

Publication date: December 9, 2018

Historical Sciences

RESULTS AND CONSEQUENCES OF THE FIRST RUSSIAN REVOLUTION IN RUSSIA

Shabunin, Andrey Pavlovich¹

¹Bachelor, Voronezh State Technical University, Street 20 years of October, 84, Voronezh, Russia, E-Mail: shabunin.1998@mail.ru

Abstract:

In article discusses the causes and consequences of the first Russian revolution of 1905-1907. The Russian revolution of 1905 played an important role in the transformation of the political system. For several years before 1905, and especially after the humiliating Russian-Japanese war (1904-1905), various social groups showed their displeasure with the Russian social and political system.

Their protests ranged from liberal rhetoric to strikes and included student unrest and terrorist killings. A general strike paralyzed the country after «Bloody Sunday». «Bloody Sunday» opens two years of revolution and fights with the government for civil liberties, justice and democracy.

Keywords: Revolution, monarchy, old regime, struggle, liberty, democracy.

I. INTRODUCTION

The French revolution that happened at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries swept away and overthrew the foundations of feudalism. Liberty, equality and fraternity were the cherished ideals of the revolution. And they long disturbed the best minds of the epoch. François-René de Chateaubriand was a great French writer, politician and historian. In the middle of the 19th century Chateaubriand wrote: "Everything that happened to us is not an abyss. I feel our century is only the beginning of the path to the abyss. Ecumenical cataclysms are being prepared. Whole nations will rise by our example. The feeling of great future blood does not leave me".

This ecumenical cataclysm predicted Chateaubriand, occurred at the beginning of the 20th century in Russia. And it will keep behind an indelible mark in the history of Russia. But the revolution of 1917 was preceded by the revolution of 1905. From point of view of history the first revolution is a success. Because it has fulfilled the main task madly frightened Russian society and warned the monarchy. The revolution clearly showed in what chaos it plunges the country. But the history later showed that her lessons then were not learned by the government. This led to the greatest tragedy in the history of Russia in 1917.

Russian Empire continued a reformist path for several years after the emancipation of the serfs. Law codes were standardized and punishments lightened. Local governments were established in the regions.

The military system was reformed and became an important force for the state. But the state had not a national representative body existed. And unfortunately, after Alexander II's assassination by anarchists in 1881, the government reversed its course on reformist tendencies.

Ironically, on that ill-fated day when the terrorist attack happened, the Sovereign informed the Minister of Internal Affairs, Count Loris-Melikov about his decision to submit the draft Constitution to the discussion of the Council of Ministers. Two hours later, Alexander II was assassinated.

Then at that turn, on the Catherine Canal, where the carriage of Alexander II exploded, Russian history will turn. And in my opinion, this direction was wrong.

The new emperor Alexander III came to the throne in 1891. He was like as a mighty Russian bogatyr, who was powered over everything, and it was hard not to obey for him. The tsar was an ideal of the Russian autocrat. By the advice of Konstantin Petrovich Pobedonostsev, who was a tutor of Alexander III, the tsar immediately dismissed Loris-Melikov. And his project was rejected. In Russia, the government started the implementation of conservative counter-reforms. The reign was remembered for taking anti-terrorism measures that restricted civil rights and freedom of the press.

In 1894, the Tsar Alexander III died after a sudden illness. He left his heir a huge empire, with its unresolved, but only temporarily frozen troubles.

II. METHODOLOGY

The main objectives of this study are a theoretical analysis of domestic politics and the life of the country before and after the revolution of 1905-07. In this work, we studied in detail the main reasons that inevitably led to the revolution, as well as the consequences of this event on the life of the country.

The methods of historical research should be understood as ways of studying historical patterns through their specific manifestations - historical facts, methods of extracting new knowledge from facts. The main historical methods of scientific research often include four methods: historical-genetic, historical-comparative, historical-typological and historical-systemic.

In this work, used the historical-comparative and historical-systemic methods.

The objective basis of the historical and comparative method for its use is that socio-historical development is a repetitive, internally determined, regular process. Many events that took place at different times and on different scales are similar in many respects, differ in many ways from each other. Therefore, comparing them, it is possible to explain the content of the considered facts and phenomena.

Under current conditions, when historical research is increasingly characterized by a holistic coverage of history, the historical-systemic method, that is, the method by which the unity of events and phenomena in socio-historical development is studied, is increasingly used.

Also in the work were used chronological and structural – functional methods. The value of the structural – functional method consists in decomposing the object under study into its constituent parts and revealing the internal connection, conditionality, the relationship between them. The essence of the chronological method is that events are presented strictly in a temporary (chronological) order.

The theoretical and methodological basis of the study was the statistical data and works of Russian and foreign historians and scholars, such as Pipes R., Lieven D., Platonov S.F., Flerovsky I., and others.

III. DISCUSSION: CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES. TIMELINE OF REVOLUTION

His son Nicholas II assumes the throne. As with his father, the new emperor conducts by the K.P. Pobedonostsev. In 17, January of 1895 was announced the inviolability of autocracy. Nicholas II spoke about the meaninglessness of dreams about management. Management is his job. It is a work of the autocrat. But Nicholas was not his father - a real Russian bogatyr. Alexander could threaten and require. But not Nicky, as his family called him. At that time, he was just a young man, too timid for such a work. Nevertheless, this meant one thing: all the expectations of the Russian people for the establishment of a democratic state were crushed in an instant. And immediately it went into society: he wants everything to be the same. But it can hardly for him.

Then there was the coronation and mystically significant catastrophe at Khodynka Field. Half a million people gathered on this field, on the occasion of the coronation. Gifts were prepared for citizens. It was for memory of the event. But the government of Moscow did not inspect this place of celebration; they did not foresee the future tragedy. Under Alexander, it could hardly was possible. But when Nicholas reigned decided that now you can. After all, the tsar was completely different. And with the connivance of the Moscow governor and Grand Duke Sergei Alexandrovich, the pits were not filled up. This led to the tragedy. When the gifts were distributed, a crush began and almost 2,000 died. That's how this reign began.

Nicholas never punished Grand Duke Sergei Alexandrovich, because he was his uncle and husband of Empress Alexandra Feodorovna's sister, his wife. Under Alexander III this could not be. After all, he even forbade all relatives and come close to the threshold of his cabinet. But with Nicholas II, it became possible. And now everything has become possible for his relatives. It was a huge problem. Nicholas was very kind, but he did not have the suitable character. The one who entered his cabinet the last won the decision. He did not have an iron will of the autocrat that was typical of his father.

In the beginning of the 20th century society still believed in the peaceful evolution of Russian Empire toward liberal institutions and prosperity. But people understood that the tsar was weak. And soon re-rattled explosions terrorist' bombs. Many influential dignitaries of the empire were killed, such as Dmitry Sipyagin, Vyacheslav von Plehve (they were in different times Ministers of the Interior), Nicholas Bobrikov (he was the Governor-General of Finland), Grand Duke Sergei Alexandrovich (he was tsar's uncle and the Governor-General of Moscow) and Viktor Sakharov (he was the Minister of War).

There were no great people in the palace near the emperor. Although this restless time required it. And there was a paradox. After all, Russia at that time was full of the smartest people of the epoch. But at the court all sorts of crooks and adventurers began to appear, because Alexandra Feodorovna was enthralled by mysticism. And that was how the life of a huge country went on. Slowly but surely began the agony of the regime.

In 1904 began Russian-Japan War. His closest dignitaries drew the emperor into the war. The war, designed to unite the Emperor with his people and challenged of the patriotic forces, should have ended quickly. The war was supposed to strengthen influence of Russia in Manchuria, Korea and position on the Liaodong Peninsula. After all, the government believed that our army is strong and invincible in comparison with the Japanese. They just forgot one thing: in the event of the loss and defeat of our troops, the tsar would have been guilty. The cause was an absolute monarchy. Otherwise, it is necessary to change the state structure. It cannot be otherwise.

In January 1904, the war began with Japan. Unfortunately, some failures pursued the Russian army. There were shameful defeats in Port Arthur, and under Mukden and Tsushima. There were several reasons for the defeat. This is the remoteness of the military theater from the center of the empire and technical absences from the Japanese army. The Russian generals were also not up to par. The military capabilities of Russia in 1905 did not exhaust themselves, but the morale in the army fell. The government was seen to be incompetent in controlling the armed forces. Military failures contributed to the fall of the prestige of the monarchy and the beginning of the coming revolution. One of the biggest causes of the revolution was the Russo – Japanese war of 1904-1905.

In the years leading up to 1905, in the country there were also economic difficulties. The economic crisis of 1900-1903 and the protracted economic depression were the cause of future revolution. The industrial recession, the breakdown of monetary circulation, the poor harvest and the huge public debt, which has grown since the Russo-Turkish war, led to the exacerbation of the need to reform the activities and authorities. The termination of the period of essential importance of the natural economy, the intensive form of the progress of industrial methods for the XIX century required radical innovations in administration and law.

Industrial workers across Russia were in unenviable position, their working conditions were poor, and their pay was minimal; most working worked 16 hour days. These unacceptable problems were thought to be able to be solved by a march not a revolution, the extreme. Illegal strikes took place across Russia including the first major one in St Petersburg in 1896 and a miners' strike in 1900 which made conditions worse.

As workers were centralized in factories, this also allowed more radical ideas to come forward. The Russians had heard about Western ideals, including democracy and humanitarianism, and how revolutions forced governments of another states to listen to these ideas. Russia was split into several parties, including Monarchists, Capitalists, Constitutional Democrats, Socialist Revolutionaries, and Social Democrats. The social unrest of the working class and the political unrest created by the numerous parties led to the Revolution of 1905.

Russia was a multi-ethnic empire. Non-Russian cultures were tolerated in the empire but were not necessarily respected it. European civilization was valued more over Asian culture, and Christianity was on the whole considered more progressive than other religions.

Besides the imposition of a uniform Russian culture throughout the empire, the government's pursuit an idea of Russification, especially during the second half of the nineteenth century, had political motives. The government thought that the borders would be defended better if the borderland regions were more "Russian" in character. The culmination of cultural heterogeneity was caused the rise of nationalist movements against the Russian government.

The peasants accounted for more than 70 percent of the country's population in the beginning of the 20th century. The government enacted laws to enable them to buy land from nobility and pay redemption payments over many decades. Individual peasants not did own the land, known as «allotment land», but by the community of peasants; individual peasants had rights to strips of land that were assigned to them under the open field system. Unfortunately, a peasant could not sell or mortgage his land, so in practice he could not renounce his rights to his land and thus he would be required to pay his share of redemption dues to the village commune. The peasants were not given enough land to provide for their needs. Their earnings were often so small that they could neither buy the food they needed nor keep up the payment of taxes and redemption dues they owed the government for their land allotments. By 1903 their total arrears in payments of taxes and dues was 118 million rubles. The situation became worse.

Under Father Gapon's charismatic leadership, thousands of Petersburg workers were organized into neighborhood associations centered around local club-houses, tearooms and libraries that for the first time provided them with venues of social, cultural and eventually political interaction. Gapon himself was influenced and assisted by a small but dedicated group of workers and intelligently who, having passed through the school of Social Democracy and found it wanting, remained nonetheless dedicated to the workers' cause as they understood it. As the months went by, it began to dawn on the St Petersburg officials who had begun by supporting Gapon financially that instead of the calming, loyal, religious influence they had hoped for, they had created a sort of Frankenstein monster, literally. But it was a movement that was rapidly escaping their control. More and more Gapon's «Assembly of Factory Workers» («Sobranie russkikh fabrichno-zavodskikh rabochikh») was being transmogrified into a giant labor union, with pretensions to represent the interests of Petersburg workers against their employers. Hence when three of its members were fired from the giant (c. 12,000 workers) Putilov engineering works in late December, precipitating an illegal strike at a plant on which the government heavily relied for its shipbuilding and armaments production, Gapon (after some hesitation) assumed the role of what today might be called 'worker-priest', encouraging the spread of the strike to many other factories and organizing a citywide protest demonstration. On 9 January 1905, thanks to nervous troops and a government that simply did not get the picture, unarmed workers and their families who attempted to march, militantly but without violence, on the Winter Palace were repeatedly fired

upon, with over a hundred demonstrators killed and many more injured. The day has gone down in history as Russia's notorious 'Bloody Sunday', the opening salvo of the revolution of 1905.

Though it was led by a presumably apolitical priest, it would be a mistake to think of the workers' demonstration of 9 January as lacking in political content. The petition to the tsar that was carried by many of the demonstrators was replete not only with the class-centered particularistic demands of industrial labor (including, however, 'economic' demands with strong political connotations such as the eight-hour day and the right to form trade unions), it also contained the demand for a Constituent Assembly elected on the basis of a four-tailed suffrage as well as such basic rights as freedom of speech, assembly and religion. At the same time, the petition included demands – the elimination of redemption payments, for example – that spoke to the interests of the peasantry, the socio-legal group («soslovie») to which most workers still belonged and with which many still had genuine economic, familial and personal links.

So the two periods of revolution starting with 'Bloody Sunday' and subsequent civil unrest and ending with the Coup of June 1907.

All across Russia, different sections of the people moved into active protest. The peasants and workers joined with the middle classes, intelligentsia and minority national groups against the oppression of the monarchy. Each group had different aims, however, and the two forces which played the leading part in the revolution were the workers and peasants, who raised economic and political demands while the better-off middle-classes sought mostly the latter.

The unrest was spread as the year progressed, reaching peaks in early summer and autumn before climaxing in October. There were naval mutinies at Sevastopol, Vladivostok and Kronstadt, peaking in June, with the mutiny aboard the Battleship Potemkin. Strikes took place all over the country and the universities closed down when the whole student body complained about the lack of civil liberties by staging a walkout. Lawyers, doctor, engineers, and other middle-class workers established the Union of Unions and demanded a constituent assembly.

In the countryside, there were land-seizures by the peasantry (including the looting the larger estates) and a nation-wide Peasant Union was created. In the towns, the workers' act of resistance was the strike. There was a general strike in St. Petersburg immediately after Bloody Sunday. Over 400,000 workers were involved by the end of January. The strikes spread across the country. In the process new forms of working class self-organization were created. These were councils made up of workers delegates, the famous "soviets".

While the soviets were created by workers to solve their immediate problems (for example winning the strike, the eight-hour day, working conditions) their role changed. They quickly evolved into an organ of the general and political representation of workers, raising political demands. Needless to say, their potential as a base for political agitation were immediately recognized by revolutionaries, and although they were not involved in the early stages both the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks attempted to gain influence in them.

The first soviet (which is Russian for council) was established in Ivanovo-Voznesensk during the 1905 Textile Strike. It began as a strike committee but developed into an elected body of the town's workers. Over the next few months Soviets of Workers Deputies were established in around 60 different towns. On October 13th, the more famous St. Petersburg Soviet of Workers' Deputies was created out of the 'Great October Strike' on the initiative of the printers' strike committee in order to better coordinate the strike.

It was Russia's first political general strike, lasting from September to October 30th. Although strikes had been common in Russia in the years leading up to 1905, this powerful weapon of direct action effectively paralyzed the whole country. The October strike started in St. Petersburg and quickly spread to Moscow and soon the railwaymen strike paralyzed the whole Russian railway network.

The magnitude of the strike finally convinced Nicholas to act. On the advice of Sergey Yulyevich Witte, he issued the October Manifesto (October 17 [October 30], 1905), which promised a constitution and the establishment of an elected legislature (Duma), also freedom of the press, assembly and association. Nicholas II also made Witte president of the new Council of Ministers (i.e., prime minister).

These concessions did not meet the radical opposition's demands for an assembly or a republic. The revolutionaries refused to yield; even the liberals declined to participate in Witte's government. But some

moderates were satisfied, and many workers, interpreting the October Manifesto as a victory, returned to their jobs.

It was enough to break the opposition's coalition and to weaken the St. Petersburg soviet. At the end of November the government arrested the soviet's chairman, the Menshevik G.S. Khrustalev-Nosar, and on December 3 (December 16) occupied its building and arrested Leon Trotsky and others. But in Moscow a new general strike was called; barricades were erected, and there was fighting in the streets before the revolution was put down. By the beginning of 1906 the government had regained control of the Trans-Siberian Railroad and of the army, and the revolution was essentially over.

The uprising failed to replace the autocracy with a democratic republic or even to convoke a constituent assembly, and most of the revolutionary leaders were placed under arrest. It did, however, force the imperial regime to institute extensive reforms, the most important of which were the Fundamental Laws (1906), which functioned as a constitution, and the creation of the Duma, which fostered the development of legal political activity and political parties.

The revolution failed to remove Nicholas from power and soon unfortunately he quickly ceased renege on his promises. In 3 June of 1907 was the Coup. The tsar disbanded the Second Duma due to disagreements. And he changed the right to vote. It let to him made the parliament become more loyal to the monarchy. It created a fundamental shift in the makeup of future Dumas in the Russian Empire: whereas previous laws had given peasants and other lower-class people a larger proportion of electors to the Duma, the new law transferred this to the propertied classes, in an effort to avoid election of the large number of liberal and revolutionary deputies who had dominated the First and Second Dumas. Although it largely succeeded in this objective, it ultimately failed to preserve the Imperial system, which ceased to exist during the Russian Revolution of 1917. Thus the revolution was over.

The monarchy was not overthrown, but the revolutionary masses achieved significant results. The manifesto on October 17, 1905, crowned the success of the unrest. First of all, Russia has become a constitutional dualistic monarchy. This is the main achievement of the revolution. The power of the tsar now was not unlimited as before. Then in Russia there is a long-awaited parliament - the State Duma. By law, without the consent of the Duma, not a single legislative act could come into force. But the tsar had the right of veto. But the monarch had no right to change the law.

On the agrarian question, the revolution brought relief to the countryside. The peasants stopped paying redemption payments. They also got the right to leave the community. The peasants became more independent in their actions. Some of them were able to leave the village, going to work in the city, and join the working class of the proletariat. The semi-feudal methods of exploiting the peasants have been reduced. The class restrictions of peasants were reduced. The long-awaited agrarian reform of Stolypin began, which will mark the reign of Nicholas II.

The proletariat received (at least legally) the right to form trade unions, conduct economic strikes, their wages increased, the working day was reduced.

In the Manifesto of October 17, 1905, some civil liberties, freedom of assembly and union, freedom of conscience, and personal integrity were announced. Preliminary censorship was abolished. It was the beginning of a general electoral system.

The main issues of the revolution were not resolved as the broad masses demanded. The social system and state structure were not changed radically. Classes and groups that ruled earlier remained in power

IV. CONCLUSION

Economic recession early in the 1900s was followed by losing in a war with Japan (1904–05). It led to revolution in 1905, as worker strikes and peasant rioting spread through the country. And will be that Bloody Sunday. Then Nicholas II did not know about a situation in Saint-Petersburg, and he left the capital and went in Tsarskoye Selo. He would not even dare to think that the demonstrating workers would be shot. This was done by the Grand Duke Vladimir Alexandrovich. It was his decision. But it was not important. After all, it was an autocracy. Anyway Nicholas II was guilty, because was an autocrat monarch. Such was the law, such was a system. And the revolution took place in the most terrible conditions. The army was at the front, and there were giant strikes in the country that paralyzes the life of the empire.

Nicholas II responded with a number of concessions. For example: redemption payments were eased on peasants, and enterprising peasants gained new rights to acquire land, creating a successful though widely resented kulak class in the countryside. Rural unrest eased as a result. On the political front a national parliament, or the Duma, was established. But the Duma soon became a mere rubber stamp, unable to take any significant initiative. Repressions returned and with it substantial popular unrest, including growing illegal trade unions.

The first Russian revolution, with all its obviousness, demonstrated that the former form of government was practically outdated, and the development of democratic institutions was a vital necessity influenced by the development of capitalism and as a result of the growth of the revolutionary movement.

The first Russian revolution, despite its defeat, was of paramount importance for the political maturity of the working class, the strengthening of opposition parties, the formation of an alliance of the working class and peasants.

The revolution was bourgeois-democratic in nature; it was the movement of the broad masses of the people who fought, among other things, for the establishment of a democratic order. But the main problems of the revolution were not solved as the masses demanded. The social system and state structure have not changed dramatically.

Monarchy did not make the turn to compromise, and in the judgment of some historians renewed revolution loomed even aside from the outbreak of war in 1914. Unfortunately, almost on the second day, the supreme government began to try to take away the victories of the revolution. After all, they thought that the parliament, the Constitution and the tsar were incompatible. After all, the oaths of loyalty by the tsar to the Russian autocracy have been violated.

Our great historian Vasily Osipovich Klyuchevsky once wrote: "Alexei Nikolaevich will not reign. The Dynasty will not live to her political death. It will die out earlier. Russia will face new chaos and new distemper. Klyuchevsky predicated it because he understood one main thing – the government did not misunderstand this lesson and results of this revolt. The government were doing similarly like on the reign of Alexander III. Eventually his prediction will come true in the future. The monarchy remained in power until February 1917 when a similar wave of mass protests finally victory over old regime. And Nicholas II was abdicated from the throne. So thousand-year history of the monarchy in Russia was ended.

REFERENCES

- Ascher Ab., (1997) *The Revolution of 1905: Russia in Disarray*. Stanford Press. Pp. 40-51.
- Ashmarov I.A., Ershov B.A. (2018) Church as a social and economic institution of society in the XIX - early XX centuries. // II International Scientific and Practical Conference "Orthodoxy and Society: the Edge of Interaction." Chita: Transbaikal State University. Pp. 33-41.
- Ashmarov I.A., Ershov B.A. (2014). The situation on the labor market of Russia at the final stage of the First World War // *Russia in world wars and international conflicts (on the 100th anniversary of the First World War): proceedings of the Int. conf.* Voronezh: Voronezh State Technical University. Part. 1. - Pp. 153-158.
- Ashmarov I.A. (2014). Global contradictions of Russia and the West // *Actual problems of development of Russia and its regions: materials Vseross. scientific and practical conf.* (November 11, 2014) - Kurgan: Dammy Printing House LLC. - Pp. 24-27.
- Ashmarov I.A., Korsun Yu.R. (2010). The economic consequences of the Russian-Japanese war // *Extremism, conflicts and wars: history and modernity: works of International conference.* Voronezh: Voronezh State Technical University. Pp. 162-166.
- Ashmarov I.A., (2008). Development of the domestic labor market at the beginning of the 20th century // *Historical and economic research* // Irkutsk: Baikal State University of Economics and Law. V.9. № 1. Pp. 43-57.
- Bonnell V.E. (1993) *Roots of Rebellion: Workers' Politics and Organizations in St. Petersburg*.
- Dillon E. J., (1918) *The eclipse of Russia*. Pp. 77-78.
- Eklöf B., Bushnell J., Zakharova L.G. (1994) *Russia's Great Reforms, 1855-1881*. Pp. 94-95.
- Encyclopædia Britannica. History of Europe. Reform and reaction in Eastern Europe. Encyclopædia Britannica. Russian Revolution of 1905. 976 p.
- Ershov, B.A., (2012) *The Russian Orthodox Church in the system of public relations in the XIX– early XX centuries. (on materials of Central-Black earth Provinces)* dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Historical Sciences / Kursk State University. 412 p.
- Ershov, B.A., (2012) *Historiographical aspects of the relationship between the Russian Orthodox Church and state structures in the provinces of the Central Chernozem region in the XIX -early XX centuries.* Bulletin of the Voronezh State Technical University. Series "Humanities". Pp. 188-192.
- Ershov, B.A., (2012) *State legal regulation of the activities of the Russian Orthodox Church in the provinces of the Central Chernozem region in the XIX -early XX centuries* Historical, philosophical, political and legal sciences, culturology and arthistory. Questions of theory and practice. Pp. 75-78.
- Ershov, B.A., (2013) *Russian Orthodox Church in the structure of public administration in the XIX - early XX centuries: Monograph* Voronezh State Technical University. 245 p.
- Figs Or., (1996) *A people's tragedy. A History of the Russian Revolution*. Indiana University. Pp. 745-749.
- Flerovsky I., (1925) *Our First Workers and Peasants Revolution of 1905*. 122 p.
- Golovkov G.Z., (2006) *1905-1907. Milestones of mutual violence of power and revolution Russia and the modern world*. Pp. 114-127.
- Lieven D., (2006) *The Cambridge History of Russia. Volume II. Imperial Russia, 1689-1917. Massacre of 1905*. Pp. 317-320.
- Nefedov S.A., (2008) *The origins of the year 1905: "The revolution from the outside"?* Questions of history. Pp. 47-59.
- Pipes R., (2005) *The Russian revolution. The agony of the old regime. 1905-1917. Production*. Pp. 247-250.
- Platonov S.F., (1999) *Full course of lectures on Russian history*. 798 p.