International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation, Vol. 24, Issue 03, 2020
ISSN: 1475-7192

Figures of Democratic Socialism in the First Quarter of the 20th Century: Socio-demographic Characteristics

Olga L. Protasova* and Irina G. Pirozhkova

Abstract--- *The aim of the study is a comprehensive research of the Russian socialist parties at the beginning of the 20th century, both in terms of formal statistical indicators and in addressing the fates of their activists. The employed unique biographical material contributes to the popularization of the case history described, arouses interest in people who have made a significant contribution to the formation of civic culture and democracy in Russia. The problem statement of the research is due to the demand for a synergistic approach in modern historical science, which allows synthesizing the methods of political science, sociology, and psychology, as well as using mathematical methods in processing the results. Through the above methods, as well as comparison and grouping, a cohort analysis (a sample of about 3 thousand people) on the main socio-demographic characteristics of both well-recognized and ordinary members of the leading political parties of Russia was carried out. The presented article reviews how the choice of political orientation was influenced by the age of the activist, the social stratum, ethnical and partly confessional affiliation, level of education, occupation and other socio-demographic factors. The conducted study resulted in following conclusion: the general conditional 'portrait' of a socialist at the beginning of the 20th century is quite amorphous, which is largely due to the incompleteness at the time of the formation of the entire political elite and of embedding it in the political culture of the country. Socialism in terms of the number of supporters prevailed over other ideologies in Russia at the beginning of the 20th century, but its democratic segment in the political struggle lost to the anti-democratic, totalitarian direction represented by the Bolsheviks.*

Keywords--- *Democratic Socialism, Socialist Revolutionaries, Popular Socialists, the Mensheviks, The Bolsheviks.*

I. INTRODUCTION

The relevance of the topic of the presented research lies in the universal importance of domestic socialist democrats' experience, acquired in the epoch of early parliamentary and civic culture of Russia. Comprehending the phenomenon of 'democratic socialism' with its constituent values, and studying political, legal and governmental activities (which was already successfully undertaken by foreign social democrats), including the ideas and proposals of Russian theorists, are essential in the context of globalization, interpenetration and cooperation of cultures, and common humanization of society. The commitment to moral imperatives in both political and personal life, which distinguished many Russian socialists of a democratic sense, is an example for modern politicians choosing the means and methods to implement their programs.

Olga L. Protasova, Tambov State Technical University. E-mail: olia.protasowa2011@yandex.ru*
Irina G. Pirozhkova, Tambov State Technical University.

DOI: 10.37200/IJPR/V24I3/PR2020354
Received: 24 Feb 2020 | Revised: 28 Feb 2020 | Accepted: 18 Mar 2020

The purpose of this article was to study the 'Human Dimension' of Russian socialist parties of the emergence period of a democratic political culture, with reference not only to formal statistical data, but also to the passions, preferences, and destinies of their activists. The tasks, the consistent solution of which leads to the achievement of the goal of the study, were as follows: identifying the middle-aged indicators of the leaders of the biggest socialist parties of Russia by 1917; the representation of different social estates in these parties; the ratio between education and partisanship, occupation and partisanship; assessment of party affiliation within the ethnical groups of the Russian Empire and the Russian Republic (before the October Uprising of 1917).

The object of the research was democratic socialism in its Russian version, which has, due to its political and cultural realities, special features that differ from the classical Western social democracy. The subject of the study was the socio-demographic characteristics of socialist revolutionaries, Popular Socialists, and the Mensheviks, whose ideological views and ethical guidelines rejected the dictatorship and radical means of political struggle, as well as (within the framework of the comparative approach) the Bolsheviks and the Cadets (Constitutional Democrats).

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The presented study is featured by the junction of two relatively new and promising research areas. On the one hand, this is an anthropological history that is gaining momentum, putting the individual as the subject of history at the forefront. A characteristic feature of the last two decades is the heightened attention of historians to the personalities of figures, which can be attributed to 'democratic socialism': Georgi Plekhanov (biographized by S.V. Tyutyukin),[1]A.V. Peshekhonov (O.L. Protasova),[2] I.G. Tsereteli, P.B. Axelrod (A.P. Nenarokov),[3] Yu.O. Martov (I.Kh. Urilov)[4], V.M. Chernov (O.V. Konovalova,[5] A.P. Novikov, A.I. Avrus [6] et. al.). On the other hand, the history of political parties, the party system as an element of political culture with its dynamic unity of values, orientations, symbols, beliefs, and even myths, corresponding to certain patterns and types of political behavior are of essential interest. Appeal to a personified reality with the involvement of mathematical methods, methods of related social and political sciences (politology and sociology), as well as social psychology, represents a new and quite promising research area. The empirical basis for the study was the prosopographic database, compiled with the participation of the authors of this article, and consisting of more than 3,000 personalities - deputies of four pre-revolutionary State Dumas, candidates for members of the Constituent Assembly, leaders of party committees, and representatives of public associations. The base allows achieving a large degree of scientific accuracy, due to the opportunity for both quantitative and qualitative content analysis. An analysis of a given cohort was conducted according to the main socio-demographic characteristics and involved all of the above methods, as well as comparison and grouping.

[1] Tyutyukin, S.V. G.V. Plekhanov: The Fate of the Russian Marxist / Moscow: ROSSPEN, 1997
[2] Protasova, O.L. A.V. Peshekhonov: A Man and an epoch / Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2004
[3] Nenarokov, A.P. Istoriia odnogo pis′ma: politicheskoe zaveshchanie Pavla Aksel′roda [Paul Axelrod's political testament] / Moscow: Medium publishing, 2008
[4] Urilov, I. Kh. Martov: Politician and Historian / Moscow: Nauka, 1997
[5] Konovalova, O.V. V.M. Chernov on the ways of Russia's development / Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2009; Konovalova: V.M. Chernov's political ideals: a glance over the years / Krasnoyarsk, 2005
[6] Avrus A. I., Novikov A. P. From Khvalynsk to New York: the Life and Social and Political Activity of V. M. Chernov / Saratov University publishers, 2013

DOI: 10.37200/IJPR/V24I3/PR2020354
Received: 24 Feb 2020 | Revised: 28 Feb 2020 | Accepted: 18 Mar 2020

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The age of politicians is an important and symptomatic factor in analysis of the overall sociodemographic picture; it is age that associates a man and an epoch, determines the chronological context of personality formation, and highlights the basic and modal characteristics of individuals in politics, indicating features that are most common or in demand in the society of a given period. In this case, a quite obvious pattern can be traced: the younger the activist was, the more radical the political direction was chosen (see Table 1).

Table 1: The Average Age of Members of the Largest Russian Political Parties in 1917 (in years)

Political party	Members average age in 1917
Bolsheviks	30.3
Mensheviks	35.4
Left-wing SRs	36. 5
Party of Socialists-Revolutionaries (the SRs)	38
Popular Socialists	45.4
Cadets	50.2
Octobrists	51
Right-wing politicians (monarchists)	58

Thus, by 1917, leaders of political parties in Russia approached the following 'median ages': the rightists were about 60 years old, the Octobrists - 51, the Cadets - 50, the Popular Socialists - around 45-47, the Social Revolutionaries, Mensheviks, left-wing SRs and anarchists were the youngest with the age averaged at 35-38. The worldview of politicians of the 'middle' generation was mainly formed at the end of the 19th century, in the midst of a pre-revolutionary surge of public energy. The necessity to fight for their way of living became a harsh reality for many of the young people with *raznochintsy* background (the term was broadly applied to denote persons of non-noble origin who due to their education could apply for the status of personal distinguished citizenship; a significant number of Russian intelligentsia of the 19th century were raznochintsy). This was a tough proposition in conditions of the caste-regulated society, but overcoming such difficulties saved a person from infantilism, naivety, 'bookish character' of views, and also gave a true knowledge of life, helped develop persistence, staunchness and convictions, which, in most cases, the politician has adhered to all his life.

There is a widely replicated saying, allegedly attributed to Winston Churchill: 'If you aren't a revolutionary when you're young, you have no heart, but if you aren't a middle-aged conservative, you have no head'. A clear confirmation, as well as an addition to the overall picture of the movement from the political 'heart' to the political 'head', is the history of inter-party transitions in the course of the Russian political processes development. Figures who sympathized to populistic doctrine (also including 'Narodnaya Volya', which declared itself to be a populist movement that succeeded Narodniks) in their youth, passed progressively as they were 'growing up' mostly to the right-wing politics - to the Cadets, above all. So was Nikolai Morozov, one of the leaders of 'Narodnaya Volya' at an early age; being an ardent supporter of political terror he spent 23 years in custody in the Peter and Paul Fortress prison and Shlisselburg Fortress, but in the fall of 1917 he suddenly became a runner to the Constituent Assembly from the Cadets. When asked why the former revolutionary joined the Cadet Party, Morozov answered that he

DOI: 10.37200/IJPR/V24I3/PR2020354
Received: 24 Feb 2020 | Revised: 28 Feb 2020 | Accepted: 18 Mar 2020

considered it necessary to fight for political reforms and a constitutional form of government: the goals of 'Narodnaya Volya' were closest to the Party of People's Freedom.[7]

Activists from the younger generations, on the contrary, mostly evolved to the left-wing: from the Social Revolutionaries (SRs) to the Left-Wing SRs, from moderate Marxists to the Bolsheviks. Of course, it was not without exception: Nikolai Valentinov-Volski, an ardent Bolshevik supporter 'ready to fight for Lenin'[8] at the dawn of his political career, revised his political views (mainly on methods of action, questions of democracy and dictatorship) after a disagreement with Lenin and joined the so-called 'liquidators'; then and there he deserted the RSDLP in mid-1917 due to disagreement with the party's course, becoming, so to speak, a socialist of a general direction, not constrained by the doctrine of a particular party. Nikolay Oganovskiy moved to the SRs in 1917, leaving the Popular Socialists by considering them insufficiently promising under the conditions of the revolution.[9] On the wave of revolutionary success in the spring of 1917, the SRs reached an incredible number for Russia — up to 300,000 people, adding new and new members (the so-called 'March Socialist-Revolutionaries'), including Alexander Kerensky, a member of the Trudoviks (a moderate, non-Marxist labour party) until that moment.

With all the processes of modernization, destroying the usual social class structure of the Russian society, 1917 Russia was still the social estate country. Estates criterion illustrates the social differentiation of the prerevolutionary Empire way greater than any other figures, (see Table 2). The SRs quite naturally lead among born into peasant families; SRs often positioned themselves as a 'peasant' party. The 'more right' was the party on the political scale, the more intelligent was its composition (with the exception, perhaps, for far-right politics).

Table 2: Social Estates and Political Party Affiliations (in %%)

	Peasants	Nobleman	Bourgeois	Merchantman	The clergy	Honorary citizen	Raznochintsy	Total
Bolsheviks	5.1	6.8	30.5	3.8	5.4	0.4	8.0	100.0
Mensheviks	33.8	16.3	37.5	3.3	5.4	–	3.7	100.0
SRs	52.4	16.5	20.9	1.9	6.2	2.1	–	100.0
Pop..Socialists	36.7	25.2	13.5	4.9	14.8	1.2	3.7	100.0
National Socialists	6.5	4.4	9.7	1.9	12.3	2.2	3.0	100.0

As for the correlation between education and partisanship (see Table 3), the interdependence of political radicalness and the level of education of the activists is obvious. With the lower level of education of some particular activist, the more chances were that this person would join the radicals and vice versa. The incompleteness of higher or secondary education characteristic of the radicals has long been noticed; even their cause to complete the studies most often was explained by a desire to engage in politics.

Table 3: Education and Political Party Affiliations (in %%)

Party / Education level	Higher	Undergraduate or secondary-special	Secondary-level	Post-basic education	Basic public education	Non-educated	Total
National socialists	56.7	19.7	3.2	7.8	12.2	0.4	100.0
Mensheviks	41.9	18.4	3.3	15.4	19.8	1.8	100.0
SRs	31.7	24.0	5.3	10.4	25.6	3.0	100.0
Left-wing SRs	26.0	28.5	3.9	16.9	24.7	–	100.0
Bolsheviks	21.6	16.9	5.5	15.5	39.5	1.0	100.0
Anarchists	21.4	25.0	10.8	21.4	21.4	–	100.0
Non-partisan	54.0	18.0	4.0	6.0	18.0	–	100.0

[7] People's Freedom bulletin, Tiflis: December 10, 1917
[8] Valentinov, N. An Unfinished Portrait / Moscow: Terra, 1993, p. 39
[9] All-Russian Constituent Assembly: Encyclopedia (compiled by L.G. Protasov) / Moscow: Political Encyclopedia, 2014, p. 286

DOI: 10.37200/IJPR/V24I3/PR2020354
Received: 24 Feb 2020 | Revised: 28 Feb 2020 | Accepted: 18 Mar 2020

The democratization of higher education is perhaps the most striking indicator of the success of Russian modernization; universities have become more accessible to people from different social classes. It should be noted that the gymnasium environment was much less conducive to the development of free-thinking in young people than the university one. Mark Vishniak, who joined the Socialist-Revolutionaries during his university years, recounted that '…our gymnasium study group was miles far from the revolution ... The main problem that interested us was the problem of righteous morality – of personal and public life'.[10] Even Vladimir Lenin himself, despite the almost inborn revolutionarism attributed to him by Soviet biographers, was not noticed in anything seditious in the gymnasium years. As noted by Richard Pipes, Lenin the young man 'showed no interest in public life ... By the time the gymnasium ended in 1887, Lenin did not have any 'certain' political convictions. Nothing at the beginning of his biography revealed the future revolutionary; on the contrary, much testified that Lenin would follow in his father's footsteps and make a noticeable service career'.[11]

However, the training of Russian nationals in foreign universities was a completely different story. Foreign education at the beginning of the 20th century was sometimes more accessible (for example, for Jews who did not fit into the quota system in higher education) than the domestic one; such choice was often made under duress. A student expelled from the university on a political charge and sentenced to exile could apply to the authorities for permission to continue his education abroad and, as a rule, such permission was granted indefinitely. The motives for choosing foreign education varied; presumably, the liberals most often had a desire to receive quality occupational training for their prospective career, with the socialists having the motives associated primarily with revolutionary work. It was the socialist parties that were, in the first place, replenished by foreign-born members who were not accepted into Russian universities, and representatives of very different 'politically unreliable' ethnic groups (including, of course, the Russians themselves). It should also be borne in mind that the wording 'studied at European universities' does not necessarily denote a completed education, more often it was just the opposite.

The importance of foreign studies for future politicians was undeniable regardless of the motives. The very immersion in the free atmosphere of European student life liberated young Russian nationals both physically and ideologically; the spacious mind and emerging opportunities rejected social and down-home narrow mindedness, as well as other attitudes, which are so replete with closed society. For future adherents of democratic socialism, student youth in Europe was the first positive experience of political socialization, because the ideas of democracy not only developed in Central and Western Europe on a scientific and theoretical level from ancient times but also had great traditions of practical application in competitive political struggle. All of that later, in the years of emigration, helped many Russian leaders of democratic socialism to successfully acculturate the Western social and political environment.

All the parties of the socialist orientation were distinguished by high educational qualifications (by standards of that time), imposed on their leaders (see Table 4). In most cases, party leaders (even sometimes in the absence of a systematic education) confidently towered over the rank and file socialists — their 'followers'. Scholarship,

[10] Vishniak, M. Tribute to the Past / New York: Chekhov Publishing House of the East European Fund, Inc., 1954, p. 37
[11] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vladimir_Lenin

DOI: 10.37200/IJPR/V24I3/PR2020354
Received: 24 Feb 2020 | Revised: 28 Feb 2020 | Accepted: 18 Mar 2020

education, and versatility have certainly accompanied the personal, charismatic qualities of the party leaders, and their extraordinary energy, as well as social and journalistic activity.

Table 4: The Structure of Higher and Secondary-special Education (in %%)

Political party/Specialization	Liberal arts	Religious	Legal	Natural history	Medical	Military	Agricultural
Popular socialists	22.5	6.7	17.2	10.6	11.9	1.8	5.5
Mensheviks	15.8	3.4	15.2	13.0	7.6	1.8	3.5
SRs	15.4	4.5	9.7	10.4	7.3	2.8	5.7
Bolsheviks	12.8	1.9	7.1	8.0	5.4	1.3	2.1

Another meaningful social parameter for the research is the occupation (see Table 5). This parameter is most difficult to verify since the majority of party leaders did not exhibit a direct correspondence between the profession that was chosen and the subsequent type of activity. Party activists often had to change their place of residence and business occupation, avoiding discovery by the police. As a result, it is often quite problematic to identify the main, predominant nature of the occupation of a particular figure. Thus, the 'member of a cooperative society' type of activity that is often encountered (in resumes or questionnaires) during their self-determination does not specify much: at the beginning of the century, the cooperative movement was not just a common form of social activity, but often the only possible form of legal work for socialists in the inter-revolutionary period. The same goes for 'opinion journalist' or 'political writer': when oppositional journalism was almost the main tool of the political struggle, representatives of any profession could define it as their main occupation.

Table 5: Business Occupation and Political Party Affiliations (in %%)

Party/Occupation	Party insiders	White collars	Professional occupations	Military	Workers and peasants	Other	Total
Popular socialists	2.4	32.0	60.1	4.2	1.3	–	100.0
SRs	34.9	19.7	29.6	8.5	5.0	2.3	100.0
Mensheviks	39.4	16.1	28.8	5.3	10.0	0.4	100.0
Bolsheviks	48.3	6.6	16.9	9.5	15.9	0.8	100.0
National socialists	15.8	17.3	52.4	11.0	2.4	1.1	100.0

The Marxists, Bolsheviks, and Mensheviks held the highest percentage of actual (not by birth, but by real activity) workers and peasants. The Bolsheviks also had the lowest proportion of people with professional education (doctors, teachers, lawyers, engineers, agronomists, professional classes); they also encountered the highest percentage of 'party insiders' - propagandists, undergrounders, etc. In this category of partisan figures, practical political activity is inextricably linked with their main occupation; these were, as a rule, people of manual labor who took upon themselves the fulfillment of current party assignments, the common term 'professional revolutionaries' is not suitable for all of them. The majority of insiders did not live solely at the expense of the party (as some members of the party elites); these were usually workers and employees who combined every day and party activities and gained access to political leaders along with fame due to their participation in various events of the revolutionary era.

The insiders of other parties called themselves officially revolutionaries incomparably less frequently; they had their own professional dominants. There were many local Zemstvo (institution of local government set up during the great emancipation reform of 1861) servants among the revolutionary and moderate neo-Narodniks (which were in many ways the intellectual and political forebears of the socialists-revolutionaries) born in the 1860-1870s. Due to the peculiarities of the Zemstvo electoral system, which gave priority to the local nobility, only an insignificant part

DOI: 10.37200/IJPR/V24I3/PR2020354
Received: 24 Feb 2020 | Revised: 28 Feb 2020 | Accepted: 18 Mar 2020

of the diverse intelligentsia was able to enter the Zemstvo in a disclosed way.[12] Raznochintsy began to join the Zemstvo as civilian employees – piece-rate employees or external professionals. This category has received the name 'third element' that has become widespread and established in history. Guided not only by occupational concerns, but mainly by the interests of the people, the new service intelligentsia (according to historians, 65-70 thousand people) diligently engaged in their direct business (however, 'it was not so easy to put up with the conditions set for them and for their business'[13]) and sought to promote the development of Zemstvo as grassroots institutions of popular initiative.

One of the most colorful figures of the 'third element' in that period was the Zemstvo demographer. The demographers of that time can be compared to some extent with modern sociologists who perform applied and practically significant tasks. The ongoing country's modernization has put the study of various spheres of economic and public life on a scientific basis. The staff of the Zemstvo statistical department occupied an outstanding position in the district bodies - partly due to its personnel with its indifference to the work, partly due to its specialty, which gave them a systematic knowledge of local needs and conditions, the ability to talk to the villagers in the language they understood; Zemstvo demographers were forced to affect the most painful and intimate aspects of the life of the people.[14] Most of the young people who began their careers in the Zemstvo service chose the Narodnik trend of socialism, becoming Social Revolutionaries or Popular Socialists.

One of the characteristic features of an 'average' moderate neo-Narodnik was a great journalistic activity and little interest, almost complete disregard for artistic culture models, if they went beyond the realistic direction or appeared not folklore; this feature follows from the natural inclination of an intelligent person to creativity, associated with a utilitarian desire to benefit the people. The Narodniks were brought up on realism; they themselves expressed this literary trend and perceived only realism. That explains why in the era of the Silver Age of Russian Poetry, with its diversity of styles and genres, right-wing populists and, in particular, Russkoye Bogatstvo magazine, which expressed their views, were often criticized and ridiculed by representatives of the creative intelligentsia.[15] Against the background of the heyday and diversity of the Silver Age with its originality, novelty, stylistic searches and experiments, and sometimes risky boldness, traditional populist Narodnik-style artwork seemed gray and lifeless for quite many people, 'like a lean black maiden under 40'[16], – as it was caustically remarked by Vasily Rozanov. With all sincere respect for the talents and civic pathos of the populist publicists, one cannot fail to recognize a significant amount of the righteous angry statements of the master of ornamental prose to the thick literary journals of social democratic orientation (not delving into political nuances, Rozanov considered all Narodniks the same): 'There is no talent, no poetry in the pages of their thick magazines — at whole ... All the classical literature has passed them: the only thing left is to beat the bag out of Pushkin, who is still less preferred than Nekrasov'.[17] The

[12] See: Russkoye Bogatstvo magazine, 1914, №2, p. 331
[13] Op. cit.
[14] Russkoye Bogatstvo magazine, 1901. № 12, p, 175
[15] Protasova, O. L. Aesthetics of «silver age» in the assessment of A. V. Peshekhonov // Isskusstvo i Kultura Scientific-Practical magazine, №1 (19). Vitebsk, 2013
[16] Department of Manuscripts of the Russian State Library, f. 225, c 4, D. 67, L. 1
[17] Op. cit.

DOI: 10.37200/IJPR/V24I3/PR2020354
Received: 24 Feb 2020 | Revised: 28 Feb 2020 | Accepted: 18 Mar 2020

narrowing of the endless field of life to the framework of the political dimension[18] is a phenomenon prevalent in the years when people were not so indifferent to social problems. Following current 'trend' of populistic 'love of people' (especially widespread in the raznochintsy environment), even a cultured, highly educated person, could try to *oprostitsya* (adopt the 'simple life') in order to become the one of 'their own' for the people. However, the very same person risked looking quite strange and even grotesque in the eyes of others, not subject to this trend.

The process of building the party system in Russia had a number of features. First, the socialist parties emerged earlier than the liberal ones. Secondly, among the early socialists prevailed the parties of suburban ethnical communities, where national discrimination was most acutely felt (Polish Proletariat, General Jewish Labour Bund, Armenian Revolutionary Federation aka Dashnaktsutyun). 'National and confessional interrelationships, as is known, arise in the process of activity and interaction of relevant social subjects: ethnic groups and confessions, ethnonational and religious (confessional) groups, institutions and organizations, and individuals differing in their ethnical and religious characteristics (identities)'.[19] With the advent of the all-Russian parties, their composition naturally began to reflect the ethnic composition of the empire's population (see Tables 6, 7). All the major national groups of the Russian party-political spectrum were represented in almost the same sequence as in the national composition of the population[20] (see Table 6 and 7).

Table 6: Ethnical Composition of Parties and Political Trends (in %%)

	Right-wing	Octobrists	Cadets	National socialists	SRs	Mensheviks	Bolsheviks	Anarchists	Nationalists	Autonomists	Total
Russians	83.0	72.3	62.0	62.0	48.8	42.8	54.5	37.9	–	22.0	54.6
Ukrainians	12.1	13.3	11.8	26.9	30.3	18.9	9.5	10.3	25.0	13.0	18.3
Belarusians	3.5	0.3	2.5	2.4	2.6	1.7	1.4	–	11.0	2.8	2.3
Jews	–	1.7	5.4	3.5	5.8	22.9	14.7	41.5	25.0	–	9.2
Polacks	0.5	0.3	1.6	0.4	0.8	1.6	1.6	–	5.0	17.7	1.8
Lithuanians	–	–	0.5	–	0.6	1.5	0.9	–	1.0	0.8	0.7
Latvians	–	–	1.0	0.2	0.5	2.2	4.8	–	1.0	1.5	1.5
Estonians	–	–	0.9	0.2	0.5	0.6	1.2	–	–	0.8	0.6
Finno-Ugrians	–	0.3	0.1	–	0.9	0.1	0.1	–	–	–	0.3
Germans	–	8.1	2.0	0.9	0.5	0.9	1.1	–	2.0	5.9	1.5
Tatars and Bashkirs	–	0.3	2.0	1.1	1.6	1.1	0.7	–	12.0	20.1	2.0
Georgians	–	–	1.0	0.2	1.2	2.5	2.7	3.4	–	–	1.3
Armenians	–	–	1.6	–	1.9	0.9	2.8	3.4	–	–	1.4
Northern Caucasia	–	–	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.6	1.0	–	–	4.3	0.6
Azerbaijani	–	–	1.2	0.7	0.2	1.0	0.8	–	4.0	2.0	0.7
Central Asia	–	–	3.5	0.2	0.7	0.1	1.2	–	8.0	3.9	1.3
Siberia	–	–	0.2	–	0.1	0.2	0.2	–	1.0	1.6	0.2
Moldavians	0.5	1.4	0.8	–	1.1	–	0.3	–	–	2.0	0.5
Small-numbered peoples	–	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.1	–	0.3	–	–	0.4	0.5
Europeans	0.4	1.4	1.0	0.7	0.5	0.4	0.4	3.5	5.0	1.2	0.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

[18] Protasova O.L., Naumova M.D., Bikbaeva E.V. The cultural life of Russia in the beginning of the XX century assessed by A.V. Peshekhonov (in German) // Vestnik TSTU, 2014; Vol. 20, № 1:196

[19] Sarkarova N.A., Gusaeva K.G. National and Religious Factors in Socio-Cultural Dimension // Problems of Contemporary Science and Practice journal, 2013, № 4 (48):110

[20] Protasov, L.G. A social portrait of provincial socialist / The fate of democratic socialism in Russia: Proceedings of the scientific conference / Foreword by K.N. Morozov // Moscow: Sabashnikov Publishers, 2014

DOI: 10.37200/IJPR/V24I3/PR2020354
Received: 24 Feb 2020 | Revised: 28 Feb 2020 | Accepted: 18 Mar 2020

Table 7: Political Party Affiliations within National Groups (in %%)

% of party members in ethnical communities	Right-wing	Octobrists	Cadets	National socialists	SRs	Mensheviks	Bolsheviks	Anarchists	Nationalists	Autonomists	Non-partisan	Total
Russians	13.8	6.6	20.5	7.4	20.2	12.1	16.3	0.3	0.6	1.5	0.7	100.0
Ukrainians	6.1	3.6	11.8	9.4	37.4	16.4	8.5	0.3	2.0	2.9	1.6	100.0
Belarusians	13.7	0.6	19.9	7.2	25.7	11.8	10.0	–	6.8	4.3	–	100.0
Jews	–	0.9	10.8	2.5	14.0	39.2	26.0	1.9	3.9	–	0.2	100.0
Polacks	2.4	0.8	16.6	1.8	9.6	13.9	14.3	–	4.0	35.8	0.8	100.0
Lithuanians	–	–	14.8	–	21.5	36.1	21.2	–	2.1	4.3	–	100.0
Latvians	–	–	12.2	1.0	8.3	22.5	51.4	–	0.9	3.7	–	100.0
Estonians	–	–	27.4	2.4	20.2	15.7	29.7	–	–	4.6	–	100.0
Finno-Ugrians	–	5.5	5.5	–	78.0	5.5	5.5	–	–	–	–	100.0
Germans	–	26.7	23.8	3.8	7.6	9.5	11.4	–	1.9	14.3	1.0	100.0
Tatars and Bashkirs	–	0.7	18.5	3.2	17.2	8.5	5.7	–	8.5	37.0	0.7	100.0
Georgians	–	–	14.0	1.1	20.4	30.0	33.4	1.1	–	–	–	100.0
Armenians	–	–	22.3	–	31.6	11.0	34.0	1.1	–	–	–	100.0
Northern Caucasia	–	–	12.9	2.6	12.8	15.0	28.2	–	–	28.5	–	100.0
Azerbaijani	–	–	31.3	6.0	5.9	21.6	17.6	–	7.8	9.8	–	100.0
Central Asia	–	–	50.0	1.1	12.2	1.1	15.6	–	8.9	11.1	–	100.0
Siberia	–	–	21.4	–	14.2	14.0	14.3	–	7.1	29.0	–	100.0
Moldavians	8.8	14.7	2.9	–	49.9	–	8.8	–	–	14.9	–	100.0
Small-numbered peoples	–	6.1	21.2	6.1	54.5	–	9.1	–	–	3.0	–	100.0
Europeans	6.0	10.0	26.0	6.0	16.0	10.0	8.0	2.0	10.0	6.0	–	100.0
Total	9.1	4.7	18.1	6.6	3,1	16.3	16.2	0.4	1.3	3.6	0.6	100.0

Noteworthy is that the modernization period has brought the ‘new generation’ Jews (especially in large industrial cities), who sometimes could steer clear of their origin since they didn’t face the phenomena of ethnic and religious discrimination that often. In addition, internationalism among the advanced youth of the turn of the century was quite common, and children from not too orthodox Jewish families were received in a friendly environment on an equal footing with Russians, Poles and others. On the contrary, the typical ethno-confessional isolation, fanaticism, perpetual humiliation with simultaneous arrogance of the ‘chosen people’ caused more irritation than sympathy in the representatives of the ‘new Jewry’. The famous revolutionary Mikhail Gots admitted in his memoirs that: ‘…never in adulthood I was a fan of the Jewish nation. The passion for nationalism experienced at an early age quickly disappeared as soon as I became acquainted with the key figures of our literature, which introduced me to the medium of general Russian interests. But what was especially dear to me always in my kind, something that reconciled my nation with its many vices and convinced of the possibility of a better future for the unspoiled lower

DOI: 10.37200/IJPR/V24I3/PR2020354
Received: 24 Feb 2020 | Revised: 28 Feb 2020 | Accepted: 18 Mar 2020

strata of my native people, that were… the types of their poor, and the way they've achieved the comprehension of the humane ideas of the century by tireless work of thought.[21]

Ekaterina Olitskaya, a prominent figure in the post-revolutionary Socialist Revolutionary Party, a long-standing prisoner of the Gulag, in her bright memoirs spoke of the love of her parents - her father, who comes from a family of wealthy Jewish businessmen, and a mother from an old noble-landowner family. They met in Switzerland, where they both studied at the university. Initially, their marriage shocked both families, but eventually reconciliation took place, and 'at the meeting of the heads of families it was decided to feather a nest for children'.[22] So, the *vykrest* (the Jew converted to Christianity) became a *pomeshchik* (landowner) of the Kursk province.

Mark Vishniak, also a native of the Jewish environment, recalled that: '…during the gymnasium years, there was an unconscious struggle between two influences: the Orthodox Jewish family with the inherited habit patterns and the Russian environment and culture. As was my custom from childhood, I prayed every day in the mornings, following all the rites prescribed by religion ... This continued for about sixteen years, when everything immediately disappeared ... I cannot say how it happened, but it happened right away and without much anxiety ... At the same age I read The Brothers Karamazov and realized my disbelief. Rejected in the family at home, the problem of religious faith lurked me, however, in another place and in another aspect - in a circle of friends and acquaintances'.[23]

The following hierarchy of factors pushed ethnical activists into the 'big-league politics': 1) the level of sociocultural development, and cultural and political consolidation of the people; 2) the deprivation of the ethnic group to a certain degree of public law restraint; 3) group and individual-family, cultural, and financial opportunities for 'a start in life'; 4) the peculiarities of the national household structure that complemented the psychosexual complexes of the future politician.

The female national-political image is generally similar to the male, but it also has original features. The women's national and confessional spectrum lacked Muslim women and representatives of small-numbered peoples of European and Asian Russia, as well as representatives of the Finnish, Lithuanian and Moldavian descent. But the percentage of Jewish women was 2.5 times higher than that of men, which was due to the passionate political impulse of Jewish daughters to escape beyond the shtetl limits, with limited opportunities to realize their passion in commerce, entrepreneurship, medicine, science, education, and artistic culture. However, some parties' composition almost had no women at all; for example, the Popular Socialists Party had almost completely masculine composition. Only scant information has kept on two women who ran from the Popular Socialists to the All-Russian Constituent Assembly: M M. Knyazeva, a teacher from Kislovodsk, and O.N. Zhitkova, an employee of local Zemstvo.[24]

[21] State Archive of the Russian Federation, f. 6243, op. 1, D. 1, L. 27
[22] Olitskaya, E.L. My Memories (in 2 volumes) / Frankfurt /M: Possev, 1971M [E-source]: http://www.sakharov-center.ru/asfcd/auth/?t=book&num=1823
[23] Vishniak, M. Op. cit. P. 24-26
[24] Political elite of the Russian province: from Nicholas II to Stalin / Tambov: TSU publishers, 2013:62

DOI: 10.37200/IJPR/V24I3/PR2020354
Received: 24 Feb 2020 | Revised: 28 Feb 2020 | Accepted: 18 Mar 2020

IV. CONCLUSION

The calculation and interpretation of data obtained as a part of the study, allow summarizing and drawing the following conclusions: the general 'portrait' of a socialist at the beginning of the 20th century is quite variable, but still amorphous, which is largely due to the incompleteness at the time of the formation of the entire political elite and of embedding it in the political culture of the country. Moreover, with the diversity of the socio-political skyline of Russia and with the dissimilarity of different parts of a huge empire, various 'average' types of party leaders arose. Socialism became so authoritative and popular in Russia because of the weakness of liberalism, its inability to oppose moderation and the rationalism of the 'middle course' to radicalism, which easily 'captured votes' in the binary Euro-Asian Russia, bouncing within the political extremities. As a result, the term 'revolutionary democracy', which hid behind itself heterogeneous socialist, and also anarchist forces, became commonly used in 1917 and was deceptively perceived as a pledge of political progress and the triumph of people's government. The choice of an individual's party affiliation was determined by a combination of many factors: social stratification, demographic, confessional, ethnocultural, etc. For all the totalitarian regimes of the 20th century, the victory was secured for those politicians who masked their 'will to power' and unlimited dominion over the nation of their own and the world in general behind various ideas;[25] Soviet Russia was not an exception, but, on the contrary, more like it launched these anti-democratic processes. It became proven by the political reality quite soon that all kinds of socialism may quite differ: just as in living nature, the strong took over the weak. Unfortunately, at that stage of the Russian political struggle, democratic socialism turned out to be weaker.

This article was prepared with the financial support of the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (RFBR), project № 19-09-00059A.

REFERENCES

[1] Avrus A. I., Novikov A. P. From Khvalynsk to New York: the Life and Social and Political Activity of V. M. Chernov / Saratov University publishers, 2013:300.
[2] Vishniak, M. Tribute to the Past / New York: Chekhov Publishing House of the East European Fund, Inc., 1954:414.
[3] Valentinov, N. An Unfinished Portrait / Moscow: Terra, 1993:560.
[4] All-Russian Constituent Assembly: Encyclopedia (compiled by L.G. Protasov) / Moscow: Political Encyclopedia, 2014:555.
[5] State Archive of the Russian Federation, fund 6243, op. 1, d. 1, list 27.
[6] Gessen, I.V. In two centuries: A life report // Berlin: Speer and Schmidt, 1937.
[7] Zenzinov, V.M. Perezhitoe (In Russ.) / New York: Chekhov Publishing House, 1953:418.
[8] Konovalova, O.V. V.M. Chernov on the ways of Russia's development / Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2009:383.
[9] Konovalova, O.V. V.M. Chernov's political ideals: a glance over the years / Krasnoyarsk, 2005:212.
[10] Mezhuyev, V. Does Socialism Have a Future? (In Russ.) // Free thought Publishing, 1991. № 14:6-18.
[11] People's Freedom bulletin, Tiflis: December 10, 1917
[12] Department of Manuscripts of the Russian State Library: f. 225, d. 67, list 1.
[13] Nenarokov, A.P. Istoriia odnogo pis′ma: politicheskoe zaveshchanie Pavla Aksel′roda [Paul Axelrod's political testament] / Moscow: Medium publishing, 2008:208.
[14] Olitskaya, E.L. My Memories (in 2 volumes) / Frankfurt/M: Possev, 1971. [E-source]: http://www.sakharov-center.ru/asfcd/auth/?t=book&num=1823

[25] Mezhuyev, V. Does Socialism Have a Future? // Freethought Publishing, 1991. № 14, p. 7

DOI: 10.37200/IJPR/V24I3/PR2020354
Received: 24 Feb 2020 | Revised: 28 Feb 2020 | Accepted: 18 Mar 2020

[15] Peshekhonov, A.V. Krizis v zemel'noi statistike [The Crisis in Zemstvo Land Assessment] (In Russ.) // Russkoye Bogatstvo magazine, 1901; № 12:167-189.
[16] Peshekhonov, A.V. Zemskaya doroga [The Zemstvo way] // Russkoye Bogatstvo magazine, 1914; №2:310-340.
[17] Political elite of the Russian province: from Nicholas II to Stalin / Tambov: TSU publishers, 2013:160.
[18] Protasov, L.G. A social portrait of provincial socialist // The fate of democratic socialism in Russia: Proceedings of the scientific conference / Foreword by K.N. Morozov. Moscow: Sabashnikov Publishers, 2014:231-240.
[19] Protasova, O.L. A.V. Peshekhonov: A Man and an epoch / Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2004:240.
[20] Protasova O.L., Naumova M.D., Bikbaeva E.V. The cultural life of Russia in the beginning of the XX century assessed by A.V. Peshekhonov (in German) // Vestnik TSTU, 2014; Vol. 20, № 1, P. 191-197; 196.
[21] Protasova, O. L. Aesthetics of «silver age» in the assessment of A. V. Peshekhonov // Isskusstvo Kul'tura Scientific-Practical magazine, №1 (19). Vitebsk, 2013:74-80.
[22] Sarkarova N.A., Gusaeva K.G. National and Religious Factors in Socio-Cultural Dimension // Problems of Contemporary Science and Practice journal, 2013, № 4 (48):110-116.
[23] Tyutyukin, S.V. G.V. Plekhanov: The Fate of the Russian Marxist / Moscow: ROSSPEN, 1997:377.
[24] Urilov, I. Kh. Martov: Politician and Historian / Moscow: Nauka, 1997: 472.
[25] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vladimir_Lenin

DOI: 10.37200/IJPR/V24I3/PR2020354
Received: 24 Feb 2020 | Revised: 28 Feb 2020 | Accepted: 18 Mar 2020