

Zh. Dyussebek*,  A. Suinova 

Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan, Almaty

*e-mail: zhan.dsmk@gmail.com

ON THE HISTORY OF THE EXPLORATION OF THE INCORPORATION OF THE LOCAL POPULATION INTO THE SERVICE IN THE GOVERNANCE SYSTEM OF THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE AT THE PRESENT STAGE

The article is devoted to the analysis of modern historiography on the problem of the process of co-optation of the local population into the system of administrative governance in the national regions of the Russian Empire (Kazakhstan, Siberia, Poland and Ukraine) through the study of monographic studies and research papers by scholars from various regions. The article uses a comparative method that allowed us to show the tools and mechanisms used by the imperial authorities in the process of integrating the local population into the empire and how Russian officials implemented new governance models in the national regions.

In modern Kazakhstan historiography attention is focused on the formation of a corps of officials, methods of attracting local nobility to the service to the empire. In modern Russian historiography on the problem of governance in Siberia, works on the history of governance, the formation of officialdom and the incorporation of local nobility into the imperial system of governance are highlighted.

Modern Polish researchers in their works explore the service, activities of Polish officials and their political career in the system of imperial power structures. In the modern historiography of Ukraine, issues on the negative consequences of imperial administrative reforms, the specifics of an implementation of the imperial governance model and the loyalty of the local nobility to these innovations are highlighted.

In addition, the article reflects the main problems that require further study and application of new scientific methods, including interdisciplinary approaches.

Key words: historiography, incorporation, officials, bureaucracy, empire, regions, local government, imperial governance model.

Ж. Дюсембек*, А.Т. Суйнова

Әл-Фараби Қазақ Ұлттық университеті, Қазақстан, Алматы қ.

*e-mail: zhan.dsmk@gmail.com

Қазіргі кезеңдегі Ресей империясының басқару жүйесіне қызмет ету үшін жергілікті халықты инкорпорациялауды зерттеу тарихына

Мақала әртүрлі аймақтардың зерттеушілерінің монографиялық еңбектері мен ғылыми мақалаларын зерттеу арқылы Ресей империясының ұлттық шетіндегі (Қазақстан, Сібір, Польша және Украина) жергілікті халықты әкімшілік басқару жүйесіне қосу үдерісін зерттеу бойынша заманауи тарихнаманы талдауға арналған.

Мақалада салыстырмалы әдіс қолданылды, бұл әдіс империялық билік жергілікті халықты империяға инкорпорациялау үдерісінде қолданған құралдар мен механизмдерді, сондай-ақ ресейлік шенеуніктердің ұлттық шеттерде басқарудың жаңа модельдерін қалай енгізгенін көрсетуге мүмкіндік береді.

Қазіргі қазақстандық тарихнамада қазақ шенеуніктер корпусын қалыптастыруға, көшпелі ақсүйектерді империя қызметіне тарту әдістеріне баса назар аударылады. Қазіргі ресейлік тарихнамасында Сібірдегі басқару мәселесі бойынша басқару тарихы, шенеуніктердің қалыптасуы және жергілікті ақсүйектердің империялық басқару жүйесіне енуі туралы жұмыстар ерекшеленеді.

Қазіргі поляк зерттеушілерінің көпшілігі поляк шенеуніктерінің қызметін және олардың империялық билік құрылымдары жүйесіндегі саяси мансабын зерттейді. Украинаның қазіргі тарихнамасында империялық әкімшілік реформалардың теріс салдары, басқарудың империялық моделін енгізу ерекшеліктері және жергілікті ақсүйектердің осы инновацияларға деген адалдығы туралы сұрақтар қарастырылған.

Сонымен қатар, мақалада жаңа ғылыми әдістерді, соның ішінде пәнаралық тәсілдерді одан әрі зерттеу мен қолдануды қажет ететін негізгі проблемалар көрсетілген.

Түйінді сөздер: тарихнама, инкорпорация, шенеуніктер, бюрократия, империя, аймақтар, жергілікті басқару, империялық басқару моделі.

Дюсембек Ж.К. *, Суйнова А.Т.

Казахский национальный университет им. аль-Фараби, Казахстан, г. Алматы

*e-mail: zhan.dsmk@gmail.com

К истории изучения инкорпорации местного населения на службу в систему управления Российской империи на современном этапе

Статья посвящена анализу современной историографии по изучению процесса кооптации местного населения в систему административного управления в национальных окраинах Российской империи (Казахстан, Сибирь, Польша и Украина) посредством изучения монографических исследований и научных статей исследователей различных регионов.

В статье применен сравнительный метод, который позволил показать инструменты и механизмы, которые использовали имперские власти в процессе интегрирования местного населения в состав империи и как российские чиновники внедряли новые модели управления в национальных окраинах.

В современной казахстанской историографии акцентируется внимание на формирование корпуса казахских чиновников, методах привлечения кочевой знати на службу империи.

В российской историографии по проблеме управления в Сибири выделяются работы по вопросу истории управления, формирования чиновничества и инкорпорации местной знати в имперскую систему управления.

Современные польские исследователи изучают службу, деятельность польских сановников и их политическую карьеру в системе имперских структур власти. В современной историографии Украины освещены вопросы о негативных последствиях имперских административных реформ, особенности внедрения имперской модели управления и лояльность местной знати к этим инновациям.

Помимо этого, в статье отражены основные проблемы, которые требуют дальнейшего изучения и применения новых научных методов, в том числе и междисциплинарных подходов.

Ключевые слова: историография, инкорпорация, чиновники, бюрократия, империя, регионы, местное управление, имперская модель управления.

Introduction

The Russian Empire – whether it was actually an empire or was a state – remains a controversial point in historical science at the present stage. To this day, discussions and polemics are underway in the scientific sphere and in academic circles regarding the use of the terms the empire, metropolis, colonization, etc. in relation to the Russian state. There is no unambiguous answer to this question due to the increase in the works of foreign, Russian and Kazakhstani scholars in recent decades, the emergence of new research directions and approaches, including from related scientific fields. All these indicators together give the opportunity to reconsider the specific problems being studied, rethink and interpret them in a new key.

Examination of the imperial situation at the regional level leads to the conclusion that the Russian Empire is a complex, multi-component administrative system. For instance, a researcher A. Kappeler, defining the features of the imperial state, came to the conclusion that the Russian state was not a “colonial power”, but was a multinational state with elements of co-optation of representatives of “non-Russian peoples to public service in the context of national policy”. (Kappeler, 2000)

The application of various governance practices, various administrative structures, use of local knowledge (native knowledge) contribute to the stable nature of the internal situation. The formation of the imperial space proceeded gradually and went through certain stages, which contributed to the heterogeneous nature of the imperial governance model. For instance, the Governor-General’s model of imperial administration developed thanks to the project “Establishment of viceroyalties”, approved in 1816. The implementation of this direction took place through the formation of ministries, with the aim of further reforming the local administration. The state charter of 1820, as well as the project of the viceroyalty, combined the centralism of public administration and the interests of local authorities. The peculiarity of these projects is that a significant part of the articles of the project are materials in relation to local government. M.M. Speransky’s reforms in management of Siberian provinces, which recognized local customs and political peculiarities as legal norms, can serve as evidence (Dameshek, 2012). The above-mentioned problems have become the object of active study in recent decades.

The expanding range of scientific research makes it possible to explore actual and important issues in historiography. Among the specific

issues, we can single out the process of officialdom formation, which is relevant not only in Kazakhstan, but also in Russia. The problem of officialdom is multifaceted and diverse, some of its aspects are to some extent covered in the scientific literature. One of the widespread key points in research is the bureaucratic apparatus represented by governors-general, governors, vice-governors, as well as the issue of centralization and decentralization of power. With the advent of new approaches, the interest of researchers regarding the formation of Institute of the Governor-General has grown. Among such researchers, it should be noted A.V. Remnev, D.I. Raskin, L.M. Lysenko, K. Matsuzato. However, with the variety of issues considered, there are still problems that lack due attention in historiography. Thus, the issues of the relationship of regional authorities with local noble and local population, the problems of perception by residents of the peripheries of the newly introduced administrative power on the imperial model are highlighted to a lesser extent.

Materials and methods

This paper focused on historiographical examination the papers and research works of scholars who set the task of studying the functioning of the officialdom and the administrative imperial system as a whole. The historiography review is aimed at reviewing the research literature on the problem of the formation and development of officialdom at the present stage as well. The article is based on dissertations, monographs, articles, research papers of scholars. Territorial borders cover the largest regions that were part of the Russian state: Kazakhstan, Siberia, Ukraine, Poland. In this study, the principle of objectivity, the principle of system and historicism were used. The principle of objectivity allows to examine the issue under study critically. Such approach to understanding the problem considered makes it possible to rethink and see the whole picture from a new point of view. A systematic principle allows us to form a holistic picture of the study. With the help of the principle of historicism, it is possible to identify processes in dynamics, the place of processes and events, their causes, stages, etc. Thus, the systematic approach allows us to consider systematically, comprehensively investigated issues.

Discussion

Currently, research on the problem of officialdom, its formation and functioning in Russian state in the XVIII – early XX centuries is of interest, such a significant number of research papers requires a comprehensive analysis. Attempts to analyze the formation of officialdom and its historiography were made by modern Kazakhstani and Russian historians G.S. Sultangalieva, G.B. Izbasarova, T.T. Dalaeva, A.A. Aitmukhambetov, A.V. Remnev, S.I. Degtyarev, A.A. Ospanova.

In modern historiography, works devoted to regional governance in the imperial period are popular. As a rule, the emergence of new approaches and an increasing number of articles have caused discussions in the scientific field. Discussions are mainly conducted in the following areas: the structure of the empire and its evolution in the regional plan are considered in the works of scientists A. Kappeler, S. Becker, L.E. Horizontov, A.V. Remnev. The main levers of imperial administration and control of the peripheries are highlighted in the works of A. Kappeler, L.E. Horizontov, S.V. Lyubichankovsky, D.V. Vasiliev. Researchers K. Matsuzato, L.E. Horizontov, I.K. Zagidullin, N.L. Semenova study the features of the regional narrative as well.

Results

Regarding the issues of imperial regulation, the formation of officialdom and its functioning in the regions, we can single out the research works of Russian scholars such as L.E. Shepelev (Shepelev, 1999), S.I. Degtyarev, (Degtyarev, 2014; Degtyarev, 2016), L.M. Lysenko (Lysenko, 2001). The scientists were aimed at studying the emergence and development of bureaucracy in the imperial state and its elements, such as governorships, departments, officials of state institutions, etc. In addition, they studied the legal and social status of officials. One of the key elements in the context of bureaucracy and officialdom is local governance. Researcher Yu.V. Tot examined the system of local administration system during the reign of Emperors Paul I and Alexander I and concluded that their methods were similar in changing the local governance system. (Tot, 2013)

If we examine the institution of the Governor-General as a separate constituent element of

officialdom, then we should note the researchers who studied organization process and evolution of the governorship, its role and importance in the general system of imperial power. The institution of the Governor-General and its influence, which contributed to the incorporation of national peripheries into the imperial system is emphasized in the work of L.M. Lysenko. Thanks to the collected material about governors, it is possible to analyze the corps of the governorship of the Russian Empire from the XVIII to the XX centuries. (Lysenko, 2001) The issues of drawing up a social portrait, studying the social origin of officials of the Russian state, the role and essence of the Table of Ranks were considered by L.E. Shepelev, in which he demonstrated the evolution of title, ranks, uniforms, orders, degrees and also drew attention to the study of public service in a whole. (Shepelev, 1999) Thus, there are currently a significant number of publications and researches devoted to various aspects of the formation and evolution of the institution of officialdom. However, the issues of professional education of officials in the XVIII–XIX centuries are not sufficiently considered.

Under the integration process of national peripheries into the Russian state, measures to implement a general imperial model of public administration in the regions were taken. Since this process was accompanied by difficulties and was practically impossible, the imperial power had to adapt the administrative apparatus to the conditions of the incorporated national regions. Another key moment in the history of officialdom is the presence of the nobility during the XVIII – early XIX centuries on a multiethnic basis. The granting of nobility to other nationalities did not have a clear mechanism. In order to avoid social discontent and conflicts in the awarding of the nobility in the integrated regions, the lower strata of local elites could receive the title of nobleman and related privileges through service in the civil and military sphere. Thus, researchers who have considered the process of cooptation of local officials into the Russian nobility, highlight the problems of reforming the administrative apparatus in peripheries and pay attention to the role and importance of local elites as well.

In modern Russian historiography on the problem of governance and administration in Siberia, authors I.L. Dameshek (Dameshek, 2002) and A.V. Remnev (Remnev, 2001), who studied the administrative reforms of M.M. Speransky, the administration of Siberian peoples and the formation of officialdom in Siberia in the XIX century should be singled out.

Among the scholars who studied the Tatar elites and process of the entry of Tatars into the estate as nobility of Russian Empire, it should be noted S. Enikeev, I.R. Gabdullin, R.V. Kadyrov (Kadyrov, 2010), etc. Thus, S. Enikeev in his works investigated the activities of Tatar nobility representatives and their official functions. (Enikeev, 1999) I.R. Gabdullin works are focused on the description of indicators (qualitative and quantitative) of the Tatar elites. (Gabdullin, 2010)

In Kazakh historiography, the process of formation of the Kazakh nobility and the peculiarities of the perception of new estates by the Kazakhs are highlighted in the research of Sultangalieva G.S. (Sultangalieva, Tuleshova, 2017; Sultangalieva, Tuleshova, 2020; Sultangalieva, Tuleshova, Werth, 2022).

The problem of integration of the Kazakh steppe into the Russian state was accompanied by changing of nomadic lifestyle of Kazakh society as a whole due to the implemented administrative and territorial reforms in the region. The adaptation of administrative governance according to the imperial model had its own specifics (Sultangalieva, 2015; Sultangalieva, Dalayeva, Malikov, 2017).

Researcher G.S. Sultangalieva concluded that within the reforms implemented in Kazakh steppe, institutions of power of kazakh privileged strata were in the sphere of interests of the imperial government. During the implementation of imperial policy into the Kazakh steppe, the Russian government was focused on attracting the Kazakh elite representatives to the imperial service, as it believed that by obtaining the loyalty of the Kazakh elite, it was possible to use levers of influence on the local population. The process of organizing and implementing such a plan was accompanied by the provision of a title, rank, position, privileges, even salary and pension provision. At the same time, being employees in an officials apparatus, the local elite pursued their goals to maintain influence in society.

A huge share of research papers dedicated to the imperial bureaucracy's formation process and its activities in Poland, which was part of the Russian Empire. The status of officials of the Polish Kingdom is highlighted in the works of A. Kuletskaya and Z. Navorsky. M. Novak studied the career growth of the small gentry – the lower strata of the Polish elite on the examples of specific officials. The officials apparatus in modern ukrainian historiography is revealed in the study of M.V. Barmak, which highlights the features of the implementation of the

imperial administration system in the Ukrainian territory (Lebid, 2006). The author emphasized in his work that the historical unity of the region was taken into account when implementing the imperial model of governance and the formation of local administrative bodies was formed taking into account the specifics of society and its way of life. Comparing the process of formation of officialdom on the territory of Ukraine and Kazakh steppe, it should be noted that the main similar feature was loyalty of the local elite to the imperial authorities, which made up the apparatus of officials. In general, the duties of the local nobility included the formation of the personnel of most power structures, including bodies in the judicial system. Whereas, Kazakh officials held positions only by decree of the Emperor, the Governor-General, the Border Commission taking into account the proposals of the candidates of the sultans-rulers. Of interest are the works of the author V.S. Shandra, which highlight various aspects of the bureaucracy of the early XIX century on the lands of Right-Bank and Central Ukraine. V.S. Shandra's views differ from the views of the scientist M.V. Barmak, since V.S. Shandra considered administrative reforms that contributed to the elimination of national peculiarities in

administration carried out in order to centralize power in the regions (Shandra, 2009).

Conclusion

Thus, formation and functioning of officialdom at the local level is an relevant trend in modern historiography, which has led to the emergence of new scientific approaches and increasing number of research papers on this problem. The history of officialdom includes the following priority areas. A significant part of the research consists of works on general theoretical aspects of the education and development of the corps of officials due to the use of the "Table of Ranks". This line of research reflects the issues of the emergence, organization and development of the officialdom, the mechanisms of governance and administrative control. Another block of scientific papers demonstrates the regional features of the officials apparatus. In this regard, we should note that the history of officialdom of the "national peripheries" has not been fully examined, for example, in the research of Kazakh officialdom, only some aspects are touched upon or fragmentary, which is a promising direction in modern historical science and sets new goals and tasks for researchers.

References

- Dameshek I.L. (2002). Sibir v sisteme imperskogo regionalizma (komparativnoe issledovanie okrainnoy politiki Rossii v pervoy polovine XIX veka [Siberia in the system of Imperial regionalism (comparative study of the peripheral policy of Russia in the first half of the XIX century)]. Irkutsk, 208 p.
- Dameshek I.L. (2012). Sibirskaya reviziya reformy M.M. Speranskogo 1822 g. [Siberian revision of the reform of M.M. Speransky in 1822] // Bulletin Irkutsk State University. The series "History". No.1(2), pp. 66-72.
- Degtyarev S.I. (2014). The History of Bureaucracy of the Russian Empire in the Russian Historiography of XIX – Early XX Century // Bylye Gody, Vol.34, No.4, pp. 554-558.
- Degtyarev S.I. (2016). Government officials from the north-eastern Ukrainian lands in the North Caucasus in the early XIX century // Bylye Gody, Vol.39, No.1, pp.45-52.
- Degtyarev S.I. (2016). Chiny kak instrument natsional'no-unifikatsionnoy politiki Rossiyskoy imperii na zemlyakh Levoberezhnoy Ukrainy, Kavkaza, Bessarabii (konets XVIII – pervaya polovina XIX vv.) [Ranks as an tool of the national unification policy of the Russian Empire on the lands of Left-Bank Ukraine, the Caucasus, Bessarabia (late XVIII – first half of the XIX centuries)] // Rusin. Vol.43, No.1, pp. 177-195.
- Enikeev S. (1999). Ocherk istorii tatarskogo dvoryanstva [An essay on the history of the Tatar nobility]. Ufa: Gilem, 355 p.
- Gabdullin I.R. (2006). Ot sluzhilykh tatar k tatarskomu dvoryanstvu [From the service Tatars to the Tatar nobility]. Moscow, 320 p.
- Kadyrov R.V. (2010). Formirovaniye etnososlovnnoy gruppy sluzhilykh tatar v Meshcherskom kraye [The formation of the ethnic group of service Tatars in the Meshchersk region]. Moscow, 222 p.
- Kappeler A. (2000). Russia is a multinational empire. Moscow, 344 p.
- Lebid A.E., Shevchenko N.A., Chuikov O.E., Svechnikov V.A. (2019). The Officialdom of the Russian Empire: A Modern Historiography of the Issue // Bylye Gody, Vol.54, No.4, p. 1490-1505.
- Lysenko L.M. (2001). Gubernatory i general-gubernatory Rossiyskoy imperii (XVIII – nachalo XX vekov) [Governors and Governors-General of the Russian Empire (XVIII – early XX centuries)]. Moscow: Publishing House of the Moscow State University, 358 p.
- Ospanova A.A. (2015). Izucheniye chinovnichestva v rossiyskoy istoricheskoy nauke [The study of officialdom in Russian historical science] // Bulletin of Samara Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Vol. 17, No. 3, pp. 499-502.

Remnev A.V. (1997). General-gubernatorskaya vlast' v XIX stoletii. K probleme organizatsii regional'nogo upravleniya Rossiyskoy imperii [Governor-General power in the XIX century. To the problem of the organization of regional governance of the Russian Empire] // The Imperial system of Russia in the regional dimension (XIX – early XX century). Moscow, 1997, pp. 52-66.

Remnev A.V. (2001). Imperskoe upravlenie aziatskimi regionami Rossii v XIX – nachale XX vekov: nekotorye itogi i perspektivy izucheniya // Puti poznaniya Rossii: novye podhody i interpretatsii. [Imperial administration of the Asian regions of Russia in the XIX – early XX centuries: some results and prospects of study // Ways of cognition of Russia: new approaches and interpretations]. Moscow, pp. 97-125.

Semenova N.L. (2015). Gubernatory i organy dvoryanskogo soslovnogo samoupravleniya Orenburgskoy gubernii v 20–30-ye gg. XIX v. [Governors and bodies of noble estate self-government of Orenburg province in the 20-30s of the XIX century] // Bulletin of Samara State University, No.7, pp. 126-132.

Shepelev L.E. (1999). Chinovnyy mir Rossii: XVIII – nachalo XX vv. [The officialdom world of Russia: XVIII – early XX centuries]. St. Petersburg: Art of St. Petersburg, 479 p.

Sultangalieva G.S. (2009). Kazakhskoye chinovnichestvo Orenburgskogo vedomstva: formirovaniye i napravleniye deyatel'nosti (XIX) [Kazakh officialdom of the Orenburg department: formation and direction of activity (XIX)] // Acta Slavica Iaponica, Vol. 27, p. 77-101.

Sultangalieva G.S. (2015). Kazakhskiye chinovniki Rossiyskoy imperii XIX v.: osobennosti vospriyatiya vlasti [Kazakh officials of the Russian Empire of the XIX century: features of the perception of power] // Cahiers du monde russe, Vol.56, No.4, p. 651-679.

Sultangalieva G.S., Tuleshova U.Zh. (2017). Sultany Baimukhamedovy: protsess vkhozheniya v dvoryanstvo Rossiyskoy imperii. [Baimukhamedov Sultans: the process of entering the nobility of the Russian Empire]. KazNU Bulletin. History series. Vol.84, No.1, pp.120-127.

Sultangalieva G.S., Tuleshova U.Zh. (2020). Kazakhskoe dvoryanstvo. XIX – nachalo XX vv.: monografiya v dokumentah [Kazakh nobility. XIX – beg. XX centuries: monograph in documents]. Almaty: Kazakh University, 429 p.

Sultangalieva G.S., Tuleshova U.Zh., Paul Werth (2022). Nomadic Nobles: Pastoralism and Privilege in the Russian Empire. Slavic Review, Vol.81, No.1, pp.77-96.

Tot Yu.V. (2003). Reforma uyezdnoy politsii v pravitel'stvennoy politike Rossii v XIX veke [The reform of the county police in the government policy of Russia in the XIX century]: abstract of the Diss.... Doctor of Historical Sciences: 07.00.02. Saint-Petersburg, 40 p.

Sultangalieva G.S., Dalayeva T.T., Malikov B.U. (2017). Understanding of Kazakh volost by Russian officials of the XIX century // Bylye Gody, Vol.46, No.4, pp.1322-1332.

Tot J. (2013). Reorganising the Local Government at the end of the XVIII and the beginning of the XIX centuries: Comparative Analysis of the Policies of Paul I and Alexander I // Bylye Gody, Vol.30, No.4, pp.36-44