

Yevhen BEVZIUK

Doctor of Historical Sciences (Dr. Hab. in History), Professor,
Department of International Studies and Public Communications,
Uzhhorod National University
(Uzhhorod, Ukraine), evbevzuk@gmail.com
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0191-7905>

S.Uvarov's Imperial Ideology as a Principle of Modernization of the Educational Environment

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15407/uhj2021.03.126>

UDC: 94(100.477.32(4/9))(092)

Abstract. The purpose of the study. The relevance of the topic has been caused by the fact, that for many years researches on S.Uvarov's ideological heritage were done mainly within the Marxist paradigm from the standpoint of social and class competition. The Soviet historical science argued that imperial education had served the interests of autocracy, therefore it had adopted the idea of Official Nationality. At the same time, historians quite carefully omitted the fact that S.Uvarov had laid the ideological tool for organising the linguistic and cultural assimilation of the peoples of the Russian Empire. **Scientific novelty.** There has recently been a tendency to study a complicated bureaucratic and intellectual heritage of S.Uvarov. Such attention has been related to a growing interest of contemporaries in the philosophy of conservatism with the intensification of national processes. **The purpose** of the research is to clarify the content and objectives of S.Uvarov's conservative and ideological doctrine, which became "an intellectual weapon" of modernisation of the educational sphere and part of the domestic imperial national policy. The object of research is the ideological system of the Russian autocracy, the subject is S.Uvarov's intellectual heritage, and specifically his programme of Official Nationality, which provided an algorithm for "evolutionary" correlation of the ideological foundation of the Russian educational environment for many years. **Conclusion.** Hence, S.Uvarov took his place in the history of the empire not just as a talented bureaucrat and reformer of the educational environment, but as a politician who tried to emancipate the Russian national consciousness against the background of the imperial ideology, in the key of loyalty to the autocracy. His Triad served the purpose of ideologising society in order to maintain control over the public. S.Uvarov's proclamation of the Official Nationality programme contrasted the uncontrolled spread of materialistic and liberal ideas with a conscious conservative barrier in the form of strengthening bureaucratic regulation in the sphere of education. Within the framework of the domestic policy of state nationalism, the minister combined public education with "the spirit of Orthodoxy, Autocracy and Nationality".

Keywords: Uvarov, education, nationality, nation, language, conservatism, empire, national movement, colonization.

The source base of the problem is represented by unpublished and published documents. Unpublished documents consist of the materials from the funds of the Central State Historical Archives of Ukraine and the Institute of Manuscript of the Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine. Archival selections contain numerous ministerial circulars and orders to the trustees of the Kyiv educational district¹. Our attention was also drawn

¹ Центральний державний історичний архів України, м. Київ (ЦДІАК України). – Ф.707. – Оп.261. – Спр.12. – Арк.1–2, 4, 13–14, 15–17.

to the letters received by S.Uvarov from the historian M.Pogodin². The documents contain recommendations on the implementation of the idea of preserving the autocracy and the cultural assimilation policy of the peoples of the empire in the content of the educational process. Reports on scientific internships of the Dnipro region university teachers allow to illustrate the practical side of the educational policy of the autocracy³.

Another group of sources consists of published periodicals and statistical publications (D.Margolin, Yu.Janson, N.Troinitsky)⁴, memoirs and impressions of supporters of the “theory of official nationality” (M.Pogodin, V.Shulgin, A.Romanovich-Slavatinsky)⁵. The “Journal of the Ministry of Public Education” created on S.Uvarov’s initiative is of particular interest for the study. The official press body of the ministry became a source of propaganda for the state ideology of the “nationality” and contained numerous recommendations and orders for the implementation of “autocratic nationalism” in the practical plane of educational and university institutions⁶.

For many years, the study of S.Uvarov’s ideological legacy was conducted within the Marxist paradigm and from the standpoint of social and class competition. At the same time, Soviet historians carefully avoided the fact that the content of the educational system was based on an ideological tool for incorporating Russian national identity into the educational structures of the colonized periphery.

Since the late 1990’s there has been a tendency to re-read the S.Uvarov’s bureaucratic legacy (E.Dneprov, O.Lavrinenko, S.Udalov)⁷ in historical science. In Russian scientific publications, a critical analysis of the theory of the “official nationality” has become largely replaced by a patriotic assessment of the minister’s reform activities. For foreign researchers (C.Whittaker, R.Wortman, O.Miller, T.Simosato)⁸, the S.Uvarov triad has become an object of interest since the direction of modern Russian political culture towards conservatism. Such attention of historians is not least related with the further distinction of Russia and Europe as two opposite spiritually and historically cultural-and-historical types in Russian historiography.

The topic of “official nationality” was considered sufficiently studied in Ukrainian historical science. A certain illustration of the practical side of Russian educational reforms was provided in the collection of documents by the Kyiv researcher O.Ivanenko⁹. But since the return of the Russian authorities to the theory of “Russian world” there has been a problem to explore the issue more deeply and to highlight the imperial content of the conservative idea.

² Институт рукопису Національної бібліотеки України ім. В.Вернадського (ІР НБУ). – Ф.ІІ. – Од.зб.3217. – 12 арк.; Ф.160. – Од.зб.280. – 10 арк.; Од.зб.281. – Спр.493(18). – 16 арк.

³ Там само. – Ф.8. – Од.зб.3414–3415. – 7 арк.

⁴ *Марголин Д.* Справочник по высшему образованию. – К., 1911. – 507 с.; *Янсон Ю.* Сравнительная статистика России и западноевропейских государств. – Т.І. – Санкт-Петербург, 1878–1880. – 372 с.; Общий свод по империи результатов разработки данных первой всеобщей переписи населения: 28.01.1897 / Под ред. Н.Тройницкого. – Т.ІІ. – Санкт-Петербург, 1905. – 417 с.

⁵ *Погодин М.* Взгляд на русскую историю (1832) // Историко-критические отрывки. – Москва, 1846. – С.1–19; *Шульгин В.* Киевский университет при Бибикове (1838–1855) // *Соловьёв И.М.* Русские университеты в их уставах и воспоминаниях. – Санкт-Петербург, 1914. – С.185–190; *Романович-Славатинский А.* Профессора и студенчество в Киевском университете по воспоминаниям // Там же. – С.190–196.

⁶ *Уваров С.* Циркулярное предложение. Распоряжение. 21.03–01.09.1833 // Журнал министерства народного просвещения. – 1834. – Ч.І. – С.ХІХ–L; *Его же.* Действия правительства: Обзорение за истекшее пятилетие // Там же. – 1839. – Ч.ХХІ. – С.1–36; *Его же.* Десятилетие министерства народного просвещения: 1833–1843. – Санкт-Петербург, 1864. – 161 с.

⁷ *Днепров Э.* Российское образование в XIX – начале XX вв. – Москва, 2011. – 648 с.; *Лавриненко А.* Теория «официальной народности» в России первой половины XIX в. – Москва, 2001. – 118 с.; *Удалов С.* Теория официальной народности: механизмы внедрения // Освободительное движение в России. – Вып.21. – Саратов, 2006. – С.77–85.

⁸ *Виттекер Ц.Х.* Граф Уваров и его время. – Санкт-Петербург, 1999. – 350 с.; *Вортман Р.* «Официальная народность» и национальный миф российской монархии XIX в. // Россия. – Вып.3(11). – Москва, 1999. – С.233–244; *Миллер А.* Триада графа Уварова: Лекция [Электронный ресурс]: <http://polit.ru/article/2007/04/uvarov/>; *Симосато Т.* Переосмысление концепции «народности»: С.Уваров как консервативный мыслитель // Мысль. – Вып.20. – Санкт-Петербург, 2016. – С.87–97.

⁹ *Иваненко О.* Наддніпряньська Україна в європейських науково-освітніх відносинах (друга половина XIX – початок XX ст.). – К., 2018. – 430 с.

In the 19th century the capitalist economic system of production and distribution began to determine increasingly the intellectual, educational, and moral state of development of the European society. This led to the emergence of various ideas and ideologies, from conservative to liberal-democratic, from nationalistic to Supranational. This was complemented by the drama of the socio-cultural problem, which against the background of the Russification policy of the centre was accompanied by an aggravation of the intellectual quality of both titular and ethno-regional elites. This trend was explained by the latent backwardness of the Russian educational sphere in comparison with the European educational indicators. Even on the eve of the World War I Russia lagged behind European Germany in the number of university students by 3 times and in the number of universities by 6 times¹⁰. In addition, according to the general educational indicators, at the end of the industrial revolution, Russian illiterate population will reach 79 percent, while in Germany this index will be only 12 percent¹¹.

The available historical material allows us to argue that the national and ethnic environment of the empires of the period of modernisation challenges caused a paradoxical scientific and educational policy, which was determined by two vectors: the first was organising the imperial scientific and educational environment according to the European model, the second was forming and consolidating the ideological (protective and assimilative) principles of the existence of the environment.

Traditionally, the formation of the state conservative-ideological doctrine Orthodoxy – Autocracy – Nationality is associated with the activities of the ideologue of socio-political communication of the empire and “Don Quixote of the Russian autocracy” Count Uvarov. It was he, who altering the well-known military motto “For Faith, Tsar and Fatherland”, formulated a fixed attribute of ideological principles that formed the foundation of the official imperial educational platform.

In general, the condition for intellectual innovation was S.Uvarov’s conviction that to solve internal social problems in the state, to resist individualism and nihilism, which quickly penetrated the educational sphere, was possible only by “evolutionary” correlation of the ideological foundation of the Russian Monarchy. That is why the final scenario of S.Uvarov’s educational reforms resulted in the imperial practice of uniting Russian society around the military-bureaucratic Romanov Dynasty. Actually, educational reforms laid the foundation for the process of administrative Russification of Ukrainian society and became part of the next policy of forced Russification (the Valuev Circular of 1863, the Ems Decree (Ukaz) of Alexander II of 1876). Accordingly, from the very beginning of the reforms the possibility of integrating society on general civil principles, and even more, on democratic practices for ethnic, religious and peripheral groups, was considered an unacceptable strategy for modernising Russia’s autocracy.

In 1833, Minister S.Uvarov, who, according to his contemporaries, “always accurately caught the emperor’s secret thoughts”, sent a ministerial circular to the trustees of the educational districts. The document read: “Our common duty is to ensure that our public education takes place in a combination of the spirit of Orthodoxy, autocracy and nationality”¹². In view of the above, we would like to say that modern Russian historiography prefers to avoid a critical assessment of S.Uvarov’s activities as of a purely imperial politician. The personal energy and initiative of the reformer of Russian education are mainly enlightened. Such an approach certainly needs some clarification. Of course, the high “energy and creative potential” of the minister as a professional official and persistent

¹⁰ Марголин Д. Справочник по высшему образованию. – С.5.

¹¹ Янсон Ю. Сравнительная статистика России... – С.119–120.

¹² Уваров С. Циркулярное предложение... – С.XLIX.

bureaucrat should be recognised. However, S.Uvarov cannot be separated from the imperial autocracy, as the minister never went beyond the political concept of Nicholas I. S.Uvarov himself repeatedly emphasised that all his reform activities were “illuminated by high will” and, moreover, “the emperor himself laid out the importance of popular origins in the content of government activities”¹³.

In view of the above, the new revival of the Constantinople-Orthodox myth should be considered as quite a consistent step, which was publicly and demonstratively carried out by the authorities and based on the historical and religious past of Russia. Accordingly, Orthodoxy was paradigmatically established as an original basis of the spiritual and material existence of the people and was determined as an instrument of social policy. The very principle of Orthodoxy was interpreted by S.Uvarov not as a simple set of traditional fundamental religious dogmas, but it was defined as a feature of Russia's Byzantine political past, which had determined the peculiarities of the world insight and mentality of the Russian people. It is worth quoting the speech of the Minister of Education S.Uvarov, where he publicly emphasised: “Sincerely devoted to his ancestors' church, the Russian man has always looked at it as the basis of his social happiness”¹⁴. In practice, the intellectual “innovation” itself served the purpose of preserving the confessional-dynastic principle of the state system of the Romanov Empire.

Hence, for many years the symbols of Russian national and state unity were strongly intertwined with the sacred symbolism of the Byzantine religious traditions. Therefore, there was no coincidence in that even later in his Manifesto of 1881 Alexander III continued cultivating syncretism of the Orthodox formula and, addressing people, he eloquently wrote: “I believe that the fervent prayers of my pious people will bring us blessings”¹⁵.

However, it should be noted that the very theory of Official Nationality could have taken the form of a final and complete ideological construction only if it had been combined with the political basis of the Russian state – the autocracy. The latter, as S.Uvarov argued: «[...] is the only possible condition for Russia's political existence. The Russian colossus rests on it as a cornerstone of its greatness”¹⁶. The political-intellectual principle, voiced by S.Uvarov, certainly served the purpose of further legitimisation of the existing political and social system. So it is not surprising that, according to apologists of security ideology, any emotional and critical comments on the principle of autocracy, did not only question the Russian historical narrative, but also threatened further existence of the Romanov Monarchy itself. For this reason the imperial theorists of statehood (N.Karamzin, M.Pogodin, N.Ustryalov, A.Khom'yakov, I.Kiriyevsky, S.Shevyryov) substantiated the idea of age-old symbiosis of people with the monarchy. In fact, their efforts formulated the myth of almost a century old kinship of the Russian autocracy and the monarchy with the Russian people.

The framework of this intellectual approach later was quite illustratively outlined by M.Pogodin. At his lecture, he said: “The Varangians came to us, but they were chosen by us voluntarily, they were not conquerors from the west. The main significant difference lies in the core, the Russian state became the very seed of its development”¹⁷. Thus, the idea of calling of the Varangians, a “hospitable meeting” with the Russian people, and not forcible conquest of Russia by the Normans, laid the foundation for the ideological concept. In such a way historians argued that at the stage of emergence of the first institutions

¹³ ЦДІАК України. – Ф.707. – Оп.261. – Спр.12. – Арк.4.

¹⁴ Уваров С. Десятилетие министерства народного просвещения. – С.2–4.

¹⁵ [Электронный ресурс]: https://ru.wikisource.org/wiki/Высочайший_манифест_29.04.1881

¹⁶ Уваров С. Десятилетие министерства народного просвещения. – С.2–4.

¹⁷ Погодин М. Взгляд на русскую историю... – С.6.

of the Russian statehood of the period of the Rurik Dynasty, the autocracy was not just legitimised and recognised by the people, but immediately became a kind of integral and popular monarchy.

The last element of S.Uvarov's canonical ideological formula was the principle of Nationality (*Narodnost*). This was rather mystical part of the content of the Triad. This fact has the following explanation. S.Uvarov looked for a holistic intellectual lecture that could be contrasted with the revolutionary negativity of European liberal and ideological movements. The latter potentially threatened the integrity of the multiethnic system of the empire. Accordingly, the Minister needed an All-Russian modernisation paradigm. Its content combined the dynastic and confessional principle of autocracy, the Byzantine-civilisational specifics of the monarchy. In fact, in multinational Russia, this laid the ideological foundation for the practical implementation of an intellectual project of creating a great All-Russian nation. S.Uvarov pretty quickly realised the destructive danger of European liberal ideas and social upheavals for the motley Romanov Monarchy. Therefore, the Minister publicly emphasised: "Social storms in Europe are causing collapse of the society, so we need to strengthen the homeland, bringing the sacred remains of our nationality together"¹⁸.

One of the main motivating factors for S.Uvarov's ideological search was the existing national discourse of a number of European national theorists. In general, the circle of Russian theorists and nationalists has long been quite diverse. The official point of view of the nationalists was represented by Minister S.Uvarov, court historian N.Ustryalov, medievalist T.Granovsky. The next group was romantic nationalists (S.Shevyryov, M.Pogodin). The feeling of "falling in love with the Russian nation" even became the basis for formulating a thesis about the insufficient intellectual quality of the "Austrians". Here is a quote from his foreign letter: "There is no dumber person in Europe than an Austrian"¹⁹. Their worldviews were close to the official position, they worked jointly with the autocracy. However, they strongly connected the idea of peculiarities of the Russian people with the idea of All-Slavism against the background of the ideology of Tsarophile Pan-Slavism.

Religious nationalists grouped separately. Their leaders were A.Khomyakov, S.Kiryevsky and S.Aksakov brothers. According to them, the church historically provided a symbolic side to the centripetal process of national unity. Finally, there was another circle of Russian theorists of the nation, the so-called dynastic nationalists, journalists F.Bulgarin, N.Grech. For them, the practical side of the Russian state formation and its continental grandeur were an exclusive merit of the institution of the monarchy. Accordingly, according to F.Bulgarin, the life principle for the imperial youth should be "firmness, diligence in fulfilling his duties"²⁰. In general, the above mentioned theorists were ideologically unanimous in terms of forming the Great Russian national agenda.

In general, taking into account the European social tendency and the Russian national discourse, S.Uvarov tried to intellectually replace the Western conceptual category of Nationality with the Russian category – *Narodnost* (Nationality). In a narrow, stylistic sense it is an intellectual formula of the epoch of national romanticism, that aimed at reproducing a certain image of Russia and its people as a special world that opposed the destructive expansion of the West.

Finally, the Minister of Education still managed to quite metaphysically define the meaning of the principle of *Narodnost*. The reason lies in the fact that in the 30–40's of the 19th century the notion of "Russian nationality" was just beginning to become the object of imperial intellectual discourse.

¹⁸ Уваров С. Десятилетие министерства народного просвещения. – С.2.

¹⁹ IP НБУ. – Ф.П. – Од.зб.3217. – Арк.2.

²⁰ Булгарин Ф. Очерк характера Петра Великого // Его же. Сочинения. – Ч.1. – Санкт-Петербург, 1830. – С.206–207.

At the same time for Europeans, the concept Nationality was already filled with the meaning of political sovereignty (F.Schiller, J.Fichte, L.Kossuth, L.Štúr, F.Palacký, K.Havlíček-Borovský). Accordingly, the European national renaissance prompted the minister to offer society an imperial interpretation of the content of Nationality. For S.Uvarov, Nationality was not only a fact that a person belonged to a certain ethnic community of people, but also a process of modernisation of communities “from above” by implementing a government-controlled All-Russian project “Empire – Nation”.

As far as the principle of Narodnost was concerned, first S.Uvarov appealed to the semantic uncertainty of the content of the principle, explaining this situation by saying that “all political difficulties were hidden in the problem of reconciling old and new concepts”. Then the need to provide an adequate, up-to-date interpretation of the principle itself encouraged S.Uvarov to use mostly metaphorical expressions, explaining the meaning and significance of such a category as Narodnost. “Like a human body, – said S.Uvarov, – nationality changes its appearance according to its age; its traits change over the years, but its face should not be changed”²¹.

In general, for the Minister the content of the principle of Narodnost was almost inextricably connected with the mental characteristics of the Russian people. It is no coincidence that in his commemorative report on the occasion of the fifth anniversary of his appointment to the post of Minister, S.Uvarov gave the following definition to Narodnost: “Russian spirit, always ready to lay down his life for his homeland... He will save Russia from the pressure of the pagan East and the half-educated regiments of the West”²². According to the Minister, the principle of Narodnost could not be separated from the peculiarities of the national Russian identity, in which the specific historical past and the historical memory of national traditions were strongly intertwined.

The reason for this approach lied on the surface. By the 19th century the Russian Empire had finally turned into an extensively growing, heterogeneous imperial space inhabited by numerous ethnic and religious minorities. The statistics of the “First General Census of the Russian Empire” point out to our statement. According to the census, the percentage of ethnic Russians among all the inhabitants of the empire did not even reach half, and was only 44 percent of the total number of Romanov subjects²³. No wonder that the authorities were aware of the potential danger of ethnic disbalance for the political stability of the empire and therefore they made every effort to eliminate this situation.

Because of the existing social problem in Russian universities in 1834, including the newly created Kyiv University of St. Vladimir, by S.Uvarov's order, the departments of Russian history and Russian literature were opened quite consistently. Such organisational government's initiatives to establish the departments should be seen as an internal political bureaucratic initiative of the autocratic system, which aimed to “scientifically rein” the growing nationalism in.

Thus, in the framework of public and scientific discourse around the category of Nationality in the 19th century, S.Uvarov's category of Narodnost (Nationality) should be seen as an attempt to solve the social problem of the multiethnic empire “from above”. The theory of Official Nationality became a “tolerant” attempt of the authorities to combine the Russian national concept with the elements of Western national theories, this fact did not only preserve the myth of the sacredness of the people's monarchy, but also saved the autocracy from “passionate dreamers”²⁴ that provoked national upheaval.

²¹ Уваров С. Десятилетие министерства народного просвещения. – С.2–4.

²² Там же. – С.7–8.

²³ Общій свод по империи результатов... – С.2–91.

²⁴ ЦДІАК України. – Ф.707. – Оп.261. – Спр.12. – Арк.4.

That is why, taking into account the existing domestic political reality, in 1833 S.Uvarov strongly recommended to take “outright measures” of an assimilative nature “in relation to various foreigners and infidels of our Great Country” in his commemorative report *Decade of the Ministry of Public Education*²⁵. As we can see, S.Uvarov made considerable efforts to destroy the beginnings of any particularistic nationalist projects, despite the fact that the cultural, historical and linguistic differences of the regions provided sufficient material for the recognition of peripheral ethnic specifics.

However, on our part it would be unfair to represent S.Uvarov as a banal political retrograde of the Romanov Monarchical House. The new minister was well aware of that the simple tradition of introducing restrictive measures in internal affairs and in the organisation of university education would inevitably be a condition for the further decline of the scientific sphere and could lead to social conflict and imperial catastrophe. Therefore, quite consistent with the content of his autocratic beliefs, S.Uvarov declared: “We live between political storms so if I can push Russia away for fifty years from what is predicted, then I will fulfill my earthly mission. Here is my theory”²⁶. S.Uvarov pragmatically outlined the contours of his ministerial activity, i.e. change of the imperial educational system on the historical principles and traditions of devotion to the Russian autocracy.

However, S.Uvarov understood the importance of launching a modernisation mechanism in education, as the man had intellectually been formed on European elite concepts, philosophical, ethical and aesthetic standards. That is why during his tenure as Minister of Public Education S.Uvarov strongly recommended the development of an autocratic educational system on the Russian cultural and historical intellectual background, provided that the existing European achievements were preserved. The Minister formulated his reformist paradigm as follows: “It is necessary to use the European educational positivity in the Russian system, not borrowing it with the purpose of blind copying, but to learn what is better”²⁷.

However, S.Uvarov’s “European” reformist approach did not contain any hint of the existence of a multinational reality of the empire. The Minister did not take into account the already existing interethnic conflict between the titular imperial ethnic group and “foreigners” (Polish National Movement, Finnish and Jewish issues, secret societies, Cyril and Methodius Society, the North Caucasus). The Ukrainian people, like other peoples of the empire, not symbolically, but already completely incorporated into the great project of the All-Russian nation.

Being the Minister of Education for sixteen years, S.Uvarov was passionate about building the framework of classical educational and scientific system, which should have ensured further existence of the absolutist system and the elite culture which had ignited it. Therefore, for all of his life an energetic and purposeful person would seek a compromise between the aristocratic ideals of the past feudal era and the pragmatic capitalist reality of the nineteenth century. That is why he would forbid the admission to universities of ignorant nobles, whose studies were a “waste of time”. At the same time, with a secular courtesy of the autocratic intellectual, S.Uvarov persistently offered a selective means of restricting the rights of the representatives of the lower classes and foreigners to enter universities. For example, in 1844 S.Uvarov wrote a note to the emperor. He stated: “In higher and secondary educational institutions the influx of foreign youth, born in the lower social classes, is increasing. For them, higher education is useless, this luxury is

²⁵ Уваров С. Десятилетие министерства народного просвещения. – С.2–4.

²⁶ Никитенко А. Дневник: В 3 т.: 1826–1857. – Т.1. – Ленинград, 1955. – С.174.

²⁷ Уваров С. О народонаселении в России // Чтения Императорской академии наук в Санкт-Петербурге за 1829 и 1830 гг. – Кн.1. – Санкт-Петербург, 1831. – С.127.

unprofitable for the state"²⁸. It is easy to predict that the autocrat Nicholas's reaction to the note was quite positive.

However, basing on the goal of reforming the imperial educational sphere, S.Uvarov gave a new quality to the university sphere. The practice of science internships abroad was resumed, this became a purposeful policy of the ministry and an integral part of the academic process. The Minister assessed the importance of internships in changing the quality of imperial education with these words: "Scientific trips will raise Russian science and universities to the heights of knowledge of those peoples who once preceded us on the educational path"²⁹.

In the future, the internship at public expense will be a prerequisite for the competitive selection for the position of head of the department. Among the names of famous intellectuals who had the opportunity to carry out foreign internships were such natives of Ukrainian lands as Slavists I.Sreznevskiy, O.Bodianskiy, V.Hryhorovych, philosopher of history P.Kulish. Graduates of Kyiv University I.Vihura, M.Piliankevych, P.Tutkovskiy. At the same time, the reports contained in the archives allow us to state that, despite the scientific nature of internships, in some cases business trips were supplemented with political tasks. Thus, the actual content of M.Pogodin's letters to S.Uvarov suggests that during his scientific journey the historian performed a secret mission, which Vienna could officially consider not only a scientific mission, but also the practice of exporting the ideology of Panslavism³⁰.

In 1835, an important university reform was carried out, which repealed a number of instructions and introduced a unified legal standard for educational institutions. The General Statute of the Imperial Russian Universities was approved by the Emperor's Decree. The new statute contained provisions on the election of administrative and bureaucratic staff, introduced the principle of competitive selection of the teaching staff. According to S.Uvarov, the reform pursued two main goals: "First, to raise university education to a rational form; second, to involve upper-class children in university studies and to reduce their passion for foreign education, which was brilliant but alien"³¹.

However, a natural question arises: did S.Uvarov's intellectual eclecticism contain risks for his political career? To answer this question, it is necessary to clear up the circumstances of S.Uvarov's socio-political activity. Last but not least, S.Uvarov's worldview paradigm and his bureaucratic success were determined by the fact that the emperor was sympathetic to him. It is known that after the events of December 1825, Nicholas I brought the categorical nature of his own judgments to the practice of public administration, and therefore "with military determination" embodied "Orthodox absolutism" in the content of state ideology. "I look at human life, – the monarch emphasised, – only as at a service, that is why everyone must serve"³². Thus, S.Uvarov could be appointed to the post of the imperial minister only on condition of devotion to the autocratic system.

Therefore, answering the above question, we can state that S.Uvarov was certainly far from the "politics" and valued his status as a senior imperial official. But within the framework of intellectual discourse, available for the authorised minister, he carefully persuaded "His Imperial Majesty" to support a state programme for the emancipation of education, which "would not be hostile to the European spirit"³³.

A significant part of the content of S.Uvarov's new educational policy was occupied by the national problem. It is clear that the practical side of the problem was solved by the

²⁸ *Рождественский С.* Исторический обзор деятельности министерства народного просвещения, 1802–1902. – Санкт-Петербург, 1902. – С. 256. [Электронный ресурс]: http://elibrary.gnpbu.ru/text/tozhdestvenskiy_istoricheskiy-obzor-deyatelnosti_1902/.

²⁹ Там само. – С. 251.

³⁰ IP HBY. – Ф. II. – Од.зб. 3217. – Арк 4; IP HBY HAH України. – Ф. 160. – Од.зб. 280. – 10 арк.

³¹ *Рождественский С.* Исторический обзор деятельности министерства... – С. 244.

³² *Шильдер Н.* Император Николай I: Его жизнь и царствование. – Т. I. – Санкт-Петербург, 1903. – С. 147.

³³ *Уваров С.* Десятилетие министерства народного просвещения. – С. 4.

unification of the empire and the cultural assimilation of its peoples. Priority was given to the idea of Russian citizenship, devotion to the autocracy, which practically determined the fact of belonging to Russian imperial society. In general, Count S.Uvarov's bureaucratic heritage is extremely important for understanding the role of imperial power in the development of Great Russian nationalism and the actual suppression of the process of formation of national thought and cultural environment of Ukraine in the first half of the 19th century.

Uvarov's educational policy concerning Ukraine was aimed at levelling the national peculiarities of Ukrainians. The period of ethno-academic interest in Little Russia, and together with it, the period of chaotic, unsystematic Russification of Ukrainians, ended. S.Uvarov's reforms became the beginning of a policy of expanding the borders of the Russian ethnic community through bureaucratic mechanisms to consolidate the process of linguistic and cultural assimilation of the peoples of Little Russia "from above". Paradoxically, the practical side of assimilation policy was provided by classical gymnasiums, teachers' seminaries, including the Kyiv University of St. Vladimir.

Later, a hereditary nobleman of Volyn Province, monarchist and Russian nationalist V.Katkov quite pragmatically voiced the purpose of organising Kyiv University: "The Russian government will open a university with the aim of extinguishing narrow national antipathies and merging the two nations into one by means of higher education"³⁴. Thus, educational institutions provided the intellectual side of the Russification of Ukrainians, Poles, which served the purpose of transforming autocratic Russia into a new stage of development of the state: Empire-Nation.

S.Uvarov's policy of consolidating the concept of the Great Russian people in the educational environment in the lands of Ukraine, could not help leading to reactions of Polish nationalists. It is clear that the Polish-Russian conflict could not leave intellectuals out from the university environment. For example, a graduate, and, later, a lecturer of Kyiv University A.Romanovich-Slavatinsky presented the cause of interethnic competition with the following words: since the establishment of the university, "there were few students, most of them of Polish origin, and the Polish language dominated in the classrooms. The current situation led to the isolation of the students of Russian origin"³⁵.

The logic of the imperial process of designing the Great Russian nation required radical decisions by the autocracy. As stated by a former graduate of Kyiv University V.Shulgin, in the first decades of the school's existence all the energy of the government, represented by D.Bibikov, Kyiv Governor-General, was aimed at "eliminating the Latin-Polish domination from education, and suppressing the so-called plague of Polish madness"³⁶. However, D.Bibikov's repressive methods against the Polish nobility and Polish culture should not be considered a concern of the ruling circles for protection of Ukrainian identity. The passion, with which the Governor-General introduced S.Uvarov's protection formula into the educational environment, was due to his exceptional desire to turn education into a means of Russification, which he understood as restoring the truly Russian Character of Lands distorted by Polonisation. Thus, the ethnic, historical and cultural identity of the Ukrainian population was not considered by the authorities as an object of domestic national policy.

So, taking into account all the above-mentioned, we can understand the provisions of the Minister of Education S.Uvarov's secret circular of 1847. In the document, the Minister obliged the heads of educational institutions to carry out a national policy by adhering "a sense of belonging to the nation" to the principle of educating students. Accordingly, the emotional and, at the same time, ideological side of the educational process, the minister

³⁴ Шульгин В. Киевский университет при Бибикове... – С.186.

³⁵ Романович-Славатинский А. Профессора и студенчество в Киевском университете.... – С.194.

³⁶ Шульгин В. Киевский университет при Бибикове... – С.186.

continued, had to come from the “Russian beginning” and in such a way it had to be filled with the “Russian spirit”³⁷. As we can see, S.Uvarov “easily” solved the national question in the imperial scientific and educational system.

There is no need to prove specifically that the practical side of the ideology of Official Nationalism received its further implementation in the practical field of construction and opening of universities and other educational institutions. Thus, in Ukraine, a promising thing of Europeanisation and modernisation of secular education, scientific knowledge and cultural sphere was opened only from the moment of establishing Kharkiv and Kyiv universities in the first half of the 19th century. However, it should be recognised that the main purpose of the tsarist governments of the period of foundation of educational institutions was not purely state interests in the modernisation of education and science, but also a purpose of preparation and implementation of the project of educating a loyal, great All-Russian nation.

Therefore, it was no coincidence that according to the Circular Order on Dissertations for Academic Degrees teachers were recommended to be responsible and loyal civil servants. It was further emphasised that dissertations should have “concrete completeness, content and clarity” and “bring good thoughts” and they should not contain ideas that “threaten our autocratic state system”³⁸.

At the same time, in Dnipro Ukraine, the practical side of the organization of the educational sphere was performed by General from the Infantry D.Bibikov. The latter not only controlled the activities of the civilian institutions of the provinces and exercised command of the army units, but also in practice he provided support for official nationalism by organising the imperial educational process within the Kyiv military governorship. We can learn about such a pragmatic approach to solving the national problem from V.Shulgin's memoirs: “By means of higher education, the Russian government started the university, aiming to extinguish the narrow national antipathies and to merge all nationalities into one common nationality, wrote a graduate of Kyiv University”³⁹. Thus, being relevant to the content of the internal national Orthodox policy of Nicholas I, the “emancipation” of the ethnocultural environment of Dnipro Ukraine took place in the conditions of incorporation of the Russian national idea into the educational structures of its colonised peripheries.

Hence, S.Uvarov took his place in the history of the empire not just as a talented bureaucrat and reformer of the educational environment, but as a politician who tried to emancipate the Russian national consciousness against the background of the imperial ideology, in the key of loyalty to the autocracy. His Triad served the purpose of ideologising society in order to maintain control over the public. S.Uvarov's proclamation of the Official Nationality programme contrasted the uncontrolled spread of materialistic and liberal ideas with a conscious conservative barrier in the form of strengthening bureaucratic regulation in the sphere of education. Within the framework of the domestic policy of state nationalism, the minister combined “public education” “with the spirit of Orthodoxy, Autocracy and Nationality”.

In practice, the ideological tool, that influenced the administrative system of autocracy in terms of organising the linguistic and cultural assimilation of peoples, was laid in the system of public education. However, the practice of using the military-bureaucratic mechanism as a means of intellectual modernisation proved to be ineffective. As a matter of fact, opposition to the possible prospect of integration of Russian society on a civic basis, restrictions on national, religious and ethnocultural practices became a condition for the suppression of regional civic initiatives, and led to intensification of national movements within the imperial peripheries.

³⁷ ЦДІАК України. – Ф.707. – Оп.261. – Спр.12. – Арк.6.

³⁸ Соловьёв И. Русские университеты в их уставах и воспоминаниях. – С.58.

³⁹ Шульгин В. Киевский университет при Бибикове... – С.186.

REFERENCES

1. Bulgarin, F.V. (1830). Oчерk kharaktera Petra Velikogo. *Sobineniya Fadeya Bulgarina, I*, 201–211. Sankt-Peterburg. [in Russian].
2. Dneprov, E. (2011). *Rosijskoe obrazovanie v XIX – nachale XX v.* Moskva. [in Russian].
3. Ivanenko, O. (2018). *Naddniprońska Ukraina v yevropejskykh naukovykh osvıtnykh vidnosynakh (druba polovyna XIX – pochatok XX st.)*. Kyiv. [in Ukrainian].
4. Lavrinenko, A. (2001). *Teoriya "ofitsialnoj narodnosti" v Rossii pervoj poloviny XIX v.* Moskva. [in Russian].
5. Simosato, T. (2016). Pereosmyslenie kontseptsii "narodnost": S.Uvarov kak konservativnyj myslitel. *Mysl*, 20, 87–97. Sankt-Peterburg. [in Russian].
6. Udalov, S. (2006). Teoriya ofitsialnoj narodnosti: mekhanizmy vnedreniya. *Osvoboditelnoe dvizhenie v Rossii*, 21, 77–85. Saratov. [in Russian].
7. Vitteker, Ts. (1999). *Graf Uvarov i ego vremena*. Sankt-Peterburg. [in Russian].
8. Vortman, R. (1999). „Ofitsialnaya narodnost” i natsionalnyj mif rossijskoj monarkhii XIX v. *Rossiya*, 3(11), 233–244. Moskva. [in Russian].

Євген Бєвзюк

доктор історичних наук, професор,
кафедра міжнародних студій та суспільних комунікацій,
Ужгородський національний університет
(Ужгород, Україна), evbevzuk@gmail.com
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0191-7905>

Імперська ідеологія С.Уварова як принцип модернізації освітнього середовища

Анотація. Мета дослідження спрямована на з'ясування змісту і завдань уваровської консервативно-ідеологічної доктрини, що стала «інтелектуальною зброєю» модернізації освітньої сфери та частиною внутрішньої імперської національної політики. Об'єктом дослідження є ідеологічна система російського самодержавства, предметом – інтелектуальна спадщина С.Уварова, а конкретно його програма «офіційної народності», яка на багато років забезпечила алгоритм «еволюційної» кореляції ідеологічного фундаменту російського освітнього середовища. **Методологія** спирається на принципи історизму, системності та цивілізаційної теорії розвитку соціумів. Такий підхід дозволяє об'єктивно й неупереджено висвітлити реформаторську діяльність С.Уварова та визначити імперський зміст його освітніх реформ. **Наукова новизна.** Внесок у дослідження інтелектуальної спадщини С.Уварова полягає не лише в розкритті ідеологічної тріади як цілісної політичної доктрини самодержавства, котра спиралася на конструкцію російської нації в рамках особливого православного історико-цивілізаційного типу. Показано, що комплексна система ідей слугувала меті «емансипації» етнокультурного середовища Наддніпрянської України задля інкорпорування російської національної ідентичності до освітніх структур колонізованої периферії. **Висновки.** С.Уваров посів своє місце в історії імперії не просто як талановитий бюрократ-реформатор освітнього середовища, а як політик, котрий намагався емансипувати російську національну свідомість на тлі імперської ідеології у ключі вірнопідданого ставлення до самодержавства. Проголошена ним програма «офіційної народності» протиставила неконтрольованому поширенню матеріалістичних і ліберальних ідей свідомий консервативний бар'єр у формі посилення бюрократичного регулювання освітньої сфери. На практиці до системи народної просвіти було закладено ідеологічний інструмент, що впливав на адміністративну систему самодержавства у плані організації мовної й культурної асиміляції народів імперії.

Ключові слова: Уваров, освіта, народність, нація, мова, консерватизм, імперія, національний рух, колонізація.