August Ludwig von Schlözer

Doctrine of the State in Its Main Parts, in Excerpts and Coherence

Part 2. General Statistics

The Theory of Statistics together with Ideas about the Study of Politics in General

The first issue. Introduction

Translated by Oscar Sheynin

Göttingen
Wandenhoek & Ruprecht
1804

torn away from the whole and praised for its usefulness it nevertheless becomes practically useless and can really degenerate into a plaything.

Bearing in mind this general sense, I am asking now: how old is this new viewpoint of the *Moniteur*? When had the opinion vanished that governing only meant *donner de ordres* (ordering)? And, if there exists an art of governing, can the human mind learn it just by routine and mechanically, like other mechanical arts? Since when governments themselves have grasped that scientific knowledge and particular study were needed for a real management just like for the judge, physician or school teacher; that ministers and other state officials also needed to educate themselves in the same way as scientists in other branches of knowledge did.

We will wonder after discovering how new are these ideas, how late they were perceived even by specialists (Gerschäftsmänner), or which unusual means had been taken even when the need for serious preparation to attain that goal became generally admitted! How much time had to pass until the separate parts of the diversified studies have been separated from each other (national economy from finance etc.). And how much longer will it take until all these not too homogeneous parts reach universities and until Cabinets and offices will trust those parts as much as school records are when people apply for state service.

31

I have found the first trace of at least a project for preparing people to work as state officials in England (Burnet 1679, vol. 1, p. 269).

A Project of a Seminary for Ministers of State

At this time [1539] many were offering projects for noble foundations, on which the king seems very earnest; but it is very likely that before he was aware of it, he had to outrun himself in his bounty, that it was not possible for him to bring these to any effect. Yet I shall set down one of the projects which shows the greatness of his [of the] mind that designed it; that is, of Sir Nicolas Bacon[1], who was afterwards one of the wisest ministers that ever this nation bred.

The King designed to found a House for the study of the *civil law* and the purity of the *Latin* and *French* tongues. So he ordered Sir Nicolas Bacon and two others, Thomas Denton and Robert Cary, to make a full project of the nature and orders of such a *House*, who brought it to him in a writing, the original whereof is yet extant.

The design of it was, that there should be frequent *pleadings* and other exercises in the *Latin* and *French* tongues; and when the *Kings Students* were brought to some ripeness, they should be sent with his *Ambassadors* to foreign parts and trained up in the knowledge of *foreign affairs*; and so the House should be the *nursery for ambassadors*. Some were also to be appointed to write the *history* of all embassies, treaties and other foreign transactions as also of all arraignments and *public trials* at home. But before any of them might write on these subjects, the Lord Chancellor was to give them an *oath*, that they should do it truly, without respect of persons or another corrupt affection.

This noble design miscarried. But if it had been well laid and regulated, it is easy to gather what great and public advantages might have flowed from it.

First of all, Burnet reported, it would have advanced the *history of the state*, but it would have been all the more necessary to enlist the services of a good historian, since at those times all the monasteries, the only compilers of chronicles in England, had been closed.

This report about the failed plan of the great Bacon was considered very important and published: Seckendorf (1781); Kapp in his Introduction to Beehr (1741, Book 8), but then forgotten.

King Henry VIII [1491 – 1547, king from 1509, O. S.] tried to find learned officials at least for some of his pursuits. There had not yet been such rich citizens who would have paid the expenses for preparing their sons for state service (or they had not thought about it, just as it had been for a long time in Russia). The king had to establish a fund himself and those admitted would be therefore called Royal students.

But where should they study? England already had universities but in those times they had been just as useless for such goals as all the other European universities. And what should they, the students, learn?

1. Jurisprudence, and not only theoretically, but even practically. Until those times, from all branches of the science of management the science of justice was the only one which was treated scientifically. For a long time none other [branch of] politics had been able to elevate itself to it.

2. Latin. Not bad! Who reasonably learns Latin fills his head with a thousand other useful matters and unwittingly discusses all as a learned man.

3. French. In those times, that language, still so unpolished, was nevertheless becoming the universal language for state officials if not for the entire cultural world[2]. But who will fail to note that the *mother tongue* was not even hinted at?

4. Foreign affairs. English envoys to foreign countries learn them *par routine*.

5. Students themselves had to learn how to describe history mostly only with respect to state trade. Still no thoughts about factories treating agricultural products or commerce, about scientific military science or finance, on public education etc.

But still, this very restrictive plan was not implemented. And for a centenary the school had not achieved the honour of assisting the education of the great British statesmen. The first instruction in this new but formerly missed matter, the management of the state, is mentioned in the parliamentary acts at the time of the rule of Queen Elizabeth [Elizabeth I, 1533 – 1603, queen from 1558, O. S.].

Notes

1. Nicolas Bacon, 1510 – 1579, father of Francis Bacon.

2. Here is Liapunov's opinion about the French language (his letter to Markov of 28 Oct. 1895 about the forthcoming French – Russian publication of Chebyshev's works, Archive, Russian Academy of Sciences, Fond 173, Inventory 1, 11, No. 12): those works should only be published in French since a Russian edition will be an *unnecessary luxury*; indeed, *each mathematician reads French*.

Alph. DeCandolle (1873) was able to foresee that English will become the international language of science.

32

We, Germans, have already essentially advanced in many very useful branches of science. However, we arrived very late to scientific politics, either in its theoretical or practical meaning. We already had

many universities and in some of them there also was a professor of politics (apparently because Aristotle had thus named one of the sciences which he created[1]). But what had politics then meant? And what did all those *institutiones politicae*, a heap of which had appeared in Germany and Holland in the 16th and 17th centuries?

When speaking about practice, even the regents, especially of the protestant persuasion, had their sons educated in science, but the instructors had usually been candidates of the church department. They only taught, and could have only taught catechism and Latin. After the Thirty Years' War (from ca. 1650) here, as in many other matters, a revolution had occurred. Our regents and well-off nobility had felt the complete futility of the previous education and its utter uselessness. They began to take their sons away from the catechism and idleness, but where to? To the universities? No, they had nothing to do there. To send them to France, partly to learn *mores* (conventions) and, in addition, to study mathematics, architecture, military science, etc. Indeed, at that time there was some possibility of achieving this in Paris.

These travels of the German nobility to France, and mostly only to France, had been the general custom for more than 80 years and had an unthinkable (mostly negative) influence on our whole nation. The groaning contained in innumerable letters of the simple-minded Germans about the so-called cavalier travels are indeed known[2].

Later (about the beginning of the 18th century) it became heard from [German] princes, counts and nobility that they attended universities although not in Germany but in Holland, – in Leiden, Utrecht, where Otto (1726) read a course on a kind of statistics (§ 1), – and Switzerland (Geneva, Lausanne).

Indeed, German universities had not yet been worthy of having future regents or statesmen as listeners. They, the universities, certainly prepared superbly educated school teachers, judges and physicians, but not Kammer-councillors (who had been therefore chosen from scientific unions), not secretaries of Cabinets or emissaries. In 1670 – 1680 the study of *notitia rerum publicarum* (study of public matters [see also Otto (1726), O. S.] had been in full swing in the universities of Helmstedt (Konring), Jena (Bose) and Frankfurt/Oder (Beckmann) and probably included a short discussion of other parts of the course on politics. But the wild despotism which just then flared up crushed science (§ 15) and threw us almost a hundred years back.

There was no help from abroad. During 1640 – 1740 all sorts of political contributions, many of them of high value, had been published in England, but at that time German scientists knew English only a little more than nowadays Russian[3]. French was more generally known but the *Esprit de lois* (the Spirit of the Law) had been still based on Montesquieus'thought and chair[4].

Notes

1. Aristotle created a doctrine of the state.

2. Did these complaints really amount to a negative influence on the whole nation?

3. Book catalogues of the main German (and probably Western in general) libraries are only compiled in the Roman alphabet which additionally testifies that Russian literature is not sufficiently used.

4. I am unable to understand this.

33

Finally the study [of politics] in our universities reached the next steps, spread over our universities, brought theory and practice in friendly connections and obviously changed the entire kind of education of future statesmen.

1. The thrifty king of Prussia, Friedrich Wilhelm [I] established economic professorships in Halle and Frankfurt/Oder (Morhof, 1688 – 1692, III, 3) had long ago published such a proposal) and recommended the lectures [of those professors] for all the students and assured that those who studies this science will be borne in mind for acquiring official positions.

In those times, the term *economics* seldom had a definite meaning, or, more precisely, it rather had infinitely many meanings. Actually, the entire practical politics had therefore an opened door to the universities. A rare phenomenon took place: students had therefore been studying not only the entire *Kameral* sciences [see § 34] but very heterogeneous sciences as parts of economics.

2. Therefore, the already essential stock of German useful writings in all the branches of the entire doctrine of the state had been gradually increasing. And we had also read and applied what the British, French and Italians taught. It was time to *arrange* the material, i. e., according to the German fashion, to compile *Compendia*. Under these circumstances there appeared at the same time two Germans. The first was Bielefeld (1760 – 1772), a courtier rather than professor. Here are excerpts from his book [Sxhlözer quoted tm in their original French]

Introduction, p. 3, § 5. *I venture to propose the following. Reduce politics to a system. Collect the excellent materials now scattered and join their knowledge and experience, consult history and state figures and create thus, if possible, a science which could be taught at the right time to princes by their tutors and to young men in general by professors. This was the practice of Grotius, Pufendorff and Wolff*[1] *with respect to the right of men and nature.* […]

The only merit which I claim is to be the first who attempted to investigate this matter according to a systematic plan. I invite the instructors of that art to perfect it. In magnis voluisse sat est (in essential matters it is sufficient auch sie gewollt zu haben); I leave the translation from that German to those who are capable, O. S.).

P. 4, § 6. *I am not afraid to admonish petty* (cf. § 6, Schl.) *men of letters who treat pedantically everything systematized. A system only eases the study of some matter, assists those who apply it to put the mind in order so that all objects with which our experience daily enriches us, find their natural and convenient places in our memory. This alleviates our inescapable weariness if we* [do not] *wish to obtain confusing and unmethodical knowledge.*

Reasonable pedantry leads to robust knowledge whereas simple reading or superficial study only ensure trumpery. A dazzling jargon of happy talents who promptly grasp the superficiality of science often shamefully disappears when faced with a professional man.

Bielefeld, a very ordinary inhabitant of Hamburg from a family of a shop-keeper (died in 1770), was introduced to Frierich I (den Einziger) when the latter had still been living in Reinsberg, then Bielefeld became the tutor of Prince Ferdinand and entitled *baron*. He

has the immortal honour of being the first to introduce scientific politics to the *courts*. He was a real and erudite scientist and had a character of a courtier. He wrote in French and his style was fully understandable and pleasant and his book was finely printed. Bielefeld circulated it to various courts including that of Ekaterina II who awarded him the order of St. Anne. Regents, ministers and chamberlains read it. Until then, they had no wish to read political books written by the fruitful Justis[2] or other German authors. Many of them, perhaps for the first time ever, began thinking that, in spite of what some scribblers had nattered, scientific politics could have been even practically not quite useless for their high occupations.

Bielefeld, as he proudly claimed, presented nothing less than a really complete system of the whole *cours de politique*. He touched most [of the necessary] matters, but many of them only superficially[3] and all of them disorderedly, without definitely separating their extremely different parts one from another. Public law and the doctrine of constitution, how important are these parts, but he talked his way out of them on seven double pages (pp. 20 – 34)[4].

The third, posthumous part of his book should have been a kind of statistics of the European kingdoms. What he supposed here and there about the future of some countries, for example, Sweden and Russia, should disgust any reader capable of thinking at any wish of becoming a political foreteller.

But it would be an impertinent ingratitude to blame strongly for this and other shortcomings a man who paved a way. However, we are 40 years younger and would be narrow-minded had we not advanced further. Bielefeld remains meritorious for representing the doctrine of the state as a science acceptable to the high and mighty.

And the second German epoch-making man[5], professor Achenwall, is meritorious for being the first to plant politics (although in a completely another meaning) into universities. Here are quotations from his book (1761).

Introduction, p. 1. *Finally, I have ventured to compile an outline of politics* […] *after I had for many years collected pertinent materials and repeatedly expressed my desire that a science so useful for general knowledge will not be so completely ignored by our universities. I* […] *have outlined contemporary ideas and guided myself by them when reading the required lectures. My initial intention was restricted to providing just an indication of a suitable order of the main matters which belonged to that idea.*

The worthy man was acknowledged by his German contemporaries but remained unknown abroad. Already in 1749 Achenwall separated statistics from political chaos (§ 1), compiled a *Compendium* (although not entitled in the best way) and still shorter than usually are the *Compendia* of German professors. There, he only indicated the required matters and even included mere verbiage. But it was incomparably better systematized and ordered and more complete than Bielefeld's contribution. After introducing a more definite terminology he dealt with politics in general (pp. 1 – 11) and mentioned Bielefeld. On pp. 12 – 50 he discussed metapolitics[6] (extremely briefly), public law and the doctrine of constitution. All the rest was practical politics or the science of government. From then

(1761) onward the study of politics for us, Germans, acquired a new image, induced a new kind of study and influenced governments as it is possible to prove and I venture to add a few observations about it.

Notes

1. Hugo Grotius, 1583 – 1645, jurist. One of the creators of international law. Samuel Pufendorff, 1632 – 1694, took in the ideas of Grotius and Hobbes, published a book on jurisprudence and history.

Chr. Wolff, 1679 – 1754, mathematician and philosopher. Following Leibniz, he attempted to create a general system of knowledge.

2. Johann Heinrich Gottlob von Justis, 1717 – 1771, economist and politician.

3. Above, Schlözer implied that Bielefeld had ordered his compiled materials, but now he refuted this impression. Cf. the title of Schlözer (1793).

4. This argument is not sufficiently justified.

5. I hesitate to consider Bielefeld as an epoch-making man.

6. See Note 2 to § 27.

34

A. Literature on the Study of Politics in Germany

In the immense range of that science there is perhaps no part which German authors had not treated. Exactly this is one of our advantageous sides and exactly it is least known abroad. Foreigners are respecting our literature for many years now and often comment on it. However, regrettably for us, Germans (and therefore for people of northern Europe), they often encounter correspondents who consider poets, novelists, actors as a measure of the scientific culture of a people. They report, for example, which verses had the Russians written, but not what did they discover in nature and in the world[1].

There is another circumstance. For a hundred years we had been remaining in disrespect since we had not published anything in folio. Now, the opposite has taken place. Many ideas are contained in university disputes and programmes, still more in journals and in the great number of booklets of all kinds. They [the ideas! O. S.] should be considered as an expansion of science and a correction of larger contributions [and the state of German science ought to be judged by all this]. We have a small number of those larger works as for example Busch (Büsch) (1800). Thousands of shorter papers on separate matters remain unknown to foreigners and we ourselves are not using them sufficiently. We have no new Bielefelds or Achenwalls who would have ordered all these wonderful materials accumulated during 40 years. In other words, we do not yet have a compendium of the entire politic which would have been possible but certainly surprisingly burdensome to achieve.

B. Study of Politics in the Universities.

How politics is being taught nowadays
in many German universities

We began to separate the great field of politics into regions. General public law would have only been an appendage of natural law and especially studied although together with the doctrine of constitution. The science of government or the entire practical politics is extensive and cannot be confined to a term. Some of its *main parts*, namely *police*, *national economy* and *finance* will be taught separately as the Kameral science. The same about *international law* (*cours*

diplomatique) with preliminary practical exercises for those who intend to follow a brilliant *carrière diplomatique*.

Listeners practise in German and French[2] by hearing out and reading reports and during missions abroad. Separate hours are devoted to statistics and history as well as to Kameral science and kindred applied technology, but there is no mention of many subsidiary or kindred sciences, foreign languages, mathematics, economics, or of a survey of positive jurisprudence etc. We call this *to complete a cours de politque*. With these matters we, sluggish Germans, spend two or three years in our universities[3].

C. Political Upbringing

I mean the type of education usual in Germany for a young man not only to become one of the three previous classes of officers (school teacher, judge, physician) but also a member of state service in a narrower sense (Kammer-councillor, chief forest warden, secretary of embassy, minister). That man completes five courses.

1. He receives the initial school education just as all his fellow citizens without exception until age ten or twelve.

2. Then he enters a gymnasium and becomes acquainted with the ancient classical literature, mostly in Latin, learns elements of geography and history and obtains as we, Germans, call it, *fundamental knowledge*.

I do not dwell here on the different names or classification of these schools and gymnasiums or their innumerable modifications due to the different destination of the young men, and the same concerning education at home.

3. Now he is about sixteen or eighteen years old and for two or three years more studies in a university his chosen special branch of scientific knowledge.

4. If he belongs to the lucky people (§ 29), he goes travelling. Is it possible to doubt the usefulness of travel after such preparation? Many years ago a French academy proposed this question as a prize problem and awarded a negative answer!

5. After returning home, either from travelling or from the university, he applies to the *Landes Kollegio*, produces certificates from his instructors and is solemnly examined once or many times in his chosen sciences. In Prussia and Hanover the examinations are known to be mostly severe.

If he passes, he will be admitted as an auditor, Referendar (candidate for position in state service) or assessor (candidate for an administrative or judicial position). *Admitted* means works without payment in the field in which he studied and is experienced for a longer or a shorter time depending on his talent, diligence and behaviour. Sometimes, if he has a patron somewhere in the Kollegio, all this is omitted and he obtains a real paid position henceforth. Thus German boys and youngsters become state servants, *Volksmitregierer*. I call it the present German, or perhaps all-German way of education since it is the same in Denmark and Sweden. However, *Olim non erat sic* (it was not long ago) not here, at least not in *carrière politique* (§ 32).

Even now this German way of education differs from that in other cultural countries in many features, especially in the third course. Until most recent times it had been omitted, for example in Russia. In

Russia, France, North America[4] and other countries reforms of the programmes of study and of the institutions of general education, especially those for preparing efficient state officers, are nowadays in the order of the day. Everything is moving. Many novelties clearly draw together our institutions. I will perhaps render a service to some foreign readers by explaining them our national words *studieren, Student, Universität*.

Notes

1. Derzhavin had written verses (and, much later than 1804, Pushkin and Lermontov as well). Among mariners we may mention in the first place Bering (a Dane by birth) and, among scientists, Lomonosov as well as Euler and Daniel Bernoulli (who regularly published his works in Petersburg).

2. German students certainly did not practise German and French the same way.

3. In 1774, Junker, the late German professor in the Paris military school, informed the cadets in a printed announcement [Schlözer published it in its original French]:

For those young men who destine themselves for state affairs [I announce] *a course on political sciences containing the principles of natural law and universal jurisprudence, the rights of men, politics in its proper sense, the public law in Europe, and, in particular, of the Germanic empire coupled with a brief exposition of political history and constitutions of the main European states, interests of the princes and the duties of ambassadors and ministers.*

The lectures will begin on 2 November and continue for four months three times weekly (six hours). The price of the course is 6 Louis to be paid in advance.

Seven main sciences in four months, three times weekly! However, in my copy, *four* is replaced by *five*. Schl.

4. North America includes Canada, but Schlözer hardly thought about it. So why did not he mention the USA properly?

35

Sometimes, when I tell foreigners that we only have a small number of governments [administrations] (Regierungen) in which some employees of state institutions from presidents (Präsidenten) down to clerks have not studied (studiert), they do not understand me. Actually, no other language except German, Swedish and Danish has the word *studieren* in our sense. (The French *étudier* in that sense is even now a Germanism.) Russians only have *learn* (uchitsa) which covers everything from elementary school to university. Ask a German artisan whether his son is still a school student or already an apprentice, and he will (always? O. S.) proudly answer: *No, he ought to studieren*, or, *he studiert already*.

Our own understanding of *university* had for a long time been also incomprehensible for foreigners. In the Paris university young men aged from ten to twelve had learned Latin and classical literature in other languages (§34: fundamental knowledge is achieved in our gymnasiums). They graduate being ca. sixteen, and after that they ought to educate themselves further in higher (?) and practical sciences by reading and other means. The celebrated De Guignes[1] spoke with me in 1774 about a completely different sense of our universities, finally understood me perfectly well and uttered a quite proper definition:

You, Germans begin in your universities at the point at which we stop and you go further.

Our German method of education has yet other peculiarities about which many foreigners are surprised.

1. The number of those studying is very large. For a region with total population of a million we may reliably suppose that in the mean year not less than 300 are studying in university (always one out of 1600 males [of 1700 of males of any age!]). Therefore, from 20 *mln* inhabitants there will always be 6000 [5880].

2. Everyone studies independently from his social standing. The sons of peasants and townspeople as well as old and new nobles. Hardly anywhere the officials (except courtiers) are, as previously, only from the higher stratum of the society. Connections and nepotism may still, as everywhere, influence, but birthright affects much less than formerly. However, our nobles began to study as seriously as ordinary people and therefore lay down their birthright and retain anew their former privileged position with respect to ordinary citizen.

3. The government does not pay for the student life or the cost of the study so that son studies at the expense of father. If the state needs a schoolteacher or a secretary, ten interested will apply for each opening whereas their long and expensive education did not cost the government even a penny. (At the time of Louis XV it was calculated that each officer graduated from the Ecole militaire had cost 20,000 louis. And how much should have been the Russian government spending long since for the education of its officials!)

Grants and other means of aiding exist everywhere but there are not enough of them and nowadays they are insufficient for ensuring study all by themselves. Some catholic countries are an exception. It was recently found out that in Vienna there is a fund with a capital of more than 4 1/2 *mln* gulden for students (presumably only for those who are preparing themselves to work for the church). The yearly interest on the capital amounts more than to 180,000 gulden which are distributed as grants.

Some precise calculations pertaining to many of our universities have been recently become available. It should be desired and hoped that such calculations will appear oftener since important conclusions will become possible by their comparison. I am now providing some pertinent data as a proof of my information formulated above.

In the large electorate Pfalz – Bavaria (*population ca.* 2 *mln*) *in 1802 in two universities and five gymnasiums there were 1244 students who actually studied or had been determined to study. Among them were 244 noblemen* (*more than* 1/5), *665 townspeople and 335 from peasants. For a poor student there always were two in a good situation. That number even after subtracting the gymnasiums students*[2] *is too large for a country of 2 mln and harms manufactures, handicraft etc. And the government had indeed taken measures to restrict extremely strictly the number of studying. Among the townspeople that number had already diminished, but it increased among the peasants who remained well-being during the latest years because of high prises.*

(from the *National Zeitung*, 1803).

In the autumn term of 1802, in the kingdom of Sweden (with about 3 *mln* inhabitants) there were three universities in Uppsala, Abo and Lund with 1840 students in all of them. Among them there were only 85 nobles, but almost 500 were sons of preachers and 336 from peasants. Also, 104 aged less than fifteen and 343 aged 25 – 40 years and more. After subtracting them there remain 1393 proper students[3]. Among all of them 110 drew royal grants and 138, private grants (*Allg. Litteratur-Zeitung Intelligenzbl*. 1803, No. 191).

In Göttingen, in the summer term of 1784, 160 were entered, and among them a prince, 5 counts, 27 nobles, 31 from peasants and the rest were foreigners (Pütter 1788, Tl. 2, p. 376).

I omit other peculiar features which favourably influence not only our universities, but the whole present situation of German science and which von Villers touched in the *Spectateur du Nord*. For example, it was attempted to create a real *Universitates litterarum* (scientific) and instruct as much as possible *in omni scibili* (in all particular branches of knowledge). Also, to concentrate all the educational institutions in one place so that they will easier be able to support each other. Then, to arrange the scientific education so intelligibly and practically that it will be useful even for those who did not reckon themselves proper scientists (future merchants, factory owners, dyers, economists, forest wardens etc.).

The docents are not confined to a certain place for all their lives. They are not always the same, they are mobile, their salaries can increase. Their talent, diligence or *renommee* (fame) is noted and from time to time either their situation improves or they are called elsewhere to occupy more favourable positions. What a *migratio professorum* in and out of Germany is taking place exactly now! Those responsible are outbidding each other and the scientific commodities become therefore more expensive (as a minister expressed himself), but certainly better to the advantage of factories and the people.

Notes

1. Joseph de Guignes, 1721 – 1800, an orientalist.
2. The universities are not regrettably properly separated from the gymnasiums.
3. Why are the students of those age groups separated from the others?

36

In § 34 I described the five courses (or at least four if the travel is omitted) as the general method of education in Germany, mostly for those who intend to follow a *carrière politique*, but there are many exceptions about which I said enough in § 29. From year to year thousands are certainly thus educated and a very small number of them cut the university.

In the *J. de Frankfort* No. 24 for 24 Jan. 1804 I came across an article *Exposé de la situation de la république* etc. with information about a new institution in France, possibly similar to our course for auditors (§ 34)[1]. [Schlözer quotes the text in its original French.]:

Another institution of the Conseil d'Etat is preparing people according to the government's choice for all the supreme branches of the administration: auditors for compiling regulations and laws and for inserting principles and maxims in the general rules. Always surrounded by witnesses and judges, often under the government's eyes, or during important missions, they begin to fulfil public duties with mature experience and reliability ensured them by their character, behaviour and tested knowledge.

I do not know anything about the structure of that institution.

Note

1. Schlözer referred to p. 131 of that § 34 but in vain.

37

The unusual tension is nowadays being experienced in Russia by the desire both to raise general enlightenment and especially to educate nationals for state service. This is known to the world and provokes general surprise and justifies serious expectations. The beneficial nature of that process becomes clearer after throwing a glance at what existed only a hundred years ago. A comparison with those times should lead both the Russians and the foreigners to thanks and best wishes.

Peter the Great found out that his people, even then numerous, were existing with respect to culture almost in the same state as the rest of Europe had been in the 14th century. Not a single school in the entire great realm, not a single university! Indeed, who will mention Kiev or the ecclesiastic seminaries[1]. The great man had been for a long time thinking about arranging the management of the state in the Swedish and French manner. So he needed scientists or at least educated civil servants. But where could he find them? It was impossible to employ only foreigners whereas nationals could be chosen only gradually, beginning with adolescents and educating them.

It was also possible to educate adults, just as the military, *par routine*, then they will serve a certain number of years beginning from the bottom. This remarkable rule was entered in the *Table of Ranks* adopted on 22 January 1722. Büsching translated it into German, completely, as it seems, in his *Magazin f. neue Historie u. Geographie*, Bd. 7, pp. 349 – 360. [See *Table of Ranks* in Wikipedia. An English translation of 2016 is indicated there. An article thus named is in the *Great Sov. Enc.*, in vol. 25 of its third edition. This edition is translated into English, see Note 6 to § 24.

The *Table* is indeed a table of 14 grades of ranks and 19 sections of commentaries (the *Encyclopaedia* wrongly mentions 14). Schlözer had only repeated sections 13 and 14, but, since there exists an English translation of the entire *Table*, I only briefly comment on them.

Military ranks were declared higher than civil, since

It will be insulting for the military, who deserved it by many years of cruel service, to see an equal or even a higher person without [such] *merit*.

Children of noblemen are promoted from the bottom. Those who had studied and have been actually educated are promoted more rapidly and sent to foreign parts for practising. O. S.]

And so, at that time Russians did however study in universities, but where and how? And had these regulations of the great man been fulfilled (1722 – 1802), or were they, like so many other documents, ignored? Foreigners cannot yet answer this question reliably. It is only possible to say the following in general.

In the next twenty years the state had been to a large extent managed by foreign civil servants, mostly Germans. During those years crowds of them migrated to Russia and found their luck, deservedly or not. However, it can be justifiably stated that due care about Russian culture had not been manifested. Elizabeth (Elizaveta Petrovna[2]) is known to have hated Germans and, when foreigners

were necessary, preferred the French. She delivered a mortal blow to the national culture by her Ukaz[3] which stipulated that no person of common origin can occupy a position higher than a secretarial in any state collegium[4].

Here then was the emerged method of education. The rich nobles had been employing chamberlains or teachers for their sons and paying them unprecendentedly generously. Not rarely these were runaway French officers, but oftener simple artisans, hairdressers or man-servants. Even twenty years ago there appeared a Russian comedy in which the education of as son of a landowner by a French coachman was bitingly described. As a play, it is still beloved by the Russian public.

Nowadays those youngsters 16 – 18 years old harnessed by such coachmen learn to chat in French, read and even somewhat write, grasp some elements of geography and history from current French booklets. They certainly do not possess even a tenth part of the knowledge acquired by a sixteen-years-old German youth in a good gymnasium. And now the young ignoramus has a position in a state collegium with title and rank, not as was intended by Peter I, – from the bottom, – but at once positioned as a translator etc. and often even paid. And in that once determined for him position he vegetates, marks time, becomes promoted both in rank and payment and naturally feels himself as being in real service for which he should have been educated but how?

1. By reading. Indeed, anyone understanding the new languages can become highly educated given the present European literature. But does the young man understand the art of reading? Does he know which books he should read? Is he sufficiently patient for spending a few months to study a main source?

Infinitely less tedious, as compared with lifeless reading, is hearing a lively oral report. Reading ten books devoted to a single matter requires much time, but a docent can tell him their essence in a few hours. And a soft compulsion to be reasoning out a science in a definite order for a whole term will do the refugee (?) exceptionally well. The invariable possibility to clear up the obscure passages and resolve doubts by turning to the docent – how will it ease those who are really eager to increase their knowledge!

2. By travelling. Not a single word after what I had described in detail about the ill-starred travelling of the unprepared. Nevertheless hundreds of Russian nobles go to Paris and elsewhere travelling in the previous regrettable way (*Allg. Zeitung*, 1804, No. 100). But suddenly the spirit of Aleksandr I[5] began fluttering over his nation. In the autumn of 1802 our Göttingen university was pleased to receive a Russian colony partly of young nobles and partly of otherwise respected families. Many of them had already been admitted in the abovementioned way to state service. They had decided to go travelling not *à la mode* (following the custom) but wishing to study *les sciences exactes*, which meant going to places in which they expected the required possibility (in the first place, to Göttingen or Paris).

They had been unusually well acquainted with other sciences as well (?) with which they had been somewhat occupied. However, they began studying these sciences once more and were exceptionally successful since the education in our universities includes an easy survey of separate sciences.

One of them told me after the first term as naively as Socrates that only now he understood that he knows nothing. All of his fellow citizens were of the same opinion. Consequently, instead of half a year as planned at first they came to the third term.

What had occurred meanwhile in Russia is discussed in Europe. The new educational institutions are obviously copying our German institutions. The sequence of attending schools, gymnasiums, universities and travelling is the same. These novelties are improved copies, for example in the existence of large charitable funds. Only for the beginning each of the new or renovated universities (in Petersburg, Moscow[6], Kazan and Kharkov, not to mention Vilnius or Dorpat [Tartu]) has a fund with a yearly income of 130,000 roubles. There are 42 gymnasiums and 405 district schools. For all these institutions taken together the government allocates 1,319,450 roubles yearly. And, as I came to know, an institute of the *Departément des aff. étrangères* (Ministry of Foreign Affairs) in Petersburg is created. The public will soon know about it.

Notes

1. See below about Russian universities. Why had Schlözer separated Kiev?

The Kiev-Mohila Academy was opened in 1632 (*Great Sov. Enc.*, third edition, vol. 12, 1973). In 1701, the Moscow School of Mathematics and Navigation was opened and the St. Peter's secondary school in Petersburg, in 1709. Its headmaster was Büsching.

2. Elizabeth (Elizaveta Petrovna), 1709 – 1761, empress from 1741.

3. I have not yet (!) seen this Ukaz and describe it according to innumerable travelogues which had certainly often deceived me. Louis XV also caused much displeasure by ordering that people of humble origin will not advance higher than lieutenant. Schl.

4. Fonvizin's play *The Minor* which Schlözer had in mind was staged in 1782 and published in 1783. The minor had three teachers, two of them Russians and one foreigner with a German name Vralman (Liarman) and German he was according to the context (not French!). The two Russian teachers taken together were acquainted with the elements (or elements of elements) of arithmetic, grammar and Christianity. Contrary to Schlözer, they were paid miserably.

Pushkin's hero Eugene Onegin from a poem of the same name (on which he began working in 1823), see the first stanzas of its Chapter 1, spoke and read French, danced properly and bowed at ease, so that the high society decided that he was clever and nice. In the mid-18th century Pushkin's hero of his *Captain's Daughter* was enlisted as sergeant in a prestigious regiment even before birth! His teacher, a Frenchman, had not taught him anything at all.

5. Aleksandr I, 1777 – 1825, emperor since 1801. At the beginning of his reign he was a moderate liberal.

6. Moscow University is older than the Petersburg University.

Author's Bibliography

Achenwall G. (1748), *Notitia rerum publicarum*.

--- (1749), *Staatsverfassung der heutigen vornehmsten europäischen Reiche und Völke im Grundrisse*. Göttingen.

--- (1752), *Staatsverfassung der europäischen Reiche im Grundrisse*. First ediiton 1749: *Abriß der neuesten Staatswissenschaft* etc.

--- (1761), *Die Staatsklügheit nach ihren ersten Grundsätzen*. Göttingen.

Beausobre L. von (1773, French), *Allgemeine Einleitung in die Kenntniß der Politik, der Finanz und Handelwissenschaft*. Riga. Translated by F. A. Albaum.

Behr (Beehr) J. von (1741), *Rerum Meclenburgicarum* … Leipzig.

--- (1793), *Statsgelartheit nach ihren Hauptteilen*, Tl. 1. Göttingen.

Berchtold L. (1789), *Essay to Direct and Extend the Inquiries of Patriotic Travellers* …, vols 1 – 2. London.

Bielfeld J. F. von (1760 – 1772), *Institutions politiques*, tt. 1 – 3. La Haye.

--- (1770), *The Elements of Universal Erudition*, bks 1 – 3.

Bonnaire (an X), *Statistique du département des Hautes-Alpes*.

Breton de LaMartinière J. B. J. (1803), *Voyage en Piemont*. Paris.

Boulainvilliers H. (1727), *Histoire de l'ancien gouvernement de la France* … . La Haye – Amsterdam, tt. 1 – 3.

--- (1727 – 1728), *Etat de la France* … London.

Burnet G. (1679), *History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, vol. 1.

Busch (Büsch) J. G. (1796), *Grundriß einer Geschichte der merkwürdigsten Welthändel*. Hamburg. Third edition.

--- (1800), *Abhandlung von dem Geldumlauf*, Tl. 2. Hamburg – Kiel. Also in *Sämmtl. Shriften*, Bd. 10. Wien, 1816.

Büsching A. F. (1758), *Vorbereitung zur gründlichen und nützlichen Kenntniß der geographischen Beschaffenheit und Staatsverfassung der europäischen Reiche und Republiken* … Sixth edition 1784.

Cicero (1928), *On the Republic. On the Laws*. Cambridge.

Clament (an X), Parallèle de le géographie avec la statistique. *Moniteur*, No. 303, 10 Thermid.

Chantreu P. N. (1803 – 1806), *Science de l'histoire*.

Curtius M. K. (1780), *Geschichte und Statistik d. weltl. fürstl. Häuser in Deutschland*. Marburg.

Décade (1794 – 1807), *Décade philosophique*, tt. 1 – 9. An anthology.

Donnant D. F. (1805), *Théorie élémentaire de la statistique*. Schlözer referred to a preliminary report in a journal.

Expilly (Abbé) (1764), *Dictionnaire géographique, historique et politique des Gaules et de la France*, t. 3. Amsterdam.

Force Piganiol de la J.-A. (1765), *Description historique de la ville de Paris et de ses environs*, t. 4. Paris. Second edition.

Gatterer J. S. (1773), *Ideal einer allgemeinen Weltstatistik*. Göttingen.

Giováne Julie de (1797), *Plan pour faire servir les voyages à la culture des jeunes gens* … Wien

Heynitz F. A. (1786), *Sur les produits du regne mineral de la monarchie prussienne*. Berlin.

Laumond (an X), *Statistique du département du Bas-Rhin*. Paris.

Lüder A. F. (1792), *Einleitung in die Staatskunde*, Bd. 1. Leipzig.

Meusel J. G. (1790), *Literatur der Statistik*. Leipzig.

--- (1792), *Lehrbuch der Statistik*. Fourth edition 1804.

Necker J. (1784), *Sur l'administration des finances de la France*, t. 3.

Nettelbladt D. (1773), *Erörterungen einiger einzelner Lehren des deutschen Statsrechtes*. Halle.

Oldenburger P. A. (1685), *Thesauri rerum publicarum*, t. 4. *Itinerario German. politico*. Helmstedt.

Otto E. (1726), *Primae lineae notitiae rerum publicata*.

Pauli C. F. (1750), *Von dem Begriff und denen Grenzen der Staatskenntniß*. Halle.

Pütter J. S. (1788), *Versuch einer akademischen Gelehrten-Geschichte von der Georg-Augustus Universität* …, Tl. 2.

Remer J. A. (1786), *Lehrbuch der Staatskunde der vornehmsten Europäischen Staaten*. Braunschweig.

Seckendorf V. L., *Reformations-Geschichte*. Excerpt: Ch. F. Junius, *Historia Lutheranismus*, Bd. 1. Tübingen, 1781.

Schlözer A. L. (1793), *Allgemeine Staatsrecht und Verfassungslehre, Metapolitik.* Göttingen.

Schwartner M. von (1798), *Statistik der Königreich Ungarn*. Ofen, 1809, Tl. 1.

Sinclair J. (1791 – 1799), *The Statistical Account of Scotland* …, vols 1 – 21. Edinburgh.

Sonnerat P. (1783), *Reise nach Ostindien … 1774 – 1781*. Leipzig, 1783. Reprint: Presses Univ. de Rennes, ca. 2004.

Sprengel M. C. (1793), *Grundriß der Staatskunde.* Halle.

Sueton (1913), *Life of Augustus* (*The Life of the Caesars*). Loeb Classical Library.

--- (1957), *The Twelve Caesers*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex.

Synesius (1612), *Opere*. Paris.

Thurmann C. (1701), *Bibliotheca statistica*. Halle.

Toze E. (1767), *Einleitung zur allgemein und besonderen Europäischen Staatskunde*. Wismar.

Welch J. G. (1749), *De ritibus baptismalihus*. Jena.

Young A. (1772), *Political Essays concerning the Present State of the British Empire*.

Translator's Bibliography

Anchersen J. P. (1741), *Descriptio statuum cultiorum in tabulis.* Copenhagen – Leipzig.

Anonymous (1838), Introduction. *J. Stat. Soc. London*, vol. 1, pp. 1 – 5.

Bernoulli Daniel (1766), Essai d'une nouvelle analyse de la mortalité causée par la petite vérole … *Werke*, Bd. 2. Basel, pp. 235 – 267.

Caesar (2002), *The Gallic Wars*. London.

Casper J. L. (1825), *Beiträge zur medizinischen Statistik*, Bd. 1. Berlin.

Chernoff H., Moses L. E. (1959), *Elementary Decision Theory*. New York.

Chuprov A. A. (1909), *Ocherki po Teorii Statistiki* (Essays on the Theory of Statistics).Moscow, 1959.

--- (1922, German), Textbooks in statistics. In author's *Voprosy Statistiki* (Issues in Statistics). Moscow, 1960, pp. 413 – 429.

Chuprov A. I. (1910), *Uchenye Trudy. Kurs Statistiki* (Scient. Works. Course on Statistics). Moscow.

Cicero (1952), *De oratore.* Latin – German edition. Reclam.

Congrès (1858), *Congrès International de Statistique. C. r.* of session in Vienna, 1857.

DeCandolle Alph. (1873 франц.), On a dominant language for science. *Annual Rept Smithsonian Instn* for 1874, 1875, pp. 239 – 248.

Donnant D. F. (1805), *Théorie élémentaire de la statistique*.

Druzhinin N. K. (1963), *Khrestomatia po Isstorii Russkoi Statistiki* (Reader in History of Russian Statistics). Moscow.

Funkhauser H. G. (1937), Historical development of the graphical representation of statistical data. *Osiris*, t. 3, pp. 269 – 405.

Graunt J. (1662), *Natural and Political Observations Made upon the Bills of Mortality* … London. Also in Petty (1899, vol. 2, pp. 317 – 435).

Herrmann K. Th.. (1809, Russian), General Theory of Statistics. In Druzhinin (1963, pp. 45 – 61, an excerpt).

Humboldt A. (1815), Prolegomena. In Bonpland A. Humboldt A., *Nova genera et species plantarum*, t. 1.

--- (1845 – 1862), *Kosmos*, Bde 1 – 5.Stuttgart. *Cosmos*, vols. 1 – 4. New York, 1850 – 1858.

Kendall M. G. (1960), Where shall the history of statistics begin? *Biometrika*, vol. 47, pp. 447 – 449. Reprint: Pearson & Kendall (1970, pp. 45 – 46).

Knies C. G. A. (1850), *Die Statistik als selbständige Wissenschaft*. Kassel. [Frankfurt/Main, 1969.]

Lamarck J. B. (1820), *Système analytique* etc. Paris.

Leibniz G. W. (manuscript 1680), Von Bestellung eines Registratur-Amtes. *Werke*, Reihe 1, Bd. 5. Hannover, 1866, pp. 315 – 320.

Montesquieu Ch. de Secondat (1748), *De l'esprit du lois*. 1748 (publ. anonymously). *The Spirit of Laws*, 1793.

Moreau de Jonnès A. (1847), *Eléments de statistique*. Paris. English translation of the first two chapters: **S, G,** 58.

Morhof D. G. (1688 – 1692), *Polyhistor Lübeck*, Bde 1 – 2, 1992.

Nordenmark N. V. E. (1929), Pehr Wilhelm Wargentin, 1717 – 1783. *Nordic Stat. J.*, vol. 1, pp. 241 – 252.

Pascal B. (1669), Pensées. *Oeuvr. Compl*., t. 2. Paris, pp. 543 – 1046.

Pearson E. S., Kendall M. G., Editors (1970), *Studies in the History of Statistics and Probability*. London.

Pearson K. (1978), *History of Statistics in the 17th and 18th Centuries* … Lectures 1921 – 1933. London. Editor E. S. Pearson.

Petty W. (1899), *Economic Writings*, viols. 1 – 2. Editor C. H. Hull. Cambridge. [London, 1997.]

Ploshko B. G., Eliseeva I. I. (1990), *Istoria Statistiki* (History of Statistics). Moscow.

Quetelet A. (1846), *Lettres … sur la théorie des probabilités*. Bruxelles.

--- (1853), Notice sur M. E. Smit. *Bull. Comm. Centr. de Statistique* [*Belg.*], t. 5, pp. 533 – 544.

Royston Erica (1956), Note on the history of the graphical presentation of data. *Biometrika*, vol. 43, pp. 241 – 247. Reprint: Pearson & Kendall (1970, pp. 173 – 181).

Schlözer C. (1823, French), *Grundriß der Gegenstände, welche in der Theorie der Statistik* […] *enthalten sind*. Göttingen, 1827.

Sharon A. (1989), *Warrior*. New York.

Sheynin O. (1976), Laplace's work in probability. *Arch. Hist. Ex. Sci.*, vol. 16, pp. 137 – 187.

--- (1977), Early history of the theory of probability. Ibidem, vol. vol. 17, pp. 201 – 259.

--- (1980), On the history of the statistical method in biology. Ibidem, vol. 22, pp. 323 – 371.

--- (1982), On the history of medical statistics. Ibidem, vol. 26, pp. 241 – 286.

--- (1984), On the history of the statistical method in meteorology. Ibidem, vol. 31, pp. 53 – 95.

--- (1997), Achenwall. *Enc. of Stat. Sciences*, vol. 1. Hobokan, NJ, 2006, pp. 26 – 27.

--- (2003, English and Russian), *Gumbel, Einstein and Russia*. Moscow.

--- (2009), *Theory of Probability. Historical Essay*. Berlin.

--- (2014, Russian), On the history of university statistics. *Silesian Stat. Rev.*, No. 14 (20), 2016, pp. 7 – 25.

Socrates (1923), *Memorabilia by Xenophon*. Harvard Univ.

Spottiswoode W. (1861), On typical mountain ranges: an application of the calculus of probabilities to physical geography. *J. Roy. Geogr. Soc.*, vol. 31, pp. 149 – 154.

Steven S. (1981), *The Spymasters of Israel*. London.

Süssmilch J. P. (1741), *Die Göttliche Ordnung* … Berlin, 1765. A few later editions.

--- (1758), Gedanken von den epidemischen Krankheiten. Reprint: Wilke J., Editor (1994), *Die königliche Residenz und die Mark Brandenburg im 18. Jahrhundert.* Berlin, pp. 69 – 116.

Tacitus (1956), *Annals of Imperial Rome*. London.

Woolhouse W. S. B. (1873), On the philosophy of statistics. *J. Inst. Actuaries*, vol. 17, pp. 37 – 56.