Russian conservative journalism, and examines the degree of their effectiveness in terms of their influence on the socio-political processes of the era.

The provisions submitted for defense:

1. The socio-political discourse of each historical era operates with a certain set of key words, the meaning of which changes over time, therefore, for an adequate interpretation of the content of socio-political dialogue in historical retrospect, it is necessary to study the specifics of the semantic content of the conceptual apparatus of the era, while an attempt to operate with contemporary meanings of words used by figures of the past inevitably leads to interpretative distortions;
2. The struggle of competing philosophical and political doctrines for dominance in the public consciousness occurs through the explanation and consolidation in public discourse of the conceptual meanings of the key words of the era inherent in the philosophy they broadcast. It should be noted that, since the semantic core of any ideology is a set of system-forming metaphors, then the dialogue regarding the basic concepts of a particular ideological model is inevitably metaphorical in nature, therefore the identification and interpretation of the key concepts of a particular socio-political movement can only be carried out through deep immersion in the socio-cultural context of the period under study;
3. Russian conservatism as a philosophical and political doctrine, being in its essence a conscious traditionalism, in each historical period of development most fully reveals itself through opposition to the current modernization challenge, therefore the main concepts of Russian conservatism in the post-reform era - "Orthodoxy. Autocracy. Nationality" - are formed in dialogical opposition to the key concepts of liberal ideology

"Freedom! Equality! Brotherhood!" and contain their implicitly transmitted refutation;

4. The key concepts of Russian conservatism, formed in the socio-political dialogue of post-reform Russia, turned out to be productive and viable in political practice, but were not dominant in socio-political discourse, which raises a fundamental question about the effectiveness of the communication practices of those public figures who sought to develop and strengthen the philosophical and political teachings of Russian conservatism;
5. The communicative practices of Russian journalists of the conservative trend in the post-reform period represent a variety of approaches and strategies, although for the most part they are ineffective. The main reason for the ineffectiveness of the communicative practices of conservatives is the peculiarity of social stratification in post-reform Russia, which excluded the lower strata of the population from participation in public dialogue, as well as the specificity of the bureaucratic system of governance.

Main scientific results:

1. The specific nature of Russian public discourse in the second half of the 19th century is shown, due to the fact that opponents, using the same words, not only filled them with different meanings, but tried to ensure that the concepts they used implicitly conveyed a refutation of alternative interpretations, thereby raising the question of to what extent it is possible to speak about the existence of a socio-political language common to all participants in the public discourse of this period;
2. The key concepts of Russian conservatism, reflected in the press of the post-reform era ¹¹⁸, are identified and analyzed, the specifics of their

¹¹⁸Kruglikova O. S. Russian bureaucracy as a brainchild of Peter the Great's modernization in the interpretation of Russian conservative publicists of the post-reform era //

understanding in the journalistic legacy of individual representatives of the conservative trend ¹¹⁹in Russian journalism are shown, and their dialogic opposition to the basic concepts of liberal ideology is demonstrated ¹²⁰;

3. The influence of the modernization challenge of the Peter the Great era on the socio-political discourse of post-reform Russia is studied ¹²¹, the important role of understanding Peter the Great's reforms and the image of the tsar-reformer in the formation of the concept of Russian conservatism at the beginning of the 19th century ¹²²and in the post-reform period is shown ¹²³(the personal participation of the dissertation author in obtaining these results is 70%);

Notebooks on conservatism. 2022. No. 3. Pp. 150–169.; Kruglikova O. S. Discussion of the issue of Russification of foreign ethnic outskirts of the Russian Empire in the Moscow conservative press of the 1860s // *Mediascope* . 2016. No. 4. Pp. 13–18.;

¹¹⁹ Kruglikova O. S. The Question of the Judicial Reform of 1864 in the Journalism of N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov and F. M. Dostoevsky // *Bulletin of St. Petersburg University. Language and Literature*. 2017. Vol. 14. No. 4. P. 664–675.

¹²⁰Kruglikova O. S. M. N. Muravyov-Vilensky in the assessment of the Russian conservative and liberal press of the second half of the 19th century // *Mediascope* . 2019. No. 1. P. 10.; Kruglikova O. S. Darwin's evolutionary theory in reflection Russian conservative and liberal press of the second half of the 19th century // *Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 10: Journalism*. 2018. No. 5. pp. 101–118.; Kruglikova O. S., Shapovalova K. A. F. M. Dostoevsky and A. I. Solzhenitsyn: Continuity of Ideas in Journalism // *Notebooks on Conservatism*. 2019. No. 1. pp. 103–117.

¹²¹Kruglikova O. S., Sonina E. S. Specifics of the verbal-visual existence of the metaphor "window to Europe" in Russian journalism of the XIX - early XX centuries // *Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 10: Journalism*. 2020. No. 4. P. 53-79. ; Kruglikova ABOUT. S. The image of Peter I on the pages of the *Sovremennik* magazine in the era of great reforms // *Bulletin of the Voronezh State University. Series : Philology . Journalism* . 2020. No. 4. P. 111–115.; Kruglikova O. S., Marchenko A. N., Sonina E. S., Shcherbakova G. I. Reforms of Peter the Great as a Precedent Phenomenon for Russian Digital Modernization // *Proceedings of the 2021 Communication Strategies in Digital Society Seminar, ComSDS 2021, St. Petersburg, April 14 , 2021 . St. Petersburg , 2021. P. 177–180.*

¹²² Kruglikova ABOUT. S. "The Herald of Europe" by N. M. Karamzin and "The Russian Herald" by S. N. Glinka about Peter the Great: consonances and dissonances // *Notebooks on conservatism*. 2022. No. 3. pp. 123–131.

¹²³ Kruglikova O. S. The Image of Peter the Great in the Journalism of F. M. Dostoevsky // *Russian-Byzantine Bulletin*. 2022. No. 3(10). Pp. 119–128. ; Kruglikova O. S. "To Interpret the Appearance of Peter from the Laws of the Development of an Idea..." – Reflections on Peter the Great in the Journalism of A. I. Herzen // *Bulletin of the Southern Federal University. Philological Sciences*. 2021. Vol. 25. No. 1. Pp. 218–228.

4. The communicative practices of leading representatives of Russian post-reform journalism of the conservative direction – M. N. Katkov ¹²⁴, F. M. Dostoevsky, I. S. Aksakov ¹²⁵, V. P. Meshchersky, N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov – are reconstructed and analyzed ¹²⁶. In particular, the visual component of journalism of the conservative direction is analyzed for the first time, the phenomenon of illustrated magazines of conservatives is studied in the context of the formation of the illustrated weekly type in post-reform Russia and the development of the designated trends at the beginning of the 20th century ¹²⁷.
5. The fundamental significance for the degree of effectiveness of conservative communication practices is indicated by the fact that publishers of the conservative trend largely went against the expectations of the majority of the readership, having made an attempt during the crisis of religious consciousness that characterized the post-reform era in Russia,

¹²⁴ Kruglikova O. S. Transfer of the newspaper *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* on lease to M. N. Katkov in 1863 (political context and financial terms of the contract) // *Bulletin of St. Petersburg University. Series 9. Philology. Oriental Studies. Journalism.* 2007. No. 4-2. P. 248–255.; Kruglikova O. S. “*Moskovskie Vedomosti*” by M. N. Katkov in the controversy over the education reform in the 1860–1870s // *Bulletin of the Ural State University: Series 1: Problems of Education, Science, and Culture.* 2008. Vol. 56. No. 23. P. 205–209.; Kruglikova O. S. “*Moskovskie Vedomosti*” after the death of M. N. Katkov: competition for the right to publish the newspaper // *Bulletin of St. Petersburg University. Language and Literature.* 2018. Vol. 15. No. 2. Pp. 252–264.; Kruglikova O. S. “To remain completely calm in assessing the activities of the late publicist”: on the characteristics of the pre-revolutionary historiography of M. N. Katkov // *Medi@lmanakh* . 2018. No. 3(86). Pp. 100–105.; Kruglikova O. S. M. N. Katkov’s newspaper “*Moskovskie Vedomosti*” (1863–1887): On the Origins and Nature of Political Influence // *Notebooks on Conservatism.* 2018. No. 3. P. 71–88.

¹²⁵ Kruglikova O. S. Publications of Russian post-reform conservatism in the assessment of modern researchers // *Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 10: Journalism.* 2017. No. 6. P. 191–199.

¹²⁶ Kruglikova O. S. N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov as a journalist and publisher // *Scientific notes of Kazan University. Series: Humanities.* 2016. Vol. 158. No. 4. P. 1015–1030.

¹²⁷ Kruglikova O. S. Illustrated magazine of Prince V. P. Meshchersky “*Dobryak*” in the context of the development of conservative journalism of the second half of the 19th century // *Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 10. Journalism.* 2022. No. 3. P. 132–151.; Kruglikova O. S. Journalistic world of St. Petersburg in caricatures magazine “*Dobryak*” (1882) // *Bulletin of the Voronezh State University. Series: Philology. Journalism.* 2022. No. 2. Pp. 137-142.; Kruglikova O. S., Silantyev K. V. “*Weekly*” *Life and Court* (1911-1917) in the Context of typological transformations of the press of the early 20th Century // *Bulletin of the Moscow University. Series 10. Journalism.* 2024. No. 5. Pp. 115-138.

to return the sacred to the political sphere and to start from the Orthodox Christian paradigm in the formation of socio-political views;

6. In methodological terms, the productivity of using the methodology of historical-semantic analysis for interpreting socio-political discourse in historical retrospect is demonstrated ¹²⁸.

¹²⁸Kruglikova, O. S. Reflections on the Method: Historical and Semantic Analysis in Research on the History of Journalism // Russian Journalism: Evolution of Ideas and Forms: Collection of Articles / Higher School of Journalism and Mass Communications, St. Petersburg State University. - St. Petersburg: Aleteya Publishing House , 2021. Pp. 55-72.

Chapter 1. Key concepts of Russian conservatism in the press of post-reform Russia

§ 1.1 Ideological dominants of Russian post-reform conservatism

The Latin term *conservatism* comes from the word "to keep, to preserve". In the Russian language of the 19th century, the term "*okhranitelstvo*" corresponds most closely to it, which was often used by Russian conservatives for political self-identification. The idea of preserving the tradition underlying conservatism explains the fact that conservative concepts, not in their ideological and philosophical basis, but in their ideas about political practice and social life, in contrast to various modifications of liberal ideology, always have a pronounced national character, bear the stamp of historical experience and the mentality of the nation that generated them.

The fundamental principle of conservatism is anti-rationalism, an appeal to the irrational beginning in the world and man, an indispensable appeal to religion. M. Yu. Chernavsky notes that conservative philosophy is generally possible only with the support of one of the monotheistic world religions, and exclusively in their orthodox format, untouched by the trends of the reformation ¹²⁹. Thus, only Catholicism, Orthodoxy or Islam can form the basis of conservative philosophy.

Gnoseological pessimism, characteristic of the philosophy of conservatism, determines the conservatives' attitude to the limitations of human cognitive abilities and, as a consequence, the impossibility of building a harmonious model of society based on any theoretical concepts generated by the imperfect human mind. Conservatism is a dystopian philosophy aimed at opposing the ideas of romantic socialists about the possibility of creating a society of social justice on rational principles.

¹²⁹ Chernavsky M. Yu. Religious and philosophical foundations of conservatism in Russia. Moscow, 2004.

Anthropological pessimism, which was another logical consequence of the religious worldview of conservatives, also an important feature inherent in any conservative philosophy. Liberal philosophy and the teachings of socialists flowed, in essence, from Rousseauism, which a priori proclaimed that "man is good by nature." The development of this thesis led to the fact that the moral nature of the "natural man," i.e. man not distorted by false concepts imposed on him by an incorrectly organized society, is initially harmonious, and the path of humanity to universal happiness lies in the direction of the emancipation of the natural man from the restrictions imposed by society, from social prejudices, the return of natural moral purity, abiding in which man will conquer evil in the world once and for all.

Conservatives who opposed this concept were extremely skeptical about the thesis of the natural goodness and perfection of man, pointing out that human nature is dualistic, there is a principle of good in him, a divine principle, but there is also a devilish principle in him.

N. V. Polyakova rightly believes that the solution to the question of human nature constitutes the ideological core, the starting point for constructing any political concepts: "in general, all political theories assume, consciously or unconsciously, reasoned or axiomatically, that man is either 'naturally good' or 'naturally evil'" ¹³⁰. Indeed, to a significant extent, the entire ideological struggle between conservatives and supporters of liberalism comes down to "the struggle of 'optimistic rationalism' with the 'pessimism of the Christian myth'" ¹³¹, where supporters of the idea of the natural harmony of human nature confront followers of the religious idea, who start from the postulate of original sin, which has forever distorted human nature.

The principle of anthropological pessimism as the basis of a political worldview is most sharply and categorically declared in the journalism of V. P. Meshchersky. Recognizing, like all conservatives, the dual nature of man, the

¹³⁰ Polyakova N. V. *Anthropology of Russian conservatism // Alexander Ivanovich Vvedensky and his philosophical era*. St. Petersburg, 2006. P. 252–253.

¹³¹ *Ibid.* P. 254.

presence of two beings in him - one desiring good and one desiring evil - Meshchersky is convinced of the dominance of the latter: "Ever since I can remember, I have known that man is a beast. Man is a beast, and a beast more ferocious than all the ferocious beasts on the globe. Man is terrible not only because he is more evil than any beast, but because he applies his morality to his atrocities and justifies himself with it ¹³². "

While the supporters of Rousseauism followed the logic of "correct society and man will be corrected," religious conservatives insisted that the only way to correct society was through the spiritual self-improvement of each of its members. Evil has been immanent in human nature since the fall, and the internal struggle between good and evil, constantly taking place in man, is, in fact, the spiritual life of the individual. One of the leading thinkers of Russian conservatism in the second half of the 19th century, N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov, asked: "Where did the false idea come from that external progress (and it is always external) is capable of improving humanity? (...) The internal nature of man remains the same century after century, and the feat of self-improvement belongs to each person personally, and each grandson and great-grandson must always begin with the same thing as his grandfather and great-grandfather" ¹³³.

Conservatives have never believed that it is possible to build a just society on rational foundations, because man by nature has never been a rational being. The world of Dostoevsky's heroes clearly demonstrates the depth of internal contradictions and the titanic spiritual struggle that takes place in man. Gilyarov-Platonov also developed this idea: "In spite of all the systems in the world, in human nature there is an abyss of inconsistency that departs from any artificial construction of the laws of human life, and thereby exposes their artificiality ¹³⁴." The idea of the existence of rational, formalizable laws of social existence - the community - is

¹³²Meshchersky V.P. *Diary // Citizen*. 1891. No. 53. P. 3.

¹³³Gilyarov-Platonov N. P. *Collected Works in 2 volumes*. Moscow: K. P. Pobedonostsev Publishing House, 1899. Vol. 1. P. 192.

¹³⁴Gilyarov-Platonov N. P. *Collected Works in 2 volumes*. Moscow: K. P. Pobedonostsev Publishing House, 1899. Vol. 1. Pp. 25–26.

repeatedly refuted by conservatives. "The community goes on, not caring about the ratios that are read to it. It is not a regiment that allows itself to be drilled by military articles," writes Gilyarov-Platonov ¹³⁵.

Conservatives predicted that an attempt to fundamentally transform society on rational principles would require a restructuring of the spiritual nature of man, which would inevitably lead to the terrible and total violence of the "emancipators" against the "liberated" humanity. Konstantin Leontiev also developed this idea in his works: "the mobile system that the egalitarian and emancipated progress of the 19th century gave to all of humanity (...) must lead either to a general catastrophe, or to a slower but deeper degeneration of human societies, on completely new, and not at all liberal, but on the contrary, extremely restrictive and coercive principles. Perhaps a kind of slavery will appear, slavery in a new form, probably in the form of the most severe subordination of individuals (...) to communities, and communities to the state ¹³⁶. " Moreover, K. Leontiev gives such a forecast of the development of society not in relation to an abstract future, but even quite accurately and prophetically indicates the time when this will happen, noting that "people of the already so close 20th century will "knead" this new culture not on sugar and rose water of uniform freedom and humanity, but on something else, even scary for those not accustomed to it"¹³⁷.

The desire to create a society without flaws and to establish people without vices in it was considered by conservatives as an attempt to build the kingdom of God on earth, as a new Tower of Babel, an attempt to fight God, a proud claim of man to equality with the Creator. The philosophical quest of conservatives in its main postulates "contained at the same time warnings against underestimating the greatness of the universe and against absolutizing the capabilities of man with excessive optimism in understanding his nature"¹³⁸.

¹³⁵Ibid. P. 173.

¹³⁶Leontyev K. N. *East, Russia and the Slavs: Philosophy, politics and journalism: Spiritual prose (1872–1891)*. M.: Republic, 1996. P. 337.

¹³⁷Ibid.

¹³⁸Polyakova N.V. *Anthropology of Russian conservatism // Alexander Ivanovich Vvedensky and his philosophical era*. St. Petersburg, 2006. P. 258.

It is important to understand that the denial of the possibility and necessity of a radical reorganization of society on rational grounds did not mean for conservatives the opposition to any change in the existing order of things – they believed that society can and should improve and change. “The bad conservatives are those who have as their slogan status quo, no matter how rotten it may be,” wrote one of the ideologists of Russian conservatism, M. N. Katkov¹³⁹. The difference in the reformist aspirations of conservatives and supporters of radical transformations consisted only in the fact that conservatives proposed to accept as a given that social evil, despite any transformations, will always exist in one form or another, because its existence is conditioned by the very nature of humanity: “no human cause is exempt from errors and abuses, and no institutions can provide against them ¹⁴⁰,” and therefore “sensitive, self-understanding conservatism is not an enemy of progress, innovations and reforms; on the contrary, it itself evokes them in the interests of its cause, in the interests of preservation, in favor of those principles whose existence is dear to it; but it instinctively monitors the process of processing, fearing that something essential might be lost in it”¹⁴¹. They saw the task of society and power in a constant patient struggle with social flaws, but without the presumptuous and utopian confidence that the complete destruction of the foundations of the existing order could give birth to a harmonious society and sinless humanity.

Representatives of the conservative way of thinking in Russia, as a rule, not only did not shy away from reforms, but were also active participants in them, of which there are many examples - this includes the work of large landowners, the Slavophiles Yu. F. Samarin and A. I. Koshelev in the commissions for preparing the peasant reform, and the reformist activity of M. N. Muravyov-Vilensky in the Vistula region, and the large-scale technological modernization of the country under the leadership of P. A. Stolypin. For conservatives, it was important to separate what

¹³⁹Katkov M. N. Collected works: in 6 volumes. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. Vol. 2. P. 39.

¹⁴⁰Ibid. P. 441.

¹⁴¹Ibid. P. 38.

should be preserved, what constitutes the core of the original Russian life, from what hinders this originality from developing and, therefore, should be reformed.

Thus, the deep philosophical basis from which all conservative concepts without exception flow is faith in God and reliance on orthodox religion, epistemological and anthropological pessimism, the natural consequence of which is the desire to preserve historical tradition. At this point, conservative concepts are already differentiated by nationality, because the traditions that must be preserved are always conditioned by the specific history of a specific people. If liberalism, socialism, and communism are initially based on a cosmopolitan perception of "all mankind" and the idea of the need to overcome patriotism as a relic of the past, and therefore these teachings will profess the same values, no matter where on the globe their apologists are born, then conservatism is closely connected with the concepts of nation and patriotism, therefore conservatism will formulate its values and tasks in its own way in each country.

It is also important to note another distinctive feature of conservatism. In the historiography of the Soviet period, conservatism was often labeled as a reactionary philosophy. Within the Marxist-Leninist approach, the concept of *reactionary* had a negative connotation, since reactionaries opposed liberal and socialist transformations, which were thought of as the only possible path to progress, and therefore were the embodiment of social evil. But if we abandon the evaluative connotations and turn to the original meaning of the word *reactionary*, i.e. 'being a reaction to an external stimulus or threat', it is necessary to recognize that conservative philosophy is objectively reactionary - and cannot be otherwise. Tradition is nothing more than the essence of the experience of many generations, this knowledge that arose from practical cognition of the world, but is fixed as a generally accepted judgment, uncritically accepted by the following generations. Tradition has the ability to become entrenched and be steadily reproduced in the social practices of many generations, and as long as nothing threatens it, it does not need rational reflection.

If a society is more or less united in following established patterns, i.e. there is no quantitatively significant group within it aimed at abolishing established social practices, and there is no external aggressive intervention with the aim of changing them, then tradition exists as a given and does not need to clearly articulate itself in the field of the rational. An attempt to formulate, record and justify the essence of tradition manifests itself as a defensive reaction during a period of intensive modernization ¹⁴², therefore conservative philosophy is always reactionary and develops in a polemical vein as a counteraction to the expansion of new social practices perceived as a threat to tradition. Therefore, when analyzing any national modification of conservative thought, it is necessary to answer two main questions: what exactly does it preserve and what exactly does it oppose, i.e. what threat is it a reaction to.

The first shoots of the ideas of Russian conservatism in embryonic form appeared as a reaction of society to the forced Westernization carried out by Peter the Great. The rapid implantation of Western European models in everyday life, in culture, in some spheres of public life, accepted without adaptation and often even without serious reflection, caused a natural reaction of self-preservation on the part of the national historical tradition and culture. True, due to the lack of institutional forms of expression, it was realized in a very peculiar way, in the only accessible version of public protest, which could be characterized as consistent sabotage by the people of the reformist initiatives of the authorities.

The Catherine era had a dual character. Striving, especially at the beginning of her reign, to integrate Russia into the mental landscape of Europe ¹⁴³, the empress outwardly declared her commitment to enlightenment cultural models, but in political practice she sought opportunities to reconcile these ideals with “native

¹⁴² Kruglikova O. S., Marchenko A. N., Sonina E. S., Shcherbakova G. I. Reforms of Peter the Great as a Precedent Phenomenon for Russian Digital Modernization // Proceedings of the 2021 Communication Strategies in Digital Society Seminar, ComSDS 2021, St. Petersburg, April 14, 2021. St. Petersburg, 2021. P. 177–180.

¹⁴³ Proskurina V. Yu. The Empire of Catherine II's Pen: Literature as Politics. Moscow: New Literary Review, 2017.

precedents”¹⁴⁴. However, in our opinion, one cannot agree with the opinion, widespread in Soviet historiography, about the calculating duplicity of the empress, who seduced society with unrealistic promises while simultaneously strengthening the conservative model of government. In our opinion, in addition to the ideological principles of Marxism, the formation of such an opinion by Soviet historians was also influenced by ignoring the dynamic aspect of the development of enlightenment philosophy.

Among the philosophers of the Enlightenment, in essence, only Rousseau can be considered a consistent supporter of atheism and republicanism, while in general the Enlightenment adhered to various modifications of the monarchical system, allowing for various forms of its limitations, and even then, taking into account the national characteristics of the nation-forming people. In this regard, Catherine II, whose programmatic document of her reign, the famous "Instructions", was largely based on the works of Montesquieu, Diderot and Beccaria, can be considered a fairly consistent adherent of the ideals they proclaimed.

However, later researchers looked at the reign of Catherine II through the eyes of the time when it was customary to judge the era and philosophy of the Enlightenment through the prism of the revolution that had taken place, i.e. understanding the social philosophy of the Enlightenment in its most radical form. It should be noted that the French Revolution, which really arose in the ideological sense from the philosophical quest of the Enlightenment, did not immediately proclaim those radical demands that became its symbol for descendants. Having begun with the demands of freedom, property and security outlined in the Declaration of Rights, it was only during the period of maximum radicalization that it proclaimed through the lips of Robespierre its triple slogan “Liberty! Equality! Fraternity!”, in the memory of descendants inevitably associated with the bloody Jacobin terror, the afterglow of which retrospectively spread to all the philosophers of the Enlightenment.

¹⁴⁴Moryakov V. I. Catherine II – an enlightener or a conservative? // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 8: History. 2010. No. 3. P. 9–26.

The philosophy and political practice of Catherine II really corresponded to the most moderate concepts of the philosophers of the Enlightenment, and she, in the spirit of Montesquieu's declarations, selected from their works those elements that, from her point of view, corresponded to the geographical location, climate, spirit and character of the people she governed. Clearly seeing the gap between theoretical constructions and administrative realities, she strove, as far as possible, to reconcile them, being during her long reign the most consistent organizer of that model of state administration that would become one of the ideal models for Russian conservatives.

The key stimulus for the development of Russian conservative thought was not the gradual spread of the ideas of the French Enlightenment at the level of salon conversations and the reading circle of the educated part of society, but specifically the period of the Great French Revolution, which became, as it were, the implementation of philosophical theory in political practice and posed acute questions to Russian society not only about the form of the country's political structure, but also about the nature of the world order as a whole. The rethinking of political practice arose from the need to confront the "godlessness of the 18th century", which gradually spread through the influence of the ideas of the French enlighteners on Western European and Russian philosophy: "the first lessons of French that the people heard, " wrote Joseph de Maistre, " were blasphemies. "¹⁴⁵

Rene de Chateaubriand and Joseph de Maistre in France, Edmund Burke in Great Britain, and the philosophers of the romantic political school in Germany (Novalis, Schlegel) rebelled against the spread of atheistic views. However, a peculiarity of the formation of Russian conservatism was that it acquired distinct contours during the period of not only ideological but also direct military confrontation with France, which undoubtedly left its mark on the philosophical judgments of conservatives. The period of the Napoleonic Wars became the starting point for the formation of Russian conservative political doctrine. After the brilliant

¹⁴⁵ Maistre J. M. de, Petersburg letters: [1803–1817] / compiled, translated and foreword by D. V. Solovyov. St. Petersburg: INApress, 1995. P. 162.

military victories of the reigns of Peter the Great and Catherine, a series of humiliating defeats in the Napoleonic Wars struck at the national pride of Russians and raised the question of the fate and mission of the Russian people.

The appeal to national tradition, national language and national history proved to be a saving grace during the Patriotic War of 1812, when the growing foreign policy crisis against the backdrop of many internal disorders set the authorities the task of consolidating society. The emperor's appeal for support to the party of Russian patriots was a politically inevitable step, although he personally was not a supporter of the conservative course, and had a deep antipathy towards many of its representatives. The Tsar did not like F. V. Rostopchin, a former supporter of Paul I and who did not hide his position regarding the regicide that had been committed, and he also disliked N. M. Karamzin, who irritated the Tsar with his sharp criticism of his foreign policy in the first manifesto of the Russian conservatives - "Notes on Ancient and New Russia". But events forced Alexander to rely on the conservatives, because it was impossible to win the war otherwise.

Victory in the Patriotic War strengthened the position of Russian conservatives for a time, but the European campaign of the Russian army and the ever-deeper penetration of Enlightenment ideas into the Russian military elite changed the ideological picture of the era and led to the December armed uprising at the beginning of the reign of Nicholas I. The new emperor faced the most difficult task of clearly articulating a national ideology. Extreme patriotism with sharp nationalist rhetoric was not only appropriate, but inevitable during the war, but now it was necessary to seek a reasonable balance and, having overcome "ignorant national pride", create "enlightened national pride".

The nobility, which before the war of 1812 did not want to know the customs of its people, during the military disasters rushed to learn Russian as passionately as they had tried to perfect their Parisian accent six months earlier. Having found themselves the savior nation of Europe and having encountered European life not from books but with their own eyes, the Russian intellectual elite once again became concerned with being as European as possible, although they had not completely

forgotten the bitter lesson of dangerously neglecting their roots and traditions. Russian culture in the 1820s and 1830s was tormented by the questions: “Who are the Russians, what is their place in world culture and history, who should they be in the future, how to realize their historical mission, and does it even exist?” The philosophical letters of P. Ya. Chaadaev and “Eugene Onegin” by A. S. Pushkin, “History of the Russian State” by N. M. Karamzin and “History of the Russian People” by N. A. Polevoy strive to give their answers to these questions.

In parallel with the spiritual search of Russian society, the state was also looking for a solid ideological support. Count S. S. Uvarov, who headed the Ministry of Public Education in 1833, already in his earliest works devoted to reflections on the principles of a properly organized state education, noted that the basis of the entire educational system should be a course in Russian history, because "in public education, the teaching of history is a matter of state", and it should be taught from the book of the writer who would be able to "select what is reliable and useful, and to match it with the proposed goal of the government ¹⁴⁶." This shows, on the one hand, the formation of the idea of educating young people about man and society, based on the study of Russian history and leading to the harmonious adaptation of European ideas about the political system to the realities of Russian political life, and on the other hand, a public statement of the need for ideological control over the teaching process. Uvarov will develop these ideas as the Minister of Public Education.

The point of origin of that complex of ideas which A. N. Pypin would later call the “theory of official nationality” is considered to be Uvarov’s famous report to the sovereign, which took place on November 19, 1833. This document outlined the ideological program of the work of the ministry under Uvarov’s leadership, but its significance for Russian culture and political philosophy was undoubtedly much broader. Due to the fact that “many other subjects belong to the general system of

¹⁴⁶Uvarov S. S. On the teaching of history in relation to public education. *St. Petersburg, 1813*. Access mode: http://dugward.ru/library/uvarov/uvarov_o_prepodavanii_istorii.html. (date of access: 20.03.2017).

Public Education, such as: the direction given to Russian Literature, periodicals, and theatrical works; the influence of foreign books; patronage given to the arts,” the principles declared in the approaches to public education extended to all spheres of public life and acquired the character of a nationwide system of ideas and values.

The report “On some general principles that can serve as a guide in managing the Ministry of Public Education” put on the agenda the issue of the systematic development of state ideology. At its core was to be the same desire “to establish public education in our country that corresponds to our order of things and is not alien to the European spirit.” According to Uvarov, the fate of the Fatherland depended on this state task, and to solve it, it was necessary to find and comprehend those principles of Russian state life on which “our order of things” was based. Uvarov’s vision boils down to the following: “Deepening into the consideration of the subject and seeking out those principles that constitute the property of Russia (and every land, every people have such a Palladium), it becomes clear that we have three main principles without which Russia cannot prosper, grow stronger, or live: 1) The Orthodox Faith. 2) Autocracy. 3) Nationality (...) Without love for the Faith of their ancestors, the people, like the individual, must perish; to weaken their Faith is the same as depriving them of blood and tearing out their hearts. (...) Autocracy is the main condition for the political existence of Russia in its present form. (...) In order for the Throne and the Church to remain in their power, the feeling of Nationality, which binds them, must also be supported ¹⁴⁷. ”

The basis of the official model of Russian culture that took shape under Nicholas I , which would cover all spheres of creativity and everyday life – architecture, literature, painting, music, fashion – was the idea of integrating European and national traditions into a new, original and integral phenomenon. In architecture, which retained its basic European features, decorative elements appeared that referred to national motifs; melodies of folk songs would be woven

¹⁴⁷Uvarov S. S. On some general principles that can serve as a guide in managing the Ministry of Public Education // Shirinyants A. A. Russian socio-political thought. First half of the 19th century. Reader / edited by A. A. Shirinyants. Moscow: Moscow University Publishing House, 2011.

into symphonic music by M. Glinka, and even elements of folk costume, creatively reworked by the imagination of court craftsmen, were introduced into European toilets of court ladies in bright details – open shoulders and corsets would be combined with pearl-embroidered semblances of kokoshniks. All the necessary symbolic elements of the established imperial statehood and the formed national ideology appeared: in 1833, Nicholas I approved the text and melody of the national anthem “God Save the Tsar!”, and then officially secured the image of two versions of the state coat of arms.

However, it should be noted that the reign of Nicholas I , which began with the Decembrist uprising, which included the Polish uprising of 1830 years and a series of revolutions that swept across Europe at the turn of the 1840s and -50s were characterized by the authorities' constant mistrust of any manifestations of freedom in public life. The feeling of a constant threat to the throne and state order, emanating both from restless subjects and from political processes that destroyed the peace and stability of the European powers, forced the authorities to gradually build a system of ideological control, after 1848 g., which essentially turned into information terror. The dark seven years of ferocity of censorship put the emperor in a disastrous position for him - wanting to protect society from negative influence, the authorities protected themselves with the same dams from understanding the true state of affairs in the state, drowning out not only the voices that could confuse the people, but also the voice of the people themselves. As one of the prominent statesmen of post-reform Russia, N.Kh. Bunge, noted in his notes: "the truthful Emperor Nicholas I was a man of duty, order, discipline and was aware of His royal duties in relation to the people entrusted to Him by Providence", nevertheless, "with all the desire to know the truth, he received an incorrect idea of the actual state of the state, and even more so about the mood prevailing in the intelligentsia and the people ¹⁴⁸. " The straightforward Nicholas I lacked the political flexibility and cunning of Catherine

¹⁴⁸Note found in the papers of N.Kh. Bunge, 1881–1894 // Source. 1993. No. 0. P. 30–31.

the Great, who preferred to use skillful propaganda instead of administrative pressure, to more successfully implement state ideology.

The separation of the authorities, who were able to act only by forceful measures, which are never effective in the ideological sphere, from the society, which resisted this influence, led to the fact that the brilliantly formulated concept of a new national idea was imposed by the state, but rejected by society, despite the fact that in its meaning it was taken from the deepest national traditions, and not a theoretically speculative program of action divorced from Russian reality. The theory of official nationality in political discourse for a long time became a symbol of official patriotism and persecution of free thought, although in the sphere of political practice it was precisely this theory that throughout the subsequent imperial, Soviet and post-Soviet history of Russia retained its viability and became the basis for various modifications of the state ideology.

During the reign of Alexander II , especially in its first period, which lasted until the mid-1860s, a sharp change in the government's course and the rapidly collapsing barriers of censorship under the pressure of public opinion brought a new phenomenon to life. Russian society was carried away by a seething stream of unexpectedly legalized freethinking, as I. S. Aksakov noted, "everything is in motion, everything is in ferment, everything has moved from its place, is busy, is swarming and asking to live." And this seething stream at first gushed like a single river, the flow of which took a very definite direction of the general demand for the fastest liberal reforms, but soon the unity of this flow began to be inevitably violated.

In Russian educated society there appeared people who began to express concerns caused by the rapidity, lack of coordination of the reforms and the impossibility of any confident forecast of their results in the conditions of such reformist haste. Having gradually broken away from the moderate-liberal camp that united the majority of the Russian intelligentsia, they began to develop an independent view of the political situation in the country in their own theoretical constructions and sought to comprehend the ideas of Uvarov's triad in the reality of their time independently, not only outside the initiative and control of the

government, but sometimes even contrary to the authorities' directives. And they clearly recognized their opposition to the social circle that followed the ideas that served as the basis for the French Revolution.

The ideas of the Enlightenment had a decisive influence on the formation of the consciousness of the Russian intelligentsia ¹⁴⁹. To some extent, they became markers of mutual recognition of people of the same circle. At the same time, they had a significant influence on the formation of the very concept of *the intelligentsia*, since the basic set of ideas of representatives of this social group was associated with the revolution, and the word *intelligent* contained an indication not so much of the intellectual level, as one might think, based on its obvious connection with the English *intellectual*, as of the protest nature of views, i.e. the word "intelligentsia" implicitly conveyed the concept of "political opposition" ¹⁵⁰.

To explain this thesis, it is necessary to turn to the history of the formation and understanding of this concept. The complex question of whether the intelligentsia is a specific phenomenon of Russian history and culture or whether its formation as a special social group marks a certain stage in the development of society regardless of the national context was resolved differently even during the period of the initial understanding of the barely formed phenomenon. Thus, along with the assertion that “the Russian intelligentsia is a completely special spiritual and social formation existing only in Russia,” which ¹⁵¹was voiced in the works of N. A. Berdyaev and other “Vekhi” members, for example, P. B. Struve, who asserted that “the intelligentsia in Russian political development is a completely special factor,” ¹⁵²in the speeches of P. N. Milyukov, which were directly polemical against the collection “Vekhi,” it was indicated that “the intelligentsia is not at all a specifically Russian

¹⁴⁹Buduchev V. A. Intelligentsia in the perspective of intercultural relations: The role of the philosophy of enlightenment and the French Revolution in the formation of the Russian intelligentsia // *Intelligentsia and the world*. 2019. No. 1. P. 159.

¹⁵⁰Ekshut S. A. *Everyday life of the Russian intelligentsia from the era of great reforms to the Silver Age*. Moscow: Young Guard, 2012.

¹⁵¹Berdyaev H. A. *Russian idea. Main problems of Russian thought of the XIX-XX centuries* // *About Russia and Russian philosophical culture*. Moscow, 1990. P. 64.

¹⁵²Struve P.B. *Intelligentsia and Revolution* // *Vekhi*. 1909. Pp. 127–145.

phenomenon... and in other countries the intelligentsia as a separate social group arose as soon as the growth of culture or the complication of social tasks, together with the improvement of the state-social mechanism and the democratization of governance, created the need for specialization and professional grouping of the intelligentsia's labor ¹⁵³. ” However, Milyukov was also far from considering the Russian intelligentsia a completely typical phenomenon, but acknowledged that it had special specific features and only warned “against the exaggerations of those writers who are ready to consider all the features of the Russian intelligentsia, without exception, without further reference, to be our purely Russian features ¹⁵⁴. ”

Regardless of the degree of exclusivity and originality that thinkers of different groups recognized for the Russian intelligentsia as a phenomenon, they all agreed on the main thing - the understanding that in its most general form the concept of the intelligentsia unites two key features: education, which makes it related to the grammatically cognate, but semantically different concept of "intellectuality", and a set of certain moral imperatives, the indispensable commitment to which distinguishes an intelligent from an intellectual. The negative perception of the state and power in this case is interpreted either as a derivative or as a single-level component of these moral principles. Maximalist idealism, which was an integral moral component of the concept of the intelligentsia, found its embodiment in the high pathos of the struggle for the common good in its ideal embodiment. But the fact that any existing or ever existing state is imperfect makes the ideal unattainable, and the intelligentsia's maximalist criticism eternal, and essentially independent of the specific political forms of the changing state.

The authors of one of the studies of the intelligentsia as a phenomenon of Russian history, in the main issue adhering to the position of the Vekhovites that “the intelligentsia as a social group, as a kind of “class” was formed precisely in Russia...

¹⁵³Milyukov P.N. *Intelligentsia and Historical Tradition // Anthology*. St. Petersburg: Publishing House of the Russian Christian Humanitarian Institute, 1998. P. 7.

¹⁵⁴Ibid.

the Russian intelligentsia is an exclusively national phenomenon”¹⁵⁵, come to a surprisingly apt conclusion: “due to its maximalist idealism, the intelligentsia is always critical of the authorities. However, the intelligentsia criticizes the authorities not “from the left” or “from the right”, but “from above”, i.e. from inflated, idealized moral and intellectual positions, which are ultimately unrealistic”¹⁵⁶.

At the same time, in Russia the general pathos of the intelligentsia's struggle against the imperfection of the state as a form of social existence was supplemented by a theoretical fascination with Western political models and their idealization, which at a certain stage transformed the desire to fight the abstract state for the "physical, social and personal liberation of the individual"¹⁵⁷(Ivanov-Razumnik's formulation) into a rejection of the national state, which Struve described as intellectual apostasy. The imperfection of the progressive regimes of the West was not obvious, since these regimes were understood not in the practice of their implementation, but in the beauty of their theoretical justification - as an ideal "where we are not", while the imperfections of the existing national state were too obvious for a suffering conscience.

Ultimately, the hostility to the shortcomings of the existing society, which arose from a pure source of abstract striving for the common good, did not lead to a responsible understanding of the ways of their careful elimination and gradual improvement, but to the fact that "the overwhelming majority of Russian people from among the so-called intelligentsia lived by one faith, had one meaning in life: this faith is best defined as faith in revolution. The Russian people - this is how we felt - are suffering and perishing under the yoke of an outdated, degenerate, evil, egotistical, arbitrary power... The main thing, the main point of aspiration lay not in the future and its creativity, but in the denial of the past and the present. That is why the faith of this era cannot be defined either as faith in political freedom, or even as

¹⁵⁵Kolesov M. S., Chemshit A. A. Intelligentsia as a Phenomenon of Russian History // Scientific Notes of the Tavrichesky National University named after V. I. Vernadsky. Series “Philosophy. Sociology”. 2008. Vol. 21 (60). No. 3. P. 36–37.

¹⁵⁶Ibid. P. 37–39.

¹⁵⁷Ivanov-Razumnik. What is the intelligentsia? // Intelligentsia. Power. People. Moscow, 1993. P. 80.

faith in socialism, and according to its internal content can only be defined as faith in revolution, in the overthrow of the existing system" ¹⁵⁸- this is how S. L. Frank defined the spiritual state of the Russian intelligentsia at the turn of the century. Later, historian N. A. Bokhanov described it as a “fetishization of the revolution” by the Russian intelligentsia, but it is important to understand that, in general terms, it was formed at the previous stage.

Therefore, that part of the Russian educated society that in post-reform Russia did not share the enthusiasm for the ideas that formed the basis of the events of the future revolution, clearly understood what exactly their aspirations should be opposed to, what ideas they would need to push off from when formulating their “positive program”. It is necessary to note one important feature of ideological discourse, noted by the researcher of conservatism A. A. Zorin: ideology is always metaphorical, and “the power of ideological metaphor, its ability to grasp reality and produce new meanings significantly affects the dynamics of historical events” ¹⁵⁹. The core of any ideology is a set of metaphors that require disclosure and explanation through the context, creating a certain ideological load of the poetic image. At the same time, political polemics in one way or another go back to the opposition of opponents to an alternative set of metaphors and the desire to deconstruct the metaphorical constructions of opponents, in the process of which “politics tests poetry for feasibility,” and “poetry tests politics for the capacity and expressiveness of the corresponding metaphors” ¹⁶⁰. ”

It was not by chance that F. M. Dostoevsky formulated one of the most important tasks of his journalistic activity in this way: “No, in Russia we need to instill other convictions, and especially regarding the concepts of freedom, equality

¹⁵⁸Frank S. L. *The Fall of Idols* // Frank S. L. *Works*. Moscow: Pravda, 1990. P. 118.

¹⁵⁹Zorin A. A. *Feeding the Double-Headed Eagle...: Russian Literature and State Ideology in the Last Third of the 18th – First Third of the 19th Century*. Moscow: New Literary Review, 2004. P. 20.

¹⁶⁰Zorin A. A. *Feeding the Double-Headed Eagle...: Russian Literature and State Ideology in the Last Third of the 18th – First Third of the 19th Century*. Moscow: New Literary Review, 2004. P. 28.

and fraternity ¹⁶¹.” He clearly identified the metaphorical core that underlay the ideas of the revolutionary intelligentsia, and understood that this set of metaphors should be conceptually opposed to the positive ideal of conservatism. I. S. Aksakov developed this idea even more deeply: “there is no doubt that the motto of the first French revolution: “freedom, equality, fraternity” is of evangelical origin... But precisely because they stripped these principles of their divine essence and reduced them to the level of legal concepts, the word that alone contains the foundation and life force of all the above-mentioned Christian principles did not make it into their motto and onto their banner: this word is “love ¹⁶².” Therefore, Aksakov continues, a tragic contradiction arose: the Gospel motto became a slogan of terror. This idea was developed in his poetic work by another prominent representative of Russian conservatism, F. I. Tyutchev. “Unity – the oracle of our days proclaimed, / Perhaps soldered only by iron and blood. / But we will try to solder it with Love, / And then we will see which is stronger ¹⁶³.”

The principles of “freedom” and “equality,” noted Aksakov, taken outside their moral Christian foundation, lead to their opposite. Freedom leads to unbridledness and self-will, and “the idea of *equality*, understood in a purely external way, logically developed outside the idea of God, cannot stop at equality before the law, at the destruction of privileges: it will raise the banner of rebellion against the inequality of status and God's gifts, it will require the equalization of the lazy with the diligent, the untalented with the gifted, the ignorant with the learned, and in eternal protest against nature and God, it will kill life itself, will lead to nothing but death and destruction. And the famous fraternite, displayed on the banner of the French Revolution, which banned by decree the confession of the existence of God, is not in itself a logical absurdity? For *brotherhood* presupposes *sonship*, and without sonship, without the concept of a common father, it is unthinkable. People are

¹⁶¹Dostoevsky F. M. *A Writer's Diary* / compiled and commented by A. V. Belov; editor-in-chief O. A. Platonov. Moscow: Institute of Russian Civilization, 2010. P. 535.

¹⁶²Aksakov I. S. *Complete works: In 7 volumes. Moscow; St. Petersburg, 1886–1887. Vol. 4. Pp. 338–358*.

¹⁶³Tyutchev F.I. *Russia and the West* / comp., entry. Art., trans. and comm. B. N. Tarasova. M.: Cultural Revolution; Republic, 2007. P. 191.

brothers only because they are children of one father, and if we are not sons of God, then there is no brotherhood. The Gospel does not use the word *equality*, and there is no need for it, because the idea of brotherhood not only includes it, but is also *higher than it*, for it compensates with love for every inequality, both artificial and natural ¹⁶⁴. "

In citing such an extensive quotation from the work of I. S. Aksakov, it should be noted that, on the one hand, it is fundamentally important for the further development of the analysis of the concepts under study, on the other hand, extensive citation of journalistic texts in general is inevitable for this study. S. L. Frank, noting in the article "The Essence and Motives of Russian Philosophy" the characteristic feature of Russian philosophy of the literary form and the most frequent occurrence of philosophical constructions in the genre of a journalistic article, emphasizes that this was the result of not only a certain specificity of the historical development of Russian philosophy, but was also conditioned by its special spiritual intention: "the free and unscientific form of philosophical creativity ... is connected to a certain extent with its essence, with what should be called the concrete intuitionism of Russian philosophy ¹⁶⁵."

This "free and unscientific form" of the studied philosophical works, permeated with metaphorical constructions and images, often does not allow the use of short fragments to argue certain positions, since both arbitrary abbreviation and the transformation of the statements of the studied authors into indirect speech destroys the organic form of existence of their thoughts and distorts it.

Summarizing the above reasoning about the fact that the ideals of the French Revolution, embodied in the metaphorical construction of its motto, were presented to conservatives as the core of the worldview of the liberal intelligentsia as the "ideal other", in opposition to which one can build one's own philosophical concept. It can

¹⁶⁴Aksakov I. S. Response to the handwritten article "Christianity and Progress" sent to the editors of the newspaper "Rus" // Complete collected works: in 7 volumes. Moscow; St. Petersburg, 1886–1887. Vol. 4. P. 339.

¹⁶⁵Frank S. L. Russian Worldview. St. Petersburg, 1996. P. 151.

be said that the answer to two key questions about Russian conservatism – what does it preserve and what does it oppose – will be an appeal to two opposed triple formulas: the revolutionary triad “*Freedom! Equality! Brotherhood!*” as the denied and the conservative triad “*Orthodoxy. Autocracy. Nationality*” – as the affirmed. It is important to note that in this case, each element of one triad is semantically precisely compared to the corresponding element of the other: Orthodoxy as the embodiment of freedom, autocracy as a symbol of equality and nationality as a form of brotherhood.

It seems, therefore, that when analyzing the reflection of key concepts of conservatism in Russian journalism of the 19th century, it is advisable to consider these concepts not in isolation, i.e. as separate words with a conceptual load that is difficult to interpret, but to form **semantic groups of concepts** that include, firstly, the concept under consideration and the concept-antithesis as a semantic core (since the meaning of the concept being asserted is not always clear without an idea of the concept being refuted), and secondly, a number of related concepts that are significant for disclosing the semantic connections of the concept being studied. These related concepts are included in this semantic group if in the studied texts of Russian journalism of the 19th century they are used with significant frequency by the authors to clarify the understanding of the main concepts of this group, i.e. they are instrumental for constructing the main concept.

Thus, three main semantic groups are formed:

1. “Freedom – Orthodoxy” and the concepts that complement them: *enlightenment, faith, knowledge, prejudice, nihilism, society, community*.
2. “Equality – Autocracy” and the concepts that complement them: *state, citizen, law*.
3. “Brotherhood – Nationality” and the concepts that complement them: *nation, unity, ethnicity*.

Each semantic group will be examined by comparing various interpretations of the key concept and the concepts that instrumentally complement it in the works of publicism by various representatives of the conservative trend in Russian

journalism in order to identify the semantic nuances that make up the field of consensus and the field of discussion, since “in the course of the formation of ideological constructions, their various versions are adjusted to each other, pass through filters of mutual additions, distortions and interpretations”¹⁶⁶. Based on the understanding that the existence of a clear and stable ideology is possible only under the condition that “there is at least a minimal consensus around its basic metaphors”¹⁶⁷, it will be possible, based on the results of this comparative analysis, to draw a conclusion about the extent to which the ideology of Russian conservatism was formed in the period under study.

§ 1.2 Orthodoxy as an ideal of freedom in the interpretation of Russian conservatives

The concept of *freedom*, included in the triple slogan of the French Revolution, meant first and foremost the liberation of man from the constraints of an unjustly organized society, i.e. it was conceived primarily as political freedom. However, this political freedom, according to the just conviction of the French enlighteners, could only be achieved on the basis of internal freedom, which in their understanding was expressed in the liberation of the enlightened mind from social prejudices, among which religion most clearly belonged, due to the maximum development of rational scientific knowledge. Much later, the supporter of the ideals of a radical transformation of society, A. I. Herzen, who witnessed the revolutionary events in France in 1848, not without bitterness stated in one of his letters: "people cannot be liberated in external life more than they are liberated *internally*." ¹⁶⁸ Thus, the fundamental thing for revealing the concept of freedom is to understand what the

¹⁶⁶Zorin A. A. Feeding the Double-Headed Eagle...: Russian Literature and State Ideology in the Last Third of the 18th – First Third of the 19th Century. Moscow: New Literary Review, 2004. P. 28.

¹⁶⁷Ibid.

¹⁶⁸ Herzen A. I. Collected works: In 30 volumes. Moscow: Nauka, 1960. Vol. 20. Book 2. P. 590.

relationship between the aspects of internal and external freedom was in the concepts being transmitted and what exactly was understood as its source.

The French enlighteners and their Russian followers paid close attention to the development of natural sciences, believing that through the successes of natural science, man would be able to abandon the religious worldview that was born exclusively from his primitive ignorance and fear of mysterious natural phenomena. Therefore, enlightenment, which gave its name to an entire period of development of philosophical thought, was understood precisely as the acquisition of academic knowledge - primarily in the field of natural sciences.

In the context of conservative thought, freedom without education is as unthinkable as in the understanding of the French encyclopedists, but education is understood not as the acquisition of scientific knowledge, but as enlightenment by the light of faith and truth, which gives a person not freedom of reason, but freedom of spirit. This distinction was formulated most clearly by F. M. Dostoevsky. Addressing a magazine opponent on the pages of *The Writer's Diary*, he wrote: "You have also uttered an important word: "Enlightenment". Allow me to ask what you mean by it: Western sciences, useful knowledge, crafts, or spiritual enlightenment? The first, that is, sciences and crafts, really should not pass us by, and we really have nowhere to go from them, and there is no reason to. I also completely agree that there is nowhere to get them from except from Western European sources, for which praise to Europe and our eternal gratitude to her. But by enlightenment I mean (I think that no one can understand it differently) – that which is literally expressed in the word “enlightenment” itself, that is, spiritual light, illuminating the soul, enlightening the heart, guiding the mind and showing it the path of life. If so, then allow me to note that we have nothing to draw from Western European sources for such enlightenment due to the complete presence (and not absence) of Russian sources... our people have been enlightened for a long time, having accepted Christ and his teaching into their essence ¹⁶⁹.”

¹⁶⁹Dostoevsky F. M. *A Writer's Diary* / compiled and commented by A. V. Belov; editor-in-chief O. A. Platonov. Moscow: Institute of Russian Civilization, 2010. Pp. 727–728.

Anticipating his opponent's objections that Christianity cannot contain the entire cycle of enlightenment and that the importance of science and civil ideas cannot be denied, Dostoevsky emphasizes that religious enlightenment cannot contradict scientific enlightenment, but must always underlie it. This conclusion is closely related to the above-cited statement by I. S. Aksakov that the entire enlightenment triad is undoubtedly of evangelical origin, but has lost the idea of God as its foundation, and without Him, both knowledge and freedom will be turned to evil. The inevitable consequence of the renunciation of God, and consequently the rejection of the moral law, as Aksakov wrote, will be the substitution of the concepts of good and evil by the concepts of harm and benefit, characteristic of materialism, the emergence of a system of views that another preacher of Russian conservatism, N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov, called "an obliging philosophy that placed the beginning and end of everything in the stomach ¹⁷⁰. "

The utilitarian understanding of freedom as the emancipation of the individual from the political constraints of society, according to Russian conservatives, inevitably entailed not liberation, but enslavement of a deeper nature. This idea was developed by N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov in his article "Where Does Nihilism Come From?" He notes that every new idea that appears at the next stage of development of the new European civilization first acts as a tool for liberation from the existing and currently conscious oppression, but later itself becomes the basis for a more subtle enslavement. The emancipating principle, which for a time is the only one noticeable in every newly emerging idea, gradually and inevitably reveals its other side - the enslaving one. Thus, slavery was formally abolished with the transition to capitalist society, but violence against man did not go away, but only changed its form to another: "the violence of capital over labor, rightly, is worth the old patriarchal violence of the master over the slave ¹⁷¹. " Analyzing the change of one form of violence to another, more subtle and less noticeable, Gilyarov-Platonov

¹⁷⁰Gilyarov-Platonov N. P. Collected Works in 2 volumes. Moscow: K. P. Pobedonostsev Publishing House, 1899. Vol. 1. P. 181.

¹⁷¹Ibid. P. 11.

comes to the conclusion that “liberation”, which presupposes freedom of public opinion and its unlimited power, will be the most dangerous and cruel violence, for it will be the violence of “the more dexterous, the more witty against the more simple-minded and modest (...) This *is* the violence of temptation and seduction; this is violence that affects not the physical side of a person, and not the external expression of his conviction, but goes against the most sacred secret of freedom. And the more dangerous it is, the more subtle it is: it kills freedom at the very root, under the guise of respect for that very same freedom ¹⁷².”

Freedom in the enlightenment paradigm is based on the elimination of prejudices through rational knowledge. In the “catechism” of the Russian revolutionary-minded intelligentsia, the novel “What is to be done?”, a clear formula for the path to freedom is proclaimed: “Let us study – knowledge will set us free.” According to the apt remark of the historian of philosophy V. V. Zenkovsky, “Russian radicalism... has merged with this naive, truly “mystical” faith in the natural sciences – although in its essence Russian radicalism... is deeply spiritualistic... Through this faith in materialism, Russian radicalism is close to the Western enlightenment ¹⁷³.”

Representatives of the revolutionary democratic wing of Russian journalism, discussing political freedom and the mission of the intelligentsia to establish it in Russia, relied on the idea that education can only be carried out as a deliverance from prejudices. For example, M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin in his essay “The Monrepos Refuge” discusses the possible role and calling of an educated person living in the village: “a cultured Russian person, in addition to agricultural undertakings, can have a completely village business, namely: the business of advice, explanation, education and feasible assistance”, realized through “...trying to dispel prejudices, fears and preconceptions”¹⁷⁴.

¹⁷²Ibid.

¹⁷³Zenkovsky V. V. History of Russian Philosophy. Moscow: Academic Project, Raritet, 2001. P. 328.

¹⁷⁴Saltykov-Shchedrin M. E. Mon Repos Shelter // Saltykov-Shchedrin M. E. Collected works: in 20 volumes. T. 13. M.: Khudozhestvennaya literatura, 1971. P. 78.

However, the word *prejudice* is used by representatives of the two poles of public discourse, obviously, in completely different senses. Conservatives took into account the direct meaning of the word, the original meaning with which it entered the Russian language, and which is most clearly expressed by the grammatical form of the Russian word - conviction, which appeared "before reasoning", i.e. accepted without reliable logical grounds. However, the discussion about the semantic content of this calqued word began almost immediately after it first appeared in the works of A. P. Sumarokov as a calque from the French *préjugé*: thus, V. K. Trediakovsky came out with a polemical judgment regarding the fact that the word *prejudice* cannot be used in the meaning of a preliminary judgment, since it must have the meaning of a false opinion fixed in a general judgment ¹⁷⁵.

It should be noted that later, thinkers of the conservative wing gravitated toward understanding prejudice as pre-rational, non-discursive knowledge, while their ideological opponents emphasized the aspect of falsity, the untruthfulness of the judgment called prejudice.

Of prejudice, characteristic of conservatives, goes back, like many other features of Russian conservatism, to the works of its founder, N. M. Karamzin. In the May 1803 issue of the "Bulletin of Europe," Karamzin published a "Letter to a Philosopher" on the topic "On Prejudices in Relation to Civil Society and Politics," in which he asserts that "no civil society can survive without prejudices, which are nothing more than opinions about things based on faith without thorough research. And so only God can be without prejudices: for He alone can survey everything and test everything ¹⁷⁶."

However, in the second half of the 19th century, including due to its frequent use in liberal-minded journalism that dominated public discourse, the word *prejudice* in Russian somewhat changed its meaning, cementing and strengthening the negative connotation of falsity. N. A. Dobrolyubov clearly contrasted prejudice

¹⁷⁵Vinogradov V. V. History of words: Approx. 1500 words and expressions and more than 5000 words associated with them. Moscow, 1999. Pp. 319-320.

¹⁷⁶Bulletin of Europe. 1803. No. 10. P. 130.

with truth (for example, in his article “On the Degree of Participation of the Nationality in the Development of Russian Literature,” he wrote about Lermontov: “he becomes decisively above all the prejudices of patriotism and understands love for the fatherland truly, sacredly, and rationally”¹⁷⁷); D. I. Pisarev fought against ethical and aesthetic prejudices, hoping that prejudices would fall under the light of rational scientific knowledge; A. I. Herzen criticized the Slavophiles for their allegedly characteristic readiness to share all the prejudices of the people for the sake of unity with the people, “instead of developing reason in the people¹⁷⁸.”

In the dictionary of V. I. Dahl, one of the meanings of the word *prejudice* is *preserved as* 'a firm concept, opinion, conviction about a matter that you do not know enough', but with an emphasis on the fact that this is 'an opinion that is distorted or one-sided, false' and with the appearance in the synonymous series of variants of 'belief, superstition'¹⁷⁹. As a result, the word *prejudice* turned out to be simultaneously a synonym for the word *ignorance* and for the words *tradition*, *faith* and *custom*.

A kind of semantic shift was created: the bearer of prejudices is ignorant, prejudices include following tradition, custom, religious faith, and therefore, an educated person cannot be a bearer of faith and tradition.

It is natural that conservatives, who attempted to return the sacred to the political sphere, to substantiate the need for a religious view of freedom, equality, citizenship and other socio-political categories, turned, among other things, to the rehabilitation of the concept of *prejudice in public discourse*. The possibilities of human knowledge are not unlimited: each new scientific discovery, questioning judgments that were previously accepted without sufficient logical grounds, makes its own, new judgment, which also cannot be ideally and reliably substantiated, since it inevitably contains some percentage of the unknown, compensated by a hypothesis, an assumption, i.e., in essence, the process of human knowledge appears

¹⁷⁷Dobrolyubov N. A., Complete collected works. Moscow, 1934, Vol. 1, p. 238.

¹⁷⁸Herzen A.I. Past and Thoughts.

¹⁷⁹Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Great Russian Language by V. Dahl: in 4 volumes. 2nd ed. St. Petersburg, 1882. Vol. 3. P. 400.

as the replacement of some prejudices by others. If we demand ideal reliability from any judgment, then only experiences of sensory cognition will be reliable, so that, in the words of Gilyarov-Platonov, “only an idiot whose mind is limited to observing the satisfaction of the needs of plant life will remain sane”, while a person who, in principle, has decided to think, i.e. to operate with abstractions, will immediately turn out to be “insane, insane precisely because he has ceased to be only a plant and an animal”¹⁸⁰.

Destroying the identity of "destruction of prejudices = progress" that was common to the Enlightenment idea, Gilyarov-Platonov asserted: "Prejudices and customs are destroyed, being replaced by new ones, and this is where humanity's success lies. But the destruction of some, the acceptance of others, is accomplished gradually and partially. It is possible to abandon all prejudices and all customs only by turning into quadrupeds: progress is small¹⁸¹."

Researchers in the history of philosophy point out that “in the intellectual debates of the new European Enlightenment, the difference between arguments based on faith and those based on reason began to emerge more clearly¹⁸²,” and the expressed desire to more clearly contrast reason and faith led to the formation of “the fundamental prejudice of the Enlightenment, which constitutes its foundation and determines its essence... prejudice against prejudices in general.”¹⁸³

The understanding that the desire to completely get rid of prejudices leads man and social institutions not to development, but to degradation, was previously expressed by Karamzin in the aforementioned letter to the philosopher about

¹⁸⁰Gilyarov-Platonov N. P. “Life is a feat, not a pleasure...” / compiled and commented by Yu. V. Klimakova; ed. O. Platonov. Moscow: Institute of Russian Civilization, 2008. P. 269.

¹⁸¹Ibid. P. 270.

¹⁸²Gabdullin I. R. Pre-conceptual prerequisite knowledge and the concept of prejudice: historical-philosophical and philosophical-legal aspects // Historical, philosophical, political and legal sciences, cultural studies and art criticism. Theory and practice issues. 2017. No. 6(80). Part 1. P. 41.

¹⁸³Gadamer H.-G. "Truth and Method: Foundations of Philosophical Hermeneutics". Quoted from: Gabdullin I. R. Pre-conceptual prerequisite knowledge and the concept of prejudice: historical-philosophical and philosophical-legal aspects // Historical, philosophical, political and legal sciences, cultural studies and art criticism. Theory and practice issues. 2017. No. 6(80). Part 1. P. 41.

prejudices. The publisher of the "Bulletin of Europe", starting from the understanding that prejudices constitute, as it were, the compressed knowledge of previous generations, the generalized experience of previous centuries, which formed the basis of a social convention determining the state existence of a particular people, notes that the rejection of these prejudices would lead to the fact that each new generation would have to painfully search anew for a difficult-to-emerge consensus regarding the foundations of social structure. Not to mention the fact that it is not easy for everyone to agree on opinions regarding civil rules, writes Karamzin, even if "all citizens agree on opinions; but a new Diet will have to be assembled for each new generation, for young people, also fearing prejudices, will want to examine everything themselves. What will be the firm foundation of states?¹⁸⁴" Therefore, Karamzin sees the meaning of prejudices in the fact that they "connect centuries with each other and are the result of the silent consent of citizens¹⁸⁵."

An important emphasis on the concept of *prejudice* appears in the journalism of Dostoevsky, who noted that a significant part of the Russian educated public, i.e. "people who have already managed to become cultured", in fact became cultured "only weakly and superficially, only in some of their habits, in new prejudices, in a new suit"¹⁸⁶, i.e. simply under the guise of getting rid of prejudices, they exchanged the prejudices of one social stratum for the prejudices of another. In this regard, the conservatives' understanding of *prejudice* as non-discursive knowledge presupposes the fundamental impossibility for a person to free himself completely from prejudices, which are an integral stage of thinking. Prejudice only outlines the background context, for which it inevitably appeals to the unspoken conceptual convention of a certain social group. And if a social group can be changed, changing the set of prejudices along with it, then it is simply impossible to get rid of prejudices completely.

¹⁸⁴Bulletin of Europe. 1803. No. 10. P. 133.

¹⁸⁵Ibid.

¹⁸⁶Dostoevsky F. M. A Writer's Diary / compiled and commented by A. V. Belov; editor-in-chief O. A. Platonov. Moscow: Institute of Russian Civilization, 2010. P. 325.

In understanding the difference in the semantic content of the concept of *prejudice* among conservatives and progressives, it is necessary to note the fact that different meanings of the word ultimately became entrenched in different speech layers. In everyday speech, the word *prejudice* represented a negative value judgment, and in academic speech, to which conservatives were more inclined, it retained the meaning of a philosophical epistemological category, signifying pre-conceptual non-discursive knowledge, and in this capacity, it was not a “polemical correlate of freedom and reason ¹⁸⁷,” but a designation of a certain inevitable stage of the thought process.

Gilyarov-Platonov, emphasizing the fact that prejudices underlie any reasoning, including the reasoning of those whose goal is to combat prejudices, points to the fundamental mistake of conservatives, supporters of a religious worldview, which they commit in polemics with materialists: the desire to give a logical, rational justification to faith. When an atheist, once again “repeating the mockery uttered back in the 17th century,” says that priests invented God in order to exploit the people, and “whether he rests on Buchner and Moleschott or goes further, he will add that there is nothing but matter and chance. And you will go against him with proofs of the existence of God, repeat Anselm’s syllogism? But you will be on the ground where it is most convenient for the enemy to strike you. No, if you are going to strike him, you must come at him from behind; "his ass is not covered. What is there to be afraid of, that religious faith is given before reasoning; and what is his faith based on? If the priests invented religion out of self-interest, then Buchner preached matter without force for a fee ¹⁸⁸. ”

The rehabilitation of the sacred, the affirmation of religious faith as the only solid foundation of social processes, the denial of the need for rational reflection of tradition as the basis of community life, led conservatives to the conclusion that true

¹⁸⁷Gabdullin I. R. Pre-conceptual prerequisite knowledge and the concept of prejudice: historical-philosophical and philosophical-legal aspects // Historical, philosophical, political and legal sciences, cultural studies and art criticism. Theory and practice issues. 2017. No. 6 (80). Part 1. P. 40.

¹⁸⁸Gilyarov-Platonov N. P. “Life is a feat, not a pleasure...” / compiled and commented by Yu. V. Klimakova, ed. O. Platonov. Moscow: Institute of Russian Civilization, 2008. P. 280.

freedom, even in the applied political sense, should consist in “not drilling community life with an article,” i.e. allowing the natural flow of human community life to freely realize itself in the mainstream of tradition and national custom, based on faith, and not reforming it with armchair ideas taken from foreign models.

The word *dormitory* in the discourse of the conservative press appears in a meaning much broader than "a place of common residence", although already in the 19th century in journalism and ego-documents one can find its use in a meaning that is close to its modern meaning ¹⁸⁹. Understanding society as a collective subject, publicists of post-reform Russia often expanded the meaning of the word *dormitory* to the fullness of social existence, using it in the meaning of "socio-political order". Thus, *dormitory* became to a greater extent synonymous with such concepts of a later time as *socio-political system*, and in the Marxist paradigm it approached the concept of *social formation*.

In the works of publicists of the liberal- democratic trend, who also in a number of cases used the word *dormitory* to designate the totality of current social processes, it often retained a moderately expressed negative connotation. For example, in the novel by A. I. Herzen "Who is to Blame?" it is interpreted as "part of the artificial chains, mutual Lancastrian persecutions, called dormitory, which everyone laughs at and above which no one dares to rise ¹⁹⁰. "

In the articles of M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin, when he spoke on his own behalf and, for example, ironically ridiculed “fairy tales about the “soil” with all the retinue of conventional forms of community life” ¹⁹¹, a negative connotation of the meaning of this word was also evident. Sometimes Saltykov-Shchedrin used the concept of *community life* in the same neutral-evaluative meaning as conservative publicists, but it is important to note that in this meaning it was put by the writer into the mouth

¹⁸⁹Illustrated dictionary of forgotten and difficult words from works of Russian literature of the 18th–19th centuries / compiled by L. A. Glinkina. Orenburg, 1998.

¹⁹⁰Herzen A. I. Who is to blame? // Herzen A. I. Collected Works: in 30 volumes. Vol. 4: Works of Art. 1841–1846. Moscow, 1955. P. 30.

¹⁹¹Saltykov-Shchedrin M. E. Well-intentioned speeches // Saltykov-Shchedrin M. E. Collected works: in 20 volumes. T. 11. Well-intentioned speeches. 1872–1876. M.: Fiction, 1971. P. 11.

of one of the heroes of his essays – a police officer, who obviously was an example of a person with a conservative way of thinking. Saltykov-Shchedrin's hero, noting "the successes of science and the development of forms of community life" or recognizing the need to "obey the rules of community life ¹⁹²," meant by this following the general principles of collective existence, but, probably, it was precisely the use of the word *community life* in this sense that, according to Saltykov-Shchedrin, should have marked the hero as a bearer of a conservative worldview.

For the conservative publicists, the call "not to drill the community with the article" was not a manifestation of that "reverent stupefaction" ¹⁹³ which, according to Saltykov-Shchedrin, overwhelmed them at any encounter with existing and established social norms, no matter how outdated they actually were. It meant only a rejection of the excessive interference of theoretical, cabinet ideas in the process of reorganizing society, the recognition that society is a complex self-regulating system that cannot be adjusted to an intellectual scheme, because life invariably turns out to be richer and more diverse than any theoretical research.

M. N. Katkov, reasoning in a similar way, comes to the paradoxical, at first glance, assertion that with a correct understanding of the essence of conservatism and liberalism, "the more liberal the government, the more conservative the society ¹⁹⁴." If the main goal of liberalism is "freedom of life, requiring that every human force develop by its own internal energy," then, striving for political freedom, which "means nothing other than a firm, reliable provision of public and personal freedom by the state," a truly liberal government will "eliminate from life everything that hinders and interferes with its natural course, not allow violence" and repeal those laws that do not represent a fixation of norms and rules born of life itself, but

¹⁹²Saltykov-Shchedrin M. E. Mon Repos Shelter // Saltykov-Shchedrin M. E. Collected works: in 20 volumes. T. 13. Messrs. Golovlevs. 1875–1880. Monrepos shelter. 1878–1879. All year round. 1879–1880. M.: Fiction, 1972. P. 312.

¹⁹³Saltykov-Shchedrin M. E. Well-intentioned speeches // Saltykov-Shchedrin M. E. Collected works: in 20 volumes. T. 11. Well-intentioned speeches. 1872–1876. M.: Fiction, 1971. P. 8.

¹⁹⁴Katkov M. N. Collected Works: in 6 volumes. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. Vol. 4. P. 652.

"organized intervention in life," so that "a liberal government in this sense corresponds to a conservative society ¹⁹⁵. "

Such conclusions led conservatives to pose another important problem: if we allow the creation in Russia of such forms of government that would establish democratic representative institutions and that complex of political freedoms that was implied by the first postulate of the revolutionary triad, then, due to the specifics of our national history and political tradition, this freedom would turn into the most obvious tyranny. The educated class automatically receives an advantage in the realization of its political freedoms through democratic institutions based on influencing public opinion with the help of the press. The power of public opinion, which is an integral part of representative government, would turn out in Russia to be the power of an educated minority over an illiterate majority.

An educated class, separated from the bulk of the population, from the people, by cultural discord or, in Dostoevsky's words, torn away from the people's soil, having gained control over the country through representative institutions, would not be able to act in the interests of the people, because it did not know, did not understand and did not share these interests. As Dostoevsky noted, Russians who had just become acculturated in the European manner, even those with little education, " always begin precisely by despising their former environment, their people and even their faith, sometimes even to the point of hatred ¹⁹⁶." "Why is it that in Europe," the writer asked, "those who call themselves democrats always stand for the people, or at least rely on them, while our democrat is often an aristocrat and, in the end, almost always serves in the hands of everything that suppresses the people's power and ends with lordship ¹⁹⁷. "

Yu. F. Samarin shared the same view: "an illiterate people, a people separated from other classes, a people thrown out of the rut of historical development by Peter's reforms, is not capable, cannot take part in the movement of state institutions.

¹⁹⁵Ibid.

¹⁹⁶Dostoevsky F. M. *A Writer's Diary* / compiled and commented by A. V. Belov; editor-in-chief O. A. Platonov. Moscow: Institute of Russian Civilization, 2010. P. 325.

¹⁹⁷Ibid. P. 730.

We cannot yet have a people's constitution, and a non-people's constitution, that is, the rule of a minority acting without power of attorney on behalf of the majority, is a lie and a deception ¹⁹⁸. ” Conservatives feared, not without reason, that, given the specifics of Russian socio-cultural stratification, democracy would quickly transform from the model of “democracy is the power of the people” to the model of “democracy is the power of democrats,” turning for the majority of Russians from freedom into a sophisticated form of despotism.

In this sense, the conservatives of post-reform Russia remained committed to one of the main and earliest theses of Russian conservatism, expressed by its founder N. M. Karamzin: “Liberalists! What do you want? The happiness of people! But is there happiness where there is death, illness, vices, passions? The foundation of civil societies is immutable: you can put the bottom on top, but there will always be a bottom and a top, will and bondage, wealth and poverty, pleasure and suffering. For a moral being, there is no good without freedom; but this freedom is given not by the Sovereign, not by Parliament, but by each of us to ourselves with the help of God. We must win freedom in our hearts with peace of conscience and trust in Providence!” ¹⁹⁹More than half a century later, his grandson, Prince V. P. Meshchersky, would argue in the same spirit, asserting that freedom, “whose source is God,” “is born from love for one's neighbor and gives the soul and life endless content, a rock-solid foundation, and unceasing contemplation of goals for which it is worth living, worth working, and the present time is not enough ²⁰⁰.”

The ideas of Christianity in the Russian public discourse of the 19th century were opposed by the materialistic concept of the "environment", which stemmed from the same Rousseauism, the logical consequence of which was the desire to shift responsibility for many human actions to an incorrectly organized society, the circumstances of the negative "environment", under the influence of which the moral

¹⁹⁸Samarin Yu. F. Regarding talk about the constitution // *Rus. 1881. No. 29.*

¹⁹⁹Karamzin N. M. Thoughts on True Freedom // *Unpublished works and correspondence of Nikolai Mikhailovich Karamzin. Part one. St. Petersburg, 1862.*

²⁰⁰Meshchersky V. P. God and the Feuilletonists // *In the Evidence of Time. 2nd ed. St. Petersburg, 1880. Pp. 174–175.*

nature of man was distorted. Among Russian conservative thinkers, Dostoevsky paid the greatest attention to the polemic with the doctrine of the environment from the standpoint of the Christian doctrine of freedom. Christ, having rejected all the devil's temptations, did not want to enslave man's faith either by force, or bread, or miracle. Christianity recognizes man's complete freedom of moral choice, placing on him the full responsibility for this choice.

Dostoevsky emphasized: “by making man responsible, Christianity thereby also recognizes his freedom. By making man dependent on every mistake in the social structure, the doctrine of the environment brings man to complete impersonality, to complete liberation from any moral personal duty, from any independence, brings him to the most vile slavery that can only be imagined ²⁰¹. ”

Freedom was understood differently in the context of the Christian tradition and secular bourgeois humanism. In Pushkin's famous speech, Dostoevsky contrasts the ideal of Apollo Belvedere, the ideal of the man-God, with the Christian ideal of the God-man, i.e. he contrasts the proclamation of human life and comfort as the highest value with the recognition that there are values higher than life itself. It is the ability to relate oneself to values that exist outside of earthly life and are not abolished by death that makes a person human. If the ideal of secular humanism consists of pleasure and self-will, then the ideal of Christianity is in complete possession of one's own will, which, in fact, makes a person free. "In the current form of the world, freedom is believed to be unbridledness, whereas true freedom is only in overcoming oneself and one's will, so as to ultimately achieve such a moral state as to always, at every moment, be one's own true master. “And unbridled desires lead only to your slavery,” ²⁰²— this is what the author of “The Writer’s Diary” believed.

It is important to note that the opposition of freedom, which has a spiritual source, and the idea of the ultimate determinism of human existence by the

²⁰¹Dostoevsky F. M. *A Writer’s Diary* / compiled and commented by A. V. Belov; editor-in-chief O. A. Platonov. Moscow: Institute of Russian Civilization, 2010. P. 54.

²⁰²*Ibid.* P. 535.

environment, which was characteristic of conservative journalism in post-reform Russia, found its profound development in the philosophical journalism of the 20th century. The materialistic philosophical concepts that had prevailed by that time relied on the thesis that “existence determines consciousness,” while the followers of Russian conservative thought, who were polemically opposed to them, continued to develop the position that man cannot be reduced to the level of one of the manifestations of the material world, perceiving him only as a product of the environment and social structure. In his work “The Russian Idea,” N. A. Berdyaev, understanding materialism as “an extreme form of determinism, the determination of the human personality by the external environment,” sees its main flaw in the fact that materialism does not presuppose “any principle within the human personality that it could oppose to the action of the environment from the outside. Such a principle can only be a spiritual principle, an internal support for human freedom, a principle that is not derived from the outside, from nature and society ²⁰³.”

In the conservative journalism of post-reform Russia, it was not just the general recognition of religion as the basis of true freedom that acquired particular importance, but specifically the correlation with the content of Orthodox dogma, the understanding of Byzantine Christianity as the most profound embodiment of freedom. The first element of the conservative triad does not sound like "religion", but specifically like *Orthodoxy*, therefore the question of the specifics of Orthodox doctrine and the fate of the Orthodox Church plays an important role in understanding the socio-political doctrine of conservatism.

Prince V. P. Meshchersky noted in his collection of publicistic works “In Evidence of Time” that “there is nothing in the world more liberal than our Orthodox Church.” At the same time, freedom, which comes from following the Orthodox faith, “requires the expulsion of intolerance and cruelty, requires the introduction of love and participation in the lives of others into all areas of life, requires the destruction of slavery and servility in all forms and in all spheres of life, and opens

²⁰³Berdyaev N. Russian idea. St. Petersburg: ABC-classics, 2008. P. 174.

up a vast horizon for the development of society, for its formation, for the state's future ²⁰⁴.”

It is important to note that for representatives of Russian conservatism, commitment to Orthodoxy was not only a tribute to tradition, not only a silent and uncomplaining acceptance of the faith of ancestors. In one of his letters, Dostoevsky, anticipating the idea of the novel "The Brothers Karamazov", writes: "But I do not believe as a fool, a fanatic!" and emphasizes that both faith in general and commitment to Orthodoxy were the result of a difficult path of spiritual quests, doubts, skepticism: "But their stupid nature did not even dream of such a strong denial that I have gone through ²⁰⁵. "

Gilyarov-Platonov makes a similar confession in correspondence with one of his associates, N. Shakhovskiy, analyzing the famous "Confession" of L. N. Tolstoy: "starting from the end of the seminary (...) there will be a painful process of searching for truth, not formal (...), religious and philosophical doubts and the way out of them. A confession about this would present a parallel to the miserable confession of Tolstoy, who was and is, with all his talent, still an ignorant person first of all. But for me it is inconvenient to set out my confession for many reasons - not to mention others, because it would require not one volume, but two ²⁰⁶. "

F. I. Tyutchev also emphasized that the path of a 19th-century man to faith was not easy. The emergence of materialistic philosophy, the successes of the natural sciences, which inspired materialists with the dream of the imminent discovery of all the secrets of nature and the complete abolition of the mystical perception of the universe, and the corrosive skepticism that gradually gained dominance in the education system, led to the fact that the "childish faith" perceived by the youth of the 19th century within the framework of patriarchal home education was destroyed at the first encounter with the education system based on the European approach to

²⁰⁴Meshchersky V. P. God and the Feuilletonists // In the Evidence of Time. 2nd ed. St. Petersburg, 1880. Pp. 174–175.

²⁰⁵F. M. Dostoevsky on Art. Moscow, 1973. P. 462.

²⁰⁶ Shakhovskoy N.V. Nikita Petrovich Gilyarov-Platonov: a short journalistic essay. Revel: Type. "Rev. Izv.", 1893. P. 48.

enlightenment as, first of all, the acquisition of natural scientific knowledge. Therefore, the controversy about the spread of natural sciences and their role in the education system in Russian journalism of this period was closely linked with the discussion of religious, moral and social issues ²⁰⁷.

Prince Meshchersky also believed that the main reason for the success of nihilistic propaganda was the establishment of a completely secular character of education and upbringing. In one of his articles, constructed in the form of a dialogue with an imaginary interlocutor, the prince discussed the liberal demand to make the study of God's law in schools voluntary, while removing clergy from teaching this course and entrusting the teaching to secular teachers. This measure would mean giving a completely atheistic character to the upbringing of youth, which in the opinion of conservatives was tantamount to a catastrophe.

Meshchersky brings forward the most natural arguments for conservatives against these demands: if education is built on rationalistic principles, then the element of morality will disappear from it altogether, because it is impossible to rationally substantiate moral principles: “let’s say I have completed a course, another, a third, a fourth; we do not know and have not studied religion. We need to obtain a certain position for ourselves: let’s say I need money to start, and so does someone else; I am of a straightforward and decisive nature: I calmly kill anyone who has money and take the money; another, less decisive, does not kill, but robs; a third comes to your house and drives you away under the pretext that he wants to live in this house; a fourth takes your own sister and insults her... ²⁰⁸”

His liberal opponent objects that even without the law of God all this is prohibited by the criminal law. But Meshchersky's hero says that the criminal law is invented by people and can be rewritten. Consequently, if the majority of people have come "through higher education to the conviction that there is nothing

²⁰⁷ Kruglikova O. S. Darwin's Evolutionary Theory in Reflection Russian conservative and liberal press of the second half of the 19th century // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 10: Journalism. 2018. No. 5. P. 101–118.

²⁰⁸ Meshchersky V.P. Press and Society // In Evidence of Time. 2nd ed. St. Petersburg, 1880. P. 108.

reprehensible in theft, or murder, or debauchery, or arson, then to those who tell us: this is not allowed, because it is a crime against the criminal law, we answer very simply: would you like to repeal these laws, we demand this, we have come to the conviction that all these laws have outlived their time; and since we are the majority, we demand that our will be carried out. These laws were established by the legislator of the past. Now we want to be legislators ²⁰⁹. "

The interlocutor objects that in this case society will be forced to use force. But force, says Meshchersky, will not calm anyone down; pressure will only provoke greater persistence in the demands of the masses and, in the end, will lead to power passing into the hands of the majority, which demands the repeal of the previous law. So, the whole question is that the masses should not demand the right to commit crimes, and for this they must have morality – the only possible internal bridle that restrains the beast in man, which cannot be restrained by any external pressure. There is no other source of morality except Christian law and the idea of God, and even the criminal law and respect for it are based on the same ideas about “can” and “cannot” that be instilled in legislators by Christian ethics. “The real world cannot provide either moderation or prudence, for it does not recognize limits to its material demands,” ²¹⁰and thus, from complete disregard for the “spiritual essence of the Russian state,” the soil is created “from which either suicides, or murderers, or regicides grow from all sides ²¹¹.”

However, despite the various exhortations of conservatives in the practice of approaching the organization of education, from the middle of the 19th century the tendency towards the dominance of materialistic teachings in education rapidly progressed, and somewhat later, already at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, the Russian conservative thinker L. A. Tikhomirov, reflecting on the reasons for the spread of political terrorism in Russia, wrote: “children entered the gymnasium as

²⁰⁹Ibid. P. 109–110.

²¹⁰Ibid. P. 113.

²¹¹Ibid. P. 135.

believers. But in the gymnasium, everyone's faith quickly faded and disappeared²¹².”

F. I. Tyutchev emphasized that the path to faith must pass through three stages: the unthinking faith of "simple" people, the skepticism of "semi-skilled" people, i.e. those who have lost the purity of intuitive faith under the influence of scientific skepticism, and the "skilled" - sages who have comprehended things in their entirety and achieved a certain synthesis of faith and knowledge. However, the trouble with the social sphere, according to Tyutchev, lies largely in the fact that neither simple people nor sages actively participate in public life, do not engage in it, and the most active are precisely the numerous groups of "semi-skilled" people who try to change and regulate the laws of society "on the basis of limited reason and unenlightened nature²¹³. "

However, even for those thinkers whose faith did not perish, having passed through the crucible of doubt and the trials of positivist skepticism, the problem of inter-confessional contradictions and the search for the most correct path in faith arose. In Russian conservative journalism there was a pronounced element of inter-confessional polemics, connected, first of all, with criticism of Catholicism and Protestantism, which are essentially closely connected with Orthodoxy.

The following logical line was built in the reasoning of the representatives of Russian conservatism: Catholicism with its characteristic unification of secular and spiritual power in one person became the first step towards distorting the truly Christian idea, rejecting the principle proclaimed by Christ "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's". This first distortion subsequently led Catholicism along the false path of constant struggle for secular power, participation in political intrigues, greed and, over time, turning into a political institution with all its inherent negative aspects: bureaucratization, the desire for enrichment and political influence. Reformation movements were a natural consequence of such an evolution of the

²¹²Tikhomirov L.A. *Shadows of the Past*. Moscow: Publishing House of the Magazine "Moscow", 2000. P. 162.

²¹³Tarasov B. N. *Fyodor Tyutchev on the purpose of man and the meaning of history* // F. I. Tyutchev. *Russia and the West*. Moscow: Cultural Revolution; Republic, 2007. P. 20.

Catholic Church, were a fair protest of believers. "The deserved punishment is carried out / For a grave sin, a thousand-year sin," ²¹⁴wrote Tyutchev about the growing influence of Protestant denominations in Europe.

However, Protestantism, which, according to Tyutchev, became a deserved punishment for Catholicism for the perversion of the Christian idea, could not replace it itself, for it was, according to its very name, precisely a philosophy of protest and existed only as long as it protested against the power of Western Christianity, but in itself did not represent a single system of spiritual values and therefore, from the very beginning of its path, inevitably went from the struggle for the purity of faith to unbelief and atheism. Sympathy for the ideas and movement of the first Protestants and, at the same time, a tragic awareness of the inevitability of their movement toward unbelief is heard in another poem by Tyutchev: "I love the Lutherans' worship, / Their strict, important and simple ritual, - / These bare walls, this empty temple / I understand the high teaching. / Don't you see? Having set out on the journey, / Vera is coming to you for the last time: / She has not yet crossed the threshold, / But her house is already empty and bare, - / She has not yet crossed the threshold, / The door has not yet closed behind her... / But the hour has come, it has struck... Pray to God, / You pray for the last time now ²¹⁵. "

Allowing, in contrast to Catholicism that had usurped the truth, unlimited freedom of personal interpretation of the Gospel, Protestantism, instead of one infallible Pope, created millions of infallible "popes", giving each of its followers the right to independent spiritual search, not correlated with either the general confessional system of ideological constants or the individual perceptions of other followers. Therefore, Protestantism a priori contained a tendency toward unlimited fragmentation into groups and groups, into branches and sects. From the point of view of representatives of Russian conservatism, unlimited freedom of interpretation

²¹⁴F. I. Tyutchev. *Russia and the West*. Moscow: Cultural Revolution; Republic, 2007. P. 180.

²¹⁵F. I. Tyutchev. *Russia and the West*. Moscow: Cultural Revolution; Republic, 2007. P. 118.

in the religious sphere was bound to lead to the fact that over time the very foundations of faith would be questioned, and then refuted and lost altogether.

This image was very vividly given by Dostoevsky in the pages of "A Writer's Diary". He describes how some people carry a vessel with a precious liquid, in front of this procession the oncoming people fall down, kiss the vessel with life-giving moisture, and suddenly "people stand up and start shouting: "Blind! Why are you kissing the vessel: only the life-giving moisture contained in it is precious, the contents are precious, not the contents... Idolaters! Throw the vessel, break it, adore only the life-giving moisture, not the glass!" However, after the vessel is broken, the precious contents spill out onto the ground and disappear. Everyone, even the main rebels who just called for the vessel to be broken, realize that the precious moisture was lost along with it. Further, Dostoevsky figuratively describes the reasons and the result of the rapid fragmentation of the once unified and harmonious teaching: "while the moisture has not yet all gone into the ground, a commotion arises: in order to save something that has survived in the broken shards, they begin to shout that a new vessel is needed quickly, they begin to argue about how and from what to make it. The dispute begins already with *from the very beginning*; and immediately, from the very first two words, the dispute goes into the letter. They are ready to bow to this letter even more than to the previous one, if only to get a new vessel as soon as possible; but the dispute becomes fierce, people break up into groups hostile to each other, and each group takes away for itself a few drops of the remaining precious moisture " *in their special*, different-sized cups, collected from everywhere, and no longer communicate with other piles. Each one wants to be saved with his own cup, and in each separate pile new disputes begin again. Idolatry intensifies as many times as the vessel is broken into shards ²¹⁶. "

Dostoevsky subtly notes that Protestantism does not have a consolidating potential - it can unite its adherents only at the initial stage of its emergence and precisely around the phenomenon of protest itself, when the unifying principle

²¹⁶Dostoevsky F. M. *Writer's Diary*. In 2 volumes. Moscow: Book Club 36.6, 2011. Vol. 2. P. 14.

becomes hatred for a common enemy, and not an understanding of the unity of creative aspirations. The writer assumed that Protestantism would begin to self-destruct after the first victory over its ideological opponent: as soon as Catholicism loses its dominant position and Protestantism needs to present to the world not only an exposure of the mistakes of its predecessor, but also its creative idea, its followers will not be able to agree on a common understanding of its foundations. Freedom of personal interpretation of scripture will gradually form a religion with a fleeting dogmatics, seeking support in a rational explanation.

Russian conservative thinkers saw in the specificity of Eastern Christianity a guarantee that Russian spiritual unity could not be threatened by the destructive trends of Protestantism: emphasizing the fundamental difference between the Orthodox paradigm and the Catholic one, they relied on the idea of symphony *and* (consonance) proclaimed by Orthodoxy, i.e. the joint harmonious action of the apparatus of secular power in the sphere of state administration and the church in the sphere of spiritual life of the nation. According to this idea, dating back to the writings of Emperor Justinian, secular power and the church, being independent of each other, act not in different directions, but together. The state acts as the guardian of the church as a guarantee of spiritual well-being and unity of the nation, and the church, in turn, spiritualizes state administration, directing the monarch and subjects on the path of Christian morality, without which the harmonious existence of society is impossible. This idea is repeatedly touched upon in Katkov's journalism, noting that "the Russian Tsar is not simply the head of state, but the guardian and protector of the Eastern Apostolic Church, which has renounced all worldly power and entrusted itself to the care and protection of the Anointed of God"²¹⁷ and at the same time "the arbitrariness of the Monarch is limited only by his conscience, by what is called the fear of God"²¹⁸.

²¹⁷Katkov M. N. Collected Works: in 6 volumes. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. Vol. 2. P. 510.

²¹⁸Ibid. P. 536.

N. M. Karamzin presented the implementation of this idea in the historical past of Russia in a somewhat romanticized form: “our clergy never opposed secular power, neither princely nor royal; they served as a useful tool in state affairs and as a conscience in its accidental deviations from virtue. The primate had one right among us – to proclaim the truth to the sovereigns, not to act, not to rebel; a blessed right not only for the people, but also for the monarch, whose happiness consists in justice ²¹⁹.”

According to the publicists of Russian conservatism, Russia, having avoided the common fate of Catholic Western Europe, had more chances than any other European nation to preserve a true commitment to the Christian faith. “The opposition between us and the West is that there everything is based on contractual relations, and here on faith, and this opposition was initially determined by the position that the Church accepted in the West and that it accepted in the East. There, the foundation is dual power, while here we have the Church’s sole power and with it freedom for the entire people, and the power, complete and indivisible, belongs to the Tsar – that is our system ²²⁰.”

From this point of view, most conservatives were critical of Peter I's activities in relation to the church. They considered the subordination of the church to the state a tragic mistake that violated the very essence of Orthodoxy, lowered the church in the eyes of the people and thus led to a crisis of faith in various layers of society.

Opponents of Russian conservatives also often pointed out this duality of the position of the Russian church. On the one hand, denouncing the errors of Catholicism and its increasingly secular character, the Orthodox Church emphasized the inadmissibility of the principle of merging secular and ecclesiastical authority and declared its influence purely in the spiritual sphere, while on the other hand, being under the control of secular authority in the person of the Synod, it was in fact no more than a part of the state apparatus. Such a close fusion of Orthodoxy with the

²¹⁹Karamzin N. M. Note on ancient and new Russia in its political and civil relations. Moscow: Nauka, 1991. P. 36.

²²⁰Katkov M. N. Collected Works: in 6 volumes. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. Vol. 2. P. 511.

Russian monarchy gave rise to a certain fashion for Catholicism in the educated circles of Russian society, which was opposed to the autocracy, already at the very beginning of the 19th century. True, for Russian Catholics, such as, for example, M. S. Lunin and P. Ya. Chaadayev, due to their obvious remoteness from the everyday political life of Europe, Catholicism was presented in a somewhat idealized form; they saw only that the popes sometimes dared to oppose the autocracy of the emperors, but they overlooked the fact that this opposition was merely a predatory struggle for this very power.

The contradictory position of the Orthodox clergy in the state and the decline in the authority of the church that was largely due to it were also recognized by Russian conservatives. Karamzin noted that “if the church submits to secular power and loses its sacred character, zeal for it weakens, and with it faith,” and meanwhile “an intelligent monarch in matters of state benefit will always find a way to reconcile the will of the metropolitan or patriarch with the will of the supreme power; but it is better if this agreement has the appearance of freedom and inner conviction, and not of all-subservient obedience ²²¹.”

"It is hard to admit," wrote I. S. Aksakov, "but due to inertia, due to the false position of the Russian Church, which has donned, in the bitter expression of Vladimir Solovyov, the uniform of the state, its voice is almost inaudible, has no authority, and apparently does not rule over souls ²²²." Yu. F. Samarin also believed that any trust in religion is destroyed as a result of the fact that "official conservatism, under the pretext of preserving the faith, goodwill towards it, pious concern for its needs, crushes and strangles it in its unceremonious embrace, allowing everyone to feel that he values it for the sake of the service it carries out for him" ²²³- such an instrumental subordination of questions of faith and spirituality to the needs of political practice leads to the complete discrediting of the church, "arouses in the

²²¹Karamzin N. M. On ancient and new Russia in its political and civil relations. Moscow: Nauka, 1991. P. 36.

²²²Aksakov I. S. On the attitude of modern progress to Christianity (regarding the article by V. S. Solovyov “On spiritual power in Russia”). // Aksakov I. S. Works in 7 volumes. Moscow, 1886–1887. Vol. 4. P. 198.

²²³Samarin Yu. F. Preface to the theological works of A. S. Khomyakov. P. 38.

conscience, if not opposition, then at least a certain distrust of itself, as an expression of undisguised hostility ²²⁴. "

V. P. Meshchersky, in his reflections on the reasons for the widespread spread of nihilism in Russian society, came to the conclusion that the defenselessness of society in the face of the principles that corrupt it is due precisely to this "numbness of the Russian Orthodox Church, which is one with the state ²²⁵."

The Conservatives were far from directly proposing the restoration of the patriarchate, but they advocated changing the role of the Holy Synod, giving it a less secular and more independent character and inviting church hierarchs to participate in the discussion of fundamental laws in cooperation with the Senate.

However, throughout the 19th century, the authorities as a whole acted in relation to the church in a completely opposite way ²²⁶: the church acquired an increasingly subordinate position, experienced financial difficulties, the number of parishes decreased, the moral influence of pastors on the flock declined, so that by the end of the century the position of the clergy in the state became extremely difficult, which was reflected not only in official documents and statistics, but also in Russian literature of that period - in the novels of N. S. Leskov, F. M. Dostoevsky and others.

The issue of the position of the church in the state was particularly acute in the journalism of N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov. A bachelor of the Orthodox Theological Academy, he repeatedly published polemical publications on issues of church structure, which brought upon himself the wrath of the chief prosecutor of the Holy Synod K. P. Pobedonostsev and a number of censorship penalties. While denouncing the synodal principle of church governance for the loss of the spirit of conciliarity and the formal, bureaucratic approach, Gilyarov-Platonov was far from dreaming of a revival of the patriarchate in the conditions of his time. He saw clearly that, firstly,

²²⁴Ibid.

²²⁵Meshchersky V.P. In the evidence of time. St. Petersburg, 1880. P. 34.

²²⁶Fedorov V. A. Russian Orthodox Church and State. Synodal Period 1700–1917. Moscow, 2003; Tsypin V., Archpriest. History of the Russian Orthodox Church. Synodal and Modern Periods. 1700–2005. Moscow, 2007.

the patriarchate in itself is not yet a guarantee of an independent position of the church in the state and, on the contrary, is potentially the basis for the development of pernicious tendencies of autocracy in the church, is "papism in the embryo"; Secondly, long years of synodal governance of the church had already led to essential changes in the relations between the state and the church, so that a formal revival of the patriarchate would in fact only result in a renaming of the position, while in its inner meaning there would be no difference between the first member of the Synod and the Patriarch. Gilyarov-Platonov saw the solution to this problem in the restoration of periodic local councils, in strengthening the collegial nature of church governance ²²⁷.

Another way out of the difficult situation in which the Church found itself was proposed by Meshchersky: the convocation of a Church Council "to discuss thousands of issues created by the licentiousness of society," so that as a result of this discussion the Church could "raise its voice on the issue of how best, most correctly and effectively to be the doctor and healer of spiritual ailments in the area of educating our youth and in general in a society overwhelmed by such a multitude of trends hostile to the Church and the people ²²⁸."

Meshchersky also proposed making it mandatory for schoolchildren to attend Sunday mass every week, and certainly in the city church, not in the school church, so that the young students would stand before the altar side by side with the faithful, unite with them in prayerful reverence and not in words but in deeds become part of the people's faith. His heartfelt idea was to organize weekly conversations in the church between a religious teacher or a parish priest and students, with the condition of "complete freedom of questions and answers," so that "no truths could have the dry meaning of lessons, where the teacher speaks and the students only listen ²²⁹." However, when voicing this idea, the prince himself clearly understood that its

²²⁷Dmitriev A. P. "Our Main Questions in the Church" // *Understanding by Faith: Correspondence of N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov and K. P. Pobedonostsev (1860–1887)*. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011.

²²⁸Meshchersky V. P. *What is needed?* // *In the evidence of time*. 2nd ed. St. Petersburg, 1880. P. 236.

²²⁹*Ibid.* P. 237.

implementation would be complicated by the lack of pastors who were both sufficiently educated and sufficiently spiritually enlightened, possessing the oratorical talent and experience of spiritual mentoring necessary to dare to have a fully open conversation with the youth.

This formulation of the question of the relationship between church and state made another aspect extremely relevant for conservatives: the problem of legal boundaries of religious tolerance in a multi-ethnic and multi-confessional state. This issue was most fully developed in the journalism of M. N. Katkov.

The publisher of *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* consistently advocated that the protection of Orthodoxy should not be carried out by mechanically separating it from other faiths or by politically oppressing the latter. Emphasizing that it was precisely the persecution of schism that gave rise to the amazing tenacity of its followers, the publicist comes to the conclusion that it is pointless to protect believers from corruption by means of police protection, since “daily experience testifies as convincingly as possible that such protection is more dangerous to the cause of religion than misfortune ²³⁰.”

The desire to protect the church by police measures was a "disservice" on the part of the state, since it revealed an internal lack of faith in the power of the teaching that underlies church unity, and indicated a fear that in a direct confrontation with preachers of other faiths, Orthodox pastors would not be convincing enough, which ultimately led to the same discrediting of the church. In this regard, Katkov was a consistent critic of such government measures as the ban on Orthodox converting to another faith. This issue became relevant, above all, in relation to the western outskirts of the empire with a traditionally high percentage of the population professing Catholicism and was exacerbated by the trends of Russification of the Vistula region ²³¹after the Polish uprising. Pointing out that forcibly holding a person

²³⁰Katkov M. N. *Collected Works*: in 6 volumes. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. Vol. 2. P. 659.

²³¹Kruglikova O. S. Discussion of the issue of Russification of foreign ethnic outskirts Russian Empire in the Moscow conservative press of the 1860s // *Mediascope*. 2016. No. 4. P. 13–18.

within the formal and ritual structure of one confession when he is spiritually drawn to another will not result in the desired civil and ideological unity, Katkov wrote that the opponents of Orthodoxy – the Catholics – do not demand that those who waver formally apostatize from the Orthodox Church, allowing their ideological followers to outwardly demonstrate their commitment to Orthodoxy if this is required by formal state law, provided that the fundamental influence of the Catholic priesthood on their spiritual structure and way of thinking is preserved. Thus, Katkov writes, “we are trying to protect ourselves from them by political measures, and they are very happy to leave us the police part of a person, and take the spiritual part for themselves. They are very happy to eat away the core, and leave us the shell. To us – the form and the letter, to us the register of births, to us the desecrated prayer and the desecrated sacrament, and to them the sanctity of conscience, to them the heart and spirit of a person ²³². ” Such an exchange, according to Katkov, is not in the interests of the church or the interests of the state.

The publicist saw the solution to this issue in following the principles of true tolerance, balancing between the certainty that “the state has no right to lay its sword between the soul of man and God,” and a clear understanding that “freedom, both religious and any other, does not mean giving weapons to our enemy; freedom does not mean renounce power in favor of someone else’s despotism ²³³.” Katkov considered it necessary for any Russian subject to have the right to freely enter and become part of the Orthodox Church and also freely leave the community of believers, without being held in it by legal frameworks, but at the same time for the state not to take measures that could directly contribute to the spread and strengthening of the influence of other faiths in Russia.

True commitment to Orthodoxy as a religion of spiritual freedom implied for conservatives a sincere conviction in the power not so much of the church organization as of the spirit of the Orthodox faith itself, which is close to the Russian

²³²Katkov M. N. *Collected Works*: in 6 volumes. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. Vol. 4. P. 648.

²³³*Ibid.* P. 637.

people and does not lose its spiritual power from contact with other teachings, and therefore does not need police surveillance. Therefore, true religious tolerance was presented to them as the absence of persecution for professing a particular faith and the full civil rights of persons of any religious affiliation. “The national church of Russia is the Orthodox Church, and no other can be a Russian national institution,” wrote Katkov, “but it does not follow that people who profess a faith that is not recognized as Russian national cannot be Russian. Nationality in the Christian world is a secular matter and is determined not by religion, but by the state ²³⁴. ”

The question of the interrelationship between the problem of religious and national self-identification in the above quotation from Katkov draws our attention to a fundamentally important feature of the conservative philosophy of the post-reform period. When analyzing the elements of the conservative triad, it is necessary to realize that they are closely connected to each other and lose their full meaning when separated from each other. The nature of the significance of Orthodoxy in the concept of Russian conservatism cannot be understood without a logical connection with the concept of the people and the form of power historically developed by this people. A. S. Shishkov, who stood at the very origins of the formation of the concept of Russian conservatism, wrote: “Faith is closely connected with love for the fatherland ²³⁵. ”

Conservatives tended to understand Orthodoxy as the basis of patriotism and national self-awareness. The centuries-long selfless struggle of the Russian people against the most diverse attempts at conquest was successful to a large extent precisely because, as a rule, it was in the nature of a confrontation with non-believers and raised the slogan of the struggle for the preservation of the Orthodox faith on the flag. It is quite possible that the state would not have withstood the constant foreign invasions if the war had not become a kind of religious asceticism, if the struggle for the preservation of the state had not simultaneously been a struggle for

²³⁴Ibid. P. 645.

²³⁵Shishkov A. S. Discourse on love for the Fatherland // Shishkov A. S. Collected Works and Translations. St. Petersburg, 1825. Part 4. Pp. 175–176.

its own cultural identity and unique faith. In part, this circumstance determined the instinctive conversion of Russian educated society at the beginning of the 19th century from the ideas of the Enlightenment, from Freemasonry and various cosmopolitan theories to the salvation of Orthodoxy during the Patriotic War of 1812.

In Orthodoxy, Russian conservatives of the 19th century saw the foundation of the Russian national idea, a unifying platform, the ground on which the spiritual unity of the nation is built and, consequently, the source from which its aspiration for political sovereignty flows, conditioned by the awareness of its otherness in relation to the rest of the world, its chosen belonging to a system of values alternative to the Western European one.

It is no coincidence that both Orthodox thinkers and their antagonists saw the turning point in Russian history precisely in Russia's adoption of Greek Christianity. If the former saw in this event the finger of Providence that protected Russia and directed it along the only true path, then the latter, following P. Ya. Chaadayev, believed that "by the will of fate, we turned for moral teaching, which was to educate us, to corrupt Byzantium" ²³⁶, to the object of "deep contempt" of the European peoples, and thereby began moving along a dead-end path that forever excluded Russia from the family of European nations, dooming ourselves to intellectual backwardness and cultural isolation.

In the thoughts of S. S. Uvarov, the author of the main formula of Russian conservatism, Orthodoxy naturally occupied a significant place: "Without love for the Faith of their ancestors," he wrote, "the people, like the individual, must perish; to weaken the Faith in them is the same as to deprive them of blood and tear out their heart (...) a person devoted to his fatherland will agree as little to the loss of one of the dogmas of the dominant Church as to the theft of one pearl from the crown of Monomakh ." ²³⁷

²³⁶Chaadaev P. Ya. Philosophical letters. Letter one // <http://www.vehi.net/chaadaev/filpisma.html>. (date of access: 09.24.2024).

²³⁷Uvarov S. S. On some general principles that can serve as a guide in managing the Ministry of Public Education // Uvarov S. S. Selected Works. Moscow, 2010.

"The most important and powerful upheaval of the kingdom is caused by the desire to destroy the faith that reigned in it," warned A. S. Shishkov. His thoughts were echoed by N. M. Karamzin: "with the weakening of faith, the sovereign loses the ability to control the hearts of the people in extraordinary cases, when everything must be forgotten, everything must be left for the fatherland, and where the shepherd of souls can promise only a martyr's crown as a reward ²³⁸." That is, Orthodoxy was conceived, among other things, as the most important spiritual support of the throne in critical moments of history, when the sovereign, in order to save the fatherland, must demand unprecedented sacrifices from citizens, which a person can make only for an idea of a higher order.

This gave the concept of freedom, understood through the idea of Orthodoxy, an additional important aspect. The vast expanses of Russia, its central position on the largest continent, the colossal length of its borders not protected by natural geographical factors, and the abundance of aggressive neighbors dictated very special conditions for its domestic political life, which gave rise to unique philosophical concepts. As one of the leading American Slavists, Richard Pipes, rightly notes, Russia's political experience "contrasted with the experience of Western Europe, which had enjoyed invulnerability to external invasions since the 11th century," since "its territory is enormous: thanks to the conquest of Siberia, Russia was already the largest state on Earth in the 18th century. Moreover, its vast expanse lacked natural borders in the form of mountains and seas, which meant that the country was vulnerable to incessant raids by nomadic Mongolian and Turkic tribes ²³⁹."

In Russian culture, literature, and journalism, the words *Russian* and *Orthodox* were freely used as synonyms, and the common people even more often used the concept of *Orthodox* to identify themselves by nationality; religion and nation were inconceivable without each other, because by the middle of the 19th century, the

²³⁸Karamzin N. M. On ancient and new Russia in its political and civil relations. Moscow: Nauka, 1991. P. 36.

²³⁹Pipes R. Russian Conservatism and Its Critics: A Study of Political Culture. Moscow: New Publishing House, 2008. P. 27.

Russian Empire remained the only Orthodox state in the world, and the Russians were the only Orthodox people who retained their political sovereignty. At the same time, there was a very close connection between Orthodoxy and the Russian autocracy, a connection within which a strong state with military and political power acted as the only guarantor of preserving the national faith from foreign cultural expansion, and in return enjoyed the moral support of the church, which propagated to the flock the unconditional acceptance of the demands of the state, even if this was associated with personal sacrifices for citizens.

Therefore, in Russian political thought, the concept of freedom always included the component of the state's freedom from invaders. While in Western Europe the emphasis was on the freedom of the individual in relation to the state and society, Russians from generation to generation habitually sacrificed the freedoms of the individual to strengthen the supra-personal whole - the state - in its struggle against foreign invasions. The willingness to sacrifice required a clear understanding of one's cultural sovereignty, one's identity based on adherence to the Orthodox faith. In the understanding of conservatives, the concept of freedom was composed of two key ideas: *Orthodoxy* as a religion of maximum freedom of spirit and *Orthodoxy* as the basis of political freedom, the sovereignty of the Russian state.

§ 1.3. Autocracy as the embodied Equality in the understanding of Russian conservative journalists

Viewing all categories of political thought exclusively through the prism of Christian doctrine forced Russian conservatives to have a negative attitude towards the idea of formal social equality, enshrined in law and imposed artificially.

Aksakov's statement, which has already been cited, formulates the main idea of the conservatives in the clearest possible way: those who demand formal equality will not stop at material equality, the socialization of property and the equalization of civil rights, but will certainly demand further artificial equalization, so that it will be necessary to look for ways to equalize the smart with the stupid, the gifted with the untalented, the hardworking with the lazy, etc.

Conservatives reject mechanically established formal equality as a direct path to despotism, to totalitarian leveling. In the novel "Demons" Dostoevsky gives a wonderful image of the provincial political theorist Shigalev, who built his political utopia on the idea of equality and with logical inevitability came to the establishment of the most brutal terror and total denunciation in a system in which geniuses have to be killed in infancy out of respect for equality as a fundamental principle.

Denying the "Shigalev" equality, which stems from "jealous observation of each other, arrogance and envy" ²⁴⁰, conservative thinkers maintain their commitment to the main and only possible form of real equality - equality in the fullness of moral responsibility for how each person managed to use those gifts and abilities that were inherent to him, to what he directed his interests and strengths. In this regard, the "protest against the inequality of God's gifts" described by Aksakov loses all meaning, because with the disparity of innate gifts, the principle of equality will triumph through the Gospel "to whom much is given, much will be required."

Dostoevsky writes about such equality: "Imagine that in a future society there are Kepler, Kant and Shakespeare: they do great work for everyone, and everyone recognizes and respects them. But Shakespeare has no time to break away from work, clean up around himself, clean out the room, take out the unnecessary. And believe me, another citizen will certainly come to serve him, he himself will want to, he will come of his own free will and will take out the unnecessary from Shakespeare. Why should he be humiliated, a slave? Not at all. He knows that Shakespeare is infinitely more useful than him: "Honor and glory to you," he will say to him, "and I am glad to serve you; even if I serve a little for the common good, for I will save you hours for your great work, but I am not a slave. It was precisely by admitting that you, Shakespeare, are superior to me in your genius, and by coming to serve you, that I proved with this very consciousness that in terms of human moral dignity I am not at all inferior to you and, as a man, I am your equal ²⁴¹."

²⁴⁰Dostoevsky F. M. *A Writer's Diary* / compiled and commented by A. V. Belov; editor-in-chief O. A. Platonov. Moscow: Institute of Russian Civilization, 2010. P. 535.

²⁴¹Dostoevsky F. M. *A Writer's Diary* / compiled and commented by A. V. Belov; editor-in-chief O. A. Platonov. Moscow: Institute of Russian Civilization, 2010. P. 745.

Closely connected to the concept of equality is the understanding of citizenship, the essence of what it means for conservatives to “be a citizen.” Having asked such a question, it is quite natural to turn first of all to the materials of the journal of Prince V. P. Meshchersky, who brought this word into the title of his publication as a manifesto and fundamental idea.

Dostoevsky, whom the publisher had enlisted for a rather brief period (1873–1874) to edit the magazine, while introducing himself to readers in his new editorial status, lamented: “Woe to the writer and publisher who thinks in our time. Even worse for the one who would like to learn and understand himself; but even worse for the one who declares this sincerely; and if he declares that he has already understood a little and wants to express his thought, then everyone will immediately abandon him... I strongly suspect that ‘Citizen’ will have to talk to himself for a long time to come for his own pleasure... ‘Citizen’ must certainly talk to citizens, and that is his whole misfortune!”²⁴² It is important to note that these words were spoken in 1873 – at a time when *civic consciousness*, *civic duty*, *civic grief*, *civic act* were perhaps the most common and frequently repeated phrases in Russian literature and journalism, and *civic consciousness* was a key word in the public discourse of post-reform Russia. Consequently, if Dostoevsky assumes that there will be no interlocutors for him among his readers, i.e. citizens, this means that he understands civic consciousness in a different way than most of his fellow writers.

He probably agrees with his publisher, who, explaining the meaning of the title of the magazine in one of its first issues, wrote: “We understand the great word “Citizen” as a worker for the inner life of his people, but an independent worker due to the freedom of a respected order. It is also true that the explanation of the concept of “Citizen” should not be sought in the vulgarized and weakened French “citoyen”, but in the English and German – Burger... To be a citizen does not mean to shout about freedom, but it means to freely participate in the correct movement of one’s people forward. Movement forward, determined not by the needs of all, but by the

²⁴²Ibid. p. 42.

whims of a few, whoever they may be, ceases to be the historical and organic development of the state ²⁴³.”

This statement deserves careful consideration. The concept of *a citizen* designates three components: labor, freedom, and adherence to the interests of the people. In addition, it is important for us that Meshchersky emphasizes the difference in the understanding of citizenship in the political traditions of different Western European states. The opposition of French political thought, largely formed by the Encyclopedists of the Enlightenment and utopian socialists, and German, which was significantly influenced by the philosophers of German idealism, is significant in that it emphasizes the antithesis of the concept of citizenship inherent in Russian liberal-minded journalism, which in ideological terms appealed primarily to the French tradition, and conservative journalism, which experienced the significant influence of Hegel and Schelling.

The socio-political discourse of Russia in the second half of the 19th century, as has already been said, was a field of collision, comprehension and attempts to adapt various concepts of Western European philosophy in the national socio-cultural context. The Old Slavonic word "citizen", which came into the Russian language during the spread of writing, was a word-formation tracing from Greek, i.e. it was related to the concept of "city" and meant a city dweller, i.e. it initially had no political connotation. The word "*citizen*" was used as a neutral designation of a city dweller, sometimes in the sense of opposition to the clergy and military class, i.e. it was closest in meaning to the word "*bourgeois*».

During the political transformations of the Peter the Great era, the first Russian emperor needed to form a new social elite that could replace the hereditary nobility that opposed the reforms, and therefore needed an ideological, conceptual tool for forming its group identity. The new elite – the future bureaucracy – had to be guided by the ideal image of *a citizen*. correlating this concept with a certain range of political rights and obligations. By order of the emperor, in 1724 the treatise of

²⁴³Citizen. 1872. No. 2.

the German legal scholar Samuel Puffendorf "On the duties of man and citizen" was translated into Russian and widely distributed in secular educational institutions. According to this treatise, the concept of *citizen* received an expanded meaning of 'compatriot, subject of the state'. Having allowed the nomination of *citizen* for the entire population of a certain state, it was also necessary to establish the key characteristics that a person claiming to belong to this category must possess - to indicate the features and qualities that make a person not just a subject, but a citizen. Puffendorf postulates the motive of service as the basis of citizenship, contrasting it with self-will and pointing out that "a person who has become a citizen loses natural freedom and subjects himself to power, which includes the right to life and death... We call a person a truly political animal, that is, a good citizen, if he clearly obeys the commands of the rulers, if he strives with all his might for the public good and willingly subordinates his personal good to it, or, more accurately, if he does not plan anything good for himself, unless it will also be good for others and also for the state..."²⁴⁴. For the time of Peter the Great, it was generally characteristic to strengthen the concept of the public good as a system-forming one for all aspects of collective existence²⁴⁵ and to postulate the desire for the common good as a natural motive for all actions of both the ruler and the subjects.

The reign of Catherine the Great brought some contradiction in the interpretation of the concept of *citizen* - in the Instruction, the empress follows the tradition of enlightenment philosophy, therefore, as G. V. Durinova notes, "for the first time, the word correlated with the French citizen in the text of Catherine's "Instruction" II, the word *citizen* became the recipient of the political semantics of the French term"²⁴⁶. To clarify this political semantics, one can refer to the text of

²⁴⁴Puffendorf S. On the Duties of Man and Citizen under Natural Law. Access mode: <https://predanie.ru/book/221340-ob-obyazannostyah-cheloveka-i-grazhdanina-po-estestvennomu-zakonu/>. (date of access 08/21/2024).

²⁴⁵Kharkhordin O. What is a "state"? // The concept of the state in four languages. St. Petersburg, 2002. P. 152–216.

²⁴⁶Durinova G. V. Word as an object of historical semantics: citizen and society in the Russian language of the second half of the 18th – first third of the 19th century: author's abstract. diss. ... candidate of philological sciences. Moscow, 2015. P. 6.

the programmatic document that recorded many key concepts of French political semantics - the "Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen ", which in its very first lines manifests the citizen's right to political protest as one of the fundamental rights. The Russian progressive intelligentsia, as already mentioned, constantly appealed to the conceptual context of the French Revolution, therefore, using the word "citizen", it implicitly conveyed the concept of protest.

Later, in 1783, Catherine II would republish Puffendorf's treatise and make it compulsory to study in schools ²⁴⁷. However, the influence of the French citizen had already become significantly stronger in the Russian cultural context, so that the use of the word *citizen* became firmly associated with revolutionary ideas ²⁴⁸. That is why, under Paul I, an attempt was made to return the word *citizen* to its original politically neutral meaning, without linking it in meaning either to the interpretation that goes back to Puffendorf's work, or to the interpretation that arose as a result of the influence of revolutionary ideas - in public discourse, it was prescribed to replace *citizen* with *bourgeois* ²⁴⁹.

The emergence of Russian conservatism, as already noted, coincided precisely with the reign of Alexander I and developed, on the one hand, as an opposition to the liberal aspirations of the first period of the reign, and on the other hand, as a response to the challenges of international politics associated with the period of the Napoleonic wars and the need to overcome the results of French cultural expansion at the previous historical stage. Therefore, during this period, one of the founders of conservatism, G. R. Derzhavin, in his discussions of the merits of a citizen, once

²⁴⁷Durinova G. V. Sketches of the history of the socio-political concept of citizen and the question of the origin of society (XVIII – early XIX centuries) // Vectors of development of modern Russia. From the formation of values to the invention of traditions. 2014. Pp. 72–87.

²⁴⁸Ulukhanov I. S. History of the words townsman—citizen // Etymological studies in the Russian language. Moscow: Moscow State University Publishing House, 1968. Issue VI. Pp. 166–178.

²⁴⁹Grech N. I. Notes on my life / text from the manuscript and with comments by Ivanov-Razumnik and D. M. Pines. M.; L.: ACADEMIA , 1930. P. 151.

again emphasizes the aspect of service, for *a citizen* must be “a subordinate obedient to his superiors and a subject zealous in serving his Sovereign ²⁵⁰.”

Thus, it can be said that by the middle of the 19th century, in the Russian cultural context, the semantic field of the word *citizen* is bifurcated, since two concepts of citizenship functioned in parallel: one characteristic of the conservative-statist direction with the dominant meaning of service and self-sacrifice, and one organic to the liberal discourse, i.e. having experienced the influence first of the ideas of the French Revolution, and then an even more significant influence of the political legacy of the Decembrists, as a result of which “*the citizen* becomes the bearer of a specifically Russian moral and ethical concept” ²⁵¹, associated with constant criticism of the authorities from the heights of unattainable moral imperatives.

It is important to note that the reign of Nicholas I, especially its final period, influenced Russian society in such a way that the liberal discourse became dominant for a time, uniting on the platform of moderate liberalism all those intuitively protesting against the restrictions of Nicholas's regime. Therefore, for conservatives in post-reform Russia, the semantic disidentification of citizenship and protest was fundamentally important: a citizen, from the point of view of conservatives, is a person who does not oppose the idea of freedom and the idea of statehood (in the spirit of Hegel's thought about the state as the highest form of self-conscious freedom), who honestly works for the benefit of this statehood and does nothing for show, i.e., in Meshchersky's formulation, "not shouting about freedom." The latter postulate contains the criticism of ostentatious citizenship characteristic of conservatives. Following a certain dominant way of thinking, an intellectual fashion instead of sincere conviction was repeatedly criticized by Dostoevsky: “Of course,

²⁵⁰ Derzhavin G.R. Speech on the Benefits of Education // Selected Passages from Russian Works and Translations in Prose. With the Addition of News about the Lives and Works of Writers, whose Works Are Placed in This Collection. St. Petersburg: in the Printing House of F. Drechsler, 1812. Page 375.

²⁵¹ Durinova G. V. Word as an object of historical semantics: citizen and society in the Russian language of the second half of the 18th – first third of the 19th century: author's abstract. diss. ... candidate of philological sciences. Moscow, 2015. P. 3.

there is partly a herd mentality here: everyone is writing, everyone is worried, so how can I not be worried, they will think that I am not a citizen, that I am not interested ²⁵².”

This intellectual fashion, established in Russian society in the post-reform period, was regarded by conservatives as a very dangerous phenomenon, since it was precisely the superficially understood and categorically interpreted postulates of liberalism that were most easily and widely spread among student youth and the provincial intelligentsia. It is important to emphasize that the existence of this fashion was recognized by representatives of both poles of the socio-political dialogue. Saltykov-Shchedrin, not without bitter irony, notes that if in former times liberalism was partly a feat, then soon liberals, in the caustic expression of the hero of the essay "Diary of a Provincial in St. Petersburg", could be used to prop up fences ²⁵³. In addition to the polemics between the ideological leaders of conservatism and liberalism, philosophers, thinkers, there was also, so to speak, a lower floor of public discourse, in which this dispute was flattened and simplified to a set of degenerate maxims vulgarized by constant repetition.

This simplification was undoubtedly quite symmetrical on both sides – at this level, the posing liberal, who claimed to stand all his life, like one of Dostoevsky’s heroes, as “an embodied reproach to the fatherland,” stood in opposition to the Sobakeviches and Korobochkas, who understood conservatism precisely as the senseless preservation of the status quo, no matter how outdated and destructive it might be. This fact was also noted by conservative publicists themselves, clearly separating the caustic mockery of the unreasonable followers who distorted the teachings, and the respectful polemics with the ideological inspirers of these teachings. Dostoevsky, the most caustic mocker of the feigned liberalism of ignorant people, always made the reservation: “I am talking about the herd, I do not touch the

²⁵²Dostoevsky F. M. *A Writer’s Diary* / compiled and commented by A. V. Belov; editor-in-chief O. A. Platonov. Moscow: Institute of Russian Civilization, 2010. P. 762.

²⁵³Saltykov-Shchedrin M. E. *Diary of a Provincial in St. Petersburg* // Saltykov-Shchedrin M. E. *Collected Works: in 20 volumes. Vol. 10. Gentlemen of Tashkent*. Moscow: Fiction, 1970. P. 450.

righteous. The righteous are everywhere, even among the European Russians, and I honor them ²⁵⁴.”

For their part, representatives of the liberal and revolutionary democratic trend noted a similar stratification in the conservative camp. Thus, Saltykov-Shchedrin divides the supporters of the "principle of restraint" into hypocritical liars who support the current system because it strengthens their dominant position, and utopian liars, sincere fanatics who provide this system with a theoretical justification. Only if Dostoevsky expresses respect for the "righteous liberals" and is skeptical of the ordinary followers of the liberal fashion, then Saltykov-Shchedrin, on the contrary, considers the ordinary adherents of conservatism to be the preferable type: hypocritical liars, in his opinion, are preferable, since it is easier to fight them. Sincere fanatics of the conservative idea do not inspire Saltykov-Shchedrin with respect even by their sincerity, since “I can despise a hypocrite-liar, whereas in the presence of a liar-fanatic I have no choice but to tremble. As you wish, but the right to despise still at least somewhat eases me... ²⁵⁵”

It must be acknowledged that due to the dominance of liberal ideas in journalism and the upper classes of society in the post-reform period, “misunderstood liberalism” was much more widespread in the public sphere than “misunderstood conservatism”. This fashion for liberal phrases seemed dangerous to conservatives, because it could put following the interests of one’s own movement above common political sense in a person’s mind. Dostoevsky called for “not to be ashamed, at least sometimes, that someone will call you a citizen, and... at least sometimes to tell the truth, even if it were not liberal enough, in your opinion” ²⁵⁶, and Katkov echoed him, suggesting to be “liberal in your conservatism and conservative in your liberalism” ²⁵⁷, the main thing is to be Russian first and

²⁵⁴Dostoevsky F. M. *A Writer’s Diary* / compiled and commented by A. V. Belov; editor-in-chief O. A. Platonov. Moscow: Institute of Russian Civilization, 2010. P. 763.

²⁵⁵Saltykov-Shchedrin M. E. *Well-intentioned speeches* // Saltykov-Shchedrin M. E. *Collected works: in 20 volumes. T. 11. Well-intentioned speeches. 1872–1876. M.: Fiction, 1971. P. 15.*

²⁵⁶*Ibid.* P. 219.

²⁵⁷From the leading article of *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*. No. 125. May 6, 1881.

foremost, and to look at any questions from the position of a sound assessment of the good and interests of Russia. This is consonant with the formulation of citizenship given by Meshchersky – “to participate in the correct movement of your people”.

However, to understand this movement it is necessary to understand the people, which is why Dostoevsky did not see enough true citizens around him to discuss civic topics; the understanding of the people by the majority of Russian educated society, from his point of view, was lost. It should be noted, however, that the opponents of the conservatives were also very clearly aware of the fact that their correlation with popular culture had been destroyed. Thus, for example, in the famous article by D. I. Pisarev, “Poor Russian Thought,” a profound statement is made: “the people do not speak to us, and we do not understand them ²⁵⁸,” but in Pisarev’s understanding this is not an obstacle for the *raznochintsy* intelligentsia to actively transform the political life of their people. Transform, not striving to understand them, but intending to remake them, but to remake them later, when the social revolution has already taken place, the burdens of which the revolutionary intelligentsia intended to sacrificially bear on their shoulders. Their position, therefore, paradoxically combined hatred for the existing usurpers and an open readiness to become usurpers themselves – of course, in the name of achieving the ideal.

Meshchersky consistently develops the theme of “non-Russian Russia” in his work. In the collection of articles “In Evidence of Time,” which is almost entirely devoted to this issue, he repeatedly repeats that “ignorance of Russia is the distinctive feature of Petersburg.” At the same time, the Petersburg intelligentsia, through misunderstanding, sincerely believes that it is acting, working for Russia, while in fact it has nothing in common with it, because “Russian Russia lives today as it did 30 years ago, believing in God, respecting family, itself, its fatherland, and

²⁵⁸ Pisarev D. I. Poor Russian thought (“Science and literature in Russia under Peter the Great.” Research by P. Pekarsky) // Pisarev D. I. Works in 4 volumes. T. 2. Articles 1862–1864. M.: GIHL, 1955. P. 36.

reverently honoring its monarch, the Russian Tsar. Petersburg is not Russia and Russia is not Petersburg! ²⁵⁹”

Russian nobles, and in the second half of the 19th century already educated *raznochintsy*, who were, in spirit, foreigners in their own country, often literally not speaking their native language, professed political values characteristic of Western culture, which conflicted with the system of national statehood created by the Russian people, which caused a systemic antagonism between the elite and the government. Moreover, since the possibility of political speeches (in the form of guard’s conspiracies, underground political organizations, propaganda, etc.) and open discussion of political issues in the press belonged exclusively to the elite, the impression was created of a total protest of the entire people against the monarchical power, which had usurped state governance by force and was held for several centuries only by an incomprehensible accident.

The conservatives, who asserted the beneficial nature of the monarchical tradition, argued that it was not the people at all who were entering into the political struggle with the autocracy, but only a narrow layer of the denationalized elite, which, in the words of Dostoevsky, “did nothing but wean itself off Russia, and ended up becoming completely unacquainted with it and communicating with it only through the chancery.” ²⁶⁰Moreover, as Meshchersky emphasized, the intelligentsia, despite such remoteness from the people, sought to remake the people’s consciousness in its own way, because “the Russian people, healthy, intelligent, with their Orthodox and political faith firmly and unshakably accepted by the spiritual instinct in their souls, appeared before the Petersburg intelligentsia of all positions as a disgusting monster, whose remaking had to be undertaken immediately ²⁶¹.” Katkov spoke in a similar vein, believing that “the true evil of Russia lies in that rotten part of its intelligentsia that shuns its own people ²⁶².”

²⁵⁹Meshchersky V.P. In the evidence of time. St. Petersburg, 1880. Pp. 15–16.

²⁶⁰Dostoevsky F. M. *Writer's Diary*. In 2 volumes. St. Petersburg, 2011. Vol. 2. P. 59–60.

²⁶¹Meshchersky V.P. In the evidence of time. St. Petersburg, 1880. P. 36.

²⁶²Katkov M. N. *Collected Works: in 6 volumes*. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. Vol. 3. P.

The most important idea of the conservatives was the conviction that despite the obvious antagonism between the elite and the government, there was no antagonism between the tsar and the people and there could not be. The unity of the tsar and the people was the key to the successful existence of the Russian monarchy for several centuries. Katkov wrote: "An organized people, having one fatherland and one supreme power, to which all other power in the people is subordinate, is one with the state and its head." The idea that the monarchical principle was the main fruit of the life of the Russian national spirit was also actively developed in the journalism of the *pochvenniks*. The monarchical state as the only significant achievement of Russian culture is named in the famous article by N. N. Strakhov "The Fatal Question." In the journalism of the Slavophiles, this idea acquired a special resonance.

Its quintessence became the concept of a people's monarchy, which was developed by Yu. F. Samarin: "We have one historical, positive force – the people, and another force – the autocratic tsar. The latter is also a positive, historical force, but only because it was put forward by the people's force, and because this latter force recognizes its personification, its external image, in the tsar. As long as the autocracy has these two conditions, it is legitimate and indestructible." Samarin expressed confidence that if the elite were to test the strength of this political principle, it would be forced to face decisive opposition from the people, since between the people and the tsar "an unspoken, but implied and understood by all alliance for mutual defense has long been concluded ²⁶³." Much later, P. B. Struve, a thinker and political figure who had gone through a difficult path of evolution of political convictions, the starting point of which were the ideas of Marxism, and the logical endpoint – ideas very close to Russian conservatism, denouncing the Russian intelligentsia in the famous and tragic collection "Milestones", developed the idea that the intelligentsia, having lost its spiritual connection with the life of the people, for three centuries set the people against the historical monarchy, which, despite all

²⁶³Samarin Yu. F. Regarding talk about the constitution // *Rus. 1881. No. 29.*

its shortcomings, still fulfilled its main function – the function of preserving national statehood.

Thus, the views of Russian conservatives did not justify the dominance of the noble elite, but to a significant extent critically interpreted the role of the Russian nobility and the common intelligentsia, which inherited many of its features and which acted as the main driving force of social processes from the middle of the 19th century. In the denationalized elite of the nobility and commoners, in the St. Petersburg bureaucracy, conservatives saw one of the main evils: a dangerous partition between the tsar and the people, under the influence of which the monarchy lost its true meaning – it lost its supra-class character.

The conservatives, who certainly respected tradition as a given, did not limit their thoughts to stating that “a single, absolutely free and indisputable supreme power is a great blessing for the Russian people, bequeathed to them by their ancestors and obtained by their labor and blood,”²⁶⁴ but sought to understand autocracy as a political model that ensured the full realization of the idea of equality.

For Katkov, the supra-class character of autocracy is fundamentally important in this regard. “The throne is then elevated,” he writes, “so that the differences of estates, guilds, ranks and classes are equalized before it²⁶⁵.” The idea of the harmony of the monarchy as supra-estate rule was, of course, not a discovery made by Katkov – this idea was also heard in the works of European conservatives (Bossuet) and in the already mentioned “Instruction” of Catherine the Great, where it was said that “it is better to obey the laws under one master than to please many²⁶⁶.”

The monarch, not belonging to any class of society, not being included in any social groups of a professional or caste nature, is the only one who can maintain objectivity in resolving issues that are important for the entire state, and in resolving these issues be sincerely guided only by considerations of the common good.

²⁶⁴Katkov M. N. *Collected Works*: in 6 volumes. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. Vol. 2. P. 441.

²⁶⁵*Ibid.* P. 433.

²⁶⁶Instruction of Empress Catherine II given to the commission on drafting a new code. St. Petersburg, 1907. P. 4.

“Russian autocracy,” Katkov explains, “has nothing in common with what people imagine it to be, judging it by other people’s concepts. Understood in its true sense, it will prove to be the best and most reliable guarantee of every good that humanity can cherish. It expresses a single power, independent of any parties or individual interests, exalted above all, pure of any egoism, equal to the whole ²⁶⁷.”

According to conservatives, any popular representation, no matter what principle the mechanism of its formation is based on, will inevitably turn into a field of intrigue, into a struggle of class and corporate interests, will serve the selfish aspirations of the most dexterous social group and to the detriment of the rest. The Tsar has no need to defend the priority of one or another group of his subjects; from the height of the royal throne, only general interests are visible, the interests of a single whole - the state. "Because the Russian Tsar is not a nobleman, not a merchant, not a tradesman and not a peasant, " wrote I. S. Aksakov, " all classes consider him equally theirs, and this significance of his contains a historical authority, recognized by the whole land, to be the supreme arbiter of all class issues and disputes ²⁶⁸. "

Partially similar thoughts were voiced by conservatives at the beginning of the 19th century, and the first manifesto of Russian conservatism – a note by N. M. Karamzin on ancient and new Russia – contains an indication that with the change of the state charter, Russia “was perishing and must perish, composed of so many and different parts, each of which has its own special civil benefits. What, except for unlimited autocracy, can produce unity of action in this machine?”²⁶⁹

The principles of a democratic system can be implemented in a small state in terms of size and population, where there is still hope that the warring groups will be able to come to an agreement to everyone's satisfaction, since they are united by the generally similar interests of a small city-polis. But as soon as the state grows, it includes more and more new parts with their own characteristics and unique

²⁶⁷ Katkov M. N. Collected Works: in 6 volumes. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. Vol. 2. Pp. 510–511.

²⁶⁸ Moscow. 1867. No. 52.

²⁶⁹ Karamzin N. M. Note on ancient and new Russia in its political and civil relations. Moscow: Nauka, 1991. P. 48.

interests, the class differentiation of society increases, and the interests of numerous social groups begin to come into sharp conflict. Therefore, according to conservatives, in a large state any representative bodies are harmful, since an element of deception is already embedded in their very foundation - although they are called upon to express the interests of all groups in society when making important state decisions, they in fact become a playground for the predatory passions of social groups fighting for power in their own selfish interests. Achieving real social harmony and respect for the interests of all members of society is possible only with the participation of an objective arbitrator, balancing the divergent interests of the parts in the name of the well-being of the whole.

From Katkov's point of view, the improvement of political forms goes precisely in the direction from the more primitive republican to the more perfect monarchical. He refutes the ideas typical of his contemporaries about the fall of the republic in Rome and the formation of the empire as the degradation of the ancient political culture, and asserts that, on the contrary, republican Rome was only a step on the great path of the formation of the most harmonious form of statehood - the monarchy.

"Not against, but in defense of freedom its sword is drawn," noted Katkov, speaking about autocratic power ²⁷⁰. For conservatives, a correctly implemented monarchical principle is the only guarantee of true social and civil freedom, and true equality. In his famous article "Which Party Do We Belong To?" Katkov asks a rhetorical question: should not progress consist in society finally freeing itself from the state? And he comes to the conclusion that "as soon as we imagine that the state principle will be excluded (...), at that very moment society, apparently freed from the state, will, on the contrary, lose the significance of a free society and in its entirety will be transformed into the very principle from which it thought to free itself; it itself will be a state, and a state all the worse because the state will be everything in everything in it, allowing nothing to exist freely and placing its seal on everything...

²⁷⁰ Katkov M. N. Collected Works: in 6 volumes. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. Vol. 2. P. 511.

Tear out the monarchical principle by the roots, it will return to the despotism of dictatorship; “Destroy the natural aristocratic element in society, its place will not remain empty, it will be occupied either by bureaucrats or by demagogues, oligarchs of the worst kind... Destroy centralization not in its abuses, but at its very root – you will kill an entire nationality, you will destroy the labor of centuries, you will undermine the basis of further development, but you will not destroy the evil, on the contrary, you will strengthen it: instead of one organic center, several false, several petty despotisms will appear, where the spirit of interference and guardianship will develop even more jealously and pickily, and where there will be even less favorable conditions for personal freedom ²⁷¹. ”

It is important to note that, excluding any formal limitation of autocracy, many representatives of the conservative wing of Russian journalism, and above all the Slavophiles, actively developed the idea of creating an advisory body in the spirit of the Zemsky Sobor. They considered the model of government that existed under the first Romanovs to be ideal, when the monarch, who had legally unlimited power, relied on the opinion of elected people from all strata of society when deciding the most large-scale state issues. In the article “Thirty Years of the Reign of Ivan Vasilyevich,” A. S. Khomyakov wrote: “The Zemsky Duma had no power and was only an expression of the people’s sense, called to consult with the sovereign; for this very reason, it not only could not produce any bifurcation of power, but affirmed it, linking together the will of the sovereign with the custom and moral feeling of the people ²⁷². ” The Slavophiles defended the Zemsky Sobor not as a counterweight to autocracy, but as its necessary support; it is no coincidence that further in the text of Khomyakov’s article it is noted that the first Romanovs, having accepted power from the Zemsky Duma, “loved to consult with it, strengthening the state power with the love and meaning of the people ²⁷³.”

²⁷¹ Katkov M. N. Collected works: in 6 volumes. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. Vol. 2. P. 36–37.

²⁷² Khomyakov A. S. Collected works: in 8 volumes. M., 1900. T. 3. P. 35.

²⁷³ Ibid.

Lacking the ability to formally limit the will and activity of the sovereign, the Zemsky Sobor, which expressed the opinion of the people, provided moral legitimation for the measures taken by the authorities, i.e. the popular representation desired by the Slavophiles did not have parliamentary functions per se, and did not violate the autocratic principle, although it was precisely the persistent propaganda of this idea that was perceived by both the censorship of the Slavophiles' time and later researchers as the basis for classifying the Slavophiles as liberals, which they never were in the true essence of their views.

Meshchersky develops his thoughts about zemstvos as one of the first attempts at representative institutions in one of his "Political Letters," entitled "Zemstvo Passion." The prince points out that the traditionally careless management of the Russian nobility in their own estates, which led to their almost complete ruin by the mid-1860s, especially after the abolition of serfdom, led to the fact that "the provinces of Russia already felt a very strong shortage of people, workers, so to speak, the intelligentsia: part of the nobility fell asleep, another part left their estates and began to live off their redemption certificates..."²⁷⁴ And it was precisely at this time of acute shortage of educated and businesslike people in the provinces that the "zemstvo reform of the most liberal Petersburg cooking" was carried out²⁷⁵, i.e. it assumed multi-stage election procedures and the formation of "multi-personal," as Meshchersky calls it, i.e. consisting of many representatives, zemstvo institutions. But in the provinces it was often difficult to find even one person capable of effectively organizing work for the common good, and the need to choose - and choose many - turned the zemstvo, from Meshchersky's point of view, into a poorly viable institution, since the strength of any public institution is not in the structure of its organization, but in the people who hold positions in it.

However, the emphasis in organizing the work of the zemstvo gradually came down to the election procedure as such, as a process that had independent

²⁷⁴Meshchersky V.P. Something like a confession // Speeches of a conservative. St. Petersburg, 1876. P. 118.

²⁷⁵Ibid. P. 115.

significance apart from the activities that the elected representatives were to conduct. Elections began to be perceived by many as a kind of new social game and sometimes turned into caricatured pseudo-political jousts of the N district, in which not only meaningful debates but also kinship, connections, dinners, promises, etc. could serve as instruments of pre-election struggle.

Meshchersky is horrified by “such a striking contrast between the reformers of St. Petersburg, who created a whole liberal project of zemstvo, where about 2,000 capable and educated zemstvo people were needed for its implementation, and between Russia, that is, Russian society, in the very first year of reform declaring that it cannot produce even a hundred such capable and educated zemstvo activists²⁷⁶.”

The motive of "civil desolation" will be one of the dominant ones in Meshchersky's journalism. Like all conservatives, the prince believed that it is not public institutions that need to be corrected, but people. Sharing the general skepticism of conservatives in relation to theoretical plans for the transformation of society, he believed that honest and intelligent people involved in the work of one or another public or state institution, with their personal qualities, good intentions and common sense, will compensate for any inevitable errors of the system, no matter on what theoretical foundations it was built, just as, on the contrary, well-intentioned fools or shrewd businesslike embezzlers will corrupt any state organism, no matter how formally it is organized. Consequently, one should not bother about the emergence of certain institutions, but about the education of worthy citizens. Therefore, issues of education and upbringing have always attracted the attention of conservative publicists, especially Katkov, who was the inspirer and architect of educational reform and sought to act in this regard not only as a thinker and theorist, but also as a practical figure, having established his own educational institution – the famous Katkov Lyceum.

²⁷⁶Ibid. P. 155.

If Meshchersky discusses the priority of the moral qualities of citizens for the well-being of the country more through the prism of political rationality, then Dostoevsky, in turn, develops a similar thought in the religious aspect : if private people managed to come closer to the Christian ideal of morality in their everyday life, then even such a monstrous institution as serfdom would lose its terrible meaning - and not as a result of its reform or abolition, but as a result of the fact that any lady, even Gogol's Korobochka, "who was already a perfect Christian, whether her peasants were serfs or not? She is their "mother", already a real mother, and the "mother" would immediately abolish the former "lady". This would happen by itself. The former lady and the former slave would disappear like fog from the sun, and completely new people would appear, in completely new relationships with each other, previously unheard of²⁷⁷. "

“In Christianity, in true Christianity,” notes Dostoevsky, “there are and will be masters and servants, but it is impossible to even think of a slave. I am talking about true, perfect Christianity. Servants are not slaves. The disciple Timothy served Paul when they walked together, but read Paul’s letters to Timothy: is he writing to a slave, or even to a servant, have mercy! Yes, this is precisely “his child Timothy,” his beloved son. This is exactly how masters will treat their servants, if both become perfect Christians! There will be servants and masters, but masters will no longer be masters, and servants will no longer be slaves²⁷⁸.”

This did not mean, however, that Dostoevsky considered such an ideal to be easily realized in political practice or insisted on not changing any social institutions at all except through the spiritual improvement of people, since conservatives, as has already been said, did not believe in the possibility of universal spiritual rebirth, but it was all the more important for them to designate that spiritual ideal with which they should relate when assessing the imperfection of reality. “Yes, of course, gentlemen scoffers, there are still terribly few real Christians (although they exist),”

²⁷⁷Dostoevsky F. M. *A Writer’s Diary* / compiled and commented by A. V. Belov; editor-in-chief O. A. Platonov. Moscow: Institute of Russian Civilization, 2010. P. 744.

²⁷⁸*Ibid.* P. 745.

the writer admitted, “but how do you know exactly how many of them are needed so that the ideal of Christianity does not die among the people, and with it its great hope? Apply this to secular concepts: how many real citizens are needed so that civic valor does not die in society? ²⁷⁹”

The equality of citizens in the system of monarchical government was understood not only in the aspect of the equality of people before God in moral responsibility for their actions or in the aspect of the harmony of the political balance of the rule of the supra-class autocrat, but also in the aspect of the relationship of civil rights and responsibilities for all members of society.

Katkov notes that all republican regimes that have existed in history provided for the operation of mechanisms of popular government only in times of peace and political stability. In cases where the state was exposed to any danger, be it an external threat or internal destabilization caused by epidemics, crop failure, etc., dictatorial mechanisms of governance were put into effect as the only effective ones in an emergency: “We have completely forgotten that not one of the freest states has ever renounced its undoubted right to legally take exceptional measures in exceptional circumstances. In England, if necessary, the act ensuring personal security, “Habeas Corpus,” could be revoked. In Rome, in moments of danger, the Senate decreed its famous *videant consules* – and the consuls were vested with dictatorial power ²⁸⁰.”

If we look at the history of Russia from the very moment of its statehood, the inevitable conclusion is that "emergency" situations - wars or threats of wars, crop failures, unrest, etc. - were its constant companions, flowing one into another. This gave rise to a form of power that, as R. Pipes rightly noted, most closely resembled a military dictatorship, distinguished by a constantly high degree of militarization and subordination of personal interests to state ones.

²⁷⁹Ibid. P. 746.

²⁸⁰ Katkov M. N. Collected Works: in 6 volumes. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. Vol. 3. P. 29.

But this form of power, the conservatives believed, arose not as an evil intent of a handful of people hoping to gain personal benefits from it, but as a political necessity, its establishment precisely in these forms of state life was a conscious choice of the nation, inclined to defend the political sovereignty and cultural uniqueness of an entire people at the cost of individual citizens renouncing their personal selfish goals. An important feature for conservatives in understanding the phenomenon of power in general and its autocratic form in particular was that they, in the wonderful expression of N. A. Berdyaev, who characterized the views of the Slavophiles in an article about A. S. Khomyakov, perceived power as "an obligation, a duty, a burden, a feat, and not a privilege, not a right ²⁸¹." According to the conservative paradigm, it was not the dynasty that usurped sole power, as revolutionary-minded public figures believed, but the Russian people "did not want this world" and placed this burden on the chosen one. In the conditions of a constantly existing external danger, the people and the sovereign seemed to have concluded an unspoken convention to equally fully take on the burden of confronting the enemy, renouncing many personal aspirations.

Hence the formula proclaimed by Katkov: "Russian subjects have something more than political rights, they have political duties ²⁸²." The same idea was expressed in the interpretation of V. P. Meshchersky: "Now it is more important for society to know and fulfill its duties than to know its rights ²⁸³." A right is something that can be used or not, at one's own discretion, a duty is something that must be fulfilled regardless of one's desire. In this sense, another shade of equality is evident in the autocratic system: the tsar and his subjects are equal in their duty to each bear their share of the burden of state concerns. "The calling of the Sovereign of Russia is high, high, but also obligatory – more obligatory than any other power on earth.

²⁸¹Berdyaev N. A. Alexey Stepanovich Khomyakov. Access mode: <http://www.vehi.net/berdyaev/khomyakov/index.html> . (date of access: 09/23/2024).

²⁸²Katkov M. N. Collected Works: in 6 volumes. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. Vol. 3. P. 982.

²⁸³Meshchersky V.P. Diary // Citizen. 1893. No. 54. P. 3.

(...) His duties are above all his rights,”²⁸⁴ Katkov wrote, emphasizing in another publication that “the Monarch himself could not diminish the fullness of his rights (...) and the people would not understand him²⁸⁵.” The people would not understand it, according to Katkov, precisely because it would be a dissolution of the unspoken convention, a violation of equality - the desire of the monarch to relieve himself of the burden of power, while his subjects have no opportunity to avoid their political responsibilities, would be a betrayal in the eyes of the people.

Gilyarov-Platonov refers to another similar maxim of Khomyakov: “I recall that a similar opinion was directly expressed by Khomyakov in a letter to the Serbs. I do not remember the exact words, but the meaning is exactly that: “For complete civic happiness, it is necessary that everyone think first of his duties than of his rights, and recognize the right itself as a duty²⁸⁶.” Gilyarov-Platonov in this context also recalls the importance of gratuitous public service, which as a result of one of the greatest, in his opinion, mistakes of the past great reforms were “if not abolished, then, one might say, trampled,” because now “everyone receives a salary, both the city government and the zemstvo and magistrate justices. Surprisingly, there still remain unpaid members of the public and honorary justices of the peace, but the latter were freed by law from any obligation²⁸⁷.”

In the semantic comparison of the concepts of *equality* and *autocracy* in the journalism of Russian conservatives, autocracy is postulated as the highest and only possible form of true equality, which is understood in various aspects. Critically treating the idea of formal social equality, conservatives turn to the Christian understanding that people are truly equal only before God - and equal only in the degree of moral responsibility for their lives. Coming to the conclusion that artificial equalization will lead not to the establishment of justice, but to the establishment of

²⁸⁴Katkov M. N. Collected Works: in 6 volumes. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. Vol. 2. Pp. 36–37.

²⁸⁵Katkov M. N. Collected Works: in 6 volumes. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. Vol. 2. P. 536.

²⁸⁶Gilyarov-Platonov N. P. “Life is a feat, not a pleasure...” / compiled and commented by Yu. V. Klimakova, ed. O. Platonov. Moscow: Institute of Russian Civilization, 2008. P. 382.

²⁸⁷Ibid. P. 172.

a total dictatorship, conservatives propose turning to the historical tradition, which offers a spontaneously formed model of human coexistence that has proven its effectiveness in centuries of confrontation with internal and external threats - an autocratic monarchy.

The principle of equality, in their understanding, is realized in the monarchical system through the supra-class nature of power, not involved in the interests of any class or social group. The equality of all citizens - from subjects of the lower classes to the sovereign himself - is understood through the prism of the concept of citizenship as a freely chosen and voluntarily accepted service, while a true citizen is not one who selfishly demands rights, but one who patiently fulfills duties, including the Sovereign himself, who considers his unprecedented rights only as a tool for the effective fulfillment of his duties, must be a worthy citizen.

§ 1.4. Nationality as a form of political brotherhood in the discourse of Russian post-reform journalism of a conservative orientation

The idea of nationality, as researchers rightly note ²⁸⁸, has been subject to various interpretations and, unlike the other two elements of the conservative triad, has not had any distinct embodiment. Orthodoxy and autocracy, in addition to being elements of the triad, have a clear field of existence in the socio-political discourse: the interpretation of the concept of Orthodoxy is impossible in one way or another without correlation with Christian dogma and the history of the Eastern Christian Church, and at the basis of any interpretation of autocracy there is inevitably a quite distinct model of political structure. We can single out certain emphases, dominant aspects, etc. in the journalism of Russian conservative thinkers, but with the support of a clearly expressed Symbol of Faith and a three-hundred-year history of the autocratic state. We do not have such a basis for thinking about the category of

²⁸⁸Badalyan D. A. The concept of "nationality" in Russian culture // Historical concepts and political ideas in Russia in the 16th – 20th centuries. St. Petersburg, 2006; Egorov B. F. Evolution in understanding the nationality of literature in Russian criticism of the mid-1850s // Scientific notes of Tartu State University. 1971. Issue 266.

nationality. Related concepts are *people*, *ethnos*, *nation*, *nationalism*, etc. are themselves quite ambiguous and have been actively debated for decades, if not centuries, both in science and in media discourse. Therefore, reconstructing the concept of nationality will probably present the greatest difficulty.

The vagueness of the semantic field of the word "nationality" leads to the fact that researchers often completely abandon attempts to interpret it, removing the nationality component from Uvarov's triple formula as seeming insignificant and superfluous. For example, in a large-scale generalizing work by G. I. Gerasimov it is said that "Russian conservatism of the 19th - early 20th centuries preserved and protected two basic, interconnected ideas: Orthodoxy and autocracy²⁸⁹." At the same time with this statement, however, the author also points out the fact that Uvarov's formula is the only successful theoretical construction of conservatism, and it remains unexplained on what basis such an ideological reduction of the "superfluous" concept was carried out in this case.

Of course, the interpretation of the third element of the conservative triad was significantly complicated by the specific form of the word - not *nation* or *nationality* as the more common forms of loan translation at that time, but *narodnost*. For a long time, different versions of the translation of the French *nationalité* functioned in parallel in Russian political discourse. Researchers believe that the translation version *narodnost* belongs to P. A. Vyazemsky²⁹⁰ and dates back to 1819, but by that time the versions *natsiya* and *natsionalnost* also existed, and were obviously more commonly used. In this regard, it is natural to pose the question of why the authors chose the form *narodnost* to construct the ideological formula of conservatism, what shades of meaning were emphasized in this word?

A. I. Miller rightly points out that the words *nationality* and *nation* appeared in the Russian language in connection with the understanding of the events and legal acts of the French Revolution, and had a close associative connection with

²⁸⁹Gerasimov G. I. Idealistic approach to history: theory, methodology, concepts. 2nd ed., suppl. Ekaterinburg: Publishing solutions, 2022.

²⁹⁰Malinov A. V. The concept of "nationality" in the historiosophical concept of S. S. Uvarov // Russia in the global world. 2016. No. 8(31). P. 519–526.

constitutionalism, representation, and the idea of limiting or completely destroying the monarchical principle ²⁹¹. Having proclaimed the will of the nation instead of the will of God as the source of power and the basis of sovereignty, revolutionary thinkers endowed the nation with a new form of political subjectivity, which was logically inconsistent with the other elements of the conservative triad, entering into direct contradiction with both Orthodoxy and autocracy. Therefore, the desire to find another form of expression of the concept was caused primarily by the desire to break the semantic connection between the word denoting the totality of the inhabitants of the state and the manifestation of their right to certain forms of political self-expression.

In addition, in the Russian context it was important to highlight another aspect that probably influenced the choice of translation option. One of the basic socio-political problems of Russia, as already noted, was the cultural, value, and ideological gap between the “European” elite and the majority of the empire’s population. The need to overcome this gap was one of the key postulates of Russian conservatism. At the beginning of the 19th century, the concept of “*nation*” was used for descriptions of constitutional reforms, remaining almost exclusively in the French-speaking parts of the Russian elite discourse ²⁹², and the words “*narod*” and “*narodny*” gradually acquired more and more pronounced connotations of “common people, plebeian”, therefore by the 1830s, by the time the conservative triad was created, its authors needed to reflect the overcoming of the cultural and social rift at the symbolic-conceptual level. Therefore, the final element of the triad “had to combine the semantic shades of the French words *nationalité* (national) and *popularité* (popular)” ²⁹³.

It seems possible, in the question of interpreting the semantic content of the concept of nationality in the concept of Russian conservatives in post-reform Russia,

²⁹¹Miller A. I. History of the concept of “nation” in Russia // *Otechestvennyye zapiski*. 2012. No. 1(46). P. 162–186.

²⁹²Ibid. P. 168.

²⁹³Malinov A. V. The concept of “nationality” in the historiosophical concept of S. S. Uvarov // *Russia in the global world*. 2016. No. 8(31). P. 523.

to start from Aksakov's thought, expressed in a quote that is key to our study, which has already been cited many times, about the opposition of the triple slogan of the French Revolution and the evangelical meaning of the concepts declared in it. Let us recall the fragment that concerns the category of brotherhood: "is not the famous fraternite, displayed on the banner of the French Revolution, which prohibited by decree the confession of the existence of God, in itself a logical absurdity? For *brotherhood* presupposes *sonship* and without sonship, without the concept of a common father, it is unthinkable. People are brothers only because they are children of the same father, and if we are not sons of God, then there is no brotherhood ²⁹⁴." To a certain extent, the concept of nationality in the conservative triad was called upon to correct this, as it seemed to conservatives, logical absurdity. Orthodoxy as the first element of the triad proclaimed love for one's neighbor as one's brother in Christ and in this regard, indeed, logically abolished the necessity of the third component - brotherhood. However, in the publicistic writings of Russian conservatives one can find indications that the category of nationality, compared with the concept of brotherhood, returns the idea of sonship to the triad, but supplements it with a political sound, i.e. the religious aspect of understanding brotherhood is completely exhausted by placing the idea of Orthodoxy at the forefront. The emphasis is shifted to brotherhood and sonship of a different kind - related to the sphere of state structure.

This is how, for example, this motif sounds in Dostoevsky's "Diary of a Writer": "Is it just a word, just a sound, just a name for us, that 'the Tsar is their father'? Anyone who thinks so understands nothing about Russia! "No, here is an idea, profound and most original, here is an organism, living and powerful, the organism of the people, merged with their tsar into one... it is precisely the faith of the people in the tsar, as in their father, that will save everything, protect everything, remove misfortune... in our country civil freedom can be established most

²⁹⁴Aksakov I. S. Response to the handwritten article "Christianity and Progress" sent to the editors of the newspaper "Rus" // Aksakov I. S. Complete Works: in 7 volumes. Moscow; St. Petersburg, 1886–1887. Vol. 4. P. 339.

completely, more completely than anywhere else in the world, in Europe or even in North America... It will not be established by written documents, but will be built only on the childish love of the people for the tsar, as for a father, for children can be allowed many things that are unthinkable among others, among contractual nations, children can be trusted with so much and allowed so much, as has never been seen anywhere else, for children will not betray their father and, like children, will lovingly accept from him every correction of every mistake and every error of theirs ²⁹⁵. ”

If the concept of Orthodoxy recreates the idea of sonship in relation to God, then the concept of nationality denotes the idea of sonship of subjects in relation to the Tsar. With this view, the concept of state, or integral, nationalism, which underlies the political views of conservatives on issues of ethno-confessional policy of the Russian Empire, becomes understandable. All citizens of the state are equally subjects of the sovereign, in this regard they are united by a brotherhood logically arising from the recognition of this sonship, and this brotherhood cannot be destroyed or questioned due to their ethnic or confessional discord.

It cannot be said, however, that there was a clear unity in the interpretation of these issues among the representatives of conservatism, but their discussion, although very active, was nevertheless instrumental in nature, not fundamental. Katkov from the very beginning interpreted nationality not as a synonym for the concept of "ethnos", but as a reflection of state unity, therefore he used a more precise concept - "political nation". For Katkov, a political nation is a social formation that is capable of building and defending its statehood and political independence. Having gone through all the foreign ethnic communities inhabiting the territory of the Russian Empire, Katkov comes to the conclusion that, despite their impressive at first glance total number - up to 19 million out of 56 million population of the state - upon closer examination it turns out that this figure is mythical, because it is made up of many small elements: firstly, more alien in

²⁹⁵Dostoevsky F. M. *A Writer's Diary* / compiled and commented by A. V. Belov; editor-in-chief O. A. Platonov. Moscow: Institute of Russian Civilization, 2010. P. 785.

language and culture among themselves than each of them is in relation to the Russian ethnic group, and secondly, incapable, due to their small numbers, of becoming a "political nation", i.e. the basis of the state.

Defining Katkov as a "nationalist", his contemporaries and later researchers often attributed chauvinistic views to him. Meanwhile, the negative meaning of the concept of *nationalism* is associated, first of all, with ethnic nationalism, since in mono-ethnic states it can be an ideological justification for military aggression and genocide of other peoples (as was the case in Germany in the mid- 20th century), and in a multi-ethnic state - the driving force of separatism, determining political instability and jeopardizing the political and territorial integrity of the state. In contrast to ethnic nationalism, state or imperial nationalism, the ideologist of which was Katkov, acts as an integrating force, uniting all smaller nationalities around the largest, state-forming nation as a political core.

It is important to note that Katkov relied on the idea of the need for legal unification of the position of foreign ethnic elements, i.e., on the process of integration, and not on the suppression of small nationalities by the state-forming nation. Ethnic, or, as Katkov often writes, "tribal" features do not necessarily have to be smoothed out, since "national unity is not uniformity. The more powerful and fruitful the life of the whole must develop, the more, with the basic and unshakable unity, diversity of elements that make up the state is required ²⁹⁶." The priority of the state-forming nation is defended in this case "not for its own sake, but for the sake of national interests as a whole ²⁹⁷. "

Aksakov, defending his interpretation of the idea of nationality, more often appealed to the category of "Russian", while Katkov found it more convenient to use the word "Russia" – a multi-ethnic state in which heterogeneous ethnic elements are integrated by a common national idea, an essential part of which was monarchical statehood.

²⁹⁶Katkov M. N. Collected Works: in 6 volumes. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. Vol. 2. P. 191.

²⁹⁷Sankova S. M. Statesman without a government position. St. Petersburg, 2007. P. 8.

The state orientation of Katkov's nationalist ideas determined his, at first glance, contradictory position regarding the Jewish question and Ukrainian separatism: the publicist persistently advocated the abolition of the Pale of Settlement and the end of the oppression of Jews, but at the same time he irreconcilably fought against any manifestations of Ukrainophilia. Through the prism of the ideas of integral nationalism, this was easily explained: the Jews in the empire did not claim political independence and autonomy, but only legal equality with other citizens of the empire, while any attempts at the theoretical construction of an independent Ukrainian identity, given that the Little Russians were legally not infringed in any way in comparison with other inhabitants of the empire, were only a tool, the first step in the implementation of further plans of separatism.

In formulating his concept of national policy, Katkov is guided, first of all, by the example of France, where “everything that had any power and share of influence, everything always felt itself French, everything held high the banner of French nationality. And therefore, of the newly joined elements, all (...) tried first of all to become undoubtedly French. The foreigner here does not want to be a foreigner; he is proud of the title of Frenchman, and feels insulted and humiliated (...) when a distinction is made between him and the Frenchman²⁹⁸. ”

Undoubtedly, the national character of France's domestic policy, from Katkov's point of view, ensures its integrity and stability as a political organism, in contrast, for example, to Austria, which chose the federal principle of political structure and which Katkov calls the weakest power in Europe. "Collective powers" (i.e. federations), as Katkov asserts, are always under threat, in a critical state, "until one nationality has been indisputably and powerfully established in them as the main condition for the strength of the state structure and at the same time as the main condition for internal prosperity and development²⁹⁹. ”

²⁹⁸Katkov M. N. Collected Works: in 6 volumes. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. Vol. 2. P. 149.

²⁹⁹Ibid. P. 187.

Continuing to comprehend the idea of nationality as a form of political brotherhood, it is necessary, therefore, to note that the state-forming nation (in the legal field of the Russian Empire the formulation was used - "sovereign people" ³⁰⁰) was assigned the place of the elder brother, who was closest to the tsar as the immediate support of the throne and at the same time bore many of the burdens of the younger brothers, being their economic and political base. This idea not only existed at the level of declarations, but was also implemented in practice. In particular, it was the sovereign people that was assigned the main role in ensuring the political independence of the state and protecting its borders - the majority of foreigners were recruited for military service only as volunteers, while the sovereign people bore the burden of conscription ³⁰¹. Due to its numbers, it also bore the main tax burden - many foreign-ethnic regions of the empire at the time of annexation needed to change their everyday and social infrastructure and demanded significant investments from the central government aimed at improving the life of the population, not always compensated by a corresponding increase in the tax base.

The complexity of resolving the issue of the intricacies of the relationship between the state-forming people of the empire and the small nations united with it by a common state life required constant clarification and deepening of the views of conservatives on the national question in the empire, especially since the second half of the 19th century was full of political upheavals that brought ever greater acuteness and diversity to the dialogue on the problem of integrating foreign-ethnic outskirts. Understanding the position of conservative publicists on this issue is necessary for explaining the concept of nationality and, in turn, requires a deeper immersion in the political context of the ongoing discussion.

The starting point for the debate on the ways of integrating the foreign-ethnic outskirts of the Russian Empire was the events of 1863 in Poland. The course of the

³⁰⁰Fadeicheva M. A. Ethnic policy in the Russian Empire of the 19th century. "Regulations on foreigners" // Scientific yearbook of the Institute of Philosophy and Law of the Ural Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences. 2003. No. 4. P. 369–382 .

³⁰¹Arkhipova A. I. The issue of military service of foreigners in the north-east of Siberia (mid-19th – early 20th centuries) // Society: philosophy, history, culture. 2018. No. 12(56). P. 85–89.

Polish uprising and the actions of the Russian administration have been covered in some detail in a number of scientific works, several works are devoted to the exceptional role of the Russian and, above all, Moscow press in the process of forming a public position on the Polish question at the height of the rebellion ³⁰², however, for the purposes of our study, the period immediately following the pacification of the Vistula region is of greatest interest, since it was marked by an extensive discussion in the press about the national policy of the Russian state.

The Polish incident of 1863 not only caused an escalation of tensions in relations between Russia and with European powers (England, France, Austria, Prussia), but also provoked the growth of separatist tendencies in western Little Russia, the East See and Northwestern Territories. The Russian authorities faced a much broader and more significant problem than suppressing a specific uprising: ensuring the harmonious integration of the empire's ethnically different regions into a single cultural and socio-political whole with the state-forming nation. "The social movement that arose in Russia thanks to the Polish rebellion has already brought the enormous benefit that it has forced us to test and evaluate the strength and durability of those external ties that connect the various parts of the Russian state...", noted I. S. Aksakov in the second issue of the *Moskvich* newspaper for 1867. And if the essence of the problem was clear, then the ways to solve it turned out to be more than not obvious.

The attitude of Russian society towards the Polish uprising during the armed confrontation itself was generally quite unanimous. Having begun as a social uprising, the uprising soon turned into a struggle for national independence, proclaiming instead of demands for social justice the slogan of returning political sovereignty within the long-lost borders "from sea to sea", which for Russia would have meant separating several provinces from its territories. Therefore, even those social forces in Russia that initially treated the actions of the Poles sympathetically gradually united under the slogan of the fastest possible suppression of the uprising

³⁰²Nevedensky S. Katkov and his time. St. Petersburg, 1888; Tvardovskaya V. A. Ideology of post-reform autocracy. Moscow, 1978; and others.

³⁰³. Perhaps the most vivid and figurative reflection of this attitude can be considered the poetic lines of F. I. Tyutchev: "A terrible dream weighed heavily on us, / A terrible, ugly dream: / In blood up to our heels, we fight with the dead, / Resurrected for new burials ³⁰⁴. "

In 1863, the doom of the Polish rebellion was obvious to Russian society, but in this case, the "resurrected corpse" clearly referred not to the Polish nation, but to the idea of an independent Polish state. A clear distinction was made between these concepts in the perception of Russian educated society, which was emphasized, in particular, by Yu. F. Samarin in his article "The Current Volume of the Polish Question," published in issue 38 of the newspaper "Den" in 1863: "An independent state is always based on a more or less integral popular element, which constitutes, as it were, its core, and the state form serves as one of the manifestations of this element ad extra; but this does not yet give the right to the opposite assumption, for not every nationality and not in every era of its existence is capable of taking the form of an independent state: this requires, in addition, other, very diverse conditions, which may or may not exist (...) national peculiarity in itself does not yet justify claims to political independence..."³⁰⁵

By 1864, when the success of the Russian army in the fight against armed rebel detachments was as obvious as the victory over the "European intrigue" of Russian diplomacy under the leadership of Prince A. M. Gorchakov, who confidently rejected the ultimatums of the European powers that supported the ardor of the Polish rebels with unrealistic promises of military intervention ³⁰⁶, the question of the further political structure of the pacified region was on the agenda. The public unanimity with which the question of the fate of an independent Polish state was

³⁰³Kruglikova O. S. Publicism and social activities of M. N. Katkova. Publicist and power. Saarbrücken : LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing , 2011.

³⁰⁴Tyutchev F.I. Russia and the West / comp. B. N. Tarasov. M.: Cultural Revolution; Republic, 2007. P. 168.

³⁰⁵Samarin Yu. F. Orthodoxy and Nationality / compiled by E. V. Zakharov. Moscow, 2008. P. 336.

³⁰⁶Shirokorad A. B. Russia – England: the unknown war , 1857–1907. Moscow: ACT , 2003; *Airapetov ABOUT. R. The Kingdom of Poland in the Politics of the Empire in 1863–1864.* Moscow: Modest Kolerov, 2013. P. 131.

decided came to an end when it was necessary to decide the question of the fate and position of the Polish nation within the Russian state.

“Russification and state unity are, without a doubt, the most current ideas and tasks of our time, large and serious tasks,” writes Aksakov in the second issue of the *Moskvich* newspaper for 1867. “Russification” or “Russification” of the imperial outskirts in the second half of the 1860s became the pulsating nerve of the country’s internal political development, although neither the representatives of power nor the educated public had a single idea not only about the paths of Russification, but also about the very meaning of this concept.

Why did this problem seem so ambiguous and almost insoluble in Russia? At that time, the question of Russification affected, first of all, the western outskirts of the empire. M. N. Katkov in the *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* constantly pointed out that “it is precisely the western outskirts of Russian possessions, subject to the greatest danger in the event of any clashes with European states, that, contrary to the obvious demands of reasonable policy, is the least connected with the core of Russia ³⁰⁷. ”

Indeed, the western provinces represented an important defensive line for Russia and at the same time a convenient springboard for European military aggression, so from the moment Poland became part of the Russian Empire, the garrisons of Russian troops stationed in this region were more numerous than in other imperial outskirts and had a special status. During the reign of Nicholas I , “in peacetime, this fully mobilized army had the status of an active one, and its commander-in-chief, Field Marshal General, His Serene Highness Prince of Warsaw, Count Paskevich-Erivansky, was not accountable to the Minister of War in his actions and was directly subordinated to the Emperor himself ³⁰⁸.” Later, Paskevich’s successors as commander-in-chief combined military and civil power in the region in their persons.

³⁰⁷Katkov M. N. *Collected Works*: in 6 volumes. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. Vol. 2. P. 260.

³⁰⁸Ekshtut S. A. *Everyday life of the Russian intelligentsia from the era of great reforms to the Silver Age*. Moscow: Young Guard, 2012. P. 89.

As the publicist and statesman E. M. Feoktistov, who headed the censorship department for a long time (1883–1896), noted in his memoirs: “Poland is our first post in the event of war; of course, the first clash with the enemy will occur within its borders ³⁰⁹.” However, these regions, which were so strategically important for the empire, had a heterogeneous social and ethnic structure. The territories, which had repeatedly changed hands as a result of military conquests throughout their history, represented a complex phenomenon in terms of the ethnocultural heterogeneity of the population. The Kingdom of Poland, which was to a certain extent an artificial political body and was created by the terms of the Vienna Treaty, united territories inhabited not only by Poles, but also, in part, by Little Russians, Belarusians, and Great Russians, subordinate to the landed gentry, which was ethnically Polish. In general, the Polish component prevailed numerically, but other ethnic groups also represented a significant part of the population of the Kingdom. The population was not homogeneous in terms of religious affiliation either – and the residents of the Orthodox faith were almost entirely representatives of the lower social classes.

In the Ostsee region, which included the Estland, Courland, and Livonia provinces, and in the so-called Northwestern region, which included the Vilnius, Kovno, Grodno, Mogilev, Minsk, and Vitebsk provinces, the more numerous lower strata of the population – the peasantry and urban bourgeoisie – were generally represented by representatives of an ethnic group different from the local noble population, and in some cases, of a different faith.

The rural population of the Northwestern provinces consisted predominantly of Belarusians of the Orthodox faith (whom, in accordance with the ideas of the mid-19th century, the imperial government considered, properly speaking, Russians), and Lithuanians, many of whom also belonged to Orthodoxy due to the fact that even before the strengthening of the Jesuit-Catholic and Uniate influence in the region,

³⁰⁹Feoktistov E. M. *Behind the Scenes of Politics and Literature // Behind the Scenes of Politics*. Moscow: Sergei Dubov Foundation, 2001. P. 250.

many Lithuanians were voluntarily baptized. The noble population of the region was predominantly Polish-Catholic.

The Estland, Courland and Livonia provinces were somewhat more homogeneous in terms of confession; the Central Statistical Committee classifies them among the provinces “completely or almost completely heterodox,” with an obvious predominance of the Lutheran faith, but from an ethnic point of view, stratification was also obvious: the peasants were predominantly Latvians and Estonians by origin, with a small number of Belarusian and Great Russian elements, while the nobility, which made up about 6% of the population, consisted mainly of ethnic Germans.

According to the report on the structure of the empire's population, prepared in 1863 by order of the Minister of Internal Affairs by the Central Statistical Committee, the percentage of the noble population in the empire increases "... in the direction of the south and southwest, in the middle of the Little Russian and former Cossack settlements and reaches its greatest size in the Belarusian and Lithuanian provinces, where the Polish landless gentry and noble outskirts bring it to its extreme limits. The Kovno province has the largest proportion of nobles not only in Russia, but in all of Europe ³¹⁰." Almost every tenth person living in the Kovno province belonged to the noble class. Due to such significant influence of the Polish gentry, the uprising of 1863 in Poland easily and quickly spread to the provinces of the Northwestern Territory, and also caused an exacerbation of nationalist sentiments among the Baltic Latvians.

As historian D. Staliunas notes, such complexity of the ethnic and social structure of the western provinces determined a completely different meaning of the word "Pole". Not only in the socio-political discourse of the mid- 19th century, but also in the official bureaucratic terminology of that time, the word "Pole" could be used as a collective term, denoting, first of all, a combination of two factors: a Pole

³¹⁰Statistical tables of the Russian Empire. Part 2: Actual population of the empire for 1858 (From the population map of European Russia). St. Petersburg, 1863. P. 296.

is a nobleman and a Catholic, while the concept of ethnicity was not clearly expressed³¹¹.

The influence of the Polish and German components on the culture and development of the western provinces added an additional dimension to the problem of integrating these territories into the system of Russian imperial statehood. Since the time of the forced and violent Europeanization of the Peter the Great era, the Russian intelligentsia had been brought up in the context of Western European culture and therefore readily recognized its intellectual and cultural primacy in relation to the national tradition.

The state administration headed by the Minister of Internal Affairs P. A. Valuev was in no hurry to take any drastic steps after the suppression of the uprising in Poland, realizing that the aggressive policy of Russification in relation to the Vistula region was fraught with the aggravation of separatism in other outskirts and, most importantly, with the growth of social contradictions within the country. As Katkov's colleague at Moscow University and the publication *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*, Professor N. A. Lyubimov, noted, after a brief moment of unity and patriotic upsurge during the Polish uprising, a cooling set in, fraught with a new political crisis, because "the intelligentsia circle, which considered itself liberal, was stunned, but not yet converted³¹²." F. I. Tyutchev thought in the same spirit: "Slavism has a worst enemy, and an even more internal one than the Germans, Poles, Magyars and Turks. These are the so-called intelligentsia." Tyutchev believed that the masses possess an exceptional political instinct, which allows the people to spontaneously make the right choice in critical moments of history, but "that's what the intelligentsia is for, to corrupt instinct³¹³."

By the middle of the 19th century, an amazing phenomenon had developed in the educated strata of Russian society, which F. I. Tyutchev called "the Russophobia

³¹¹Staliunas D. Ethnopolitical situation of the North-West region in the assessment of M.N. Muravyov (1863–1865) // *Baltic Archive*. 2002. Vol. 7. Pp. 250–271.

³¹²Lyubimov N. A. N. M. Katkov and his historical merit. St. Petersburg, 1889. P. 260.

³¹³Tyutchev F. I. *Russia and the West* / compiled by B. N. Tarasov. Moscow: Cultural Revolution; Republic, 2007. P. 342.

of some Russian people – by the way, highly respected” in a letter to I. S. Aksakov on September 20, 1867.³¹⁴ The Russophobia of educated Russians (which, we note, also affected some high-ranking officials) led to the fact that the spread of the general principles of Russian statehood and elements of Russian national culture in the western provinces was viewed by the representatives of the Russian administration themselves as a path to the degradation of a more developed culture under the pressure of the barbaric force of Russian political rule. It was precisely this aspect that was carelessly and very openly touched upon by N. N. Strakhov in his article “The Fatal Question,” which served as the reason for the closure of the Dostoevsky brothers’ magazine “Time” in 1863.

The fascination with the cultural achievements of the Poles and Germans, who “civilized” the Russians, Lithuanians, Estonians and Latvians in the western provinces with their influence, led to the dialogue on the Russification of the foreign-ethnic western outskirts being organically woven into a broader and more significant dialogue on the Europeanization of Russia, on the nature of its correlation with European civilization, in other words, into the eternal dispute between the Slavophiles and Westernizers. But even within the Russian National Party, as is well known, there was no complete agreement.

The publisher and editor of the newspaper *Moskovskie Vedomosti*, M. N. Katkov, the ideological inspirer of the anti-Polish campaign in the press in 1863, after the suppression of the uprising, launched an active campaign in favor of the administrative Russification of the region, insisting on depriving the Polish gentry involved in the uprising of their estates and selling these lands to ethnic Russians at the most favorable prices, as well as on the introduction of various economic benefits for Russian settlers.

I. S. Aksakov, while acknowledging that there are “a number of blatant outrages in the relationship of our outskirts to the center,” did not agree with Katkov’s position, noting that state unity cannot be understood outside the idea of

³¹⁴Ibid. P. 334.

nationality, “no artificial or forced identification of foreigners with a national historical type (...) will achieve the goal if there is no action of moral and purely social forces ³¹⁵. ”

The publications of Aksakov and Katkov developed their basic positions regarding Russification: Katkov – from the point of view of the practice of state administration, Aksakov – from the point of view of the search for unifying moral principles, on the basis of which the non-violent integration of foreign elements with Russians should occur.

The search for common moral foundations required, to begin with, a moral justification for the very fact of the annexation of certain alien territories to the empire. In this regard, Katkov and the publicists of the Slavophile camp were completely unanimous, recognizing the key reason for the absorption of one or another alien fragment by the empire as the fact that the given nationality had lost or was unable to create its own national statehood for reasons of an internal nature, not directly related to external influences or a violent seizure.

F. I. Tyutchev also shared this idea, emphasizing in his correspondence with I. S. Aksakov that Russia has never played the role of an active provocateur of negative processes in international politics, “it is not Russia’s calling to appear on stage as *Deus ex machine* . It is necessary that History itself clear a place for it in advance... ³¹⁶”

Katkov has repeatedly spoken out regarding Poland, claiming that that it was precisely internal turmoil, based on the extreme individualism of citizens, the inability to act in concert and the unwillingness to sacrifice private interests for the sake of the common good, that destroyed its once powerful statehood. That is why the Moscow publicist urged not to blame the man who, in passing, leaned against the porch of a wooden house that was completely rotten from the inside and thereby brought down the dilapidated structure. The cause of the destruction was not a

³¹⁵Moskvich. 1867. No. 2.

³¹⁶Tyutchev F.I. *Russia and the West* / comp. B. N. Tarasov. M.: Cultural Revolution; Republic, 2007. P. 337.

random passerby, but the many years of slow decay of the building, which its owners and inhabitants allowed. In general, Yu. F. Samarin is guided by a similar logic, reflecting on the moral foundations of Russian rule in the Baltic region. In "Letters from Riga", an unpublished journalistic work that circulated in copies from 1848, Samarin writes that the Baltic region was not fully Germanized, i.e. was not seriously influenced by German culture, since "in the 13th century, crusaders and merchants came to the Baltic region to hunt, and returned from there: the former with well-deserved indulgences, the latter with profits," while both did not see their ultimate goal in developing the region, did not settle there, did not become fully local residents themselves, but exploited the region and its indigenous inhabitants, and quite cruelly, arousing the discontent of the latter against themselves. "Nowhere," writes Samarin, "was the disunity between the natives and the newcomers so deep and disastrous for both as in the Baltic colony." Such internal disunity naturally led to the impossibility of fully resisting the growing external aggressions - the population of the region fragmentarily joined the Latin knights, then the Muscovites, then cooperated with individual Tatar detachments, guided by conflicting considerations. Therefore, Samarin believes, "as a result of the formation of the Ostsee region, it could not extract and develop a state principle from within itself; it had to penetrate into it from outside. The loss of political independence was a revelation of its internal insolvency³¹⁷."

Starting from a common foundation, in their further reasoning Aksakov, Katkov and Samarin diverged above all in their understanding of the role of the state. Katkov saw the basis for resolving the national question in Russia as the immutable principle of the equality of all territories and peoples before a common and uniform law for all, the general principles of statehood. Citing in this regard the example of French policy on the national question, Katkov notes that the powerful unity of France "occurs, of course, from the fact that after each conquest France, sheathing its sword, opened its arms to its new subjects and placed them in a position of

³¹⁷Samarin Yu. F. *Orthodoxy and Nationality* / compiled by E. V. Zakharov. Moscow, 2008. P. 512.

complete equality relative to its older children ³¹⁸. " As for Russia, its main mistake in the sphere of domestic policy was that "we have acquired an unconscious tendency to give not only a special position to foreign elements, but also to impart to them advantages over the Russian nationality and thereby develop in them not only a desire for separateness, but also a sense of pride in their separateness; we have acquired an instinctive tendency to humiliate our nationality ³¹⁹. " It should be noted that Katkov was quite consistent in defending the principle of equality of foreign elements and the dominant nationality and insisted on the application of this principle also to expand the political rights of those foreign ethnic elements that were in worse conditions than the state-forming nation (the consistency of his positions on the so-called Jewish question has already been noted above).

"National unity is not uniformity ³²⁰," Katkov believed, but the power and significance of a state-forming nation are determined by its role as a unifying core for the smaller peoples of the empire, of which "not only the Cheremis will not understand the inhabitant of Suomi or Finland at all, but the Estonian, who is closer to the latter, is not able to understand him ³²¹." However, each of these peoples, having lived in close proximity to and influenced by the Russian people for a long time, is able to understand it and is more closely related in the cultural and historical sense to the Russian people than to any of the smaller peoples of the empire. Thus, the Russian people, or rather, their intellectual, spiritual, political and everyday culture, must be a universalizing model, in an indispensable correlation with which all foreign cultural components must be, which, however, for Katkov did not mean the forcible imposition of their culture by the Russians as the only alternative.

The state, to which Katkov assigned an extremely active role in this process, had to ensure the priority of Russian national culture, but priority precisely as a unifying factor that did not exclude the existence and development of local dialects

³¹⁸Katkov M. N. Collected Works: in 6 volumes. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. Vol. 2. P. 173.

³¹⁹Ibid. P. 174.

³²⁰Ibid. P. 191.

³²¹Ibid. P. 177.

and other confessions along with the common state language, common state faith and church. “There is one dominant nationality in Russia,” Katkov asserted, “one dominant language, developed over centuries of historical life. However, there are also many tribes in Russia, each speaking its own language and each having its own customs; there are entire countries with their own special character and traditions. But all these heterogeneous tribes, all these diverse regions lying on the outskirts of the great Russian world, constitute its living parts and feel their unity with it in the unity of the state, in the unity of the supreme power (...) There is a dominant church in Russia, but it also contains many mutually exclusive beliefs. However, all this diversity of countless beliefs, uniting and dividing people, is covered by one common principle of state unity. People of different tribes and different faiths equally feel themselves members of one state entity (...) everything heterogeneous in the composition of Russia, everything that can be, excludes each other and is at odds with each other, merges into one whole, as soon as the feeling of state unity speaks out ³²².” Statehood, political power, was for Katkov the basis for solving, among other things, the national question – the definition by citizens themselves of their national identity not through correlation with an ethnic group, but through correlation with the state.

Aksakov, however, insisted in principle that the national question should be removed from the political sphere as much as possible, and should be resolved in the sphere of the people's own search for the lost spiritual inner foundations of self-awareness, which gives them that almost mystical power of spiritual and cultural subordination of other nationalities - voluntary subordination, which even in the eyes of the oppressed themselves has some inner truth and moral strength. It is interesting that Aksakov, like Katkov, cites France as an example, but the situation appears to him in a completely different light - the strength of the national spirit of the French helps them to dissolve other nationalities in themselves to complete homogeneity. Katkov had already made fun of Aksakov's publications, noting that Aksakov, in the

³²²Ibid. P. 49.

course of his verbose reasoning, came to the most valuable conclusion that the French Frenchify only because they are French, the Germans Germanize because they are German, and only the Russians cannot Russify anyone because they themselves are not Russian enough. Aksakov also did not deny himself the pleasure of offending his polemical opponent, saying that among the motley crowd that has now set out on a crusade to Russify the Russian outskirts, there are also strange gentlemen who have invented some kind of state nationality, a chimera whose ghostly existence is not based on the spirit of any particular nation.

“We can expect a political merger as a consequence of internal rebirth and spiritual reconciliation, but we cannot assume the opposite, that is, pacification and agreement through violent and external combination,” Yu. F. Samarin supported Aksakov’s idea, believing that “the measure proposed by *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* would not even stop the struggle, but would open up a new, broader arena for it ³²³. ”

It should be noted that in practice, the state administration, despite its hesitations and some inconsistency in its measures, nevertheless generally moved in the direction indicated by Katkov. Both in the Polish region (which in the last quarter of the 19th century, in the spirit of the Russification policy, would be officially called *Privislinsky*) and in the North-Western region, headed by General M. N. Muravyov, administrative measures were taken aimed at strengthening the positions of the representatives of the sovereign people ³²⁴.

In 1864, a peasant reform was carried out, which abolished temporary obligatory relations in the North-West Territory (performance of feudal duties by peasants until all redemption payments were paid), and lands that had previously belonged to rebellious landowners were distributed to landless peasants and farm laborers. 5 million rubles were allocated from the treasury to implement this

³²³Samarin Yu. F. *Orthodoxy and Nationality* / compiled by E. V. Zakharov. Moscow, 2008. P. 353.

³²⁴Kruglikova O. S. M. N. Muravyov-Vilensky in the assessment of the Russian conservative and liberal press of the second half of the 19th century // *Mediascope*. 2019. No. 1. P. 10.

measure. On February 19, 1864, a decree was issued "On the economic independence of peasants and their legal equality with landowners", an increase in peasant allotments occurred simultaneously with a reduction in taxes. These measures quickly had an effect not only on increasing the loyalty of the local population to the authorities, but also on the rapid development of agriculture. And subsequently, even during the reactionary period of the reign of Alexander III, the authorities did not dare to fully extend to these territories those measures that limited the results of the peasant reform and acted in the interests of large landowners, which the government adopted in relation to the main territory of Russia: "in Belarus, due to fear of the influence of Polish landowners, the law on zemstvo chiefs³²⁵ The tsarist authorities introduced it only in 1900 and only within the Vitebsk, Mogilev and Minsk provinces³²⁶. ”

In December 1865, a law was passed according to which all those expelled from the western provinces for participating in the rebellion were required to sell their lands to Orthodox settlers within 2 years. Persons of Polish origin, primarily Catholics, were prohibited from buying these lands, and they were also deprived of the right to use the loan of the Nobles' Bank. In April 1869, the Ministry of State Property was forced to issue an additional order according to which only the children of Catholics who converted to Orthodoxy, and not the persons who made such a conversion themselves, were considered Russian and had the corresponding economic privileges. This order was caused by the mass conversion of local Catholics to Orthodoxy in order to obtain economic benefits.

In general, the spread of Orthodoxy in the western provinces was one of the main tasks of the local authorities. Avoiding direct and sharp manifestations of

³²⁵The "Regulations on Zemstvo District Chiefs", adopted on July 12, 1889, limited the powers of volost courts, assemblies and elders, i.e. organs of peasant self-government, subordinating them to the administration in the person of the zemstvo chief, whose position could only be occupied by a person belonging to the nobility and having overcome a high property qualification. For more details, see: Complete Collection of Laws of the Russian Empire. Third Collection. Vol. 9. Pp. 507-535.

³²⁶Kovkel I. I., Yarmusik E. S. History of Belarus: From Ancient Times to the Present. Minsk: Aversev, 2004.

persecution of Catholicism, the authorities limited themselves to imposing the police's responsibility to ensure that priests did not incite residents to rebellion. However, many churches were closed under the plausible pretext of dilapidated buildings or a lack of parishioners.

On the initiative of M. N. Muravyov, a church construction committee was created to revive Orthodox churches, and the salaries of the Orthodox clergy were increased. "The need to increase the salaries of the Orthodox clergy in the Northwestern Territory," wrote M. N. Muravyov in a note submitted to the Emperor, "is one of the most important issues currently subject to resolution. <...> This issue is so important that there are no donations that the government should not make for it ³²⁷." It should be noted that Muravyov proposed a unique solution to this issue from an economic point of view. So-called contribution payments were made until 1897 for the construction of churches, additional payments to the clergy and Russian officials in the region (who also received higher salaries compared to other regions of the empire). From 1864, a 10% tax was levied on all income of local landowners.

The language of instruction in schools in the Northwestern Territory was switched to Russian, with the teaching of the catechism in the local (Szmud or Lithuanian) dialect being preserved in some areas. The Lithuanian script was switched from Latin to Cyrillic, although the publication of books in Lithuanian was not prohibited, unlike the publication of books in Polish. A certain view of the history of the region was also propagated, with the "Materials on the History of the Russian-Lithuanian Region", regularly published in the "Mogilev Provincial Gazette", focusing more on the ethnocultural opposition of Belarusians and Lithuanians to the Poles than on an attempt to unite them with the Russians, that is, the principal importance was acquired not so much by Russification as by the de-Polonization of the region.

M. N. Muravyov even put forward a project to create a new Vilnius University for six provinces of the North-West Territory. According to his plan, the university

³²⁷From the papers of Count M. N. Muravyov // Russian Archive. 1887. No. 5. P. 307.

could include four faculties where Belarusians and Lithuanians would study (it was planned to gradually replace the Russian officials in the region with people from the local population), and even the possibility of creating a department of the Lithuanian language was considered. However, this bold initiative of Count Muravyov for that time did not find support in the highest circles and was not implemented ³²⁸.

The policy of the Russian Empire on the national question was always complex and somewhat contradictory ³²⁹, and it should be noted that the issue of the internal structure of the numerous nationalities that made up the Russian state sometimes became part of a complex system of foreign policy intrigues. The European powers rightly believed that it was the ethnic question that could be the zone of greatest vulnerability of the multinational imperial statehood, and they skillfully provoked and directed confrontations on national grounds. The uprising in Poland in 1863 was used by England and France as a pretext for possible interference in the internal affairs of the Russian Empire, it entailed the emergence of Ukrainophilia and the emergence of separatist tendencies in the western provinces. The internal stability and external security of the country directly depended on the successful solution of the problem of integration of foreign ethnic outskirts. Therefore, the understanding of this issue occupied the society of post-reform Russia, especially representatives of the national-conservative party, always putting the interests of a strong centralized state at the forefront.

As in the two previous elements of the triad under consideration, in their understanding of brotherhood and the national question, conservative publicists could not ignore the problem of cultural disunity between educated society and the people. The forced Europeanization of the Russian nobility at the beginning of the 18th century determined the difference in culture and life of the privileged class and the common people and led to the fact that *nationality* began to be interpreted to a

³²⁸Gigin V. Slandered, but not forgotten (Essay on M.N. Muravyov-Vilensky). Access mode: <http://zapadrus.su/zaprus/istbl/575-2012-02-22-21-57-02.html>. (date of access: 09/25/2024).

³²⁹Dyakin V. S. The national question in the domestic policy of tsarism (19th – beginning of the 20th century). St. Petersburg: LISS, 1998.

significant extent as "common people", i.e. a correlation not with the nation, but with a certain social group within it, and also with a disparaging connotation - in essence, the word "national" was more often used in the meaning of "plebeian" than in the more obvious meaning of "national". The resulting division into "the public" and "the people", artistically outlined in the famous article by K. S. Aksakov ³³⁰, led to a much more dangerous split in political brotherhood than polyethnicity and multi-confessionalism.

If we develop further the idea of brotherhood as a common sonship, we can say that the Russian educated class seemed to conservative publicists to be the prodigal son from the Gospel, who, although he had not lost his father's love despite the abundance of his sins, wandered for a long time in a spiritual foreign land. This idea of a break with the national soil and the need to overcome it was most consistently developed in the works of Dostoevsky. The reunification of national tradition with European education, which formed the basis of *pochvennichestvo*, "the reconciliation of civilization with the national principle" ³³¹, was conceived by Dostoevsky as an opportunity for a unique cultural synthesis, which would be the new word that Russia was called upon to manifest in the world, if only the "prodigal son" could return to the paternal threshold. But this required the final overcoming of the division of the nation into the "public" and the "people", and therefore the need to comprehend the sources of this division - Peter the Great's reform.

Dostoevsky, moving away from the traditional for the journalism of this period discussions about the cruelty of the repressive measures of the first Russian emperor, who introduced the cane education, sees the problem of his reforms in the spiritual disorder caused by the cultural split of the Europeanized elite with the people. Entering into polemics with the publicist of the "Russian Herald" V. G. Avseenko, who allowed himself several critical statements on the pages of M. N.

³³⁰Aksakov K. S. Experience of synonyms. Public-People // Aksakov K. S. State and people. M.: Institute of Russian Civilization, 2009. pp. 237–238.

³³¹Advertisement for subscription to the magazine "Time" for 1861 // Gromova N.A. Dostoevsky. Documents, diaries, letters, memoirs, reviews of literary critics and philosophers. Moscow: Agraf, 2000. P. 68.

Katkov's magazine about the Russian people as a passive and inert force, skeptical about Dostoevsky's idea of the superiority of the people's truth over the education of the upper classes, the author of "The Writer's Diary" points out that in the era of Peter the Great, one part of the nation was enslaved in the name of enlightening another. The nation split into two unequal parts, each of which carried out its part of the mission - some acquired an unprecedented expansion of view and tasted the fruits of the culture of all nations, others preserved the sanctity of Orthodoxy and the people's truth. This period was necessary and natural, but now it has passed, and the future of Russia depends on how many of those who "tasted of culture" will be able to "return again to the people and to the people's ideals, without losing their culture."

Dostoevsky exclaims pathetically, addressing his opponent and accusing him of ingratitude to the people: "... it was worth cultivating you, in order to corrupt the people in return... Is it really true that our people, enslaved precisely for the sake of your culture..., after two hundred years of slavery, deserve from you, from a cultured man, instead of gratitude or even pity, only this arrogant spit... For your sake they were tied hand and foot for two hundred years, so that you would gain intelligence from Europe, and now you, when you have gained intelligence from Europe (?), leaning on your hips in front of the bound one and looking at him from your cultural height, suddenly conclude about him that he is "bad and passive and has shown little activity (this bound one), but has shown only some passive virtues . ”³³²

The question of culture sounds interesting notes, in many ways anticipating the ideas formulated at the beginning of the 20th century by Oswald Spengler about the fundamental difference between the concepts of *civilization* and *culture* . Although in the disparate publicistic speeches, letters and rough notes of Dostoevsky it is impossible to trace a clear terminological division, at the level of connotations this difference is readable. From Europe, as Dostoevsky notes, the educated class accepted not culture, which is always organically connected with the life of the people, but civilization, i.e. not the spirit and meaning, but external attributes. "What

³³²Dostoevsky F. M. A Writer's Diary / compiled and commented by A. V. Belov; editor-in-chief O. A. Platonov. Moscow: Institute of Russian Civilization, 2010. P. 310.

cultural, in your opinion, did we bring to the people: gloves, carriages?"³³³ – Dostoevsky writes in his notebook of 1875–76. The writer develops a similar idea in one of his letters to K. P. Pobedonostsev: “ We don’t have *culture* (which is everywhere), dear Konstantin Petrovich, and we don’t have it – because of the nihilist Peter the Great. It was torn out by the roots. And since man does not live by bread alone, our poor uncultured one involuntarily invents something more fantastic, more absurd, and so that it doesn’t resemble anything (because even though he took everything entirely from European socialism, he still remade it here so that it doesn’t resemble anything) ³³⁴. ”

Culture as a synonym for spirituality and civilization as a symbol of everyday comfort, immoderate consumption and debauchery repeatedly appear in the writer's notebooks. "Our society, weaned from any business by Peter the Great" ³³⁵, continuing to master the external attributes of civilization, turned out, as Dostoevsky writes, to be "negatively acculturated", and only a distorted French language and the living of income remained from this external acculturation. The civilization of "gloves and carriages" was assimilated through debauchery: "Every civilization begins with debauchery. Greed for acquisition. Envy and pride. The reform of Peter the Great took debauchery." The theoretical justification of the need for civilization led later to the debauchery of thought: " And so all generations turned out to be insolvent, and these are the fruits of Peter's labors! What did our generation bring, how did it end: social theories that are not ours and a slavish fear of having our own thought ("Sovremennik", "Russkoye slovo")" ³³⁶. This idea was also reflected in the April 1876 issue of the *Diary of a Writer*. g., where Dostoevsky especially emphasizes that people who have come into contact with the depravity of

³³³ Unpublished Dostoevsky: Notebooks and Notebooks 1860–1881 / Literary Heritage. Moscow: Nauka, 1971. Vol. 83. P. 463.

³³⁴ Dostoevsky F. M. Letters. 209. K. P. Pobedonostsev. May 19, 1879. *Staraya Russa* // Dostoevsky F. M. Collected works: in 15 volumes. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1996. T. 15. pp. 577–579.

³³⁵ Unpublished Dostoevsky: Notebooks and Notebooks 1860–1881 / Literary Heritage. Moscow: Nauka, 1971. Vol. 83. P. 293.

³³⁶Ibid. P. 258.

civilization, outwardly civilized people, begin to despise and hate their former environment, people and national culture.

Joining the extensive discussion about the significance of Peter the Great's reforms, which unfolded in Russian journalism of this period ³³⁷, Dostoevsky emphasizes that it is wrong and impossible to dispute the general vector of Peter's activity. And this vector was not set by Peter, but by the entire previous history and future calling of Russia: " ...through Peter's reform there was an expansion of our *previous* idea, the Russian Moscow idea, and an increased and strengthened understanding of it was obtained ³³⁸." In this regard, Dostoevsky joins the number of those historians and publicists who regarded Peter's actions not as a breakdown in the trajectory of Russia's state development ³³⁹, but only as an accelerated, forced movement toward the same goals that had been designated by the entire previous development of the Russian state: "Tsar Ivan Vasilyevich made every effort to conquer the Baltic coast, about a hundred and thirty years earlier than Peter. If he had conquered it and taken possession of its harbors and ports, he would inevitably have begun to build his own ships, just like Peter, and since they cannot be built without science, science would inevitably have appeared from Europe, just like under Peter ³⁴⁰. ”

But the writer looks at Peter the Great's reform through the prism of his idea of the messianic calling of the Russian people, closely connected precisely with the understanding of nationality: "Yes, the purpose of the Russian person is undoubtedly pan-European and worldwide. To become a real Russian, to become completely

³³⁷See about this: Kruglikova ABOUT. S. The Image of Peter I on the Pages of the *Sovremennik Magazine* in the Era of Great Reforms // *Bulletin of the Voronezh State University. Series: Philology. Journalism.* 2020. No. 4. Pp. 111–115 ; Kruglikova O. S. “To Interpret the Appearance of Peter from the Laws of the Development of an Idea...” – Reflections on Peter the Great in the Journalism of A. I. Herzen // *Bulletin of the Southern Federal University. Philological Sciences.* 2021. Vol. 25. No. 1. Pp. 218–228.

³³⁸*Ibid.* P. 414.

³³⁹Kruglikova O. S. The Image of Peter I on the Pages of the *Sovremennik Magazine* in the Era of Great Reforms // *Bulletin of the Voronezh State University. Series: Philology. Journalism.* 2020. No. 4. P. 111–115 .

³⁴⁰Dostoevsky F. M. *Writer's Diary.* In 2 volumes. Moscow: Book Club 36.6, 2011. Vol. 1. P. 332.

Russian, perhaps, means only... to become *a brother* <italics mine – O. K. > of all people, the universal man, if you like ³⁴¹." Speaking about Pre-Petrine Russia, which "was active and strong, although it was slowly taking shape politically ³⁴²," Dostoevsky notes that in its desire for isolation, in its thrifty and jealous attitude towards the sanctuary of Orthodoxy inherited from Byzantium, carefully preserved by it from the corrupting trends of the West, Russia was already preparing "to be wrong." To be wrong in its desire to preserve Orthodoxy in itself and for itself, and not to bring it to the rest of the world, fulfilling its great mission. Peter did not allow it to remain wrong, he pushed Russia into Europe, and "with Peter's reform there was an unprecedented expansion of views - and this, I repeat, is the entire feat of Peter ³⁴³. "

Only after becoming a full-fledged part of European culture did the Russians have the opportunity to realize and fulfill their pan-human significance: "We have accepted into our souls, not with hostility (as it would seem should have happened), but with friendship, with full love, the geniuses of foreign nations, all together, without making preferential tribal distinctions, knowing by instinct, almost from the very first step, to distinguish, remove contradictions, excuse and reconcile differences, and thus have already shown our readiness and inclination, which we ourselves have only just announced and expressed, for a general pan-human reunification... Oh, all this Slavophilism and Westernism of ours is only one great misunderstanding of ours, although historically necessary... our destiny is universality, and not acquired by the sword, but by the power of *brotherhood and the fraternal aspiration of ours* <italics mine – O. K. > to the reunification of people. If you want to delve into our history after Peter's reform, you will already find traces and indications of this thought, this dream of mine, if you like, in the nature of our communication with European tribes, even in our state policy. For what did Russia do in all these two centuries in its policy, if not serve Europe, perhaps much more

³⁴¹Ibid. P. 448.

³⁴²Ibid. P. 412.

³⁴³Ibid. P. 413.

than itself? I do not think that this happened only due to the incompetence of our politicians ³⁴⁴. " In Dostoevsky's interpretation, it was precisely the unification of the two parts of the disunited Russian people that was the main guarantee that the world destiny of the Russians, which he connects precisely with the idea of brotherhood, and universal brotherhood at that, could one day be fulfilled.

Thus, the concept of nationality as interpreted by conservatives has several key aspects, each of which is semantically linked to the concept of brotherhood:

- firstly, the aspect determined by the paternalistic principle of state power, i.e. the brotherhood of the subjects of the empire, citizens, through the consciousness of their sonship in relation to the monarch;

- secondly, the understanding of nationality as the basis for constructing civil identity, i.e. the brotherhood of many peoples as a single family in a multi-ethnic empire, where the sovereign people are assigned the role of elder brother;

- thirdly, universal brotherhood, again no longer political, but evangelical, which is the crowning achievement of the development of the Russian national idea, but will become possible only after the cultural unity of the elite with the people.

It should be noted that the idea of nationality as the implementation of the Christian concept of brotherhood in state building (both in the aspect of brotherhood between people, and in the aspect of brotherhood between peoples within a multi-ethnic empire) turned out to be, in historical retrospect, one of the most fruitful in domestic political practice: this principle was addressed both in the imperial and Soviet periods, and today it continues to be implemented, remaining symbolically enshrined in one of the main attributes of the state - the national anthem, which glorifies the "age-old union of fraternal peoples."

Summarizing the consideration of the key concepts of Russian conservatism in the pages of the press of the second half of the 19th century, it can be stated that, firstly, they were clearly determined by the basic philosophical attitudes underlying conservatism as a philosophical system: religious worldview, anthropological and

³⁴⁴Ibid. P. 448.

epistemological pessimism; secondly, due to the a priori reactionary nature of any traditionalist philosophy, they were conceptualized in many ways “from the opposite”, i.e. they were based on the need to give a different semantic content to words and concepts already functioning in public discourse, or to replace them with related ones with a different semantic accent. In this case, it was often a question of the need to reconceptualize linguistic borrowings that were semantically associated with a foreign cultural context.

This made the question of the essence of language and the ways of its development fundamentally important for conservatives. Even at the earliest stage of the formation of Russian conservatism, it was the discussion of language as a fundamentally important factor in the formation of personal and national identity that revealed the differences between conservative and liberal philosophical systems in understanding the influence of the national language on the formation of consciousness. A. S. Shishkov, one of the key figures in the initial stage of the formation of Russian conservatism and an active participant in this discussion, saw a clear connection between language and the picture of the world - from his point of view, it is the language that a person masters primarily, as native and main, that determines the set of concepts and meanings assimilated by him, which, in turn, determine the morality and manner of behavior of a person. In this regard, Shishkov was capable of a kind of scientific insight, coming close to defining the concept of linguistic mentality and to the formation of a unique philosophy of language, which demonstrated the deep linguistic intuition of the creator of "Conversations of Lovers of the Russian Word" ³⁴⁵. For Shishkov, the appeal to the social significance of language as the basis of personal morality and value correlation with the tradition of ancestors was of fundamental importance: “according to A.S. Shishkov, the use of a word in unfamiliar semantic connections (“links of concepts”), “imposed” by foreign word usage, “reshapes” the consciousness of the speaker, in modern

³⁴⁵Kamchatnov A. M. Shishkov as a forerunner of Russian philosophy of language // Bulletin of the library "House of A.F. Losev". Moscow: Vodolay, 2009. Issue 9. Pp. 73–89.

scientific language, changes the linguistic picture of the world in the consciousness of the speaker, depriving him of linguistic intuition ³⁴⁶. ”

The publisher of the "Russian Messenger" S. N. Glinka continued Shishkov's similar reasoning, noting that "as the meaning of words changes, so do concepts; words are closely connected with thoughts, and thoughts with deeds. What will follow if every century and half a century, our words, concepts and deeds change; finally, if every year and every month, we are educated according to the whims of taste and foreign fashions? ³⁴⁷"

In this regard, it can be said that the task of securing in socio-political discourse for certain units of language, including borrowed ones, those conceptual meanings that organically follow from national tradition and serve the interests of strengthening national identity, was inherited by conservatives in post-reform Russia from their ideological predecessors.

The socio-political attitudes conveyed by conservatives allow us to say that the accusations often made against them of opposition to social development, chauvinism, and aspirations for political and cultural isolationism are hardly fair. If conservatives did fight for the interests of the state-forming nation, then for the most part in cases where these interests were infringed upon to the detriment of political common sense, and they fought in the interests of a supra-ethnic whole – the imperial state. They were not isolationists in the full sense of the word, since they were focused on cultural dialogue with other peoples, demanding only that their compatriots could act as equal parties in this dialogue, having a clear understanding of their distinctive national view, and not being in eternal cultural apprenticeship.

Conservative ideology, which began its formation in Russia not under the wing of the authorities, but in the environment of a patriotically minded educated society, developed for a long time as an oppositional socio-political movement. After the change in the government's course, having been theoretically refined and adopted

³⁴⁶Sedova D. D. "Archaists" and "Innovators": Generalization of the Controversy // Rhema. Rema. 2009. No. 3. P. 57–69.

³⁴⁷Russian Herald. 1811. No. 7.

by the state as a basis for the official state ideology, it became an accessory of the administrative -bureaucratic apparatus; in society, on the contrary, it began to cause ridicule and hidden criticism, the open manifestations of which were suppressed by censorship. As in the era of Catherine, under Nicholas I, society was not concerned with the development of conservative ideology - the state coped with this perfectly well. But during Nicholas's reign, the state obviously overdid it in this direction, creating a system of information terror that outraged even the conservatively patriotically minded part of society and separated the emperor from the intellectual elite of the nation.

Soon the political situation changed again, the era of liberal reforms of Alexander II again transferred the "center of gravity" of Russian conservatism to the public social and literary sphere, turning conservative monarchists into an opposition consisting of people who thought independently and were ready to defend their views from attacks by both censorship and fellow writers, most of whom enthusiastically welcomed the liberal reforms. The literary talents of M. N. Katkov, I. S. Aksakov, N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov, F. M. Dostoevsky, V. P. Meshchersky created a harmonious system of conservative views, the basis of which were religious beliefs free from obscurantism, monarchism free from servility, patriotism without chauvinism and state pragmatism.

In an effort to actualize in the contemporary socio-political discourse the ideological formula proposed at the previous stage of the formation of the conservative idea and largely discredited by the short-sighted information policy of the reign of Nicholas I, conservative journalists of post-reform Russia tried to reconceptualize its basic concepts, introducing into them an element of internal, hidden polemics with the key concepts of the ideology of their opponents.

In the most concise form, the concepts they reconceptualized could be characterized as follows:

1. **Orthodoxy** , understood in the spiritual sense as the absolute embodiment of freedom of spirit, and at the level of socio-political practice as a system of values of society, which, firstly, establishes the priority of spiritual goods in relation to

material ones and the interests of the collective in relation to the individual, and secondly, forms a clear idea of the cultural, spiritual identity of the followers of this system of values, their isolation in relation to the rest of the world (cultural sovereignty) and consolidates society on the basis of the declared cultural opposition to other states and societies, thereby guaranteeing not only spiritual freedom, but also political freedom from foreign influence and domination.

2. **Autocracy** , understood as the immutable value of national political sovereignty, ensured by a strong state with a centralized system of government, gravitating toward the concentration of all indivisible power in the person of a specific person with the aim of ensuring social equality due to the supra-class nature of government, based on the understanding of power as a burden, and citizenship as the awareness of the inseparability of duties and rights;

3. **Nationality**, symbolizing the fraternal unity of the subjects of the empire in filial devotion to the monarch and politically realized in a multinational imperial state in the form of a system of integral nationalism, i.e. recognition of the priority of the political interests of the sovereign people as the core of a multiethnic statehood, against the background of broad cultural autonomy of small peoples, aimed at preserving the characteristics of their language, culture, everyday traditions and the desire to establish equal rights and opportunities for representatives of the various peoples of the empire.

Chapter 2. Communicative practices of Russian conservative journalism in the post-reform period

The fundamental question that the research undertaken in this section of the work is aimed at solving is the question of why the conservative philosophical and political doctrine was unable to successfully position itself in the Russian public consciousness of post-reform Russia and collapsed at the turn of the century, unable to oppose anything to the impending revolution. Having analyzed the main concepts of Russian conservatism, we must admit that historical experience proves the viability and sustainability in Russian political practice of those attitudes that it postulated. Therefore, it can be assumed that the reasons are not in the failure of the doctrine itself, but in the circumstances that accompanied its presentation to the broad public consciousness, in other words, not in the ideas, but in the practice of conveying them to the addressee. This forces us to turn to the analysis of the communicative practices of Russian conservatives.

Communicative practices, as part of social practices, are always largely determined by the realities of the era - technical, social, cultural, political, etc. Studying communicative practices in historical retrospect, we need to consider several fundamentally important components of each publishing project in the context of the era under study. The main one is goal setting: what goal did the author of a particular publishing project set for himself, why did he need to engage in social communication, how did he see his social mission? At the same time, it is necessary to ask the question of to what extent this goal was objectively achievable in the context of the socio-cultural processes of the era.

Naturally, the next aspect is the relevance of the means used by the publisher to achieve these goals. This concerns the genre and stylistic features of the publications that were characteristic of various publishing projects, the

organizational structure of the editorial work, the ways of interacting with the readership, the nature of the relationship with the authorities and censorship.

It is important to emphasize once again that the evaluation of communication practices in terms of their effectiveness is possible only under the condition of a clear understanding of the main goal pursued by a given publisher or public figure. For example, in a number of cases, such traditional indicators of the effectiveness of journalistic communication as the growth of popularity and circulation of publications, positive feedback from readers, recognition of the professional environment, etc., will not be criteria for success - perhaps the publisher from the very beginning did not count on popularity with the public and turned a blind eye to the possible contempt of colleagues in the industry, having in mind other tasks of his communication strategy.

This chapter attempts to analyze the communication practices of the most significant publishers of the conservative trend, examining their most large-scale publishing projects through the prism of their stated goals. In some cases, such a study will partly overlap with the genre of an essay on the creative biography of a publisher, but we will touch on biographical details only to the extent that they had a significant impact on the formation of the communication strategy of a particular character in the narrative. For example, it is impossible to underestimate the importance of aristocratic origin for the communication strategy chosen by Prince V.P. Meshchersky, or not to realize that the choice of journalistic style and type of publication by N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov is conditioned by his theological education and origin from the clergy.

The difference in the studied communicative practices also determined the asymmetrical structure of the chapter – the paragraphs differ significantly in length, and there are objective reasons for this. The publishing activity of F. M. Dostoevsky as a journalist of a conservative orientation was not as long and varied as, for example, the activity of V. P. Meshchersky, although the ideological, spiritual influence of Dostoevsky as a thinker on the formation of conservative thought and

on the contemporary socio-political discourse as a whole was much more significant than that of the publisher of "Grazhdanin".

The degree of success of publishing activities in terms of the scale of their influence on society and politics does not correlate directly with their duration and diversity of forms, and in the context of the research task at hand, it is necessary to study, if possible, all the details and circumstances that determined the evolution of publishing projects and the degree of their effectiveness, paying due attention to both the achievements and failures of publishers. Analysis of the effectiveness of the communicative practices of conservative journalists presupposes consideration of the causes and consequences of the transformation of publishing forms to a greater extent than the statement of the success of a once-found model of an influential publication. In this regard, it is understandable that the activities of the creator of several dynamically changing projects will be given more attention than the author of a single, albeit much more successful, publication.

§ 2.1. M. N. Katkov's communicative strategy: from influencing the reader to influencing the official

In relation to the communicative practices of conservative journalism, the phenomenon of M. N. Katkov as a “statesman without a state position” is of primary interest. The question of Katkov’s true position in the socio-political life of contemporary Russia remains open despite numerous studies devoted to this problem. The nature of the fluctuations in the attitude of researchers towards Katkov, depending on the political situation of the era and the documentary materials at the disposal of scientists, is exhaustively described in a detailed historiographical essay by S. M. Sankova³⁴⁸. De jure, being a retired professor and editor of a newspaper not popular with the general reader, de facto Katkov was one of the most influential figures in Russia’s domestic and foreign policy in the 1870s–80s – there is no disagreement between researchers in this regard. Nor is there a comprehensive

³⁴⁸Sankova S. M. Statesman without a government position. M. N. Katkov as an ideologist of state nationalism. Historiographic aspect. St. Petersburg: Nestor, 2007.

understanding of the origins and practical mechanisms of this exceptional political influence.

The memoirs and epistolary legacy of the highest government officials and public figures of that era, as well as the office papers of the Third Section of the OEIVC, provide rich material for studying this issue. In private records and classified reports, one can find information about those hidden springs of the bureaucratic machine that forced the course of state affairs to be subject to the influence of a person not vested with formal power, while newspaper publications and open official documents show only the external layer of the socio-political life of the era. Let us consider the biography and public activity of Katkov through the prism of these specific sources.

Katkov began his journalistic work in 1839. While a student at the Moscow Imperial University, Katkov began collaborating with the *Moskovsky Nablyudatel*, whose editor at the time was V. G. Belinsky, a close friend of Katkov at the time. In May of the same year, Katkov negotiated with the editor of *Otechestvennye Zapiski*, A. A. Kraevsky, about collaborating on the magazine, and in October he moved from Moscow to St. Petersburg to devote himself entirely to the magazine. His first youthful works did not go unnoticed: Katkov's article, written about a collection of folk songs published by I. P. Sakharov, was even attributed to the famous Moscow professor N. I. Nadezhdin.³⁴⁹

In addition, Katkov translates many masterpieces of world literature, and the public also finds his translations successful. His translations from Shakespeare, Heine and Hoffmann appear on the pages of *Otechestvennye Zapiski* and *Literary Supplement to the "Russian Invalid"*.

While studying at the University of Berlin (1840–1841), Katkov led a column in *Otechestvennye Zapiski* devoted to German literature, reporting foreign news, which was published in the "Mixture" section under the title "Berlin News". Upon returning from Berlin, Katkov temporarily stopped participating in the magazine and

³⁴⁹ Nevedensky S. Katkov and his time. St. Petersburg, 1889. P. 10.

devoted himself entirely to working on his dissertation, which he defended brilliantly in 1845. His scientific work “On the Elements and Forms of the Slavic-Russian Language” was highly praised by his colleagues at Moscow University. At this time, Katkov had a falling out with Belinsky, who was one of the main pillars of the editorial board of *Otechestvennye Zapiski*.

But probably the main reason for the interruption in his literary activity was poverty. Magazine publications took a lot of time and effort, but at that time they did not provide a livelihood. Katkov, a commoner by origin, born into a poor family, which, moreover, soon lost its father, was forced to take care not only of himself - he had an elderly mother and younger brother in his care. Lack of money forced Katkov to look for ways to strengthen his financial situation, and he seriously thought about civil service and a career as an official.

After defending his dissertation, Katkov became a professor at the Moscow Imperial University. The Department of Russian Literature was occupied at the time, and he was offered a position as an adjunct professor in the Department of Philosophy, where he lectured on psychology, logic, and the history of philosophy. Katkov’s professorial career was short-lived : in 1850, an order was issued that the teaching of philosophy should be transferred to professors of theology and clergy. At the request of Count Stroganov, the trustee of the Moscow educational district, Katkov received the position of editor of the university newspaper *Moskovskie Vedomosti*. Managing this publication from 1851 to 1856, Katkov acquired invaluable first experience in editorial work and not only showed himself to be a literary figure, but also demonstrated his abilities as a leader, entrepreneur, and organizer. However, a serious difficulty in the editor’s work was that the newspaper did not belong to him; His enterprise and initiative were largely limited by the university board, and Katkov began to think about independent publishing activities.

II lifted restrictions on the creation of new periodicals, Katkov decided to submit a petition to the Minister of Public Education A. S. Norov in 1855 for permission to publish a new magazine. Having received this, Katkov left his post as

editor of *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* and became the editor and publisher of the magazine *Russkiy Vestnik*.

The role of the "Russian Messenger" and its editor in the literary process was great. It was on the pages of this magazine that the greatest works of Russian classical literature saw the light: most of the works of F. M. Dostoevsky, "Provincial Essays" by M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin, novels by L. N. Tolstoy and stories by I. S. Turgenev, works by N. S. Leskov ("On the Knives"), A. F. Pisemsky ("The Turbulent Sea"), V. Krestovsky and many other famous Russian writers adorned the literary section of the publication.

From the point of view of his political position, Katkov's change of views is usually interpreted as a decisive turn from liberalism to conservatism. However, if we pay closer attention to the early period of Katkov's work and the youthful stage of his biography, we can see that there was no radical change - rather, there was a gradual acquisition of an independent and decisive voice as he overcame his natural youthful conformism in relation to the authorities that were unquestionable for his circle of friends and peers. In the late forties - mid -1850s, Katkov, in search of interesting interlocutors, comrades in development, joined the famous university circle of N. Stankevich, which became the intellectual cradle for many leading figures of the Russian liberal movement. But even during the times of Katkov's warmest relations with Belinsky, Bakunin, Herzen and other members of the circle, the latter often spoke of a feeling of alienation towards their young friend, who, despite their influence, still thought in his own unique way ³⁵⁰.

From his youth, Katkov, brought up in the spirit of a living and deep religiousness, sympathized with those philosophical systems that seek the possibility of reconciling the spiritual quest of religion with the movement of science along the path of rational knowledge; he saw in religious mysticism not a contradiction to knowledge, but "another knowledge" that organically complements the imperfection of the human mind. His fascination with the idealistic philosophical system of

³⁵⁰Nevedensky S. Katkov and his time. St. Petersburg, 1889. Pp. 64–67.

Schelling and his personal acquaintance in Berlin with the famous philosopher undoubtedly had a significant influence on him, while the friends of his youth were mainly carried away by the study of materialistic philosophical systems. From the second half of the 1840s, “Katkov completely moved away from Belinsky” and from that moment “he no longer joined any circles”³⁵¹, just like, incidentally, his future fierce opponent A. I. Herzen, who, having experienced an ideological break with his circle of close friends and having recognized the final collapse of his circle, left his homeland in 1847.

The second half of the 1850s was a period of interest for its surprising manifestation of public unanimity in supporting the general movement of renewal and reform. However, the reason for this unanimity was not that the entire Russian educated society, which comprised both the press and its readers, saw the prospects and tasks of this renewal in the same way, but that the short-sighted, excessively harsh information policy of the previous reign of Nicholas I had surprisingly united completely opposite social forces against itself. “In the first era of the literary movement that began with the new reign,” recalled N. A. Lyubimov, “the hidden discord that was hidden in this movement was not yet noticeable. There was a flow, as it were, of a common stream... but soon the discord in directions came to light...”³⁵² Even the publications of Katkov and Herzen did not yet differ as strikingly as after the turning point of 1862. Moreover, “in the minds of a less sophisticated audience, *Kolokol*, *Russkiy Vestnik*, and *Sovremennik* complemented each other³⁵³,” with the only difference being that their liberalism had different shades: a little more conservative in *Vestnik* and a little more radical in *Kolokol*, which, however, many explained only by the fact that *Russkiy Vestnik* spoke under censorship, while *Kolokol* broadcast freely.

³⁵¹Egorov B.F. *The Struggle of Aesthetic Ideas in Russia in the 1860s*. L., 1991. P. 304.

³⁵²Lyubimov N. A. M. N. Katkov and his historical merit. Based on documents and personal memories. SPb.: *Obshchestvennyye polza*, 1889. P. 6.

³⁵³Makushin L. M. M. N. Katkov and the “*Russian Herald*” in 1856–1862: from liberalism to conservatism // *Accents*. 2001. No. 5–6. P. 70–77.

In 1856–58, the Russian Herald was perceived by the censors as a quarrelsome magazine, and repeatedly incurred the wrath of the censors. In December 1858, censor von Kruse was even threatened with dismissal from his post for omitting several articles that had caused a lot of noise ³⁵⁴. The Third Section, which had included Katkov on the list of unreliable persons for his youthful literary experiments on the pages of *Otechestvennye Zapiski*, became more distrustful of the journalist during the first years of his editorship. But the temporary consolidation on the platform of moderate liberalism in the editorial board of the Russian Herald was short-lived ³⁵⁵. A conflict between the employees of the increasingly popular magazine led to a split in the editorial board – the radically minded B. N. Chicherin and E. F. Korsh left, while Katkov remained the full-fledged ideological leader of the publication.

In general, such a conflict between editors and employees was typical for Russian journalism in the 19th century: journalists wanted to express their social position, and the editor-publisher wanted to avoid censorship and save the magazine. However, in this case, the reasons for the confrontation were more serious: the fate of the Russian Herald to a large extent reflected the fate of the entire liberal current of Russian social thought during the period of internal demarcation of this heterogeneous ideological trend. The ideological pressure of Nicholas I's time, which equally excluded the possibility of practical influence on public opinion and state policy for representatives of all ideological currents, made opposition to the regime a universal unifying platform for the entire thinking intelligentsia. Now, when real prospects for social activity were opening up, yesterday's like-minded people, "making friends against" a third party hated by both, became opponents, and sometimes even enemies. In fact, it turned out that Katkov's youthful moderate liberalism was, in fact, a criticism of the policies of Nicholas I ; however, over time

³⁵⁴Nikitenko A.V. *Diary*. M.: Zakharov, 2005. T. 2. P. 98–99.

³⁵⁵Kantor, V. M. N. Katkov and the Collapse of the Aesthetics of Liberalism. // *Voprosy literatury*. 1973. No. 5. Pp. 23–35; Kitaev, V. A. *From the Fronde to Conservatism. From the History of Russian Liberal Thought in the 1850s–60s*. Moscow: Mysl, 1972.

Katkov will also consider her, although not always successful in her choice of means, “but correct in her goal.”

Gradually, the divergence of views became more and more obvious; Katkov’s moderately liberal “Russian Herald” would already begin attempts in 1861 to undermine Herzen’s exceptional authority by hints and indirections, which was especially obvious among young people who obtained and read London publications despite the bans. Speaking about the polemics of certain Russian publications with Herzen at this time, one can only mean indirect references to the materials of “Kolokol” and mentions of London exiles in the Aesopian language so familiar to the Russian censored press, since both Herzen’s works and his name were forbidden to be mentioned publicly, and “Russian journalists had to pass through the censors only hidden Herzen quotes, which were far from understandable to everyone.”³⁵⁶

In the second issue of the Russian Herald for 1861, in the article “Old Gods and New Gods,” Katkov openly polemicizes with *Sovremennik* and secretly, between the lines, makes ironic remarks about the authority of Herzen’s publications. Comparing Herzen with the Moscow soothsayer Ivan Yakovlevich, about whom there was much talk in Moscow at the time, Katkov writes that one should not reproach the unenlightened Moscow ladies who go to worship a charlatan soothsayer, if the educated Russian public just as blindly goes to worship their new idol, with whom even open polemics are forbidden, for “new cults have privileges: they are surrounded by the sanctuary of inviolability³⁵⁷. ” Let us recall that during these years a kind of pilgrimage took place: many Russians really did go to London, and not only those who had some real business with Herzen, but also those who wanted to see him simply out of curiosity: “Herzen was known as the ‘Apostle of Russian Freedom’, as he was then called by street boys in London, who brought Russian tourists to worship him³⁵⁸. ”

³⁵⁶Gromova L. P. A. I. Herzen and Russian journalism of his time: dis. ... Doctor of Philological Sciences. St. Petersburg: Publishing house of St. Petersburg University, 1994. P. 93.

³⁵⁷Russian Bulletin. 1861. No. 2. P. 894.

³⁵⁸Pavlov N. M. Katkov's controversy with Herzen. An episode from the sixties.// Russian Review. 1895. No. 5. P. 311.

After the *Russkiy Vestnik* rapidly evolved to the right under Katkov's "single-power" leadership, led the polemics of the Russian censored press with Herzen ³⁵⁹, and entered into confrontation with *Sovremennik*, the journalist, who had once been considered ideologically dangerous, was already viewed by the censors as a well-intentioned person. However, Katkov's acquisition of that exceptional status, which provided him with significant influence on the course of state affairs, occurred already in 1863, when Katkov acquired the *Moskovskie Vedomosti* newspaper on lease.

The fact that the transfer of the newspaper for lease to Katkov coincided with his transition to statist, pro-monarchist positions forced both his contemporaries and researchers to suspect the journalist that his devotion to the throne was not selfless, but well-paid ³⁶⁰, especially since *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* had an important privilege – the right to publish government announcements. However, these accusations had no serious basis: the initiator of the lease of the newspaper was the Moscow Imperial University, which owned the publication and which, when choosing a lessee from among the persons competing for this right, was guided exclusively by considerations of material gain; the lease contract was drawn up in such a way that the profit from government announcements did not constitute a significant income for the lessee; no evidence of interference by the authorities in the course of the announced “tender” and the drafting of the terms with the lessee could be found ³⁶¹.

The strengthening of Katkov's pro-monarchist positions was largely due to the political context of the time. The events that determined the political agenda at the beginning of 1863 were the uprising in Poland and the diplomatic war against Russia that broke out in connection with it. The European powers had repeatedly used the

³⁵⁹Kruglikova O. S. Publicism and social activities of M. N. Katkov. Publicist and power. Saarbrücken: LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing, 2011.

³⁶⁰Tvardovskaya V. A. Ideology of post-reform autocracy (M. N. Katkov and his publications). Moscow, 1978.

³⁶¹Kruglikova O. S. Transfer of the newspaper *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* on lease to M. N. Katkov in 1863 (political context and financial terms of the contract) // Bulletin of St. Petersburg State University. Series 9. 2007. No. 4-2. Pp. 248–255.

Polish question to put pressure on Russia. Even during the Crimean War, the countries of the anti-Russian coalition attempted to form Polish military units for the war with Russia, and in the early 1860s, the major colonial powers, primarily France, maintained active relations with the Polish revolutionary committee and promised it not only diplomatic support, but also direct military intervention in the event of a uprising by Polish revolutionaries. Soon after the start of the uprising, Russia received ultimatums from three powers - England, France and Austria - demanding a speedy resolution of the Polish question and the satisfaction of all the political demands of the rebels.

The Russian government found itself in a grave crisis: against the backdrop of destabilization in domestic politics caused by the period of reforms, it could not bring itself to swiftly and harshly suppress the military uprisings of the rebels, although force was certainly on the side of the empire, and there was nothing to hope for in a direct military confrontation with the Poles. But the government did not have the political support for decisive action - the anti-government movement was rapidly developing in society and the opposition was growing stronger. Colossal foreign policy pressure complicated the situation, especially since the Russian army, which had suffered a crushing defeat several years earlier at the hands of the united military forces of Europe, was in the process of a complete systemic modernization, designed for a long period and which was in progress at the very beginning. Minister of War D. A. Milyutin was forced to give a disappointing answer to the sovereign's direct question about the combat readiness of the army during this transitional period ³⁶². The government, in essence, had nothing to choose from: a European war was an honorable death in battle, and concessions to the demands of foreigners were shame and political suicide.

The editor of *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* made a difficult decision: despite the fact that he was critical of many of the domestic political processes of the era, Katkov began to serve the interests of national statehood at a time of crisis. His activities

³⁶²Milyutin D. A. *Memories of Field Marshal Count Dmitry Alekseevich Milyutin, 1863–1864* / edited by L. G. Zakharova. Moscow: Rosspen, 2003.

during the Polish Uprising have been covered in great detail in scientific literature. From the first days of the uprising, Katkov unconditionally and confidently demanded its prompt suppression, convinced society that European threats were nothing more than a political bluff, sharply polemicized with the illegal émigré press, and sounded the alarm about the separatist tendencies that emerged as a result of the uprising in other outskirts of the Russian Empire. But most importantly, he conducted a broad propaganda campaign to consolidate public forces within the country. Having declared that "the energy and unanimity with which the Russian people would speak out against plans that were not in line with the vital interests of Russia could have a considerable influence on the further course of events," Katkov not only supported, but partly initiated, a wave of patriotic demonstrations that found expression in the mass submission of loyalist addresses. Katkov took an active part in compiling some of them (from the Moscow nobility, from the Moscow Imperial University, and from the Old Believers-bespopovtsy) ³⁶³and provoked the further development of this social movement, whipping up a patriotic frenzy around the submission of addresses. Carried away by the patriotic wave, the public consolidated around the throne, and the government received, albeit temporary, but much-needed unanimous support from the people.

L. M. Makushin in his article about the "Katkov Department" ³⁶⁴notes that Katkov managed to create a well-coordinated ideological machine, in which each of his publications carried out its own political maneuver in the context of a general propaganda campaign. After M. N. Katkov became the lessee of "Moskovskie Vedomosti", "Russky Vestnik" acquired a new status and new functions. Katkov considered any issue from the point of view of its correlation with the political processes in the country, and at the same time was an exclusively authoritarian editor (despite the fact that the main current work on editing "Russky Vestnik" gradually passed to his friend and comrade-in-arms P. M. Leontiev, Katkov never ceased to

³⁶³Kruglikova O. S. Publicism and social activities of M. N. Katkov. Publicist and power. Saarbrücken: LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing, 2011.

³⁶⁴Makushin L. M. "Katkov's Department": ideology and technology" // Accents. Voronezh, 2002. Issue. 1–2. P. 37–45.

control the general direction of the magazine), so that all of his publications clearly reflected a single system of political views. Lyubimov was in charge of both the editorial board's material issues and the content of the literary and news sections, but he was forbidden to write political reviews - the formulation of the publication's political views was Katkov's exclusive prerogative. And since Katkov, "issuing six editorials a week for *Moskovskiyye Vedomosti*, was unable to provide *Russkiy Vestnik* with his journalism" ³⁶⁵, then from 1863 political reviews in the magazine ceased altogether.

"*Moskovskie Vedomosti*" responded vividly to the burning issues of the day in a short newspaper format, while "*Russkiy Vestnik*" was supposed to provide scientific and historical substantiation of the publisher's political positions, and to give the newspaper's publications depth and thoroughness of argumentation.

The July 1863 issue of the *Russian Herald* published an article by P.K. Shchebalsky entitled "French Policy in Poland in 1768–69." The obvious purpose of this publication was to emphasize the role of France and England as provocateurs of the Polish uprising, as indicated by Katkov's newspaper, showing in a historical context that the stimulation of Polish-Russian national antagonism had traditionally been a characteristic feature of French foreign policy.

From the moment the uprising began in Poland, there were fears that it could spread to the neighboring regions of Little Russia, where the element of the Polish Catholic gentry had historically been strong, so it was important to immediately begin an ideological struggle in this direction, so in the August issue of the *Russian Herald* there appeared an article not by a professional historian, but by the writer and publicist Vasily Avseenko, "Little Russian gentry in 1762. New materials on the history of the 18th century," which had the goal of demonstrating, on the basis of historical documents, the mutually beneficial and generally loyal relations between the Little Russian nobility and the Russian monarchy.

³⁶⁵Russian Writers. 1800–1917: Biographical Dictionary / compiled by P. A. Nikolaev. Moscow: Kniga, 1982. Vol. 2. P. 510.

It was not easy for the editors of the magazine to promptly prepare serious scientific historical research that would correspond to the political goals of the "Katkov Department"; it took time. By the beginning of 1864, a whole pool of historical publications had been prepared that met the objectives of anti-Polish propaganda, many of which were written by the then flagship of historical topics in the "Russky Vestnik" D. I. Ilovaisky. His article "May 3, 1791" was published in the January 1864 issue. On that day, the short-lived (only 19 months) Polish Constitution was adopted. It is important that the very fact of an attempt to adopt such a constitution was the response of the last Polish monarch Stanislaw August Poniatowski to the obvious signs of degradation of the state system of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. As is well known, one of the fundamental points in Katkov's anti-Polish propaganda was the reference to the fact that Polish state sovereignty ceased to exist not at all in connection with Russian aggression, but due to internal political processes that reflected the inability of the Polish nation to organize statehood.

The Polish theme is just one of the precedents of the coordinated information impact of the editorial boards of *Moskovskie Vedomosti* and *Russkiy Vestnik*. In the future, each new turn in Russian foreign policy will be covered in the magazine in terms of its historical background. For example, in 1868, during another aggravation of the political confrontation in the Balkans, associated with the opposition of the combined forces of Anglo-French diplomacy to the development of the Union of Balkan States created by Russia. Under pressure from the Anglo-French coalition, the Union ceased to exist in 1868, in response to which Russia took a standard step for itself in the case of all diplomatic disputes with England - it increased the threat to the Indian colonies by annexing the Kohan Kingdom and began actively developing Central Asian markets, which ultimately led to a general escalation of tension in the Eastern Question.

At this time, Katkov in *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* furiously denounced external enemies, and *Russkiy Vestnik* again worked out its maneuver in this campaign: from January to May 1868, historical and popularizing publications by E. M. Feoktistov

appeared on its pages: “Review of Rosen’s book “Russian policy in the East before the Crimean War””, “Russian diplomacy in Greece’s struggle for independence”. The goal of these publications is transparent and quite traditional – to substantiate the selflessness, historical and moral right of Russian claims in the Balkans.

Returning to the moment of the beginning of the Polish uprising, it is necessary to note that Katkov's popularity in society at that time was rapidly growing, his publications attracted wide public attention, in the eyes of the majority of the public, and also of his fellow writers, at that time Katkov was the ideological leader of Russian society. Naturally, Katkov's activities attracted the attention of many high-ranking officials. The Minister of Internal Affairs P. A. Valuev entered into correspondence with him, the Milyutin brothers and the Minister of Public Education A. N. Golovnin became close to him, through the mediation of F. I. Tyutchev Katkov interacted with the Minister of Foreign Affairs A. M. Gorchakov. For Katkov, the Polish uprising became the beginning of his ascent from a retired university professor to a "herald of the people's will", who did not hesitate to give advice not only to the government, but also to the Russian autocrats. Even A. I. Herzen, his fierce opponent, would ironically call his employees “the government editorial board of the Russian Herald.”³⁶⁶

However, it is fundamentally important to note that during this ascent, the system of relations between the journalist and the authorities was not reduced to the ideological dictate of officials in relation to the publication. Katkov sought to simultaneously maintain both the goodwill of the higher spheres and the freedom of ideological maneuver, although both the Minister of Internal Affairs and the Minister of Public Education wanted to seize Katkov's pen and the popularity of his publication to solve their own political problems.

In one of his letters in the summer of 1863, P. A. Valuev suggests that the journalist, in order to avoid possible distortions of information received from the editorial correspondents, contact the minister directly for information on any issue

³⁶⁶Herzen A.I. Collected works: in 30 volumes / ed. V. P. Volgina. M.: Publishing House of the USSR Academy of Sciences, 1956. T. 17. P. 112.

of interest to him. In subsequent letters, he repeatedly repeats his proposal to report “accurate and reliable information ³⁶⁷.” Katkov does not directly refuse the proposed cooperation, but does not resort to it either³⁶⁸. The minister’s persuasion to use correspondence with him as a source of reliable information continues in subsequent letters: “If you want to inquire about something, write simply: is this and that true, on half a page. I promise in the same pagina fracta quick and definitive answers” ³⁶⁹.

Golovnin considered it possible for the state treasury to make a concession to the newspaper in the fee for sending the issues to subscribers by mail. Katkov refused this offer. Since the minister approached the publisher a second time with a proposal to assist the newspaper, Katkov pointed out that it would be more convenient for the editors if they were given the right to independently seal the post-packages when sending the publication and send them to the railway station, bypassing the newspaper dispatch service. Moreover, Katkov himself petitioned not for a reduction in the newspaper's fee to the post office, but only for the elimination of the organizational inconvenience.

The Minister of Public Education sent a petition to the postal service, offering not only to accommodate the publication, but also to reduce the newspaper's fee to the post office in connection with the independent performance of this type of work by the editorial staff. However, the postal service refused. Arriving in Moscow and personally talking with Katkov, the Minister of Public Education suggested to the editor to open a special pedagogical department in *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*, which would be regularly supplied with articles on the organization of the education system in the Russian Empire. With such a department in mind, the Ministry of Public Education would purchase more than 2,000 copies of the newspaper annually. This was already an obvious offer of "sponsorship" on the part of the ministry, and an

³⁶⁷M. N. Katkov and P. A. Valuev in their correspondence // *Russkaya Starina*. 1915. No. 9. P. 412.

³⁶⁸The correspondence between Katkov and Valuev has not been fully preserved; there are only eight letters from Katkov, while there are 30 letters from Valuev, so the content of Katkov’s missing letters can only be partially reconstructed from Valuev’s responses.

³⁶⁹M. N. Katkov and P. A. Valuev in their correspondence // *Russkaya Starina*. 1915. No. 9. P. 412.

extremely profitable offer - more than 2,000 guaranteed subscribers. However, Katkov refused this offer as well ³⁷⁰.

It was important for the editor of *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* to maintain his independence, and although he avoided direct confrontation with the ministers, his newspaper did not hesitate to criticize the activities of both departments. For some time, the ministers did not lose hope of taming the obstinate Katkov. This created a serious problem for the officials of the censorship department. As early as August 1863, numerous comments from censors were received on the articles of *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*, because "Katkov cuts from the shoulder right and left." ³⁷¹ However, the high authorities left his critical antics unattended for a long time - in October 1863, A. V. Nikitenko noted in his diary that "Golovnin does not want Katkov to be responded to with some force for his attacks on the Ministry of Public Education, against which he fights fiercely and abusively."³⁷² The ministers' indulgence put the censors in an awkward position, so that by the beginning of 1864 Katkov's relations with the censors were almost comical: "Today at a meeting of the Council for Press Affairs," writes Nikitenko, "among other things, a most abusive article in *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* about Petersburg was reported. I said on that occasion that the Council could not decide anything about Katkov: let the minister deal with him as he considered most convenient, and the Council would only be ridiculous, listening to and fruitlessly recording in its minutes what it could not resist and what it was unable to stop ³⁷³." Katkov graciously accepted the ministers' curtseys towards him, but was prepared to support in the press only those ideas that he sincerely shared.

However, the patience of senior officials was not limitless, and Valuev began to get irritated by the fact that Katkov had "something like an *idé e fix* on the need

³⁷⁰Lyubimov N. A. M. N. Katkov and his historical merit. St. Petersburg: Public benefit, 1889.

³⁷¹Nikitenko A.V. Diary: in 3 volumes. M.: Zakharov, 2005. T. 2. P. 450.

³⁷²Ibid. P. 469.

³⁷³Ibid. P. 496.

for an exceptional situation for *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*³⁷⁴. By the beginning of 1866, Valuev's dissatisfaction had reached its peak - having despaired of improving relations with Katkov, the minister decided to give the newspaper three warnings, and publication was suspended. This episode is described in great detail in the scientific literature: Katkov refused to publish the warnings he received, paid all the necessary fines and, having been officially removed from the editorship, temporarily handed over the newspaper to his friend and colleague N. A. Lyubimov, but did not compromise with the minister. The government was interested in stopping the hype that had unfolded in the press around the scandalous confrontation between the minister and the journalist, and thanks to the personal intervention of Alexander II, who returned Katkov the right to publish the newspaper, the latter not only defended his right to discuss ministerial affairs, but also received permission in the future to address letters directly to the sovereign³⁷⁵.

The situation turned in Katkov's favor also because the conflict with the censorship broke out on the eve of Karakozov's assassination attempt on Alexander II. Against the backdrop of this event, the struggle of the liberal minister (and precisely the one in whose immediate competence were the issues of the sovereign's security) with the best publication of the protective-monarchist wing looked very symptomatic, which was immediately reflected in the epigram written by V. P. Meshchersky:

The day before the fateful day,

Inflamed with tinsel zeal,

Warned. Who? Katkov!

But he didn't warn the tsar...³⁷⁶

³⁷⁴Diary of P. A. Valuev, Minister of Internal Affairs / edited by P. A. Zayonchkovsky. Moscow: Publishing house of the USSR Academy of Sciences, 1961. Vol. 2. P. 180.

³⁷⁵Derevyagina E. V. On the censorship history of M. N. Katkov's *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*. // The educational mission of journalism. St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg State University Publishing House, 2004. Pp. 62–74; Kantor R. M. The crisis of *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* in 1866. St. Petersburg, 1922.

³⁷⁶Meshchersky V.P. Letters to Tveritino // Russian Bulletin. 1897. No. 8. P. 43.

Katkov's readiness to defend his opinion in a dispute with the government and censorship was positively assessed even by journalists of the following generations, including in the liberal environment. Vlas Doroshevich, comparing in his memoirs the behavior of Katkov and Suvorin in similar situations of clashes with censorship, gives undoubted preference to Katkov, who "had the resourcefulness and courage at the right moment: - Not to obey. And not to pay the fine imposed on him. Defending his independence. I. S. Aksakov responded to the warning for "lack of patriotism" with a thunderous article. (...) These were newspaper publishers. Suvorin silently subordinated "New Time" to the order ³⁷⁷." Katkov managed to position himself in such a way that in the future, officials who tried to gain his friendship and support did not risk turning to propaganda for those measures that, as they knew, Katkov could not sincerely approve. "Katkov's outstanding abilities as a writer and publicist, his popularity sometimes forced the leaders of the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Internal Affairs to resort to the help of Katkov's pen in order to popularize those measures and their initiatives that, as they knew, coincided with his personal views ³⁷⁸."

The attitude of the Third Section officials towards the moderate liberal journalist who had once been included in the list of unreliable people was also constantly changing. In 1863, Katkov was the embodiment of public opinion, and public opinion that was advantageous to the government, based on the idea of consolidation around the throne in the face of the threat of an external enemy and internal revolutionary upheavals, an opinion that needed to be protected from harmful influences. Katkov's contacts and conversations were the subject of the keenest interest of the Moscow Chief of Police, who monitored them on behalf of the Chief of Gendarmes, General A. L. Potapov. After Katkov was visited by the British embassy translator Thomas Mitchell on May 1, 1863, the chief of police sent a reassuring report to his superiors that as a result of a conversation with a foreign

³⁷⁷Doroshevich V. M. *Memories*. Moscow: New Literary Review, 2008. P. 604.

³⁷⁸M. N. Katkov and P. A. Valuev in their correspondence // *Russkaya Starina*. 1915. No. 8. P. 289.

agent, whose goal was to change Katkov's hostile attitude towards England as one of the parties deliberately inciting the Polish uprising, the journalist did not change his patriotic mood, and the foreigner left without achieving success ³⁷⁹.

Later, the government's idea of vigilantly monitoring changes in the political positions of both the editor of *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* and his opponents was strengthened and developed. The officials of the Third Section, who made extracts from the censored letters of persons suspected of unreliability and placed under secret police surveillance for reports to their superiors, obviously had orders to monitor any negative statements about Katkov as statements indirectly insulting the government itself.

Their attention was drawn to a fragment from a letter from I. A. Zabelin, an official on special assignments to the Vilnius Governor-General, from Vilnius on September 5, 1866 to Ivan Belyustin in Kalyazin, Tver Province: "No Pole could have done as much harm to the Russian cause as the scoundrel Katkov. This is a raging vanity, which, with the extreme limitations of local information, wants to rule the whole of Russia." In 1866, I. A. Zabelin headed the editorial board of the oldest Lithuanian newspaper, the *Vilensky Vestnik*. His letter also contains a curious indication that the authorities were secretly restricting the press in its desire to polemicize with Katkov's publication: "I am forbidden to write against Katkov, against his absurd fantasies about the Russification of the Jews and Poles through the Russian language ³⁸⁰."

The most trenchant statements sometimes led to further investigations and measures on the part of the authorities. One of such reasons for investigation was an extract from a letter signed "P. Rat." from Geneva on September 16, 1870 to retired Colonel Vasiliev in Warsaw "... it is very regrettable that Messrs. Katkov and his ilk, instead of pointing out everything useful that we should borrow from the institutions of all branches of Germany (...) with their essentially useless writing irritate the

³⁷⁹Report of the Moscow Chief of Police to General Potapov dated May 1, 1863 // GARF. F. 109 (Third Section). Op. 38. D. 23. Part 84. L. 81–83.

³⁸⁰ Excerpts from letters of certain persons // GARF. F. 109 (Third Section). Op. 1. File 1969. L. 5.

nationalities within and impudently offend their neighbors. (...) God protect us from the influence of journalism, whose heroes, instead of a conscientious explanation, are ready to plunge everything into chaos, just to have more subscribers ³⁸¹. " The extract contains a note in the hand of the manager of the 3rd section dated September 28, 1870: "To the Chief of the Warsaw Gendarme District, secret: "I ask Your Excellency to order a secret investigation and to inform me who P. Rat may be." ³⁸²The response received, marked "secret," stated that "P. Rat" was Lieutenant General Pyotr Alekseevich Ratov, whose activities were now under the watchful eye of the police ³⁸³.

It should be noted that Katkov's courage and determination in interacting with the authorities were given by the truly nationwide popularity he acquired during the Polish uprising. The nature of the uprising was such that the demands for social reforms proclaimed at the beginning gradually gave way to territorial claims. Even the Russian liberal intelligentsia, which sympathized with the Poles, was not prepared to support the demands for the separation of several large provinces from the empire and was irritated by the foreign policy pressure on the government. A healthy instinct for national self-preservation contributed to unity in the face of the "Polish threat", and Katkov, with his fiery calls for unity in the struggle, became increasingly popular. But unanimity weakened as the uprising pacified, and soon the unity of public opinion on key political issues came to an end. And at the same time, Katkov's exceptional popularity in society was also on the wane.

Katkov's faith in the influence of the printed word on the masses was shaken, but the experience of interaction with the official-bureaucratic environment indicated the possibility of another way of participating in state affairs. From now on, Katkov tries to reinforce the influence of publications on society with the influence of the publisher on the government. The newspaper's circulation at this time was steadily falling (as E. M. Feoktistov notes: "Moskovskie Vedomosti" only

³⁸¹Ibid. L. 3.

³⁸²Ibid. L. 3 and 3 rev.

³⁸³Ibid. L. 4.

had a wide circle of readers during the Polish uprising of 1863, subsequently the number of their subscribers did not exceed 6,000 for the entire Russian Empire!"³⁸⁴), but the editor's political influence only grew.

As Katkov's court and official connections strengthened, society's attitude towards him changed. In May 1863, the Council of the Imperial Moscow University notified the trustee of the Moscow Academic District that the university professors had decided to honor Katkov with the title of honorary member of the university. Professor Polunin's submission stated: "Mikhail Nikiforovich Katkov studied at Moscow University and gloriously occupied the philosophy department there. Having left the department, he has been pursuing his literary career with no less glory, and with his literary works he has rendered a significant service to the fatherland and brought honor to the place of his upbringing"³⁸⁵. However, already in December 1863, members of the Academy of Sciences stubbornly resisted the election of Katkov as a corresponding member, which was being forced upon them by the president of the Academy. Nikitenko notes with satisfaction: "We somehow got rid of Katkov by presenting the reason that the set of corresponding members is full and there are no vacancies, although, strictly speaking, this is not the reason"³⁸⁶. The publication's increasingly pronounced conservative platform narrows the circle of devoted readers.

In 1865, during the period of growing conflict with Valuev, Katkov again managed to attract the sympathies of a significant part of society, but these sympathies were only the reverse side of public discontent with the minister. The Moscow nobility presented Katkov with a silver inkwell with a dedication "as an

³⁸⁴Feoktistov E. M. *Behind the Scenes of Politics and Literature. Memories // Behind the Scenes of Politics* (E. M. Feoktistov. V. D. Novitsky. F. Lear. M. E. Kleinmichel). Moscow: Sergei Dubov Foundation, 2001. P. 151.

³⁸⁵The case of the election of State Councilor Katkov as an honorary member of the University // CIAM. F. 418 (Moscow Imperial University). Op. 32. D. 154.

³⁸⁶Nikitenko A.V. *Diary: in 3 volumes*. M.: Zakharov, 2005. T. 2. P. 487.

expression of pleasure for the patriotic direction of his literary works" ³⁸⁷, and Moscow University supported him in the conflict with the censors ³⁸⁸.

But already in the early 1870s, officials of the Third Section made the following excerpt from a letter from L. Maine from Moscow dated March 5, 1872 to K. A. Bilbasov: "Many have already understood him in Moscow. It is impossible for him to rise in public opinion, and he, of course, realizing this, has given up and is playing "with all his might". He will not break his neck, people of this kind are despised, but cherished ³⁸⁹." Further, the author of the letter notes with obvious enthusiasm that subscriptions to *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* are falling and general interest in the newspaper is declining: "Let at least public contempt be expressed openly, since the press is shutting up everything and everyone ³⁹⁰."

Although liberal-minded people had left *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*, the narrow circle of permanent admirers that remained included mostly influential people. Conservative reformers, who were related to Katkov in their way of thinking and who, as a rule, were the key players in the small and large politics of the 1880s, drew arguments for their ideological position from *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*. Nikitenko was not entirely right when he wrote in his diary in February 1872 about the suspension of A. A. Kraevsky's newspaper *Golos* that the last independent newspaper in Russia had now ceased to exist, because *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* was not worth counting, because it had become a government newspaper ³⁹¹. *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* did not become a government newspaper in the sense that it did not become a reptilian publication, by definition loyal to everything that came from the department that sponsored it. Katkov chose the opposite path. Subtly using the editor's connections among high-ranking officials and the publication's popularity among high-ranking readers, *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* tried to create a

³⁸⁷News. December 23, 1865.

³⁸⁸Nikitenko A.V. Diary: in 3 volumes. M.: Zakharov, 2005. T. 3. P. 5.

³⁸⁹Excerpts from letters of certain individuals // GARF. F. 109 (Third Section). Op. 1. File 1969. L. 10.

³⁹⁰Ibid.

³⁹¹Nikitenko A.V. Diary: in 3 volumes. M.: Zakharov, 2005. T. 3. P. 328.

government with which they would agree in opinion and which they could support without compromising their principles.

In the second half of the 1870s, Katkov did exert a direct influence on a number of personnel decisions at the top. For example, the removal of N.Kh. Bunge from the post of Minister of Finance and his replacement with I.A. Vyshnegradsky was entirely attributed by his contemporaries to the activities of the editor of *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*. As S.Yu. Witte recalled, “Katkov, as a representative of the extremely conservative trend, waged war against the then Minister of Finance Bunge, a very respectable man with liberal views... Attacking Bunge, Katkov, together with the entire extreme conservative party that he led, had to put forward one of his own candidates. So he put forward Vyshnegradsky ³⁹². ”

It is important to note another point: each such appointment was Katkov's contribution to his political future. As Witte noted: "Katkov contributed greatly to Vyshnegradsky's appointment, and since Vyshnegradsky was apparently indebted to Katkov to a certain extent, he treated Katkov with great care when he became Minister of Finance ³⁹³." A particularly striking illustration of this principle is the appointment of D. A. Tolstoy as Minister of Public Education, which took place with Katkov's participation. Katkov had long been personally acquainted with the newly appointed minister; however, his journal, *Russkiy Vestnik*, was in conflict with Tolstoy as the Chief Prosecutor of the Synod ³⁹⁴, but the editor of *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* never disdained a temporary coalition with former opponents if it was necessary in the interests of the matter. The gymnasium reform carried out by Tolstoy was, in essence, the fulfillment of Katkov's directives, who was its true developer and inspirer. According to E. M. Feoktistov, Katkov's exceptional influence on the minister was explained primarily by Tolstoy's complete helplessness in the matter entrusted to him: "he had no ideas of his own, and he greedily seized

³⁹²Witte S. Yu. *Memories*: in 3 volumes. Vol. 1 (1849–1894) Childhood. The reigns of Alexander II and Alexander III . Moscow; Tallinn: Skif Alex, 1994. P. 276.

³⁹³*Ibid.*

³⁹⁴Lyubimov N. A. N. M. Katkov and his historical merit. St. Petersburg, 1889.

upon the man who stood before him with a fully prepared program ³⁹⁵." Katkov's influence on Tolstoy was not only an obvious fact for his contemporaries, but also a reason for wit. Nikitenko calls Katkov Tolstoy's "master" and records the following incident in his diary: "During the debate in the State Council commission on classicism and realism, when Count Tolstoy, defending classicism, lost his temper and praised it excessively, Chevkin, after finishing the reading, turned to Tolstoy and said: "You, Count, have not read everything Katkov says about this . "³⁹⁶

When Katkov gained the influence he needed over the Minister of Public Education ³⁹⁷, he faced another task: to defend the "obedient" minister against the attacks of the opposition and criticism from society. Tolstoy's appointment and his first steps under Katkov's leadership to introduce classicism did not meet with the approval of the liberal public. The future Minister of Internal Affairs M. T. Loris-Melikov wrote about D. A. Tolstoy: "This person, who stood for fifteen years at the head of one of the most important branches of state administration, did more harm to Russia than all the other figures, even taken together ³⁹⁸. "

Not only people of liberal views, but even adherents of conservative convictions, who respected Count Tolstoy personally, often did not approve of his activities as a minister and chief prosecutor. "I must say," writes Prince V.P. Meshchersky, "that the appointment of Count Tolstoy as Minister of Public Education and Chief Prosecutor of the Holy Synod was one of the greatest mistakes of the reign of Alexander II , for it would hardly have been possible to find a less suitable person for these two positions. (...) his shortcomings and spiritual

³⁹⁵ Feoktistov E. M. Behind the Scenes of Politics and Literature. Memories // Behind the Scenes of Politics (E. M. Feoktistov. V. D. Novitsky. F. Lear. M. E. Kleinmichel). Moscow: Sergei Dubov Foundation, 2001. P. 180.

³⁹⁶Nikitenko A.V. Diary: in 3 volumes. M.: Zakharov, 2005. T. 3. P. 319.

³⁹⁷ Kruglikova O. S. "Moskovskie Vedomosti" M. N. Katkova in the controversy about the education reform in the 1860-1870s // Bulletin of the Ural State University: Series 1: Problems of education, science and culture. 2008. Vol. 56. No. 23. P. 205–209.

³⁹⁸Figures of Russian history. Biographical reference book / comp. A. P. Shikman. M.: Nauka, 1997. P. 452.

characteristics were reconciled with any activity, with any position, with the exception of those two to which he was appointed ³⁹⁹. ”

Such general dissatisfaction with Tolstoy's appointment should have led to his inevitable rapid fall, but he held on to his posts until 1880 – and in large part thanks to the tireless activity of Katkov, who set the goal of keeping the "obedient" minister in power for as long as possible.

Katkov's correspondence with Alexander II and Alexander III (both in the status of Tsarevich and after his accession to the throne) on educational issues is quite extensive. And one of its important themes is the desire to emphasize Tolstoy's merits as a person, as a minister, as a loyal servant of the sovereign.

In his letters to Alexander II, Katkov repeatedly warns him against pandering to public opinion, which is agitating against the Minister of Public Education, since in troubled times people are inclined to “want what they themselves do not know, demand what they do not want, and act contrary to themselves ⁴⁰⁰.” Public opinion, Katkov admits, is against the current minister; the opposition reasonably believes that removing Tolstoy will stop the work of reform. However, the reform has been approved by the Tsar, and there is no need to listen to public opinion – the state can have only one master. Fearing to be accused of having a personal interest in the fate of the minister, Katkov writes: “I have no personal bias towards Count Tolstoy. I became close to him only in the interests of the cause which both he and I serve; in my personal relations with him, I would rather have reason to feel dissatisfied and even insulted. But God forbid that I should be guided in the matter of the common good by any personal considerations ⁴⁰¹. ”

Katkov's attempt to influence the change not only of gymnasium education, but also of the principles of the university's organization, caused resistance from the Moscow professors. In 1879, a conflict situation arose around the re-election of the rector of the Moscow Imperial University, N. S. Tikhonravov: the university council

³⁹⁹Meshchersky V. P. My Memories. Moscow: Zakharov, 2003. P. 555.

⁴⁰⁰ Letter from M. N. Katkov to Alexander II // RGIA. F. 1101. Op. 1. D. 705. L. 15.

⁴⁰¹Ibid. L. 19.

voted by an overwhelming majority (35 against 12) to leave N. S. Tikhonravov in this position. However, it was difficult to expect that this decision of the council would be unhindered by the trustee of the Moscow educational district, N. P. Meshchersky. The trustee, who was an ardent supporter of classicism, sympathized with Katkov, and Rector Tikhonravov not only had a well-deserved reputation as a person of liberal convictions and an opponent of the transformation of the university in favor of the classical system, but also consistently conducted litigation with the publisher, which arose in connection with financial misunderstandings between the university and *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*. Anticipating the possibility of opposition from the trustee to the confirmation of the elected rector, the Moscow Governor-General V. A. Dolgorukov addressed a special note to the Minister of Internal Affairs A. P. Valuev, and even asked the latter to forward this note to the sovereign ⁴⁰². In the note, the Governor-General wrote: " There is no proper agreement between the trustee and the rector on the affairs of the University... The lack of a proper share of self-confidence, weakness of character, tactlessness and the limitedness of the necessary talents in the matter of management have made the trustee morally dependent on the advice and instructions of Katkov." Katkov, "taking advantage of the constant appeal to him by the trustee, has great influence on the educational institutions of the Moscow educational district."

Complaining that Katkov was strongly opposed to Tikhonravov because of the financial dispute between the university and the editorial board, Dolgorukov expressed concerns that the trustee's attempt to pressure the university council and the failure to approve Professor Tikhonravov, beloved by both students and colleagues, could provoke student unrest and have dangerous political consequences: "there is no doubt that Katkov would like to use the trustee to install one of his supporters as rector instead of Tikhonravov, which, given the hostility of other professors and students alike, would threaten manifestations of general

⁴⁰² Correspondence between the Minister of Internal Affairs P.A. Valuev and the Moscow Governor-General Dolgorukov regarding the approval of Tikhonravov as rector of Moscow University // GARF. F. 109. Op. 1. D. 1238. L. 2.

discontent that would be dangerous for the peace of the University ⁴⁰³." Ultimately, the incident was resolved peacefully, but the very fact of secret correspondence at such a high level seems very symptomatic for assessing Katkov's role.

The education reform was especially hateful to the youth, for whom Katkov had already become a symbol of all social evil by the mid-1870s. N. P. Goncharov, who had been fired from the Technological Institute for participating in student unrest and was close in his circle of acquaintances to the Nechayevites and Tchaikovsky groups, published several illegal leaflets under the general title "The Gallows" in 1871. Calling the reform of classical education "the vile projects of a vile creator," Goncharov wrote that Katkov "cannot be reached with newspaper criticism and polemics, he has won again, and again his intrigues have been turned into law... This slave, gallows man, and scoundrel must be fought in a different way. He has been triumphant for twelve years now and almost rules the Russian land. He has destroyed tens of thousands of people in Siberia, leaving sadness and poverty to the lot of many families. "As a result of this, he became rich, acquired a lyceum and has now issued classically immoral laws of education for our youth. He will go even further if this reptile is not finally killed... Let this little bloodletting be the beginning of our future events ⁴⁰⁴." In early 1872, for printing and distributing these leaflets, Goncharov appeared before the St. Petersburg Court of Justice and was sentenced to 6 years of hard labor and permanent exile in Siberia ⁴⁰⁵. It is interesting that during the trial itself, one of the main, from the point of view of the prosecutor, evidence of the accused's attempt on the most important foundations of state order was precisely the aggressive attacks against Katkov, while the defense insisted on regarding them as indirect incitement to murder a private individual and emphasized that Katkov did not hold a government position, and therefore was not a statesman or a formal bearer of supreme power ⁴⁰⁶.

⁴⁰³Ibid. L. 5.

⁴⁰⁴"The Gallows" - revolutionary leaflets about the Paris Commune: underground press of the 1970s / preface, publ., commentary. S. Valka. "Periodical Leaflets" by N. P. Goncharov. Literary Heritage. Moscow, 1931. Vol. 1. P. 162.

⁴⁰⁵Ibid. P. 160.

⁴⁰⁶Government Gazette. 1872. No. 47.

N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov, one of the employees of the Russian Herald in the 1860s and later the editor of the Moscow daily newspaper *Sovremennye Izvestia*, wrote to K. P. Pobedonostsev regarding the Goncharov affair: “The times are strange!.. What nonsense! Katkov is identified with public order..” Reflecting in another letter to the same addressee on the reasons for the change in society’s attitude towards Katkov, Gilyarov-Platonov wrote: “Society faced a dilemma: revolutionary audacity was disgusting, but so were the ideals of the *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*. It is natural for everyone to have convictions, but the defense of Tolstoy at all costs, which the *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* conducted (...), and under the auspices of the censorship, which forbade objections, is, if you please, a dishonest role⁴⁰⁷. ”

In the 1880s, Katkov was indeed “under the auspices of censorship” – the authorities preferred to sort things out with the publisher of *Moskovskie Vedomosti* outside the standard scheme of interaction with the press, pointing out the publicist’s mistakes in private. For example, Minister of Internal Affairs D. A. Tolstoy wrote to E. M. Feoktistov on January 21, 1885: “Please write to M. N. Katkov that the Emperor finds it unfair that *Moskovskie Vedomosti* accuses the Minister of Finance of negotiating with Hansemann about concluding a loan, since the minister did not envisage any loans, and therefore there were no negotiations.”⁴⁰⁸.

Friendly correspondence with Katkov was for high-ranking officials both a source of possible support and a source of potential danger; in the specifics of the bureaucratic world, with its intrigues and career struggles, excessive openness in conversations with a journalist could threaten trouble. On November 17, 1882, N. A. Lyubimov warned Katkov in a letter: “Feoktistov begs that if it happens to be found out through him, not to make it transparent in the press. He was very alarmed by the hint at Reptilien Fond in your article, because he had a conversation about this only with Tolstoy. He was afraid it would harm him⁴⁰⁹. ”

⁴⁰⁷Understanding by Faith: Correspondence between N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov and K. P. Pobedonostsev (1860–1887). St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. P. 194.

⁴⁰⁸ Letters from D. A. Tolstoy to E. M. Feoktistov // OR IRLI RAS. Unit 9108. L. 33.

⁴⁰⁹ Correspondence of N. A. Lyubimov with M. N. Katkov // GARF. F. 1718 (Katkov). Op. 1. D. 6. L. 17.

The correspondence between E. M. Feoktistov and K. P. Pobedonostsev contains a description of an indicative case that occurred in 1886. E. M. Feoktistov turned to his patron for clarification, enclosing the following letter from Katkov to his appeal: "From the very beginning, that is, from 1863, when Moskovskiye Vedomosti came into my hands, subscriptions for their delivery to His Majesty's office were renewed annually from the Ministry of the Court. Usually this demand was received at the beginning or in the middle of December. Now we are already at the end of the year, and there is no demand and, in all likelihood, there will not be one. This, of course, will not prevent me from sending Moskovskiye Vedomosti in the same manner to the same address. But I am afraid of a scandal: will this copy not be returned to me upon recall that it is not necessary to send the newspaper to His Majesty's name? This, of course, will not remain without publicity, the consequences of which will hardly be good, if not for me and not for the newspaper, then for the cause it serves. This would be a strange désaveu after the charter given to me this year ⁴¹⁰. But from [I. I.] Vorontsov [-Dashkov] or from his henchmen anything can happen. I do not know how to act to prevent such an outcome. I myself feel awkward turning to anyone for advice ⁴¹¹. "

In a reply letter to Feoktistov, Pobedonostsev ironically notes: "I recognize [M. N.] Katkov in this note. He imagines dark intrigues here, and this, in all likelihood, is either office negligence or office economy." Further, the chief prosecutor of the Synod explains the office mechanism that allowed Katkov to attract such close attention from the highest-ranking officials – and even the sovereign – on the content of his articles: "I would send the newspaper as before. To find out what the matter is, I would have to ask the little people in the court chanceries, but I would be ashamed to even ask the big ones about such a circumstance. I am convinced that there is no intent here. And newspapers of any kind are not placed on the sovereign's table, but his attention is drawn to the Mosk[ovskie] Ved[omosti] from the outside,

⁴¹⁰In this case, Katkov is talking about the Order of St. Vladimir, second degree, awarded to him for helping to strengthen the true principles of Russian state life in people's minds.

⁴¹¹Letters from K. P. Pobedonostsev to E. M. Feoktistov // Literary Heritage. T. 22–24. P. 507.

in connection with various articles ⁴¹²." It is important to note the indication that the sovereign's attention is drawn to the newspaper's articles "from the outside," i.e. by representatives of precisely that official circle with which Katkov actively interacted and, undoubtedly, including for his own purposes, i.e. with the aim of defending the government measures proposed by him with the help of Katkov's arguments.

Details of the operation of this mechanism are also reflected in the correspondence between N. A. Lyubimov and Katkov. In a letter from St. Petersburg dated October 30, 1882, Lyubimov writes: "The article in *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* about the parallel with republican France particularly pleased Ivan Davydovich <Delyanov>. He asked Konstantin Petrovich <Pobedonostsev> whether he had sent it to the Tsar. Konstantin Petrovich accidentally did not receive the issue of *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* that day. Ivan Davydovich sent his copy ⁴¹³." Lyubimov wrote to Katkov on January 20, 1884: "I have heard something about the impression made by the article on January 12. Pobedonostsev immediately sent the article to the Tsar with a letter. The Tsar expressed himself to Count Tolstoy: I am glad that there is a sensible person in Russia ⁴¹⁴."

The status of "minister without portfolio" that Katkov acquired in the mid-1880s also gave rise to some ambiguous excesses in the bureaucratic environment. In one of his letters, Lyubimov recounts to Katkov an amusing incident that occurred in the circles of the highest Petersburg bureaucracy: "The issue of the petitions committee was considered at a special meeting of Counts Tolstoy, Pobedonostsev, Ostrovsky and one senator on G. - I forgot his last name; I think it was Richter. They ask: - Why did Ostrovsky get in? They answer: - He is a friend of Katkov. Ivan Davydovich <Delyanov> told me the joke ⁴¹⁵."

Katkov's influence on the resolution of certain issues of state policy became so obvious that an idea arose to put an end to the dual uncertainty of Katkov's

⁴¹²Ibid. P. 507.

⁴¹³Correspondence of N. A. Lyubimov with M. N. Katkov // GARF. F. 1718 (Katkov). Op. 1. D. 6. L. 16.

⁴¹⁴Ibid. L. 43.

⁴¹⁵Ibid. L. 104.

position in relation to the authorities and to give his influence official status by making Mikhail Nikiforovich a member of the State Council. Rumors of his appointment spread thanks to the publication of a note in *Novoye Vremya*, from which many metropolitan publications borrowed the information. Developing this theme, the press gave birth to a whole bunch of non-existent appointments - with the light hand of newspapermen, the writers A. N. Ostrovsky and I. S. Turgenev also turned out to be candidates for the State Council. Based on the information given in newspaper publications, the editor and co-owner of the International Telegraph Agency A. A. Kraevsky hastened to transmit a dispatch about these appointments to foreign publications, for which he subsequently had an unpleasant explanation with the Minister of Internal Affairs Ignatyev ⁴¹⁶.

The rumors reached the court, too, from a report by Grand Duke Mikhail Nikolaevich. The Emperor immediately ordered the publication of an official government announcement with the following content: “Some periodicals reported rumors about the supposed appointment of the editor of *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*, Privy Councilor Katkov, as a member of the State Council, and even about his alleged refusal of this high appointment. Both of these rumors are completely groundless ⁴¹⁷.” This government announcement, however, was not published immediately, since its content alerted the prudent and experienced Minister of Internal Affairs in playing with public opinion. Count Ignatiev decided to hold off on publishing the announcement and to inquire additionally with the Secretary of State E. A. Peretz, whether it was worth publishing the government announcement in this particular version. The confusion was caused, firstly, by the fact that “Privy Councillor Katkov is named in the report as the editor of the *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*, and Mr. Petrovsky was appointed editor by the Main Directorate for Press Affairs at his request two weeks ago” ⁴¹⁸ and, secondly, by the concern that “in refuting rumors about the appointment of a member of the State Council, the

⁴¹⁶ Case of the government communication // RGIA. F. 1162. Op. 1. ODS 1882. D. 8. L. 4.

⁴¹⁷ *Ibid.* L. 2.

⁴¹⁸ *Ibid.* L. 3.

government report itself should not fall into one-sidedness.” The minister believed that “when rumors are circulating in society (...) about the appointment of several people as members of the State Council, it seems inconvenient to limit ourselves to a refutation of only one of them, since this will be taken by the public as indirect confirmation of the rumors about the others.” After the Secretary of State conveyed these considerations of the minister to the Grand Duke, he in turn also found himself in confusion. The proposed wording of the refutation was approved personally by the Emperor. It could be changed only after a second report, but the issue was too insignificant to draw the Emperor’s attention to it twice. But the minister's arguments were also significant. In this situation, Mikhail Nikolaevich considered it best to publish a refutation of Katkov's appointment, without touching on the rumors about Ostrovsky and Turgenev, but in order to avoid a direct error in the message, he suggested simply removing the words "editor of Moskovskiye Vedomosti" from the text. In this version, the message appeared in the "Government Herald."

K. P. Pobedonostsev's reaction to these rumors is curious. In a letter to Ignatiev dated January 20, 1882, he wrote: "Today I read in *Novoye Vremya* that Katkov is being appointed a member of the State Council, and in the city I hear talk that the article was suggested by you. I am an old friend of Katkov, but I admit that I would not approve of such an appointment if I were asked. The government will lose the old Katkov, but will not gain a new one ⁴¹⁹. "

In 1886, Katkov’s active criticism of the foreign policy irritated not the officials, but the Tsar himself, and the enraged Alexander III demanded that the *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* be given a third official warning. However, here too, the authorities decided, having subdued the first outburst of anger, not to enter into open confrontation with Katkov. Pobedonostsev, who had great influence on the Tsar, convinced Alexander III that such a step would give too many trump cards to the liberal party opposing the government’s course, and its consequences would be large-scale and difficult to predict: “The telegraph will carry this news to all corners

⁴¹⁹Pobedonostsev and his correspondents. Letters and notes / compiled by M. N. Pokrovsky. Moscow, 1923. Vol. 1. P. 359.

of the world. This will be a remarkable political event. It will be interpreted as a turn in our policy. It will be reflected on the stock exchange. It will cause triumphant demonstrations in all major cities, and, by the way, on the part of parties hostile to Russia. Extreme bewilderment and confusion will occur within Russia.” Having judged that the chief prosecutor was right to fear the destructive consequences of Katkov's censorship persecution, the sovereign limited himself to reprimanding the journalist in a private conversation. It is important to note that even during this private conversation, Katkov did not reveal to the sovereign which of the representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was the source of the information published in the article that caused discontent.

Although it should be noted that Pobedonostsev himself by this time believed that "Katkov was forgetting himself and was adopting a tone inconsistent with his position", however, the chief prosecutor placed the blame for this to a greater extent on the officials who "put him in an abnormal position and turned his head", creating a state of affairs in which "everyone would forget themselves" ⁴²⁰. Further, the chief prosecutor of the Synod reasons about Katkov's creative biography: "Katkov's entire strength is in the nerve of his journal activity, as a Russian publicist and, moreover, the only one, because everything else is trifle or rubbish, or a trading stall. But why was it necessary to make a statesman out of Katkov?.. This spoiled him and brought him out of proportion. He wrote excellent articles, but one could rejoice in them, and not make a state event out of them" ⁴²¹.

The story of the suspension of *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* that broke out in March 1887 was not only the result of Katkov's self-confident ardor, but also the consequence of a complex game of court intrigues. The displeasure of the sovereign that fell upon the publicist and the prospect of a possible loss of favor in the highest spheres had a fatal effect on the health of Katkov, who had been terminally ill for a long time. Katkov was deeply upset by his disgrace, which took place against the

⁴²⁰ Pobedonostsev K. P. *The Secret Ruler of Russia: K. P. Pobedonostsev and His Correspondents: Letters and Notes, 1866–1895*. Moscow: Russian Book, 2001. Pp . 218–219.

⁴²¹Ibid. P. 220.

backdrop of the obvious gloating of his political enemies. K. P. Pobedonostsev, persuading the sovereign to change his anger towards Katkov to mercy, drew the monarch's attention to the fact that "Katkov is unlikely to hold out for long"⁴²². "

Indeed, against the backdrop of these events, the disease developed rapidly, so that by July 1887 Katkov was dying. N. A. Lyubimov wrote with alarm to K. P. Pobedonostsev on July 15: "There is still no news of any sign of attention from above to our great dying man... This is a pity in the interests of the authorities themselves, who found such support in the talent and authority of Mikhail Nikiforovich. It is even more of a pity since the twists and turns of recent times had a very strong influence on the development of Mikhail Nikiforovich's illness. Will it be good to remember later that Katkov died as if in oblivion from above?"⁴²³

Katkov died five days after this letter, on July 20, 1887. The Emperor sent a telegram of condolences to his widow. The telegram was perceived in society as a sign of reconciliation between the authorities and the obstinate publicist, as I. D. Delyanov wrote in a letter to Pobedonostsev: "all Russian people and supporters of the autocracy were somehow encouraged"⁴²⁴. In the telegram, addressing the widow, the Emperor called Katkov's death "your and our loss," and expressed his opinion about the deceased's merits as follows: "His strong word, inspired by love for the fatherland, excited hearts and strengthened thoughts in troubled times"⁴²⁵. "

After Katkov's death in 1887, his biography became the subject of an ideological struggle, as did his reputation during his lifetime⁴²⁶. Many years after the death of the publicist, during the reign of Nicholas II, the powerful influence of Katkov's ideas was still felt in Russian state policy. State Secretary A. A. Polovtsov wrote in his diary on August 15, 1898: "The Emperor is full of good intentions; in a verbal report he agrees with everything that is said to him, but when written reports

⁴²² Ibid. P. 220.

⁴²³ Ibid. P. 246–247.

⁴²⁴ Ibid. P. 248.

⁴²⁵ Ibid. P. 247.

⁴²⁶ Kruglikova O. S. "To Maintain Complete Calm in Assessing the Activities of the Deceased Publicist": Towards a Characteristic of M. N. Katkov's Pre-Revolutionary Historiography // *Medi@lmanakh*. 2018. No. 3(86). P. 100–105.

are subsequently presented to him, these reports produce resolutions of a completely different meaning, inspired by echoes of Katkov, Tolstoy, and Delyanov . "⁴²⁷

The origins of Katkov's specific position in the political picture of Russia in the second half of the 19th century are in vain to be sought in the special nature of his publishing activities, and even more so, one should not attribute his enormous political influence to his unique journalistic talent. Literary abilities in the society of the second half of the 19th century could bring fame, create a reputation, bring trouble, result in exile, but could not have a direct influence on the course of state affairs.

An undoubtedly talented publicist, an original thinker and a pragmatic politician, Katkov succumbed to the charm of the omnipotence of public opinion only at the dawn of his public activity. By the mid-1860s, he was already complaining about the instability of opinions and the uncontrollability of public initiatives. The lack of consolidation and the anti-government orientation of political journalism, fraught with the destabilization of the state, led Katkov to an idea characteristic of many "statist" politicians - in the interests of the common good, public opinion can and should be neglected.

It is fundamentally important in this case to make a reservation about the nature of public opinion as a phenomenon in Russia in the 19th century. By "society" was meant only that very insignificant stratum of educated people relative to the general population of the empire who made up the audience of periodicals. This stratum "by its genesis was formed as a Western subculture" ⁴²⁸, torn away from national culture by Peter the Great's Westernization, and from the state by Catherine's free charter, and therefore found itself in complex relationships, often turning into direct antagonism both with the supreme power and with the bulk of the people, who were, due to their illiteracy, inaccessible to any influence of the press,

⁴²⁷Polovtsov A. A. Diary of State Secretary A. A. Polovtsov: in 2 volumes / ed., biographical essay and commentary by prof. P. A. Zayonchkovsky. Moscow: Nauka, 1966. Vol. 2. P. 212.

⁴²⁸Domestic history of the 9th–19th centuries: a textbook for students of higher educational institutions / A. A. Fedulin, V. E. Baghdasaryan, A. Yu. Belov, et al.; edited by prof. A. A. Fedulin. Moscow: Knourus, 2011. P. 440.

and themselves, by tradition, remained silent. Katkov clearly felt that "public opinion" and "the opinion of the people" were different things in Russia, and therefore decided to disregard the opinion of society for the sake of the interests of the people and the state.

From now on, *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* is not a newspaper for society, but a newspaper for the government, an instrument of pressure on the bureaucratic world, since it is impossible to influence the opinion of the broad masses due to their illiteracy, and it is extremely difficult to influence educated society, because the overwhelming majority of it adheres to completely different values and moral guidelines.

The newspaper had a narrow circle of high-ranking readers who drew arguments for their actions from Katkov's editorials or checked the direction of the general political movement of the elite, adjusting their personal political course to it. Vasily Rozanov would say about Katkov's unique role in Russian politics in the 1880s that in his office "the 'reforms' of Russia were conceived, other reforms were limited; in general, the 'well' and 'whoa' of Russia were conceived ⁴²⁹." The newspaper was the heart of a certain bureaucratic party, in which some owed their advancement to Katkov, while others valued his favor as a guarantee of the stability of their social position. The main thing is that these practical arbiters of the state's fate saw Katkov as their ideological leader and inspirer, and the fall in circulation and the raging hatred of the majority of the reading public did not matter to Katkov. In essence, beginning in the 1870s. Katkov's real field of activity was not journalism, but the bureaucratic backstage, and this was his conscious choice.

This is probably why it was not possible to revive the political influence of *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* after Katkov's death, and the problem was not in the poverty of the journalistic talent of L. A. Tikhomirov or S. F. Sharapov, who tried to replace the Moscow thunderer after his death, but in the fact that the beauty and

⁴²⁹Rozanov V.V. Suvorin and Katkov // *New Time*. 1997. No. 7. P. 37.

argumentation of the “thunder” editorials in themselves did not have a decisive significance if they were not supported by skillful intrigue.

However, this does not diminish Katkov's role as a talented journalist and courageous publisher. He achieved his position as a person who is valued and listened to precisely because of his journalistic and organizational talents, as well as because of the consistency and courage with which he defended his views.

Having realized the insufficiency of the influence of the "loud" editorials, Katkov was drawn into the intricacies of personal relationships with those in power, and nevertheless, the authorities never managed to make an ideological puppet out of Katkov; on the contrary, even very high-ranking officials were sometimes afraid of Katkov, fearing damage to their political image from the effect that a harsh word from the popular *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* could produce; moreover, "even government officials who found support from Katkov were burdened by it; their pride was extremely irritated by the fact that they were forced to curry favor with a man who represented a kind of special authority in the state and in whose patronage a certain amount of contempt for them shone through," notes E. M. Feoktistov⁴³⁰.

A characteristic feature of Katkov's journalism is polemics. However, Katkov's polemics were always distinguished by the fact that they were frankly personal, harsh, sometimes offensive towards the opponent. In general, the tone of Katkov's journalism was always somewhat exaggerated, regardless of whether he was really considering issues of exceptional state importance, or very mundane, ordinary problems. This allowed Rozanov to say that "Katkov's intelligence, vigilance, foresight - were much weaker than his words. He spoke quite ordinary thoughts like thunder. His words were enough to London, Berlin, Paris, New York; his thoughts were enough for the Moscow district, well, for Petersburg ... "⁴³¹.

The foreign press's response to the death of the famous Moscow publicist is indicative in many respects. "The only journalist with whom we would like to

⁴³⁰Feoktistov E. M. *Behind the Scenes of Politics and Literature. Memories // Behind the Scenes of Politics* (E. M. Feoktistov. V. D. Novitsky. F. Lear. M. E. Kleinmichel). Moscow: Sergei Dubov Foundation, 2001. Page 120.

⁴³¹Rozanov V. *Suvorin and Katkov // New Time*. 1997. No. 7. P. 39.

change places died yesterday in Moscow. There is not a single newspaper in the world published in the center of affairs that would come close to our ideal, except for the one that was known to Europe for a quarter of a century as Mr. Katkov's organ," wrote PallMall Gazette . No less vividly characterized Katkov's merits as a publicist Independent Belge : "Gifted with talent, possessing a methodical consistency of thought, a tireless polemicist, the great Moscow journalist did not belong to any party. He was neither a Pan-Slavist, nor a Slavophile, nor a Westernizer; he was only Russian, but Russian to the deepest recesses of his mind."

It is difficult to answer unequivocally whether Katkov's communication strategy was effective. As a man of the immediate horizon of thinking and a pragmatic disposition, he consciously rejected the idea of influencing the spiritual picture of the era of his time, preferring the political and administrative level of implementing ideas "here and now." And in this regard, Katkov was certainly effective, having managed to impose his political will on the authorities in resolving the most important issues. But social processes are interesting in that the current practice of the moment is not as important as the long-term rooting of certain ideas and patterns of thinking. While Katkov was alive, his influence was undeniable, but when he was gone, the ideas he broadcast were quickly and long forgotten.

§ 2.2. Enlightenment and “a certain measure of vulgarity” as the publishing strategy of N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov

Nikita Petrovich Gilyarov-Platonov (1824–1887) was called an “unidentified genius⁴³²,” so vast and varied were his interests, so profound and original were his philosophical thought, his journalism unique, and his social activities fruitful. A clergyman and theologian, philosopher, teacher, publicist, censor, and publisher, Gilyarov-Platonov did not attract the attention of researchers for a long time. Coming from the clergy, Gilyarov-Platonov graduated with honors from the Moscow Theological Seminary, and later from the Moscow Theological Academy,

⁴³²This is how the Russian thinker S. F. Sharapov described him.

receiving a master's degree in theology. His teaching career was relatively short-lived (1848–1855) due to a conflict with the academic administration, although, as one of his students, Archpriest G. P. Smirnov-Platonov, notes in his memoirs, as a teacher Nikita Petrovich enjoyed great success and authority among his students ⁴³³.

From May 1856, Gilyarov-Platonov held the post of censor of the Moscow Censorship Committee. A man of principle and a liberal censor, Nikita Petrovich decided to allow articles on the peasant question to be published, contrary to the instructions of the censorship department, without first sending them for approval to trusted officials in St. Petersburg. "Thanks to this, in particular, such magazines as *Russkiy Vestnik* and *Russkaya Beseda* were able to publish current materials on the abolition of serfdom ⁴³⁴." The omission of several articles on the peasant question in the Slavophile *Selskoe Ublagostroistvo* and A.D. Zheltukhin's *Zhurnal Zemlevladel'tsev* led Gilyarov-Platonov to serious troubles at work ⁴³⁵.

It should be noted that Nikita Petrovich approached his censorship duties with extreme scrupulousness and responsibility. How he imagined the role of the censor in the social and literary process can be seen from his letter to one of the authors, whose work was subjected to certain censorship deletions, which is why the indignant writer demanded an explanation from the censor. "You express the idea," Gilyarov-Platonov writes to the author of the censored article, "that I, a servant of the school, am prohibiting a passage only because it disagrees with my personal convictions. No, I am a servant of the state, the idea of which, in my opinion, should be the protection of the weak against the strong; and a servant to the extent that its demands actually agree with my personal convictions. (...) But you consider me an honest man, thank you, thank you a thousand times. An honest man needs to be in

⁴³³Shakhovskoy N.V. Nikita Petrovich Gilyarov-Platonov // Gilyarov-Platonov N.P. Collection of works: in 2 volumes. M.: Synod. typ., 1899. T. 1. P. VI.

⁴³⁴Dmitriev A. P. N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov – author and censor of "Russian Conversation" // "Russian Conversation": History of the Slavophile Journal: Research. Materials. Article-by-article listing / edited by B. F. Egorov, A. M. Pentkovsky and O. L. Fetisenko. St. Petersburg: Pushkin House, 2011. P. 180.

⁴³⁵Shakhovskoy N.V. Nikita Petrovich Gilyarov-Platonov // Gilyarov-Platonov N.P. Collection of works: in 2 volumes. M.: Synod. typ., 1899. T. 1. P. IX.

the shoes of a censor at least for a while to understand how much this simple admission means, how difficult, almost impossible, to wait for it ⁴³⁶.”

Gilyarov-Platonov's practice as a censor is clearly illustrated by an episode, the story of which was published shortly after his death in the magazine "Russian Archive". Under the signature of F. E., in the December 1887 issue of the magazine, a story "A Feature from the Life of Gilyarov-Platonov" was published, in which the publicist F. P. Elenev, who knew Nikita Petrovich well, ⁴³⁷related an incident that could serve as "a good framework for the moral character of a colleague who recently left us ⁴³⁸." During Gilyarov-Platonov's tenure as a censor, literally shortly after he was forced to leave the Moscow Theological Academy under such circumstances that only thanks to the patronage of Count Bludov "he was not thrown out onto the street ... but received the position of censor ⁴³⁹," Nikita Petrovich received for consideration a manuscript by a provincial author who had been unable to obtain a verdict from the censor regarding his text for several months. Gilyarov-Platonov was delighted with the manuscript, expressed his complete agreement with the author's thoughts and promised that he would give permission for publication, although at the same time he expressed confidence that he would be immediately dismissed from his post for omitting this article. Seeing the censor in a homely environment and guessing in him a family man and not very rich, the embarrassed author opposed this manifestation of nobility, and did not want publication at such a price. This episode, as Elenev notes, characterizes Gilyarov-Platonov as "a man of integrity... who did not bargain with his convictions and conscience ⁴⁴⁰."

Later, in 1863, having already left the post of censor, as an official of the Ministry of Public Education, N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov joined the commission for the development of a new censorship charter, where he vehemently defended the

⁴³⁶Ibid. P. XI .

⁴³⁷Masanov I.F. Dictionary of pseudonyms of Russian writers, scientists and public figures: In 4 volumes. Vol. 3. Moscow, 1958. P. 191.

⁴³⁸Russian archive. 1887. No. 12. P. 574.

⁴³⁹Ibid. P. 573.

⁴⁴⁰Ibid.

need to minimize the instruments of administrative influence on the press. When the draft censorship rules were adopted, in which there was still a very wide scope for administrative measures of influence (warnings), Gilyarov-Platonov, disagreeing with the majority of the commission, filed a dissenting opinion, insisting on the full implementation of judicial liability of the press instead of administrative ones.

In December 1867, N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov, already in the status of editor-publisher of the daily newspaper *Sovremennye Izvestia* (the first issue was published on December 1), entered into a heated polemic with the departmental newspaper *Severnaya Pochta* on the same issue. The decree of Alexander II of April 6, 1865 on granting some relief and conveniences to the domestic press, as was originally intended, was to be temporary. Thus, the text of the document states that it operates "in the present transitional state of our judicial system and until further indications from experience ⁴⁴¹." Consequently, the system of warnings outlined in it should be used until the moment when the country's judicial system is transformed and all cases of violation of the press law are considered by the reformed court. However, in practice, the Ministry of Internal Affairs sought to preserve the system of warnings intact even after the reform of judicial proceedings. N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov, and after him I. S. Aksakov, expressed a demand on the pages of the newspaper *Moskvich* for a revision of the Temporary Rules on Censorship and the Press due to the fact that they had exhausted themselves after the judicial reform. In particular, Gilyarov-Platonov placed in *Sovremennye Izvestiya* the text of the aforementioned special opinion, filed in 1863. In response, *Severnaya Pochta* published a collegial decision justifying the system of warnings. Thus, the dialogue was repeated in full almost 5 years later, this time publicly, in print, but the result remained the same – the publicists' objections were not taken into account.

N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov's work in the Moscow Censorship Committee, given the intransigence of the obstinate censor's character, could not, of course, be long-lasting. He was dismissed from his post by A. V. Golovnin in 1862 with a very

⁴⁴¹Complete Collection of Laws of the Russian Empire. 2nd Collection. St. Petersburg, 1867. Vol. 40. P. 396.

curious argument: the reason for his dismissal was that the censor himself was too actively collaborating in the periodical press.

Indeed, N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov repeatedly published in the publications that he censored⁴⁴². True, not all of his publications can be identified, since in most cases they were not signed. Presumably, Gilyarov-Platonov wrote polemical publications in *Molva* directed against S. M. Solovyov and his historical school: for example, the authors of the notes to the publication of Gilyarov-Platonov's memoirs indicate that Nikita Petrovich may have written the article "Two Words about the New Non-Historical School of Mr. Solovyov", which was published on May 11, 1857⁴⁴³. It is known for certain that he published several articles on ethical and social issues in the "Journal of Landowners", of which he was a censor, and there are also indications that many of the editorials of I. S. Aksakov's newspaper "Moscow", devoted to issues of church life and the activities of the clergy, were written by Gilyarov-Platonov.

We cannot help but note the following fact here. In 1886, I. S. Aksakov's wife undertook the publication of a complete collection of his works (7 volumes were published over five years by the printing house of M. G. Volchaninov (formerly M. N. Lavrov and Co.)). It is noteworthy that in the first volume of "The Slavic Question. 1860-1886. Articles from "Den", "Moskva", "Moskvich" and "Rus". Speeches in the Slavic Committee in 1876, 1877 and 1878" an article was published that belonged to the pen of Gilyarov-Platonov, about which the publishers had to make the following reservation at the end of the book: "When this book was almost completely printed, it turned out that someone else's article had ended up in it, i.e., one not written by I. S. Aksakov. This is precisely the article published in the review of articles in the newspaper "Moscow", on pp. 159–165, belonging to N. P. Gilyarov-

⁴⁴²See about this: Kruglikova O. S. N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov as a journalist and publisher // Scientific notes of Kazansky University. Series: Humanities. 2016. Vol. 158. No. 4. Pp. 1015–1030.

⁴⁴³Gilyarov-Platonov N. P. From the Experienced: Autobiographical Memories: in 2 volumes / prepared by A. P. Dmitriev. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2009. Vol. 2. P. 481.

Platonov, as a former employee of “Moscow”. We consider it necessary to stipulate this regrettable error ⁴⁴⁴.”

In the early 1870s, A. S. Suvorin approached Gilyarov-Platonov with a request to write an autobiography for the Russian Dictionary ⁴⁴⁵, conceived by the publisher of *Novoye Vremya*. According to Suvorin, the last section of the magazine was to contain biographical information about the worthiest figures of our time, among whom he unconditionally included Nikita Petrovich. In his reply, Gilyarov-Platonov indicated that his printed works were published in *Russkaya Beseda*, *Den*, *Molva*, and partly in *Russkiy Vestnik* and *Zhurnal Zemlevodel'tsev*. “*Russkaya Beseda* began with my critical article,” he notes ⁴⁴⁶. In his correspondence with I. F. Romanov, ⁴⁴⁷we find: “When Moskva began, the late Aksakov offered me columns for the leading articles twice a week ⁴⁴⁸. We see the same thing in the correspondence with Prince N. IN. Shakhovsky: “When Aksakov began publishing Moskva and suggested that I write leading articles with unlimited power (I wrote them) ⁴⁴⁹.” In messages addressed to K. P. Pobedonostsev, Gilyarov-Platonov also mentions that he was offered the position of editor of the official ministerial newspaper *Severnaya Pochta*, which he refused ⁴⁵⁰.

N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov considered his most serious and significant articles to be those published in “*Russkaya Beseda*”, which he also censored during his time as a censor; here he published nine major articles and almost became a permanent

⁴⁴⁴Works by I. S. Aksakov: in 7 volumes. M.: Type. M.G. Volchaninova, 1886. T. 1. P. 792 (page follows 791, unnumbered - O.K.).

⁴⁴⁵An annual magazine published in St. Petersburg since 1875. It included reference information, images, advertising, and statistical materials.

⁴⁴⁶Gilyarov-Platonov N. P. From the Experienced: Autobiographical Memories: in 2 volumes / prepared by A. P. Dmitriev. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2009. Vol. 2. P. 210.

⁴⁴⁷Romanov Ivan Fyodorovich (1861–1913) – writer, conservative publicist. Pseudonym – Rtsy.

⁴⁴⁸Gilyarov-Platonov N. P. From the Experienced: Autobiographical Memories: in 2 volumes / prepared by A. P. Dmitriev. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2009. Vol. 2. P. 248.

⁴⁴⁹Gilyarov-Platonov N. P. From the Experienced: Autobiographical Memories: in 2 volumes / prepared by A. P. Dmitriev. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2009. Vol. 2. P. 484.

⁴⁵⁰Understanding by faith: Correspondence of N. P. Gilyarova-Platonova and K. P. Pobedonostsev (1860–1887). St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. P. 61.

employee and co-editor of the journal ⁴⁵¹. Among these articles were such important works for the formation of Gilyarov-Platonov's worldview as a review of S. T. Aksakov's "Family Chronicle" ⁴⁵², "A Few Words about Mechanical Methods in the Study of History" ⁴⁵³, "New Explanations for an Old Debate" ⁴⁵⁴, "Are Modern Ideas Orthodox?" ⁴⁵⁵ and others.

N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov's editorial and publishing activities began against his will: he, in his own words, used in a letter to I. F. Romanov, "was drawn into it by deception ⁴⁵⁶." Gilyarov-Platonov describes this situation in more detail in the above-mentioned correspondence with A. S. Suvorin: " One gentleman, now deceased, asked me: 1) to submit a request to publish a newspaper, 2) to take on, so to speak, domestic censorship along with the compilation of two or three articles per month. The economic part and the entire editorial staff were not supposed to rest on my shoulders. Money for publication was promised. But it happened - poof, and the publication ended up on my shoulders, so that after my name was declared, even retreat was impossible ⁴⁵⁷. "

As a result, on December 1, 1867, Gilyarov-Platonov began publishing the daily newspaper *Sovremennye Izvestia* in Moscow. As a rule, the start of publication coincided with the beginning of the calendar year. The start of publication in December was probably due to the fact that Nikita Petrovich, who was not entirely confident in his organizational talents and had no editorial experience, decided to "send a month ahead to make sure that we had correctly guessed the need of the time ⁴⁵⁸." In addition, this month was, as it were, an advertising presentation of the publication, giving readers a full understanding of what the new newspaper would

⁴⁵¹Gilyarov-Platonov N. P. From the Experienced: Autobiographical Memories: in 2 volumes / prepared by A. P. Dmitriev. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2009. Vol. 2. P. 252.

⁴⁵²Russian Conversation. 1856. No. 1. P. 1–69.

⁴⁵³Russian Conversation. 1858. No. 1. P. 66–87.

⁴⁵⁴Russian Conversation. 1857. No. 4. P. 1132–1134.

⁴⁵⁵Russian Conversation. 1859. No. 1. P. 47–56.

⁴⁵⁶Gilyarov-Platonov N. P. From the Experienced: Autobiographical Memories: in 2 volumes / prepared by A. P. Dmitriev. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2009. Vol. 2. P. 280.

⁴⁵⁷Gilyarov-Platonov N. P. From the Experienced: Autobiographical Memories: in 2 volumes / prepared by A. P. Dmitriev. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2009. Vol. 2. P. 212.

⁴⁵⁸Modern news. 1868. No. 1.

be like. The publishers hoped to attract a larger number of subscribers for the following year.

However, despite the fact that Gilyarov-Platonov's publishing debut took place largely against his wishes, when the testing period expired, he stated with some self-confidence: "Yes, *Sovremennye Izvestia* is not superfluous in the modern press⁴⁵⁹." The newspaper quickly gained popularity among readers and earned some favorable reviews from the press. Not only Aksakov's *Moskvich* and Katkov's *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*, but also Kraevsky's liberal *Golos* welcomed the new publication with encouragement⁴⁶⁰.

However, the publisher himself did not know at that time whether to rejoice at this emerging popularity: N. I. Osnovskiy, who had persuaded Gilyarov-Platonov to put his name on the title page of the newspaper and promised to take on the main part of the technical work and care for the material side of the publication, soon ran away, leaving Nikita Petrovich in extreme difficulty. Gilyarov-Platonov would like to get rid of his editorial duties and hand over the newspaper to the care of a worthy publisher, remaining only an employee, but soon abandoned this idea. Thus, in a letter to K. P. Pobedonostsev he reports: "To hand over the newspaper, a month after its founding, means to create a scandal and completely kill the newspaper itself. Who will take it then? In addition, I should have announced at the same time that those who signed not for the cheapness, but for my sake, can get their money back, but would not this completely kill the newspaper? <...> Without this, the matter would take on the appearance of a scam, and I would take on the appearance of a person who had substituted his name to lure the public and then left⁴⁶¹."

So, N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov decided to keep the publication for himself. The biggest difficulty for him was the need to manage the editorial finances.

V. A. Gilyarovskiy testifies in the newspaper "*Moskva Gazetnaya*": N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov was "a man who was not of this world. He slept during the day,

⁴⁵⁹Ibid.

⁴⁶⁰Ibid.

⁴⁶¹Understanding by faith: Correspondence of N. P. Gilyarova-Platonova and K. P. Pobedonostsev (1860–1887). St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. P. 74.

worked at night, rarely received anyone except his closest employees, and even with them he rarely spoke. <...> At that time the newspaper was doing well, there was a lot of money in the cash register, but Nikita Petrovich paid little attention to it. The issues were published partly by himself (the printing house was located nearby, in Vagankovsky Lane), partly by the second editor, his nephew F. A. Gilyarov, a famous teacher-philologist and publicist. Also not of this world, also not counting money”⁴⁶². When friends and employees complained to Nikita Petrovich about the financial dishonesty of the manager and advised him to take it into account, Gilyarov-Platonov answered everyone the same thing: “Oh, leave this money, it’s all so disgusting”⁴⁶³.

Looking ahead, we cannot help but say that it was precisely this inattention, or rather unwillingness to pay attention to financial issues, that became in many ways disastrous for the newspaper. The editorial board of *Sovremennye Izvestia* was robbed twice of a large sum by its unscrupulous employees, which decisively undermined the financial well-being of the publication.

Gilyarov-Platonov, in the program accompanying the petition for permission to publish, indicated that “while maintaining a political character, the newspaper will not miss events of public significance, no matter in what area they occur: in the religious, literary, commercial, industrial world and in the sphere of public life in the strictest sense of the word⁴⁶⁴.” At the same time, the addressee of all these diverse pieces of news was a wide circle of undemanding public, moving in an environment by no means only of abstract questions of politics and philosophy, and representing a numerous middle class of city dwellers.

V. A. Gilyarovsky notes that the main competitor of *Sovremennye Izvestia* would later become N. I. Pastukhov’s *Moskovsky Listok*, a mass-market newspaper published by a semi-literate editor for a semi-literate reader⁴⁶⁵.

⁴⁶²Gilyarovsky V. A. Works: in 4 volumes. Moscow: Pravda, 1989. Vol. 3: Moscow newspaper. Friends and meetings. Pp.

⁴⁶³Ibid. P. 63.

⁴⁶⁴CIAM. F. 31. Op. 3. D. 17. L. 2

⁴⁶⁵Gilyarovsky V.A. Works: in 4 volumes. Moscow: Pravda, 1989. Vol. 3: Moscow newspaper. Friends and meetings. P. 63.

However, the information presented by Gilyarovsky, which for many years determined the attitude of researchers towards *Sovremennye Izvestia* as an ordinary representative of a series of Moscow tabloid newspapers, is not entirely correct.

N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov sought to create a specific format for the publication. “We want to satisfy the thirst for political knowledge caused by the new era. Every minute a new public grows,” he wrote in the first issue of the newspaper for 1868, “every minute they arrive, and they are intercepted by literary industrialists. At the same time, Gilyarov-Platonov had no intention of becoming one of these industrialists in journalism and entertaining the public with jokes and gossip. “You say that the cheap Petersburg newspapers are doing business in a freeloading manner,” he argues in a letter to K. P. Pobedonostsev, “that is absolutely true; but draw a completely opposite conclusion from this. Do you really think that these newspapers are successful because they are freeloaders? Are there really tens of thousands of people in Russia who subscribe to newspapers precisely because they hope to see scandals in them? This cannot be allowed. An issue with scandals makes it to the door-to-door sale; someone or other pays five kopecks to read a scandal. But will you allow such a conclusion to be drawn in the whole masses: will we subscribe for six months, for a year, because there will be scandals there? No, they subscribe because a thirst for political reading has already developed and has penetrated the masses, even to the cabbies. Cheapness makes it easier to satisfy this thirst; but publishers, and you along with them, imagine that this requires tricks.”

“He will act honestly, fulfill his high civic duty, serve his compatriots more than other people, he who, having a gift for something higher and more brilliant, for something deeper and more learned, will take off the ceremonial clothes of a publicist-general and, in the rags characteristic of the common people, will talk to him about what he would like to know, but what they partly do not want to explain to him, partly do not know how,” believed N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov ⁴⁶⁶.

⁴⁶⁶Understanding by faith: Correspondence of N. P. Gilyarova-Platonova and K. P. Pobedonostsev (1860–1887). St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. P. 74.

Inviting his old friend K. P. Pobedonostsev to participate in the newspaper in October 1867, Nikita Petrovich explains his plans for the publication as follows: Social and political events should provide material from which, in small details, in the form of private conclusions, to convey the principles of thought and civic duty to the public. And for this, it is necessary first of all to descend to the public, to some extent to sacrifice oneself ⁴⁶⁷. The only thing that worried him and what Gilyarov-Platonov called his feat was “the difficulty of maintaining a certain measure of vulgarity necessary for a cheap publication.”

It was precisely by observing the “certain measure of vulgarity” that allowed him to reach a broad and uneducated readership that N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov invited the poet and writer N. I. Pastukhov to collaborate on his publication. Pastukhov, who, after leaving *Sovremennye Izvestia*, founded his own publication, the aforementioned *Moskovsky Listok*. At the same time, at the planning stage of the publishing project, Gilyarov-Platonov did not consider the tabloid sheets to be his main competitor. *Russkie Vedomosti* ⁴⁶⁸ seemed to him and his companion, who later turned out to be “a rogue of rogues and a deceiver of deceivers ⁴⁶⁹,” the most likely rival in the struggle for an audience. Moreover, N. A. Osnovskiy, who had persuaded N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov to take over as editor, and who, as it turned out, was negotiating with Nikita Petrovich about starting a new joint publication and, at the same time, with the owner of *Russkie Vedomosti* about renting the newspaper from him, later offered 3,000 rubles a year as compensation – payment so that he would not use the permission he had already received to publish, since the negotiations about renting *Russkie Vedomosti* had been successful by that time ⁴⁷⁰.

The idea of a format that combined an entertaining tone and a political and educational focus sometimes misled even experienced representatives of the

⁴⁶⁷Ibid.

⁴⁶⁸A socio-political newspaper founded by the writer N. F. Pavlov (1803–1864) and published in Moscow from 1863 to 1918; it was the organ of liberal Moscow professors and zemstvo activists, opposing the more conservative *Moskovskie Vedomosti*.

⁴⁶⁹Understanding by faith: Correspondence of N. P. Gilyarova-Platonova and K. P. Pobedonostsev (1860–1887). St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. P. 70.

⁴⁷⁰Ibid. P. 54

magazine world. Gilyarov-Platonov complained about some misunderstanding that arose on this matter between him and I. S. Aksakov, who announced Nikita Petrovich's future publication in his newspaper: " Ivan Sergeyevich, out of the goodness of his heart, did me a bit of a disservice: reading his advertisement, an educated person can easily come to the conclusion that my little publication is intended exclusively for the bourgeoisie, will be written in a small-peasant style, and in the end - there is such a publication that has no place in a decent living room. The eccentric did not show me his recommendation in advance. However, it does not matter: not very many people read "Moskva" ⁴⁷¹.

The specifics of the target audience of *Sovremennye Izvestia* determined the very diverse nature of the information. On the pages of one issue there were publications about the construction of a bridge in Olviopol and the case of an Orthodox priest in a Jewish tavern, a list of the personnel of the University of Dorpat and the news that in St. Petersburg a woman gave birth to a freak, accompanied by a detailed description of it and an indication that the latter was sent by an obstetrician to be alcoholized in the Medical-Surgical Academy. At the same time, the editorial preceding this news kaleidoscope was devoted to the systemic shortcomings of the country's social structure.

The political articles of N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov were distinguished by an elegant simplicity of style and the obviousness of their simple argumentation. Unlike the florid and pathetic "thunderous" editorials of M. N. Katkov, which were incomprehensible to an uneducated reader, the editorials of Gilyarov-Platonov contained simple analogies and clear examples. Thus, in the editorial devoted to the tender announced by the government for the conclusion of a large contract in connection with the expansion of the Nikolaevskaya railway, the author sets out his opinion based on an analogy with a well-known example of credit cheating in the Russian merchant world, when a borrower who has previously taken out some credit subsequently "no longer asks, but demands, and the lender does not dare to refuse

⁴⁷¹Ibid. P. 68.

him for fear of losing everything that was given before ⁴⁷²." This is much clearer to a semi-literate reader than a detailed exposition of the complex credit relations between the state and the Main Society of Russian Railways.

Not all of Gilyarov-Platonov's correspondents were able to maintain this elegant simplicity of style, which allowed them to speak simply and entertainingly about the most complex socio-political processes. And Nikita Petrovich himself had to "speak in a treble voice" sometimes it was a burden, and he also had to refuse publication to some of his correspondents: "To my great regret, I cannot publish your article," he wrote to K. K. Tolstoy, "for the same reason that I published the article "Where Nihilism Comes From" not in my place, but in "Rus", and I publish my memoirs "From the Experienced" in "Russky Vestnik". The audience of "Sovremennye Izvestia" is completely different, your article is too tough for them, as the proverb says, "fodder for a horse is not enough"⁴⁷³.

"Is it really pleasant to waste time on trifles?" N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov reflected in one of his letters to K. P. Pobedonostsev. "It would be enough for something bigger. Do you want to pass on gossip and deal with it? But you can't. The public that a journalist lives on is extremely diverse. Don't let them fall asleep over too serious things, you have to keep in mind the infant readers who still need curiosities like savages. And they are the majority and they are always the foundation of the publication."⁴⁷⁴.

Such closeness to the reader determined the rapid growth of the publication's popularity. "There was a time when *Sovremennye Izvestia* was the most widely distributed newspaper in Moscow and quite unique: on the one hand, it published political articles, and on the other, it burst into public city life and philistinism with the same fervor. Sometimes they smashed "Cunning Albion", sometimes with no less fervor they fell upon the barrels of migrant workers who disturbed Nikita

⁴⁷²Modern news. 1868. No. 85.

⁴⁷³Sharapov S. F. Unidentified genius: In memory of Nikita Petrovich Gilyarov-Platonov: articles, notes, letters and excerpts. M.: Tipo-lithographic. A. V. Vasilyeva and Co., 1903. P. 50–51

⁴⁷⁴Understanding by faith: Correspondence of N. P. Gilyarova-Platonova and K. P. Pobedonostsev (1860–1887). St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. P. 106.

Petrovich Gilyarov-Platonov at night, who lived on the corner of Znamenka and Antipyevsky Lane," recalls V. Gilyarovsky ⁴⁷⁵.

It is significant that the readers themselves often took part in the creation of the newspaper. Letters and responses from correspondents from the people were actively published on the pages of *Sovremennye Izvestia*. Their unique language, which was preserved intact by the editorial board (according to the secretary of the editorial board M. S. Skavronskaya, in them only the most serious grammatical errors were corrected and the letter *ѣ* was put back in its proper place ⁴⁷⁶), enlivened the newspaper, and most importantly – brought it even closer to the target audience. However, the editorial style of presentation was also quite appealing to the reader. The language of N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov forever retained the imprint of the church, theological, preaching style. M. P. Pogodin wrote to him: “The seminary and Filaret also left their mark on your way of acting and on your speech” ⁴⁷⁷. Most readers of *Sovremennye Izvestia* acquired the basics of literacy in church parish schools, where, under the guidance of clergy, they learned to read from the Book of Hours and the Psalter.

It should be noted that the newspaper's success with a certain type of public did not go unnoticed by the censors, who, for obvious reasons, were always particularly partial to cheap publications for the people rather than to large, high-quality periodicals. Over the 20 years of its activity, Gilyarov-Platonov's publication was subjected to various censorship penalties 20 times, including being banned from retail sale 13 times, and in 1877 it was suspended for 2 months. Moreover, the censors' reports often cited the specifics of the newspaper's audience as the most decisive argument: "we do not believe that this kind of correspondence is appropriate

⁴⁷⁵Gilyarovsky V. A. Works: in 4 volumes. Moscow: Pravda, 1989. Vol. 3: Moscow newspaper. Friends and meetings. P. 61.

⁴⁷⁶Skowronskaya M. S. For a quarter of a century // *Observer*. 1897. No. 1. P. 201–227; No. 2. P. 221–239

⁴⁷⁷Shakhovskoy N. V. Materials for the biography of N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov // *Russian Review*. Moscow: University Printing House, 1896. Book 6 (vol. 42). November. Pp. 454–470; December. P. 995.

in a newspaper that is cheap and accessible to the mass of readers" ⁴⁷⁸; "such phrases are inappropriate and harmful in his small, cheap newspaper, which has semi-educated people among its subscribers", ⁴⁷⁹etc.

Meanwhile, the representative of conservative political views N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov could count on the censorship's leniency, because he believed that the role of a publicist in society is by no means to promote the growth of social tension and antagonism. On the contrary, he emphasized that a publicist, although by virtue of his journalistic purpose he inevitably "must seek out imperfections in the social order," does so only in order to promote the elimination of these imperfections and to take part in constructive social work. To find a subject of discontent in public life "does not mean to arouse discontent, to stir up passions, to undermine order. Here lies a clearly distinguishable line: within what limits does discontent revolve, to whom do they turn with the demand for correction, and what means are proposed? "A publicist who does not respect the history and traditions of his people and the fundamental foundations of the social life in which he lives is as unworthy of his calling as an admirer of superstition and the wild instincts of the masses, or an impudent flatterer of the authorities ⁴⁸⁰."

An important question for assessing Gilyarov-Platonov's publication is to what extent he managed to realize the idea of a political and educational publication, "observing a certain measure of vulgarity" in order to gain popularity with the public; did this publication ultimately cross the line separating it from a tabloid sheet? Partially, the answer to this question can be provided by the assessments of intelligent readers, such as M. P. Pogodin, for example, who wrote to N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov in June 1872: "The article in issue 167 of *Sovremennye Izvestia* about ultramontaniam is magnificent, state-like, European. When I read such articles, I

⁴⁷⁸CIAM. F. 31. Op. 3. D. 32. L. 12 rev.

⁴⁷⁹CIAM. F. 31. Op. 3. D. 32. L. 17.

⁴⁸⁰Shakhovskoy N. V. Materials for the biography of N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov // *Russian Review*. Moscow: University Printing House, 1896. Book 6 (vol. 42). November. Pp. 454–470; December. Pp. 40–42.

always feel sorry that such a strong mind is wasted on trifles ⁴⁸¹," as well as the experience of *Sovremennye Izvestia*'s collaboration with L. N. Tolstoy.

In the 1870s, L. N. Tolstoy, as is well known, sought to make his stories and novellas accessible to a broad, poorly educated readership, to direct his religious sermon not only and not so much to the intelligentsia as to the masses of ordinary people. To do this, he needed to publish his works in publications accessible to this category of readers, and not on the pages of elite thick magazines, as before. Tolstoy's choice fell on *Sovremennye Izvestia*, most likely, precisely because it was a cheap publication aimed at the urban man in the street, which at the same time did not fall into an obviously tabloid tone.

Gilyarov-Platonov and Tolstoy had extensive plans for cooperation: they respected each other, the writer needed a platform for publications, and the publisher needed to increase the popularity of the newspaper, which was experiencing constant financial difficulties. Having published an article about the Moscow population census in the nineteenth issue of *Sovremennye Izvestia* in 1882, in which he himself took part, L. N. Tolstoy suggested to N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov to place his new story in the newspaper. "The Death of Ivan Ilyich", which he first read in the editorial office of *Sovremennye Izvestia*. The story had already been partially put into type, but further cooperation was hampered by ideological differences. Gilyarov-Platonov refused to facilitate the publication of Tolstoy's famous "Confession". He forwarded it to the editors of *Russkaya Mysl* for publication, but the text was obviously impossible from the standpoint of censorship, so the editor of *Russkaya Mysl* asked Nikita Petrovich to write a preface to the text that would make it possible to try to "smuggle" the scandalous text through censorship. But Gilyarov-Platonov not only refused to participate in preparing this text for publication, but as a believer and churchgoer, he responded with a heated polemical rebuke that exposed the writer's spiritual pride. The refusal with explanations was sent by letter to the editor of

⁴⁸¹Shakhovskoy N. V. Materials for the biography of N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov // *Russian Review*. Moscow: University Printing House, 1896. Book 6 (vol. 42). November. Pp. 454–470; December. P. 995.

Russkaya Mysl with a copy to Tolstoy. “This letter so angered Count Lev Nikolayevich that he not only refused to give his story to *Sovremennye Izvestia*, but forever broke off his acquaintance with Nikita Petrovich. Nikita Petrovich was very upset by the break with Tolstoy, but never repented of his actions,” writes S.F. Sharapov⁴⁸².

N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov, addressing the broad masses of the reading public with a simple and clear word, did no less, and perhaps more, to popularize conservative political views and the principles of national culture than the editors of the elite quality press of the conservative trend M. N. Katkov and I. S. Aksakov. However, he was not a very successful entrepreneur; the publication was undermined by the above-mentioned carelessness of the publisher in relation to editorial finances and competition with newly opened cheap city leaflets. When in 1881 the “*Moskovsky Listok*” began to be published, and two years later - the similar newspaper “*Novosti Dnya*”, the financial collapse of “*Sovremennye Izvestia*” became inevitable. As N. V. Shakhovskoy notes, “the main mass of subscribers, on whom the entire publication of the newspaper rests, is the very same public to whom Gilyarov wanted to descend, so that later he could raise them up and they would quickly fall away from *Sovremennye Izvestia*, in order to exchange instruction for entertainment⁴⁸³.”

The fatal thing for N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov was that this outflow of subscribers coincided with significant investments that he decided to make in his publishing business, buying new printing machines and a stationery factory on credit. In order to save himself from his desperate financial situation, Nikita Petrovich attempted to publish a weekly magazine with pictures, *Raduga*, which began to appear in 1883. More details about this publishing project will be given in the section devoted to illustrated weeklies of the conservative trend; here we will

⁴⁸²Sharapov S. F. Unidentified genius: In memory of Nikita Petrovich Gilyarov-Platonov: Articles, notes, letters and excerpts. M.: Tipo-lithographic. A.V. Vasilyeva and Co., 1903. P. 95.

⁴⁸³Shakhovskoy N.V. Nikita Petrovich Gilyarov-Platonov // Gilyarov-Platonov N.P. Collection of works: in 2 volumes. M.: Synod. typ., 1899. T. 1. S. LV.

only note that this new publishing project did not prove to be a salvation for Gilyarov-Platonov.

Gilyarov-Platonov's magazine "Raduga" adhered to the educational tone of entertaining family reading, using pictures only as explanatory illustrations to publications. In the magazine, as in the newspaper, Gilyarov-Platonov followed the idea of using the possibilities of an attractive format for the average person to talk to him about socio-political issues.

Introducing the publication, N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov wrote: "The publisher's fifteen years of journalistic activity relieves him of the obligation to explain in detail the spirit in which Raduga will be conducted. We will not indulge a dirty imagination, give food for embittered mockery, or encourage cleverness, smug and limited. We want to serve pure tastes, innocent pleasures, quiet entertainment, thoughtful curiosity ⁴⁸⁴." Explaining the choice of the title for the publication, he gives a poetic image of nature after a thunderstorm, when everything still bears witness to a recent downpour, but the storm has died down, the sky has cleared, and under the first rays of the sun, raising steam from the earth, a rainbow hangs in the air. Gilyarov-Platonov turns this image into an allegory for the social state of his time: "the current lull is an inevitable consequence of a twenty-year period of reforms, just as fatigue always follows a fever. Partly fatigue, partly disappointment, partly helpless tension. <...> Meanwhile, everything has shifted, from political institutions of social life to family relations, even to concepts and beliefs. It has shifted, but has not settled down ⁴⁸⁵."

Each issue of the magazine opened with a current political editorial in the simple language typical of Gilyarov-Platonov's publications, aimed at the average consumer, and continued with the traditional headings for a family magazine: works of art; popular science stories; notes; recipes; fashion; crosswords; charades.

The journalistic section of the magazine, like *Sovremennye Izvestia*, was characterized by a certain kaleidoscopic nature, which, however, met the needs of

⁴⁸⁴Rainbow. 1883. No. 1. P. 1.

⁴⁸⁵Ibid.

the so-called motley reader. For example, the second issue of the magazine *Raduga* begins with detailed information about the state budget for 1883, which was made public the day before, followed by an analysis of the composition of some of its articles and an attempt at an economic forecast. Immediately after them, without any separate heading, comes a confirmation of the ban on employees reporting any information about their activities to the press without the sanction of their superiors. After this (also without any separation or logical transition), there is a story about a fire in the circus in Berdichev, which resulted in significant human casualties ⁴⁸⁶.

As for the illustrations, most of them were made by artists to order specifically for *Raduga*. The tasks set by the publisher for the magazine required a special approach to the illustrations. Each picture had an educational meaning and was very rarely used as a decorative element. For example, a series of explanatory illustrations were prepared for a popular science article about primitive people, and a short piece of information about the acquisition of a snow leopard by the Moscow Zoo was accompanied by an entertaining popular science description of this biological species and an illustration from life.

The publisher hoped that the new format would revive readers' interest in his publications and help him get out of financial difficulties, but his hopes were in vain. After one year of publication, he was forced to transfer the rights to the loss-making weekly to L. M. Metzl and D. A. Mansfeld, who, having changed the structure and content concept, published it until 1887. Under the new publishers, the magazine lost its socio-political focus, the editorials were replaced by biographies of celebrities with portraits, the charades and rebus section increased, the theater and music sections were separated into independent publications - "Scene" and "Akkord", which came out as supplements to "Raduga".

Gilyarov-Platonov continued to publish the newspaper *Sovremennye Izvestiya* until his death in 1887, despite the fact that in 1883 his property was sold at auction to pay off debts and he had to move into furnished rooms, and in 1884 he

⁴⁸⁶Rainbow. 1883. No. 2.

seriously considered closing his brainchild. However, in 1885 the situation gradually changed for the better: subscriptions were revived, his memoirs, *From the Experienced* (1886), which were first partially published in the *Russky Vestnik* and then as a separate book, enjoyed success.

After the death of M. N. Katkov in 1887, Gilyarov-Platonov tried to get the government to transfer *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* to him. However, despite the support of some supporters in the bureaucracy (I. D. Delyanov, I. P. Kornilov and others worked on his behalf), he was denied the editorship, and these useless and sometimes humiliating efforts, which caused him a lot of worry, brought his death closer.

The extensive and most interesting publicistic legacy of N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov was collected and published by his relatives, students, and associates. Thus, K. P. Pobedonostsev undertook a two-volume publication of the "Collection of Works" (1899), which included the main publicistic articles of Gilyarov-Platonov; A. M. Galperson prepared for publication his "Excursions into Russian Grammar" (1883) and the posthumous work "The Basic Principles of Economy" (1889).

In general, the work of Gilyarov-Platonov has been little studied, and his figure in Russian conservative journalism remains, as it were, in the shadow of more famous characters, such as M. N. Katkov, I. S. Aksakov, A. S. Suvorin, and others, to whom he is not inferior in the originality of his views and journalistic talent. In part, this was a conscious choice by N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov, who did not seek to join the "publicists in generals' uniforms" and wished to talk about his fundamental ideas with the common people "in rags ⁴⁸⁷." However, this does not diminish the influence of his publishing and journalistic activities on the formation and dissemination of Russian national-conservative ideology in the second half of the 19th century.

⁴⁸⁷Understanding by faith: Correspondence of N. P. Gilyarova-Platonova and K. P. Pobedonostsev (1860–1887). St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. P. 61.

§ 2.3 V. P. Meshchersky: Patronage and Publishing Innovation in the Communicative Practices of a High-Society Writer

Vladimir Petrovich Meshchersky (1839–1914) came from an old princely family. His background gave the prince a wide range of diverse acquaintances and connections in high society, and his relationship with P. A. Vyazemsky and N. M. Karamzin, to whom he was a grandson on his mother's side, created a certain aura of sympathy and expectations around the young man, allowing him to count on a favorable public reception of his journalistic experiences. Looking ahead, it is worth noting that Vladimir Petrovich's journalistic activity received the most contradictory assessments, making him an odious figure in general, while his contribution to historiography was highly valued by both his contemporaries and historians, both those who belonged to the number of his political opponents and those who joined the circle of his like-minded people. The memoirs that Meshchersky began publishing during his lifetime became a unique source of information about the political intrigues and private life of the court, so much so that in the obituary of the prince, published in the "Historical Herald" (which had previously published many positive reviews of these memoirs), it was said: "it is absolutely impossible to write the modern history of Russia without including the memoirs of Prince Meshchersky. His closeness to the court created for him, as a writer, an exceptional position and, to his credit, he used this closeness widely and with great benefit for our historical knowledge⁴⁸⁸." However, "the well-known focus of the memoirist's memory"⁴⁸⁹ gives Meshchersky's memoirs a biased character and forces researchers to carefully double-check the information provided by the prince against other sources.

As a journalist, the prince made his debut in 1860 in the *Severnaya Pchela*, and for some time was an employee of *Katkov's Russkiy Vestnik* and *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*. All this time, he did not leave the civil service: in the first years after

⁴⁸⁸Glinsky B. Vladimir Petrovich Meshchersky. Access mode: http://az.lib.ru/m/mesherskij_w_p/text_1914_nekrolog.shtml . (date of access: 06/24/2024).

⁴⁸⁹ Volgin I. L. Dostoevsky – journalist: ("A writer's diary" and the Russian public). Moscow: Moscow State University Publishing House, 1982. P. 9.

graduating from the School of Law, he served in the judicial department, was a police attorney, and then a district judge.

Meshchersky became close to the sons of Emperor Alexander II in 1861–62. His initial acquaintance with the august family took place during the Tsar's journey with his wife to Livadia. Thanks to the patronage of T. B. Potemkina, he was introduced to the imperial family and made a positive impression on Empress Maria Alexandrovna, who saw in him a well-behaved and fundamentally educated young man of good origin, who had managed to gain a variety of impressions of real life during his service, and, moreover, a peer of the heir to the throne, Grand Duke Nikolai Alexandrovich. Considering Meshchersky's company to be useful for her son in some respects, the Empress gave the prince a letter of recommendation to the Tsarevich. In St. Petersburg, having introduced himself to the Grand Dukes, Meshchersky, through their tutors S. G. Stroganov and O. B. Richter, quite soon became one of the narrow circle of friends of Tsarevich Nikolai Alexandrovich.

Later, in 1863, Meshchersky, under the patronage of P. A. Valuev, whom he had known since his mother's salon, transferred to serve in the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and those seven years that he spent traveling around the Russian provinces as an official on special assignments for the ministry turned out to be surprisingly valuable for him in terms of building his system of political views. Meshchersky was one of the few St. Petersburg publicists and perhaps the only courtier who was truly familiar with the country whose future he pondered and whose past he treasured: "I studied Russia not in St. Petersburg, but in constant travels around the eight central Great Russian provinces ⁴⁹⁰." His unique knowledge of provincial Russian life, which distinguished him from his fellow writers not only in the liberal but also in the conservative camp, and from his acquaintances in high society salons, made Meshchersky an indispensable interlocutor for the future heir to the throne. From these trips, by the prince's own admission, he took away "two convictions: first, that life in Russia is moving forward, and second, that in many ways Petersburg

⁴⁹⁰Meshchersky V.P. Something like a confession // Speeches of a conservative. St. Petersburg, 1876. P. 3.

liberalism is holding back this forward movement of Russian life ⁴⁹¹." These two convictions would become the ideological basis of Meshchersky's journalism for many years, and since by "Petersburg liberalism" the prince understood mainly the liberal press, his polemical attacks would most often be directed specifically at liberal journalists.

During his numerous trips, Meshchersky wrote many letters, primarily to the Tsarevich, with whom he could discuss both the most diverse impressions of Russian provincial life and intimate topics of love and friendship. At the same time, the prince "did not miss the opportunity to impress with his experience and knowledge of life. Exciting and semi-detective stories from the practice of an official on special assignments, described by his lively pen, awakened genuine interest in readers ⁴⁹²." Between numerous business trips, while staying in St. Petersburg, Meshchersky became a regular at many social events with the participation of the Grand Dukes, however, when Nikolai Alexandrovich's famous trip around Russia began, Meshchersky was not included in the retinue appointed to accompany the heir.

During the trip around Russia and then the Tsarevich's trip abroad, Meshchersky, who remained in St. Petersburg, became close to the younger Grand Dukes, especially Alexander Alexandrovich. The future Alexander III considered his elder brother Nikolai to be his only true friend. Having lost the friendly communication that was so necessary to him, who always disliked secular conventions and the false atmosphere of the court, in separation from his brother, he became close with sympathy and trust to the young Prince Meshchersky, in whom he was accustomed to seeing a person who was friendly and close to his beloved and respected elder brother. The long-term relationship that subsequently developed between Meshchersky and Alexander III abounded in both periods of ardent friendly affection and stages of complete cooling; their complex twists and turns are

⁴⁹¹Ibid. P. 5.

⁴⁹²Leonov M. M. *Salon of V. P. Meshchersky: Patronage and Mediation in Russia at the Turn of the 19th and 20th Centuries*. Samara: Publishing House of the Samara Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2009. P. 53.

beautifully reflected in the now published and accessible to the general reader correspondence between the prince and the heir to the throne ⁴⁹³.

It shows that the most important stage of this relationship was the period of 1865-67, when Alexander Alexandrovich was struck by the terrible news of the death of his brother Nikolai - an event as a result of which he lost the person closest to him and acquired the frightening position of heir to the Russian throne, i.e. he was forced to take on a mission for which he was not at all prepared. Therefore, for the new heir to the throne, "in the difficult days after the death of his brother, Meshchersky was the one who helped him get used to the unexpected and unwanted situation, the one in whom Alexander found the moral support he so needed before taking the oath ⁴⁹⁴."

Moreover, Prince Vladimir Petrovich obviously claimed the role of a kind of spiritual mentor, a guide for the heir to the throne in his preparation for accession to the throne. At first, after acquiring the status of Tsarevich, the depressed and confused Alexander Alexandrovich was very favorable to the persistent advice and educational conversations of the prince, but soon Meshchersky's mentoring tone and his stubborn desire to impose his ideas of what is proper and improper on the heir to the throne began to irritate the future sovereign. Meshchersky's relationship with the royal friend worsened even more as a result of the fact that the prince tried to extend his educational influence to the young wife of the Tsarevich, who categorically did not accept his demanding guardianship and tiresome friendship.

However, the time during which Meshchersky enjoyed the trust and favor of the Tsarevich was not in vain - one of the main "educational" achievements of Vladimir Petrovich was that he managed to create a salon, often visiting which, Alexander Alexandrovich had the opportunity to meet many representatives of Russian public thought, to hear various opinions on current political issues.

Meshchersky called his meetings a "forum" - a place where the Senate met with the people, in contrast to similar meetings at A. A. Tatishchev's, which the

⁴⁹³Meshchersky V. P. Letters to the Grand Duke Alexander Alexandrovich. Moscow: New Literary Review, 2011.

⁴⁹⁴Chernikova N. Prince V. P. Meshchersky and his epistolary legacy // Meshchersky V. P. Letters to the Grand Duke Alexander Alexandrovich. Moscow: New Literary Review, 2011. P. 9.

prince actually called the "Senate", since only high-ranking officials gathered there⁴⁹⁵. The prince's political salon was very useful to the Tsarevich as a channel of communication with versatile and deeply educated people, an exchange of opinions with whom gradually led to the formation of an independent political worldview in the heir to the throne, which, of course, bore the stamp of the ideological influence of the hospitable host of intellectual evenings. The Tsarevich attended the meetings of Prince Vladimir Petrovich with great interest, sometimes sitting up past midnight; the acquaintances made in Meshchersky's salon could contribute to the court career of his guests; the prince's influence on the political worldview of the future emperor was becoming increasingly obvious.

This led to growing irritation against the prince at court, where his main ill-wishers were the head of the Third Section P. A. Shuvalov and the Minister of Internal Affairs A. E. Timashev. They feared Meshchersky's attempts to influence the Tsarevich in matters of foreign policy. At that time, Russia was faced with a difficult choice of foreign policy. On the eve and at the beginning of the Franco-Prussian War, the conservative "Russian party", to which Meshchersky belonged, insisted on a diplomatic alliance with France and opposition to the political strengthening of Germany, while the adherents of the "German party" at the Russian court, which included Timashev and Shuvalov, wanted the opposite. In 1871, Meshchersky was invited to the chief of the gendarmes and heard unambiguous threats against "people who want at all costs to make the Tsarevich the head of the political Russian party"⁴⁹⁶.

In addition, the Grand Dukes, the younger brothers of the Tsarevich, were jealous and hostile towards Meshchersky. When the dislike of some nobles and brothers was added to the discontent of the wife of the future emperor, the Tsarevich distanced himself from Meshchersky. Much later, already at the end of the 1880s, when the biography of the odious publicist was overgrown with a great many

⁴⁹⁵Leonov M. M. Salon of V. P. Meshchersky: Patronage and Mediation in Russia at the Turn of the 19th and 20th Centuries. Samara: Publishing House of the Samara Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2009. P. 9.

⁴⁹⁶ Meshchersky V.P. Memories. Moscow: Zakharov, 2003. P. 293.

rumors, willingly spread by his ill-wishers, the assumption was discussed that such a sharp break with the Tsarevich was due to the manifestation of financial dishonesty of the prince - the embezzlement of state funds allocated for the organization of an educational institution. However, researchers were unable to find any confirmation of this, not even hints, either in the correspondence of all participants in the process or in official documents, while the version about the hostile attitude of the emperor's family towards Meshchersky as the reason for the break is confirmed by many epistolary documents and memoirs ⁴⁹⁷.

The Tsarevich's visit to Meshchersky's salon in the winter of 1873 was his last. The letter informing the prince that he would no longer be received at the Anichkov Palace stated that this break was not final and mentioned the possibility of meeting in a few years, but in reality this meant a ten-year exclusion of the prince from personal meetings with the heir to the throne, although their correspondence, albeit rare, was preserved. It was precisely at the time when a cooling in relations with the Tsarevich was clearly evident that in 1872 Prince Meshchersky decided to try his hand as a publisher and began publishing the newspaper-magazine "Grazhdanin".

Meshchersky's very first publications in "Grazhdanin" irritated his superiors. The prince was offered to choose between journalism and government service, and Meshchersky resigned, preferring the field of publicist to career advancement. However, leaving the service meant the need to do without the only permanent source of income, since the prince did not have any significant wealth. "Grazhdanin" did not meet Meshchersky's expectations financially; the publication was not particularly successful, acquiring no more than 1,600 subscribers in the first years. Probably, even together with copies distributed at retail, the circulation of the publication in the first year did not exceed 2,000 copies.

In order to start publishing "Grazhdanin", the prince borrowed money in the expectation of a quick return from the magazine's profits, but he could only dream

⁴⁹⁷ Leonov M. M. Salon of V. P. Meshchersky: patronage and mediation in Russia at the turn of the 19th–20th centuries. Samara: Publishing House of the Samara Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2009.

of profits for now. His appeal to the friendly help of the Tsarevich - a request for a large gratuitous subsidy - gave rise to the opinion, which has long been prevalent in the historiography of Russian journalism, that "Grazhdanin" was subsidized by Alexander Alexandrovich from the very beginning of its publication. However, this assumption has been convincingly refuted by modern researchers ⁴⁹⁸- Meshchersky was denied financial support, and "Grazhdanin" did not receive subsidies until 1883. The prince quickly spent his small fortune on the publication, and soon "Grazhdanin" was threatened with closure due to losses, but another loan (presumably from M. N. Katkov) allowed the prince to save the magazine.

At this time, the prince's main source of income became his literary work. With astonishing speed, he published novels about high society life one after another, which, despite their dubious artistic merits and extreme sloppiness of style, enjoyed exceptional popularity with the public. ⁴⁹⁹The brisk, albeit careless pen of the novelist, who, according to his contemporaries, never reread what he had written, possessed a unique, albeit somewhat one-sided talent. Meshchersky subtly noticed typical, recognizable character traits, ironically and with a humor not devoid of elegance, he painted the shades of high society relationships and passions, and the author's closeness to spheres of the social elite inaccessible to most made his novels an inexhaustible source of exciting material about the life of society. And although one cannot but agree that "the history of Russian fine literature can easily do without the name of Prince V. P. Meshchersky as a novelist who left behind a more or less

⁴⁹⁸Chernikova N. Prince V. P. Meshchersky and his epistolary legacy // Meshchersky V. P. Letters to the Grand Duke Alexander Alexandrovich. Moscow: New Literary Review, 2011; Leonov M. M. V. P. Meshchersky's Salon: Patronage and Mediation in Russia at the Turn of the 19th–20th Centuries. Samara: Publishing House of the Samara Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2009.

⁴⁹⁹"Tauriada", a modern poem (St. Petersburg, 1863); "One of Our Bismarcks", a science fiction novel (St. Petersburg, 1873); "Women of St. Petersburg High Society", a novel (St. Petersburg, 1874); "The Lord Apostle", a story (St. Petersburg, 1876); "I Want to Be Russian", a novel (St. Petersburg, 1877); "Count Obezyaninov" (St. Petersburg, 1879); "A Terrible Night", a story (St. Petersburg, 1881); "Realists of High Society", a story (St. Petersburg, 1883); "Misunderstanding", a novel (Citizen. 1884. Books 2, 3, 4, 6-8); "Heart Diseases", a comedy (St. Petersburg, 1886); "The Student", a story (St. Petersburg, 1886); "A Million", a comedy (St. Petersburg, 1887); "From Afar", a comedy (St. Petersburg, 1888); "Secrets of Modern Petersburg", "Men of St. Petersburg High Society" (St. Petersburg, 1897), etc.

significant mark ⁵⁰⁰,” it is nevertheless necessary to acknowledge that his contemporaries, from among the not particularly demanding public, read his works with great interest, and for some time it was precisely the financial success of Meshchersky the novelist that allowed Meshchersky the publicist and publisher to stay afloat.

During his separation from the Tsarevich, the prince undertook several high-profile and successful charitable projects, most likely not so much for the purpose of actual charity, but in an effort to regain the favor of the Grand Duke through his vigorous public activity. Among such projects is the publication of the charitable collection "Skladchina" for the benefit of those who suffered from the three-year crop failure and the subsequent famine in the Samara province. The collection, published in early 1874 and bringing in about 15,000 rubles in net proceeds, included works by I. A. Goncharov, P. A. Vyazemsky, F. M. Dostoevsky, N. K. Mikhailovsky, A. N. Maikov, A. N. Ostrovsky, M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin, and others. More important in financial terms was not even the proceeds from the publication itself, but the popularity of the topic of helping the starving, which Meshchersky managed to create in society, together with active agitation in "Grazhdanin". The number of voluntary donations, thanks to such information support, grew rapidly. An important aspect for clarifying the moral reputation of Prince Meshchersky is that the participants in the collection, by common consent, elected him treasurer of the project, and he fully justified this trust, which indirectly refutes the previous accusation of the prince embezzling state funds⁵⁰¹. If there had actually been a story of embezzlement, the information would certainly have leaked into society, and the reputation of a swindler would not have allowed the prince to enjoy such unanimous trust from his fellow writers.

⁵⁰⁰Glinsky B. Vladimir Petrovich Meshchersky. Access mode: http://az.lib.ru/m/mesherskij_w_p/text_1914_nekrolog.shtml . (date of access: 06/24/2024).

⁵⁰¹Leonov M. M. Salon of V. P. Meshchersky: Patronage and Mediation in Russia at the Turn of the 19th and 20th Centuries. Samara: Publishing House of the Samara Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2009. P. 79.

The public position of "Grazhdanin" often appears contradictory, having experienced the traditional evolution of Russian conservatives "from left to right". Researchers draw attention to the fact that the prince's stated desire in his correspondence with future employees "not to chase color, not to chase popularity" in order to avoid party one-sidedness ⁵⁰², coexisted with the constant mention of the epithet "conservative" in relation to his publication. In essence, there is no contradiction here. The statist nature of Russian conservatism puts forward as one of its main demands the rejection of party affiliation, motivated by the need to avoid the primacy of party guidelines over the observance of the practical, urgent interests of the state. This motive was often heard in Katkov, who called for not being conservatives, but simply Russians, caring about the specific benefits of their state; we easily find the same motive in Meshchersky's journalism.

In his review of R. Fadeev's book "What Should We Be?" Meshchersky admires the author under review for the fact that "he obviously belongs to a tiny handful of people who clearly see the situation of today's Russia, while the distinguishing feature of any party is that it clearly sees only itself and no one else ⁵⁰³." Meshchersky also writes to the Tsarevich about his desire to create a "journal without a tendency," explaining the concept of the future publication. "Cosmopolitanism alone will be banished," ⁵⁰⁴ the prince promises, meaning that the ideological basis of the journal will be following the practical interests of Russian national statehood.

Meshchersky did not rely only on his personal journalistic abilities and from the very beginning understood that the key to the magazine's success was in the team of talented employees, therefore he sought to attract many popular writers and journalists to participate in "Grazhdanin". He managed to secure the participation in

⁵⁰²Letter from Meshchersky to N. A. Korf. Quoted from: Kartsov A. S. Russian conservatism of the second half of the 19th – early 20th century. Prince V. P. Meshchersky. St. Petersburg: Publishing House of St. Petersburg State University, 2004. P. 53.

⁵⁰³Meshchersky V.P. Political letters // Speeches of a conservative. St. Petersburg, 1876. P. 1.

⁵⁰⁴Dronov I. E. The Path of a Conservative // Meshchersky V. P. Citizen Conservative. Moscow: Ichthyos magazine "New Book of Russia", 2005. P. 21.

the magazine of literary stars of the first magnitude F. M. Dostoevsky, N. S. Leskov, A. F. Pisemsky, F. I. Tyutchev, A. N. Apukhtin, A.K. Tolstoy, A. N. Maikov, M. P. Pogodin, Ya. P. Polonsky and N. N. Strakhov willingly wrote for "Grazhdanin". There were two main reasons for this: firstly, the tireless energy of the enterprising prince, who sometimes knew how to subtly flatter the author's vanity, play on ambitions, and sometimes be simply persistently intrusive; secondly, the practical absence of people with a conservative way of thinking in choosing platforms for expression - in the picture of journalism at that time, the main place was occupied by publications of a left-liberal and radical persuasion, the conservative press was small in number, so there was no need to analyze it in particular.

In his publication, Meshchersky initially occupied the position of the founding publisher and publicist, providing the position of editor to hired employees. The first editor of "Grazhdanin" was G.K. Gradovsky. Having been deceived in the interpretation of the "non-tendentious" position of the publication, which was initially proclaimed by Meshchersky, the future famous liberal publicist soon realized that he was not on the same path with the publisher, who adhered to conservative convictions, and begged either to sell him the right to publish, or to terminate the contract for the position of editor early.

Meshchersky's first publications were met not just coldly, but with hostility. Discussing the fate of the Great Reforms, the prince allowed himself to make a statement that later earned him the nickname "prince period": without denying the positive significance and benefit of these reforms, he noted that the haste of the reforms being carried out does not even allow one to fully comprehend their results and prospects, Russian state life does not have time to "digest" the reforms, and therefore it is necessary to take a break, to stop the reformist leap at least in order to assess what has come out of the reforms already carried out, to temporarily "put a period" in the reforms.

This article caused a storm of criticism in the liberal press, and criticism of a highly personal nature. For example, in "Notes of the Fatherland" M. E. Saltykov-

Shchedrin will introduce Meshchersky to the public as one of the heroes of "The Diary of a Provincial in St. Petersburg" by Prince Oboldui-Tarakanov.

Although the prince was, of course, upset by such a reception from his fellow writers, Meshchersky "was one of those people who are only egged on by antagonism. Not for ten, not for twenty, not for thirty years, but for half a century he had the 'peculiar courage' to stand alone, having all of Russia against him ⁵⁰⁵." Much later, in the preface to the second edition of the journalistic collection "In Evidence of Time," Meshchersky would declare: "In response to the numerous abuses that characterized the essence of the reviews of my book, I will answer only one thing: I am publishing a second edition, corrected and supplemented with three new articles." However, it is important to remember that this cocky address was sent before the collection of 1880 - this is already the position of a mature journalist who has gained extensive and sad experience in magazine battles. The beginning author reacted to the first critical feuilletons addressed to him with not at all such militant composure. The emotional young man, whom some of his youthful friends had characterized as a "notorious slobberer" for his sentimental nature, after the first attacks in the press on his rashly conservative opuses, so unfashionable in Russian society at the time, by his own admission "out of grief, and again, due to inexperience, I did not sleep for two, but three times two nights ⁵⁰⁶."

Despite such a lukewarm reception of the idea of a "point in reforms" in journalism and in the public, Meshchersky will persistently and consistently develop this idea in his further works. In "Political Letters", he polemicized with those public figures who claimed that in order to overcome the negative aspects of the reforms that had already become clearly evident by the end of the 1870s -, their intensive continuation was necessary. This thesis always puzzled the prince. Reflecting on the problem of freedom of the press, regarding which the publicists of the liberal camp also expressed the opinion that the government, despite the obvious growth of

⁵⁰⁵Russian Word. 1914. No. 158.

⁵⁰⁶Meshchersky V.P. Something like a confession // Speeches of a conservative. St. Petersburg, 1876. P. 6.

nihilistic and socialist propaganda, should continue along the path of liberating the press from state control and it was precisely in moving along this path that they saw the guarantee of harmonizing the situation in the future, Meshchersky wrote: “Here, I confess, what I cannot understand is why the press, which under censorship manages to preach so many lies and falsehoods, will suddenly begin to preach truth and morality with complete freedom! ⁵⁰⁷”

He followed the same logic when reflecting on the problems of zemstvo activity, wondering how the expansion of zemstvo activity could be a solution to the problem of insufficient conscientiousness, efficiency and effectiveness of the already existing zemstvos: “Where is the logic here? The zemstvo has (...) too narrow a circle of activity, the nobility too, and neither one nor the other does anything for the good of Russia or very little: why then, when those who do less are entrusted with doing more, will they do this more better than the less that they did poorly? ⁵⁰⁸” And this question is especially acute in relation to the political representation that many dreamed of, which, according to Meshchersky, will inevitably turn into “empty rhetoric”, since it is completely incomprehensible how “the same zemstvo and the same nobility, who now do not know how to elect chairmen of the boards and leaders, *due to the lack of people* , will suddenly find and elect 58 brilliant Russian people” ⁵⁰⁹, if they are allowed to elect not leaders, but deputies of the Zemstvo Duma. All this, according to Meshchersky, creates a picture in which “children who cannot yet read fluently” were told: “you will never learn to read well, go straight to your own compositions - you will develop faster” ⁵¹⁰. The idea of a “period” or, more accurately, a pause in reforms, which is necessary for understanding and correcting what has already been done, will be one of the constant dominants of Meshchersky's journalism.

⁵⁰⁷Ibid.

⁵⁰⁸Meshchersky V.P. Political letters // Speeches of a conservative. St. Petersburg, 1876. P. 11.

⁵⁰⁹Ibid. P. 12–13.

⁵¹⁰Ibid.

Despite the prince's own pugnacious tone of polemics and the assiduous assistance of the best literary forces, "Grazhdanin", as has already been said, had neither wide distribution nor financial success. Some revival of subscriptions was noted in 1873-74, when F. M. Dostoevsky agreed to take over the editor's duties after Gradovsky's dismissal. We examine this episode in detail in the section devoted to Dostoevsky's journalism; here we will only note that the name of the famous novelist and his column "A Writer's Diary" attracted about a thousand additional subscribers to Meshchersky's publication and, what is important, new authors. Although on the whole "Grazhdanin" did not particularly suffer from a shortage of employees, Dostoevsky's editorship expanded the number of journalists willing to publish in Meshchersky's publication, although the editors did not have the means to pay high fees. Until March 1873, Fyodor Mikhailovich worked alone, then he insisted on the appearance of a secretary position in the editorial office, which was filled by V. F. Putsykovich, who became the official editor of the magazine after Dostoevsky left *Grazhdanin* ⁵¹¹.

It is important to emphasize that close acquaintance and collaboration with Dostoevsky greatly influenced the development of Meshchersky's thought. Gradually, under the influence of Fyodor Mikhailovich's ideas, he developed an idea of the essence of conservatism that was very close to the concept of *pochvennichestvo*: "Now the history of Russia has forced us to enter an era when we must most urgently decide: to whom to sacrifice ourselves: to the Russian people, to be defeated by the Petersburg Russian society, which has finally parted ways with it, or to the latter to submit to the Russian people ⁵¹². "

The insignificant circulation of "Grazhdanin" increased somewhat in 1877, which was, however, a reflection of the general trend associated with the Russo-Turkish War and the increased demand for all periodicals due to it. The theme of Slavic unity and assistance to the Balkan peoples occupied a significant place in

⁵¹¹Chernikova N. Prince V. P. Meshchersky and his epistolary legacy // Meshchersky V. P. Letters to the Grand Duke Alexander Alexandrovich. Moscow: New Literary Review, 2011. P. 31

⁵¹²Meshchersky V.P. People and Society // In the Evidence of Time. 2nd ed. St. Petersburg, 1880. P. 139.

Meshchersky's journalism, but his views on this matter underwent significant changes. The prince's confidence in the need for Russia's active participation in the life of the Balkan Slavs was shaken by his impressions from a trip to Serbia undertaken in 1876. In his book "The Truth about Serbia", Meshchersky describes in detail how the mirage of Slavic unity collapsed in his ideas and a completely different picture was formed, testifying to the absence of real sympathy for the Russians in the Balkans, about the obvious alienation that lay between the "liberators" and the "enslaved".

During the Russo-Turkish War, Meshchersky also found himself in the very center of events and, in the midst of the military campaign, undertook a charity trip to deliver necessary supplies to the wounded. In St. Petersburg, having placed advertisements in newspapers about collecting charitable funds, Meshchersky collected a fairly significant sum, more than 5,000 rubles, and set off on a journey full of dangers, the diary of which he later published as a separate book.

This charity event gave rise to more rumors in society about possible embezzlement, the fact of which the prince, of course, denied. Direct evidence, as well as direct refutations, is impossible to provide in this case, but it is important to note that such accusations affected not only Meshchersky, but also other figures of charity "for the Slavic cause." According to the general practice of that time, accounting of charitable sums was carried out carelessly, it was impossible to take a receipt for its receipt from each soldier who was given tobacco or clothing, it was not customary to pay attention to formalities of this kind. This led to the fact that the hype around charitable sums arose repeatedly - in a similar case, a criminal case was even opened against N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov, which ended in nothing due to the absurdity of the accusations, which I. S. Aksakov, for example, considered offensive and emphasized that in the matter of charity, we can only talk about complete mutual trust between donors and those whom they entrust with managing the collection and distribution of funds.

Like all conservative publications, *Grazhdanin* did not avoid clashes with censorship. The first of these date back to the period of F. M. Dostoevsky's editorship

and represent rather a series of misunderstandings, but in the period 1876-78 the prince's relations with the censorship department can be described as a systematic provocation on its part. The publisher deliberately violated censorship prohibitions every now and then. During the maturing crisis in the Balkans, the Minister of Internal Affairs removed the Eastern Question from public discussion in the press, but Meshchersky, despite this, published an article about the events in Herzegovina and the mistakes of Russian diplomacy. The publication was suspended for a month.

Almost immediately after the resumption, Meshchersky again published an article on the Balkan problem, and the publication was again suspended, this time for a longer period. At the end of 1876 Mr. "Grazhdanin" received a second warning for his article on the university issue, but the enthusiasm of the censorship officials in persecuting the magazine-newspaper faded for a time due to the fact that the sovereign showed interest and favor in some of the publications of the publication, expressing several positive judgments about Meshchersky's articles. The specificity of the bureaucratic machine was always such that the personal sympathies of the authorities meant much more than formal regulations in the eyes of subordinates, so that the embarrassed censors, fearing to receive a reprimand for being picky about a publication that was favorably read by the sovereign, "scrupulously recorded the violations committed by the newspaper," but "instead of real punishment, the editor received only a reprimand"⁵¹³. " However, the prince's stubbornness in criticizing the foreign policy department on the Balkan issue eventually overflowed the patience of even his high-ranking patrons, and in June 1877 the newspaper was suspended after receiving a third warning.

Having barely managed to return to the publishing market, Meshchersky decided to do something that led to the loss of his publication. He published a scandalous speech by I. S. Aksakov at a meeting of the Moscow Slavic Committee. For the indignation expressed in this speech by Aksakov regarding the mistakes of

⁵¹³ Leonov M. M. Salon of V. P. Meshchersky: patronage and mediation in Russia at the turn of the 19th–20th centuries. Samara: Publishing House of the Samara Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2009. P. 285.

Russian diplomacy, which allowed the revision of the San Stefano Treaty at the Berlin Congress, the speaker was sent into exile, so Meshchersky understood perfectly well that the censorship would seize the print run with the text of the speech, not allowing its distribution. According to censorship rules, publications published without prior censorship had to send the censor a test copy before sending the publication by mail. Meshchersky deliberately delayed the delivery of the issue to the censor in order to have time to send the print run to subscribers. The publication was suspended for three months, and its editor V. F. Putsykovich was put on trial.

When interpreting such provocative behavior in the context of the communicative practices of conservative journalism, it can be assumed that Meshchersky was to some extent guided by the precedent of Katkov's confrontation with censorship in the mid-1860s. Katkov's demonstrated integrity, although extremely risky in terms of the publication's prospects, had a huge impact on the formation of his image as a convinced and independent fighter for his political ideals and destroyed any suspicions of selfish pro-government loyalty in the eyes of the public. Let us recall that, despite all the risks, Katkov, thanks to the personal intervention of the emperor and a confluence of political circumstances, emerged victorious from the confrontation with the seemingly all-powerful Minister of Internal Affairs. And this victory not only gave him the opportunity to continue publishing, but also once and for all cemented his reputation as an independent political figure in the eyes of the public, a selfless voice of truth in the eyes of the authorities and, what is important, made him a person practically untouchable in the eyes of censorship.

It can be assumed that such provocative behavior on the part of Meshchersky was an attempt to correct the reputation of "Grazhdanin" as a subsidized pro-government publication, to declare himself as an independent, principled publicist, to attract the sympathetic attention of the public to his selfless struggle for the national interests of Russia. Moreover, the constant favor of high-ranking patrons gave hope for a successful outcome for the prince of such incidents. Let us note that

this hope was much stronger than that of Katkov in 1866, who had neither high-society acquaintances nor experience of personal relations with members of the august family and relied only on his journalistic fame. However, if this assumption is correct, and Meshchersky "played for broke", fighting for the popularity of "Grazhdanin" and his reputation as a selfless political fighter, it must be acknowledged that the prince's strategy was mistaken. The Balkan crisis was too painful a question of Russian foreign policy for the government and the sovereign to tolerate sharp criticism of the foreign policy course in a situation where any mistake could result in a global war with a coalition of the world's largest powers.

The main question that inevitably arises when reflecting on the first period of Meshchersky's publishing activity is what prompted the prince, a skilled courtier and popular novelist, to continue, despite the lack of financial profit, persecution by censors and constant abuse from the press, a seemingly unsuccessful publication? Partially, the answer to this question can be found in the prince's own journalism. In the article "Something Like a Confession" he writes: "In our time of spiritual slush and mud, when a person knows something clearly and is firmly convinced of something, he must speak or, at least, try to speak his thoughts out loud ..." ⁵¹⁴And Meshchersky's sermon was addressed, first of all, not to the convinced supporters of rational progress and nihilism, whom he no longer hoped to convert to other truths, but to those who, due to frivolity and indifference, had not yet made this choice. Meshchersky, criticizing St. Petersburg society, readily admitted that its mass "still consists of good, albeit falsely enthusiastic people," to whom the prince suggests "to come to their senses and conscientiously ask the question: what should be done to help our poor state?" ⁵¹⁵

After the suspension of "Grazhdanin", the prince went abroad, and while he was hatching various plans to organize an editorial office abroad, a lawsuit was launched in Russia against the official editor of the publication, Putsykovich, with

⁵¹⁴Meshchersky V.P. Something like a confession // Speeches of a conservative. St. Petersburg, 1876. P. 4.

⁵¹⁵Meshchersky V.P. People and Society // In the Evidence of Time. 2nd ed. St. Petersburg, 1880. P. 143.

the aim of depriving him of the right to publish "Grazhdanin". The prince's ill-wishers took advantage of the editor's recklessness, having borrowed a large sum of money from one of the Moscow merchants. When it became clear that the borrower could not repay the debt, his property, including the right to publish the newspaper, was auctioned off. After that, for several years, the publication was bought from each other by various people, then it was renamed and ceased to exist altogether.

Left without the "Citizen", the indefatigable prince undertook a number of alternative publishing initiatives. Fearing to be subjected to new troubles in cooperation with hired editors, Meshchersky sought a form of publicistic expression that would leave him freedom of expression of thoughts and eliminate the need to create a collective of authors. The most suitable in this case was the form of the "Diary" tested by Dostoevsky, to which Meshchersky turned. Having received in 1880 In 1881, after receiving permission to publish his Diaries twice a month, the prince also launched another publishing project – the magazine Dobro. The publication was short-lived, with only 24 issues published in 1881. g., it covered issues of charity, church activities and problems of education.

Obviously, the concept of the magazine was connected with some of Meshchersky's old ideas about the problems of education and upbringing. In general, educational issues occupied an important place in the prince's journalism and were directly related to his understanding of the very concept of conservatism. In a short article, "Two Words about Our Conservatives," designated as a "leaflet from a diary," Meshchersky complains that there is no conservative trend in Russian public life, and asks about the reason for this, as he calls it, social vice. He states the reason as follows: "We have no conservatives because we are terribly uneducated and terribly corrupted as a society; we have no conservatives because we do not know what we should protect ⁵¹⁶. "

The source of the negative principle is ignorance, while in order to become a conservative, one must study a lot, because "political convictions are acquired only

⁵¹⁶Meshchersky V.P. Two words about our conservatives // In evidence of time. 2nd ed. St. Petersburg, 1880. P. 155.

through education and learning ⁵¹⁷." The protection of foundations requires a deep understanding of the philosophical and historical prerequisites for their formation, because "if you can destroy what you do not know by denying, you cannot protect what you do not know: whether you want to or not, if you wanted to be a conservative, you had to learn something and drive some moral piles into yourself in order to rest your political and moral world on them ⁵¹⁸. "

Probably, the desire to speak out about these problems prompted the prince to publish the magazine "Dobro", but the idea did not justify itself, the lack of polemical intensity of the articles and a somewhat saccharine tone made the publication boring, and in 1882 Mr. Meshchersky renamed it "Grazhdanin". The prince planned to publish a supplement to the revived "Grazhdanin" - a magazine with caricatures "Dobryak". This satirical publication in the context of the communicative practices of conservative journalism is a unique precedent, since it represents an attempt to turn to satire and caricature, i.e. traditionally uncharacteristic tools of magazine struggle for the conservative direction.

Since "in the last third of the 19th in. the type of weekly satirical magazine with caricatures was already a worldwide phenomenon" ⁵¹⁹, and public demand for satirical graphics was quite high; perhaps Meshchersky counted on an illustrated supplement not so much as an independent publishing project, but as a tool for reviving readers' interest in "Grazhdanin". This is indicated by the fact that with the announced annual price of an annual subscription to "Dobryak" at 7 rubles and the retail price of an issue at 20 kopecks, the supplement cost "Grazhdanin" subscribers 4 rubles a year.

In the first issue of Dobryak, the subtitle was "a small newspaper in the spirit of the times," and instead of an editorial, there was a humorous message to the reader with the following content: "No pen can convey the wealth of thoughts that burst forth at the moment when we sit down to write an editorial, and therefore we do not

⁵¹⁷Ibid.

⁵¹⁸Ibid. P. 160.

⁵¹⁹Golikov A. V. Problems of source study of political caricature (second half of the 19th – early 20th century) // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 8: History. 2011. No. 4. P. 54.

write one ⁵²⁰.” Among the main topics that Dobryak constantly addressed, one can single out the topic of international politics, criticism of liberal public figures (both specific individuals and generalized social types, such as the civilizing intellectual, the Russian liberal, etc.) and the topic of Russian journalism contemporary to the author (it is characteristic that the publisher's satirical attacks were directed not only against prominent figures of the liberal front, such as A. A. Kraevsky, M. M. Stasyulevich, O. K. Notovich, but also against some representatives of the conservative wing, such as A. S. Suvorin, and magazine figures with an uncertain political position, such as P. D. Boborykin and G. D. Goppe) ⁵²¹. The magazine's sharp criticism was also directed against the negative aspects of the journalistic profession that were clearly evident at that time - incompetence, the pursuit of sensation, flirting with the public for commercial purposes. The publisher did not ignore the events of everyday life in the city, for example, the dubious entertainment of the undemanding public. In general, the thematic spectrum of the content of "Dobryak" was quite wide; along with these systematically worked out topics, from time to time the problems of the forming zemstvo, the activities of the St. Petersburg city council, the bureaucratization of state administration, the luxury and extravagance of high society, etc. were also touched upon.

In the sphere of international politics, Meshchersky's satirical attacks were directed at the French Prime Minister, the republican Leon Gambetta, and the "iron chancellor" of the united Germany, Otto von Bismarck. The topic of Russian liberalism, its key figures and social types, was revealed in a topical and diverse manner on the pages of "Dobryak". In the fourth issue of the magazine, in the form of a satirical imitation of advertisements, Meshchersky attacked liberal eloquence: "The Lenta Museum. An unprecedented thing. A talking machine. It takes all sorts

⁵²⁰Good guy. 1882. No. 1. P. 9.

⁵²¹ Kruglikova O. S. The journalistic world of St. Petersburg in caricatures magazine "Dobryak" (1882) // Bulletin of the Voronezh State University. Series: Philology. Journalism. 2022. No. 2. P. 137–142.

of orders for liberal speeches, legal defenses in court for the humiliated and insulted. It is conveniently transferred and even transported to the provinces for zemstvo assemblies." The liberal intelligentsia's reverence for the image of Europe is ridiculed in a cartoon entitled "One of Our Future Metternichs," which depicts an enlightened Russian reader lost in thought over a stack of European newspapers and utterly unaware of the image of Russia hovering before him, traditionally depicted as a young woman in national dress. The hero's reflections are given in the text caption to the drawing: "Of course, Russia, called Rus in the vernacular, is something that exists, I do not argue, but then there is that... there is Europe..."⁵²²

In the criticism of Russian liberalism in Dobryak, the motif of isolation from the people, lack of understanding of their life and interests, traditional for Russian conservatism, sounded most vividly. The caricature "A Civilizing Intellectual in the Village," published in issue 6, depicted a smartly dressed city dweller, who, against the backdrop of a village landscape, is talking with a sullen, frowning peasant. Their conversation was as follows: "– What good is your all-class volost to us? – What? You don't understand? – How can we understand! – Lord: Understand that you can then elect anyone you want as volost elders, an educated person, a cultured intellectual, me, for example. – We humbly thank you..."

A constant hero of Dobryak's cartoons is the grotesque image of the "new intellectual" - an unkempt, long-haired man with a silly but extremely arrogant expression on his face, with the characteristic attributes of a representative of the raznochintsy intelligentsia of the 1870s: a crumpled, shapeless hat and a plaid as outerwear. Most often, this character appears in the vicinity of the leader of the liberal movement, A. A. Kraevsky, either as an employee of his editorial office (Fig. 1), or as a generalized image of the Russian intelligentsia, whose burden the editor of Golos symbolically shouldered (Fig. 2).

⁵²²Good guy. 1882. No. 1. P. 6.



The theme of Russian liberalism is in many ways connected with the theme of Russian journalism, since, criticizing the Russian liberal movement, Meshchersky ridiculed its leaders, famous journalists and publishers, choosing for this not only visual forms - in the fifth issue of *Dobryak*, Kraevsky was awarded an extensive epigram in the form of a ballad song, and in the sixth issue, a large play, "At the Editor of the French Petersburg Newspaper," was published, satirically depicting a whole circle of metropolitan journalism: its heroes, in addition to Kraevsky, were P. D. Boborykin, O. K. Notovich, A. F. Marx and others. Representatives of a completely well-intentioned direction also got it: hinting at a radical change in the political position of the publication "Novoye Vremya" and its owner A. S. Suvorin, who, in the opinion of some contemporaries, danced any dances ordered by the authorities, *Dobryak* placed an advertisement: "We need a teacher of graceful dances, a capable person of old age. years, who always danced the cancan, teach graceful dances even for high society. Address to the editorial office of "New Time"

523.

It was entirely in the spirit of the conservative way of thinking of the editor-publisher, when starting a new business for himself, a satirical magazine, to turn to

⁵²³Good guy. 1882. No. 1. P. 10.

the best examples of the past, to tradition. Remembering the heyday of Russian magazine satire in the time of Catherine the Great, Meshchersky seeks inspiration in publications from a century ago, and successfully masters such forms as the genre of satirical imitation of an advertisement invented by N. I. Novikov, literary masks with speaking names in the spirit of the era of classicism.

Examples of satirical ads have already been given above, it should be noted that in their caustic satire "Dobryak" did not always manage to preserve an element of refined elegance, and along with examples of language play such as "Disorder in order, a new book of 365 sheets, the Main warehouse in Stasyulevich's bookstore"⁵²⁴, there also appeared such simple ones as "Sarah Bernard - a miraculous laxative. Sold in all drugstores in the city"⁵²⁵. Among the undoubtedly successful attempts of the publisher to master the satirical genres of the Catherine era, one can include an imitation of the scientific and philosophical treatise "On the application of mathematics to life. An attempt at a dissertation for the title of humorist", placed under the signature of Integral Evolvents in the fifth issue of the magazine. The "dissertation" was a witty attempt to describe all stages of a person's life through mathematical functions.

Apparently, having become more familiar with the best examples of satire of the past, Prince Meshchersky saw that many of them retained interest and relevance after a century, and therefore, in the conditions of a shortage of authors, he decided to make up for the lack of original materials with unique retrospective borrowings. Thus, a political section, "The Conversational Citizen," appeared in "Grazhdanin," with a title that reminded readers of the Masonic magazine of the 18th century, and it was decided to place the "satirical, poetic and anecdotal parts" of the contents of the magazines of Catherine's time in "Dobryak": "And since these materials are drawn from old Russian magazines and newspapers that were published a hundred years ago or more, we found it entirely appropriate to give this new section in

⁵²⁴Ibid.

⁵²⁵Ibid.

“Dobryak” the name “Centennial Dobryak ⁵²⁶.” The “Centennial Dobryak” column was published in the first five issues of the magazine, and soon disappeared from its pages, apparently not having gained recognition from readers.

"Dobryak" actively used small forms of satire - puns, aphorisms, jokes in the form of short question-and-answer dialogues. Sometimes they could really lay claim to being called successful witticisms, but for the most part they had a strained, heavy tone of a forced joke. So, for example, along with sharp barbs addressed to fellow journalists like "When you want to be a newspaper employee, try to write about what you don't know, someone else will write about what you know", there were also such examples of wit as "Why does a duck swim? From the shore". The same examples can be found in the "Upper Levels" column, published in issues 5-8 of the magazine and containing aphorisms built according to one pattern - actions were named that were declared "the height of stupidity", "the height of absent-mindedness", "the height of frivolity", etc. In this column, satirical attacks on the magazine's opponents, such as "the height of naivety is to think that *the aunt* to whom Shchedrin writes letters reads them," ⁵²⁷were accompanied by jokes like "the height of absent-mindedness is to leave the evening with someone else's wife" or "the height of forgetfulness is to forget your own name ⁵²⁸." Over time, satirical materials were displaced from the pages of Dobryak by fiction, and satirical genres gave way to reprints of news from other newspapers.

Speaking about the genre specificity of the illustrative part of the magazine, first of all, caricatures, it should be noted that obvious grotesque, which is the most traditional technique of caricature, was resorted to in Dobryak extremely rarely. This was a particular manifestation of the tendency, common for Russian magazine satirical graphics of this period, to transfer the comic emphasis to the text part, which sometimes required providing the drawing with very lengthy captions. In addition to the fact that the genre nature of caricature itself is characterized by the unification

⁵²⁶Good guy. 1882. No. 1. P. 10.

⁵²⁷Good guy. 1882. No. 5. P. 8.

⁵²⁸Good guy. 1882. No. 6. P. 6.

of verbal and iconic components into a visual and semantic whole ⁵²⁹, researchers rightly see in this the influence of the censorship realities of the time ⁵³⁰- the attention of censors to images was traditionally especially close, so that artists involuntarily gravitated towards a neutral genre scene as the basis of the plot, while the comic meaning was revealed in the text accompaniment, and sometimes arose from a combination of textual cues of the dialogue/monologue of the characters and the circumstances outlined by the genre scene.

It is this type of caricature that is most often encountered on the pages of the magazine "Dobryak". For example, on the 7th page of the 1st issue of the magazine there was a caricature depicting, without any visual exaggeration or distortion, a dialogue between typical officials of a certain department. The image does not give us anything other than a completely typical picture of everyday official life; on a visual level, from the mutual position of the figures we can only extract the understanding that a dialogue is depicted between a superior and a subordinate. The comic meaning is revealed only in the lines of the characters given in the text: "- Have mercy, this is a year's work, the certificates alone will last for a year and a half. - And great, throw away this year and a half, and I will give you an hour of time: a quarter of an hour for reflection, a quarter of an hour for consideration, a quarter of an hour for a conclusion, a quarter of an hour for a decision ⁵³¹. "

One of the ideological leaders of the liberal movement, A. A. Kraevsky, was subjected to a grotesque depiction with the preservation of a pronounced portrait resemblance on the pages of Dobryak. He was depicted on the pages of Dobryak as short-legged and fat, disproportionately built, sometimes in deliberate proximity to the gigantic, well-built figure of a Russian peasant ⁵³², which was probably supposed

⁵²⁹Voronina O. A. Caricature as a type of creolized text // Bulletin of the Central International Relations Department of Moscow State University. Russian Studies. 2009. No. 2. P. 14-16.

⁵³⁰Golikov A. V. Problems of source study of political caricature (second half of the 19th – early 20th century) // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series. 8: History. 2011. No. 4. P. 51–71; Finyagina N. P. Exposing the struggle of the autocracy against revolutionary democrats in Russian caricature of the 1860s // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series. 8: History. 1968. No. 4.

⁵³¹Good guy. 1882. No. 1. P. 7.

⁵³²Good guy. 1882. No. 28. P. 2.

to show the spiritual insignificance of the liberal intelligentsia, which had broken away from the people, compared to the power of the people's truth - a very characteristic motif for Russian conservative journalism of this period.

The pages of *Dobryak* also featured full-fledged, detailed graphic stories, most reminiscent of modern comics in format – a series of 5-10 pictures telling the story of a certain character. Obviously, the new format was not something familiar and established, it was tested by the publisher in the process of a certain creative search – one can notice changes in the ratio of the pictorial and textual parts of the narrative. In the two-part graphic story “The Matchmaker Horse”, published in the 18th and 20th issues of the magazine, the comic plot is revealed through short dialogue lines of the characters, given in each graphic miniature, i.e. exactly as we most often see in modern comics. In the stories “An Ordinary Story” (issue 4) and “Daily Petersburg Drama in Three Acts” (issue 8), the text is given only as a title to each graphic miniature, designating a certain stage of the process, for example, the life stage of the hero in “An Ordinary Story” or the stage of the ordeals of petitioners forced to seek information from government agencies, in “Petersburg Drama”; in conveying the content, feelings and thoughts of the heroes of the depicted stage, each graphic miniature of the series is self-sufficient and does not require textual cues.

The 8th issue of the magazine also uses a completely original method of correlating the narrative image and text. The series of graphic sketches "Money. The Great Poem of Life" is placed separately from the text on an insert significantly larger than the format of the magazine pages, stitched together with the other pages, but folded in four (it should be noted that this is not the only case of placing large-format images on a folding insert - the story "The Matchmaker Horse" and some other illustrations are given in the magazine in exactly the same way). On the next page of the usual format, under the heading "Text for the First Series of Pictures", there is a cycle of poems, each of which reveals the plot of one of the graphic sketches.

The genre and content transformation of the magazine was probably determined by two main factors. First of all, there were constant clashes with

ensorship. The second factor was the impossibility of maintaining a high level of originality and diversity of texts in a magazine that was essentially created by a single author, who also acted in the same capacity for *Grazhdanin*, which also did not have a wide permanent circle of employees. Meshchersky, who was essentially forced to write all the texts for two publications at once, took on an overwhelming task, especially considering the fact that he was responsible for all the publishing and legal hassles for both magazines. A gradual decrease in satirical sharpness and the displacement of original genre forms by borrowings, reprints and fiction (often by the same Meshchersky) was inevitable. Perhaps, at the beginning of the project, the prince hoped that he would be able to attract a wide circle of authors to collaborate, but in reality this did not happen.

Already in September 1882, Meshchersky published a heartfelt address from the editors to the readers, which he puts in the form of a diary entry. The editor-publisher announces to the readers a change in the format of the magazine – from now on, “*Dobryak*” will be published as a collection of fiction without illustrations, and instead of the traditional caricatures, art albums will be published once a month. In the opinion of the prince, “compiled without haste,” such albums “will satisfy subscribers much more than hastily prepared drawings.” Wanting to explain this decision to the public, the prince then includes a fragment from his diary.

This form presupposes a trusting intimacy with the reader and allows the editor to admit his mistakes bluntly, albeit bitterly: “I am as convinced that ‘*Grazhdanin*’, thank God, is moving forward, as I am convinced that ‘*Dobryak*’ is a failure.” The following lines suggest that we may be dealing with an imitation of a diary entry rather than a genuine document: “I think that readers will agree with this <with the failure of ‘*Dobryak*’> agree. The French proverb says that a sin confessed is half forgiven.” If these are diary reflections in solitude, then where is the appeal to the reader, to whom the said sin was confessed and by whom it was forgiven? In the 1883 edition In the prince’s diaries, the entry reprinted in “*Dobryak*” is indeed

present with the same date "Wednesday, July 28, 1882" g." ⁵³³, however, it should be understood that Meshchersky's desire to publish his own diaries for the general public during his lifetime gave these entries a specific character - this is more a form of artistic and journalistic work than a diary in the original sense of the word. However, a comparison of these entries shows that they are not identical, since on the pages of "Dobryak", which was subject to censorship as a periodical, the prince did not consider it possible to print what could have been printed in a book, namely his complaints about the ferocity of censorship, which are present in the book edition, but crossed out in the magazine. The main reason for the failure, the prince believes, "is the impossibility of publishing what I had planned, a politically satirical publication with caricatures, under preliminary censorship. The picture is ready, the caption is made, there is salt: this salt, bam, is crossed out and it turns out - nothing; and sometimes like this: the picture is ready: the picture is fucked, would you like to compose and launch a new one in a hurry" ⁵³⁴.

Explaining to the reader the reasons for the fiasco of the publishing project on the pages of Dobryak itself, the editor points only to the lack of personnel and the impossibility of making up for it with his own efforts - good artists "have been taken apart between previous publications, and there are no new ones; we have to make do with mediocrity, and that's not it" ⁵³⁵, and the editor himself "doesn't have enough time and brains for this kind of publication". Noting that he devotes his main efforts to Grazhdanin as his life's work, Meshchersky admits that "a satirically illustrated publication can only come out tolerable when you give it a lot of time and a large circle of collaborators" ⁵³⁶.

From issue 32 to 39, Dobryak is published as a collection of fiction, and at the end of issue 38, an announcement is placed that the first issue of an album of pictures is enclosed with this issue. However, then the format of the magazine changes again.

⁵³³Meshchersky V. P. Diaries. St. Petersburg: M. Rumsha Printing House, 1883. Pp. 316–318.

⁵³⁴Meshchersky V. P. Diaries. St. Petersburg: M. Rumsha Printing House, 1883. P. 317.

⁵³⁵Good guy. 1882. No. 29. P. 1.

⁵³⁶Ibid.

Apparently, the publisher was never able to determine the exact path for the magazine to emerge from the crisis, trying to hold out until the end of the subscription year in tossing and turning and doubting. From issue 42 to 47, chaos reigns in the magazine: illustrations of different formats and genres - landscapes, portraits, copies of pastoral drawings, a sketch of the Suez Canal and several caricatures - replace each other in an unclear logical sequence and in a dubious correlation with the text part of the magazine. From issue 47 to 52, the magazine is published without illustrations, and at issue 52 it ceases to exist ⁵³⁷.

The idea of an illustrated magazine had been nurtured by the prince for a long time - in a letter to Tsar Alexander III in October 1882, he points out that a year earlier he had already talked with Count N. P. Ignatiev about the need for a conservative illustrated publication "with the participation of the best writers and with pictures and articles of a strictly conservative direction, in imitation of the magazine "Niva", which was distributed in fabulous quantities with 75,000 subscribers, to our shame in the hands of a German subject" ⁵³⁸. Although in the prince's further explanations regarding this project, a concept emerges that is fundamentally different from the first issues of "Dobryak": "The idea was this: through imperceptibly interesting reading, good stories, strong and heartfelt articles, little by little to produce propaganda of order and force people to get used to the sounds of conservative speech as willingly as they are now getting used to the sounds of liberal speech" ⁵³⁹.

Apparently, the prince came to the idea of a magazine with an "inconspicuous" idea, i.e. an entertaining and outwardly apolitical magazine, like the family "Niva", after the first experiments with publishing "Dobryak", which, while striving to get closer to A. F. Marx's magazine in format and richness of illustrations, in terms of

⁵³⁷ Kruglikova O. S. Illustrated magazine of Prince V. P. Meshchersky "Dobryak" in the context of the development of conservative journalism of the second half of the 19th century // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 10. Journalism. 2022. No. 3. P. 132–151.

⁵³⁸ Meshchersky V. P. Letters to Emperor Alexander III, 1881–1894 // V. P. Meshchersky. Correspondence. Moscow: New Literary Review, 2018. Pp. 14–15.

⁵³⁹ Ibid. P. 15.

content had the character of a cocky and sharp political satire, very far from the restrained tone of entertaining family reading.

The first issues of *Dobryak*, published in January 1882, contained many sharp political attacks against liberal journalism, caustic epigrams, and attacks on the St. Petersburg City Duma. However, by October 1882, i.e. by the time the aforementioned letter to the Emperor was written, the magazine had partially changed its character, moving from pamphlets and epigrams to fiction, and from political caricatures to sketches of city festivities, portraits, and paintings depicting scenes of family life.

What was the reason for the change in the tone of the publication? Probably, when taking on a new publishing project with his characteristic impulsiveness and eccentricity, the prince did not form a fully completed idea, a publishing concept. Meshchersky, analyzing the experience of contemporary publishers, counted on strengthening the market position of the magazine "*Grazhdanin*" due to the illustrated supplement.

Indeed, by the end of the 1870s, illustrated weeklies had won the sympathy of a fairly wide range of readers: "the total audience of illustrated magazines was approximately 100 thousand subscribers at the end of the 1870s, and about 500 thousand at the beginning of the 20th century."⁵⁴⁰ But what was this audience? A. I. Reitblat, characterizing the typical audience of illustrated weeklies in the last quarter of the 19th century based on subscription data and the memoirs of contemporaries, notes that it was "an 'intermediate' layer of the reading public, consisting of 'semi-educated' readers. These were, as a rule, minor and mid-level officials, rural priests, merchants and townspeople, provincial intelligentsia"⁵⁴¹, and their reading practice included subscribing to the magazine as a tribute to fashion, to mark their belonging to the educated class, and contact with the magazine was reduced to looking at pictures, sometimes without reading the texts at all. This undemanding public, who

⁵⁴⁰ Reitblat A. I. *From Bova to Balmont and other works on the historical sociology of Russian literature*. Moscow: New Literary Review, 2009. P. 102.

⁵⁴¹ *Ibid.* P. 101.

wanted "sensationalism, interest, and enticing information" ⁵⁴²from the publishers required a certain approach, and this approach did not involve turning to political satire, especially satire of the kind used by Meshchersky. The characteristics of the target audience will set a unique direction for the development of the illustrated weekly as a type of publication, and at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries will provide examples of an eclectic hybrid format of the illustrated press.⁵⁴³

The semi-literate reader did not understand the intricacies of the relationships between journalists of the elite St. Petersburg press, did not reflect on the intrigues of Bismarck, did not read the subtle allusions to the press of the last century. Such content clearly showed that Dobryak was addressed to an educated readership. Among this audience, Meshchersky's publication, aimed at ridiculing and criticizing liberal views, could not count on commercial success, and in this respect, it repeated the fate of all journalistic projects of the conservative camp. Liberal democratic ideas were the dominant direction of thought of the educated society of the post-reform era, so Meshchersky's hopes for reviving interest in the conservative *Grazhdanin* through a satirical supplement were utopian from the very beginning - a magazine called to ridicule the liberalism of the educated classes could not be popular among those whom it chose as the target of its ridicule.

Undoubtedly, the censorship realities of the time also did not contribute to the success of "Dobryak". The time for political caricature, even of a conservative nature, was not at all favorable: the precarious position of the new sovereign in the first years of his reign forced him to seek a difficult balance between firmness in the fight against radical terrorist parties and the need not to irritate moderately liberal social groups, if possible, turning them into allies. Therefore, from the point of view of censorship, Meshchersky's right-wing radical statements were just as inappropriate at that time as the statements of the left-wing radical press, and some of the prepared materials for the issue were banned from time to time.

⁵⁴²Ibid.

⁵⁴³ Kruglikova O. S., Silantyev K. V. "The Weekly "Life and Court" (1911–1917) in the Context of Typological Transformations of the Press at the Beginning of the 20th Century." *Moscow University Bulletin. Series 10. Journalism*. 2024. No. 5. pp. 115–138.

All of these factors combined led to the fact that Dobryak, during the year of its publication, did not demonstrate a clearly expressed publishing concept, wavering between sharp satire and the harmless entertainment of a politically neutral illustrated magazine, and ultimately did not win the sympathy of the public. However, despite the commercial failure of the illustrated supplement, the new *Grazhdanin* marked a very special stage in the work of Prince Meshchersky.

Having begun publication after the accession of Alexander III, the magazine acquired a particularly important significance in the picture of Russian journalism after the publisher regained the emperor's personal favor. In 1883 Mr. Meshchersky was invited to the palace through Pobedonostsev, and his ten-year exclusion from the person of Alexander Alexandrovich ended with a friendly meeting. No longer limited by pressure from his father and his confidants, Alexander III this time did not refuse his friend from his youth financial assistance for his publication. "*Grazhdanin*" began to receive a subsidy, at first quite moderate, about 3,000 rubles a year, and after 1887 In the year 1917, when Meshchersky succeeded in transforming his weekly into a daily newspaper, the subsidy could reach 100,000 rubles per year. It should be noted that the exact amount of the subsidy is widely disputed by both contemporaries and historians, so it is difficult to say for certain how much was allocated to support *Grazhdanin*. The widest range of different versions is given by A. IN. Kyle ⁵⁴⁴.

Such "generous support became possible not only thanks to the emperor's favor, but also thanks to the assistance of Meshchersky's protégés - Vyshnegradsky and Durnovo ⁵⁴⁵." Speaking about Meshchersky's "protégés," it should be explained that, simultaneously with the return of the emperor's favor, the prince's salon, which gathered in his house in Grodno Dead End, also regained its former influence. From the end of the 1880s, the source of Meshchersky's political influence was not the popularity (very dubious) of his publication, but his skillful use of the weapon of

⁵⁴⁴Kail A. V. "Citizen" of Prince V. P. Meshchersky // *Bulletin of the Saratov University. Series: History. International Relations*. 2011. Vol. 11. Issue 1. Pp. 8–15.

⁵⁴⁵Dronov I. E. *The Path of a Conservative // Meshchersky V. P. Citizen Conservative*. Moscow: Ichthyos magazine "New Book of Russia", 2005. P. 54.

court intrigue to promote his like-minded people to government posts. "Who among the influential St. Petersburg officials, ministers and courtiers does not know Grodno Dead End," the newspaper "Evening Time" joked about this ⁵⁴⁶. Yes, the path to power for many famous politicians of that time lay through these "environments", where, by demonstrating political views close to the owner of the salon, one could enlist support for further promotion. At the same time, it should be noted that Meshchersky's patronage was completely disinterested; he used his extensive family connections and influence at court to fill government positions with his protégés, not because he himself hoped to enrich himself or advance in the service in this way. Explaining Meshchersky's refusal to take the position of Minister of Public Education offered to him, the researcher of his court life M. M. Leonov makes a reasonable assumption that "he was psychologically repelled by bureaucratic activity" ⁵⁴⁷, so the prince's motives were most likely not connected with personal career ambitions.

In 1880, in one of the articles in the collection "In Evidence of Time," Meshchersky describes his vision of Russia's needs as follows: "Russia needs what its Tsar needs most of all: politically moral and honest servants, and she needs nothing more. With honest servants, Russia can be patient, happy, and powerful without reforms, but with dishonest servants, any reform will only harm Russia and increase disorder ⁵⁴⁸." This idea is encountered many times in various forms in Meshchersky's journalism: Russia's main problem is the lack of people, the lack of deep and serious statesmen. Meshchersky was always irritated by talk about new public institutions as a way to save the situation; he understood that the issue was not in the structure of this or that new institution, but in the fact that any institution consists of people who, if they are immoral or uneducated, will distort and turn any, even the most noble institution, into harm.

⁵⁴⁶Evening time. 1914. No. 812.

⁵⁴⁷ Leonov M. M. V. P. Meshchersky: Russian conservatism and government policy in the late 19th – early 20th centuries: author's abstract. diss. ... candidate of historical sciences. Samara, 1999. P. 11.

⁵⁴⁸Meshchersky V.P. Letter to one of our Pitts // In evidence of time. St. Petersburg, 1880. P. 298.

Meshchersky also exhaustively characterizes the qualities that a true statesman should possess in his publicistic speeches: “To always be a son of his country, not by the salary he receives from it, and not only in body, but in spirit, to be unable to think otherwise than with his country, undividedly, to feel himself existing for it, and not it for himself, to imagine himself vividly and constantly before the Head of this country, and not to be able to imagine the Head of the country separately from the country and the people, to be aware of his invisible responsibility before the conscience and judgment of the people every time he stands before the Throne, and to know neither concessions to duty nor deals with his conscience...”

⁵⁴⁹All who managed to appear in the eyes of the prince as a person at least to some extent corresponding to these high requirements could count on the prince’s support in court circles and his comprehensive patronage.

In this desire to promote his protégés to vacant positions, Meshchersky comes into sharp conflict with Pobedonostsev, who had once patronized him. Moreover, “behind their clashes over the filling of administrative positions are hidden not only the desire to promote their own creature, but also fundamental differences. In the selection of candidates for positions, it is easy to see the profound difference in the models of state administration they defend ⁵⁵⁰.” Understanding this conflict is important for understanding the evolution of Russian conservatism as a whole.

For many conservatives, who saw autocracy as a historically justified form of power, generated by the direct expression of the will of the people and closely connected with this people, it was typical to perceive bureaucracy as a dangerous dividing wall between the tsar and the people, which led to conservative press organs (publications of Katkov, Aksakov, and others) actively criticizing the highest officials. In Meshchersky, who at this period of his activity considered himself free from persecution by censorship thanks to the patronage of the sovereign, this criticism sometimes reached the point of "outright mockery of the bureaucratization

⁵⁴⁹Ibid. P. 295.

⁵⁵⁰ Dronov I. E. *The Path of a Conservative // Meshchersky V. P. Citizen Conservative.* Moscow: Ichthyos magazine “New Book of Russia”, 2005. Pp. 7–84.

of Russian ministries ⁵⁵¹." "Grazhdanin" smashed the St. Petersburg bureaucracy in every way, and Meshchersky, in the late 1880s. increasingly inclined to the concept of Russian autocracy, akin to the ideas of Yu. F. Samarin about the "people's monarchy", he began to consider the omnipotence of the bureaucratic machine and the growing formalism, the "officialism" of the conservative philosophy appropriated by the bureaucracy, as the main danger to the state. The ideological background of the conflict between the prince and Pobedonostsev, who in the eyes of Meshchersky was the living embodiment, the symbol of bureaucracy and official "bureaucratic" conservatism, was precisely that the publisher of "Grazhdanin" feared the death of a living and independent conservative idea under the yoke of the deadening formalism of its official apologists ⁵⁵². Therefore, if Pobedonostsev's protégés were professional bureaucrats, whose personality and views were formed in the depths of the official machine, then Meshchersky's creatures were temperamental charismatics, convinced that common sense is above formal rules ⁵⁵³.

The struggle for the post of publisher of *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* after the death of M. N. Katkov gave this conflict a special edge. Meshchersky fought with all his might against the candidacy supported by Pobedonostsev and his protégé, the head of the censorship department, E. M. Feoktistov. The prince feared that *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*, which was completely under the control of Feoktistov and Pobedonostsev, would become a tool in the journalistic struggle against *Grazhdanin*, which he was reviving in a new format, and he tried to persuade the sovereign not to give the newspaper to S. A. Petrovsky, who was favored by Pobedonostsev.

It should be noted that the scandalous topic connected with the accusation of Prince Meshchersky of sodomy first appeared and began to be actively discussed in

⁵⁵¹ Leonov M. M. *Salon of V. P. Meshchersky: Patronage and Mediation in Russia at the Turn of the 19th and 20th Centuries*. Samara: Publishing House of the Samara Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2009. P. 300.

⁵⁵² Dronov I. E. *Development of a conservative concept of Russia's development in the works of V. P. Meshchersky (second half of the 19th – early 20th centuries): author's abstract*. diss. ... candidate of historical sciences. Moscow, 2007.

⁵⁵³ Dronov I. E. *The Path of a Conservative // Meshchersky V. P. Citizen Conservative*. Moscow: Ichthyos magazine "New Book of Russia", 2005. Pp. 54–57.

society precisely during the intense competitive struggle around the *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*, and the source of these rumors and their most active distributor, according to Meshchersky himself, was E. M. Feoktistov.

Many researchers of Meshchersky's life and work note that the intensification of obscene hints about the prince's non-traditional preferences in society and the press always accompanied certain political conflicts or court intrigues in which he was involved⁵⁵⁴, of course, with the aim of discrediting him. For the prince's political opponents, this argument was a sure bet, despite the fact that the Russian high society of the 19th century treated sexual deviations in general quite tolerantly and not aggressively, but it was in relation to Meshchersky that this accusation acquired special meaning, since a sodomite who advocated for the inviolability of Orthodoxy and willingly moralized on the topic of family values seemed to be a person who was, by definition, two-faced and not worthy of trust. Therefore, speculations around the moral character of the prince would become an effective tool of political struggle against him for many years. Leaving aside the still controversial question of the validity of these accusations, we will only note that perhaps it was the conflict around *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* and the conflict with Pobedonostsev's circle in general that was the starting point for the further persecution of Meshchersky as a "citizen of Gomorrah"⁵⁵⁵.

After F. M. Dostoevsky passed away in 1881, I. S. Aksakov in 1886, and a year later M. N. Katkov and N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov, Meshchersky remained the only major representative of the conservative idea in the publishing market. Relying on the exceptional nature of his position, he asked the sovereign for the right to transform his weekly into a daily newspaper and received an additional subsidy for this transformation.

⁵⁵⁴ Leonov M. M. *Salon of V. P. Meshchersky: Patronage and Mediation in Russia at the Turn of the 19th and 20th Centuries*. Samara: Publishing House of the Samara Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2009. Pp. 222–251; Chernikova N. *Prince V. P. Meshchersky and his epistolary legacy // Meshchersky IN. P. Letters to the Grand Duke Alexander Alexandrovich*. Moscow: New Literary Review, 2011. P. 9.

⁵⁵⁵ One of the most famous epigrams about Prince V. P. Meshchersky, written by Vl. Solovyov, contained the line "Prince of Sodom and citizen of Gomorrah."

Meshchersky had won the struggle for ideological influence on the emperor; Pobedonostsev's political influence was on the wane. The pessimism inherent in the nature of the chief prosecutor, who was distinguished by an amazingly subtle critical mind but incapable of positive, creative activity, had a depressing effect on the emperor and paralyzed Pobedonostsev's own administrative initiatives. The tsar needed not a sad statement of the incorrigibility of humanity, but a program of action, a strategy for the development of the state, a plan of specific measures, and an optimistic belief in their feasibility and the possibility of success, a belief without which an active reign was impossible. The tireless Meshchersky always had this at his disposal - new plans (sometimes very dubious), new people, conviction in the great future of the country and a thirst for activity. Pobedonostsev, who was irreplaceable at the beginning of the reign, fulfilled his function, as K. Leontiev put it, of "freezing the rotting", but he could not grow the living, and was no longer needed. Meshchersky will reach the apogee of his influence in 1892, when "not a single major appointment of the year took place without a weighty word from the publisher of "Grazhdanin" ⁵⁵⁶.

The question of the newspaper's popularity during this period remains open. If we look solely at the circulation figures, we are forced to conclude that Meshchersky's publication was not popular - at the height of its influence, in the early 1890s, the publication had about 5,000 subscribers and no more than 1,000 issues in retail sale. At the beginning of the 20th century, its circulation did not exceed 2,000 copies. But at the same time, "Grazhdanin" was undoubtedly at the very center of magazine life and controversy, and its content was well known to the educated reader. Interesting observations are made in this regard by researcher M. M. Leonov, who turned to library archival data. "Grazhdanin" had almost a record number of requests from readers. For people with a vague socio-political position, who sometimes sympathized with some of the ideas of "Grazhdanin", having a copy of Meshchersky's newspaper or even more so a subscription receipt was undesirable,

⁵⁵⁶ Dronov I. E. The Path of a Conservative // Meshchersky V. P. Citizen Conservative. Moscow: Ichthyos magazine "New Book of Russia", 2005. P. 57.

since such an expression of interest in a conservative publication was "not comme il faut" from the point of view of social fashion, and could cause mocking glances from representatives of the party of progress. The liberal-minded reading public did not want to contribute to the material success of "Grazhdanin" by subscribing or buying it at retail, but wanted to familiarize themselves with its content in order to "know the enemy by sight". So "Grazhdanin", despite its formally low circulation, had a fairly wide readership, replenished by library subscribers.

A new period in Meshchersky's creative activity began with the death of his royal patron. Nicholas II was hostile to Meshchersky at the beginning of his reign and, although he did not dare to immediately stop the subsidy to *Grazhdanin* upon his accession, which would have been a gesture that was too obviously at odds with the policy of his late father, he nevertheless warned the prince that financial assistance to the publication was being provided for the last time ⁵⁵⁷. Having lost his support, the prince was forced to abandon the idea of publishing a daily newspaper in 1895 and publish *Grazhdanin* twice a week.

However, since 1902, the process of rapprochement between the prince and the court and the sovereign has begun once again, Nicholas II changes his anger to mercy, and, having returned the subsidy to the magazine, although in a much smaller amount (according to various sources, from 18,000 to 24,000 rubles per year ⁵⁵⁸), he expresses sympathy for many of the prince's ideas in his personal correspondence, and over time, switches to the informal "you" with him. The prince acquired colossal influence on the domestic and foreign policy of Nicholas II. One of the leading motives in the prince's journalism during this period and especially on the eve of the First World War becomes the demand for Russia's non-interference in the affairs of the Balkan Slavs and the further debunking of the myth of pan-Slavic unity. Since 1911, "Grazhdanin" became a weekly and was published until the prince's death in

⁵⁵⁷Kail A. V. "Citizen" of Prince V. P. Meshchersky // *Bulletin of the Saratov University*. Series: History. International Relations. 2011. Vol. 11. Issue 1. P. 13.

⁵⁵⁸Kail, A. V., "The Citizen" of Prince V. P. Meshchersky // *Bulletin of the Saratov University*. Series: History. International Relations. 2011. Vol. 11. Issue 1. Pp. 8–15; Dronov, I. E., *The Path of a Conservative // V. P. Meshchersky, The Citizen Conservative*. Moscow: Ichthyos Magazine "New Book of Russia," 2005. Pp. 7–84.

1914, continuing during the 1905 revolution to consistently defend the inviolability of the monarchical idea and the basic principles that had formed in Meshchersky's system of political views in the 1870s and 1880s.

§ 2.4 Communicative practices of F. M. Dostoevsky: between journalism and preaching

The question of the relationship between the elements of publicism, journalism and artistic literary creativity in Dostoevsky's writing remains open and is widely debated ⁵⁵⁹. This debate was already started by Dostoevsky's contemporaries. The liberal democratic press of the 1870s and 1880s, both in the capital and in the provinces, was unanimous in its assessment of Dostoevsky as a good writer, but a second-rate thinker and a mediocre publicist ⁵⁶⁰, while K. N. Leontiev, for example, believed that "A Writer's Diary" was of greater value than all of Dostoevsky's novels, and N. N. Strakhov, wanting to describe the creative biography of Fyodor Mikhailovich, from the very beginning focused his attention on his journalistic activities: "it is most convenient for me to begin my memoirs with a reference to his journalism⁵⁶¹." Later, Strakhov emphasized that Dostoevsky was "a true journalist... from his youth he was brought up on journalism and remained faithful to it until the end ⁵⁶²."

In saying that Dostoevsky "was brought up on journalism," Strakhov notes a feature that is characteristic of the ideological development of not only Dostoevsky, but also of an entire generation of Russian educated society. In the spirit of the

⁵⁵⁹ Prokhorov G. S. Narrative structure of "A Writer's Diary" by F. M. Dostoevsky (formulation of the question) // *New Philological Bulletin*. 2010. Vol. 15. No. 4. Pp. 5–14.

⁵⁶⁰ Volgin I. L. Dostoevsky – journalist: ("A writer's diary" and the Russian public). Moscow: Moscow State University Publishing House, 1982. Pp. 29–35.

⁵⁶¹ Strakhov N. N. Memories of F. M. Dostoevsky // *Dostoevsky in the Memories of Contemporaries: in 2 volumes*. Moscow: Fiction, 1990. Vol. 1. P. 375.

⁵⁶² *Ibid.* P. 531.

ideological legacy of the 1840s, Dostoevsky's generation in its youth still believed in journalism as a public service, in the power of the public speech, perceived as a feat. In the second half of the century, under the influence of commercialization and the desire for mass appeal, journalism changed, and its reader changed, which, of course, did not escape the keen eye of the writer, who generously gave very ironic and caustic characteristics to many figures in the press of his time. However, despite this, he always considered journalistic creativity to be an important matter - "speaking to the public and the literary sphere, he went out to the market, to the square, and did not in the least think of being ashamed of either his craft or his fellow craftsmen ⁵⁶³. " Dostoevsky always strove to directly express himself on the issues of the day.

Dostoevsky's philosophical and political concept is expressed primarily in works of art, i.e. indirectly, through the plot, through the words, actions and assessments of his characters. We can judge the author's own position only by his attitude to the characters who are the bearers of one or another system of views, and his attitude is often expressed symbolically and figuratively, so that, in the words of M. Bakhtin, "for some researchers Dostoevsky's voice merges with the voices of one or another of his characters, for others it is a kind of synthesis of all these ideological voices, and for others, finally, it is simply drowned out by them⁵⁶⁴." This always worried the writer himself.

In one of his letters to K. P. Pobedonostsev, written during the period of work on the novel "The Brothers Karamazov", Dostoevsky reveals his intention to express a positive idea that would provide answers to the questions posed by Dostoevsky's opponents and put into the mouth of his literary hero, Ivan Karamazov. In the image of Ivan, the writer deliberately embodies in a concentrated form the features of the movement that he would like to oppose, but does not seek to simplify this image to a collection of negative features; on the contrary, he paints Ivan for readers in all his apparent correctness and charming attractiveness. That is why the writer's main

⁵⁶³Ibid. P. 523.

⁵⁶⁴Bakhtin M. M. Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics. Moscow: Fiction, 1972. P. 29.

concern is whether the positive idea expressed in the image of Alyosha Karamazov will be a "sufficient answer", since this answer is "not direct, not to the positions previously expressed (in "The Grand Inquisitor" and earlier) point by point, but only indirect. Here something directly opposite to the worldview expressed above is presented, but again it is presented not point by point, but so to speak, in an artistic picture. This is what worries me, that is, will I be understood and will I achieve at least a drop of the goal. And here, in addition, there are still the duties of artistry: it was necessary to present a modest and majestic figure, meanwhile life is full of comedy and is only majestic only in its internal sense, so that, involuntarily, due to artistic demands, I was forced to touch on the most vulgar aspects in the biography of my monk, so as not to damage artistic realism⁵⁶⁵." "Will I be understood" is the eternal trepidation of Dostoevsky the writer, which gave rise to his desire for journalism.

The desire to address the reader directly, to speak bluntly about current events, always possessed Dostoevsky. "Eternal questions" for him did not exist in isolation from everyday life; everyday life was their living and direct expression, so that in the journalism of his time Dostoevsky decided on an ambiguous step – "he took a risk on a sermon" ⁵⁶⁶. He sought to form a fundamentally new approach to journalism: reconciling the eternal and the fleeting, balancing on the fine line between friendly conversation and patristic sermon, accepting journalism as a spiritual feat and at the same time not denying all the routine aspects of its modern existence, its simplification, provocation, sensationalism, which required, in the words of Strakhov, the ability to "combine the importance of thought with the simplicity and ease of chatter" ⁵⁶⁷.

⁵⁶⁵Dostoevsky F. M. Letters. 217. To K. P. Pobedonostsev. August 24 (September 5), 1879. Ems // Dostoevsky F. M. Collected Works: in 15 volumes. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1996. Vol. 15. Pp. 593–595.

⁵⁶⁶Zakharov V.N. Dostoevsky's Code. Journalism as a writer's creative idea // Dostoevsky and journalism / ed. V. N. Zakharova, K. A. Stepanyan, B. N. Tikhomirov. St. Petersburg: Dmitry Bulanin, 2013. P. 21.

⁵⁶⁷Strakhov N. N. Memories of F. M. Dostoevsky // Dostoevsky in the memoirs of his contemporaries: in 2 volumes. Moscow: Fiction, 1990. P. 501.

"Journalism was Dostoevsky's ideal creative aspiration ⁵⁶⁸," but the secret of the popularity of his journalistic works was that, unlike Gogol and Tolstoy, he avoided "unequivocal moral imperatives ⁵⁶⁹," did not adopt a didactic tone of detached moralizing, and always called on the reader to think together. The intimate tone of Dostoevsky's journalism excluded the accusatory pathos of appeals to the reader; the author, analyzing the vices of his contemporary society, did not separate himself from this society. It is no coincidence that, even when considering the causes of such a terrible phenomenon as Nechaevism, Dostoevsky writes: "Allow me to say one thing about myself: I probably could never have become a Nechaev, but I cannot guarantee that I could have become a Nechaevite ... in the days of my youth ⁵⁷⁰." For Dostoevsky, such a confessional admission was an essential condition for further sincere conversation with the reader about the causes of common vices: "I have now started talking about myself so that I have the right to talk about others ⁵⁷¹."

At the same time, Dostoevsky deliberately adhered to the feuilleton style of presentation, in the words of N. N. Strakhov, "sometimes even forcing himself, trying to be a scribbler and feuilletonist for the sake of bringing common good ⁵⁷²." This quality of his journalism flowed directly from Dostoevsky's understanding of the task of journalism as influencing the reader; in his view, it was not the statement as such that was important, but the result it had, the moral revolution that this contact was supposed to bring about in the reader. And in order to influence the reader, it was necessary to be entertaining and popular, therefore Dostoevsky never shared the somewhat arrogant lack of concern for success among the mass of readers of the

⁵⁶⁸Zakharov V.N. Preface // Dostoevsky and journalism / ed. V. N. Zakharova, K. A. Stepanyan, B. N. Tikhomirov. St. Petersburg: Dmitry Bulanin, 2013. P. 16.

⁵⁶⁹Volgin I. L. A writer's diary as a world-creating project // Dostoevsky and journalism / ed. V. N. Zakharova, K. A. Stepanyan, B. N. Tikhomirov. St. Petersburg: Dmitry Bulanin, 2013. P. 38.

⁵⁷⁰Dostoevsky F. M. *Writer's Diary*: in 2 volumes. Moscow: Book Club, 2011. Vol. 1. P. 194–195

⁵⁷¹*Ibid.* P. 195

⁵⁷²Strakhov N. N. *Memories of F. M. Dostoevsky* // Dostoevsky in the memoirs of his contemporaries: in 2 volumes. Moscow: Fiction, 1990. P. 419.

Slavophiles. This desire for popularity was reflected already in the writer's first publishing projects – the magazines “Time” and “Epokha”.

The magazine *Vremya*, which began publication in 1861, marked the formation of a new trend in Russian social thought – *pochvennichestvo*. The announcement of a subscription to the magazine, the publication of which was a joint undertaking of the Dostoevsky brothers, but the ideological leadership was carried out by Fyodor Mikhailovich, stated: “The reform of Peter the Great cost us too much even without it: it separated us from the people... But now the separation is ending. Peter's reform, which continued right up to our time, has reached its final limits. It is impossible to go further, and there is nowhere to go: there is no road; it has all been traveled. All those who followed Peter got to know Europe, joined European life and did not become Europeans... We now know that we cannot be Europeans, that we are not capable of squeezing ourselves into one of the Western forms of life, outlived, developed by Europe from its own national principles, alien and opposed to us ⁵⁷³.”

The magazine, which proclaimed “the reconciliation of civilization with the people's origins ⁵⁷⁴,” managed to attract the interest of a fairly large number of subscribers and gather a promising circle of talented authors, which included N. N. Strakhov, A. Maikov, Pleshcheyev, Poretsky, Ya. Polonsky, and others. I. S. Turgenev, N. A. Nekrasov, and N. A. Ostrovsky were occasionally published on the pages of the magazine.

Mikhail Mikhailovich's organizational talents ensured the publication's financial success, and Fyodor Mikhailovich's lively pen, who willingly took on not only serious articles but also feuilletons, provided the entertainment of varied reading. “Time” sought to discuss the most pressing issues of our time, including economic problems that were of keen interest to Fyodor Mikhailovich.

⁵⁷³Advertisement for subscription to the magazine “Time” for 1861 // Gromova N.A. Dostoevsky. Documents, diaries, letters, memoirs, reviews of literary critics and philosophers. Moscow: Agraf, 2000. P. 68.

⁵⁷⁴*Ibid.*

Economic topics were intensively developed in the magazine "Time", this was generally a tribute to the general trend in Russian journalism of that time - in the era of the Great Reforms, the question of the paths of economic development of the country was extremely relevant and the analysis of various economic theories seemed to be a "hot" topic for the press. During 1861, the magazine published several publications by the economist I. N. Schill on the problems of developing banking and an anonymous review of the book by the German economist Bruno Hildebrand "Political Economy of the Present and Future". The author of the review very sympathetically reflected on Hildebrand's conclusions regarding the impossibility of constructing economic models, starting from the initial postulate of the assertion of the absolute value of personal gain, from the desire of man for profit as the only motivation for entrepreneurship. The author of the review shares with the author of the work under review the opinion that the moral nature of man should be taken into account as the most important factor in economic models, that questions of ethics and religious orientations are not entirely alien to economic questions. In Dostoevsky's journal, "modern economic science appears as a field of struggle between two teachings - the teaching of "profit" and the teaching of "conscience" ⁵⁷⁵, and such a position related the economic views of the authors of "Time" with the position of other conservatives, for example, Gilyarov-Platonov, a separate area of whose creativity was the development of the idea of the moral principles of the economy.

The magazine was a success, and after the first year of publication Mikhail Mikhailovich managed to make it profitable: the number of subscribers, of which there were more than two thousand, was encouraging. During 1862, the magazine published "Notes from the House of the Dead," which caused a great stir and added to the magazine's popularity. The author himself later wrote: "My "Dead House"

⁵⁷⁵Novikova E. G. Economic issues of Dostoevsky's journalism // Dostoevsky and journalism / ed. V. N. Zakharova, K. A. Stepanyan, B. N. Tikhomirov. St. Petersburg: Dmitry Bulanin, 2013. P. 64.

literally made a splash, and I renewed my literary reputation with it ⁵⁷⁶.” In 1863 In response to the uprising that broke out in Poland with an article by N. N. Strakhov, “The Fatal Question,” which was controversial in content and not very successful in composition, the magazine was subjected to censorship persecution and was closed.

The publishers found themselves in a difficult financial situation – the need to settle accounts with subscribers prompted them to resume publication, although many circumstances did not contribute to this: the censorship treated the magazine *Epoch*, which had replaced *Vremya*, with bias; Fyodor Mikhailovich, distracted by his family drama – his wife’s illness – could not write anything for the first issues of the new publication; the other authors of the previous publication, in Strakhov’s words, “were in some kind of disarray,” so the first issues turned out to be “sloppy ⁵⁷⁷.” This did not contribute to an increase in subscriptions, the announcement of which had already been delayed due to the expectation of censorship permission. The worries about the new magazine, the need to explain to creditors, and other worries had a heavy impact on Mikhail Mikhailovich’s health, and in July 1864 he passed away. Having taken on all the concerns of managing editorial affairs, Fyodor Mikhailovich no longer found the strength for his own creativity, and this became one of the reasons for the unpopularity and eventual closure of the magazine: “with this backbreaking work,” wrote Dostoevsky, “I myself could not write and publish a single line of my own in the magazine. The public did not hear my name, and even in St. Petersburg, not only in the provinces, they did not know that I was editing the magazine ⁵⁷⁸.”

After the inevitable collapse of *Epoch* in 1865, a long "novel" period began for Dostoevsky. The need to get out of debt left over from his first journalistic experience, the instability of all the circumstances of his private life, and intense

⁵⁷⁶ Strakhov N. N. *Memories of F. M. Dostoevsky // Dostoevsky in the Memories of Contemporaries*: in 2 volumes. Moscow: Fiction, 1990. P. 478.

⁵⁷⁷ *Ibid.* P. 470–472.

⁵⁷⁸ *Ibid.* P. 482.

spiritual quests left no room in the writer's life for journalism, although he never for a minute abandoned the thought of the possibility of publishing a new periodical ⁵⁷⁹.

Such an opportunity presented itself in 1872, when the publisher of the magazine-newspaper "Grazhdanin" V. P. Meshchersky offered him a position as an official editor on a salary at his publication. The relationship between the editor and the publisher had a certain prehistory at that point. Meshchersky and Dostoevsky met through a circle of mutual acquaintances in 1871, after the writer's return from abroad. In the near future, Meshchersky made an attempt to help the writer get out of his severe debt dependency by turning to the heir to the throne for financial assistance.

The prince, taking advantage of the personal favor of Alexander Alexandrovich, not only gave him Dostoevsky's letter asking for a loan, but also supported the writer's appeal with his own ardent request not to remain indifferent to this "cry of despair... of the best writer of our time in Russia ⁵⁸⁰." The Tsarevich did not refuse the writer his help ⁵⁸¹, so the prince's mediation turned out to be successful and, in many ways, saving for Dostoevsky in difficult circumstances. In the future, mutual sympathy will grow stronger thanks to a common circle of friends: at Meshchersky's "Wednesdays," Dostoevsky met with K. P. Pobedonostsev, T. I. Filippov, N. N. Strakhov, and others. The unity of views on many problems of literature, art, and politics, despite the almost twenty-year difference in age, will strengthen the friendly relations between the great writer and the aspiring publicist, yesterday's official.

For Meshchersky, the need to hand over the organizational work of the magazine to reliable hands was caused by the fact that G.K. Gradovsky, who had

⁵⁷⁹Viktorovich V. A. Between "Demons" and "Teenager": journalism as creativity // Dostoevsky and journalism / ed. V. N. Zakharova, K. A. Stepanyan, B. N. Tikhomirov. St. Petersburg: Dmitry Bulanin, 2013. P. 134.

⁵⁸⁰ Meshchersky V.P., Letters to the Grand Duke Alexander Alexandrovich. Moscow: New Literary Review, 2011. P. 419.

⁵⁸¹Panyukova T. V. "LIFE looks brighter...": Relations between V. P. Meshchersky and F. M. Dostoevsky in the context of their correspondence // Unknown Dostoevsky. 2017. Vol. 4. No. 1. P. 19.

initially taken on this work, gradually diverged in his views from Meshchersky, who was gradually strengthening his conservative convictions, and therefore begged to be relieved of his editorship. On the part of Dostoevsky, the main reason that prompted him to accept Meshchersky's offer was the desire to enter into a magazine polemic with critics of the novel "Demons" published in parts in "Russky Vestnik". The novel was received coldly and even hostilely by readers; the reputation of a moderately liberal writer, which Dostoevsky had previously enjoyed as the author of "Poor Folk" and a political prisoner in the Petrashevites' case, was destroyed by the furious criticism of socialism that was clearly expressed in "Demons".

The need to continue the dialogue with his opponents in the form of a more direct and clear journalistic statement drew Dostoevsky to the magazine, so it is no coincidence that “he submitted his petition for editorship on the very day (December 15, 1872) when the Russian Herald came out with the end of the novel *The Demons*⁵⁸².” Meshchersky, for his part, hoped that Dostoevsky’s growing popularity would push up the sluggish subscription to the increasingly conservative magazine, although, according to the prince himself, Fyodor Mikhailovich warned him against overly rosy expectations, urging “don’t give in to illusions – my name will not bring you anything: hatred for *The Citizen* is stronger than my popularity...⁵⁸³”

This moment should be noted as symptomatic for the formation of Dostoevsky's communicative strategy in the future - both he and his publisher clearly understand that the writer is forced to balance, at the expense of personal popularity and authority in the eyes of readers, the known unpopularity of the ideas that he is going to broadcast. Despite the fact that Dostoevsky expressed doubts that his personal credit of trust with the reading public would outweigh its hostility to conservative ideas, he took up the task with selflessness.

Already in February 1873, in a letter to M. M. Pogodin, Dostoevsky stated that “‘*Grazhdanin*’ was going well, but only relatively well. There were 1,800 subscribers, that is, already more than last year, and meanwhile the subscription still

⁵⁸²Ibid. P. 131

⁵⁸³Meshchersky V. P. *My Memories*. Moscow: Zakharov, 2003. P. 382.

hasn't stopped and is flowing in a certain order... the separate sale of issues has increased fivefold (if not more) compared to last year”⁵⁸⁴ and noted that “we should get into a system and into order; but now I feel that this is lacking. It's a new business, and I despair that I am not capable of it⁵⁸⁵.” Of course, editorial duties were not a completely new business for Dostoevsky – he had significant experience working in magazines, so the novelty of the editorial work he had undertaken lay, apparently, precisely in the high frequency of publication, which was unusual for him, since the writer had to deal with a weekly for the first time.

The writer did not quite succeed in establishing the system and order in the editorial management of *Grazhdanin* that Dostoevsky so desired, as evidenced by his rather extensive correspondence with Prince Meshchersky and the memoirs of the editor of the printing house where the magazine was published, M. A. Aleksandrov, who recorded numerous interesting details of the technical and organizational aspects of the magazine's work. Aleksandrov notes that “Fyodor Mikhailovich pursued with increasing persistence the difficult task he had taken upon himself of bringing *Grazhdanin* to generally accepted literary forms, which this magazine had ignored before him⁵⁸⁶.” In Meshchersky's magazine, according to the editor, there were many “claims to originality and eccentricity”⁵⁸⁷, which included the declared “newspaper-magazine” format, and the publication date, which was unusual for Russian journalism of that time and inconvenient for the printing house (“*Grazhdanin*” was published on Monday, although Sunday was a non-working day and preparing a Monday edition was especially difficult), and the harsh, shocking tone of many of the publisher's publications. But the main feature of “*Grazhdanin*” was that “almost nothing was ever done in it according to the established order; at

⁵⁸⁴Dostoevsky F. M. *Collected Works: in 15 volumes*. L.: Nauka, 1989–1996. Vol. 15. P. 497.

⁵⁸⁵*Ibid.*

⁵⁸⁶Aleksandrov M. A. *Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky in the memoirs of a typesetter in 1872–1881 // Dostoevsky in the memoirs of his contemporaries: in 2 volumes*. Moscow: Fiction, 1990. Vol. 1. P. 265.

⁵⁸⁷*Ibid.*

first this happened because the publisher did not want to constrain himself with any rules, and then because the magazine ended up with two owners" ⁵⁸⁸.

As A. G. Dostoevskaya recalls, "at first, when he was editing *Grazhdanin*, Fyodor Mikhailovich was very interested in the novelty of his editorial duties and the mass of the most diverse types he had to meet in the editorial office," ⁵⁸⁹ although the urgent editorial work at the weekly often seemed routine to him, and took away time and energy from creating his own articles. "Rereading articles takes a huge amount of time..." Dostoevsky complained in one of his letters to M. M. Pogodin, "there are an abyss of topics that I would like to write about myself. I think and compose an article nervously to the point of illness; I start writing and, oh horror, on Thursday I notice that I cannot finish. Meanwhile, I don't want to cut anything off. And so, I abandon what I started, and hurry, so as to be on time... I grab hold of some new article and write, so as to be on time within 24 hours, because on Friday night our acceptance of articles ends ⁵⁹⁰." Exhausted by organizational work and the magazine's rush, Fyodor Mikhailovich turned to the publisher with a request to introduce the position of secretary in the editorial office, which was filled by V. F. Putsykovich, who subsequently headed the publication.

Dostoevsky tried to level out many of the prince's eccentricities, if not in organizational terms, then at least in terms of content. Sometimes minor disagreements took the most harmless forms - for example, when making previously unspoken amendments to the text of a subscription announcement that had already been agreed upon many times, Meshchersky very gently, in a repentant tone, reported this to the editor: "Yesterday, when sending the announcement, I sinned against heaven and before you by inserting 3 lines: remembering that you also said that the announcement lacked an indication of our main goal: "Russian life", the gap seemed significant and my hand did not tremble to add these 3 lines ⁵⁹¹." But there

⁵⁸⁸Ibid. P. 264.

⁵⁸⁹Dostoevskaya A. G. *Memories*. Moscow: Zakharov, 2002. P. 259

⁵⁹⁰Dostoevsky F. M. *Collected Works: in 15 volumes*. L.: Nauka, 1989–1996. Vol. 15. P. 496.

⁵⁹¹F. M. Dostoevsky, V. P. Meshchersky *Correspondence (1872–1880)* // Unknown Dostoevsky. 2017. Vol. 4. No. 1. P. 43.

were also more serious disputes. In a letter to M. M. Pogodin, one of the active authors of the magazine, T. I. Filippov, writes that, striving to help as much as possible to put the affairs of “Grazhdanin” in order, he first of all “repeatedly put an end to the misunderstandings that arose between Meshchersky and Dostoevsky ⁵⁹².”

Prone to sharp polemics, Meshchersky was easily offended by the liberal press’s attacks on the magazine. A small disagreement occurred between the publisher and the editor over one such episode, connected with the publication of criticism of *Grazhdanin* in the *Sankt-Peterburgskie Vedomosti*. In early November 1873, Dostoevsky wrote to Meshchersky: “Dear Prince, your reply to S. P. *Vedomosti* is very nicely and sensibly written, but it is harsh, arrogant (it wants a quarrel) and – perhaps the tone is wrong. Instead of a mocking tone, wouldn’t it be better to have a calm, clear one? That’s exactly what I think: there will be more dignity. And that’s why I am sending you my reply... I would very much like you to agree to my editing... ⁵⁹³” In the postscript, Dostoevsky, apparently assuming that the prince would be stubborn, adds: “*Vedomosti* has barely touched us for a whole year. We will deal with it as gently as possible at first, then we will still be able to respond ⁵⁹⁴.” Meshchersky responded that Dostoevsky’s position was “naive and good-natured,” and emphasized: “I admit, I do not understand your delicacy in relation to S.P. *Vedomosti*’s vile trick ⁵⁹⁵.”

This episode is quite symptomatic of Dostoevsky's editorial approach - the writer never sought to increase the degree of polemical confrontation, although the harshness of statements and magazine squabbles sometimes became a tool for magazines to warm up readers' interest. But Dostoevsky was always concerned with the right tone. Understanding that polemics in journalism are inevitable, he wanted to give it the tone of a friendly conversation, and not an offensive squabble, believing

⁵⁹²“The Citizen is published by a sick and restless person...” from letters to M. P. Pogodin, 1873–1874 // Unknown Dostoevsky. 2017. Vol. 4. No. 3. P. 31.

⁵⁹³F. M. Dostoevsky, V. P. Meshchersky Correspondence (1872–1880) // Unknown Dostoevsky. 2017. Vol. 4. No. 1. P. 46.

⁵⁹⁴*Ibid.* P. 47.

⁵⁹⁵*Ibid.*

that the reader should be carried away by the topic under discussion, and not by the excitement of the conflict around it.

Some organizational misunderstandings occurred between the editor and the publisher, both regarding the approval of publications in the issue and regarding their arrangement. M. A. Alexandrov lamented: “How much I had to hang around with both of them to achieve this issue’s composition!.. For example, among other materials, there is this article: one approves of it, the other rejects it! And no matter how successfully you put together the issue, thanks to running from one to the other, from the other to the first... some confusion would inevitably occur: either one of the proposed articles would not appear at all, or one or another of them would appear longer or shorter than proposed... ⁵⁹⁶”

Examples of such inconsistency include a disagreement regarding the publication of an article by K. P. Pobedonostsev, which Meshchersky considered necessary to place at the very beginning of the journal, while Dostoevsky proposed to place it, like the previous article by the same author, in the middle. Meshchersky categorically demanded that his order be followed and the article placed at the beginning, citing the fact that “the participation of K. P. Pobedonostsev is too great an honor and service for us,” and, moreover, “this is the author’s desire – delicately expressed ⁵⁹⁷.”

The participation of the chief prosecutor in the magazine was partly due to the fact that "Grazhdanin" under the editorship of Dostoevsky devoted much attention to the issues of pedagogy and education that were widely discussed at the time. The criticism of socialist teachings that the writer put forward in the novel "Demons" was closely linked for him with the issues of the spiritual development of the individual; in socialism, Dostoevsky was "interested in the spiritual roots of the phenomenon", he saw his task as proving that socialism and Christianity were

⁵⁹⁶Aleksandrov M. A. *Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky in the memoirs of a typesetter in 1872–1881 // Dostoevsky in the memoirs of his contemporaries: in 2 volumes.* Moscow: Fiction, 1990. Vol. 1. P. 265–266.

⁵⁹⁷F. M. Dostoevsky, V. P. Meshchersky *Correspondence (1872–1880) // Unknown Dostoevsky.* 2017. Vol. 4. No. 1. P. 45.

antitheses, refuting the then dominant idea of the "environment" that determined the consciousness and behavior of man, and reviving the "Christian idea of the moral responsibility of the individual" ⁵⁹⁸. Therefore, in the polemics on issues of education, "Grazhdanin" opposed the positivist pedagogical concept, arguing that the education system should be aimed not at the acquisition of knowledge, but at the comprehensive moral development of the individual. In one of his publications in "The Citizen", Dostoevsky polemicizes with an article in "The Russian World", the author of which insisted that Nechayev and his ilk (let us recall that it was the Nechayev case that served as the plot basis for "The Demons") can recruit proselytes only among young people who are not studying at all, who are idle and underdeveloped, while the diligence in science that can be observed in modern young people gives a comforting idea that Nechayevism will not spread among the mass of studying youth. Dostoevsky responds to this: "I, too, stood on the scaffold, sentenced to death, and I assure you that I stood in the company of educated people... No, sir, Nechayevites are not always made up of lazy people who have not studied at all ⁵⁹⁹. " This formulation of the question sincerely surprises Dostoevsky, who notes that knowledge – "science" and "knowledge" – does not shape the human soul, that receiving a diploma is not yet a guarantee against spiritual temptations, passions and vices, that the source of the soul's strength against the temptations of evil is not in knowledge, but in morality, in commitment to the Christian foundations of human society and the traditions of one's people.

In "The Citizen", edited by Dostoevsky, A. expressed his opinions on issues of pedagogy. U. Poretsky, A. Maikov, T. AND. Filippov, K. P. Pobedonostsev and, of course, the publisher V. himself. P. Meshchersky under various pseudonyms. The unifying idea of the speeches, which varied in information occasions and genres, was that the authors considered pedagogy as the most important part of the life of

⁵⁹⁸Viktorovich V. A. Between "Demons" and "Teenager": journalism as creativity // Dostoevsky and journalism / ed. V. N. Zakharova, K. A. Stepanyan, B. N. Tikhomirov. St. Petersburg: Dmitry Bulanin, 2013. P. 133.

⁵⁹⁹Dostoevsky F. M. Writer's Diary: in 2 volumes. Moscow: Book Club, 2011. Vol. 1. P. 194.

society, understanding that the picture of social life depends not only and not so much on the external forms that will be given to it by certain institutions, but on the character and spiritual world of individuals who make up this society. Therefore, the authors of publications in "Grazhdanin" were skeptical about public enthusiasm for increasing the number of zemstvo peasant schools, believing that the key to success was not in the number of schools, but in their quality, and it was this aspect that exacerbated the question of the personality and character of the most important figure in this process - the rural teacher. Formalism and the attitude to pedagogy as a duty, and not as a calling, teaching "by method" and not "by soul" - this is what the publicists of "Grazhdanin" saw as the main problem of the rural school of their time.

In general, Dostoevsky's participation in "Grazhdanin" allowed the circle of authors to be significantly expanded, and for a time the magazine ceased to have the character of the sole creation of Prince Meshchersky. For example, having learned about Dostoevsky's editorship, M. M. Pogodin returned his favor to the magazine, who "had written to the editors his previous renunciation of participation, driven out of patience by their malfunction, but now ... I am glad, as before, to work, if only things go well ⁶⁰⁰." Dostoevsky's editorial work significantly transformed the publication, including because, as an editor, he improved and refined the texts of the manuscripts sent, doing this subtly and carefully, sparing the author's pride and preserving the author's manner of presentation and, nevertheless, giving the texts a unique and recognizable sound, associated with his personal creative manner. A textual analysis of a number of publications of "Grazhdanin" in 1873 allowed V. A. Viktorovich to make several interesting hypotheses about the nature of the editorial changes made by Dostoevsky, and to come to the conclusion that "Grazhdanin" under his editorship represented, given the collective nature of its creation, a unique form of editorial creativity, which is "hidden from us, like gold sparkles in a magazine 'ore'" ⁶⁰¹.

⁶⁰⁰“The Citizen is published by a sick and restless person...” from letters to M. P. Pogodin, 1873–1874 // Unknown Dostoevsky. 2017. Vol. 4. No. 3. P. 32.

⁶⁰¹Viktorovich V. A. Dostoevsky. Collective "Citizen" as the editor's creativity // Unknown Dostoevsky. 2015. Vol. 2. No. 4. P. 20.

The revival of the magazine's contents was noticed by both readers and the publisher's conservative supporters. In September 1873, Putsykovich conveyed in a letter to Dostoevsky the news conveyed by G.K. Markevich, who had arrived from Moscow, that "Katkov is delighted with the summer issues of "Grazhdanin""⁶⁰²; in the same month, Meshchersky wrote to Dostoevsky: "The latest issues are excellent: everyone, without exception, finds this! I shake your hand firmly. And three times more strongly for the Diary, simply delightful..."⁶⁰³

It was on the pages of "Citizen" that Dostoevsky tried out the format that would later become Dostoevsky the publicist's calling card - the "Diary" format. The idea of this format, as A. G. Dostoevskaya recalls, arose in the writer's mind during his stay abroad, but he did not dare at that time to come out with an independent publication due to financial and family circumstances. Meshchersky's proposal in this regard came in very handy, as it gave him the opportunity to try out an old idea without entering into a risky financial venture, but remaining a hired editor. The "Writer's Diary" column was published on the pages of "Citizen" throughout 1873. The name implied several aspects: firstly, a conversation specifically about the current, immersion in the events of the day, secondly, the utmost frankness that a person can allow himself only when alone with himself, only in a diary. But the deliberate publicity of this "diary" performance, its original purpose for the reader, gave rise to a specific genre: "this "ego-document", unique in its literary nature, only imitated the properties of the diary genre, remaining in fact an act of public conversation, a subtle literary game"⁶⁰⁴. Soon the format, tested in the magazine column, will find its independent embodiment.

Having ceased his editorship at Meshchersky's publication, Dostoevsky devoted himself to writing the novel *The Adolescent*, which was published in the pages of Nekrasov's *Otechestvennye Zapiski* in 1875. However, the constant desire

⁶⁰²Zinkova V. S., Solopova A. I. Correspondence between F. M. Dostoevsky and V. F. Putsykovich (1873–1880) // *Unknown Dostoevsky*. 2016. Vol. 3. No. 4. P. 121.

⁶⁰³F. M. Dostoevsky, V. P. Meshchersky Correspondence (1872–1880) // *Unknown Dostoevsky*. 2017. Vol. 4. No. 1. P. 40.

⁶⁰⁴Volgin I. L. *Over the Barriers* // *Dostoevsky F. M. Writer's Diary: in 2 volumes*. Moscow: Book Club, 2011. P. 11.

for a journalistic dialogue with the reader will soon again prompt the novelist to work in a magazine – in 1876 Mr. Dostoevsky will revive the “Diary of a Writer”, but this time in the format of a monthly mono-journal.

Marking the emergence of a completely new format in Russian journalism, The Writer's Diary was a complex combination of diverse elements. As I. L. Volgin, “In terms of volume, the “Diary” resembled a brochure, in terms of format – a weekly newspaper, in terms of frequency – a monthly magazine, and in terms of authorship – a separate book ⁶⁰⁵.”

Despite the fact that the mono-magazine also published works of fiction – the stories “A Boy at Christ’s Christmas Tree”, “The Peasant Marey”, “The Hundred-Year-Old” and others saw the light of day on its pages – its basis was a direct dialogue between Dostoevsky and the reader. Elements of fiction were woven organically into the fabric of the story about contemporary events, although the author made fun of himself, concluding the story “A Boy at Christ’s Christmas Tree”: “And why did I make up such a story, so out of place in an ordinary, reasonable diary, especially a writer’s? And I promised stories mainly about real events! But that’s the thing, it seems and seems to me that all this could have really happened... ⁶⁰⁶”

"Today's impressions, generalized to the philosophy of being" - this is how the famous modern writer and blogger Zakhar Prilepin characterizes Dostoevsky's mono-journal, noting that such a specific format makes "A Writer's Diary" akin to the modern blogosphere. The tone and character of Dostoevsky's publications are really so close to the popular today format of a public pseudo-diary (blog) that many representatives of the modern blogosphere recognize Fyodor Mikhailovich as their forerunner: "The first blogger (with an adjustment for the technical capabilities of his time) was Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky ... "Post" F. M. ... once a month, but in bulk. The circulation was about 5-6 thousand copies - quite impressive for those years. "Comments" did not take long to appear - numerous letters from readers

⁶⁰⁵Ibid. P. 6.

⁶⁰⁶Dostoevsky F. M. *Writer's Diary*: in 2 volumes. Moscow: Book Club, 2011. P. 219.

(mostly immensely grateful), an unprecedented phenomenon at that time" ⁶⁰⁷; "In the first year of the publication of "The Diary", 1982 subscribers subscribed to it (which is not a "thousander" by LJ standards, but what a one - not comparable to today's ones!" ⁶⁰⁸and etc. The uniqueness of the format, which allowed for a free transition from current events to a frank detailing of one's worldview, created a new form of journalism, which "opens up in its binary: it is a heated response in the wake of an event, naturally turning into a sub- judgment specie aeternitatis (under the sign of eternity) » ⁶⁰⁹.

However, along with the desire for a frank conversation with the reader, the author also had concerns about how this blunt speech would be received. Vsevolod Solovyov recounts in his memoirs that to his remark about the convenience of the journal form precisely for the purpose of "speaking out directly and clearly," Dostoevsky responded: "To speak out directly and clearly! What would be better and of course, oh, of course, someday it will be possible, but it's impossible, my dear fellow, it's absolutely impossible right away, haven't I thought about it, haven't I dreamed about it!.. But what can I do... Well, and then, there are things that if suddenly, no one will even believe... ⁶¹⁰"

Some areas of thought, which were, on the one hand, the sphere of the writer's most painful spiritual quests, were at the same time themes that "cannot be touched upon right away," i.e. themes that, in Dostoevsky's own words, even in the frank form of a diary, had to be only "let slip," leaving the reader to formulate the thought to the end.

"The form of the Diary that existed in 1876–1877s, was intuitively, empirically felt by Dostoevsky: it is inextricably linked with the individual characteristics of his genius. At the same time, the "Diary" was the realization of

⁶⁰⁷ <http://a-fixx.livejournal.com/11648.html>.

⁶⁰⁸ <http://parven.livejournal.com/3290.html>.

⁶⁰⁹ Viktorovich V. A. Between "Demons" and "Teenager": journalism as creativity // Dostoevsky and journalism / ed. V. N. Zakharova, K. A. Stepanyan, B. N. Tikhomirov. St. Petersburg: Dmitry Bulanin, 2013. P. 141.

⁶¹⁰ Volgin I. L. Over the Barriers // Dostoevsky F. M. Writer's Diary: in 2 volumes. Moscow: Book Club, 2011. Vol. 1. P. 4.

potential opportunities accumulated by the practical experience of all Russian journalism ⁶¹¹.” This idea is also confirmed by the fact that from the moment Dostoevsky mastered this unique format, he found many adherents. Already in November 1876, apparently seeing the exceptional success of this format tested by Dostoevsky, Prince Meshchersky announced the appearance of his “Diary” in the “Citizen” left in the care of Putsykovich. The description of the format practically verbatim repeats the announcement of the subscription given by Dostoevsky, while Putsykovich, anticipating the appearance of a new column as an editor, ascribes to Meshchersky the primacy in the discovery of this genre. O. V. Zakharova, who drew attention to this episode in Meshchersky's publishing biography, believes that "Dostoevsky apparently and perhaps intentionally did not pay attention to this tactlessness of his comrade. He was interested in developing the direction that he supported and preached, to which Putsykovich and Meshchersky belonged along with him" ⁶¹², although she rightly considers such behavior of the editors to be disrespectful towards Dostoevsky. After the publication of "Grazhdanin" ceased in 1878 (when Dostoevsky's project had also already ceased publication), the idea of publishing his "Diary" as an independent publication again occupied Meshchersky, who, having revived his magazine in 1881, ran a column in it with this name. Aksakov also thought about the possible form of such a diary during the break in the publication of Rus (although Ivan Sergeevich did not consider himself “presumptuous enough” for such a format) ⁶¹³; A. S. Suvorin’s “Little Letters” and V. V. Rozanov’s “Fallen Leaves” undoubtedly gravitate toward this genre.

The mono-magazine format, on the one hand, did not eliminate the need to work to a deadline, which always tormented Dostoevsky, but, on the other hand, it did not torment the writer with editorial work, i.e. rereading and compiling other people's articles, it allowed him to concentrate on his own work and opened up the

⁶¹¹ Volgin I. L. Dostoevsky – journalist: (“A writer’s diary” and the Russian public). Moscow: Moscow State University Publishing House, 1982. P. 20.

⁶¹² Zakharova O. V. Editorial tactlessness, or two “Diaries” in “Grazhdanin” of the 1870s // Scientific notes of Petrozavodsk State University. 2018. No. 1 (170). P. 26.

⁶¹³ Badalyan D. A. "The Calling Bell": Ivan Aksakov in Russian Journalism of the Late 1870s – First Half of the 1880s. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2016. P. 86.

possibility of ideological independence. "One thing bothers me for you," Kh. D. Alchevskaya wrote to Fyodor Mikhailovich, "is the obligation to meet a deadline... but if this is unpleasant, how good it is that "A Writer's Diary" is a completely independent, self-sufficient work. You are kind enough to adapt to the tendencies of some editorial board and keep them in mind when you start writing (this is a kind of censorship), but here you are your own master - excellent."⁶¹⁴

It is worth noting separately the problem of the writer's relationship with censorship during this period. Earlier, during his editorship of "Grazhdanin", the publication he headed was twice subjected to censorship persecution. July 1, 1873 Prince Meshchersky, responding to Dostoevsky's letter, lamented: "My dearest Fyodor Mikhailovich, I received your letter; only from it did I learn of the fate that befell you because of me: magnanimously forgive two days of arrest!"⁶¹⁵ The censor's displeasure was caused by Meshchersky's article, which, while telling the story of the Kirghiz delegation in St. Petersburg, allowed himself to include in the text several words spoken by the emperor on that occasion, ignoring the censor's ban on presenting the monarch's direct speech without prior approval from the Minister of the Court. The phrase of Alexander II, cited by the prince in the text of the article, was of a completely formal nature, but disregard for the requirements of the law entailed censorship persecution. In the same year of 1873, for a careless hint about the Samara famine, retail sale of "Grazhdanin" was prohibited.

All these censorship hassles, the need to appear with explanations at various departmental reception rooms, fines and other worries had a painful effect on Dostoevsky. Understanding that, despite all the conservatism and good intentions of his convictions, he would not be spared from such incidents during the transition to a punitive censorship system, the writer preferred to publish his own mono-journal under preliminary censorship, although he was given the opportunity to escape

⁶¹⁴Alchevskaya H. D. Dostoevsky // Dostoevsky in the memoirs of his contemporaries: in 2 volumes. Moscow: Fiction, 1990. Vol. 1. P. 331.

⁶¹⁵F. M. Dostoevsky, V. P. Meshchersky Correspondence (1872–1880) // Unknown Dostoevsky. 2017. Vol. 4. No. 1. P. 38.

preliminary censorship, according to Aleksandrov ⁶¹⁶, even on preferential terms, i.e. without posting bail. However, researchers subsequently questioned this instruction: most likely, at first the journal was allowed under the conditions of preliminary censorship, and the readiness to transfer "The Writer's Diary" to censorship after its publication was expressed by the censorship department somewhat later, but then Dostoevsky himself preferred to leave the established order unchanged ⁶¹⁷.

But, one way or another, the police surveillance of the once unreliable writer was lifted back in 1874. The Third Section assessed his reputation as that of a completely trustworthy person ⁶¹⁸, so Dostoevsky had no reason to fear any particularly unfriendly attention from the censorship department. Nevertheless, he preferred to send his articles for preliminary verification. Explaining his decision to Aleksandrov, the writer said that he wanted to avoid self-censorship - not to be his own censor, because it is the hardest thing to edit your own text. According to Aleksandrov's observations, the censor N. A. Ratynsky, for his part, tried to interfere with Dostoevsky's text as little as possible, and preferred to replace several words, softening the statement, instead of deleting controversial fragments, and he joked about not censoring the text, but only correcting the style, so that more or less major censorial blots occurred extremely rarely ⁶¹⁹. The exception was the double July-August issue – the sharp anti-bourgeois pathos of the writer's statements, as well as articles on the Eastern Question, which was painful at that time, became a serious stumbling block between the author and the censor.

Overall, *The Writer's Diary* turned out to be a uniquely successful publication. This is evidenced by the impressive print run of 6,000 copies, the wide geography

⁶¹⁶Aleksandrov M. A. *Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky in the memoirs of a typesetter in 1872–1881 // Dostoevsky in the memoirs of his contemporaries: in 2 volumes.* Moscow: Fiction, 1990. Vol. 1. P. 277.

⁶¹⁷Dostoevsky F. M. *Letters.* 217. To K. P. Pobedonostsev. August 24 (September 5), 1879. *Ems // Dostoevsky F. M. Collected Works: in 15 volumes.* St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1996. P. 420.

⁶¹⁸Kogan G. F. *Research on Dostoevsky // Literary Heritage.* 1973. Vol. 86. No. 1. P. 581–605.

⁶¹⁹Aleksandrov M. A. *Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky in the memoirs of a typesetter in 1872–1881 // Dostoevsky in the memoirs of his contemporaries: in 2 volumes.* Moscow: Fiction, 1990. Vol. 1. P. 278.

of distribution, the abundance of lively reader responses (hundreds of letters with questions, reviews, and thanks came to Dostoevsky), and the fact that the number of copies sold at retail exceeded the number sent by subscription. The significance of the latter circumstance is explained by M. A. Alexandrov, who is well acquainted with the commercial side of the book publishing process. Buying the magazine at retail was more expensive, but the issue was immediately sent to retail from the printing house, while the mail could delay the receipt of a copy for several days, and many readers waited with such intense impatience for the appearance of the next Diary that they preferred to overpay just to receive it without delay. Another indicator of the publication's popularity was that, upon receiving a fresh issue for sale, booksellers, as a rule, would display it in the window of their establishment as a product designed to attract customers ⁶²⁰.

E. A. Stackenschneider notes in his memoirs that "The Diary of a Writer" made Dostoevsky's name "known throughout Russia, made him a teacher and idol of the youth, and not only of the youth... His significance as a teacher is still so new that he himself does not fully realize it..." ⁶²¹Indeed, in hundreds of readers' letters that the publisher of "The Diary" received, there were responses to the magazine's publications that expressed a thirst for help and guidance in finding answers to "questions that Heine called damned." ⁶²²Thanks to the mono-magazine, Dostoevsky acquired the status in Russian society of not just a writer, publisher, journalist, but a preacher and a spiritual pole of Russian public life.

A furious apology for the war during the Russo-Turkish confrontation in the Balkans and the development of the Russian volunteer movement, a consistent criticism of socialism, closely linked in Dostoevsky's worldview, were interspersed on the pages of "A Writer's Diary" with publications on other topics that were equally

⁶²⁰ Aleksandrov M. A. *Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky in the memoirs of a typesetter in 1872–1881 // Dostoevsky in the memoirs of his contemporaries: in 2 volumes.* Moscow: Fiction, 1990. Vol. 1. P. 271–280.

⁶²¹ Shtakenshneider E. A. *Memories // Gromova N. A. Dostoevsky. Documents, diaries, letters, memoirs, reviews of literary critics and philosophers.* Moscow: Agraf, 2000. P. 176–177.

⁶²² *Ibid.*

acutely exciting for the writer. Reflections on high-profile court cases ⁶²³, among which Dostoevsky most reverently analyzed cases of crimes against children, publications in general about the completed reform of legal proceedings, in which the author of "A Writer's Diary" saw many flaws, also aroused the keen interest and response of his readers.

However, at the end of 1878, Dostoevsky decided to stop publishing his mono-magazine, which was at the peak of its popularity. The writer began working on a long-cherished idea for a new major novel – the creation of *The Brothers Karamazov* required the writer to be completely focused, undisturbed by publishing concerns. Readers bitterly parted with their beloved interlocutor, and the publisher of *A Writer's Diary* received many letters expressing regret about the closure of the magazine.

The publication of *The Brothers Karamazov* in the *Russian Herald* was completed by November 1880. A significant event in Russian public life that year was the unveiling of a monument to A. S. Pushkin in Moscow. The Pushkin Festival brought together representatives of the most diverse trends in Russian social thought, writers, scientists, and public figures. At a meeting of the Society of Lovers of Russian Literature on June 8, 1880, Dostoevsky gave a speech about Pushkin, which became one of the most widely known works of his journalism. Pushkin's speech "embodied the most characteristic features of Dostoevsky's creative genius: his ethical maximalism, his heightened perception of the Russian man and Russian history... ⁶²⁴" The speech evoked an ovation and enthusiastic responses from all the listeners, creating an amazing effect of universal unity - under the emotional impression of the speech, the listeners cried, hugged, exchanged the warmest friendly handshakes, it was impossible to calm the hall for a long time after the ovation, and the speakers announced in the evening's program after Dostoevsky's

⁶²³ Kruglikova O. S. The Question of the Judicial Reform of 1864 in the Journalism of N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov and F. M. Dostoevsky // *Bulletin of St. Petersburg University. Language and Literature*. 2017. Vol. 14. No. 4. P. 664–675.

⁶²⁴ Volgin I. L. *Over the Barriers* // Dostoevsky F. M. *Writer's Diary*: in 2 volumes. Moscow: Book Club, 2011. Vol. 1. P. 39.

speech simply refused to read, feeling the impossibility of maintaining the height of the impression he had made.

Pushkin's speech was published by Dostoevsky in the only issue of "A Writer's Diary" for 1880, which was published in August. In addition to the speech itself and a lengthy preface containing some explanations of the points made in the speech, as well as polemical responses to the printed criticism that was quick to follow, the issue contained a mention that the publisher planned to resume "A Writer's Diary" in 1881, "if health permits."⁶²⁵ However, the magazine was not destined to be revived. The only issue of 1881 was published on the day of the writer's funeral.

The unique format of the great philosopher and novelist's publicistic speeches, the piercing and at the same time confidential, "homey" tone of his journalism, the paradoxical and sometimes prophetic judgments about the historical fate of Russia and spiritual insights into the nature of man made his journal not only the most popular periodical organ of its time, but a certain center of the spiritual life of Russia "imprinted over the abyss"⁶²⁶.

Dostoevsky conveyed his conservative ideas, which were unpopular with the reading public, periodically resorting to the use of the magazine mask of a "familiar paradoxicalist" in order not to be immediately rejected by an indignant reader. The uniqueness of his communication model was that the exceptional popularity of his publication did not mean that his ideas were equally widely and unconditionally accepted by readers. In the memoirs of the writer and public figure E. P. Letkova-Sultanova, a devoted reader of "The Writer's Diary", the following picture of the audience's perception of the magazine is recorded: on the one hand, young people read each issue of the magazine with captivating interest, but in most cases it was a reason for fierce debate, some of Dostoevsky's words "exploded the youth, like sparks on gunpowder... the youth desperately fought against the charm of

⁶²⁵Dostoevsky F. M. *Writer's Diary*: in 2 volumes. Moscow: Book Club, 2011. Vol. 1. P. 425.

⁶²⁶Volgin I. L. *Over the Barriers* // Dostoevsky F. M. *Writer's Diary*: in 2 volumes. Moscow: Book Club, 2011. Vol. 1. P. 40.

Dostoevsky's name, indignantly cited his preaching of "the alliance of the tsar with his people", his justification of war and arrogance" ⁶²⁷.

It can be assumed that the struggle between the charm of Dostoevsky's genius and indignation against some of his conclusions probably led in some cases to the acceptance of the ideals outlined by the writer, therefore Dostoevsky's communicative strategy should probably be recognized as one of the most effective in the conservative journalism of post-reform Russia. Having decided to be "even a scribbler" for the sake of the cause, as N. N. Strakhov put it, Dostoevsky was fascinatingly provocative for superficial young readers and at the same time infinitely profound for thoughtful and serious readers. He not only managed to exert a profound influence on the socio-political discourse of his time - he, unlike Katkov, whom he deeply respected, was not disappointed in his ideological influence on society. Therefore, his ideas, expressed vividly and sometimes provocatively, far outlived him and were significant not only for his era.

§ 2.5 Communicative practices of I. S. Aksakov - to remain on the height of the idea and not to give in to censorship

I. S. Aksakov (1823–1886), a representative of the so-called “younger” Slavophiles and one of the most prominent and prolific figures in Slavophile journalism, was born into the family of the famous Russian writer S. T. Aksakov, author of “Family Chronicle” and the story “The Childhood Years of Bagrov the Grandson,” and was raised in a unique cultural environment: literary readings were held in the Aksakovs’ Moscow home, and evenings were held at which the best representatives of the educated society of the time discussed the most pressing issues of literature, art, science, and public life.

In 1842, Ivan Sergeyevich graduated from the School of Law and entered the civil service in the Senate Criminal Department, although his official career was not

⁶²⁷Letkova-Sultanova E. P. Memories // Gromova N. A. Dostoevsky. Documents, diaries, letters, memoirs, reviews of literary critics and philosophers. Moscow: Agraf, 2000. P. 207.

very successful - Aksakov showed himself to be a capable and energetic person in his official activities, but he had a hard time enduring the heavy atmosphere of the Russian bureaucratic world of the Nicholas era. Having left the Ministry of Justice in 1848, he became an official on special assignments at the Ministry of Internal Affairs. The Slavophile circle that formed at that time, one of the leaders of which was his elder brother Konstantin, brought upon itself suspicions of politically unreliable intellectualism. Due to his family affinity to this circle (let us note that during this period there was no ideological consonance between Ivan Sergeyevich's views and Slavophilism; in his youth he was more of a Westernizer), Aksakov was also interrogated and arrested. Although he was released after a "fatherly" admonition from the chief of the gendarmes, he was under secret police surveillance from 1848.

Aksakov had been interested in poetry since his youth and wrote poetry in his free time from government service. The young official's superiors considered poetry to be too frivolous an occupation for a statesman, and the Minister of Internal Affairs instructed Aksakov to abandon poetry if he wanted to continue his career as an official. However, Aksakov instead left the service and, having retired in 1851, devoted his leisure time to literary activity, taking over the editorship of the Moscow Collection, a collective publication of the Slavophile circle, which Ivan Sergeyevich joined in the early 1850s, having rethought some of his youthful convictions. The collection was banned by censors, and Aksakov was deprived of the right to further act as an editor of periodicals.

Left without a literary field, Ivan Sergeevich took up scientific research on behalf of the Russian Geographical Society, but the Crimean War that began in 1853 interrupted his research activities, since Aksakov did not consider it possible to remain on the sidelines and do nothing, believing that the high calling of a Russian nobleman obliged him to go into military service, and he volunteered for the militia.

At the end of the Crimean campaign, in an era full of public optimism, when the new reign offered so many different hopes, in the depths of the Slavophile circle the idea of a new publishing project arose, the magazine "Russian Conversation"

(1856–1859), and Aksakov became one of its active employees, and from 1858, its unofficial editor.

"*Russkaya Beseda*", which it was decided to publish collectively, on a share basis, had a collegial nature of editorial management, all controversial issues were resolved jointly; A. I. Koshelev, who was the official editor of the publication, considered himself only the "chief manager". Koshelev, like many other members of the Slavophile circle (Yu. F. Samarin, Cherkassky), took an active part in the process of developing the Regulation of February 19, 1861, so that in 1858, at the height of the work of the provincial editorial commissions, he did not have enough time to devote himself to the journal's activities and was looking for a replacement for himself, assuming that if he found a successor, he would close the journal altogether. Aksakov agreed to take on the actual editorship on the condition that Koshelev would be listed as the official editor: "I insisted on this both because," Aksakov explains in a letter to a friend, "*Beseda* would still be published with his capital... and it would be unfair to take away from him the honor of the title of publisher... and also because it is much more convenient and calmer for me to support it with the established and established relations with the employees, with the public, with the government, than to take on personal responsibility for it... I look at *Beseda* as a common cause... my name would give it the significance of my personal cause ⁶²⁸."

In addition to the circumstances listed by Aksakov, there was another one: in 1858 g., having achieved the lifting of the ban on editing periodicals, he at the end of March 1858 Mr. Aksakov obtained permission to publish his own newspaper, *Parus*. When he took over the management of *Russkaya Beseda*, Aksakov did not want to leave his weekly, since he had complete ideological independence in his own publication. There was no complete unanimity among the Slavophiles, disagreements arose every now and then on various socio-political issues, the collegial nature of the management of *Russkaya Beseda* forced them to constantly

⁶²⁸Correspondence of I. S. Aksakov and Yu. F. Samarin (1848–1876) / prepared by T. F. Pirozhkova, O. L. Fetisenko and V. Yu. Shvedova. St. Petersburg: Pushkin House, 2016. P. 65.

seek a compromise with other opinions, and Aksakov, a passionate and impulsive nature, was not inclined to compromise in the ideological sphere. His comrades (Koshelev, Samarin) were wary of his characteristic harshness of uncompromising judgments, and, as practice showed, not in vain - in Parus, not restrained by obligations to the team, Aksakov immediately took such a cocky tone that only two issues of the weekly were published before the censor banned the publication.

The history of Parus, although very short-lived, is very indicative of Aksakov's position as editor and publisher. From the very beginning, he assumed that his publication would not have a peaceful and prosperous existence in the field of domestic journalism, noting in a letter to A. I. Herzen: "...the fate of my newspaper is closely connected with the state of censorship because I cannot publish a dull newspaper ⁶²⁹." Parus drew criticism from the censors from the very moment of the publication of the subscription announcement, which came out in August 1859. This announcement alone, in which Aksakov promised subscribers special attention from the future newspaper to the Slavic question, as well as his published letter to Slavic writers, scientists and public figures with an offer of permanent cooperation in Parus and Russkaya Beseda, caused discontent among the censors. The censors who had allowed the newspaper announcement and the letter to be printed received stern remarks. Aksakov was told that the program of the publication he had submitted did not say a word about the Slavic question, and that such an appeal to the Slavs could only be published after prior approval from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Thus, the publication was subjected to censorship penalties even before its actual publication. Aksakov was persistent and filed a petition to expand the publication's program. Aksakov's editorials, published in the first and second issues, were considered provocative, so the publication was banned, the Moscow Censorship Committee received a reprimand, and the censor who had directly signed off on the issues for printing was dismissed from his post ⁶³⁰.

⁶²⁹Quoted from: Motin S. V. "I will still publish Parus until it is banned..." (on the history of the newspaper's publication by I. S. Aksakov) // MediaAlmanac. 2013. No. 2. P. 67.

⁶³⁰Ibid. P. 65-73.

Despite the fact that Aksakov, who, in Koshelev's words, "acted up" in "Parus", was threatened with exile after the newspaper was banned, he continued to work on compiling "Russian Conversation". On the pages of the magazine, under Aksakov's direction, some of the materials prepared several years earlier for the banned "Moscow Collection" saw the light of day, including several poems by Ivan Sergeevich himself, his revised article "On the Crafts Union in the Yaroslavl Province", devoted to the analysis of possible forms of industrial cooperation based on a peasant community. It is important to note that on the pages of "Russian Conversation", economic issues were developed in the same direction as in the works of Dostoevsky and Gilyarov-Platonov - the idea of the significant role of spiritual and moral principles in economic activity was common to all conservatives. In the spirit of A. S. Khomyakov's article "On the Russian Community", in which the author reproached the capitalist economic model for the fact that the West had become carried away by competition and neglected cooperation, Aksakov developed the idea that the communal principle, characteristic of Russian social life and based on Christian morality, could save Russia from the disastrous path of predatory capitalism. Aksakov also developed his economic ideas in the article "Ukrainian Fairs. Introduction", which was a reduced version of his scientific work, once compiled for the Russian Geographical Society.

Despite the fact that the young, active editor strove, as his friends expected, to "add some fire and a breath of fresh air" to the magazine, trying to overcome the "senile element" that was beginning to dominate ⁶³¹, he was unable to save the fading publication. The financial failure of the publication, supported only by constant, non-repayable capital injections from Koshelev, the constant pressure from the censors and the false position of the two editors, the official and the actual one, in which Aksakov "did not want to subject Koshelev to responsibility for views that he did not share and did not approve of... and Koshelev did not want to support with his

⁶³¹Correspondence of I. S. Aksakov and Yu. F. Samarin (1848–1876) / prepared by T. F. Pirozhkova, O. L. Fetisenko and V. Yu. Shvedova. St. Petersburg: Pushkin House, 2016. P. 67.

name an editor whose direction he did not sympathize with ⁶³²," led to Koshelev deciding to close the magazine at the end of 1859.

In 1860, Aksakov undertook a long-planned trip abroad. Returning to Russia, in January 1861 he began to apply for permission to publish a new publication, and in May, after much torment, he received it. Aksakov approached the publication of one of his main brainchildren, the weekly *Den*, the first issue of which would come out in October 1861, as a mature publicist and experienced organizer of publishing - however, it was precisely at this time that he experienced that period of personal development that was characterized by painful internal contradictions and uncertainty: "how everything has changed, and how I myself have changed," he wrote in a letter to Samarin, "the memory of my former self is quite vivid and interferes with the free, natural manifestation of my present self, which, perhaps, has not yet taken shape ⁶³³. "

The Slavophile circle, already small, had by that time lost its main pillars, since in 1861 the Kireevsky brothers, A. S. Khomyakov, and K. S. Aksakov were no longer alive. Left without the ideological environment that had supported his spirit and nourished his thoughts, Aksakov, on the one hand, felt himself in a painful emptiness and loneliness, and on the other, he felt the need to continue the work that had united him and his deceased friends and teachers, as an absolute moral duty. Speaking about the future newspaper, he noted: "I myself am afraid of this burden... so afraid that I would like to refuse. On the other hand, there is a moral need to take on the burden, to shoulder a moral social feat ⁶³⁴."

Considering the sad experience of "*Russkaya Beseda*", which, in the words of A. S. Khomyakov, "was cut short by the indifference of society" ⁶³⁵, Aksakov, in his

⁶³² Grekov V. N. Ivan Aksakov – employee and editor of "*Russkaya Beseda*" // "*Russkaya Beseda*": history of the Slavophile journal: Research. Materials. Article-by-article listing / ed. by B. F. Egorov, A. M. Pentkovsky and O. L. Fetisenko. St. Petersburg: Pushkin House, 2011. P. 159.

⁶³³ Correspondence of I. S. Aksakov and Yu. F. Samarin (1848–1876) / prepared by T. F. Pirozhkova, O. L. Fetisenko and V. Yu. St. Petersburg: Pushkin House, 2016. P. 100.

⁶³⁴ Ibid.

⁶³⁵ Egorov B. F. The Last Year of "*Russian Conversation*" // "*Russian Conversation*": History of the Slavophile Journal: Research. Materials. Article-by-article listing / ed. B. F. Egorov, A. M. Pentkovsky and O. L. Fetisenko. St. Petersburg: Pushkin House, 2011. P. 240.

reflections on the content of the future weekly, immediately abandoned the idea of providing abstract dogmatic philosophical articles that were incomprehensible to the general public (which was the fault of "Russkaya Beseda", which, unlike its competitors, neglected the entertainment of the reading provided to subscribers). To explain Slavophile dogmas not in the form of theoretical constructs, but through their application to the assessment of practical phenomena of current life - such was Aksakov's conceptual plan regarding the newspaper, although it was precisely this intention that confused some of his like-minded people. Samarin feared that the newspaper format was not suitable for Slavophilism – and not only in the spirit of the common conviction of the Slavophiles that their literary purpose is higher than the vanity of the current newspaper rush and magazine squabbles, while “a newspaper more than any other publication needs success, it needs if not sympathy, then anger, at least some participation of the public”, which the Slavophiles could not count on, if we take into account their previous publishing experience. Samarin points out another important aspect: a newspaper cannot serve as a platform for constructing theoretical and philosophical concepts, in his formulation – “the formulation, definition and development of principles”⁶³⁶, because it must cover current events. This is exactly how Aksakov intended to run *Den*, i.e. to talk about the events of the past week, analyzing them through the prism of Slavophile views. But these views, as Samarin pointed out, are “almost unknown and decidedly not recognized” among the public, so that in discussing all current issues, the Slavophiles will have to “start with the ABCs,” otherwise “not only will they not agree with us, but they will simply not understand us”⁶³⁷.

Samarin's fears in this regard were partly confirmed - willy-nilly, the tone of *Den*'s publications was "not newspaper-like": the relatively short format and the compulsion to write quickly led to the fact that *Den*'s articles were often not a complete statement, but were like a retort in an ongoing dialogue, their meaning was

⁶³⁶Correspondence of two Slavophiles // Correspondence of I. S. Aksakov and Yu. F. Samarin (1848–1876) / prepared by T. F. Pirozhkova, O. L. Fetisenko and V. Yu. Shvedova. St. Petersburg: Pushkin House, 2016. P. 102.

⁶³⁷Ibid.

unclear outside of a general acquaintance with the contents of the publication as a whole. When in 1863 a rather chaotic polemic broke out between *Den'* and *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* (a little more about this episode will be discussed below), it was precisely this nature of the publications that became one of the reasons for the misunderstanding that arose between Katkov and Aksakov.

The dispute concerned the future political structure of Poland within Russia after the suppression of the Polish uprising of 1863. The editor of *Den* accused *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* of deliberately distorting his position, admitting that in his article of August 24 "there is indeed some ambiguity ⁶³⁸," but pointing out to Katkov that he had not paid attention to the views expressed by *Den* in previous issues and had not studied its position as a whole. Katkov responded sarcastically that in such a dangerous time there were other subjects more worthy of holistic study, expressing not so much his own unwillingness to delve deeply into a comprehensive acquaintance with the Slavophile weekly, as the general relationship between the author's practices and the readers' expectations in the newspaper of that period - a complete independent statement was expected from the newspaper editorial. Aksakov, forced, as Samarin had warned, to start with the ABC every time, found such a short, complete statement difficult. This led to *Den'* sometimes becoming a convenient target for ridicule for liberal journalism. Regarding this same episode, the publisher of *Golos*, A. A. Kraevsky, would ironically note that the editor of *Den'*, "distinguished by an amazing ability for logical voltfases, leaps and circles, at the same time has the ability to forget in the thirtieth issue of his newspaper what was said in the twenty-ninth ⁶³⁹." In fact, in order to understand Aksakov's position, Kraevsky needed to know what was written not only in the thirty and twenty-ninth issues, but also in the first and all subsequent issues, which were fully revealed only in their substantive unity.

"*Den*" was published on Saturdays, when consumer demand for retail sales of periodicals was traditionally higher than on weekdays, the issue had an average

⁶³⁸Day. 1863. No. 36.

⁶³⁹Voice. 1863. No. 233.

volume of 24 pages, its content was mainly made up of correspondence from the Slavic lands and news about life in the Russian provinces ⁶⁴⁰. Aksakov's weekly faced the same problems that plagued all Slavophile publications. A narrow circle of followers of Slavophilism, among whom, in addition, many were large landowners or statesmen who did not have the leisure for constant literary work, and some simply treated journalism rather dismissively, could not ensure a constant influx of the necessary number of materials. Aksakov's extensive correspondence during the period of publication of "Russkaya Beseda" and "Den" consists almost half of appeals, exhortations and entreaties addressed to his correspondents, from whom the editor still did not lose hope of receiving at least some articles. However, the response to these requests was very weak, so Ivan Sergeyevich had to work for everyone at Den, so he "published Den at his own expense, was its sole owner and at the same time its main author ⁶⁴¹." In order to cover the costs of publication, which was not only not profitable, but also did not always pay for itself, Aksakov had to go into debt. The lack of assistants and authors exhausted Ivan Sergeyevich with backbreaking labor, the censorship conditions were extremely difficult for the publication. In a conversation with N. S. Sokhanskaya, he described his journalistic activity at this time as follows: "I work like an ox, completely alone, without assistants, and I fiddle with this instrument of the devil - censorship ⁶⁴²."

The relationship of all of Aksakov's publications with the censorship was not easy. In the summer of 1862, an article in issue 31 of Den' about the situation of the Orthodox clergy in Western Russia caused indignation of the censors, and Aksakov was required to provide the name of the author, which he categorically refused to do, despite the twice repeated order from the highest authority. Such impudence of the editor caused a predictable reaction from the authorities - the publication was suspended, and Aksakov was removed from the editorship. Samarin, who was

⁶⁴⁰Badalyan D. A. "The Calling Bell": Ivan Aksakov in Russian Journalism of the Late 1870s – First Half of the 1880s. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2016. P. 26.

⁶⁴¹Ibid.

⁶⁴²Quoted from: Pirozhkova T. F. Correspondence of two Slavophiles // Correspondence of I. S. Aksakov and Yu. F. Samarin (1848–1876) / prepared by T. F. Pirozhkova, O. L. Fetisenko and V. Yu. Shvedova. St. Petersburg: Pushkin House, 2016. P. 25.

outraged by the fact that "... Den' would be banned, while Slovo and Sovremennik would continue their work", volunteered to help the newspaper and the publisher out of this difficult situation,⁶⁴³ and offered to be a substitute editor in order to save the publication. This support would cause the warm gratitude of Aksakov, who believed that even if he gave half of his fortune, his friend would not have done more for him than by offering to use his name at this difficult moment. After Aksakov's personal letter to the Tsar, publication was allowed to resume; from September 1862 to January 1863, Den was published under the nominal editorship of Samarin, then the right of official editing was returned to Aksakov.

1863 became a severe moral test for the Slavophiles. The Polish uprising extremely aggravated precisely those aspects of the views of this circle that put its adherents in a difficult position – how to develop the idea of uniting the Slavic peoples at a time of open military confrontation between them. In the newspaper Den, Aksakov defended, just like Katkov in Moskovskiye Vedomosti, the need to suppress the uprising, and just as enthusiastically accepted the sovereign's manifesto on amnesty for the Polish rebels who would lay down their arms and surrender to the Russian government, noting that "no victor had ever offered the enemy such generous conditions of surrender"⁶⁴⁴. Together with Moskovskiye Vedomosti, Den was indignant at the idea of the European powers, which was offensive to Russia, about the possibility of convening a congress to resolve the Polish question⁶⁴⁵, was delighted with the manifestations of popular patriotism⁶⁴⁶ and welcomed Russia's responses to the diplomatic representations of the three powers⁶⁴⁷. Like Katkov, Aksakov believed that winning the confrontation with Europe was not yet a solution to the Polish question, but a solution to the Russian question itself, and "the Polish

⁶⁴³Correspondence of two Slavophiles // Correspondence of I. S. Aksakov and Yu. F. Samarin (1848–1876) / prepared by T. F. Pirozhkova, O. L. Fetisenko and V. Yu. Shvedova. St. Petersburg: Pushkin House, 2016. P. 126.

⁶⁴⁴Day. 1863. No. 14.

⁶⁴⁵Day. 1863. No. 20.

⁶⁴⁶Day. 1863. No. 23.

⁶⁴⁷Day. 1863. No. 26.

question is only just beginning now,”⁶⁴⁸ and it consists of what to do with Poland after the suppression of the rebellion, how to arrange a peaceful life for the pacified kingdom.

Such similarity in the opinions of the two publications could have created an unfavorable impression for Den', that Aksakov's newspaper "sings from the words of Moskovskie Vedomosti " without having an independent position. This effect arose due to the fact that the frequency of publications was different - the daily Moskovskie Vedomosti, which promptly responded to political events, managed to express its point of view on them two or three times by the time the weekly Den' spoke out about the events of three days ago, presenting them as news.

The essential difference between Aksakov's publicistic writings and Katkov's editorials, despite the obvious general commonality of views on the subject, was that Aksakov's position was couched in less harsh and categorical formulations. The articles were full of digressions and often after reading them the reader, although he had formed some idea of the general direction of the author's thought, was left with a feeling of something left unsaid, a logical incompleteness of thought, and consequently, a feeling that the author himself did not have an internal certainty of views on some aspects of the issue.

A striking example of such an article is the editorial of the 12th issue of March 23. Speaking about the Polish uprising and the prospects for further relations between Russia and Poland, Aksakov devotes more than two-thirds of the article to reasoning about the nature of the nation in general, placing the concepts of "Polonism", "Teutonism", "Germanism" on a par; he asks the question "Are the Poles less Polish than the Germans are Germans", asserts that "the Germans (...) Germanize the Slavs only because they are Germans (just as the French Frenchify because they are French)", and, having concluded from this that the Russians do not Russify the Poles only because they themselves are not Russian enough, he concludes his article with an assertion about the lack of national originality among

⁶⁴⁸Day. 1863. No. 34.

Russians, caused by blind imitation of Europe. After reading the article, which occupied more than three pages of the publication, the reader is left with an unclear question: is the author “for” or “against” the Russification of Poland? Many of Aksakov’s articles of the period in question were of this kind. It can be assumed that such a position is partly explained by the fact that Aksakov, although he was the absolute master of his publication, nevertheless perceived himself as the spokesman for the general attitude to the problem of the entire Slavophile circle, wishing to express not only his own views, but also the consolidated opinion of his “party”. And among the Slavophiles on the Polish question there was not even a hint of unity; the most diverse opinions were voiced ⁶⁴⁹.

A. A. Teslya rightly points out this complexity of Aksakov’s position, noting that the publication of *Den* itself was for Aksakov “an act of remembrance and a forced act.” After the death of the senior Slavophiles, the inspirers and founders of the teaching, “the main thing was to preserve, not to violate or damage what was in the care – one’s own, the author’s, faded into the background, faded into the background: Aksakov did not value and trust his own thoughts so much as to prefer them to the thoughts of the dear departed. He was forced to act independently – but he found the meaning of this activity in preserving what was inherited ⁶⁵⁰.” Aksakov was forced to constantly relate himself to the movement, feeling a deep responsibility for each of his public statements as an expression of the position of the teaching as a whole, while other Slavophiles “preferred not to advertise their disagreements, trying to change and correct Aksakov’s position through persuasion, without going as far as public polemics and, in any case, trying to maintain a compromise tone in it – thus Aksakov turned out to be the one setting the public image and the main person shaping the Slavophile public agenda ⁶⁵¹.” This position left a certain imprint on Aksakov’s authorial manner, trying to reconcile different

⁶⁴⁹Teslya A. A. Slavophiles and the "Polish Question" in the 1840s - 1st half of the 1860s // *Philosophy. Journal of the Higher School of Economics*. 2021. Vol. 5. No. 3. Pp. 191-216.

⁶⁵⁰Teslya A. A. “The Last of the “Fathers”: Biography of Ivan Aksakov. St. Petersburg: Vladimir Dal, 2015. P. 25.

⁶⁵¹*Ibid.* P. 30.

points of view in one statement, to find a compromise, which from the outside looked like an uncertain and unformed position.

Katkov, graciously accepting the support of the Slavophile publication in the main provisions of its view of Poland, could not help but notice this shortcoming of Aksakov's articles. And, as he himself would later explain in a response article, "he considered it not superfluous to clarify the issue that had arisen, quite naturally *using* the opinion of the newspaper " Den " for this purpose. " ⁶⁵²The question was, in fact, what system of government should be established in the reconciled region after the suppression of the rebellion. Katkov considered it necessary for Russia to do with the Kingdom of Poland what Austria did with Galicia, and Prussia with Poznan: to merge rebellious Poland with itself into a single whole, introducing continuous Russian land ownership in the region. Aksakov's position is not so obvious. Agreeing with Katkov that a temporary military dictatorship is necessary to pacify the region, and "outraged by the situation in which our government has been placed in the region," he notes in an article in issue 34 of Den' for 1863 that "the very suppression of the revolution and the pacification of rebellious Poland is possible only with a clear and precise resolution by the authorities to the question: what exactly does it intend to do with Poland? ⁶⁵³"

Aksakov, after a series of inferences that Kraevsky called "logical volt-fases", comes to the following conclusions: the existence of an independent government in sovereign Poland would be advantageous for Russia, since, even if the Poles were dissatisfied with Russian interference in their internal affairs, we would have in the person of this government a specific, personified opponent, with whom it would be easier to deal than with a hidden, silent conspiracy and the hatred of an entire nation. An independent Polish government cannot pose a danger to Russia, since the advantage in any power confrontation would be on the side of Russia - "a state that

⁶⁵²Moscow News. 1863. No. 194.

⁶⁵³Day. 1863. No. 34.

has a population of more than 60 million" against "a small political body, which Poland could be ⁶⁵⁴. "

In response to this, Katkov points out that a military dictatorship is incompatible with the very idea of political independence, and is indignant that the editor of *Den*, speaking of the general dissatisfaction in Poland with Russia's rule, notes that this concerns the entire population of the country, except for the peasantry. This assertion gave Katkov a reason to accuse Aksakov of not paying attention to the role of the peasantry, that for him "the peasants mean nothing ⁶⁵⁵. "

The editor of *Den* was outraged by Katkov's attacks and in the 36th issue of the newspaper was "willy-nilly forced to deal with and occupy the readers' attention with *Den*'s personal accounts and settlements with *Moskovskie Vedomosti*, no matter how inappropriate this occupation is at the present time." ⁶⁵⁶Aksakov declares that on the part of *Moskovskie Vedomosti* there was an "unworthy distortion" of his opinions, which cannot be explained by a lack of understanding, but only by intent, by design, therefore the Slavophile newspaper is forced to enter into a dispute with an opponent "in whom we see much passion and little sincerity, who imposes on us opinions completely opposed to ours, and with pathos refutes what we have never said, and fights, however, quite successfully, with the ghosts of his own imagination." In addition, Aksakov is offended by the self-confidence of the editor of *Moskovskie Vedomosti*, who called himself the lone voice of Russian patriots. "What will our readers say to this," asks Aksakov, "who have been familiar with *Den* from the very beginning of its existence? ⁶⁵⁷"

The dispute between the two Moscow publications attracted the attention of the liberal St. Petersburg newspaper *Golos* and its editor A. Kraevsky. Kraevsky does not deny a certain amount of glee with which he observes the "internecine struggle in unsympathetic Moscow journalism ⁶⁵⁸," but he does not consider it possible to

⁶⁵⁴Ibid.

⁶⁵⁵Moscow News. 1863. No. 189.

⁶⁵⁶Day. 1863. No. 36.

⁶⁵⁷Ibid.

⁶⁵⁸Voice. 1863. No. 231.

remain an outside spectator, since *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* on September 1, “addressing its notes to the editor of *Den*,”⁶⁵⁹ noted that they were also addressing the St. Petersburg newspaper. It seems strange to Kraevsky that *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*, accusing the majority of Russian journalism of cosmopolitanism, is starting a polemic with the Slavophile *Den*. “We do not know,” writes Kraevsky, “whether anyone, with the exception of *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*, would dare to accuse the editor of *Den* of anything resembling cosmopolitanism.”⁶⁶⁰

Kraevsky criticizes Aksakov, first of all, for the inconsistency of the presentation of views, which, moreover, are an attempt not at a practical, but at an abstract-philosophical, speculative view of politics, which is precisely why, according to Kraevsky, *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* took up arms against them, because “it is convenient for everyone to choose for themselves the field of action in which they consider themselves stronger”⁶⁶¹. Just as *Den* considers the independence of Poland to be necessary in the future, but now premature, so *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* considers its Russification premature, agreeing on the need for a temporary military dictatorship at the present time. Consequently, Kraevsky asserts, their dispute is meaningless, and readers “will gain nothing from that evil, bilious, picky polemic” of two newspapers that do not contradict each other at all, for “in essence, they are children of the same mother, children of transcendental philosophy applied to politics”⁶⁶².

This entire controversy as a whole bears the features characteristic of disputes within Russian journalism of this period. Kraevsky accuses Katkov and Aksakov of arguing about irrelevant issues, while agreeing on a pressing issue, but Kraevsky himself, arguing with both of them, puts forward only a third view on the same irrelevant issue at that time, and agrees with both Aksakov and Katkov on the need for an immediate establishment of a military dictatorship. There is no fundamental difference in views between these three points of view, as there was none, in essence,

⁶⁵⁹Ibid.

⁶⁶⁰Ibid.

⁶⁶¹Ibid.

⁶⁶²Voice. 1863. No. 233.

between all the Russian publications of this period, which differed from each other only in certain details.

Polemics within the conservative camp will occur quite often, and Aksakov and Katkov will become its main characters more than once. However, when considering the nature of this polemic, we will be forced to come to a conclusion close to the statement of one of the late Slavophiles, A. A. Kireev, left by him in his diary: “Aksakov and Katkov consider themselves opponents, and meanwhile, all of Russia, and especially the entire Slavic world, fully understand that they serve the same ideals, pursue the same goals, and it seems to them that they are opponents, because Aksakov would like the Tsar to quickly assemble a land council, and Katkov thinks that nothing good will come of this now ... Aksakov believes in society more than in the government, Katkov - on the contrary, but both of them are for Orthodoxy, for nationality, for autocracy, for the liberation of the peasants, both are enemies of parliamentarism, enemies of intellectuals, lawyers, bloodsuckers ⁶⁶³. ”

In 1865, Aksakov decided to end the weekly. In outlining the reasons for the cessation of *Den*, Aksakov, among other things, speaks of circumstances of a purely personal nature (at that time he was preparing for his wedding with A. F. Tyutcheva), but at the same time adds: “Even if I had not had marriage in mind, I could not continue publishing *Den*. Firstly, due to a lack of funds; the number of subscribers is decreasing, the amount of expenses is increasing: we need assistants, department heads, we need a politician, we need a critic, etc. Secondly, I have really overexerted my health ⁶⁶⁴.”

However, Aksakov's social temperament did not allow him to remain aloof from open political discussion for long. Aksakov's journalistic activity in 1867–68 was connected with the publication of the daily newspaper *Moskva* (during the four-month suspension of *Moskva*, Aksakov published its copy under the name

⁶⁶³Quoted from: Aksakov, Ivan Sergeevich. *Materials for the Chronicle of His Life and Work: Vol. 6: in 2 parts. 1880–1886: Editor-publisher of the newspaper “Rus”.* Part 1: 1880–1884 / compiled by S. V. Motin. Ufa: ULI MVD of Russia, 2015. P. 8.

⁶⁶⁴Correspondence of I. S. Aksakov and Yu. F. Samarin (1848–1876) / prepared by T. F. Pirozhkova, O. L. Fetisenko and V. Yu. Shvedova. St. Petersburg: Pushkin House, 2016. P. 225.

Moskvich). Aksakov began the new publication after having regained his strength and acquired a fairly powerful source of financing in the form of Moscow merchants, who wanted to have a printed organ in Moscow that covered trade issues. Aksakov outlines the conditions under which the merchants agreed to act as shareholders in the new publication as follows: “Their entire demand consists of the fact that out of the 24 columns of the newspaper, at least two should be devoted to trade correspondence, that at least once a week there should be an editorial on industrial and financial issues, written by Chizhov or Babst, that the economic section should be under the responsibility of Chizhov and Babst, that in each issue I should give space to trade telegrams, the delivery of which they themselves undertake to arrange; finally, that I should not go beyond the general budget figure (which they have calculated at 70 thousand silver rubles per year). Then, within this figure, I can dispose of it at my own discretion ⁶⁶⁵.”

Aksakov, for his part, did not abandon hope that if the above conditions were met, he would not be constrained by the shareholders of the publication in his main speeches and would be able to turn the newspaper into an organ that would have weight and significance in the Slavic cause. His father-in-law F. I. Tyutchev expressed the same hope, complaining in a letter to his daughter that the subscription to Moskva “is not going as we would like” and impatiently awaiting the appearance of a new publication: “like all your husband’s friends, I ardently wish, in the interests of his publication, that the ideas that inspire him be fully understood both by the public and in the highest circles... of all the social trends represented in the Russian press, his trend has the most pronounced national character, and therefore seems the most openly conservative, the most sincerely devoted to the very principle of power in Russia ⁶⁶⁶.”

Tyutchev took a lively and active part in the fate of the newspaper, reporting the latest news, sharing his thoughts on various political issues, and protecting the

⁶⁶⁵Correspondence of I. S. Aksakov and Yu. F. Samarin (1848–1876) / prepared by T. F. Pirozhkova, O. L. Fetisenko and V. Yu. Shvedova. St. Petersburg: Pushkin House, 2016. P. 235.

⁶⁶⁶F. I. Tyutchev - A. F. Aksakova // Tyutchev F. I. Russia and the West / comp., intro. Art., trans. and comm. B. N. Tarasova. M.: Cultural Revolution; Republic, 2007. P. 309.

publication from censorship attacks whenever possible. The latter, however, was extremely difficult. As early as February 1867, he noted in a letter that caution and common sense required him to say: “it is desirable that the newspaper, at least for the first time, firmly adopt a certain restraint in relation to the personal composition of the government,” but he immediately added, bearing in mind both his own unwillingness to make such compromises and Aksakov’s well-known stubbornness, that “all admonitions in this sense are as disgusting as they are ridiculous, and lead to nothing ⁶⁶⁷.” And yet, after some time, Tyutchev could not resist a cautious hint: “a newspaper like Moskva brings benefit to Russia and therefore has the right to exercise caution. ”⁶⁶⁸

However, caution was not at all characteristic of Aksakov’s nature, so “the experience of publishing... this newspaper was very bitter: in less than two years of existence – nine warnings, three suspensions... and finally closure by the authorities.” This was caused by the fact that “Aksakov, who was critical of the government bureaucracy, gave free rein to his own emotions in his articles ⁶⁶⁹.”

Aksakov's uncompromising position towards censorship was reflected in all his publishing projects. It was precisely during the period when censorship was particularly strict with his publication, during the suspension of Moskva, that Aksakov would criticize the current censorship system on the pages of the "replacement" newspaper Moskvich. "Between Aksakov's way of thinking and the bureaucratic mindset characteristic of the leadership of our press," Tyutchev stated, "there is a bottomless abyss..." ⁶⁷⁰. Aksakov's attention to the topic of organizing censorship at that time was due to the fact that in 1867 the preparatory stage of the reform of legal proceedings adopted in 1864 was completed, and jury trials were introduced into the practice of conducting judicial proceedings. The censorship rules

⁶⁶⁷Ibid. P. 317.

⁶⁶⁸Ibid. P. 321.

⁶⁶⁹Pirozhkova T. F. Correspondence of two Slavophiles // Correspondence of I. S. Aksakov and Yu. F. Samarin (1848–1876) / prepared by T. F. Pirozhkova, O. L. Fetisenko and V. Yu. Shvedova. St. Petersburg: Pushkin House, 2016. P. 25.

⁶⁷⁰F. I. Tyutchev - A. F. Aksakova // Tyutchev F. I. Russia and the West / comp., intro. Art., trans. and comm. B. N. Tarasova. M.: Cultural Revolution; Republic, 2007. P. 315.

that had been in effect since 1865 and were based on a system of administrative measures of influence were introduced as transitional measures until the new system of courts was established ⁶⁷¹. In 1867, the new courts began their work, but the government was in no hurry to update the censorship rules, wanting to keep the instruments of administrative control over the press in its hands. Aksakov spoke out on this matter, demanding the fulfillment of what was planned and promised by the decree of April 6, 1865. Assessing Aksakov's harsh and irreconcilable position in relation to censorship, one must keep in mind that Aksakov, as V. N. Grekov put it, was always in the position of a person who does not oppose the law, but defends the law, and "defends it not blindly, without reasoning, but, on the contrary, relies on the law, appeals to the law. Aksakov's position can be formulated as follows: by defending myself and the newspaper, I defend the law from the tyranny of the authorities ⁶⁷². "

The result was sad: Moskvich "was stopped at the request of the Minister of Internal Affairs, and the reasons for the ban were not explained ⁶⁷³." Having resumed Moskvich after the suspension, Aksakov first of all attacked the censorship department with sharp criticism for banning Moskvich without explaining the reasons and without even sending the warnings required by law under the procedure that existed at that time.

F. I. Tyutchev, who was worried about the fate of the publication, wrote to Aksakov at that time: "Your Moscow is terribly burdening our poor Main Administration. It has been raging for the second meeting, and they still have not been able to come to any conclusion – it has been postponed until the next one. There is no positive hostility towards you in the composition of the Main Administration

⁶⁷¹Dzhanshiev G. A. The Era of Great Reforms. Chapter 6. Law on the Press of April 6, 1865. St. Petersburg, 1905. Page 338.

⁶⁷²Grekov V.N. "I am going my own way": Ivan Aksakov on journalism without thorns, censorship and the ban on the newspaper "Moscow" // Mediascope. 2011. No. 3.

⁶⁷³Ibid.

itself. They are only upset by your excessive harshness. Hostility from above ⁶⁷⁴.” In response to Tyutchev’s accusations against the censors about partiality contrary to moral duty, they agreed with him, but responded, “But what can we do!.. That’s what was ordered ⁶⁷⁵.” One of the harshest trends in Aksakov’s journalism at that time was criticism of the Russian administration in the Baltics, including a high assessment of Samarin’s scandalous book “The Outskirts of Russia,” which caused that “hostility from above” to which Tyutchev pointed.

hostility was that, despite the split in the censorship department regarding the measures to be taken against Aksakov’s publication, in the end “at repeated hearings in the general meeting of the first three departments and the heraldry department, the majority spoke in favor of banning Moskva. The opinion of the majority was confirmed by the emperor. In April 1869, Aksakov received an official message about this from the office of the Moscow Governor-General ⁶⁷⁶.”

With the closure of Moskva, which was a heavy blow for Aksakov, his publishing activities would be interrupted for more than a decade. Only in 1880 Ivan Sergeevich decided to return to magazine work, starting to publish the newspaper Rus. “In this word – “Rus” – the whole meaning of that truth, which our lying social existence so lacks, for which the Russian man so yearns, so exhausted,” this is how the editor himself explained the meaning of the title, “our land is terribly tired of writing, sophistication, falsehood, which for so long, so powerfully bent, drilled, reinterpreted it in various foreign ways and orders. All the need, all our task now is precisely in finally bringing truth into Russian life, in order to return to it the freedom of organic self-growth, so that in fact Rus becomes Rus ⁶⁷⁷.”

⁶⁷⁴Letter from F. I. Tyutchev to I. S. Aksakov. Quoted from: Chulkov G. Tyutchev and Aksakov in the Fight against Censorship // Muranovsky Collection. Muranovo: Publishing House of the Poet F. I. Tyutchev Museum, 1928. Issue 1. P. 15.

⁶⁷⁵Ibid.

⁶⁷⁶Grekov V.N. “I am going my own way”: Ivan Aksakov on journalism without thorns, censorship and the ban on the newspaper “Moscow” // Mediascope. 2011. No. 3.

⁶⁷⁷Quoted from: Aksakov, Ivan Sergeevich. Materials for the Chronicle of His Life and Work: Vol. 6: in 2 parts. 1880–1886. Editor-publisher of the newspaper “Rus”. Part 1: 1880–1884 / compiled by S. V. Motin; edited by S. V. Motin. Ufa: ULI MVD of Russia, 2015. P. 8.

For the new publication, Aksakov chose the weekly form, which was familiar to him and best suited the properties of his writing style. The experience of publishing a daily newspaper was difficult for Aksakov; he agreed to publish Moskva daily only because this was an indispensable condition of the investors who did not agree to a weekly. In addition, publishing a weekly gave Aksakov the opportunity not to leave his position as Chairman of the Mutual Credit Society, which provided a stable income. The program of Rus, which Aksakov received permission to publish on September 12, 1880, largely repeated the program of Den, so in the subscription announcement Aksakov stated that there was no need to explain the direction of the future publication, and in correspondence he indicated that "it will be exactly like Den"⁶⁷⁸. There was only one fundamental difference in the structure of the publications: Rus was initially declared to have a political section, which was formally banned from Den.

Aksakov's ten-year silence in print made the public eagerly and impatiently await the appearance of his new publication. The first issues did not have many subscribers, about 2,300, but they sold well at retail - up to 5,000 copies were sold. In addition, it can be assumed that the circle of readers was greater than the number of copies, since, according to contemporaries, the issues passed from hand to hand and were read like hot cakes⁶⁷⁹. In the first issues, Aksakov focused his attention on issues of internal socio-political life, primarily the development of district self-government, temporarily moving away from the Slavic question dear to his heart.

In December 1880, Aksakov responded vividly in Rus to the wave of student unrest that swept across Russia. As was traditional for conservative publicists, Aksakov's publication stated that a significant share of the blame for what was happening should be placed on the liberal press organs, which sowed indignation in immature minds and were largely responsible for the general spread of nihilistic teachings and the rejection by young people of the traditional guidelines of Christian

⁶⁷⁸Badalyan D. A. "The Calling Bell": Ivan Aksakov in Russian Journalism of the Late 1870s – First Half of the 1880s. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2016. P. 31.

⁶⁷⁹Ibid. P. 43.

morality. Later, developing this theme in his journalistic speeches, Aksakov would note: “Was it possible to assume that the magazine ravings of the young Pisarev, who incessantly scribbled everything that came into his head, and who once, when reproached for contradicting his own words, said a year ago, naively answered: “I am developing” – was it possible to think that all this, seemingly innocent ravings, would be capable of responding in the student youth with such sad phenomena? So, he did not meet with opposition from the teachers, or were they too powerless against the all-crushing authority of such a “force” as Pisarev?! And how could they not be powerless, when they themselves raised young men in superstitious reverence for the “last word of science and life”, themselves firmly believing that in the “last word” lies “progress”? "Young people greedily caught every last word, not wanting to know the words that came before, nor the old models, nor the historical experiences. All this, however, leads to the conclusion that magazine chatter does not remain without any influence on the development of our youth, especially since magazines have almost supplanted both reading and even the publication of books, and that it would not hurt our magazine publicists to treat words more conscientiously and sometimes think about the consequences to which any frivolous, hastily written and printed speech can lead young readers... ⁶⁸⁰"

Soon, a section of criticism and bibliography was introduced into the newspaper, which paid great attention to the analysis of books intended for children and young people, and Aksakov saw his task as helping parents and educators choose worthy textbooks and fiction for children ⁶⁸¹.

The pages of *Rus* also saw the light of day of some works by early Slavophiles that could not be published at the time of their writing for reasons of censorship. For example, in 1883 Aksakov published in the newspaper an article by his brother Konstantin, “On the Modern Literary Dispute,” which had been banned from publication in 1846.

⁶⁸⁰Aksakov K. S., Aksakov I. S. *Literary criticism* / compiled, introduction and commentary by A. S. Kurilova. Moscow: Sovremennik, 1981. Pp. 283–284.

⁶⁸¹Fedoseeva T. V. I. S. Aksakov’s newspaper “*Rus*” on Orthodox spirituality as the basis of public education in Russia // *Bulletin of Novgorod State University*. 2015. No. 84. P. 176–177.

The most important element of the content of "Rus" were the articles by V. Solovyov on the fate and significance of the Russian Orthodox Church. The articles "On Spiritual Authority in Russia", "On the Schism in the Russian People and Society", which raised questions about the role of the church in society, problems of freedom of religion, often exposed the vices of the church structure contemporary to Solovyov.

Despite the fact that in Rus, as in Aksakov's previous weekly, his own publications constituted the most significant part of the content, Ivan Sergeevich sought to attract other authors to collaborate, and "when selecting correspondents, Aksakov focused on specialists in one field or another who were skilled in writing"⁶⁸², and "in less than five years of publication of the newspaper, almost 500 different signatures appeared under its publications"⁶⁸³. At various times, the newspaper's employees included S. F. Sharapov, D. F. Samarin, N. N. Strakhov, Or. F. Miller, A. A. Kireev, Vl. Lamansky, P. D. Golokhvastov, I. N. Pavlov, S. A. Rachinsky, Archpriest A. M. Ivantsov-Platonov and others.

The newspaper's initial success was short-lived. By 1882, some subscribers had already left the publication, and retail sales had also fallen. The reasons for the decline in interest in the publication were the serious tone of its profound philosophical articles, Aksakov's fundamental lack of concern for the entertainment value of light reading that readers of the time expected to find in the newspaper, and the partly disappointed expectations of those subscribers who had expected from Rus' a furious polemical fervor in the spirit of the once published Moskva. The mature Aksakov's positions increasingly gravitated toward the classical tenets of conservatism, although he himself fundamentally rejected such a designation (as, incidentally, did not accept the liberal one). In October 1884, in a letter to E. A. and M. S. Tomashevsky, Aksakov wrote: "A daily newspaper is now everyone's daily bread, and my publication is a cookie that is already a luxury, without which one can

⁶⁸²Badalyan D. A. The circle of authors of I. S. Aksakov's newspaper "Rus" // History and Culture, 2009. No. 7. P. 195.

⁶⁸³Ibid. P. 190.

do. And it is too serious. By the number of my subscribers, I can judge the number of serious people (educated) in Russia. There are only 2,300 of them ⁶⁸⁴. "

Soon Aksakov would decide to abandon the weekly format, which, on the one hand, could not compete in terms of the speed of information with the widely distributed mass newspapers, and on the other hand, did not provide enough time for a comprehensive and comprehensive development of serious socio-political issues, since it still had rather constraining time frames. Recognizing that in terms of speed, his publication, which also did not have a large number of correspondents, was still losing, Aksakov would rely on analytics and decide to transfer *Rus* to a less frequent publication, publishing a larger issue every two weeks from January 1, 1883, thereby preserving the general annual page count of the publication and avoiding the need to revise commercial commitments given to subscribers. *Rus* began to resemble a thin magazine rather than a newspaper. "I am so tired of this obligatory periodic writing that when there is nothing that stimulates writing, I always put it off until the very last days," Aksakov complained in a letter to A. S. Suvorin in October 1884, and added: "You are a lucky man... The publisher of the newspaper has been absent for 6 months in a row, living it up in Italy... and my publication is "Everything is in me, and I am in everything! ⁶⁸⁵"

"*Rus*" continued with varying success until 1886 – until the death of its creator. The financial circumstances of the publication were never particularly brilliant, Ivan Sergeevich was still exhausted, trying to give worthy content to "*Rus*" as a publicist and thinker, he also suffered from the lack of active assistants, and more than once doubted whether it was worth continuing the work he had begun. "...Is it necessary, is it useful for me to continue publishing "*Rus*" in one form or another, or to leave the stage?" ⁶⁸⁶– Aksakov wrote in a letter G. P. Galagan in the

⁶⁸⁴Quoted from: Aksakov, Ivan Sergeevich. *Materials for the Chronicle of Life and Work: Vol. 6: in 2 parts. 1880–1886: Editor-publisher of the newspaper "Rus". 1880–1884 / compiled by S. V. Motin. Ufa: ULI MVD of Russia, 2015. Part I. P. 5.*

⁶⁸⁵Quoted from: Aksakov, Ivan Sergeevich. *Materials for the Chronicle of His Life and Work: Vol. 6: in 2 parts. 1880–1886: Editor-publisher of the newspaper "Rus". 1880–1884 / compiled by S. V. Motin. Ufa: ULI MVD of Russia, 2015. Part I. P. 3.*

⁶⁸⁶*Ibid.* P. 8.

autumn of 1884. But he still perceived his publication as a moral feat, as the most important social field, therefore, in moments of doubt, he always found the inner strength to continue the work, and was even able in 1885 to return “Rus” to a weekly periodicity, admitting that “the two-week method of publication turns out to be inconvenient and unprofitable with our public ⁶⁸⁷.”

In general, at this time Aksakov, despite the relatively small circulation of his publication, acquired colossal public authority, enjoyed great respect not only from his like-minded people, but also from ideological opponents. For his contemporaries, Aksakov was a symbol of honest and uncompromising adherence to his convictions, an active civic position, impeccable conscientiousness in publishing activities - Aksakov's publications never enjoyed financial support from the government or its individual representatives, valuing their independence.

§ 2.6 Conservative press in communication processes of post-reform Russia

The communicative practices of the Russian conservative press of the second half of the 19th century had their own distinctive features, determined, first of all, by the specifics of the social structure of Russia of that period. The ideological center of Russian conservative periodicals became the ancient capital of Russia – Moscow. All the numerous, although, as a rule, short-lived, publications of the Slavophiles, the daily *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* of M. N. Katkov and *Sovremennye Izvestiya* of N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov were published in Moscow. The conservatives attached great symbolic significance to their Moscow “residence permit.” For them, Moscow was a stronghold of national culture and a symbol of national history, in contrast to the pseudo-European Petersburg. V. V. Rozanov, speaking about M. N. Katkov, noted that he “could not have grown and developed in Petersburg; Petersburg would have broken him into pieces. Only in Moscow, far from the center of “current affairs”

⁶⁸⁷I. S. Aksakov – letter to M. O. Koyalovich // Aksakov Ivan Sergeevich. Materials for the chronicle of life and work: Issue 6: in 2 parts. 1880–1886: Editor-publisher of the newspaper “Rus”. 1880–1884 / compiled by S. V. Motin. Ufa: ULI MVD of Russia, 2015. Part I. P. 10.

– from the courts and gossip about the details of these affairs, close to the Kremlin and the Moscow cathedrals, could this monumental figure be cast.” Moscow journalists who, according to Rozanov, were “out of business” in their political judgments had “as a criterion and guiding principle in criticism the historical deed that Moscow did for Russia. This deed is the unity and greatness of Russia ⁶⁸⁸.”

For conservatives, Petersburg was not only a symbol of the pernicious cultural expansion of the West ⁶⁸⁹, but also the center of that phenomenon of political life that they hated, which arose in the Petersburg period of Russian history. Petersburg was first and foremost a bureaucratic capital: even in Gogol's stories it was subtly noted how crowds of officials of all stripes "greened" Nevsky Prospect with their uniforms. For conservatives, who were faithful to the idea of monarchy as an all-class people's power, bureaucracy was a dangerous dividing wall between the tsar and the people, the source of many errors in the Russian state mechanism.

In St. Petersburg, the only notable and long-lasting representative of the conservative wing of the Russian press was “Grazhdanin”, published with a short break by V. P. Meshchersky from 1872 to 1914. For a short period from 1876 to 1877, the conservative camp of the St. Petersburg press was replenished with “Dnevnik pisatel” (A Writer’s Diary), a mono-journal by F. M. Dostoevsky. In general, “St. Petersburg journalism” and “St. Petersburg feuilletonists” were widely used symbolic designations for their opponents by Russian conservatives, and St. Petersburg was the center of those principles that were perceived as alien, and often detrimental to national culture and statehood. Strangely enough, it was the only “St. Petersburg” conservative, Prince Meshchersky, who was distinguished by particularly fierce attacks on St. Petersburg, who, in his article “What Do We Need?” and even called for moving the official capital of the state back to Moscow, implying

⁶⁸⁸Rozanov V. V. Suvorin and Katkov // *New Time*. 1997. No. 7. P. 36–38.

⁶⁸⁹Kruglikova O. S., Sonina E. S. Specifics of the verbal and visual existence of the metaphor "window to Europe" in Russian journalism of the XIX - early XX centuries // *Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 10: Journalism*. 2020. No. 4. P. 53-79.

by this, of course, not only the relocation of the state apparatus, but also a symbolic shift in the emphasis of domestic and foreign policy.

The attention of researchers of the history of journalism of this period is often drawn to the fact that representatives of the conservative wing willingly entered into polemics with each other in magazines and often allowed themselves unflattering comments about their comrades in the conservative camp in correspondence or memoirs. Thus, Katkov's *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* most fiercely polemicized with Aksakov's *Den*, *Dnevnik Pisatel* fiercely criticized V. G. Avseenko's publications in *Russkiy Vestnik*, Dostoevsky said that some of Meshchersky's ideas were deeply contrary to his convictions ⁶⁹⁰, Konstantin Leontyev noted that he felt a personal aversion to Katkov, although he proposed to erect a monument to him in recognition of his public services during his lifetime - the series of similar examples can be continued. Usually, these episodes are pointed to as an argument confirming the lack of a single ideological platform in Russian conservatism, giving an idea of the eclecticism, disunity and contradictoriness of this worldview. However, it should be remembered that polemics between ideologically closely related publications have always been a common and natural thing – let us recall at least the fierce magazine battle between *Sovremennik* and *Russkoe Slovo*, called by Dostoevsky “A Split in the Nihilists”. After all, it is precisely the bearers of common deep ideas who most often have a desire for polemics regarding disagreements on the “ideological periphery”, it is precisely the different shades in common views that can be most effectively argued about, while a dispute between people with fundamentally different worldviews is practically impossible – the difference in reference points and ideological coordinates excludes constructive polemics, leaving the possibility only for emotional and personal squabbles. As for personal relations between representatives of the conservative camp of Russian journalism, they were complex and uneven, just like relations within the liberal and left-radical circles – a clear

⁶⁹⁰Dostoevsky F. M. Letters. 164. To V. P. Meshchersky. November 3–4, 1873. Petersburg // Dostoevsky F. M. Collected Works: in 15 volumes. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1996. Vol. 15. Pp. 777–778.

example of this can be the thoroughly studied twists and turns of relations in the editorial office of the same *Sovremennik*, the attacks of Herzen and Ogarev on Kraevsky and much more. So, the polemical attacks and uneven relations between conservatives should be regarded as a manifestation in a particular case of the general laws of the journalistic process, and not evidence of internal “defects” of the conservative worldview.

Among the general, systemic features of the publicists of the conservative camp, it is worth noting the process of evolution “from left to right”, which often complicates the interpretation of their political position, characteristic of almost all conservatives. The moderate liberalism of the Anglophile Katkov of the 1850s in the “*Russian Herald*”, which contemporaries ironically called the “*Westminster Herald*”, was replaced by the beginning of the 1860s by the pathos of a convinced conservative, loudly expressed on the pages of the “*Moskovskie Vedomosti*”, which aroused suspicions among contemporaries and historians of the journalist’s bribe and bias. The vague political position of Dostoevsky's *pochvennik* journals *Vremya* (1862–63) and *Epokha* (1864–65), when "Dostoevsky did not regard the differences between *Vremya* and *Sovremennik* as irreconcilable" ⁶⁹¹, was replaced by the "reactionary" nature of *Dnevnik Pisatel* (1876–77), which repelled many of his former admirers. Its ideological positions forced Soviet researchers to see an official character in Dostoevsky's journalism, to suspect the writer of fulfilling the "social order" of the elite, "putting abstract thought at the service of tsarism" ⁶⁹². The Slavophiles, who, thanks to the idea of the *Zemsky Sobor* that they developed, were even credited with radical democratic aspirations in the 1850s–60s, began to already confidently attributed to the conservative direction, and in relation to the personal creative biography of I. S. Aksakov, the question of what caused the “correction” of his views in the last period of his work is still being debated ⁶⁹³. Prince Meshchersky,

⁶⁹¹Rosenblum L. M. *Dostoevsky's Creative Diaries*. Moscow: Nauka, 1982. P. 63.

⁶⁹²Grossman L. P. *Dostoevsky and government circles of the 1870s*. Quoted from: Volgin I. L. *Dostoevsky – journalist: (“A writer’s diary” and the Russian public): Manual for a special course*. Moscow: Moscow State University Press, 1982. P. 13.

⁶⁹³ Badalyan D. A. *"The Calling Bell": Ivan Aksakov in Russian Journalism of the Late 1870s – First Half of the 1880s*. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2016.

who in his youth cheerfully welcomed liberal reforms, already in the early 1870s proposed “putting an end to” the matter of social transformations.

Often such evolution is interpreted as a desire for social mimicry, sometimes even as unscrupulousness and apostasy pursuing selfish goals. Even economic arguments make one doubt such an interpretation. If we assume that the ideological evolution of the named historical figures was guided by personal selfish interests, then it would be logical for them to join the camp of the liberal and even left-wing radical press, which was much more successful commercially than conservative publications. Of the conservative publications, only *Dnevnik Pisalystka* can be considered at least relatively commercially successful; the rest, including even the subsidized *Grazhdanin*, barely made ends meet. *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* stayed afloat due to the fact that it was part of a large publishing complex, the main income of which came from *Russkiy Vestnik* and the book publishing activities of the printing house. The commercial demand for liberal phraseology in the second half of the 19th century was more intense: N. A. Nekrasov, A. A. Kraevsky and G. E. Blagosvetlov made large fortunes on their publishing projects, which cannot be said about conservative publishers. It is difficult to assume self-interest in the "indirect dividends" associated with strengthening career prospects and position in society. K. N. Leontiev noted that if in Nicholas's time "liberalism was a personal and living feeling; it was then generosity. In many cases - courage", then by the middle of the century the situation changed radically and "now liberals (in Shchedrin's words) prop up fences" ⁶⁹⁴, so that the reputation of a conservative did not bring public recognition at that time, but on the contrary, put the journalist in the position of a marginal, for suspicious reasons "breaking away" from the main direction of the socio-political movement of society.

It seems that in searching for the cause of the ideological evolution of the figures of Russian conservatism, it is worth abandoning the appeal to the motives of

⁶⁹⁴Leontiev K. N. How and in what way is our liberalism harmful? // Enlightened conservatism: Russian thinkers on the paths of development of Russian civilization / compiled and edited by D. N. Bakun. Moscow: Griffin, 2012. P. 82.

personal gain, characteristic of studies of the Soviet period. It would be more correct to note that its causes partly followed from the natural stages of personal maturation, and partly were conditioned by the socio-political picture of the time. At the beginning of the reformist era, Russian educated society, long constrained by the information terror of Nicholas I's time, was united in its abstract thirst for diverse transformations for the better, most clearly described as a platform of moderate liberalism. This situation is perfectly described by one of the active publicists of that time, N. N. Strakhov: "then the parties were not clearly distinguished and all literature merged into something single... everyone equally stood for education, freedom of speech, the removal of all ties and restrictions, etc. – in a word, for the most common liberal principles, understood in a completely abstract way, so that the most diverse and contradictory aspirations fit under them ⁶⁹⁵." But over time, the practice of current political life and real reforms required public figures and publicists to concretize their political positions. In these conditions, some thinkers naturally evolved in the direction of radical democratic convictions, some in the direction of conservatism, but it is important to recognize that both were primarily guided by sincere convictions and truly completed a difficult path of spiritual quest.

Conservative publications were not obliging apologists for the existing order, glorifying any government order simply because it came from the highest authority. They had their own idea of the meaning of national state tasks and in cases where they believed that the government was deviating from the correct course, they attacked it with caustic criticism. True, it should be noted that these critical speeches had a completely special character, which distinguished the publications of the conservative bloc from the critics of the government from the left-radical press. Publications of a revolutionary democratic persuasion were traditionally distinguished by the weakness of the so-called "positive program", critical pathos prevailed in them, but, while exposing shortcomings, they were far from always able to offer a concrete and easily implemented way to eliminate them. A distinctive

⁶⁹⁵Strakhov N. N. *Memories of F. M. Dostoevsky // Dostoevsky in the Memories of Contemporaries: in 2 volumes. Moscow: Fiction, 1990. Vol. 1. P. 397.*

feature of conservative criticism was the immediate proximity of critical denunciations with concrete recipes for curing the designated social ills. Meshchersky's denunciatory pamphlets always ended with recommendations for specific measures and official appointments ⁶⁹⁶; many of Katkov's editorials could be directly rewritten into government orders ⁶⁹⁷. At the same time, the critical attacks of the conservative press could concern not only the general course of government policy or individual officials, but in some cases extended to members of the imperial family, as, for example, during the Polish Uprising of 1863, when both *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* and *Den'* criticized the nature of the governance of the region carried out by Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolaevich.

Such critical fervor of the conservative press caused understandable complications in interaction with censorship. Multiple bans on retail sales brought Gilyarov-Platonov's newspaper *Sovremennye Izvestia* to ruin, Aksakov's publications were closed (*Parus*) or subjected to multiple suspensions (*Den'*, *Moskva*), Katkov's *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* was suspended after three warnings in 1866 and was on the verge of suspension in 1887, Meshchersky's *Grazhdanin* was also repeatedly suspended and was closed in 1877.

In the preface to the journalistic collection “In the Evidence of Time,” Meshchersky tells the story of how, in his early youth, in the early 1860s, he wrote an article about university unrest, which expressed a completely conservative position and blamed the events at the university not on the students, but on the St. Petersburg press, which “incited the youth to passions ⁶⁹⁸.” Despite the fact that the article was completely well-intentioned, it returned to the author from the censorship department in an unrecognizable form, so Meshchersky refused to publish it. According to him, he kept the manuscript, mangled by five different departments and five types of ink, for posterity and took it out of the drawer every time “when it

⁶⁹⁶ Leonov M. M. *Salon of V. P. Meshchersky: patronage and mediation in Russia at the turn of the 19th–20th centuries*. Samara: Publishing House of the Samara Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2009; Dronov I. E. *The Path of a Conservative // Meshchersky V. P. Citizen Conservative*. Moscow: Ichthyos magazine “New Book of Russia”, 2005.

⁶⁹⁷ Rozanov V. V. *Suvorin and Katkov // New Time*. 1997. No. 7. P. 36–38.

⁶⁹⁸ Meshchersky V.P. *Instead of a preface // In evidence of time*. St. Petersburg, 1879. P. II.

is necessary to confirm with evidence the idea, which is not at all new, that censorship constrains not those who want to carry out evil or liberal exaggerations, but us conservatives, and only us, who stand for order and for the basic principles of the Christian monarchical system, but who stand firm and do not give in to any deals with either an official or a liberal ⁶⁹⁹. ”

Very characteristic is this last mention of conservatives being persecuted for refusing to "make a deal" with the bureaucracy. The conservative press certainly sought to act in the interests of the state, but the state as an abstractly conceivable single whole, a monolithic embodiment of national interests. Meanwhile, the real state mechanism was set in motion by people, or rather, by many people, most of whom were motivated not by the lofty motives of improving the national state greatness, but by petty everyday aspirations for career growth and the struggle for "cushy jobs", greed, vanity, and sometimes even tyranny. Conservatives such as M. N. Katkov spoke "on behalf of the Russian government in its ideal, in its intelligible conception," i.e. they were often forced to fight with the real bureaucracy for the ideal state, with specific officials for the common good of the country. As V. V. Rozanov defines this position, speaking about Katkov, the conservatives irritated officials, since their criticism from the position of strict adherence to national interests exposed their "insufficient purity of service to Russia ⁷⁰⁰."

That is why the censorship, formally managed or informally directed by high-ranking officials, into whose "backroom games" certain provisions propagated by the publicists of the conservative camp did not fit, persecuted the conservative statist with such, at first glance, astonishing zeal. And it is quite natural that in this case the conservatives sought protection from the one in whom they saw the only counterweight to official tyranny, whom, in accordance with the model of national statehood they had developed, they considered the highest arbiter in the event of a clash of interests of social groups – the sovereign. Aksakov, Katkov, and Meshchersky had to save themselves from censorship difficulties by resorting to the

⁶⁹⁹Ibid. P. III – IV.

⁷⁰⁰Rozanov V. V. Suvorin and Katkov // New Time. 1997. No. 7. P. 36–38.

intercession of the tsar, directly or using the mediation of noble associates and patrons.

Another common feature of conservative periodicals was their relatively low popularity, which determined their modest circulation and questionable commercial effectiveness. Perhaps the main reason for this can be considered the fact that, ideologically, conservatives expressed convictions that were fundamentally opposed to the bulk of the Russian reading public. The Russian educated class, as has been repeatedly mentioned, due to its orientation toward the Western civilization model, treated folk tradition with disdain. As Meshchersky wrote, “the Russian people, healthy, intelligent, with their Orthodox and political faith... appeared before the St. Petersburg intelligentsia... as a disgusting monster, whose remaking had to be undertaken immediately ⁷⁰¹.” For conservatives, it was precisely the folk political and religious tradition that was the starting point of all logical constructions. The intuitive, non-reflective bearer of this complex of ideas were the lower classes, the people, but the people were mostly not only uneducated, but also simply illiterate, therefore they did not read the philosophical constructions of conservatives, and even if they had, they would hardly have understood them. In the language of modern market relations, conservative periodicals "did not hit the target audience", addressing those to whom it was pointless to address these ideas, and had no opportunity to address their like-minded people.

In this regard, the concept of Gilyarov-Platonov's publications is a unique example of communicative practice for conservatives, based on an attempt to overcome the barriers separating the mass, uneducated reader from the socio-philosophical dialogue about his future that was conducted among representatives of the educated class. He was the only one who attempted to direct his efforts to strengthening traditional conservative principles among the people, so that the people would not only intuitively believe and involuntarily sympathize with these principles, but also understand them, comprehend them, and creatively develop

⁷⁰¹Meshchersky V.P. In the evidence of time. St. Petersburg, 1879. P. 36.

them. This attempt cost Nikita Petrovich his personal popularity and literary ambitions and led to the fact that after his death his name was forgotten for a long time in the history of Russian journalism and literature. This sacrifice, apparently, turned out to be in vain, because the close attention of the censorship to the publication addressed to the people led to the fact that, while recognizing the admirable nobility and scope of the publisher's intentions, it is necessary to acknowledge the very small success of this plan.

Publishers sought different ways to overcome this most difficult problem for conservative journalism. Dostoevsky decided to provocatively preach ideas that were obviously alien to the public, reasonably counting on the power of his writing talent, the charm of which even a negatively minded audience could not resist. Not afraid to become "not only a writer, but also a scribbler" to attract the attention of the audience, Fyodor Mikhailovich created, in fact, the only commercially successful and highly appreciated by the public publishing project of a conservative persuasion. However, he was prevented from developing and strengthening this success by the constant internal struggle of his writing and journalistic aspirations and plans, and his early death, which interrupted his work at the peak of his popularity.

Aksakov chose a different tactic – focusing on a “small but faithful flock”, he did not compromise with the public’s tastes, afraid of “dropping the idea”, maintained a deep philosophical tone in his publications, and did not care about commercial success as a matter of principle. To some extent, one can say that he worked more for the future than for the present – a modern researcher can find the deepest and clearest expression of many postulates of Russian conservative philosophy in the texts written by Aksakov, but these texts are academic in nature, hardly acceptable to the general reader. Aksakov will never become outdated or lose his significance for posterity, but at the same time, paradoxically, he was not at all interesting to his contemporaries.

The rapid disappointment of conservatives in the political power of the printed word suggested another way to solve the problem of relations with the audience. The

desire to participate in the country's political life through ideological influence on the government, and not on the reader, was attempted to be realized with their communicative practices by Meshchersky and Katkov. Their path could be briefly described by a phrase uttered by one of his contemporaries about the creative biography and worldview of another prominent conservative, K. N. Leontiev - in fact, the ideal model of public activity for Leontiev was the position of N. M. Karamzin under Alexander I, and not the role of a popular journalist: "he always dreamed of writing notes to the emperor." With a certain degree of simplification, of course, but this remark can be extended to all conservative journalism - it was written for the tsar and the government to a greater extent than for its nominal reader.

Katkov achieved the greatest success in this regard. The importance of *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* for the Russian government by the mid-1880s was enormous. The newspaper headed by M. N. Katkov was the most influential conservative press organ for many years, and its publisher was a "minister without portfolio" who took an active practical part in resolving many important state issues. The conservative wing of the Russian press and public thought did not abound in successful figures who managed to gain popularity and influence, and after F. M. Dostoevsky died in 1881, and I. S. Aksakov in 1886, the publisher of *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* remained almost the only conservative publicist who combined literary talent and the role of an independent political figure influencing the course of affairs in the state. Therefore, the problem of finding a new publisher for *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* seemed to be a large-scale issue of national importance.

Katkov's death was not an unexpected event; the gradual deterioration of his health forced his employees, as well as government officials interested in the fate of the newspaper, to ponder in advance the question of who would become his successor. The approach of his death was hastened by the experiences associated with the scandalous story that erupted around *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* in the spring of 1887. The warnings Katkov's publication received for its articles on foreign policy issues were partly the result of the intrigues of his political opponents at court and almost caused a worldwide sensation, putting *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* on the brink

of closure. Only thanks to the intervention of Katkov's high-ranking patrons, among whom was the chief prosecutor of the Holy Synod K. P. Pobedonostsev, was it possible to obtain a personal audience for the editor with Alexander III, which ended with the reconciliation of the sovereign with the obstinate journalist and the complete forgiveness of the *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*. However, already during the discussion of this episode, in March 1887, Pobedonostsev noted in a letter to the sovereign that it was now all the more important to reconcile with Katkov because the government would soon inevitably lose him, and “when he is gone, there will be absolutely no one to replace him in our dissolute press, poor in serious talent,” and “the moment that one cannot help but fear is probably not far off, because Katkov is unlikely to last long ⁷⁰². ”

Apparently, this was also understood in society. One of the future candidates for the editor's post, N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov, wrote in a draft of a report addressed to the Minister of Public Education I. D. Delyanov: "Immediately after Katkov's death, and even earlier, in the last days of his life, I began to receive numerous applications from his admirers and people of the Russian orientation in general, insisting that I (...) take the place of the former famous publicist ⁷⁰³. "

Reflections in government circles about Katkov's future successor also began some time before his death, and when on July 15, an official of the Ministry of Public Education, M. N. Lyubimov, a long-time close friend of Katkov, informed Pobedonostsev that "Katkov is obviously not long for this world ⁷⁰⁴," these reflections took on a very practical character.

Gradually, two circles of candidates for the post of editor of *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* emerged. The wider circle of possible participants in this competitive struggle, or at least people who considered themselves as such, included professor of medicine I. F. Tsion, one of Katkov's confidantes, his godson and regular

⁷⁰² *The Secret Ruler of Russia: K. P. Pobedonostsev and His Correspondents: Letters and Notes, 1866–1895.* Moscow: Russian Book, 2001. Pp. 219–220.

⁷⁰³ Gilyarov-Platonov N. P. *From the Experience: Autobiographical Memories: In 2 Volumes.* St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2009. Vol. 2. P. 245.

⁷⁰⁴ *The Secret Ruler of Russia: K. P. Pobedonostsev and His Correspondents: Letters and Notes, 1866–1895.* Moscow: Russian Book, 2001. P. 247.

correspondent, appointed as an official in the Ministry of Finance under Katkov's patronage; professor of Slavic philology and supporter of Slavophile ideas A. S. Budilovich; one of the former employees of *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*, an official in the Ministry of Public Education, Katkov's assistant in the foreign policy department A. I. Georgievskiy; Russian anti-Normanist historian, publicist for *Russkiy Vestnik* and *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* D. I. Ilovaiskiy; conqueror of Turkestan General Chernyaev, who published the conservative newspaper *Russkiy Mir* in the 1870s. However, the claims of these individuals to inherit Katkov's business were very weak, but the most likely contenders, who had a certain amount of support in the circles of power and sufficient editorial and publishing experience for such a field, were two - the publisher of the Moscow daily newspaper *Sovremennye Izvestia*, Gilyarov-Platonov, and a representative of the previous editorial staff, S. A. Petrovsky, a weighty argument in favor of whom was the fact that during the last six years of Katkov's life he formally headed the editorial board of the newspaper.

The ever-increasing workload of editorial affairs, together with Katkov's ever-increasing involvement in the behind-the-scenes political struggle in government spheres, made it impossible for him to fully perform all of his formal editorial duties, and he handed them over to his assistant Petrovsky, turning at the beginning of January 1882 with a petition to the Main Directorate for Press Affairs with a request to appoint the latter as editor of *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*, while retaining for himself the status of publisher-tenant.⁷⁰⁵

It is also interesting that the publisher of the newspaper-magazine "Grazhdanin" Prince V.P. Meshchersky, although he was not a formal applicant for the right to publish "Moskovskie Vedomosti", was perceived by the public as one of the possible candidates. Meshchersky's participation in the competitive struggle for "Moskovskie Vedomosti" is one of the many rumors that have always surrounded the bright and in many ways controversial figure of this public figure. The growth of Meshchersky's influence at court and personally on Alexander III after 1883,

⁷⁰⁵Case of the Government Communication. RGIA. F. 1162. Op. 1. ODS. 1882. D. 8. L. 3.

when after a ten-year break in friendly relations the prince formally reconciled with the sovereign, forced many readers to assume that the sovereign might come up with the idea of replacing the departed Katkov with his protégé friend from his youth, Meshchersky. At the same time, Meshchersky's journalistic reputation was such that by this time he had become an odious figure not only for the liberal press, but also for many of his comrades in the conservative direction of thought. For example, V. S. Solovyov, who had a negative attitude towards Meshchersky's publication, answered the question of the head of the censorship department E. M. Feoktistov about why he did not read the newspaper "Grazhdanin", by writing: "Being by nature inclined to contempt for humanity, but considering this quality partly sinful, I do not see the need to constantly nourish it; therefore, I prefer to read other publications ⁷⁰⁶." When rumors reached Solovyov about the possibility of transferring "Moskovskie Vedomosti" to Prince Meshchersky after Katkov's death, he responded to this news as follows: "And suddenly - what an unexpected passage! I am far from being an adherent of Katkov and cannot, from my point of view, recognize all his activities as unconditionally useful for Russia. But there is a specific weight to objects. Katkov and Prince Meshchersky! (...) This can drive one to despair. – But leaving Katkov aside, there is no doubt that "Grazhdanin", supported by Tertiĭ Ivanovich <Filippov> and others, can seriously compete with the current, Katkov-style "Moskovskie Vedomosti". The feud between them will of course be not life-or-death, but death, and thus these two only noticeable organs of the conservative press will portray themselves as two wolves who have bitten each other to death, leaving only the tail ⁷⁰⁷."

At the same time, Meshchersky's own publication was undergoing a transformation: from October 1, 1887, *Grazhdanin*, which had announced throughout August that it would cease publication as a weekly magazine, was to be revived in the format of a daily newspaper. Meshchersky, who was passionate about this modernization of his own publication (unlike the previous version, which was

⁷⁰⁶ Letters to E. M. Feoktistov from V. S. Solovyov // RO IRLI RAS. Unit 9068. L. 6–9.

⁷⁰⁷Ibid.

generously subsidized), although he was not a seeker of the post of publisher of *Moskovskie Vedomosti*, took an indirect active part in this matter.

In addition to the circle of candidates, a circle of government officials interested in the decision on the *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* issue and wishing to influence its outcome was also determined. Due to its multifaceted status, the *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* fell within the sphere of administrative influence of several large departments. The newspaper, historically associated with the Moscow Imperial University, belonged to the sphere of governance of the Moscow Educational District and, as a whole, the Ministry of Public Education, headed by Delyanov; since the government announcements published in the *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* were an item of state revenue, and the calculation for them was transferred to the state treasury, the head of the Ministry of Finance (since 1888 - Minister of Finance) I. A. Vyshnegradsky and the Minister of State Property M. N. Ostrovsky, as well as the head of the State Control D. M. Solsky, had influence on the decision on the issue. Since the newspaper was still in the middle of the 19th century, moved from the university to general censorship, it was subordinated to the Main Directorate for Press Affairs, which was headed by Feoktistov, and was subordinated to the Minister of Internal Affairs D. A. Tolstoy; the Governor-General of Moscow V. A. Dolgorukov also sought not to let one of the oldest publications of the ancient capital entrusted to him slip from under his influence, and, of course, a question of such importance could not be decided without the “secret ruler of Russia”, the Chief Prosecutor of the Holy Synod Pobedonostsev.

It is important to note that if in the process of leasing *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* to Katkov in 1863 there was an open “tender”, during which the decision was made based on the economic interests of the owner and regardless of political sympathies⁷⁰⁸, then in 1887, on the contrary, economic interests were little taken into account, the political issue was of fundamental importance, because, as Pobedonostsev noted

⁷⁰⁸Kruglikova O. S. Transfer of the newspaper *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* on lease to M. N. Katkov in 1863 (political context and financial terms of the contract) // Bulletin of St. Petersburg State University. Series 9. 2007. No. 4-2. Pp. 248–255.

in a letter to the emperor: “everything that happens to *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* becomes an event not only all-Russian, but also European”⁷⁰⁹. The government, ready to allocate significant subsidies to support the loyal press, did not expect profit from *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*, it was interested in the political direction of the articles and their literary level, therefore the business acumen and commercial abilities of potential lessees were not given decisive importance.

The financial side of the issue was important only from the point of view that, remembering Katkov’s merits, the government did not want to leave the family of the deceased publicist, for whom his work in publishing the newspaper was the only source of income, in a dire situation.

Katkov's wife, Sofya Petrovna, was not a woman of great talent. Katkov's biographers agree that this marriage was considered extremely strange⁷¹⁰. In Feoktistov's harsh words, "her exemplary stupidity", moreover, "stupidity with pretensions", irritated and surprised many. The petition to leave the newspaper to her, submitted by the widow to the Main Administration for Press Affairs, caused some confusion.

On August 1, 1887, the head of the Chancellery of the Minister of Internal Affairs, A. D. Pazukhin, wrote to Pobedonostsev that handing over the newspaper to her "would have aroused mockery in the camp of Mikhail Nikiforovich's political enemies" and suggested abandoning the idea of "rewarding the widow for her husband's services in such roundabout, crooked ways⁷¹¹." Instead, he considered it a more direct and honest step for the government to appoint a decent pension to the widow, citing as a precedent the fact that the family of the late historiographer N. M. Karamzin was assigned a pension of 50,000 rubles, while Katkov had done no less for Russia than Karamzin. Gilyarov-Platonov's letters cite a rumor that was

⁷⁰⁹ *The Secret Ruler of Russia: K. P. Pobedonostsev and His Correspondents: Letters and Notes, 1866–1895.* Moscow: Russian Book, 2001. P. 219.

⁷¹⁰ Sheglovitov S. G. *Katkov and his time.* SPb.: Type. A. S. Suvorin, 1888; Lyubimov N. A. *Mikhail Nikiforovich Katkov and his historical merit: according to documents and personal memoirs of N. A. Lyubimov.* SPb.: Type. of the Society for Social Benefit, 1889.

⁷¹¹ *The Secret Ruler of Russia: K. P. Pobedonostsev and His Correspondents: Letters and Notes, 1866–1895.* Moscow: Russian Book, 2001. P. 251.

spreading in society at that time that Katkov had left the family a fortune of about three million rubles ⁷¹². Without naming specific figures, the rumor that "Katkov left his children a very large fortune" ⁷¹³ was also conveyed by Minister I. I. Vorontsov-Dashkov, who forwarded to the sovereign a petition from one of the candidates for the post of publisher of "Moskovskie Vedomosti". However, the already mentioned letter from Pazukhin undoubtedly contains more reliable information, which was available to the chancellery of the ministry: "The fortune left by Katkov does not exceed 500 thousand. With a family of 14 people (a widow, 11 children and 2 nephews - orphans), this is barely daily bread ⁷¹⁴. "

However, even if, in gratitude for her husband's services, the editorial board of the newspaper had been left to the widow, she herself, undoubtedly, would not have claimed to determine editorial policy; in fact, the newspaper would have been managed by the same Petrovsky, who initially expressed his willingness to continue working as editor under the widow-publisher.

To try to avoid any cardinal changes in the position and image of the newspaper, hoping that the team created by Katkov had fully assimilated his opinions, his skills and talents - this idea seemed tempting to many, including Feoktistov, whose opinion as the first censor in the state was immediately sought: "publicists like Mikhail Nikiforovich will be born for centuries, it would be completely fruitless to dream of any worthy replacement for him (...) No matter how much I thought about it, this question seemed to me an insoluble riddle, until I settled on the thought that if Katkov left us, then the entire composition of his editorial board remained... people who were trained by him as well as possible ⁷¹⁵. "

⁷¹² Gilyarov-Platonov N. P. From the Experience: Autobiographical Memories: in 2 volumes. Vol. 2. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2009. P. 522.

⁷¹³ Yushko A. G. Behind the Scenes of Journalism (Authorities and Moskovskiy Vedomosti in 1887 after the Death of M. N. Katkov) // Nikita Petrovich Gilyarov-Platonov: Research. Materials. Bibliography. Reviews: for the 125th Anniversary of the Death of N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov / edited by A. P. Dmitriev. St. Petersburg: Rostok, 2013. P. 165.

⁷¹⁴ The Secret Ruler of Russia: K. P. Pobedonostsev and His Correspondents: Letters and Notes, 1866–1895. Moscow: Russian Book, 2001. P. 251.

⁷¹⁵ Feoktistov E. M. Behind the Scenes of Politics and Literature // Behind the Scenes of Politics. Moscow: Sergei Dubov Foundation, 2001. P. 172.

Looking ahead, we note that it was precisely this feature – the “well-trained” nature of Katkov’s editorial staff – that played a negative role in the subsequent fate of the newspaper. Feoktistov himself admitted that there were no “independent figures” among Katkov’s employees; he was an extremely authoritarian editor, did not allow pluralism of opinions in the editorial staff, and, consequently, did not tolerate people who thought independently near him. “Moskovskie Vedomosti” in print in the second half of the 19th century “represented a kind of relic of “personal journalism”⁷¹⁶. ”

However, this lack of ideological independence was an argument not against, but rather in favor of preserving the integrity of the editorial board created by Katkov. Katkov was unique in that his conservatism was the fruit of his freethinking. He fought for the idea of a strong state and a strong government, sometimes even with the government itself. His multiple clashes with censorship have been studied and presented in considerable detail⁷¹⁷; despite all the efforts of various ministries and departments, it was never possible to turn Katkov into a government puppet. In the person of Petrovsky, the censorship department found a convenient editor who could not lay claim to political influence and who agreed to the role of an obedient translator of government ideas. It was probably precisely the fatigue from the bureaucratic turmoil associated with Katkov’s waywardness and the need to settle scandals with Moskovskiye Vedomosti, and not just the desire “not to ruin the nest” of Katkov’s editorial staff, that caused the persistent desire on the part of the then censorship leaders, Tolstoy and Feoktistov, to leave the editorial office to Petrovsky⁷¹⁸.

⁷¹⁶Kotov A. E. Conservative press in the socio-political life of Russia in the 1860s – 1890s: M. N. Katkov and his entourage: diss. ... Doctor of History. St. Petersburg, 2016. P. 71.

⁷¹⁷ Derevyagina E. V. "Moskovskie Vedomosti" of M. N. Katkov (1863-1887) in the Russian literary process: author's abstract. diss. ... Cand. Philological Sciences. Veliky Novgorod, 2004 ; Kantor R. M. Crisis of "Moskovskie Vedomosti" in 1866. St. Petersburg, 1922.

⁷¹⁸ Yushko A. G. Behind the Scenes of Journalism (Authorities and Moskovskiye Vedomosti in 1887 after the Death of M. N. Katkov) // Nikita Petrovich Gilyarov-Platonov: Research. Materials. Bibliography. Reviews: for the 125th Anniversary of the Death of N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov / edited by A. P. Dmitriev. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2013. Pp. 153–182.

However, events took an unexpected turn, because Petrovsky and Katkov's widow soon quarreled and refused to cooperate. The financial issue also took on a different meaning in this regard - according to the terms of the lease agreement concluded by the late Katkov, the printing house was practically his property, and was inherited separately from the rights to lease *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*. Meanwhile, as one of the contenders for the position of publisher, Gilyarov-Platonov, rightly argued, "Katkov's income came not only from *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*, but from the printing house and from *Russkiy Vestnik*, the printing of which cost almost nothing. And now *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* will no longer have a printing house; well, and *Russkiy Vestnik* as well, which means that the future publisher will have to enter into a deal with the widow, to whom the printing house belongs ⁷¹⁹. "

Gilyarova-Platonov, a former publisher with over 20 years of experience, fully understood the financial side of editorial work. His newspaper *Sovremennye Izvestiya*, published daily in Moscow since 1867, enjoyed considerable popularity and, if not for the numerous repressive measures taken by the censors, could have been quite successful economically. However, multiple bans on retail sales and suspensions (including at the height of subscription) brought the newspaper and its once successful publisher to the brink of ruin. The censors' increased attention to *Sovremennye Izvestiya* was due to the fact that the newspaper's audience consisted of the least educated broad strata of the urban population, was a newspaper for the people, and was therefore viewed by the censors with particular severity. In addition, Gilyarova-Platonov was a man of independent thinking and in this respect was close to Katkov, whose conservative views never had the character of ideological servility. The editor of the most successful conservative newspaper for the common people was not afraid to express his opinion, including critical opinions, regarding the actions of government officials. This was especially acute in relation to the leadership of the Orthodox Church, since Gilyarov-Platonov, a graduate of the

⁷¹⁹ Gilyarov-Platonov N. P. From the Experience: Autobiographical Memories: in 2 volumes. Vol. 2. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2009. P. 227.

Theological Academy, took issues of church structure to heart. It was on this basis that his conflict with Pobedonostsev flared up.

Sovremennye Izvestia repeatedly criticized the missionary work of some of the most successful and welcomed by the Chief Prosecutor missionaries for formalism and profanation of true pastoral work, persistently sought to discuss various aspects of the church's work on its pages. Therefore, Pobedonostsev, who in his youth was a good friend of Gilyarov-Platonov, and in his mature years his constant correspondent, eventually became completely angry with the publisher of *Sovremennye Izvestia*. In January 1887, in one of his letters to Feoktistov, he wrote: "There is no way out with Nikita Gilyarov ⁷²⁰," referring to the obstinacy of the editor, who did not reduce the polemical intensity of his introductions, despite the Chief Prosecutor's displeasure expressed many times in personal correspondence. The final change in Pobedonostsev's attitude toward the publisher of *Sovremennye Izvestia* was facilitated by the publication abroad by Gilyarov-Platonov of the book "Something about the Russian Church in chief prosecutor K. P. Pobedonostsev «, which contained sharp criticism of his activities, as well as a critical analysis of the Synodal period of the life of the Russian church as a whole. Therefore, when starting to bother about the "Moskovskie Vedomosti", Gilyarov-Platonov in vain assumed the possibility of assistance from Pobedonostsev, who "not wanting Gilyarov to become Katkov's successor, remained unwavering in his internal decision to oppose this appointment in every possible way ⁷²¹. "

Gilyarov-Platonov counted on the support of the Governor-General of Moscow Dolgorukov and the Minister of Public Education Delyanov, and partly still hoped that Pobedonostsev would remember their former friendship; Feoktistov, Tolstoy and Vyshnegradsky proposed leaving the newspaper to Petrovsky.

⁷²⁰ Letters from K. P. Pobedonostsev to E. M. Feoktistov // *Literary Heritage*. M., 1935. T. 22/24. P. 523.

⁷²¹ Dmitriev A. P. "In the church our main questions are..." (N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov and K. P. Pobedonostsev in their relationships, correspondence and judgments about each other) // *Understanding by faith: correspondence of N. P. Gilyarov-Platonova and K. P. Pobedonostsev (1860–1887)*. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. P. 21.

Having quarreled with Petrovsky, Katkova, through her son Pavel Mikhailovich, entered into negotiations with Gilyarov-Platonov about him taking the place of Petrovsky, whom she did not like, on the editorial board of *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*. This position more than suited Gilyarov-Platonov, since he was more of a publicist than an organizer, and had experienced all the vicissitudes and hardships of managing the financial affairs of the editorial board, so that the position of editor on a salary with a widow-publisher was even more desirable to him than the status of official publisher. However, this was not destined to come true - the right to publish the newspaper was not left to the widow.

Gilyarov-Platonov, under the influence of some people from the previous editorial board of *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* who had fallen out with Petrovsky after Katkov's death, began preparing an article by E. L. Kochetov for publication in *Sovremennye Izvestiya*, which contained detailed, caustic and extremely negative characterizations of the editorial staff of *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*, and first and foremost Petrovsky. The article, which was intended to discredit Petrovsky in the eyes of the decision-making dignitaries, was of an unbridled and sometimes offensive nature, so when Gilyarov-Platonov sent proofs of this article to Delyanov through Solsky, it was perceived as a dirty intrigue and only harmed Gilyarov-Platonov. Using this as an additional argument, Delyanov, Pobedonostsev, and Tolstoy all spoke out against his candidacy.

Thus, all interested parties gradually inclined to the decision to leave the newspaper to Petrovsky. The only serious opponent of such a decision, who tried to influence the sovereign in this vein in correspondence, was Meshchersky. Most likely, the prince was prompted to do this by several reasons.

Firstly, it was at this time that his ideological conflict with the highest Petersburg bureaucracy, which he mercilessly castigated in "The Citizen", began to mature. Many conservatives, who saw autocracy as a historically justified form of power, generated by the direct expression of the will of the people and closely and directly connected with these people, were characterized by the perception of the bureaucracy as a dangerous partition wall between the tsar and the people. This led

to the conservative press (publications by Katkov, Aksakov, and others) actively criticizing the highest officials. In Meshchersky's case, who at this time considered himself free from persecution by censorship thanks to the patronage of the sovereign, this criticism sometimes reached the point of "outright mockery of the bureaucratization of Russian ministries ⁷²²." In the late 1880s, Meshchersky began to consider the omnipotence of the bureaucratic machine and the growing formalism, the "officialness" of the conservative philosophy appropriated by the bureaucracy, as the main danger to the state. Pobedonostsev was in Meshchersky's eyes a living embodiment, a symbol of officialdom and official "bureaucratic" conservatism. The ideological background of the conflict between the prince and the chief prosecutor was precisely that the publisher of "Grazhdanin" feared the death of a living and independent conservative idea under the oppression of the deadening formalism of its official apologists ⁷²³.

In this regard, he feared that after Petrovsky's appointment as head of *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*, Pobedonostsev, Feoktistov, and Tolstoy would acquire complete control over the once ideologically independent conservative publication, which under the late Katkov had claimed to control them. In his correspondence, Meshchersky warned the Tsar against handing over the oldest Moscow newspaper to a person without an independent position or name in journalism, obviously believing that the popularity of the publicist and his reputation would, at least in part, guarantee the preservation of some freethinking in the newspaper.

Secondly, having aroused personal hostility in many representatives of the highest bureaucracy with his political attacks, Meshchersky had good reason to fear that *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*, which was completely under the control of Feoktistov and Pobedonostsev, would become a tool in the journalistic struggle against *Grazhdanin*, which he was reviving in a new format. This is indeed what happened,

⁷²² Leonov M. M. *Salon of V. P. Meshchersky: patronage and mediation in Russia at the turn of the 19th–20th centuries*. Samara: Publishing House of the Samara Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2009. P. 300.

⁷²³ Dronov I. E. *Development of a conservative concept of Russia's development in the works of V. P. Meshchersky (second half of the 19th – early 20th centuries): author's abstract*. diss. ... candidate of historical sciences. Moscow, 2007.

since, having handed over the leadership of the editorial board to Petrovsky, Pobedonostsev told him when and how intensively *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* should attack Meshchersky's newspaper on this or that issue ⁷²⁴.

The final decision on the fate of the newspaper was made at a meeting with the participation of Pobedonostsev, Delyanov, Vyshnegradsky, Ostrovsky, Solsky and Feoktistov, who was obviously invited not only as the head of the censorship department, but also as a potential successor to the post of Minister of Internal Affairs of Count Tolstoy, whose state of health allowed him to assume his imminent retirement ⁷²⁵. The Tsar was absent from Russia at that time, although he was constantly informed in writing about the state of the issue of *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*. The meeting, after some debate, decided to give *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* to Petrovsky. The monarch added a hesitant resolution to this decision, stating that the newspaper should be given to Petrovsky for a short period (3 years) and see how events would develop ⁷²⁶.

The Petersburg bureaucracy, which reluctantly tolerated the obstinate Katkov because, in the words of Pobedonostsev, "as a journalist he rendered valuable services to Russia and the government in difficult times ⁷²⁷," was not prepared to replace him with another talented obstinate person - Gilyarov-Platonov, who was original in his political views and unyielding in his opinions. Under Petrovsky's leadership, *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* quickly lost the political significance it once had, although in the first years of the new editorial board the newspaper even

⁷²⁴ Yushko A. G. *Behind the Scenes of Journalism (Authorities and Moskovskiye Vedomosti in 1887 after the Death of M. N. Katkov)* // Nikita Petrovich Gilyarov-Platonov: Research. Materials. Bibliography. Reviews: for the 125th Anniversary of the Death of N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov / edited by A. P. Dmitriev. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2013. P. 180.

⁷²⁵ Feoktistov E. M. *Behind the Scenes of Politics and Literature* // *Behind the Scenes of Politics*. Moscow: Sergei Dubov Foundation, 2001. P. 248.

⁷²⁶ Yushko A. G. *Behind the Scenes of Journalism (Authorities and Moskovskiye Vedomosti in 1887 after the Death of M. N. Katkov)* // Nikita Petrovich Gilyarov-Platonov: Research. Materials. Bibliography. Reviews: for the 125th Anniversary of the Death of N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov / edited by A. P. Dmitriev. St. Petersburg: Rostok, 2013. P. 178.

⁷²⁷ *The Secret Ruler of Russia: K. P. Pobedonostsev and His Correspondents: Letters and Notes, 1866–1895*. Moscow: Russian Book, 2001. P. 218.

increased its circulation somewhat and attracted new subscribers ⁷²⁸. This was due to the fact that the new editorial board gradually shifted its emphasis from socio-political materials to informational and entertaining ones; the furious editorials of the "thunderer of Strastnoy Boulevard" no longer appeared on the pages of *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*, and soon the leading newspaper became just one of the many Moscow information publications.

It is impossible not to note the fact that the unsuccessful efforts for the newspaper were the direct cause of Gilyarov-Platonov's death. Of course, trips to Petersburg, with daily visits to the apartments of acquaintances and offices of officials on whom the decision to lease *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* could depend, were both physically difficult and morally tormenting for the elderly Gilyarov ⁷²⁹. The failure of humiliating quests led to Nikita Petrovich's heart giving out: he died in Petersburg in a room at the Belle Vue Hotel, not even having time to return home to Moscow with the disappointing news.

At the turn of the century and in the pre-revolutionary years, there were repeated attempts to revive the political and propaganda influence of *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*, for example during the editorship of L. A. Tikhomirov (1909–1913). There was a kind of cult of Katkov's personality, "widespread among the next generation of conservative publicists. All these writers looked at Katkov in the same way as the Decembrists and Prince Andrei Bolkonsky looked at Napoleon in their time ⁷³⁰." And although becoming a "new Katkov" was a sweet dream for Russian conservative publicists of the early 20th century (L. A. Tikhomirov and S. F.

⁷²⁸Kruglikova O. S. "Moskovskie Vedomosti" after the death of M. N. Katkov: competition for the right to publish the newspaper // *Bulletin of St. Petersburg University. Language and Literature*. 2018. Vol. 15. No. 2. Pp. 252–264.

⁷²⁹Dmitriev A. P. N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov and his memories // *From the experiences: autobiographical memories: in 2 volumes*. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2009. Vol. 2. P. 353.

⁷³⁰Kotov A. E. *Conservative press in the socio-political life of Russia in the 1860s – 1890s: M. N. Katkov and his entourage: diss. ... Doctor of History*. St. Petersburg, 2016. P. 77.

Sharapov dreamed of this), it was already obvious to his contemporaries, as Gilyarov-Platonov put it, that “Katkov was Katkov, and will not happen again ⁷³¹.”

The communicative practices of the Russian conservative press of the second half of the 19th century generally contain more examples of failures than examples of success. In essence, among the undoubtedly successful strategies, only two can be named: the strategy of Katkov, who timely and correctly assessed the prospects of his influence on the opinion of the reading public and saw other ways to achieve his goals, and the strategy of Dostoevsky, who, having placed his bet on the all-conquering power of literary talent, decided to preach religiously under the guise of a paradoxical philosopher.

Aksakov's publishing experiences became a colossal acquisition for the history of Russian philosophy, but they did not play a fundamental role in Russian journalism and political reality. Aksakov set himself the goal of influencing public opinion, but he saw his reader as an equal and like-minded person and conducted a highly intellectual conversation with him from the position of common ideological attitudes, neglecting the need to captivate the poorly educated and indifferent and to convince ideological opponents. Aksakov was proud of the fact that, having extensive court acquaintances by birth and family connections, much more significant than Katkov, he, unlike the latter, almost never went to court and did not seek interaction with the official world. Aksakov was entirely occupied with the world of ideas, his goal was to influence the spiritual state of future generations, therefore his tool was philosophical journalism. Katkov, however, cared, as best he could, about the benefits of the present day and the everyday life of the imperial state, so this instrument turned out to be unsuitable for him.

K. Leontyev in the already mentioned letter to Fr. Joseph Fudel wrote about Aksakov that he “believed too much in the good qualities of the Russian people, the Russian tribe, the Russian spirit. – Katkov, apparently, did not believe in them very

⁷³¹ Dmitriev A. P. “In the Church, Our Main Questions...” (N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov and K. P. Pobedonostsev in their relationships, correspondence, and judgments about each other) // *Understanding by Faith: Correspondence of N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov and K. P. Pobedonostsev (1860–1887)*. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. P. 26.

much. (...) Katkov believed in the strength and future of the Russian State; and he did not particularly consider the means for strengthening it...". Leontyev compares Katkov with an energetic military leader who "in view of the advancing enemy, does not find it possible to "convince" the timid, rebellious soldiers with high-flown speeches; no time! He himself smashes the head of one with his hand, hits another in the face; scolds a third; affectionately encourages the rest and briefly appeals to their patriotism. – I.S. During the fire, Aksakov gives a noble lecture on the future benefits of mutual insurance in love. - God be with him at such a moment ⁷³². "

The failure of Gilyarov-Platonov's publishing experiments is due to the fact that, having set himself the goal of educating a poorly educated reader, he overlooked the subtleties of interactions with the administrative machine, neglecting the requirements of caution in working with censorship. Probably, a simple lack of personal entrepreneurial abilities also played a role - it was strange to assume that a philosopher, theologian and unmercenary would easily retrain as a shrewd publisher of a tabloid sheet.

It is more difficult to give a clear assessment of Prince Meshchersky's communicative practices. Firstly, because he himself hardly ever formulated a clear and distinct goal of publishing. Unlike Katkov, he could influence the course of state affairs even without having a newspaper at his disposal - only due to his position in society, family ties and prospects for an official career. Rather, he was guided by an intuitive desire for literary fame, a high-profile public arena; the bureaucratic backstage was not enough for him. He obviously sought to analyze and partially master the experience of more successful comrades in the direction - he partly built a system similar to Katkov's, sometimes he tried with interest to master the format of Dostoevsky's journalism, but he could not compare with them either in state intelligence or in literary talent.

⁷³²Fetisenko O. L. "Heptastylists": Konstantin Leontiev, his interlocutors and students (Ideas of Russian conservatism in literary, artistic and journalistic practices of the second half of the 19th – first quarter of the 20th century). St. Petersburg: Pushkin House, 2012. P. 304.

Russian conservative journalism entered the 20th century drained of blood; figures of the caliber of Katkov, Dostoevsky, Aksakov, and Gilyarov-Platonov left the historical stage. In the 1890s and at the turn of the century, Meshchersky's *Grazhdanin* remained the only influential organ of the conservative press, but the scandalous reputation of the publisher, whose journalism was also distinguished by the extreme harshness of its views and expressions with not very extensive argumentation, made this printed organ not so much a ruler of opinions as a convenient target for witty criticism from ideological opponents. The storm of 1917 was approaching inexorably, and the time of statist journalists who, while defending conservative values, knew how to position their publications in such a way that they, like Katkov's *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*, "meant the appearance of a fairly significant political force next to and separately from the government... " ⁷³³ was a thing of the past.

⁷³³ Soloviev Yu.B. *Autocracy and nobility at the end of the 19th century*. Leningrad: Science. Leningrad branch, 1973., p. 23.

Conclusion

In analyzing the key concepts of Russian conservative journalism of the second half of the 19th century, it is necessary to start from an understanding of some essential features of conservative philosophy. First of all, it is necessary to take into account anti-rationalism, epistemological and anthropological pessimism, characteristic of the conservative worldview, and logically leading conservatives to defend those forms of social existence that are enshrined in the historical tradition of a certain people. Since tradition requires rational reflection only in those periods when it is threatened with destruction and is forced to confront modernization challenges, any conservative doctrine manifests itself most vividly through polemical opposition to those concepts on which the modernization theory that threatens it is based, and in this sense any conservatism is reactionary.

Russian conservatism of the second half of the 19th century saw the symbolic triad of the Great French Revolution as the conceptual core of the modernization theory it was challenging, since it was the revolutionary events of the late 18th century that gave impetus to the development of the most diverse theories of social reorganization and showed the world the most striking example of the upheavals that could result from an attempt to radically reorganize society based on the theoretical principles of rationalist philosophy. Therefore, conservative publicists saw their task as providing the most relevant, and at the same time in line with national tradition, understanding of the concepts *of freedom, equality and fraternity*. *Having put forward their triple slogan “ Orthodoxy, autocracy, nationality ”* as an antithesis, conservatives symmetrically compared each of the three listed concepts, revealing their content with the help of a number of auxiliary concepts that formed certain semantic series.

This opposition gave a specific character to the Russian public discourse of the second half of the 19th century – opponents, using the same words, not only filled them with different meanings, but tried to make sure that the concepts they

used implicitly conveyed a refutation of alternative interpretations. This allows us to speak about the dubious potential of forming a public consensus regarding the basic concepts of social existence, compiling the desired “ideological dictionary of the era” by philologists ⁷³⁴, and in a broader sense raises the question of the extent to which it is possible to speak about the existence of a socio-political language common to all participants in the public discourse of this period.

In the second half of the 19th century, which supporters of the rationalist approach called the century of the triumph of progress, and religious thinkers - the century of spiritual corruption and unbelief, conservatives attempted to rehabilitate the sacred in the political sphere. They proposed a view of freedom, equality and brotherhood through the prism of a religious worldview.

Understanding freedom as freedom of the spirit, enlightened by the light of faith, conservatives saw the only possible realization of freedom in self-restraint and selfless service. The supra-class character of autocracy became in their model the only truly realizable form of political equality, the basis of which was the understanding of citizenship as strict attention to the fulfillment of one's duties, more important than concern for the implementation of rights. Brotherhood, the existence of which outside of the religious idea conservatives considered a logical absurdity, was understood by them both in the aspect of paternalistic relationships between the state and citizens, when civil brotherhood was a reflection of the general "political sonship " of subjects in relation to the sovereign, and was also understood in the aspect of the brotherhood of various peoples within a multi-ethnic empire.

Contrary to popular belief, Russian conservatism did not arise and develop as a set of ideas based on unconditional loyalty to the existing government or aimed at maintaining the status quo, whatever it may be. On the contrary, Russian conservatism was born outside the system of state administration as a form of opposition ideology.

⁷³⁴Vinogradov V.V. History of words / Russian Academy of Sciences. Department of Literature and Language: Scientific Council “Russian Language”. Institute of Russian Language named after. V.V. Vinogradov RAS / Responsible ed. Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences N. Yu. Shvedova. M., 1999.

Understanding the essence of this ideology and the nature of its influence on the socio-political reality of the era is impossible without analyzing the forms of its reflection in the press, since journalism in post-reform Russia had a completely unique position. In the early 1840s, V. G. Belinsky optimistically proclaimed that "nowhere in the world does a magazine have such an important meaning as it does here," ⁷³⁵and 30 years later, Prince V. P. Meshchersky noted with some sadness what this had led to: "feuilletons educate our society, especially St. Petersburg, not only in political life, but even in civil, social and family life," ⁷³⁶and acknowledged that over these years in Russia "a feuilletonized society has been created and spiritually formed ⁷³⁷." The head of the censorship department of the Russian Empire in the 1880s and 1890s. E. M. Feoktistov conveys in his memoirs the words spoken to him by the Chief Prosecutor of the Holy Synod K. P. Pobedonostsev: "a great disaster for our society, which was not distinguished by its high level of development, alien in the vast majority of its members to any intellectual interests, was that, as soon as the dawn of a new life broke over Russia, it found itself with a newspaper in its hands instead of a book ⁷³⁸."

This exceptional position of journalism during the formation of the conceptual system of Russian socio-political discourse determines the importance of analyzing the journalistic activities of supporters of various socio-philosophical systems for understanding historical processes. The ability to consolidate in the public consciousness the dominant meaning of those interpretations of key concepts that are broadcast by a certain movement or public figure entirely depended on the success of the communicative practices they implemented. Therefore, the assertion often heard by researchers that conservatives "... never managed to present the authorities, society, and even their own like-minded people with a clear concept for

⁷³⁵ Belinsky V. G. Complete Works: In 13 volumes. Moscow: Publishing House of the USSR Academy of Sciences, 1953–1959. Vol. XI, p. 566.

⁷³⁶Meshchersky V. P. God and the feuilletonists // Speeches of a conservative. St. Petersburg, 1876. P. 162-163

⁷³⁷Ibid., p. 168.

⁷³⁸Behind the Scenes of Politics / E. M. Feoktistov. V. D. Novitsky. F. Lear. M. E. Kleinmichel. – M.: Sergei Dubov Foundation, 2001, p. 145

the reorganization of Russia,” and “conservatism did not develop into a single ideology, did not develop a clear program, and did not generate a significant political force”⁷³⁹ is difficult to recognize as entirely fair. It would be more correct to say that conservatives were unable to impose their original and quite productive political and philosophical model on the consciousness of educated society, although they often managed to achieve its implementation in political practice. There are several reasons for this.

Of course, “conservatism was strong and confident only when it operated with ideas created in the religious Orthodox paradigm⁷⁴⁰,” and the bearer of Christian ideas and the foundation of the Orthodox Church in Russia in the 19th century was that social stratum that was not a direct participant in public discourse, since it was either completely illiterate or did not have the financial means to become a regular reader of quality socio-political press. It should not be overlooked that right up until the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, quality press remained an elite commodity in market categories, addressed to a materially sufficient public.

In a more general sense, the most serious reason for the ineffectiveness of conservative communication practices can be formulated as an ideological dissonance with the expectations of the audience they were addressing, given the technical impossibility of addressing an audience that consisted of their like-minded people. For a similar reason, there was no deeper understanding of the conceptual basis of the political attitudes of conservatism on the part of its later researchers – Soviet scientists were mostly brought up outside the religious paradigm and considered it fundamentally outdated.

An appeal to religious dogma in political discourse is often regarded as speculative – as an attempt to compensate for the lack of rational argumentation with mystical justifications and dogmatic statements. However, it is necessary to take into

⁷³⁹Repnikov, A. V. Conservative concepts of the reorganization of Russia in the context of the historical process of the late 19th - early 20th centuries: specialty 07.00.02 "Domestic history": abstract of a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Historical Sciences, p. 17.

⁷⁴⁰Gerasimov, G. I. Idealistic approach to history: theory, methodology, concepts. 2nd edition, supplemented. Ekaterinburg: Publishing solutions, 2022. P. 281.

account the fact that the opponents of conservatives, in essence, were based on the same a priori and dogmatic foundations, uncritically accepting the thesis about the feelings of goodness and justice immanent to natural man. In essence, in any polemical discussion we are dealing with a conflict of ideal models – the conceptual constructions of both sides strive to express themselves in the fullest possible categoricalness, while in the course of the practical implementation of the provisions of any of these systems they will inevitably undergo adjustments by political practice. When we talk about the opposition of concepts understood differently by opponents, we must not lose sight of the fact that any of these concepts initially contains an internal conflict, expressing the tension “between the present being generalized in the concept and the project of the future, which it tries to formulate and impose as a logical inevitability ⁷⁴¹. ”

In this regard, labeling the Orthodox-based system of Russian conservatives as idealistic and unrealistic in contrast to the supposedly rational and functional system of their opponents seems questionable. After all, as historical practice shows, building a state based on an ideal model of democracy has proven to be no more realistic than building a state based on the principles of Christian love. And even on the contrary, those models of state building that declared commitment to a religious worldview with its inherent acceptance of the imperfection of the earthly world as inevitable turned out to be more flexible and viable than attempts at uncompromising implementation of ideal rationally substantiated models of social structure, which quickly turned into totalitarian dictatorship. In this regard, the conservatives' confidence in the need to adhere to forms of social existence that have proven their viability in practice looks quite sensible, and warnings about attempts to implement the liberal-democratic ideal in life seem prophetic.

Understanding how attractive the ideas of liberalism could be, taken in their ideal formulas, conservatives pointed out the need to clearly understand national

⁷⁴¹Koposov N. E. Basic historical concepts and terms of the basic level: towards the semantics of social categories // *Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology*. 1998. Vol. 1. No. 4, p. 32.

specifics and relate to them in plans for the practical implementation of the ideals of liberalism. The clash with Russian reality convinced even many bearers of liberal views that these ideas, with all their charm, were inapplicable in Russia, the consequence of which was the declarative repetition of liberal maxims by the educated public without faith in the possibility of their implementation, and , consequently, without a practical goal, which allowed Dostoevsky in the novel "Demons" to declare with bitter irony that "the highest liberalism" and "the highest liberal", that is, a liberal without any goal, are possible only in Russia ⁷⁴².

While not being fundamentally opposed to reforms, conservatives generally welcomed the ideas of introducing local self-government mechanisms, increasing freedom of economic activity, developing entrepreneurship, and improving legal proceedings. However, defending the priority of state interests, i.e. the interests of the people, sometimes forced them to treat with irony public figures who loudly advocated liberal freedoms without seriously analyzing the consequences of their practical application in Russian political reality. "If we are talking about the state of which we are citizens, about the people of which we are children, about the cause we serve (...) then the question is not at all whether we are liberals or conservatives (...) We are Russian people, our fatherland is Russia; give us what is required for the benefit of our country, what can serve for the good of our people. If you are honest people and do not want to be made fools of, do not think about conservative measures or liberal institutions, but only worry about what, in your sincere and mature conviction, corresponds to the real needs of the country at the given time," ⁷⁴³this is how Katkov's formula of state pragmatism, which underlies the views of conservatives, looked.

The statist character of Russian conservatism determines its ideological flexibility and apparent vagueness in content, its internal contradictions as a system of socio-political views. In fact, Russian conservatism, which declares as its main

⁷⁴²Dostoevsky F. M. Collected works in 15 volumes, T7, p. 33.

⁷⁴³Katkov M.N. Collected works: in 6 volumes. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. Vol. 3. P. 384-385.

value the unconditional priority of preserving and strengthening the power of a national sovereign state, at each historical stage offers a system of actions aimed at solving the problems that this state faces today. The diversity of these problems also determines the diversity of the details of the political programs of Russian conservatives, although in its deepest foundation Russian conservatism follows the ideological constants, fixed in its triple slogan, without any internal contradictions.

Sources and literature

STATISTICAL MATERIALS

Statistical tables of the Russian Empire. Part 2: Actual population of the empire for 1858 (From the map of the population of European Russia). St. Petersburg, 1863.

LEGISLATIVE AND OFFICE WORKING ACTS

1. Instruction of Empress Catherine II given to the commission on drafting a new code. St. Petersburg, 1907.
2. Complete collection of laws of the Russian Empire. Collection 2. St. Petersburg, 1867. Vol. 40.
3. Federal Law of 05.05.2014 No. 128-FZ "On Amendments to Certain Legislative Acts of the Russian Federation".
4. Decree of the President of the Russian Federation of 09.11.2022 No. 809 "On approval of the Fundamentals of state policy for the preservation and strengthening of traditional Russian spiritual and moral values."

JOURNALISM

5. Aksakov I. S. Our banner is the Russian nationality. Moscow: Institute of Russian Civilization, 2008.
6. Aksakov I. S. Complete Works: in 7 volumes. Moscow; St. Petersburg, 1886–1887.
7. Aksakov K. S. State and People. Moscow: Institute of Russian Civilization, 2009.
8. Belinsky V. G. Complete Works: In 13 volumes. Moscow: Publishing House of the USSR Academy of Sciences, 1953–1959. Volume XI
9. Berdyaev H. A. About Russia and Russian philosophical culture. Moscow, 1990.

10. Berdyaev N. A. Alexey Stepanovich Khomyakov. Access mode: <http://www.vehi.net/berdyaev/khomyakov/index.html>. (date of access: 09/23/2024).
11. Herzen A.I. Collected works: in 30 volumes / ed. V. P. Volgina. M.: Publishing House of the USSR Academy of Sciences, 1956. T. 17.
12. Gilyarov-Platonov N. P. "Life is a feat, not a pleasure..." / compiled and commented by Yu. V. Klimakova; ed. O. Platonov. Moscow: Institute of Russian Civilization, 2008.
13. Gilyarov-Platonov N. P. From the Experienced: Autobiographical Memories: in 2 volumes / prepared by A. P. Dmitriev. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2009.
14. Gilyarov-Platonov N. P. Collected Works in 2 volumes. Moscow: K. P. Pobedonostsev Publishing House, 1899. Vol. 1. P. 192.
15. Gilyarovskiy V. A. Works: in 4 volumes. Moscow: Pravda, 1989. Vol. 3: Moscow newspaper. Friends and meetings. Pp.
16. Glinsky B. Vladimir Petrovich Meshchersky. Access mode: http://az.lib.ru/m/mesherskij_w_p/text_1914_nekrolog.shtml. (date of access: 24.06.2024).
17. Grech N. I. Notes on my life / text from the manuscript and with comments by Ivanov-Razumnik and D. M. Pines. M.; L.: ACADEMIA, 1930.
18. Derzhavin G.R. Selected passages from Russian works and translations in prose. With the addition of News about the lives and works of writers whose works are included in this collection. St. Petersburg: in the printing house of F. Drechsler, 1812.
19. Dostoevsky F. M. Writer's Diary / compiled and commented by A. V. Belov; editor-in-chief O. A. Platonov. Moscow: Institute of Russian Civilization, 2010.
20. Ivanov-Razumnik. What is the intelligentsia? // Intelligentsia. Power. People. Moscow, 1993. P. 73-81.
21. Karamzin N. M. Note on ancient and new Russia in its political and civil relations. Moscow: Nauka, 1991.

22. Katkov M. N. *Collected Works: in 6 volumes*. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011.
23. Leontiev K. N. *East, Russia and Slavdom: Philosophy, Politics and Journalism: Spiritual Prose (1872–1891)*. Moscow: Republic, 1996.
24. Maistre J. M. de, *Petersburg letters: [1803–1817] / compiled, translated and foreword by D. V. Solovyov*. St. Petersburg: INApress, 1995.
25. Meshchersky V.P. *In the evidence of time*. St. Petersburg, 1880.
26. Meshchersky V.P. *Diary // Citizen*. 1891. No. 53.
27. Meshchersky V. P. *Something like a confession // Speeches of a conservative*. St. Petersburg, 1876. Meshchersky V. P. *Speeches of a conservative*. St. Petersburg, 1876.
28. Milyukov P.N. *Intelligentsia and Historical Tradition // Anthology*. St. Petersburg: Publishing House of the Russian Christian Humanitarian Institute, 1998.
29. Samarin Yu. F. *Orthodoxy and Nationality / compiled by E. V. Zakharov*. Moscow, 2008.
30. *Works of I. S. Aksakov. Slavophilism and Westernism (1860–1886)*. Articles from “Day,” “Moskva,” “Moskvich,” and “Rus.” Vol. 2. 2nd ed. St. Petersburg. A. S. Suvorin Printing House, 1891.
31. Struve P.B. *Intelligentsia and Revolution // Vekhi*. 1909. Pp. 127–145.
32. Tyutchev F. I. *Russia and the West / compiled by B. N. Tarasov*. Moscow: Cultural Revolution; Republic, 2007.
33. Frank S. L. *Russian Worldview*. St. Petersburg, 1996.
34. Frank S. L. *Works*. M.: Pravda, 1990.
35. Khomyakov A. S. *Collected works: in 8 volumes*. M., 1900. T. 3.

MEMOIRS AND DIARIES

36. Witte S. Yu. *Memories: in 3 volumes. Volume 1 (1849–1894) Childhood. The Reigns of Alexander II and Alexander III*. Moscow; Tallinn: Skif Alex, 1994.

37. Diary of P. A. Valuev, Minister of Internal Affairs / edited by P. A. Zayonchkovsky. Moscow: Publishing house of the USSR Academy of Sciences, 1961. Vol. 2. P. 180.
38. Doroshevich V. M. Memories. Moscow: New Literary Review, 2008.
39. Dostoevskaya A. G. Memories. Moscow: Zakharov, 2002.
40. Dostoevsky in the memoirs of his contemporaries: in 2 volumes. Moscow: Fiction, 1990.
41. Meshchersky V. P. Diaries. St. Petersburg: M. Rumsha Printing House, 1883.
42. Meshchersky V. P. My Memories. Moscow: Zakharov, 2003.
43. Milyutin D. A. Memories of Field Marshal Count Dmitry Alekseevich Milyutin, 1863–1864 / edited by L. G. Zakharova. Moscow: Rosspen, 2003.
44. Unpublished Dostoevsky: Notebooks and Notebooks 1860–1881 / Literary Heritage. Moscow: Nauka, 1971. Vol. 83.
45. Nikitenko A. V. Diary: in 3 volumes. M.: Zakharov, 2005.
46. Pavlov N. M. Katkov's Controversy with Herzen. An Episode from the Sixties // Russian Review. 1895. No. 5. P. 309-315.
47. Polovtsov A. A. Diary of State Secretary A. A. Polovtsov: in 2 volumes / ed., biographical essay and commentary by prof. P. A. Zayonchkovsky. Moscow: Nauka, 1966.
48. Skowronskaya M. S. For a quarter of a century // Observer. 1897. No. 1. P. 201–227; No. 2. P. 221–239.
49. Feoktistov E. M. Behind the Scenes of Politics and Literature // Behind the Scenes of Politics. Moscow: Sergei Dubov Foundation, 2001.
50. Shakhovskoy N. V. Materials for the biography of N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov // Russian Review. Moscow: University Printing House, 1896. Book 6 (vol. 42). November. Pp. 454–470; December. P. 995.

EPISTOLARY SOURCES

51. Meshchersky V. P. Correspondence. Moscow: New Literary Review, 2018.

52. Meshchersky V. P. Letters to the Grand Duke Alexander Alexandrovich. Moscow: New Literary Review, 2011.
53. Letters to K. P. Pobedonostsev to E. M. Feoktistov // Literary heritage. T. 22–24.
54. Pobedonostsev and his correspondents. Letters and notes / compiled by M. N. Pokrovsky. Moscow, 1923. Vol. 1. P. 359.
55. Pobedonostsev K. P. The Secret Ruler of Russia: K. P. Pobedonostsev and His Correspondents: Letters and Notes, 1866–1895. Moscow: Russian Book, 2001.
56. Understanding by Faith: Correspondence between N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov and K. P. Pobedonostsev (1860–1887). St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011.
57. Correspondence of two Slavophiles // Correspondence of I. S. Aksakov and Yu. F. Samarin (1848–1876) / prepared by T. F. Pirozhkova, O. L. Fetisenko and V. Yu. St. Petersburg: Pushkin House, 2016.
58. F. M. Dostoevsky, V. P. Meshchersky: Correspondence (1872–1880) // Unknown Dostoevsky. 2017. Vol. 4. No. 1. P. 35–58.
59. Meshchersky V. P. Letters to the Grand Duke Alexander Alexandrovich. Moscow: New Literary Review, 2011.
60. Zinkova V. S., Solopova A. I. Correspondence between F. M. Dostoevsky and V. F. Putsykovich (1873–1880) // Unknown Dostoevsky. 2016. Vol. 3. No. 4. P. 18–24.
61. “The Citizen is published by a sick and restless person...” from letters to M. P. Pogodin, 1873–1874 // Unknown Dostoevsky. 2017. Vol. 4. No. 3.

NEWSPAPERS AND MAGAZINES

62. Voice. 1863.
63. Day. 1863.
64. The Good Man. 1882.
65. Moscow News. 1863.

- 66. Moscow . 1867.
- 67. Muscovite. 1867.
- 68. Observer. 1897, No. 1.
- 69. New Time. 1997, No. 7.
- 70. Government Bulletin. 1872, No. 47.
- 71. Rainbow 1883.
- 72. Russian conversation. 1856-1859.
- 73. "Russian Word". 1914, No. 158
- 74. "Modern News". 1868.

ARCHIVAL MATERIALS

- 75. Report of the Moscow Chief of Police to General Potapov dated May 1, 1863
// GARF. F. 109 (Third Section of SEIVK). Op. 38. D. 23. Part 84. L. 81–83.
- 76. Excerpts from letters of some individuals // GARF. F. 109 (Third Section of SEIVK). Op. 1. File 1969. L. 5.
- 77. The case of the election of State Councilor Katkov as an honorary member of the University // CIAM. F. 418 (Moscow Imperial University). Op. 32. D. 154.
- 78. Letter from M. N. Katkov to Alexander II // RGIA. F. 1101 (Documents of personal origin that do not form separate funds). Op. 1. D. 705.
- 79. Correspondence between the Minister of Internal Affairs P. A. Valuev and the Moscow Governor-General Dolgorukov regarding the approval of Tikhonravov as rector of Moscow University // GARF. F. 109 (Third Section of SEIVK) . Op. 1. D. 1238. L. 2.
- 80. Letters from D. A. Tolstoy to E. M. Feoktistov // OR IRLI RAS. Unit 9108.
- 81. Correspondence of N. A. Lyubimov with M. N. Katkov // GARF. F. 1718 (Katkov). Op. 1. D. 6.
- 82. Case of government communication // RGIA. F. 1162 (Chancery of the State Council). Op. 1. ODS 1882. D. 8.

83. Petition for permission for the newspaper *Sovremennye Izvestia* // CIAM. F. 31 (Moscow Censorship Committee). Op. 3. D. 17.
84. Censors' reports on the newspaper "Sovremennye Izvestia" // CIAM. F. 31 (Moscow Censorship Committee). Op. 3. D. 32.
85. Reports to the Moscow Censorship Committee by censor Vorontsov-Velyaminov // CIAM. F. 31 (Moscow Censorship Committee). Op. 3. D. 50.
86. Letters to E. M. Feoktistov from Vl. S. Solovyov // RO IRLI RAS. Unit 9068.

DICTIONARIES AND REFERENCE PUBLICATIONS

87. Aksakov, Ivan Sergeevich. Materials for the Chronicle of His Life and Work: Vol. 6: in 2 parts. 1880–1886: Editor-publisher of the newspaper "Rus". Part 1: 1880–1884 / compiled by S. V. Motin. Ufa: ULI MVD of Russia, 2015.
88. Figures of Russian history. Biographical reference book / compiled by A. P. Shikman. Moscow: Nauka, 1997.
89. Illustrated dictionary of forgotten and difficult words from works of Russian literature of the 18th–19th centuries / compiled by L. A. Glinkina. Orenburg, 1998.
90. Russian Writers. 1800–1917: Biographical Dictionary / compiled by P. A. Nikolaev. Moscow: Kniga, 1982. Vol. 2.
91. Russian conservatism of the mid-18th – early 20th centuries: Encyclopedia / Institute of Social Thought. Moscow: Political Encyclopedia, 2010; Historical metamorphoses of conservatism / ed. P. Yu. Rakhshmir. Perm, 1998.
92. Dictionary of pseudonyms of Russian writers, scientists and public figures / compiled by Masanov I.F.: In 4 volumes. Moscow, 1958. Vol. 3.
93. Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Great Russian Language by V. Dahl: in 4 volumes. 2nd ed. St. Petersburg, 1882. Vol. 3.

BOOKS AND MONOGRAPHS

94. *Airapetov ABOUT. R.* The Kingdom of Poland in the Politics of the Empire in 1863–1864. Moscow: Modest Kolerov, 2013.
95. Badalyan D. A. "The Calling Bell": Ivan Aksakov in Russian Journalism of the Late 1870s – First Half of the 1880s. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2016.
96. Badalyan D. A. I. S. Aksakov's newspaper "Rus" and censorship // Russian literature. 2006. No. 1. P. 94–115.
97. Bakhtin M. M. Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics. 2nd ed., revised and enlarged. Moscow: Sov. pisatel, 1963.
98. Vinogradov V.V. History of words / Russian Academy of Sciences. Department of Literature and Language: Scientific Council "Russian Language". Institute of Russian Language named after. V.V. Vinogradov RAS / Responsible ed. Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences N. Yu. Shvedova. M., 1999.
99. Volgin I. L. Dostoevsky – journalist: ("A writer's diary" and the Russian public). Moscow: Moscow State University Publishing House, 1982.
100. Gerasimov G. I. Idealistic approach to history: theory, methodology, concepts. 2nd edition, supplemented. Ekaterinburg: Publishing solutions, 2022.
101. Gerasimov G. I. Ideological foundations of the history of Russia (mid-19th – early 20th centuries). Tula: Third Way, 2019.
102. Gromova N. A. Dostoevsky. Documents, diaries, letters, memoirs, reviews of literary critics and philosophers. Moscow: Agraf, 2000.
103. Grosul V. Ya., Itenberg B. S., Tvardovskaya V. A., Shatsillo K. F., Eymontova R. G. Russian conservatism of the 19th century. Ideology and practice. M., 2000.
104. Dzhanshiev G. A. The Era of Great Reforms. Chapter 6. Law on the Press of April 6, 1865. St. Petersburg, 1905.

105. Dronov I. E. *The Path of a Conservative // Meshchersky V. P. Citizen Conservative*. Moscow: New Book of Russia, 2005.
106. Dyakin V. S. *The national question in the domestic policy of tsarism (19th – beginning of the 20th century)*. St. Petersburg: LISS, 1998.
107. Egorov B.F. *The Struggle of Aesthetic Ideas in Russia in the 1860s*. L., 1991.
108. Esin B. I. *Russian newspaper and newspaper business in Russia: tasks and theoretical and methodological foundations of study*. Moscow, 1981.
109. Zakharov V. N. *The System of Dostoevsky's Genres: Typology and Poetics*. L.: Leningrad State University named after A.S. Pushkin, 1985.
110. Zenkovsky V. V. *History of Russian Philosophy*. Moscow: Academic Project, Raritet, 2001.
111. Zorin A. A. *Feeding the Double-Headed Eagle...: Russian Literature and State Ideology in the Last Third of the 18th – First Third of the 19th Century*. Moscow: New Literary Review, 2004.
112. *Historical concepts and political ideas in Russia in the 16th–20th centuries: Collection of scientific works*. St. Petersburg: Aleteya, 2006.
113. Kantor R. M. *Crisis of the Moskovskiye Vedomosti in 1866*. St. Petersburg, 1922.
114. Kaplin A. D. *Slavophiles, their associates and followers / ed. O. A. Platonov*. Moscow: Institute of Russian Civilization, 2011.
115. Kartsov A. S. *Russian conservatism of the second half of the XIX – beginning of the XX century*. Prince V. P. Meshchersky. St. Petersburg: Publishing house of St. Petersburg State University, 2004.
116. Kitaev V. A. *From the history of the ideological struggle in Russia during the first revolutionary situation (I. S. Aksakov in the social movement of the early 60s of the XIX century)*. Gorky, 1974.
117. Kitaev V. A. *From the Fronde to Conservatism. From the History of Russian Liberal Thought in the 1850s and 1860s*. Moscow: Mysl, 1972.
118. Kitaev V. A. *From the Fronde to Conservatism. From the History of Russian Liberal Thought in the 1850s–1860s*. Moscow: Mysl, 1972.

119. Conservatism in political and spiritual dimensions: materials of the international scientific conference (Perm, May 12–13, 1994). Perm, 1995.
120. Kotov A.E. "The Tsar's Path" by Mikhail Katkov: The Ideology of Bureaucratic Nationalism in Political Journalism of the 1860s–1890s. St. Petersburg: Vladimir Dal, 2016.
121. Lebedev S. V. Guardians of the True Russian Principles. Ideals, Ideas, and Policy of Russian Conservatives of the Second Half of the 19th Century. St. Petersburg: Nestor, 2004.
122. Leonov M. M. Salon of V. P. Meshchersky: Patronage and Mediation in Russia at the Turn of the 19th and 20th Centuries. Samara: Publishing House of the Samara Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2009.
123. Lyubimov N. A. M. N. Katkov and his historical merit. Based on documents and personal memories. SPb.: Public benefit, 1889.
124. Minakov A. Yu. Russian conservatism in the first quarter of the 19th century. Voronezh: Voronezh University Publishing House, 2011.
125. Minakov A. Yu. Against the Current: Historical Portraits of Russian Conservatives of the First Third of the 19th Century / ed. A. Yu. Minakov. Voronezh, 2005.
126. Minakov A. Yu. Russian conservatism in the first quarter of the 19th century. Voronezh: Publishing house of the Voronezh State University, 2011.
127. Motin S. V. Russian Slavophile in Law Enforcement Service. I. S. Aksakov – employee of the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Russian Empire. Ufa: Ufa Law Institute of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia, 2017.
128. Nevedensky S. Katkov and his time. St. Petersburg, 1889.
129. Nechaeva V. S. Journal of M. M. and F. M. Dostoevsky "Time". 1861-1863. Moscow: Nauka, 1972.
130. Nechaeva V. S. Journal of M. M. and F. M. Dostoevsky "Epoch". 1864-1865. Moscow: Nauka, 1975;

131. Pipes R. *Russian Conservatism and Its Critics: A Study of Political Culture*. Moscow: New Publishing House, 2008.
132. Perevalova E. V. *Around M. N. Katkov: authors and staff of the Russian Herald and Moskovskiye Vedomosti*. Moscow: Moscow Polytechnic University, 2019.
133. Pirozhkova T. F. *Revolutionary Democrats on Slavophilism and Slavophile Journalism*. Moscow: Moscow State University Publishing House, 1984.
134. *Enlightened Conservatism: Russian Thinkers on the Paths of Development of Russian Civilization* / compiled and edited by D. N. Bakun. Moscow: Griffin, 2012.
135. Proskurina V. Yu. *The Empire of Catherine II's Pen: Literature as Politics*. Moscow: New Literary Review, 2017.
136. Reitblat A. I. *From Bova to Balmont and other works on the historical sociology of Russian literature*. Moscow: New Literary Review, 2009.
137. Rosenblum L. M. *Creative diaries of Dostoevsky*. Moscow: Nauka, 1982.
138. *Russian Conservatives* / Bokhanov A. I. (head), Oleynikov D. I., Sekirinsky S. S., and others. Moscow: Russian World, 1997.
139. *Russian liberalism: ideas and people*. Moscow: Liberal Mission Foundation, 2007.
140. *With faith in Russia. Russian conservatism: history, theory, modernity: speeches and reports of participants of the scientific-practical conference from December 21, 1998*. Moscow: VOPD "Our Home is Russia", 1999.
141. Sankova S. M. *Statesman without a government position. M. N. Katkov as an ideologist of state nationalism. Historiographic aspect*. St. Petersburg: Nestor, 2007.
142. Sementkovsky R. I. *Mikhail Nikiforovich Katkov, his life and literary work*. St. Petersburg: Popov Publishing House, 1892.
143. Sladkevich N. G. *The struggle of social currents in Russian journalism of the late 50s – early 60s of the XIX century*. L., 1979.

144. Soloviev Yu. B. Autocracy and nobility at the end of the 19th century. Leningrad: Science. Leningrad branch, 1973.
145. Tvardovskaya V. A. Ideology of post-reform autocracy (M. N. Katkov and his publications). Moscow, 1978.
146. Teslya A. A. "The Last of the "Fathers": Biography of Ivan Aksakov. St. Petersburg: Vladimir Dal, 2015.
147. Fedorov V. A. Russian Orthodox Church and State. Synodal Period 1700–1917. Moscow, 2003.
148. Fetisenko O. L. "Heptastilists": Konstantin Leontiev, his interlocutors and students (Ideas of Russian conservatism in literary, artistic and journalistic practices of the second half of the 19th – first quarter of the 20th century). St. Petersburg: Pushkin House, 2012.
149. Friedlander G. M. Dostoevsky's Realism. M.; L.: Nauka, 1964.
150. Guardians of Russia: Anthology / S. V. Perevezentsev, A. A. Shirinyants, A. Yu. Minakov [et al.] M.: Publis, 2016.
151. Tsimbaev N.I.I.S. Aksakov in the public life of post-reform Russia. M., 1978.
152. Tsy-pin V. History of the Russian Orthodox Church. Synodal and modern periods. 1700–2005. Moscow, 2007.
153. Chernavsky M. Yu. Religious and philosophical foundations of conservatism in Russia. Moscow, 2004.
154. Chernikova N.V. Portrait against the backdrop of the era: Prince Vladimir Petrovich Meshchersky. Moscow: Political Encyclopedia, 2017.
155. Shaposhnikov L. E. Conservatism, modernism and innovation in Russian Orthodox thought of the XIX - XXI centuries. St. Petersburg, Publishing House of St. Petersburg State University, 2006.
156. Sharapov S. F. Unidentified genius: In memory of Nikita Petrovich Gilyarov-Platonov: Articles, notes, letters and excerpts, collected. and editor Sergei Sharapov. M.: typo-lit. A. V. Vasilyeva and Co., 1903.

157. Shakhovskoy N.V. Nikita Petrovich Gilyarov-Platonov: a short journalistic essay. Revel: Type. "Rev. Izv.", 1893.
158. Shirokorad A. B. Russia – England: the unknown war , 1857–1907. Moscow: ACT , 2003.
159. Shchennikov G.K. The Integrity of Dostoevsky. Ekaterinburg: Publishing House of the Ural University, 2001.
160. Ekshtut S. A. Everyday life of the Russian intelligentsia from the era of great reforms to the Silver Age. Moscow: Young Guard, 2012.
161. Language parameters of modern civilization. Collection of papers of the first scientific conference in memory of Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences Yu.S. Stepanov / Edited by V.Z. Demyankov, N.M. Azarova, V.V. Feshchenko, S.Yu. Moscow: Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences, IP Shilin I.V. ("Eidos"), 2013.
162. Yanov A. Ya. Russia against Russia: Essays on the History of Russian Nationalism. Novosibirsk, 1825–1921. Novosibirsk, 1999.

DISSERTATIONS AND DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS

163. Gromova L. P. A. I. Herzen and Russian journalism of his time: dis. ... Doctor of Philological Sciences. St. Petersburg: Publishing house of St. Petersburg University, 1994.
164. Derevyagina E. V. "Moscow News" M. N. Katkov (1863-1887) in the Russian literary process: author's abstract. diss. ... candidate of philological sciences. Veliky Novgorod, 2004 .
165. Dronov I. E. Development of a conservative concept of Russia's development in the works of V. P. Meshchersky (second half of the 19th – early 20th centuries): diss. candidate of historical sciences. Moscow, 2007.
166. Durinova G. V. Word as an object of historical semantics: "citizen" and "society" in the Russian language of the second half of the 18th century – first third of the 19th century: diss. ... Cand. Philological Sciences. Moscow, 2015.

167. Kitaev V. A. From the history of social thought in Russia in the second half of the 50s – early 60s of the 19th century (political program of the magazine “Russian Bulletin in 1856–1862): author’s abstract. diss. ... candidate of historical sciences. Moscow, 1970.
168. Kotov A. E. Conservative press in the socio-political life of Russia in the 1860s – 1890s: M. N. Katkov and his entourage: diss. ... doc. of history. St. Petersburg, 2016.
169. Lebedev S. V. The system of values of the philosophy of Russian conservatism of the second half of the 19th century: author's abstract. diss. ... doctor of philosophical sciences. St. Petersburg, 2004.
170. Leonov M. M. V. P. Meshchersky: Russian conservatism and government policy in the late 19th – early 20th centuries: author's abstract. diss. ... candidate of historical sciences. Samara, 1999 .
171. Perevalova E. V. The system of conservative values in domestic periodicals: M. N. Katkov and his publications (second half of the 1850s – 1880s): diss. ... doctor of philological sciences. Voronezh, 2023.
172. Repnikov A. V. Conservative concepts of the reorganization of Russia in the context of the historical process of the late 19th - early 20th centuries: specialty 07.00.02 "Domestic history": abstract of a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Historical Sciences.
173. Chernikova N. V. Prince V. P. Meshchersky in the public life of Russia, the last third of the 19th – beginning of the 20th century: diss. ... Cand. of History. Moscow, 2001.

ARTICLES

174. Arkhipova A. I. The issue of military service of foreigners in the north-east of Siberia (mid-19th – early 20th centuries) // Society: philosophy, history, culture. 2018. No. 12(56). P. 85–89.

175. Akhmadullin E. V. Problems and methodology of systemic research of the history of domestic journalism // *Izvestiya SFedU. Philological sciences*. 2009. No. 1. P. 118–129.
176. Badalyan D. A. Zemsky Sobor: the history of the concept from Karamzin to Ivan Aksakov // *Russian Idea: a website of conservative political thought*. Access mode: <https://politconservatism.ru/experiences/zemskij-sobor-istoriya-ponyatiya-ot-karamzina-do-ivana-aksakova>. (date of access: 06/23/2023).
177. Badalyan D. A. Ivan Aksakov in 1862: the choice between the law and journalistic honor // *Modern media in the context of information technology*. St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg State University of Industrial Technology and Design, 2017. Pp. 56–59.
178. Badalyan D. A. The circle of authors of I. S. Aksakov's newspaper "Rus" // *History and Culture*, 2009. No. 7.
179. Badalyan D. A. The concept of "nationality" in Russian culture // *Historical concepts and political ideas in Russia in the 16th – 20th centuries*. St. Petersburg, 2006.
180. Barabanov E. V. Russian philosophy and the crisis of identity // *Questions of Philosophy*. 1991. No. 8. P. 102–116.
181. Bik-Bulatov A. Sh. Conceptualization of the history of domestic journalism at the present stage // *Scientific notes of Kazan University. Humanities*. 2012. Vol. 154. Book 6. Pp. 169–178.
182. Buduchev V. A. *Intelligentsia in the Perspective of Intercultural Relations: The Role of the Philosophy of Enlightenment and the French Revolution in the Formation of the Russian Intelligentsia* // *Intelligentsia and the World*. 2019. No. 1. P. 146-151.
183. Varakin V. S. *Genesis of Journalism in Russia: Problems of Establishing Initial Coordinates* // *Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 10. Journalism*. 2021. No. 1. P. 100–123.

184. Vershinin M. S. Russian conservatism: retrospective political analysis // *Clio*. 1998. No. 1. P. 25–29;
185. Viktorovich V. A. Dostoevsky. Collective "Citizen" as the editor's creativity // *Unknown Dostoevsky*. 2015. Vol. 2. No. 4. P. 11-19.
186. Viktorovich V. A. Between "Demons" and "Teenager": journalism as creativity // *Dostoevsky and journalism* / ed. V. N. Zakharova, K. A. Stepanyan, B. N. Tikhomirov. St. Petersburg: Dmitry Bulanin, 2013. pp. 129-143.
187. Volgin I. L. "A Writer's Diary" as a World-Creating Project // *Questions of Philosophy*. 2014. No. 5. P. 116–122.
188. Volgin I. L. Metamorphoses of "writer's journalism" Dostoevsky – Gogol – Tolstoy // *Russian literature and journalism in the movement of time*. 2015. No. 1. P. 103–115.
189. Volgin I. L. *Over the Barriers* // Dostoevsky F. M. *Writer's Diary*: in 2 volumes. Moscow: Book Club, 2011.
190. Voronina O. A. Caricature as a type of creolized text // *Bulletin of the Central International Relations Department of Moscow State University. Russian Studies*. 2009. No. 2. P. 14-16.
191. Gabdullin I. R. Pre-conceptual prerequisite knowledge and the concept of prejudice: historical-philosophical and philosophical-legal aspects // *Historical, philosophical, political and legal sciences, cultural studies and art criticism. Theory and practice issues*. 2017. No. 6(80). Part 1. P. 39-41.
192. Golikov A. V. Problems of source study of political caricature (second half of the 19th – early 20th century) // *Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 8: History*. 2011. No. 4. P. 51-71.
193. Grekov V.N. "I am going my own way": Ivan Aksakov on journalism without thorns, censorship and the ban on the newspaper "Moscow" // *Mediascope*. 2011. No. 3. Access mode: <https://mediascope.ru/node/858> (date accessed: 05/25/2024)

194. Grekov V. N. Ivan Aksakov – employee and editor of “Russkaya Beseda” // “Russkaya Beseda”: history of the Slavophile journal: Research. Materials. Article-by-article listing / ed. by B. F. Egorov, A. M. Pentkovsky and O. L. Fetisenko. St. Petersburg: Pushkin House, 2011. Pp. 124–158.
195. Grossman, L. Dostoevsky and government circles of the 1870s // Literary heritage. 1934. Vol. 15. Pp. 83-162.
196. Derevyagina E. V. On the censorship history of M. N. Katkov’s Moskovskiye Vedomosti. // Educational mission of journalism. St. Petersburg: Publishing house of St. Petersburg State University, 2004. Pp. 62–74.
197. Dmitriev A. P. “In the Church Our Main Questions...” (N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov and K. P. Pobedonostsev in their relationships, correspondence and judgments about each other) // Understanding by Faith: Correspondence of N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov and K. P. Pobedonostsev (1860–1887). St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2011. Pp. 5–26.
198. Dmitriev A. P. N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov – author and censor of “Russian Conversation” // “Russian Conversation”: History of the Slavophile Journal: Research. Materials. Article-by-article listing / ed. by B. F. Egorov, A. M. Pentkovsky and O. L. Fetisenko. St. Petersburg: Pushkin House, 2011. Pp. 158–183.
199. Dmitriev A. P. N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov and his memories // From the experiences: autobiographical memories: In 2 volumes. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2009. Vol. 2. P. 5–8.
200. Durinova G. V. Sketches of the history of the socio-political concept of citizen and the question of the origin of society (XVIII – early XIX centuries) // Vectors of development of modern Russia. From the formation of values to the invention of traditions. 2014. Pp. 72–87.
201. Durinova G. V. Russian socio-political language: “Instruction” of Catherine II // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 21: Management (state and society). 2015. No. 1. P. 3–13.

202. Evstafiev D. G. Step Over the Threshold of the Global World // Russia in Global Affairs. 2023. Vol. 21. No. 2. Pp. 8–21.
203. Egorov B. F. The Last Year of “Russian Conversation” // “Russian Conversation”: History of the Slavophile Journal: Research. Materials. Article-by-article listing / ed. B. F. Egorov, A. M. Pentkovsky and O. L. Fetisenko. St. Petersburg: Pushkin House, 2011. Pp. 236-249.
204. Egorov B. F. Evolution in the understanding of the national character of literature in Russian criticism of the mid-1850s // Scientific notes of Tartu State University. 1971. Issue 266. Pp. 53-70.
205. Esin B. I. Once again about typology // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 10. Journalism. 2005. No. 6. P. 65–70.
206. Zhivov V. M. History of concepts, history of culture, history of society // Essays on the historical semantics of the Russian language of the early modern period. Moscow: Languages of Slavic cultures, 2009, pp. 10-19.
207. Zaynalabdiev V. Kh. Communicative practices in the regional blogosphere // The world of linguistics and communication: electronic scientific journal. 2015. No. 38. P. 62-71.
208. Zakharov V. N. Dostoevsky's Code. Journalism as a writer's creative idea // Dostoevsky and journalism / ed. V. N. Zakharova, K. A. Stepanyan, B. N. Tikhomirov. St. Petersburg: Dmitry Bulanin, 2013. pp. 17-27.
209. Zakharov V. N. Preface // Dostoevsky and journalism / ed. V. N. Zakharova, K. A. Stepanyan, B. N. Tikhomirov. St. Petersburg: Dmitry Bulanin, 2013. pp. 9-17.
210. Zakharov V. N. Thesaurus analysis and the problem of attribution of editorial articles in Dostoevsky's “Citizen” (1873–1874) // Horizons of humanitarian knowledge. 2019. No. 5. P. 104–116.
211. Zakharova O. V. Editorial tactlessness, or two “Diaries” in “Grazhdanin” of the 1870s // Scientific notes of Petrozavodsk State University. 2018. No. 1 (170). P. 24–28.

212. Zotov V. V., Lysenko V. A. Communicative practices as a theoretical construct for studying society. // Theory and practice of social development. 2010. No. 3. Access mode: http://www.teoria-practica.ru/rus/files/arhiv_zhurnala/2010/3/sociologiya/zotov-lysenko.pdf . (date of access: 01.05.2023).
213. Kail A. V. "Citizen" of Prince V. P. Meshchersky // Bulletin of the Saratov University, Series: History. International Relations. 2011. Vol. 11. Issue 1. Pp. 8–15.
214. Kalashnikov M. V. Ideologeme. Concept? Notion! (On the issue of the minimum significant unit of research within the framework of historical-semantic analysis) // Walls and Bridges – III: the history of the emergence and development of the idea of interdisciplinarity. Moscow: Academic project; Gaudeamus, 2015. P. 124–133.
215. Kamchatnov A. M. Shishkov as a forerunner of Russian philosophy of language // Bulletin of the library "House of A.F. Losev". Moscow: Vodolay, 2009. Issue 9. Pp. 73–89.
216. Kantor V. M. N. Katkov and the collapse of the aesthetics of liberalism. // Questions of Literature. 1973. No. 5. P. 23–35.
217. Karasik V. I. Linguocultural concepts: approaches to study // Sociolinguistics yesterday and today. Moscow: Institute of Scientific Information on Social Sciences, Russian Academy of Sciences, 2004. Pp. 130–159.
218. Kitaev V. A. On the issue of the controversy between Katkov and Chicherin in 1862 // Questions of the history of socio-political thought and domestic policy of Russia in the 19th century. Gorky, 1971. Pp. 45–56.
219. Kitaev V. A. The Polish question in the journalism of I. S. Aksakov (first half of the 60s of the XIX century) // Issues of economic and socio-political history of Russia in the XVIII-XIX centuries. Gorky, 1975. Issue 1. pp. 70–80.

- 220.Kogan G. F. Research on Dostoevsky // *Literary Heritage*. 1973. Vol. 86. No. 1. P. 581–605.
- 221.Kolesov M. S., Chemshit A. A. *Intelligentsia as a Phenomenon of Russian History // Scientific Notes of the Tavrichesky National University named after V. I. Vernadsky. Series “Philosophy. Sociology”*. 2008. Vol. 21 (60). No. 3. P. 36–37.
- 222.Koposov N. E. Basic historical concepts and terms of the basic level: towards the semantics of social categories // *Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology*. 1998. Vol. 1. No. 4. P. 31–39.
- 223.Kotov A.E. “Means of Struggle and Surrogate of Politics”: Political Journalism of M.N. Katkov and His Followers // *Questions of the History of Conservatism*. 2015. No. 1. P. 174–193.
- 224.Kotov A.E. Bureaucratic nationalism of Mikhail Katkov // *Questions of nationalism*. 2014. No. 1(17). P. 174–186.
- 225.Kotov A. E. Classicism in the journalism of M. N. Katkov // *Cultural diversity in education*. St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg Institute of Humanitarian Education, 2009. Part 2. P. 74–78.
- 226.Kruglikova O. S. Transfer of the newspaper *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* on lease to M. N. Katkov in 1863 (political context and financial terms of the contract) // *Bulletin of St. Petersburg University. Series 9. Philology. Oriental Studies. Journalism*. 2007. No. 4-2. P. 248–255.
- 227.Kruglikova O. S. “*Moskovskie Vedomosti*” M. N. Katkova in the controversy about the education reform in the 1860-1870s // *Bulletin of the Ural State University: Series 1: Problems of education, science and culture*. 2008. Vol. 56. No. 23. Pp. 205–209.
- 228.Kruglikova O. S. Discussion of the issue of Russification foreign ethnic outskirts of the Russian Empire in the Moscow conservative press of the 1860s // *Mediascope*. 2016. No. 4. P. 13–18.

229. Kruglikova O. S. N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov as a journalist and publisher // Scientific notes of Kazan University. Series: Humanities. 2016. Vol. 158. No. 4. Pp. 1015–1030.
230. Kruglikova O. S. Publications of Russian post-reform conservatism in the assessment of modern researchers // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 10: Journalism. 2017. No. 6. P. 191–199.
231. Kruglikova O. S. The question of judicial reform of 1864 in the journalism of N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov and F. M. Dostoevsky // Bulletin of St. Petersburg University. Language and Literature. 2017. Vol. 14. No. 4. P. 664–675
232. Kruglikova O. S. Darwin's Evolutionary Theory in Reflection Russian conservative and liberal press of the second half of the 19th century // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 10: Journalism. 2018. No. 5. P. 101–118.
233. Kruglikova O. S. “Moskovskie Vedomosti” after the death of M. N. Katkov: competition for the right to publish the newspaper // Bulletin of St. Petersburg University. Language and Literature. 2018. Vol. 15. No. 2. Pp. 252–264.
234. Kruglikova O. S. “To Maintain Complete Calm in Assessing the Activities of the Deceased Publicist”: Towards a Characteristic of M. N. Katkov’s Pre-Revolutionary Historiography // Medi@lmanakh. 2018. No. 3(86). P. 100–105.
235. Kruglikova O. S. M. N. Muravyov-Vilensky in the assessment of the Russian conservative and liberal press of the second half of the 19th century // Mediascope. 2019. No. 1. P. 10.
236. Kruglikova O. S., Sonina E. S. Specifics of the verbal and visual existence of the metaphor "window to Europe" in Russian journalism of the XIX - early XX centuries // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 10: Journalism. 2020. No. 4. P. 53-79.
237. Kruglikova ABOUT. S. The Image of Peter I on the Pages of the Sovremennik Magazine in the Era of Great Reforms // Bulletin of the Voronezh State University. Series: Philology. Journalism. 2020. No. 4. P. 111–115.

238. Kruglikova O. S. "To interpret the phenomenon of Peter from the laws of the development of the idea..." – reflections on Peter the Great in the journalism of A. I. Herzen // *Bulletin of the Southern Federal University. Philological sciences*. 2021. Vol. 25. No. 1. Pp. 218–228.
239. Kruglikova O. S. Illustrated magazine of Prince V. P. Meshchersky "Dobryak" in the context of the development of conservative journalism of the second half of the 19th century // *Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 10. Journalism*. 2022. No. 3. P. 132–151.
240. Kruglikova O. S. The journalistic world of St. Petersburg in caricatures magazine "Dobryak" (1882) // *Bulletin of the Voronezh State University. Series: Philology. Journalism*. 2022. No. 2. P. 137–142.
241. Kruglikova O. S. Newspaper of M. N. Katkov "Moscow News" (1863–1887): On the Origins and Nature of Political Influence // *Notebooks on Conservatism*. 2018. No. 3. P. 71–88.
242. Kruglikova O. S., Shapovalova K. A. F. M. Dostoevsky and A. I. Solzhenitsyn: Continuity of Ideas in Journalism // *Notebooks on Conservatism*. 2019. No. 1. P. 103–117.
243. Kruglikova ABOUT. S. "The Bulletin of Europe" by N. M. Karamzin and "The Russian Bulletin" by S. N. Glinka about Peter the Great: consonances and dissonances // *Notebooks on conservatism*. 2022. No. 3. P. 123–131.
244. Kruglikova O. S. Russian bureaucracy as the brainchild of Peter the Great modernization as interpreted by Russian conservative publicists post-reform era // *Notebooks on conservatism*. 2022. No. 3. P. 150–169.
245. Kruglikova O. S. The Image of Peter the Great in the Journalism of F. M. Dostoevsky // *Russian-Byzantine Bulletin*. 2022. No. 3(10). P. 119–128.
246. Kruglikova O. S., Bityutskaya V. V. Religious and moral meanings of A. I. Solzhenitsyn's journalism // *Orthodoxy*. 2023. No. 1. P. 132–155.
247. Kruglikova O. S., Silantyev K. V. "The Weekly "Life and Court" (1911–1917) in the Context of Typological Transformations of the Press at the

- Beginning of the 20th Century.” Moscow University Bulletin. Series 10. Journalism. 2024. No. 5. pp. 115–138.
248. Kruglikova, O. S. Reflections on the Method: Historical and Semantic Analysis in Research on the History of Journalism // Russian Journalism: Evolution of Ideas and Forms: Collection of Articles / Higher School of Journalism and Mass Communications, St. Petersburg State University. - St. Petersburg: Aleteya Publishing House, 2021. Pp. 55-72.
249. Makushin L. M. "Katkov's Department": ideology and technology" // Accents. Voronezh, 2002. Issue. 1–2. P. 37–45.
250. Makushin L. M. M. N. Katkov and the “Russian Herald” in 1856–1862: from liberalism to conservatism // Accents. 2001. No. 5–6. P. 70–77.
251. Malinov A. V. The concept of “nationality” in the historiosophical concept of S. S. Uvarov // Russia in the global world. 2016. No. 8(31). P. 519–526.
252. Mezhev B. V. VI. Soloviev, N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov and the “decomposition of Slavophilism” // History of Philosophy. 2000. No. 6. P. 33–61.
253. Miller A. I. History of the concept of "nation" in Russia // Otechestvennye zapiski. 2012. No. 1(46). P. 162–186.
254. Minakov A. Yu. Russian conservatism in the first quarter of the 19th century // Orthodoxy. 2021. No. 3. P. 14–41.
255. Minakov A. Yu. At the origins of Russian conservatism: the “Russian party” of the first quarter of the 19th century // Tractus Aevorum: evolution of socio-cultural and political spaces. 2014. Vol. 1. No. 1. P. 67–77.
256. Moryakov V. I. Catherine II – an enlightener or a conservative? // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 8: History. 2010. No. 3. P. 9–26.
257. Motin S. V. “I will still publish Parus until it is banned...” (on the history of the newspaper’s publication by I. S. Aksakov) // Media Almanac. 2013. No. 2. P. 65-73.

258. Novikova E. G. Economic issues of Dostoevsky's journalism // Dostoevsky and journalism / ed. V. N. Zakharova, K. A. Stepanyan, B. N. Tikhomirov. St. Petersburg: Dmitry Bulanin, 2013. pp. 58-76.
259. Panyukova T. V. "LIFE looks brighter...": Relations between V. P. Meshchersky and F. M. Dostoevsky in the context of their correspondence // Unknown Dostoevsky. 2017. Vol. 4. No. 1. P. 18-34.
260. Perevalova E. V. Agrarian program of M. N. Katkov's magazine "Russian Bulletin" in the 1880s // Media readings of SKFU. Stavropol: Service School, 2017. Pp. 56–63.
261. Perevalova E. V. V. P. Bezobrazov – employee and correspondent of M. N. Katkov // News of higher educational institutions. Problems of printing and publishing. 2015. No. 6. P. 79–86.
262. Perevalova E. V. K. F. Golovin – employee of M. N. Katkov's journal "Russian Bulletin" // News of higher educational institutions. Problems of printing and publishing. 2020. No. 4. P. 29–35.
263. Perevalova E. V. National policy of Emperor Alexander I (based on materials from M. N. Katkov's journal "Russian Bulletin") // Communication in the modern world. Voronezh: Voronezh State University, 2022. Part I. P. 138–140.
264. Perevalova E. V. Olga Novikova – employee of "Moskovskie Vedomosti" M. N. Katkova (based on materials from the OR RSL) // Rumyantsev Readings-2017: 500th Anniversary of the Publication of the First Slavic Bible by Francisk Skaryna: the Formation and Development of the Culture of Book Printing / compiled by E. A. Ivanova. Moscow: Pashkov Dom, 2017. Part 2. Pp. 46–51.
265. Perevalova E. V. Department of foreign literature in M. N. Katkov's magazine "Russian Bulletin" // Bulletin of the Moscow State University named after. Ivan Fedorov. 2011. No. 7. pp. 81–90.

266. Polyakova N. V. Anthropology of Russian conservatism // Alexander Ivanovich Vvedensky and his philosophical era. St. Petersburg, 2006. P. 252–253.
267. Prokhorov G. S. Narrative structure of “A Writer’s Diary” by F. M. Dostoevsky (formulation of the question) // *New Philological Bulletin*. 2010. Vol. 15. No. 4. Pp. 5–14.
268. Revzina O. V. Temporal structure of the concept // *Language parameters of modern civilization*. Moscow, 2013. P. 183-192.
269. Repnikov V. A. Russian conservatism: yesterday, today, tomorrow // *Conservatism in Russia and the world: past and present*. Voronezh, 2001. Issue 1. P. 9–20.
270. Rosenthal V. N. Socio-political program of Russian liberalism in the mid-50s of the XIX century (Based on materials from the "Russian Bulletin" for 1856-1857) // *Historical notes*. 1961. No. 70. P. 197-222.
271. Sedova D. D. “Archaists” and “Innovators”: Generalization of the Controversy // *Rhema. Rema*. 2009. No. 3. P. 57–69.
272. Seleznev F. A., Smolin M. B. The Great Guardian of the Empire // *Imperial Word: articles by M. N. Katkov / Comp. M. B. Smolin*. M.: Moscow, 2002. P. 5-44.
273. Staliunas D. Ethnopolitical situation of the North-West region in the assessment of M.N. Muravyov (1863–1865) // *Baltic Archive*. 2002. Vol. 7. Pp. 250–271.
274. Teslya A. A. Slavophiles and the "Polish Question" in the 1840s - 1st half of the 1860s // *Philosophy. Journal of the Higher School of Economics*. 2021. Vol. 5. No. 3. Pp. 191-216.
275. Timofeev D. V. Principles of instrumentalization of the methodology of the "history of concepts" in studies on the history of public consciousness of Russia in the 18th - first quarter of the 19th century // *Bulletin of Tomsk State University*. 2018. No. 436. P. 184-191.

276. Ulukhanov I. S. History of the words townsman—citizen // Etymological studies in the Russian language. Moscow: Moscow State University Publishing House, 1968. Issue VI. Pp. 166–178.
277. Fadeicheva M. A. Ethnic policy in the Russian Empire of the 19th century. “Regulations on foreigners” // Scientific yearbook of the Institute of Philosophy and Law of the Ural Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences. 2003. No. 4. P. 369–382.
278. Fedoseeva T. V. I. S. Aksakov’s newspaper “Rus” on Orthodox spirituality as the basis of public education in Russia // Bulletin of Novgorod State University. 2015. No. 84. P. 176–177.
279. Finyagina N. P. Exposing the Struggle of the Autocracy against Revolutionary Democrats in Russian Caricature of the 1860s // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 8. History. 1968. No. 4. P. 39-54.
280. Kharkhordin O. What is a “state”? // The concept of the state in four languages. St. Petersburg, 2002. P. 152–216.
281. Chernikova N. V. Prince V. P. Meshchersky and his epistolary legacy // Letters to the Grand Duke Alexander Alexandrovich: 1863–1868 / introduction, commentary by N. V. Chernikova. Moscow: New Literary Review, 2011. Pp. 5–49.
282. Chulkov G. Tyutchev and Aksakov in the fight against censorship // Muranovsky collection. Muranovo: Publishing house of the museum named after the poet F. I. Tyutchev, 1928. Issue 1. P. 7-29.
283. Shirinyants A. A. Once again about M. N. Katkov // Katkov Bulletin: Religious and Philosophical Readings: for the 190th anniversary of the birth of M. N. Katkov. Moscow: Progress-Pleiades, 2008. Pp. 107–113.
284. Shirinyants A. A. Katkov Mikhail Nikiforovich // Social Thought of Russia in the 18th – early 20th centuries: encyclopedia. Moscow: Political Encyclopedia, 2005. Pp. 197–198;

285. Shcherbakova G. I. V. Meshchersky's newspaper "Grazhdanin" as an organ of the conservative nobility: towards the formulation of the problem // *Bulletin of the Humanitarian Institute of TSU*. 2010. No. 3(9). P. 127–134.
286. Shcherbakova G. I. New methods of presenting the image of the monarch in the magazine "Citizen" // *Information Age*. 2017. No. 2-1. P. 69–70.
287. Shcherbakova G. I. The Image of the Author in the Fiction of V. P. Meshchersky // *Text: philological, socio-cultural, regional and methodological aspects*. Tolyatti, 2023. Part 1. P. 490–498.
288. Shcherbakova G. I. Pasquinade as a tool of information warfare (based on the comedy by V. Meshchersky "10 Years in the Life of an Editor") // *Digital journalism: technologies, meanings and features of creative activity*. Ekaterinburg, 2024. Pp. 131–133.
289. Shcherbakova G. I. The Church Question in V. Meshchersky's "The Citizen" // *Media in the Modern World. 63rd St. Petersburg Readings*. St. Petersburg, 2024. Vol. 1. Pp. 50–52. Shcherbakova G. I. Representation of the Author's Image in V. Meshchersky's Journalism // *Media in the Modern World. 62nd St. Petersburg Readings*. St. Petersburg, 2023. Pp. 135–136.
290. Yushko A. G. Behind the Scenes of Journalism (Authorities and Moskovskiye Vedomosti in 1887 after the Death of M. N. Katkov) // *Nikita Petrovich Gilyarov-Platonov: Research. Materials. Bibliography. Reviews: for the 125th Anniversary of the Death of N. P. Gilyarov-Platonov / edited by A. P. Dmitriev*. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2013. Pp. 153-182.
291. Reforms of Peter the Great as a Precedent Phenomenon for Russian Digital Modernization / OS Kruglikova, AN Marchenko, ES Sonina, GI Shcherbakova // *Proceedings of the 2021 Communication Strategies in Digital Society Seminar, ComSDS 2021, St. Petersburg, April 14, 2021*. – St. Petersburg, 2021. – P. 177-180.