From Monarchy of Self-olding- Zemesky to Self-containing-burocratic: question of Russian statehood evolution in early new time

From Monarchy of Self-olding- Zemesky to Self-containing-burocratic: question of Russian statehood evolution in early new time

DE LA MONARQUÍA AUTOCRÁTICA- ZEMESKY A LA AUTOCRACIA-BURÓCRATA: LA EVOLUCIÓN DEL ESTADO RUSO EN SUS INICIOS

Vitaly V. Penskoy[1], Tat'yana M. Penskaya[2], Leonid P. Rasskazov[3], Fedor G. Shukhov[4], Boris V. Zmerzliy[5]

[1, 2,] *Belgorod State University, Russia*
[3] *Federal State-funded Educational Institution of Higher Professional Education «Kuban State Agrarian University», Russia*
[4] *Emperor Alexander I St. Petersburg State Transport University, Russia*
[5] *V.I. Vernadsky Crimean Federal University, Russia*

abstract

In this study, authors considered evolution of Russian statehood, the political regime, and relations of power, and society in the early new times, using the heuristic potential of concepts of "composite state" and "military revolution". Authors showed the need of external expansion in poverty conditions of Russian state which led to transform Russian monarchy from the autocratic-Zemstvo (where effective work of the state mechanism was ensured by cooperation of supreme power and local self-government) to the autocratic-bureaucratic monarchy (where supreme power rested primarily on bureaucracy and violence, reducing local government to a supporting role in public administration).

Keywords: Early New Time, Political Regime, Bureaucracy, Composite State, Russian State, Autocracy, Absolutism, Reforms.

En este estudio, los autores consideraron la evolución del estado ruso, el régimen político y las relaciones de poder y la sociedad en los primeros tiempos, utilizando el potencial heurístico de los conceptos de "estado compuesto" y "revolución militar". Los autores mostraron la necesidad de una expansión externa en las condiciones de pobreza del estado ruso que llevó a transformar la monarquía rusa del autocrático-Zemstvo (donde el trabajo efectivo del mecanismo estatal estaba asegurado por la cooperación del poder supremo y el autogobierno local) al autocrático-burocrático monarquía (donde el poder supremo descansaba principalmente en la burocracia y la violencia, reduciendo al gobierno local a un papel de apoyo en la administración pública).

Palabras clave: Nuevos tiempos, Régimen político, Burocracia, Estado compuesto, Estado ruso, Autocracia, Absolutismo, Reformas.

Introduction

In 1907 Russian historian and publicist S.P. Melgunov noted that in the 16th - 17th centuries in Russia, the "autocratic-territorial monarchy was replaced by an autocratic-bureaucratic one", while "public and state life lost its original patriarchal character and began to be regulated by certain legal norms" (Melgunov, 1907; Brewer, 1989; Leviathan, 1999; Politics and Society in Reformation Europe, 1987; Tilly, 1990; Barkey, 2008; Henshall, 1992; Elliott, 1992; Koenigsberger, 1978; MacKenney, 2002; Parker, 1988; Parker, 1976; Roberts, 1967; Kollmann, 1999; Gennady et al, 2017; Lipich et al, 2016). For him, the early Russian state, in the first stages of its development, was a "patriarchal" "Zemstvo-autocratic" monarchy, the political regime which was based on a kind of "social contract" between the sovereign and the subjects. This "treaty" was unwritten and was not fixed in any legal act, remaining entirely within the traditional political culture framework. The main actors of Moscow political "theater" knew their role without a text so, this formalization was not needed.

However, it is clear that during the "long" 16th century, this traditional political culture and related institutions and practices were severely tested (and not just in Russia, the "long" 16th century was marked by a series of upheavals that changed the world and accelerated formation of new reality of the "classic" modernity).

The gradual transformation process of "patriarchal" Zemstvo-autocratic monarchy into an autocratic-bureaucratic monarchy was based on formalization of political-legal relations, which was clearly defined in the middle of the 16th century and reached its climax in the era of Peter the Great.

Methodology

The S.P. Melgunov stated idea consists of a number of conceptual provisions explaining features of early-moderated states development. It is considered that the early New Time is the era of folding of the "Centralized" states. They differed from the former medieval "patriarchal" monarchies by the strong central authority, which controlled the territory and was able to impose its demands to inhabitants.

These days, this view was criticized. Revisionists considered this problem from another viewpoint, drawing attention to the study of what J. Brewer called "sinews of power" (Brewer, 1989). A careful analysis of political, legal, administrative, judicial, institutions, and practices of early-moderated "centralized" states showed that traditional opinion about the "centralization" degree which is an erroneous (Rethinking Leviathan, 1999; Politics and Society in Reformation Europe, 1987).

Regardless of whether these early-modem states were "national", "tribure-taking empires" or were "fragmented sovereignty systems", their supreme power did not have a developed administrative "musculature" and a corresponding legal framework to enshrine it legally (Tilly, 1990;). Therefore, she was forced to seek local elite's assistance, corporations and other traditional public structures, in K. Barkey [6. 10]. This can be attributed not only to the Ottoman or Holy Roman Empire, but also to all states of the early New Time. Even such a "national state" as France, could not be an example of a certain political, administrative, and legal monolith, about which, N. Henshell has written (Henshall, 1992; Elliott, J. H. (1992). Therefore, a different approach is needed to analyze the features of political and administrative structure of the early-moderated states, and their political and legal regime..

A good way to get out of this situation is the concept of an early-modern state as a "composite state" which was proposed by H.G. Koenigsberger and revised by J.H. Elliott (Elliott, 1992; Koenigsberger, 1978).

By considering the process of formation of Early New Age states, they proceeded from the fact that, at the early stages of their development which were lost and was consisted of heterogeneous territorial elements of polity. When possession of significant territories and, accordingly, resources gave an advantage in competitive struggle with neighbors, it tempted to embark on political organization development (Elliott, 1992).

Naturally, in this case, the monarch faced this question that how to ensure loyalty of population to the newly acquired territories? J. Elliott noted changes in political status caused some dissatisfaction among these territories' people. At the same time, the supreme power, seeking to ensure loyalty of local elites and communities, avoided using violence and solved this problem by a written or unwritten conclusion of a treaty. This agreement was provided for a certain division of competences between supreme power and local elites. At this time, the supreme power, in order to control events in these lands, "superstructure" administrative, judicial, and legal structures which were maintained by local authorities, and actively used various strategies, formal and informal, to attract local assets to their side (Elliott, 1992).

It cannot be said that the supreme power sought to expand its sphere of competence, to achieve greater subordination of local communities and elites. At first, this problem was solved by increasing and improving the notorious

"sinews of power". The need for these actions was determined by difficult foreign policy situations in which development of early-moderated states took place. As R. MacKenney noted 16th century and the following centuries are the time of expansion and conflict (Koenigsberger, 1978). The success of this expansion was determined by perfection degree of military machine that was created by the early modern monarchies. Also, the idea of M. Roberts about "military revolution" should be noted in this study (Parker, 1988; Parker, 1976; Roberts, 1967).

Analyzing the development of European military affairs in the early modern period, M. Roberts concluded that radical changes in military technology caused serious changes not just in early modern military affairs. The need for complying with new military standards led to change the character of statehood of that era. So, the need for recruiting and maintaining more numerous mercenary armies, that without prior arrangement turned into permanent ones, required administrative-bureaucratic apparatus reorganization (Roberts, 1967). The state infrastructure is changing in the same way, ensuring proper management, resource mobilization, and tax collection. Impart appropriate legality to these changes led to reformat the legal and judicial systems of states (Kollmann, 1999).

These processes inevitably caused growing discontent among provincial elites and communities. As a result, Europe from the middle of the 16th century to the middle of the 17th centuries was going through internal reorganization period. Wars, insurrections, religious, social movements, and such troubles - within the "composite states" showed that there is a certain restructuring and redistribution of power, expressed in strengthening role of the state and its active intervention in economy, social life, education, and etc. The Polizeistaat concept is not by the end of this period. The state is gradually turning into the notorious "Leviathan" which was similar to the processes that took place in the Russian early-state.

Results and Discussion

The "Composite" nature of early modeled Russian statehood, with a careful analysis of actual materials, judicial practice, and legislation, in general, does not cause doubts about which was written before (Gennady et al, 2017; Lipich et al, 2016; Renskaya et al, 2017). Ivan III, Vasily III and Ivan IV, being brought up in a strictly conservative Moscow, permeated with patriarchal clan-family and patron-client relations and environment; they were not radical reformers. They continued to think and act within the

framework of quite a traditional "discourse" of the "common good". In addition, the limited resources that were possessed (early-modern Muscovy - poor agrarian society) forced them to avoid risky socio-political and administrative experiments.

From Moscow's sovereigns, first of all the society expected that, as N. Kollmann noted, they would rule in accordance with the prevailing views, that "the ruler would be safe." Its touchstone was piety of the tsar; the historian continued, he didn't want to protect them. He patronized; and it was a moral example for all of them (Kollmann, 1999). Due to the fact that was formed at the end of the 16th century to the beginning of 17th century, no large-scale social upheavals and insurrections was not observed, indirectly, in favor of assumption that even the "classic" "tyrant", Ivan IV, corresponded to these ideas and its legitimacy from the undoubted subjects' point of view .

It's better to return to "patchwork" of the early modern Russian state. Acting within the framework of a conservative tradition, the last Rurikovich on Moscow throne was managed to build an externally centralized state. However, behind this facade, which was skillfully draped with spectacular declarations in the spirit of "classical" absolutism) (The first message to Kurbsky, 2005), the usual "composite state" with its "superstructure" over traditional local government structures was hidden. In addition, in the course of "reforms" of the 40s - 50s of 16th century, there is a certain legitimation, imparting a kind of "vein" of legality on part of the supreme power, and streamlining the work of local governments.

Even more clearly "patchwork" of the Russian state in the 16th century is observed by analyzing the state of its legal space. Unifying the judicial procedure, taking investigation and punishment of especially dangerous crimes under its jurisdiction, the supreme authority did not interfere in other issues, leaving their permission to be determined by local legal customs. And even in the conquered territories, Ruriks did not rush to change the existing system. A vivid example of this is the order of Ivan, the terrible governors, whom entrusted with the management of the conquered Polotsk, in which the governors were instructed to focus on local legal customs and traditions and administer court together with elected members from the local "best people" (Baranov, 2004; Matandare, 2018).

Generally, it can be said that by the beginning of the 17th century in the Russian state, there is a kind of separation of powers, perhaps a classic for early-modern polities, based on a kind of "partnership". The supreme power was achieved in "state case", diplomacy, war, finance, and

supreme arbitration, while local communities kept order on the ground, resolving disputes and litigation that arise in everyday life, tax and duties, along with their collection, and other issues which were related to everyday life. All of these were given at the mercy of the local electoral (highlighted by Authors) i.e. self-government. The latter in their actions was guided not only (and sometimes not so much) by above mentioned instructions, but also by local customs. Zemstvo self-government felt the "taste" of power, gained the necessary management experience and firmly stood up. And, in our opinion, it was this circumstance that first of all caused the "wonderful", at first, inexperienced view of Russia's withdrawal from the troubles, when Zemstvo self-government structures replaced the collapsed sovereign power and brought country out of the deepest crisis.

However, in the 2nd half of the 16th century the trends that have emerged before became even more noticeable; this is bureaucratization of the central administration in the first place, expressed primarily in the final formulation of the mandatory system. At the same time, degree of its "autonomy" from the supreme power, which was already present in the 2nd half of the 30s of the 16th century (as pointed out by MM Krom) increased, as well as powers, and scope of jurisdiction (Chrome, 2010). In addition, in frontier cities and counties, where a "civil society", consisted of service people, was underdeveloped, the voivodeship department was gradually established and taking local power into its hands more than usual.

These new phenomena, superimposed on unfavorable economic conditions and the complex foreign and domestic political situation, in the beginning of the 17th century, led to exhaustion of safety of the autocratic-Zemstvo monarchy and contributed to the beginning of a sharp political crisis. In addition, the experience of military conflicts of the 2nd half of the 16th and at the beginning of the 17th century showed that the "classical" Moscow military machine, which was based on the local police, was inferior in combat capability, all other things being equal to the common wealth and Sweden armies. For a successful revenge and renewed expansion in the western direction, Russian military system had to be transformed in accordance with the latest innovations of "military revolution".

The first experience of creating a new European-trained and equipped army, which were obtained during the Smolensk War of 1632-1634, showed the complexity and inevitability of such steps. Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich, deployed an active offensive in western direction since 1654, relied on the new army using, and reorganized it in accordance with the latest European standards.

However, its maintenance was extremely expensive. The need to maintain necessary level of mobilization in case of the already noted above poverty of Russia and obviously insufficient development of "sinews of power" led to further bureaucratization of management and gradually reduced the Zemstvo self-government from the place of junior partner to the role of assistant. This could not cause to social and political tensions growth in the society, especially if the difficult economic and financial situation, aggravated by unsuccessful actions of the government. It is not by chance that the epoch of Aleksei Mikhailovich entered Russian history under characteristic of "The Rebel Age". The weakened zemstvos could no longer resist pressure from above, especially the traditional counterbalances to autocratic aspirations of the supreme power, aristocracy, and the church.

As a result, autocratic-Zemstvo monarchy of the last Rurikovich, gradually began to transform into an autocratic-bureaucratic Romanovs monarchy. The decisive, turning point in this evolution was the era of Peter the Great. In an effort to accelerate the socio-economic, political and cultural development of Russia, he relied on the bureaucracy as the main tool in their implementation. Local government was reduced to a minimum and although after Peter, definite recoil from this over-centralization and bureaucratization, the new tradition, which began at the beginning of the 18th century and was relied on trends that arose much earliercan be mentioned.

Conclusions

Analyzing features of development of Russian statehood in the early New Age (late XV - 1st quarter, XVIII centuries) and determining the factors that has the great effect on formation of its peculiar external form, it is believed that two points played a role. The first is the necessity and inevitability of expansion, due to a number of both objective and subjective reasons. The second is Russia's poverty of resources. These two factors, superimpose on the need for a substantial restructuring of military mechanism to meet requirements of the military revolution, and make it inevitable to bring to logical conclusion the idea of a "serving state" in which all its "ranks" are obliged to serve the state. The latter is perceived by society as a whole and by individual communities in particular as a kind of power cocoon ensuring survival of society and preservation of the usual way of life. The growing demands of state to society and inability to satisfy them while maintaining the old orders which make the strengthening of top-down force pressure inevitable. The autocratic-territorial

monarchy, based on a definite contract and cooperation of land and power, was replaced by an autocratic-bureaucratic monarchy, in which the sovereign power rested primarily on violence.

References

Melgunov S.P. (1907) Church and State in Russia (on the issue of freedom of conscience). Moscow, Publishing House Partnership I.D. Sytin: 196. [In Russian].

Brewer, J. (1989) The sinews of power. War, money and the English state, 1688–1783. London, Unwin Hyman: 253.

Rethinking Leviathan: The Eighteenth-century State in Britain and Germany (1999). Eds. J. Brever and E. Hellmith. London-Oxford, Oxford University Press: 428.

Politics and Society in Reformation Europe (1987). Eds. Elton G., Kouri E., Scott T. London, Palgrave MacMillan: XIX. 568 r.

Tilly Ch. (1990) Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990-1990. Oxford, Basil Blackwell: XI. 269.

Barkey K. (2008). Empire of Difference. The Ottomans in Comparative Perspective. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 342.

Henshall, N. (1992) The Myth of Absolutism: Change & Continuity in the Early Modern European Monarchy. London & New York, Longman: 245.

Elliott, J. H. (1992) A Europe of Composite Monarchies // Past & Present. Number 137. The Cultural and Political Construction of Europe: 48-71.

Koenigsberger, H. G. (1978). Dominium Regale or Dominium Politicum et Regale // Theory and Society. Vol. 5. 2: 191-217.

MacKenney R. (2002). Sixteenth Century Europe. Expansion and Conflict. London, Palgrave Macmillane: 425.

Parker G. (1988). The Military Revolution. Military innovation and the Rise of the West, 1500-1800. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 234.

Parker G. (1976). The "Military Revolution," 1560-1660 - a Myth? // The Journal of Modern History. Vol. 48. No. 2 (Jun., 1976): 195-214.

Roberts M. (1967). The Military Revolution, 1560-1660 // Roberts M. Essays in Swedish History. London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson: 195-225.

Kollmann N.S. (1999). By Honor Bound: State and Society in Early Modern Russia. Ithaka & London, Cornell University Press: 312.

Gennady A. Borisov, Vladimir G. Krikun, Victoria V. Kutko, Vitaly V. Penskoy & Svetlana V. Sherstobitova (2017). Comparative Law Analysis // Journal of Politics and Law; Vol. 10, No. 3: 121-124.

T.I. Lipich, V.V. Lipich, V.V. Penskoy and T.M. Penskaya (2016). The Reign of Ivan the Terrible: From "Patrimonial State" to "Composite Monarchy" // The Social Sciences. Volume 11. Issue 10: 2421-2424.

Renskaya, T., Zajcev, V., Podgornyj, V., Shabalina, E., & Potapov, V. (2017). Moscow Autocracy of the XVI - XVII Centuries: Eastern arch 'Despotism' 'or An Early Modern European Monarchy? // Journal of History Culture and Art Research. # 6 (3): 1190-1198.

The first message to Kurbsky (2005) // Messages from Ivan the Terrible. St. Petersburg, Science: 9-71.

Baranov K.V. (2004). Notebook of the Polotsk campaign of 1562/1563 // Russian diplomatary. M .: Ancient storage: 119-154.

Matandare, M. A. (2018). Botswana Unemployment Rate Trends by Gender: Relative Analysis with Upper Middle Income Southern African Countries (2000-2016). *Dutch Journal of Finance and Management, 2*(2), 04.

Chrome MM (2010) "The Dowager Kingdom": The Political Crisis in Russia of the 30s – 40s of the 16th Century. Moscow, New Literary Review: 888.