

Evolution of Psychology of the Russian Bureaucracy During the Revolution of 1905-1907 Years

¹Ivan T. Shatohin, ¹Aleksandr N. Moshkin, ¹Svetlana B. Shatohina

¹Oksana V. Shevchenko and ²Aleksandr V. Perepelitsyn

¹Belgorod State University, Pobeda Street 85, 308015 Belgorod, Russia

²Voronezh State Pedagogical University, Lenin Street 86, 394043 Voronezh, Russia

Abstract: The revolutionary upheaval of 1905-1907 years covered all aspects of life in the country. The result of the revolution, among other things was the change of psychology of the Russian bureaucracy which had lost confidence in the inviolability of the state system and its position. Bureaucracy in 1905, on the one hand, was under increasing terror of radical political groups, on the other hand, with the development of the revolution was losing vision because of the indecision and confusion of the Supreme power.

Key words: Historical psychology, bureaucracy, revolution of 1905-1907, governor, political terror

INTRODUCTION

The change of mentality and socio-psychological views of social groups is a natural historical process which is determined by the evolution of their daily life. The change of the legislation regulating the legal status of social groups, new trends in development of economy, modernization of equipment and introduction of technological innovations into people's lives changed not only official and private everyday life but also the inner world of people, their values, ideals, behavioural motivation. Moreover, in history there are times when their way of life and established practices are broken under the impact of social upheavals-wars or revolutions. A similar period took place during the First Russian Revolution 1905-1907 years. And this could not affect changes in behavioral patterns and mentality of the Russian bureaucracy.

The history of the Russian Revolution in the post soviet period in the Russian historiography has ceased to be relevant and popular issues. Rare studies, however, suggested new approaches to understanding the events of the early 20th century (for example, Leonov, Kanishhev and Shherbinin. The new estimates, accents and perspectives in the study of the revolution of 1905-1907 proposed the doctrine of the Institute of Russian History in the collective monograph. Interest in the Russian revolution is not lost in the English historiography. Its development continued historians of the older generation (Ascher, 2004, etc.) and young researchers (Geifman, 1993; Malone, 2004, etc).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

For the solution of research tasks sources of personal origin were used. It's memories of Russian officials who held positions of governors, ministers as well as the memoirs of family members of officials and contemporaries, who knew the bureaucratic environment. Content analysis of sources used allowed to conclude the following: despite the fact that almost all of the examined memoirs written after the collapse of the imperial state system, the authors accurately and consistently evaluate the evolution of the psychology of officials in the period of revolutionary upheaval. This conclusion is confirmed by the comparative analysis. Comparison of the psychological sketches of S. Yu. Vitte, who wrote his memoirs after the First Russian Revolution and these stories come from authors of a later time show the closeness and similarity of the essential assessments and descriptions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Fully accruing crisis phenomena in local crown management was already evident in the revolutionary year 1905, when the Ministry of Internal Affairs was forced to make a disappointing conclusion: "the governors don't give realize the seriousness of what is happening in their eyes, phenomena, in the decisive moments they are lost and take action, on the contrary, contributing to the expansion of the riots". The conclusion reached by the Ministry after the fact, the weakness of the governors were known to the Russian public and the authorities. Drawing the ideal of a Governor, a famous public activist

and correspondent of Nicholas II, wrote in his newspaper "The Citizen": "of one's own energy is not enough for the governor, without the possession of tact, endurance and balance, the governor, who under the pretext of strengthening the power is in the county of yell: I'll show you, I ask you and other manifestations of power but raised our fists, capable, more harmful than the weak governor" (Shacillo, 2000). The head of government S. Yu. Vitte, describing the positions of various social groups on the eve of 17 October 1905, clearly pointed out the impossibility of a reliable support of absolutism in this layer as "officials, seeing close many orders of magnitude in the offices and the system of protectionism, developed in the reign of Nicholas II to gigantic proportions, began against the regime which served". Confirms the words of S. Yu. Vitte and Minister of Finance V.N. Kokovtsov. Defining the political situation in the province during the operation of the first State Duma, he gives a description of the voltage which was discussed in the Council of Ministers telegrams to the governors. They were anxiously observed, "governors can't vouch for the maintenance of order and warned of the possibility of the most extreme consequences. It was also stated fermentation that swept the lower bureaucratic environment and almost heard everywhere that calm, coming after the suppression of the Moscow uprising is replaced by open manifestations of the revolutionary ferment which cannot be eliminated by any measures" (Kokovcov, 2004).

The Governor's body was engulfed in confusion and perplexity, when they are striving to consistently defend the interests of the supreme power, learned that the government dramatically changed course. It happened, when was published the famous manifesto of 17 October 1905. Very vividly describes in his memoirs, the Deputy Director of the Department for General Affairs of the Ministry of Internal Affairs S.N. Paleolog state of local authorities in those days. "The Manifesto of 17 October 1905 was caught off guard by our provincial administration and the military authorities. No one was prepared for this act and the initial clarification of the Directive from the centre, in particular the President of the Council of Ministers, Vitte was more than evasive in nature. Everyone understood "freedom" in their own way. In many places, confused the authorities, fearing not to fall, was ready to surrender the arrogant revolutionaries. Come down to the fact that the Perm Governor A.P. Naumov accidentally took part in some crowded procession to the Governor's house came up with a revolutionary crowd, carrying a red flag forced him on the road imposed. This is not a joke. Naumov had civil courage immediately about what had happened to him

misfortune a telegraph to send a detailed message to the Minister of Internal Affairs and I was the researcher of the report to the Emperor a petition of resignation of Naumov, the discrepancy from the position held by it". Minsk Governor P.G. Vergeles was outraged and full of indignation when he received the official text of the Manifesto of October 17 as they found out about its existence before and not from the interior Ministry. The Manifesto was circulated privately. In his memoirs in exile, he wrote with bitterness, "that the revolutionary party cared much more about awareness of their provincial comrades about the situation than the Ministry of the interior, the governors" (Kurlov, 2002). The Yaroslavl Governor A. P. Rogovich after receiving the Manifesto resigned, announced his disagreement with the government. It is only some evidence of the loss of government management of the country in those days. This could not become a breeding ground for the formation of the state which some historians call the "devastation in their heads". This could not form the sovereign's servants distrust of the autocrat, the uncertainty in its position, her career and given birth to a hidden bitterness and anger to the representatives of the highest echelons of power.

Psychology behavioral stereotypes especially in the context of the revolutionary events all officials, other than officials of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, against the governor, personified and actually defending the autocracy, was in the secret or explicit detachment. Sometimes such opposition acted openly and decisively, demonstrating to society and especially to the revolutionary camp, the lack of unity of power and thereby, undermining its foundations. The eldest daughter of P. A. Stolypin gives an interesting example of such a situation characterizes the relationship between her father, Saratov Governor with local bureaucratic opposition on the eve of the First Russian Revolution. "War has come and papa has an even more difficult time, especially in the ranks of the administration were very far from unanimity in the political attitude. So, occupying a prominent position branch Manager of farmers Bank Bean convinced peasants that they have nothing to buy the land from the landlords, as is still the land soon all will belong to the people. The Prosecutor Trial chamber of the Makarov is clearly and unashamedly expressed their hostility to papa".

So, if the Saratov Governor P.A. Stolypin some provincial administrators openly became frondeurs in terms of the revolution, the Minsk Prosecutor Bibikov directly asked the Governor P. G. Kurlov to transfer power into the hands of the judiciary after the latter has adopted very stringent measures for the "settlement order" in the provincial centre (Kurlov, 2002).

The goals and objectives of the revolution were hostile to the Russian bureaucracy as it is, exercising state control in the name and on behalf of the autocrat, stood guard of the existing system but because the law and professional ethics had to deal with any anti-government and anti-monarchist actions. The revolutionary camp, regardless of the actual actions of the government and its agents, officials considered their main enemy which is usually the revolutionaries identified with autocracy. It is not surprising that terrorist acts were directed against all agents of the government "killed" "the office." Only in 1905 in Russia killed 20 governors. Next year three more were killed Governor (Tver, Samara and Simbirsk), killed the mayor of St. Petersburg and the Warsaw Governor-General. In addition, in the second year of the revolution killed and wounded 768 820 officials of different levels. During 1901-1911, from the revolutionary terror affected about 17 thousand people, among which about half were civil servants.

The loss during the First Russian Revolution of significant part of the provincial bureaucracy of faith in the power and the inviolability of the autocracy destroyed the psychological basis of service "for conscience", the conviction. The service is now "fear" has become dominant in psychology official. And this fear was not before the monarch and bosses faces and before the revolutionary element, to radical terrorist groups. Many thousands of attempts on the lives of the sovereign's servants formed an ugly climate of fear and uncertainty that was repeatedly mentioned in the memoirs of contemporaries. One piece of evidence we find the son who was killed in December 1906 the leader of the right in the State Council of count Alexander Ignatiev: "every day, wear the uniform with mourning band and go to a memorial service, then one, then another, to General or dignitary... Now sad orthodox chants only increased the gloomy mood of the ruling circles and has not yet recovered from the fear caused by the revolution".

They understand that signature authority is unable to resolve a serious socio-economic problems, low living standards of the vast number themselves sovereign's servants and with the beginning of the revolution ignorance about the limits of retreat of the Supreme power before the revolutionary element, its inability to protect its servants from violence and terror, has formed favourable conditions for the loyalty crisis of consciousness of civil servants in the Russian province. Of all recorded in the Central Black Mould Region the revolutionary actions of public servants took part in 128 of 301 cases (42.5%). When in the course of the First Russian Revolution in the arena of wrestling left political parties to participate in

elections to the State Duma, some of the officials openly declared their political views. Although, politicized ideas consciously separated a few provincial officials but it was primarily the highly educated representatives of middle management and socially active specialists. It should be noted that the demonstration of their liberal political affiliation in some cases defying his political radicalism, was the peculiar fashion of the revolutionary era.

After the revolution, despite the pre-existing legal framework of the state service of the Russian bureaucracy acted in the new state system. The work of the State Duma (especially third and fourth), the emerging practice of interaction with her government showed the crown to the bureaucracy that exists and operates another institution (after the will of the monarch, the letter and the spirit of the law) which may prevent them from arbitrarily exercising their powers. Clear and specific indication that is the understanding of the role of the Duma are the words from the speech of P. A. Stolypin during the opening sessions of the II State Duma in March 1907: "the government would welcome any open disclosure of any confusion, any abuse. People, Lord. Peculiar to be mistaken and carried away and abuse of power. Let these abuses be exposed, let them be judged and condemned". Addressing the deputies, the head of the government expected and that all the Russian bureaucracy will hear these words and will draw the appropriate conclusions.

CONCLUSION

The First Russian Revolution changed the legal conditions for activities of Russian bureaucracy, appeared, though still for the most part nominal, control of the press for its activities. The head of the government pointed out that the supreme power will not cover crimes and misdemeanors. Those positive for society changes in the status of civil servants for much of the last were a challenge. Many went to the conservative camp, the other with pessimism and even fear expected for new disasters, having lost faith in the monarch, in right of his ministry and others with even greater indifference and hopelessness adrift.

Summary: The First Russian Revolution destroyed decades of practice of service activities formed by decades, formed value orientations, psychological stereotypes that defined the service and life prospects. All this could not affect the change in motivation of service activities of the Russian bureaucracy and motivating individual actions of officials of different levels in the adoption of certain managerial decisions.

REFERENCES

- Ascher, A., 2004. The Revolution of 1905: A Short History. Stanford University Press, Palo Alto, California, Pages: 228.
- Geifman, A., 1993. Thou Shalt Kill. Revolutionary Terrorism in Russia, Moscow, Russia, Pages: 381.
- Kokovcov, V.N., 2004. From My Past 1903-1919. Memories and Memoirs, Minsk, Belarus, (In Russian).
- Kurlov, P.G., 2002. The Death of Imperial Russia. Memories Publisher, Moscow, Russian (In Russian),.
- Malone, R., 2004. Analysing the Russian Revolution. Cambridge University Press, Canberra, Australia,.
- Shacillo, K.F., 2000. Conservatism in the XIX-XX, Russian Conservatism of XIX Century. The Ideology and Practice, Moscow, Russian (In Russian),.