

---

## EDITORIAL

---

*Dear readers,*



We are pleased to present the fourth issue of ‘Historia provinciae – the journal of regional history’. It is devoted to the most important event not only in the Russian but also in the world history – the Great October Socialist Revolution, the centenary of which is being celebrated this year. It goes without saying that our journal could not take no notice of such a significant event, however it would be incorrect to consider this issue as a response to this anniversary only. The Russian Revolution of 1917 left such a deep trace in our history that its study will always remain the most important trend and an area of activity for historians and other specialists in the humanities knowledge. The scientific interests of the authors in this issue are related to the revolutionary topic, and their articles were not only prepared because of the ‘anniversary’ date, but rather reflect the current trends of the research. Following the subject theme of our journal, we are publishing the materials of researchers from various regions of this country: Arkhangelsk, Yelets, Oryol, Cherepovets and Yaroslavl.

The article of A.N. Egorov is devoted to the analysis of mass public sentiments among the population in Vologda Governorate on the eve of the February Revolution. At its basis are the reports of gendarme and the constabulary to their headship, adequately reflecting the state of affairs at the local level. The timeliness of this subject matter is in the intention of several historians, politicians and public figures to fix the idea in the public perception that there were no objective reasons for czar’s demise, and the revolution took place because of destructive activity of masons, liberals and other opponents of the existing established order. Entering polemics regarding this point of view, A.N. Egorov shows at the example of one of the peaceful governorates of Russia, the naturally-determined nature of the February Revolution, in many aspects caused by the inability of the authorities to solve one of the most important problems in the country’s life.

In the article of S.V. Kholyaev, at the example of Yaroslavl, the mutual influence of events is shown with regards to the course of revolution, that were taking place both in the capital and in the provinces. The author shows that the major problem in 1917 became the disaccord of the central and the regional authorities, whereas the refusal of the Provisional Government to recognise the priority of committees for public security, influential at the local level, led to the crisis of the whole system of regional governance. The rise to power of the Bolsheviks prevented the disintegration

---

of the country, once again securing support for the central government on part of most of the principal towns of the provinces.

The most important problem in 1917 became the issue of inter-ethnic relations, splitting apart the Russian Empire. In the article of A.N. Hajiyeu, the factors of social-economic and socio-political development of the Southwestern Caucasus are considered, which set the prerequisites for formation of democratic republics in Transcaucasia. The revolutionary upheavals of 1917 caused the natural growth of national movements in Transcaucasia, and the rise to power of the Bolsheviks and their withdrawal from World War I created the real conditions to change the state-territorial status of Caucasian regions and provinces. Under such conditions, as the author shows, the creation of independent republics in Transcaucasia was becoming inevitable.

Up to now, the debates go on with regards to responsibility for the revolution that various politicians and public figures would assume. A certain contribution to this discussion is made by the article of D.V. Shchukin devoted to consideration and reflection of the image of historical people and the revolutionary events of 1917 in diaries, memoirs and letters of political personalities of the considered epoch. The author emphasizes that those events left a strongly pronounced emotional colouring in their contemporaries' memory, and such colouring passed onto the historiography of the Russian Revolution from private sources.

Of polemical character is also the article of D.V. Aronov on the place and role of President in the liberal law-making in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Having analysed the texts of the liberal projects of the Constitution of Russia (Basic Law) in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century and the law-making process of the Special Committee and the Minister of Justice in the Provisional Government, the author made a conclusion about inappreciable influence of liberal ideas on the statutory law making in 1917. In the opinion of D.V. Aronov, the project of introducing the post of Acting (Provisional) President confirms the overall conclusion that the liberal, based on rule of law, 'recipes' for overcoming systemic crises do not work in the revolutionary time, when the choice of the society gravitates towards other ways of reforming the social reality and crisis recovery, offering simple and understandable solutions for the ordinary people.

The materials published in the journal are complemented by the review of V.I. Goldin for the collection of reports at the international scientific conference that took place in March 2017 in St Petersburg 'February Revolution of 1917: Problems of History and Historiography'. In the section 'Chronicle of Scientific Life', the information regarding All-Russia (with international participation) academic seminar 'State, capitalism and society in Russia in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> – early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries' arranged by Cherepovets State University with financial support from RFBR, is presented. At the seminar, among other things, the problems of the Great October Socialist Revolution were considered, where many authors of the articles participated in its work.

---

The Editorial Board of the journal hope that the presented materials will be interesting and useful not only for historians but also for non-specialist audiences, whilst the suggested debatable points of view will become the impetus for new research.

*Andrey Nickolayevich Egorov,  
Doctor of Historical Sciences,  
Head of Department of History and Philosophy  
Cherepovets State University,  
Deputy chief editor of the journal  
'Historia provinciae – the journal of regional history'*