

Security Services in Russia (1802 – 1837)

¹Ahmed Abdul Hussein Hussein Karou Al-Jiashi, ²Prof. Dr. Muhammad Yusuf Ibrahim Al-Quraishi

^{1,2}Tikrit University - College of Education for Humanities - Department of History

Email: ahmed.abd.k@st.tu.edu.iq

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Received: 29 Dec 2024

Revised: 15 Feb 2025

Accepted: 24 Feb 2025

The security structures of the Russian Empire emerged at the end of the 19th century. The mayors' councils and their regional branches were replaced by the offices of police chiefs and city governors. From 1766 to 1871, the police in Russian cities were commanded by police chiefs and police chiefs. The lowest police rank was the city guard. Since 1882, the position was no longer elective. The governors appointed police officers. The main task of police officers was the faithful fulfillment by all residents of the county of their duty, the protection of public safety, and control over the correct and speedy processing of cases. The counties were divided into camps commanded by bailiffs. County police officers often inspected them and supervised the execution of cases of particular importance. They brought dissatisfied bailiffs to obedience and pursued (thieves, robbers, fugitives, and tax collection). Police officers monitored the health of roads, supervised the health of erected buildings, controlled tax collection, forestry, and field guards. The law obliged police officers to (educate the rural population about their duties and merits, encourage them to hard work, highlight the benefits of spreading and improving agriculture, crafts, and trade, and especially the maintenance of good morals and order). Usually, there were three or four camps in the county, divided into volumes. According to the instructions, the officers had The police had many responsibilities. The bailiffs supervised all executive, investigative, judicial, economic, and administrative affairs in their camp. The lower-ranking police officers of the district police and the officers of the ten were to assist the police officer. The bailiff was the local executor of government orders and the direct guardian of public safety, peace, and order in the country. He stopped all kinds of quarrels, fighting, riots, and disorder. He observed that no prohibited acts and actions were prohibited. He reported all emergency situations to the authorities. The police exercised general, temporary, and life supervision over many subjects of the empire. The superintendent did not have the right to change their place of residence. In 1802, the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Russian Empire was established, which included all police structures. From 1812, the Russian Emperor ruled the country with the assistance of the Privy Chancellery of His Imperial Majesty, which consisted of six branches. The Third Department and the separate gendarmerie division, which became the most powerful investigative and political investigation bodies since 1880, and the police administration and security departments operated in the most professional and efficient manner. The activities of the security services depend in everything on the will of the king. In the 19th century, the ministerial century of the Russian Empire, it was terrible, stupid, and of course completely unprofessional. The Tsars of Moscow did not like the general laws and regulations that were valid throughout the state. They constantly violated the law with their separate decrees. The Tsars viewed the general laws not as rules that should be applied always/everywhere, but as approximate models for their decisions and the implementation of their autocratic will.

Keywords: Security Services.

Introduction:

During the Tsarist era, the security services played a pivotal role in protecting the Russian monarchy and suppressing any political or social opposition. These agencies were used to monitor revolutionary activities, spy on opponents, and carry out arrests and exiles, especially with the rise of revolutionary movements in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Among the most prominent security agencies in Tsarist Russia were the Tsarist Secret Police, which was responsible for monitoring revolutionary groups. There was also the gendarmerie, the military police, which was responsible for internal security and counterinsurgency, and played an important role in suppressing peasant movements.

As the Tsarist regime weakened and the Russian Revolution escalated, these agencies failed to contain the revolutionary tide, leading to the fall of the Tsarist regime in 1917. These agencies were replaced by Soviet security agencies such as the Cheka, which were more brutal and organized.

The security services in Tsarist Russia played a crucial role in maintaining the stability of imperial rule and confronting internal threats, especially with the rise of revolutionary movements and social unrest during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. These agencies were responsible for monitoring political opponents, suppressing uprisings, and censoring revolutionary thought that had begun to spread among workers and intellectuals. Although they were partially successful in curbing some anti-government activities, the repressive methods employed by these agencies—such as espionage, arbitrary arrests, and exile to Siberia—contributed to the rise of popular anger against the Tsarist regime. As revolutionary movements, such as the Bolsheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries, grew stronger, these agencies were unable to contain the unrest, ultimately leading to the collapse of the Tsarist regime during the Russian Revolution of 1917.

This research aims to analyze the origins and development of the security services in Tsarist Russia, their methods of confronting opposition, their impact on the political and social landscape, and their role in the fall of the imperial regime.

Introduction: Security services in Russia during the period (1802-1923)

First: The Ministry of the Interior during the reign of Alexander I (Alexander I)¹:

The first appearance of the police apparatus in the Russian Empire occurred during the reign of Tsar Peter the Great (Peter the Great) (1682 – 1725 AD)² In the year 1715 in the city of St. Petersburg, to maintain public order in the capital, he was keen to pay attention to this device and develop it, as he established nine large complexes for this device, distributed them in the various main places of his country, and made their direct connection with the local rulers and their agents.³ He appointed many individuals to this apparatus as soldiers to carry out police duties, avoid internal disturbances, maintain law and order, and defend the Tsar and his rule. He provided the leaders of this apparatus with instructions, the most important of which was to leave employees who abused their powers alone, as long as they declared their loyalty to the Tsar and fulfilled their financial obligations. This gave these employees the opportunity to abuse people and use their powers to harm all members of society, taking advantage of the police's neglect of holding them accountable.⁴

There were no clear lines of work for this apparatus, especially since those who ran it were military personnel (the Protection Forces Division), and they did not have the experience in how to deal with civil cases, which are related to the judiciary. This apparatus also suffered from a significant shortage in the number of its personnel, especially in the border cities and deputy provinces that were very far from the centers of state in the main Russian cities.⁵

Empress Catherine II worked (Catherine II)⁶ (1762-1796 AD), on major reforms in local administration, as it granted the local police broad powers and added new regulations to them that included dividing the entire country's lands into (26) provinces consisting of districts and towns.⁷ The organization of the local police was very simple in the district center, consisting of one field commander (kapitan-espravnik), assisted by two elected noble councilors, and two peasant assessors, who together formed the district court, which was essentially a district-level police institution, which also performed some minor judicial functions.⁸

The local police administration in the provincial towns was more complex and varied depending on the size of the town and its population, as the decree (ustav) determined⁹ For public order and police in cities, which was adopted by Empress Catherine in 1782, small police units were to be formed in the city departments, each department having a person called the inspector, assisted by two assistants who were residents of the department for which they were responsible, and all the city departments were linked to the city governor and his assistant, and the governor had a special council called the city police council that included a number of senior officers and individuals.¹⁰

The sections run by the inspectors had a number of officers and men to carry out the duties assigned to the section, and the city police board and the city governor had to provide the necessary support to the section officers in the cities, when the matter required the intervention of forces larger than the strength of the sections.¹¹

Police officers in rural and urban areas were appointed by order of the city governor, while field commanders in the provincial capital and their advisors were elected by the assembly of local nobles, with the approval of the provincial governor. Their most important duties were to investigate crimes committed against the tsar's rule and to protect public property in times of unrest.¹² .

The police force, especially in rural areas and some cities, relied on the nobility to maintain security and order in their areas of influence. This was because the cities in the Russian Empire were a collection of different social classes, many of whom were free and had the ability to own private property, while the countryside was inhabited primarily by serfs.¹³ Owned by the nobility, they were not free but bound to their lords. Serfs could not own property, participate in contractual relations, marry, or be a party in court.¹⁴ .

The noble owner had full control and legal authority to maintain public order within the borders of all his possessions, and they performed judicial and security duties in crimes committed in their possessions, which included individuals from (100 – 1000 people in each village or small town.¹⁵ These nobles were able to supervise the daily life of the community, which was governed by customary law, as well as the state police apparatus, which had no difficulties in its work in villages, countryside and small towns, because the peasant community bore mutual responsibility towards all members.¹⁶ Therefore, police officials usually rely on local communities to monitor themselves. When a police officer has to investigate a serious crime, he expects the community and the elders to search for the person who committed the crime and abandon him.¹⁷ .

On September 8, 1802, Russian Tsar Alexander I issued a manifesto in which he created eight central ministries of executive power, including the Ministry of Internal Affairs.¹⁸ The Ministry of the Interior was considered the true beginning of the development of the Russian police apparatus, which received the attention of the Russian Tsar, as this ministry was one of the most important institutions for defending the Tsarist throne and his rule in Russia. Therefore, the Russian Tsar was the one who personally appointed the Minister of Internal Affairs, and the minister had to submit his reports directly to the Tsar. The Ministry of the Interior replaced the police, which was established by Peter the Great in 1715, in terms of responsibility for security in society.¹⁹ .

The establishment of the Ministry of Internal Affairs in 1802 changed the police system in Russia. The Ministry of Internal Affairs was charged with an unlimited set of tasks. The Ministry of Internal Affairs became responsible for community welfare, maintaining peace, and maintaining order in the countryside. In order to perform these tasks, the Minister of Internal Affairs was given administrative authority over all state institutions. He supervised industry.²⁰ .

The most important position in the ministry after the position of minister was the position of deputy minister, who assisted the minister in the tasks of managing the ministry, in a wide range of duties, which required the formation of a broad organizational and administrative structure of four main departments, which are:²¹ :

- Department of Living Supplies.
- The Public Order Department, which is actually responsible for the real functions of the company.
- Industry Interest Department.
- Public institutions such as hospitals, prisons, shelters, and orphanages.

These departments had small branches for issuing passports, registering births, and registering the peasant and merchant classes, the nobility, as well as registering the residences of citizens. A department was called the Address Establishment Mission, which had offices in St. Petersburg and Moscow, and the maintenance of all public buildings, and providing the necessary resources to citizens to support them in the event of a famine or any general emergency.²² .

The General Medical Mission was also established within the Ministry of the Interior in 1804, to supervise the work of public health care institutions. The work of the General Medical Mission continued over the decades, allowing the Ministry of Health and Housing to supervise public medical institutions that included mental and psychological illness agencies.²³ .

In 1806, the General Postal Administration was transferred from the Senate to the Ministry of the Interior, which made it easier for the Ministry of the Interior to control it. The Department of School Supervision was transferred from the Ministry of Education to the apparatus of the Ministry of the Interior. In 1819, the Economic Department was attached to the structure of the Ministry of the Interior and was tasked with organizing urban life, providing the population with necessary supplies, improving agriculture in the countryside, and organizing settlements in the newly acquired lands. In 1823, the Department of Foreign Religious Affairs was formed to protect Orthodox Christianity and supervise the activities of other religions throughout the Russian Empire.²⁴ .

One of the main tasks of this administration was to control the Jewish population and limit their movements within the country. The police participated in the deportation of Jews from the western provinces to the prohibited areas in central Russia, where the government allowed the establishment of Jewish settlements.²⁵ .

The Ministry of the Interior then withdrew powers from the provincial governors and their control over the local police, as well as the local land courts and city councils, and transferred them to special agents of the Ministry, with the result that the local police became a representative of the Ministry of the Interior.²⁶ .

In 1837 a new Provincial Police Act and Instructions to Governors were issued, which directed governors and landowners to follow the instructions of the Ministry of the Interior and its Minister, and local police institutions acted as personal security agents for protection and maintenance of order.²⁷ .

During the early years of the Ministry of the Interior, the provincial governors continued to enjoy independence and resented any orders coming directly to them from the Ministry of the Interior, as the provincial governors considered themselves and their police agencies directly responsible only to the Tsar.²⁸ By the mid-1830s, the formal structure of the Ministry of the Interior had grown. The Ministry of the Interior took control of local police institutions and governors, and established a superior hierarchy for the Russian police. Local police agencies ceased to be security forces and personal agents of governors. Local agencies became part of the national police apparatus, thus becoming a unified, formal, and professional apparatus.²⁹ .

Second: The development of the Ministry of Interior after the Decembrist uprising.³⁰ 1825:

The failed Decembrist uprising of 1825 prompted Tsar Nicholas I to establish the Supreme Police Department, known as the Third Department, which was the first permanent political police department established in the Russian Empire. By imperial decree of July 3, 1826, its purpose was to protect the monarchy and the political order, replacing the temporary political police agencies established under Alexander I under the name of the Supreme Police Committee and Privy Council.³¹ .

The Third Department was structurally separated from the Ministry of the Interior, was subordinate to His Majesty's Imperial Chancellery, and by the Okaz Decree of 1826 was made responsible for the duty of supervising the work of the agents of the Ministry of the Interior, which led to the Third Department becoming the most influential office in Russia. The subordination of the regular police to the political police continued throughout the history of the Russian Empire.³² .

The Gendarmerie Corps, founded in 1827, was one of the most important organs of the Third Department. They were the personal agents of the Tsar, officially charged with acting according to their conscience rather than official law.³³ The reason for the creation of the gendarmes was to be agents of the Russian Empire, and its men had to declare their trust and loyalty to the throne, the emperor and the monarchy.³⁴ To carry out these tasks, the gendarmes were distributed in each province and district, as the entire country was divided between five gendarmerie districts, which later became eight, headed by the General Commander of the Gendarmerie. The local gendarmerie surveillance network grew significantly by 1850, consisting of (126) gendarmerie commands spread throughout the country, and their main duty was to report on the local political environment, the opinions of the local nobility, and other groups of the free population.³⁵ .

Although the Third Department always operated under the decree of 1826, its power and influence over the regular police administration continued to be on the widest scale, so it was considered a supreme and above-the-law institution with authority throughout the Russian Empire. Because the gendarmes often performed the functions of the regular police, the public viewed the Third Department and the Ministry of the Interior as one and the same.³⁶ .

Despite the great development of police administration in the first half of the nineteenth century, its local offices in urban and rural areas were severely criticized for being inefficient, corrupt, and slow to act. Ironically, despite centralization and almost absolute judicial authority, the central office of the Ministry of the Interior had few mechanisms to monitor the implementation of its duties by the local offices.³⁷ .

The linear, hierarchical structure assumed complete subordination, the law provided no mechanism for feedback on public abuse, and there was no evaluation of the performance of local police officials. This led to increased abuse of power and widespread corruption the further the provinces were from St. Petersburg and Moscow, yet the police presence was minimal.³⁸ .

The lack of oversight mechanisms and the problem of the availability of large numbers of police were not the only issue. Since the establishment of the Ministry of Interior, its mandate was not well defined. The establishment of the central administrative apparatus and the local offices of the Ministry of Interior was intermittent and unbalanced. Sometimes these authorities had overlapping jurisdictions and were given conflicting instructions. At

the same time, they were given almost absolute authority in carrying out those tasks. This alone created the opportunity for unlimited abuse of power and corruption.³⁹

Corruption was the tool used by local authorities to filter out tasks that needed to be done and ignore basic duties. The creation of the Gendarmerie Corps was an apparatus known to be above the law, often performing regular police duties, which led to widespread abuse and corruption. The gendarmes were known to be abusive and violent, and the Third Department did nothing to stop their misbehavior.⁴⁰

The tasks of the Ministry of the Interior and its local agents were also responsible for many problems. The Ministry of the Interior was charged with controlling almost every aspect of daily life in the Russian Empire, from maintaining public order and preventing crime, to controlling public buildings and emergency living supplies.⁴¹

However, the local offices did not have sufficient manpower to carry out the enormous duties, and as the central administrative apparatus of the Ministry of Interior expanded, the number of decrees, instructions and directives defining the work of the Ministry increased dramatically. However, the expansion of the local workforce in the Ministry of Interior occurred mostly at the provincial level rather than at the level of rural areas and their subdivisions.⁴²

Local police officers received a large number of instructions on a monthly basis, some of which were conflicting and some of which were unrealistic to implement. In order to survive, local police officials had to choose which instructions and decrees to implement. These decisions were often made under the influence of stakeholders and influence in the local authority, from the governor-general to the local gentry involved in the city or county government. Pressure was implemented through political means, as well as bribery.⁴³ Another obstacle to police administration in Russia was the quality of the selection of inferior police officers. Local police chiefs were paid low salaries and received few benefits compared to other public servants. For this reason, soldiers who were no longer suitable for military service were often appointed as department supervisors and assistants in city police agencies. Many of them were either illiterate or semi-literate. They tried to use military discipline measures to maintain public order in their wards during investigations of criminal cases. Therefore, they frequently used torture methods to obtain confessions from the accused.⁴⁴

Emperor Nicholas I (1832-1837) increased the salaries of city police officers and urged the nobility in each province to provide suitable peasants for police service, but these measures did not prove effective.⁴⁵

Third: Police Administration in the Reform Era (1856-1881) :

Tsar Alexander II (Alexander II (1855 – 1881 AD) ⁴⁶, known as the (editor) made several important reforms to the Russian imperial government, two of which were directly related to police administration:

The first: the reform of self-government in 1862.

The second: the judicial reform of 1864.

The loss of the Crimean War (1853-1855) revealed serious internal problems in Russian society related to the previous systems and the serfdom of Russian society, the slow progress of industrialization, and the backwardness of the government apparatus, which was described as bureaucratic and backward. Therefore, it was not surprising that immediately after the coronation of Alexander II in 1856, he announced plans to emancipate the serfs and reform the administrative apparatus. The implementation of the reform took five years, during which Alexander II relied on younger and more educated civil servants, whom he called “enlightened bureaucrats,” who joined the government at the beginning of his reign to implement the reforms.⁴⁷

As for the issue of liberating slaves, the existing local administration was not able to do so and absorb the large numbers of liberated slaves, as Greater Russia consisted of (21 million private slaves and (25 million state-owned slaves, most of whom were illiterate and never left the borders of their property or region.⁴⁸

The issue of emancipation raised serious questions about whether large landowners could continue to maintain public order within the communities of emancipated serfs.⁴⁹ This also called into question the ability of the new police force to prevent civil unrest and accommodate the new societal structure, because the rural police had not witnessed real reforms, but rather were modest, despite the fact that this force was burdened with many duties.⁵⁰

The government put forward three alternative plans for local administration and police reform, each representing a competing view of police functions. The first plan was proposed by Interior Minister Sergei Lanskoy (Sergey Lanskoy, who called for decentralization of local administration, which was to be achieved by strengthening the power of the governors and the Ministry of the Interior and granting them direct administrative powers, which had previously been the exclusive prerogative of the Tsar.⁵¹

The plan was approved by most of the governors, but was strongly opposed by other ministers, because the Ministry of the Interior continued to have direct control over the governors according to that plan. The decentralization proposed by Lansky simply strengthened the power of the Ministry of the Interior over the representatives of the local ministries. According to the plan, the local police administration was completely removed from the hands of the local nobles and landlords, and the police administration became subordinate to the state bureaucracy in order to maintain the existing authoritarian system.⁵²

The alternative plan proposed by the group of conservative ministers (Ministry of State Property, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Justice, etc.) was to restore the military governors and give them supreme authority in the countryside, with them reporting directly to the government or the Tsar and not to the Minister of the Interior, and with the governor-general of the region having a local representative called the (regional governor), who had the power to veto any decisions taken by the local police.⁵³ This scheme of complete administrative centralization reserved partial control over local police agencies to the nobles and landowners, provided close administrative supervision over local police officers, and simplified the chain of command that was often broken within the Ministry of the Interior system.⁵⁴

The police continued to be a force serving the interests of the local nobility, but they were also controlled by state agents, who reported directly to the Tsar. This plan aroused opposition from the local rulers because it undermined their authority.⁵⁵

The third local administration plan included the idea of the concept of self-government for the empire, according to which it would operate through elected provincial and district councils that did not include representatives of the nobility, and representatives of other social classes within Russian society. These agencies would have an executive body and be responsible for electing local police leaders.⁵⁶

Under this plan, the functions of the local police were to be in the name of the state and the Russian order (the Tsar), and also in the name of all other social groups represented through a local council. Although not all classes of Russian society were represented in the agencies, it included the social classes of merchants, clergy, and wealthy peasants who had previously been separated from the local police administration, which was to assume the duties of protecting the members of the community, not just the Tsar.⁵⁷

On 25 December 1862, the Provisional Rules on the Organization of Police in County Cities and Districts Governed by Local Authorities were adopted to strengthen the police structure. The new rules did not follow any of the three plans mentioned above, but instead were a mixture, keeping local police functions under the control of the Ministry of the Interior, and the agencies did not have the power to elect local police officers.⁵⁸

The rural and city police were merged under the name of District Police Departments (Uezdnoe Politseikoe Upravlenie) headed by the district commander (Uezdnyi Ispravnik), the new district commander was appointed directly by the governor upon approval of the Ministry of the Interior, and was not elected by the council of local landowners and gentry.⁵⁹

Landlords and nobles were removed from the direct control of the local police, and independent urban police stations existed only in major cities such as St. Petersburg and Moscow. The lowest-ranking city police officer was directly responsible for patrolling the streets, while his superior, the okolodushny nadziratel, was charged with informal supervision of the neighborhood's residents, as well as conducting preliminary investigations.⁶⁰

In 1864, when the agencies were established as self-governing local bureaus, some basic administrative functions relating to the maintenance of local public buildings, roads, and structures were transferred from the local police to the agencies.⁶¹ However, a wide range of administrative supervisory functions, including passport control, liquor store licensing, fire department, street health standards, and hunting and fishing licenses in natural areas, remained under the authority of the local police.⁶²

Regardless of the changes, the new police under the 1862 law remained a function of the state bureaucracy and was directly controlled by the autocratic Tsar while excluding most social groups from the police administration process.

Conclusion:

The most effective way to address these issues is to view them from a historical perspective. The Security Police has a long tradition in Russian and Soviet history, which sheds much light on its operations today. The Tsarist and Soviet political police were always the ultimate symbol of repression, and the degree of repression at any given time was a useful yardstick for measuring the apparent powers of the police. As this study has confirmed, the Tsarist political police, despite their interventionism and unscrupulousness, were ineffective in their attempts

to stem the tide of the revolutionary movement. The Soviet political police made up for the failings of their predecessors and gradually evolved into one of the most brutal police systems in the world. What made the All-Russian Extraordinary Committee so effective was that it was established for the sole purpose of propping up a regime that lacked any popular support for its rule. The Russian monarchy, even when it had lost credibility in the eyes of the people, always enjoyed a certain legitimacy based on the autocratic tradition and the Orthodox Church. The Bolsheviks had no legitimacy whatsoever and were threatened from all sides by the opposition. Therefore, it was essential for the survival of the Bolsheviks that the political police have unrestrained coercive powers over the population.

References:

- (1) Alexander I: Russian Emperor, born in Saint Petersburg on December 12, 1777 AD, became Emperor of Russia between the years (1801-1825 AD), in 1805 AD, he joined the European coalition against Napoleon, and was defeated by the French armies, so he made peace with Napoleon in Tilsit in 1807 AD, and later he formed an alliance with the European countries against Napoleon, witnessed the Congress of Vienna in 1815 AD, and died on December 19, 1825 AD. For more, see: The New Encyclopedia Britannia, London, 1986, Vol. I, pp.242 – 244.
- (2) Peter ALAGrow up: Russian Emperor, born in Moscow on June 9, 1672 AD. He is the son of Tsar Alexei from his second wife. He became Tsar of Russia between 1682 and 1692.-(1725 AD), was one of Russia's most prominent figures throughout its history and one of its greatest organizers and reformers. He expanded his country's borders westward and southward, fought the Swedes and Poles, organized the army, administration, and education, and called for women's freedom. He built St. Petersburg and made it the capital of Russia. He abolished the Patriarchate and appointed himself head of the Orthodox Church. The famous will (the Will of Peter) calling for access to warm waters is attributed to him. For more, see: Bassam Al-Asali, Peter the Great, Arab Foundation for Studies and Publishing, Beirut, 1980. The New Encyclopedia Britannia, Vol. 25, pp. 518 – 519.
- (3) AG Fastov, Organy Vnutrennih del Rossi: Istoriya Stanovleniya i Razvitiya, Volgograd Law Academy, Volgograd, 2005, Ctp.116.
- (4) VM Gordon & AD Kisilev & NP Palienko, et al., Administrativnoe Pravo iz Kursa Pravove – Deniya po Narodnoi Entsiklopedii, Obschestvenno-Yuridicheskie Nauki, Tipografiya Tovarisch – Estva ID Sytina, Moscow, 1911, Ctp.241.
- (5) George L. Yaney, The Systematization of Russian Government: Social Evolution in the Domestic Administration of Imperial Russia (1711 – 1905), University of Illinois Press, USA, 1973, P.211.
- (6) Catherine II: Russian Empress, originally named Sophia Augusta, born on May 12, 1729. She married Peter III, then plotted to overthrow him and ascended the throne in 1762, declaring herself Empress of Russia. During her reign, Russia's borders expanded by acquiring Ottoman possessions in the Balkans and the Black Sea. She developed ambitions to restore the glory of the Byzantine Empire. She died in November 1796. For more, see: The New Encyclopedia Britannia, Vol. 3, p. 1005.
- (7) RS Mulukaev & AY Malygin & AE Epifanov, Istoriya Otechestvennykh Organov Vnutrennikh Del, Moscow, 2005, Ctp.64.
- (8) J. Le Donne, The Provincial and Local Police under Catherine the Great (1775 – 1796), Canadian Slavic Studies, Vol. 4, No. 3, 1970, PP. 516–517.
- (9) The Zemstvo Reform of 1864 began, He entrusted zemstvo institutions with local and public functions., The state takes control of it. for Form of government supervision or private supervision and the appointment of specific regulations, The orders of the Zemsky Sovereignty Bodies themselves can be implemented with the help of tax and financial authorities or through the police., The Zemsky reform hampered the authorities' attempts to concentrate local power in the hands of bureaucratic bodies., embodied publicly. Wanting to form new bodies of local government on the class principle, the reform organizers did not dare, Universal suffrage is unacceptable to them., It was therefore decided that the elections would divide the population of the district into three parts, controlled by representatives of a particular estate., Given that. Due to the presence of property qualifications, the veche system allowed the government to plan the number of voters in zemstvo institutions, providing a majority for representatives of the ruling class.
- (10) SO Gonyukhov & VI Gorobtsov, MVD Rossi (MVD of Russia), Reitar, Moscow, 2002, P.83.
- (11) VV Rybnikov & GV Aleksushin, Istoriya pravookhranitel'nykh Organov Otechestva, Schit – MX, Moscow, 2008, Ctp.67.
- (12) EP Sichinskii, Ugolovnyi sysk Rossii VX – Nachale XX VV, Chelyabinsk Law Institute of MVD, Chelyabinsk, 2002, Ctp.202 ; George L. Yaney, Op. Cit., p.214.
- (13) ATo Qanana: It is a socio-economic status of the peasant class under feudalism., Which It was a state of slavery or modified slavery that first appeared..in Europe during the Middle Ages, The serf was forced to work in the fields of the landowners, in exchange for protection and the right to work in the rented fields. For more see: TYelchok and AKron, A Brief History of Soviet Society, translated by Khairi Al-Damen, Dar Al-Taqaddum, Moscow, 1973.p. 106-107.
- (14) RS Mulukaev & AY Malygin & AE Epifanov, Предыдущий источник, Ctp.65.
- (15) Peter Waldron, Governing Tsarist Russia, Red Globe Press, New York, 2007, p.156.
- (16) Michael Confino, Russian Customary Law and the Study of Peasant Mentalities, Russian Review, Vol. 44, No. 1, 1985, pp.37 – 38.
- (17) EP Sichinskii, Read more, Ctp.203; George L. Yaney, Op. Cit., p.219.
- (18) Ministry of Internal Affairs: These ministries formed what was called the State Council, which met regularly and represented the advisory body to the Tsar. The aim of establishing this council was to simplify the procedures of the executive branch of the state and to create functional offices that would assist in implementing government procedures. It also limited professional bureaucratic procedures by simplifying the responsibilities of the executive branch and dividing work between these ministries and their subsidiary offices. For more see: K. Б. Валиулин & Р. К. Зарипова, История России. XX век, РИО БашГУ, 2002, Ctp.61.
- (19) Daniel H. Kaiser & Gary Marker, Reinterpreting Russian History: Readings 860 – 1860s, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1994, P.257.
- (20) RS Mulukaev & AY Malygin & AE Epifanov, Предыдущий источник, Ctp.71.

- (21) Daniel T. Orlovsky, *The Limits of Reform: The Ministry of Internal Affairs in Imperial Russia (1802 – 1881)*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge and London, 1981, P.44; A.G. Fastov, Read more, Ctp.116.
- (22) Salo W. Baron, *The Russian Jew under Tsars and Soviets*, Macmillan Publishing Inc, London, 1976, P.93.
- (23) J. Le Donne, Op. Cit., p.524.
- (24) Mervyn Matthews, *The Passport Society, Controlling Movement in Russia and the USSR*, Westview Press, Oxford, 1993, P.106.
- (25) Salo W. Baron, Op. Cit., p. 94.
- (26) J. Le Donne, Op. Cit., p.524.
- (27) Daniel T. Orlovsky, Op. Cit., p.46.
- (28) Peter Waldron, Op. Cit., p.156 ; George L. Yaney, Op. Cit., p.221.
- (29) J. Le Donne, Op. Cit., p. 526 ; Daniel H. Kaiser & Gary Marker, Op. Cit., p.258.
- (30) Decembrist Revolution or Decembrist Uprising: It was a revolutionary movement carried out by a group of noble Russian revolutionaries, most of whom were officers in the imperial army. 14 December 1825 Against the absolute tsarist rule, this revolution failed, and its leaders were sentenced to death and exile in Siberia. For more, see: Ahmed Nazim Abbas, "The Decembrist Organizations and Their Impact on the Russian Internal Conditions in 1825," *Journal of Strategic and Military Studies*, Issue (11), Berlin, 2021, p. 70.-71.
- (31) RS Mulukaev & AY Malygin & AE Epifanov, Предыдущий источник, Ctp.71.
- (32) Squire Fat, *The Third Department, The Establishment and Practices of the Political Police in the Russia of Nicholas I*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1969, P.24.
- (33) George L. Yaney, Op. Cit., p.223.
- (34) M. Lemke, *Nikolaevskie Gendarmes and Literature of 1826 – 1850*, S. V. Bunin, St. Petersburg, 1909, p.36 ; George L. Yaney, Op. Cit., p.225.
- (35) VV Rybnikov & GV Aleksushin, Предыдущий источник, Ctp.72.
- (36) M. Lemke, Op. Cit., p. 39.
- (37) Ibid., p. 39.
- (38) Frederick S. Starr, *Decentralization and Self-Government in Russia 1830 – 1870*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 2015, P.41.
- (39) RS Mulukaev & AY Malygin & AE Epifanov, Предыдущий источник, Ctp.74.
- (40) Sidney Monas, *The Third Section: Police and Society in Russia under Nicholas I*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1961, P.191.
- (41) J. Le Donne, Op. Cit., p. 530 ; Peter Waldron, Op. Cit., p.156.
- (42) Frederick S. Starr, Op. Cit., p.44.
- (43) George L. Yaney, Op. Cit., p.227.
- (44) EP Sichinskii, Read more, Ctp.206.
- (45) SO Gonyukhov & VI Gorobtsov, Op. Cit., p.84.
- (46) Alexander II: Alexander Nikolayevich Romanov, Emperor of Russia, was born in Moscow on April 17, 1818. He was the eldest son of Tsar Nicholas I. He assumed power after his father's death in 1855. He was able to introduce reforms to Russia, most notably the decree abolishing serfdom in Russia and emancipating the serfs in 1861, which is why he was called the "Tsar Liberator." He also reformed education and introduced conscription. He was assassinated by the People's Will organization on March 1, 1881. For more, see: John Paxton, *Leaders of Russia and the Soviet Union: From the Romanov Dynasty to Vladimir Putin*, Routledge, New York, 2004, PP.69 – 70.
- (47) B. W. Lincoln, *The Genesis of an Enlightened Bureaucracy 1825 – 1856*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1994, P.260 – 261.
- (48) Peter Czap Jr., *Peasant – Class Courts and Peasant Customary Justice in Russia 1861 – 1912*, *Journal of Social History*, Vol. 1, No. 2, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1967, pp.159 – 160.
- (49) Stephen P. Frank, *Crime, Cultural Conflict, and Justice in Rural Russia 1856 – 1914*, University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, 1999, P.72.
- (50) Robert J. Abbott, *Police Reform in the Russian Province of Yaroslavl 1856 – 1876*, Stanford University Press, California, 1973, P.295.
- (51) Daniel Balmuth, *Censorship in Russia 1865 – 1905*, University Press of America, Inc, Washington, 1979, p.61.
- (52) Peter Czap Jr., Op. Cit., p.163.
- (53) Jacob Walkin, *The Rise of Democracy in Pre-Revolutionary Russia*, Frederick A. Praeger, New York, 1962, p.94.
- (54) LY Gusman, *Stanovlenie Tsenzurnogo Zakonodatel'stva V Rossii (Pervaya Polovina 19 Veka)*, St. Petersburg State University of Aerospace machinery, St. Petersburg, 2002, Ctp.120.
- (55) EN Anuchin, *Istoricheski Obzor Razvitiya Administrativno – Politseiskih Ucherezhdenii v Rossii s Ucherezhdeniya o Gubernoyakh do Nashih Dnei*, Tipographia MVD, St. Petersburg, 1872, Ctp.87.
- (56) Jacob Walkin, *The Rise of Democracy in Pre-Revolutionary Russia*, p.98.
- (57) EN Anuchin, see more, Ctp.88.
- (58) Peter Czap Jr., Op. Cit., p.169.
- (59) Marc Raeff, *The Well – Ordered Police State: Social and Institutional Change Through Law in the Germanies and Russia*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1983, P.250.
- (60) EN Anuchin, see more, Ctp.91.
- (61) Jacob Walkin, *The Rise of Democracy in Pre-Revolutionary Russia*, p.99.
- (62) Marc Raeff, Op. Cit., p. 250.