

Historical-Philosophical Analysis of Siberia Administrative Control

D.N. Gergilev and N.S. Dureeva
Siberian Federal University, Svobodny Avenue, 82 Krasnoyarsk, Russia

Abstract: This study examines the characteristics of Siberia administrative management. The peculiarities of Siberia control system development and its operation were studied. The geographical, territorial and geopolitical features of the Siberian region were shown. The basic tendencies were shown and the main approaches to Siberia control development were determined. Also the article outlined the perspectives of Siberia development in the 21st century.

Keywords: Siberia, administrative control, centralization, localization, social organization

INTRODUCTION

The development of administrative control in Siberia was performed using general empire principles and the origins of administrative impact on the processes of life in Siberia but on the basis of national approach flexible use and the political and legal institutions, combining them with Siberian geopolitical characteristics, taking into account the existing traditional governance systems and the customary law of indigenous peoples in order to incorporate the marginal areas of a state and ensure the stability of a geopolitical power.

The main trends in public administration development in Siberia are the centralization and localization of power in a region (consolidation and division) during the simulation of power relation unified model characteristic for an empire, during the development of which the relations “center-region” were formed where government acts as a central authority and its local level and representative in Siberia is represented by the general Directorate headed by the Governor-general of Siberia as a whole and after 1822 by the Governor-generals of Western and Eastern Siberia.

The government system in Siberia was based using the experience of institutions that proved the viability in the central part of the country but taking into account the characteristics of the region that was ensured by legislative embodiment of seizures of their empire-wide statutes without the violation of orientation general principles for a centralized management system development from an imperial center level to a Siberian region level with the inclusion of all levels of Siberia control into it.

In 18th, the first half of 19th century, the supreme power deliberately took into account the regional peculiarities of Siberia, giving them the status of system

forming factors during the development of legislation in the field of state management by a region, although there was no a distinct concepts and a regional government policy.

SIBERIA CONTROL ORGANIZATION

Three fundamentally different approaches to the organization of Siberia control were tested in various configurations, each of which accounted for about a century. During the 17th century, they used an extremely simple and a rigidly centralized system with its territorial orders, located in Moscow and appointed by the local administration from the center. In the 18th century, the first attempt to unify the management of Siberia with the control of the European part of the country and the standards were spread in the Asian part of Russia applied to inland provinces of the Russian Empire. On the contrary 19th century passed under the sign of search, introduction and application of a special management model with the maximum consideration of Siberia specifics as its developers considered (Shishkin, 2010).

The state control in Siberia and the local Siberian self-government was implemented with the consideration of the management impact influence and the legal regulation of social relations among various categories of the Siberian population, developed in the course of a free peasant colonization within the conditions of constantly grown Russian tax-paying population prevalence at the beginning of the 18th century.

The localization of management by self government of various social population categories in a Siberian society was of great importance for Siberia management. It allowed to provide the administrative influence of government through the appointment or approval of self-governing community leaders under the conditions of

certain groups compact residence. The organization of the Siberian public administration system took into account the spatial and geographical features of a region associated with the presence of areas with poor communications system and putting the problem of management function complex localization at various levels Siberian administrative bodies that provided the control of remote areas but decreased the level and the possibilities of the governor-general control and the supervision of the central government bodies over the activities of the Siberian administration officials.

As any form of a social organization the Siberia management was based on local nature and society specifics. The natural conditions in which the Russian population of Siberian taiga, steppe and tundra appeared, forced to modify the administrative authorities which were operated successfully in the European part of Russia or to create new institutions. The combination of political and natural data gave rise to a number of political and geographical factors that determined the forms of regional governance. They influenced the operation of the central and local administrations. The peculiarities of the professional and social status of newcomers Russians gave a distinctive flavor to the multinational community of Siberians, serving people, peasants, merchants, industrialists and Cossacks. The specific historical conditions of a region colonization (development) the social composition of its inhabitants led to the appearance of important socio-political factors of management. Finally, a complex ethnic structure, the coexistence of newcomers and natives gave rise to the appearance of ethnic-social factors.

An important role in the development of the administrative system of Siberia was played by political and geographical factors. Many features of Siberian management were based on the vastness of its territory and the remoteness from the state capitals. Since the end of the 16th century, Russia started to expand to the East quickly by the annexing of new lands. The issue rose before the government concerning the ways of newly acquired ownership management and control. The capital city of Moscow and moreover St. Petersburg appeared on the western periphery of the empire the borders of which reached the Pacific Ocean. The task of elementary government oversight for Ural region area required an urgent solution. In this situation, the solution was in the determination of Siberia as an administrative unit with a special control mode. This approach was justified and relevant both in 17th century and in the beginning of the 20th century. In 1907, the ideologist of the Siberian "regionalism" G.N. Potanin wrote the following: "A vast empire can not be divided into separate areas although, the relation between them continued to persist". The

substantiation for this idea was given from the standpoint of Russian border regions economic development: "This subdivision shall be based not on ethnographic but on economic characteristics in view of the fact that the physical conditions in different regions of the empire are different" (Potanin, 1907). Although, the economic goals (mainly the income from fur sale) were actually one of the main incentives for the establishment of Russian authorities beyond the Ural Mountains, the control organization was influenced primarily not by sable "forties" but the desire to prevent separatism and embezzlement on the part of many Cossack and servitor chiefs.

The government decided to set up a special, administrative center parallel to the capital of the state which would submit to the local authorities. First they wanted to make Tyumen such a center won from Tatars but then Tobolsk became the seat of the supreme Siberian governors founded in 1587 (Kopylov, 1965). Tobolsk governor headed the so-called "rank" a large area consisting of several provinces. According to recent studies, ranks appeared in Siberia earlier than in other Russian border regions (Bakhrushin, 1955). Later (in the 18th, the beginning of the 20th century) the control of the area was built on the principle of large districts, governorships and governor-general areas control. The supreme administrator of Siberia had far greater amount of power as compared to his counterparts in other parts of the empire.

Harsh natural conditions and the distance from inhabited European Russia prompted the police department to use Siberia as the place of exile and hard labor. In mines and mining plants developed the whole settlements of criminals escaped convicts huddled in gangs and roamed taiga terrorizing forest villages and indigenous camps. The convicts made a significant part of Siberian population therefore, on the one hand, the local authorities required a special vigilance and they needed special law enforcement powers on the other. The focusing of Siberian penal institutions was the reason for a deliberate strengthening of local administrative power.

The introduction of large districts in a province as well as smaller territorial units was facilitated by the absence of an old administrative division across the whole Siberia. A huge country, poorly studied and poorly developed had no internal borders, inherited from the pre-Russian period. Thus, the frequent redrawing of the administrative map of Siberia was based only on population proportionality, the mutual arrangement of provincial urban centers or natural landscape zones (this was manifested most clearly during the provincial reform of 1775).

SIBERIA CONTROL FACTORS

Of course, the political and geographical factors, were represented by the neighborhood of Siberia with Central Asian and Pacific countries much power of the Siberian administration heads facilitated the transfer of diplomatic and trade relations with the neighboring countries. Merchant caravans went from China and Mongolia through Siberia, so the organization of the customs service became a major foreign economic prerogatives of the Siberian governors during the 17th century. Besides, a rank Tobolsk governor received the right to diplomatic relations (sending and acceptance of embassies) with the Mongols and Kalmyks (Aleksandrov and Pokrovsky, 1991).

The most important prerequisite for a control system development was the peculiarities of the area occupation by Russians. Siberia was settled on the one hand by servitors who performed public administration, defense and tax collection function. On the other hand, the Urals were crossed by Russian peasants, attracted by the local open spaces, rich lands and the absence of serfdom. Siberian authorities could not afford to exceed the measure of fiscal and political pressure as the subjects always had the possibility to move away in the wilderness and be beyond the reach of the official government authorities. Settlers came from different places of Russia, settling around towns and castles, forts. They formed townsmen and rural communities other than Russian ones because they were based not on a traditional community. Without relying on it in a distant and undeveloped country Russians inevitably fall into a greater dependence on local government. Trading municipality was almost absent and the administrative bodies of a trading quarter turned in a substantially lower police bodies whereas in the European parts of the country they guarded the citizen interests and rights (Kopylov, 1965). However, the researchers noted the solidarity of the Siberian world which generally met the administration interests. The city clerks, the official authorities regarded the social institutions as the means of additional control over the governors (Bypl, 1830).

There was no organized nobility in Siberia. The representatives of the princely and boyar families sent to a province, came back "to Russia" after service. Accordingly, there were no necessary conditions for the development of representative nobility bodies as the basis of local government in European Russia.

First of all, this stimulated the unity of Siberian administrator command who were forced to concentrate all branches of administration in their offices, including the economic ones (Rabtsevich). There were the situations

when the duties of the central authorities were assigned for the supreme governor of Siberia. So in 1697 the Tobolsk governor allowed to perform allotment and the distribution of estates (Bypl, 1830) whereas the Local Order was in complete charge of it. And at the time of Peter I not the recruiters not of the same Local order but the voivodship performed three recruitments in Siberia.

Secondly, under the conditions of staff shortage the local government was forced to replenish its ranks from non-traditional layers of Russian society-merchants, industrialists and sometimes peasants (Bakhrushin, 1929). This lack of qualified management personnel among the nobles (among other reasons) forced the government to provide the part of the administrative powers to the native nobility and Speranskii prompted to start the radical reforms of Siberian management in 1820-'s. In 1822, according to Speransky's initiative the body of legislation acts was accepted known as the "Institution for Siberian province management" (or "Siberian institution"). M.M. Speransky's reforms allowed to carry out the codification of the Siberian laws a decade earlier than federal ones. Thus, a strict legal basis was created for many administration branches. Besides, Siberia received a rational territorial division for the first time.

Administration was based on powers: the main one (Government-General level) provincial one (provinces and regions), county, municipal and foreign ones.

A Governor-General of Siberia had the Council of officials appointed by a tsar as well as Government-General senior officials. The monitoring of economy, finance and internal order state was his official task and the covert function was to prevent a possible abuse by authorities.

A province administration was headed by a civil governor a member of the provincial council which duplicated the Governor-General Council on the lower level and also had police powers. The areas had the same councils and since all areas were in the border areas and troops were placed there, the regional chiefs (governors) had the powers of the military command in contrast to the civil governors.

Districts varied by population: common district offices were established in populated districts (a chief of a district and chairmen of district courts) and private administrative bodies (courts, treasury, medical facilities) in the districts with an average amount of population they created only private administrative bodies, headed by a district chief only a police captain and a doctor acted in sparsely populated regions. The district chiefs had basically the same responsibilities as that of higher provincial administration officials but they were also in

charge with a monthly inspection, prison audit and the distribution of duties among the region population. In crowded cities the administrative power belonged to a mayor, together with the class Duma and in sparsely populated towns it belonged to an elder elected from citizens. In general, the bureaucratic staff was brought into a system and significantly reduced. In many Siberian "backwoods" the official places and the heading posts were not provided.

The volost governing was the same as in European Russia. Administration was formed a volost head, an elder and a clerk elected annually by the "attorneys" from each village. Elders and village policeman acted in a village. Peasant chiefs had to monitor the payment of taxes, to make paper reports to a police captain and judge minor offenses.

In the 17th century, there were specific Siberian positions (Aleksandrov and Pokrovsky, 1991) the writing heads (agents of governors) suburban clerks, tradesmen and convict clerks who were in charge of tillage farmers affairs of new settlements and forts. Most of the duties executed by those persons in the European regions of Russia was entrusted to local landowners. Since there was no serfdom as such in Siberia and all its people were "state-owned", the central government, based on regional authorities had the opportunity to perform any reforms there and to change the administrative division of a region because public institutions were the highest and the only authority for all Siberians.

Finally, a poor population is among the characteristic manifestations of the Russian occupation of Siberia. The social and political impact of this was in the fact, that the settlements had not a sufficient number of inhabitants to establish any class, representative or zemsky bodies. Therefore, instead of elections they practiced appointments more often (especially, in the 17th-the first half of the 19th century).

Secondly, Siberia as the part of a unified state was governed generally by the same local authorities like all state. However, a poor population and a shortage of qualified personnel led to the fact that these bodies often took a simple shape in comparison with the European Russia (Eroshkin, 1968), they had a more compact organizational structure.

Finally, an important socio-political factor was penal servitude and exile, demanded a special attention from the local authorities, the main areas of hard labor were allocated into mining and metallurgy districts, formally subordinate to the provincial administration but with its own control procedure and its own communication with the government body.

A certain role in the development of an administrative system in Siberia was played by ethnic-social factors. The

state power contacts with the Siberian indigenous peoples also contributed to the outbreak of Siberia control features. The challenge of new tribes and territories conversion to citizenship and then their keeping in subjection encouraged the central government to provide the Siberian governors not only civil but also military power. Furthermore, the duties of Siberian governors included such functions as tax collection, the protection of hunters ("tribute-paying people") from the raids of southern nomads and the suppression of discords between Siberian tribes.

It was necessary to comply with the measure in relation to the population and not increase the tax collection indefinitely. At the understanding that the Siberian natives could migrate from public collectors into the depths of taiga or even kill fort garrisons they had to demonstrate loyalty to the natives constantly. Once a clan or a tribe agreed to pay taxes or tributaries, the government was very reluctant to sanction violent measures, even if they stopped to supply fur for any reason or delivered them only partially (Bakhrushin, 1929). The main means of tax payers attraction was the preservation of traditional prerogatives by tribal elders, tribal leaders and ulus princes in return to the recognition of Russian administration supremacy. The customary law continued to exist within the tribal communities. Since the nobility agreed and acknowledged by oath the consent of paying tribute to treasury, the Russian administration reserved the nobility power over their people. Thus, the clan and the tribal nobility of Siberian peoples were involved in the organization of the overall management structure, although at the lowest level.

Thus, the main factors which influenced the Siberia management specifics were the following ones: political and geographical ones-the territory vastness, the lack of strict administrative division, the proximity to Asian countries social and political ones-the lack of nobility and tradesmen organizations, the shortage of administrative staff, the lack of privately owned land, military and administrative nature of settlement organization the spontaneous migration of peasants and a small amount population ethnic social ones-the need of management for native nobility.

All this influenced the development of more stable traditions in Siberia. They were founded in the 17th century and continued to operate until the fall of the empire in 1917. One of these traditions is the administrative division of Siberia into large districts. In the 18th century, they were represented by ranks in the second half of the 18th century, they were represented by governorship and by Governor-General post in the 19th, the beginning of 20th century. Each of these units could be divided into provinces and districts according to a

national sample but Siberia peculiarities gave rise to the need for the organization of additional territorial subdivision, an intermediary between the central government and local authorities (in counties, provinces, towns).

Another developed tradition is a strong administrative prerogative of Siberian authorities. As rank magistrates of Tsar Alexey Mikhailovich, so as the governor generals at beginning of 20th century combined the duties of civilian and military management of Siberia. The prerogatives of the rank and the governor-general's offices were in many respects similar to those held by the central departments (orders, boards, ministries) on the territory west of the Urals.

One may consider foreign powers of higher Siberian dignitaries as local governance traditions that stemmed from the geographical position of the region and its distance from Moscow and St. Petersburg. With the expansion of the borders of Russia to the east many areas turned out to be in its composition and accordingly, under the control of the Siberian governor. Thus the foreign relations were transformed into domestic ones-the whole history of tax collection was represented by such a picture. When Russia came to the Pacific ocean and completed the accession of the Siberian and Far Eastern lands, this factor did not lose its value. As an example we can point to the fact that Russian America was nominally subordinate to the main board of Eastern Siberia in administrative aspect and in 1914 the autonomous protectorate Uryankhai territory was included in the Irkutsk Governor-General territory.

SIBERIA MANAGEMENT APPROACHES

The combination of numerous factors gave rise to the phenomenon of Siberia "special management". This term circulated during the first half of the 19th century but the actual management of the Russian state eastern part was a "special" one from the end of the 16th century until the Revolution.

Thus, three main approaches to management were developed in Siberia: economic, territorial and demographic one. The economic approach was conditioned by rich natural resources of Siberia. The territorial and demographic approaches were conditioned by the complexity of a vast territory control with minimum population. This complexity led to the trend of unbundling (the division of Siberia into the Western and the Eastern one).

A considerably new approach appeared in the 20th century: national municipalities. Since the beginning of the construction of the Trans-Siberian railway the

population increased significantly. For example in Krasnoyarsk the population of 30 thousand men at the end of the 19th century increased to 1 million men by 1997. The control system refused from the division into East and West a single region was developed. The territory enlargement was similar to the Russian policy of the 19th century. So, Siberian territory became divided into autonomous regions on national grounds.

In the 21st century, the global world greatly influenced the socio-economic development. There was the return to economic approach in the management of Siberia. The competition with the world economy led to Siberian industrial potential overestimation. The industry, established mainly during 60-70 years, needs some radical modernization. However, the most difficult thing in the process of modernization is not an acute shortage of money, not in huge transfer costs concerning the overcoming of regional distance but in the absence of a clear vision concerning the future of the Russian region beyond Urals a clear understanding of this vast region development. In our view, this is related with the development of regional management methodology, with the new views on the history of regions, the ratio of state administration and self-government.

CONCLUSION

The 21st century demonstrated the tendency of Siberia diplomatic cooperation with EAEC, BRICS, SCO and the Asia Pacific countries. In these conditions Siberia as a significant part of our country, should use its historical and social experience and implement its national advantages. The Siberia management methodology should be based and clearly built using this experience. This will strengthen the positions of our region on a global level and will allow to establish an effective diplomatic cooperation with neighboring countries.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The research was produced with the support of Russian Federation Ministry of Education and Science.

REFERENCES

- Aleksandrov, V.A. and N.N. Pokrovsky, 1991. Power and Society: Siberia in the XVII-th Century. Nauka Publisher, Novosibirsk, Russia, Pages: 401.
- BYPL., 1830. Complete collection of Russian Empire laws: The 1st meeting. Boris Yeltsin Presidential Library, Saint Petersburg, Russia. <http://www.prlib.ru/EN-US/Lib/Pages/item.aspx?itemid=10285>.

- Bakhrushin, S.V., 1929. Siberian natives under Russian rule until the revolution of 1917. *Soviet North Coll.*, 1: 66-97.
- Bakhrushin, S.V., 1955. The governors of Tobolsk in the XVII-th century. *Sci. Works*, 3: 253-262.
- Eroshkin, N.P., 1968. *The History of Public Institutions in Pre-Revolutionary Russia*. Graduate School, Russia, Pages: 368.
- Kopylov, A.N., 1965. The central and voivodship management of Siberia at the end of XVI-XVII century. *Proc. Siberian Branch USSR Acad. Sci. Ser. Humanities*, 9: 80-88.
- Potinin, G.N., 1907. Regional trend in Siberia. *Prior Gas Sib. Life*, 28: 1-65.
- Shishkin, V.I., 2010. State management of Siberia in the late XIX-th-early XX-th century. *Collect. Sci. Art.*, 1: 3-36.