ZEMSTVO OF THE XIX-XX CENTURIES. IN RUSSIA: THE FORMATION OF SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

INTRODUCTION

One of the leading factors is the level of development of local government, which was most widespread during the Zemstvo reform of 1864, the implementation of which allowed providing the necessary conditions for solving social problems in a particular territory. Zemstvo institutions assumed responsibility for providing most areas of life that were not a priority for state authorities; they promoted education and culture in cities and villages, thereby narrowing the disparities in their socio-economic development. During 1865-76, Zemstvo institutions were introduced in 34 Russian provinces, which indicates the broad scope of the ongoing social changes. The significance of Zemstvo activity, according to the estimates of public figures of the XIX century, was not only that “the Zemstvo institutions contributed to the economy of the country in many areas of their feasible expenses, but also that they served as a school of political education of society and the people” (DZHANSHEIEV, 1905). That is why successful practices of Zemstvo management require a new understanding during the development of modern social policy and local government reform in Russia.

The socio-economic development of the state and territories and the well-being of the population largely depend on the level of functioning of the social infrastructure. Accordingly, the transformation of models of management of these processes arises from the need for continuous improvement of management practices, their adaptation to socio-economic and political conditions of development of society. Key areas of infrastructure (such as housing and utilities, transport, social security, health, education, etc.) throughout all stages of historical development needed legal, organizational, and financial and economic support. In different periods of Russian history, various factors have influenced the formation and functioning of infrastructure, especially at the local level (FROLOVA, 2016).

The historical aspects of infrastructure development are now the focus of much scientific research. This is due to rather long-standing management practices for the development of infrastructure facilities, As Smith M. L. emphasizes, the infrastructure that shapes and facilitates everyday life is one of the most dynamic systems in both ancient and modern cities (SMITH, 2016).

Of interest is the study by Bel G., who analyzes the directions of Spanish infrastructure policy since the early 1700s: the construction of roads in the eighteenth century, the creation and expansion of railways in the nineteenth, the expansion of highways in the twentieth. The scientist’s conclusions illustrate the dysfunctions of public policy; the analysis shows a long-term model in which the activity of the government authorities in developing infrastructure in Spain is determined not by the needs of trade and economic activity, but rather by the desire to centralize its objects around the country’s political capital (BEL, 2011). An analysis of the development of infrastructure in post-independence African countries has shown that it is only
through investment in infrastructure that the interests of the population have been met (WETHAL, 2019). The work Da Silva (2019) is dedicated to identifying the role of charitable associations in the development of health care in the state of Sao Paulo from 1838 to 1915. Lee, Li, Jung (2019) examine the factors that drive political innovation among local governments to develop infrastructure after democratization in Korea. The role and influence of ideology, technology, and geopolitics on the development of infrastructure industries from 1830 to 1990 are described in the work of Millward (2011). Appropriate social conditions, adequate funding (HANLEY, 2002), effective management practices, project approach and support (ROGACH et al, 2020) are essential conditions for urban infrastructure development.

The works of Russian scientists devoted to social infrastructure at different stages of its historical development usually reflect the issues of the formation of individual infrastructure sectors: public education (POZDNYAKOV, 2018), Zemstvo medicine (MIRONOVA, 2020), etc.

The analysis of publications on the historical experience of infrastructure development shows a high interest of scientists in this issue: the factors of infrastructure functioning in the conditions of historical development of territories, dysfunction of management practices, specifics and directions of authorities’ activity in various periods of social development are studied. However, despite considerable amount of publications the scientific literature insufficiently investigated issues related to comprehensive analysis of the development of social infrastructure in terms of land reforms, identifying the most promising managerial practices of providing social services.

The purpose of the article is to identify the role of the Zemstvo reform in the formation of social infrastructure in Russia, as well as to study the activities of Zemstvo institutions in the XIX-early XX century for the development of social infrastructure facilities.

METHODS

The principle of historicism used in the research methodology allows us to analyze the historical experience of the development of social infrastructure during the Zemstvo reform.

The method of retrospective analysis highlighted the advantages and disadvantages of the Zemstvo system of self-government. The comparative method allowed us to identify trends in the financial and economic provision of Zemstvo bodies at various stages of the Zemstvo reform. Analysis of key indicators of social infrastructure development in the second half of the XIX – beginning of XX was carried out based on a statistical method.

The source base of the research was made up of archival materials of Zemstvo institutions, statistical data presented in encyclopedic publications of the XIX – early XX centuries, as well as articles, abstracts, reports, reviews of public figures of the XIX century.

RESULTS

Issues of development of social infrastructure of territories were most widespread as a result of the Zemstvo reform of the XIX century, thanks to which there was an institutionalization of public control, the practice of organizing local economy, activities to improve life and social services of the population and to meet its needs by the authorities of a particular territory.

According to the Regulations of 1864, provincial and district Zemstvo institutions were created to resolve mainly economic affairs. Article 2 of the Regulations prescribes the competence of the Zemstvos: “managing the property, capital and monetary collections of the Zemstvos; arranging and maintaining buildings, other structures and communication routes belonging to the Zemstvos; providing people’s food; managing Zemstvos’ charitable institutions and other charity measures; participating in the care of public education, public health and prisons, etc.” (REGULATIONS, 1864). The rather broad competence of Zemstvo institutions indicates a significant amount of activities assigned to these bodies, despite the fact that they were not provided with financial resources. Their budget was based on real estate taxes.

At the same time, the Zemstvos did not have full independence in solving local issues, as they were limited only to providing economic affairs. The lack of clearly defined competencies of Zemstvos in public life often became a source of conflict situations. In particular, the
educational department did not recognize the Zemstvos’ right to participate in the organization of educational affairs, leaving them only the economic support of educational institutions, despite the fact that it was during the period of Zemstvo administration that the greatest success was achieved in the field of public education.

On one hand, many scientists and public figures saw the Zemstvo reform as a path to decentralization and self-government (LOKHVITSKY, 1864; VASILCHIKOV, 1872). According to B.N. Chicherin, “the Zemstvo has acquired independence and conducts the affairs provided to it as successfully as its forces and means allow it; it repairs roads, builds bridges, conducts household duties, starts hospitals, hires doctors, manages its charitable institutions, orphanages, paramedic schools, etc. ...These institutions are dear to us, we see the future of Russia in them” (CHICHERIN, 2010). As V.D. Kuzmin-Karavaev notes, “The idea of local self-government is based on a proven ability to conduct business, a willingness to bring personal strength and funds to serve the needs and benefits of the local population” (KUZMIN-KARAVAEV, 1904). V.Yu. Skalon notes the usefulness of Zemstvo work: “Zemstvo work cannot be considered fruitless, just because it resulted in a lot of very valuable materials” (SKALON, 1884).

On the other hand, it was true that Zemstvo institutions did not have full independence in solving most issues, including infrastructure development. Zemstvo institutions, according to A. A. Golovachev, are only bodies of “central management for administrating a well-known branch of the economy, which they cannot dispose of independently” (GOLOVACHEV, 1872). Bezobrazov and Gradovsky as the main drawback of the Zemstvo reform singled out the poor organization of Zemstvo institutions: “are not introduced into the general system of state administration, but are placed next to it, as separate state and public bodies that do not have any organic connections with it” (BEZOBRAZOV, 1874; GRADOVSKY, 1878). The impossibility of organizing true self-government in the conditions of autocracy is pointed out by S.Yu. Witte, due to the fact that the Zemstvos as a result of the reform become only a part of the state system (WITTE, 1903).

The uncertainty of the legal status of the Zemstvos and the growing distrust of the Government to the Zemstvo movement has led to the fact that according to the Regulations of 1890 the authorities have taken measures that strengthened the centralization of the state power and limit the autonomy of the Zemstvos: “the number of objects on which the resolutions of the meetings are subject to the approval of the governor or minister was increased; the Governor is given the right to review the provincial regulations not only from the point of view of legality and national uses and needs, but also from the point of view of the interests of local people” (Position, 1890). As a result, the implementation of the powers of the Zemstvos in the field of infrastructure operation caused additional difficulties.

Special attention should be paid to the consideration of Zemstvo finances, on the volume of which the level of development of social infrastructure facilities in a certain territory depended. The main revenue items of the Zemstvo budgets were, as a rule, taxes on real estate (from 37 to 67%). In particular, statistical data from the Central Russian provinces allow us to note that the largest collections from real estate were made by the budgets of the Vladimir and Moscow provinces. This was largely due to the predominance of industrial and commercial infrastructure in these territories (figure 1).
In addition, Zemstvo property, various fees, allowances, receipts, etc. were sources of income for Zemstvos. For example, the Zemstvo revenue estimates of the Moscow province for 1912 show a significant preponderance of fees from real estate, which accounted for more than 60% of all income (Income..., 1912). (Fig. 2).

Based on the Charter of 1851, Zemstvo duties were divided into general (state) and local (provincial) duties. The provisional rules of January 1, 1864 allowed the Zemstvos to add Zemstvo duties to their estimates at their own discretion. As a result, the expenses of the Zemstvos constantly increased: from 1814 to 1890, the Zemstvo fees increased from 4401684 rubles to 55896700 rubles. [Chronicles..., 1903] From 1853 to 1875, there was an increase in
state duties by 76% [Chronicles..., 1880]. After the adoption of the Regulations of 1864, the expenses of Zemstvos in 30 provinces increased sharply. However, if in a number of provinces they increased by an average of 30% (Smolensk and Kherson), in some, they reached 420-440% (Moscow and Samara). This was largely due to the emergence of new Zemstvo duties and the creation of new Zemstvo institutions.

All land expenses were divided into mandatory and optional. Mandatory duties included road, apartment and underwater duties, maintenance of civil institutions, etc., and optional – solving issues of education, health, etc. Since the 1870s, there has been a downward trend in mandatory spending. If in 1871, they were 51%, by 1890 – only 39.4% of the total amount. Thus, large amounts of money were spent by the Zemstvos on “optional” needs, such as medicine and education. The analysis of the set of estimates for 1868 allows us to note that the expenditure on the medical part was 8.3%, on public education – 5.1%. By 1890, the situation was somewhat changing and the expenditure on education and health care became a priority for the Zemstvos (on public health and public charity accounted for 27%, on education – 13.4%). (Fig. 3).

Fig. 3. Expenses of the Zemstvos (1868 and 1890), %

Thus, despite the fact that the provision of social services was not a priority for the Zemstvos, it was there that significant results were achieved: there were Zemstvo schools, hospitals, libraries, and museums.

DISCUSSION

The results of the study indicate a significant role of the Zemstvos in the development of folk medicine, education, and culture.

Thanks to the Zemstvo reform, a system of separate medical sections was organized; emergency rooms appeared; the number of rural hospitals increased; county medical councils were established to manage the medical unit, etc. At the same time, medical care was provided evenly to all Zemstvo payers, and patients in rural hospitals were exempt from payment for treatment in most of the Zemstvo provinces. The development of Zemstvo medicine is evidenced by the data provided by Z.G. Frankel in the essays of the Zemstvo medical affairs: by 1910, compared with 1870, there was an increase of 5 times in the number of medical sites; a decrease in the number of the population, on average, per 1 site (from 95 thousand to 28 thousand people); an increase in paramedic stations by 2 times; the number of doctors increased by 5 times (from 610 to 3082 people) (FRANKEL, 1913).
However, there were also certain difficulties in the functioning of Zemstvo medicine, in particular, the provision of qualified medical personnel in some provinces. Thus, “in 1870, there were only 19 doctors in the service of the Tula Zemstvo. On average, the doctor had 15 thousand patients per year” (VESELOVSKIY, 1909). These working conditions for doctors were difficult, however, it is worth noting the advantages that were used by local doctors. These are long vacations to University cities for professional development, periodic increases in maintenance, pensions and allowances to families of deceased doctors, etc.

Thanks to the Zemstvo initiative, libraries-reading rooms and Sunday classes for adults were created in almost all 34 provinces; Zemstvo periodical press bodies were organized. According to the reports of the trustees of educational districts, in 1887, 42% of the total expenditure on the maintenance of rural and urban public schools was made up of Zemstvo funds. Issues of providing educational literature, expenses for school construction, and teachers’ salaries were included in the Zemstvo budget. The Zemstvo authorities promoted the opening of new schools together with peasant societies, which built or allocated premises for the school, provided heating and lighting, first fully and then partially paid to teachers. Each County school had a Board of Trustees, working on a voluntary basis, which drew up the budget and distributed the funds of the school (FALBORK, 1903, p.184). By 1910-11, Russia had opened about 30 thousand Zemstvo schools, their teaching corpus was more than 40 thousand teachers, most of whom were trained by the Zemstvos themselves, and “the level of organization of educational work in the Zemstvo schools was significantly higher than in the Ministerial and especially in parochial schools” (BOLSHAYA, 1972). In particular, in one of the reports of the Glazovsky Zemstvo Board, the Zemstvo school was considered as “the main means to raise the spiritual, civil and economic development of the population”, and the main goal of education was “the moral development of the people, accompanied by the widespread dissemination of useful information and knowledge” (EVDOSENKO, 2014).

Considerable merit of the Zemstvos is observed in the dissemination of cultural and educational work. The Zemstvos paid great attention to the organization of library services: central libraries were created in district cities, and volost libraries, libraries attached to Zemstvo schools, and mobile libraries were created in villages. Since the beginning of the twentieth century, Zemstvo museums have been actively developed. By 1917, the number of Zemstvo museums reached 1,700. Thirteen Zemstvos created local historical (they were called natural-historical) museums. At the beginning of the twentieth century, Handicrafts Museums were established in 15 Russian provinces. The main task of such museums was to provide artisans with raw materials and expand sales opportunities for finished products (MEDVEDEVA, et. al 2019).

The Zemstvo institutions played a significant role in tourist and excursion activities in the late XIX – early XX century. In 1910, a special column “student excursions” appeared in the budget of county and provincial Zemstvos. To plan the trip correctly, special guides were issued for teachers, which recommended that it be organized according to the age of the students (respectively, trips were divided for Junior and senior classes). The most significant experience of such activities is that of the Zemstvo of the Moscow province. In 1914, about 10,000 rubles were allocated for organizing school excursions. Funding for student excursions in the Moscow province was uneven. The largest amount of funds, as a rule, was allocated by the Moscow provincial Zemstvo (in 1914, 5000 rubles) (YANKOVSKY, 2016). Thanks to the efforts of the Zemstvos, in 1913, student tours were organized for 152 schools in Moscow district (75% of the total number), and 6,708 people took part in them (40% of all students). Moreover, in 1914, Zemstvo institutions provided assistance to 393 schools in Moscow province, resulting in about 14 thousand schoolchildren visited Moscow. (ZVYAGINTSEV, 1915).

In addition, a separate area of activity of the Zemstvo institutions were issues of social protection, which consisted not only in the construction of almshouses, orphanages, boarding schools, but also included their maintenance and arrangement. “Over three decades of local self-government (from the 60s to the 90s), the number of almshouses and disabled homes has been increased by 5 times. In the 90s, each Zemstvo province had two orphanages and foster houses” (MELNIKOV, KOLOSTOVA, 2002). Such results of the Zemstvos’ activities indicate positive trends in the development of the local social security system in the field. It was the
social character, the targeting of social problems, and the orientation to the needs of a particular territory that contributed to the development of the Zemstvo business.

CONCLUSIONS
Thus, the successful practices of the Zemstvo administration for the development of social infrastructure at the local level indicate the significant organizational resources that the Zemstvos had. The success of the Zemstvo self-government bodies was also due to their stable interaction with the population, support for local initiatives, and the formation of a system of public control, which was carried out through the reports of elected representatives on the work done before the meetings of residents. In particular, elected representatives of rural societies represented the interests of the peasantry, therefore for the first time it became possible to solve problems of rural infrastructure and improve the quality of rural life.

However, the lack of support from state bodies, opportunities for independent financial and economic development, and a clear legal framework that ensures the full spread of Zemstvo administration in all Russian provinces, significantly limited the activities of Zemstvo bodies to meet the needs of the population. Despite this, the experience of management activity for the development of social infrastructure, formed by local authorities, can be in demand in modern Russian conditions and adapted to the current system of local government.
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Zemstvo of the XIX-XX centuries in Russia: the formation of social infrastructure at the local level

Zemstvo dos séculos XIX-XX na Rússia: a formação de infraestrutura social a nível local

Zemstvo de los siglos 19-20 en Rusia: la formación de infraestructura social a nivel local

Resumo
O artigo analisa o papel da reforma Zemstvo realizada na Rússia nos séculos XIX e início do século XX para o desenvolvimento e gestão da infraestrutura social em nível local. Os métodos de pesquisa foram: uma análise retrospectiva e um método comparativo. Os autores identificaram tendências no apoio financeiro e econômico dos órgãos de Zemstvo em vários estágios da reforma de Zemstvo, investigaram as vantagens e desvantagens da reforma de Zemstvo. A análise dos principais indicadores do desenvolvimento da infraestrutura social na segunda metade do século XIX - início do século XX foi realizada com base no método estatístico. Como resultado do estudo, os autores concluem que o sucesso do Zemstvo foi determinado pela estreita interação do governo e da população, o apoio às iniciativas locais e a formação de um sistema de controle público.
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Abstract
The article analyzes the role of the Zemstvo reform carried out in Russia in the XIX-early XX centuries for the development and management of social infrastructure at the local level. The research methods were a retrospective analysis and a comparative method. The authors identified trends in the financial and economic support of the Zemstvo bodies at various stages of the Zemstvo reform, investigated the advantages and disadvantages of the Zemstvo reform. The analysis of the main indicators of the development of social infrastructure in the second half of the XIX - early XX century was carried out on the basis of the statistical method. As a result of the study, the authors conclude that the success of the Zemstvo was determined by the close interaction of the government and the population, support for local initiatives, and the formation of a system of public control.

Keywords: Social infrastructure. Zemstvo reform. Zemstvo institutions. Zemstvo budget. Zemstvo education.

Resumen
El artículo analiza el papel de la reforma Zemstvo realizada a cabo en Rusia en el siglo XIX-principios del XX para el desarrollo y gestión de la infraestructura social a nivel local. Los métodos de investigación fueron: análisis retrospectivo y método comparativo. Los autores identificaron tendencias en el apoyo financiero y económico de los órganos de Zemstvo en varias etapas de la reforma de Zemstvo, investigaron las ventajas y desventajas de la reforma de Zemstvo. El análisis de los principales indicadores del desarrollo de la infraestructura social en la segunda mitad del siglo XIX y principios del XX se llevó a cabo sobre la base del método estadístico. Como resultado del estudio, los autores concluyen que el éxito del Zemstvo estuvo determinado por la estrecha interacción del gobierno y la población, el apoyo a las iniciativas locales y la formación de un sistema de control público.
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