

Giada Hitthaler

P. A. Stolypin and the  
renaissance of rhetoric

**Opera Slavica Coloniensia**  
Edited by Daniel Bunčić and Jörg Schulte

**Volume 11**

Cologne 2019

Opera Slavica Coloniensia

Slavisches Institut  
Universität zu Köln  
Weyertal 137  
50931 Köln

ISSN: 2748-6060

This thesis was supervised by Professor Jörg Schulte. In 2019 it was accepted as a master's thesis by the Faculty of Arts and Humanities of the University of Cologne.

The thesis was awarded the **Leonid Čertkov Prize**  
for innovative papers on Slavic philology  
(<https://slavistik.phil-fak.uni-koeln.de/studium/auszeichnungen>).

Published without modifications  
on the Cologne University Publication Server (KUPS)  
of the University and City Library of Cologne (<https://kups.ub.uni-koeln.de/>)  
in April 2022

© Giada Hitthaler 2022

This work, including its parts, is protected by copyright. Any use without the author's consent is prohibited. This applies in particular to electronic or other reproduction, translation, distribution and making available to the public.

# Contents

Introduction .....	3
1. Peculiarities of Stolypin’s speeches .....	5
1.1 General data about Stolypin’s speeches .....	5
1.2 Beginning and end of the speeches .....	7
1.3 Literary references and foreign languages .....	10
1.4 Performance and personality .....	14
2. Nonviolent rhetoric: Stolypin’s values.....	20
2.1 Common sense and politeness.....	20
2.1.1 Peace and unity .....	23
2.2 Action and the importance of time .....	39
2.3 Law, order and freedom.....	46
2.4 Truth and honesty .....	53
2.5 Patriotism .....	57
Conclusion.....	63
Bibliography .....	65
Primary sources.....	65
Secondary sources .....	66
Webliography.....	69



## Introduction

This thesis analyses Pyotr Arkadyevich Stolypin's rhetorical talent: the persuasive skills of his speeches and the peculiarities of his performances. There are three constant elements in his discourses that are red threads within this text: Stolypin's politeness, firmness and unconditional devotion towards his fatherland. At the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, in the period between the two revolutions, his unusual political figure and his nonviolent communication and persuasion have been counter current. The most relevant topics of this thesis will be the peasants' liberation from their landowners, the repression of revolutionary acts, the troubles that constantly emerged with the Eastern and Western marginal areas of the Empire, and Stolypin's replies to Azef's betrayal and Kutler's false assertions.

The first chapter introduces general information about the delivery and the composition of his speeches. When, where and the kind of occasions in which his discourses were held, what were their length, which were their main themes and his persuasive reasons behind the decisions on how to start and how to end his speeches. This chapter also reports the different foreign words and quotations of popular literal works he employed to picture situations that were taking place in Russia at that time. At the end of this chapter, the discussion moves in the direction of the importance of the delivery of a speech: the performance itself. In relation to this, will be discussed the reactions and replies from his opponents. Besides Stolypin's speeches, his background and personality were also of huge importance in order to gain credibility and support. This chapter also reveals the existence of Stolypin's speechwriter.

The second chapter goes deeper into Stolypin's political beliefs and values. He applies his nonviolent and impartial rhetoric to achieve successful collaboration and peace within Russia and with other countries; unity and integrity of the Empire; the enactment of laws; trust and honesty within the government, the Duma and the Sovet. To represent these concepts and to convince his audience of their importance, Stolypin often used everyday examples and most of all metaphors. Typical for his rhetoric will also be the confrontation of two different attitudes: Stolypin put his audience in front of two opposite decisions and orientations.

There are no works explicitly centred on the complete analysis of Stolypin's rhetoric. In the article *Ritoricheskii portret P. A. Stolypina: obraz Rossii v rechakh 1906–1911 godov*, Makarova analysed Stolypin's persuasive means in relation to his use of metaphors and the terms related to *Rossiia*, *rodina* and *tsar'*. In the chapter *Dinamika rechevykh sredstv sozdaniia obraza ritora v rossiiskom politicheskom diskurse* of the collective monograph *Ritorika russkogo delovogo i politicheskogo diskursa*, Sharafutdinova made some observations about Stolypin's orator image, his rhetorical techniques, his use of expressive means, pronouns and justifications. Goffman's paper *ON FACE-WORK. An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction* and Gorsevski's work *Peaceful Persuasion. The Geopolitics of Nonviolent Rhetoric* were of great importance in the analysis of Stolypin's impartial attitude. Historical literatures and (auto-) biographical texts were used to give a complete frame of the social and political context of that time and to understand Stolypin's personality directly from the testimony of his contemporaries. Tarquini's work *Pëtr Arkadevič Stolypin: Il ministro dello zar che fu ucciso per la sua riforma agraria. E cambiò il corso della storia*, Avrekh's *P. A. Stolypin i sud'by reform v Rossii* and Healy's *The Russian Autocracy in Crisis: 1905 – 1907* were of great inspiration in relation to the historical background. Statements about his performances and the resonance he obtained at that time were often taken from the testimonies of Podolinsky's *Russland vor der Revolution: die agrarsoziale Lage und Reformen* and Maklakov's *Pervaia gosudarstvennaia Duma (vospominaniia sovremennika)*. Pozhigailo edited a huge collection of witnesses of Stolypin's contemporaries, titled *P. A. Stolypin glazami sovremennikov* that were also relevant for this thesis. In Zenkovskii's work *Stolypin: Russia's Last Great Reformer*, Zenkovskii reported Stolypin's memories, his political concepts and aims. Stolypin's complete biography by Sidorovnin *Stolypin. Zhizn' za otechestvo. Zhizneopisanie (1862 - 1911)* contains pieces of his speeches and brief background data to Stolypin's performances and his opponents' replies. Stolypin's original speeches used in this thesis are taken from the complete collection of his speeches *Polnoe sobranie rechei 1906 – 1911* which contains all the 49 speeches that Stolypin released as Minister of Internal Affairs and Prime Minister of Russia.

# 1. Peculiarities of Stolypin's speeches

## 1.1 General data about Stolypin's speeches

Pyotr Arkadyevich Stolypin has served as Minister of Internal Affairs and Prime Minister of Russia from 1906 to 1911. At the time of the First Duma, he covered the charge of Minister of Internal Affairs in Goremykin's government and was soon noticed because of his rhetoric skills and his strong personality.<sup>1</sup> In Goremykin's short Duma, Stolypin released only three speeches, all of them in front of the Duma. Two were answers to inquiries and one was a reply to a question. The Second and Third Duma, saw him as Prime Minister and Minister of Internal Affairs at the same time. He performed 9 speeches in front of the Second Duma. Stolypin introduced the Duma on the 6<sup>th</sup> of March, 1907, and declared its end with the discourse he delivered on the 1<sup>st</sup> of June of the same year. This speech contained only 135 words and was the shortest of his career. Stolypin decided to dissolve the assembly because he did not get the needed support for his Agrarian Reform.<sup>2</sup> On the contrary, the Third Duma resisted almost five years; from November, 1907, to June, 1912. Stolypin was murdered in September, 1911, and gave his last speech on the 27<sup>th</sup> of April, 1911. From the beginning of the Third Duma to the day he died, he released 37 speeches.

During the three Dumas, Stolypin issued 49 speeches: he delivered 29 of them in front of the State Duma, 18 in front of the Sovet, one in the Commission of State Defence and one at the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the *Zemsky* Department of the Ministry of the Interior. Two of his speeches were official introductions and presentations of the Second and Third Duma. Stolypin held 9 speeches concerning the Western issues of the Empire: four of them had as the main topic Finland. The Eastern borders of the country were also important to Stolypin, in particular, he issued two discourses about the construction of the Amur railroad. Four speeches had peasantry and properties as main theme: the most popular and significant was the agrarian speech held on the 10<sup>th</sup> of May, 1907. Stolypin also gave two speeches about the navy situation and one speech about the freedom of religious confessions. In most of his speeches he remarked the need to repress

---

<sup>1</sup> Healy, A.E. 1976. *The Russian Autocracy in Crisis: 1905 - 1907*. Hamden: Archon Books. Page: 144.

<sup>2</sup> Tarquini, B. 2006. *Pëtr Arkadevič Stolypin: Il ministro dello zar che fu ucciso per la sua riforma agraria. E cambiò il corso della storia*. Napoli: Controcorrente. Page: 86.

revolutionary upheavals. These were the most significant issues he had to face. Other speeches were about special laws and bills, road payments and taxes and other important declarations and explanations of the situations of the time. Stolypin held 12 speeches that were answers to questions, inquiries or accusations: three of them were only supplement explanations (*dopolnenie*) to discourses he held on the same day and that were misinterpreted during the assemblies. These supplements were given without previous preparation and were very brief.<sup>3</sup> All of them took place in 1910: 376 words were part of the supplement explanation of the 26<sup>th</sup> of March, 215 words composed the short speech on the 27<sup>th</sup> of March, 1910, and the *dopolnenie* held on the 20<sup>th</sup> of February only contained 110 words and was his shortest speech. The most of his 49 speeches contained more than thousand words. The longest was delivered on the 5<sup>th</sup> of May, 1908. It contained more than 6100 words and discussed the Finnish question. Located at the second place is the speech that was an answer to an inquiry: the betrayal enacted by Azef. It is composed of approximately 5800 words and was issued on the 11<sup>th</sup> of February, 1909. Stolypin delivered 14 speeches in 1910. Eleven speeches were held in 1907 and ten in 1908. Six were released in 1911, five in 1909 and, as mentioned, only three in 1906.

Stolypin had a speechwriter,<sup>4</sup> Il'ia Iakovlevich Gurliand, who is often just regarded as his co-worker. Gurliand started and ended his career as Baron Boris Vladimirovich Shturmer's professional speechwriter. Shturmer discovered his talent<sup>5</sup> but Stolypin brought his texts to a concrete success.<sup>6</sup> Stolypin actively contributed to the creation of his own speeches. He sent Gurliand his thoughts and views for the discourse he was ought to deliver: The webpage of the Presidential Library<sup>7</sup> contains many original handwritten letters from Stolypin to Gurliand. In these documents he asked his speechwriter to create convincing formulations for

---

<sup>3</sup> On six occasions he issued two speeches on the same day, probably all of them were unprepared and spontaneous. Mendeleev asserted: "A ego blestiaschchie repliki, tut zhe improvizirovannye otvety, proizvodivshie eshche bol'shee vpechatlenie, chem samye rechi!" Pozhigailo, P. A. (Ed.) 2008. *P. A. Stolypin glazami sovremennikov*. Moskva: Rosspen.

<sup>4</sup> The actual birth of this occupation took place in Ancient Greece. Speechwriters were called logographers and wrote the defence for those people who were charged for crimes. Lawyers did not exist at that time but the accused subject had the possibility to read logographers' texts. Krivonosov A.D. 2003. *Osnovy spichraitinga*. Sankt-Peterburgskii gosudarstvennyi universitet. Page: 10.

<sup>5</sup> Pozhigailo, P. A. (Ed.) 2008. Pages: 326-327.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid. Pages: 56-57.

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.prlib.ru/>

the next discourses he had to perform. Gurliand also helped him to write answers for interviews and replies to the press.<sup>8</sup>

## 1.2 Beginning and end of the speeches

Stolypin started almost every speech with the introduction or explanation of the main theme of the meeting. He went right to the point, without unnecessary preambles. He did not want to repeat the positions he had already exposed. For him, it was important not to waste his audience's time but also not to waste his own time:

Господа члены Государственного совета!  
Я уже имел честь излагать перед вами свое мнение относительно национальных отделений. Повторяться я не буду. Я должен, я могу подтвердить одно: правительство считает, что вопрос о национальных отделениях – вопрос государственной важности, центральный вопрос настоящего законопроекта.<sup>9</sup>  
(4.03.1911)

In the first sentence of his shortest speech, Stolypin underlined that he was not going to talk at length: “Ia zaderzhu vas na odnu tol’ko minutu.”<sup>10</sup> (20.02.1910) He often used the adjective short (*kratkii*) at the beginning of speeches to politely underline that it was not going to take that much time: “Gospoda chleny Gosudarstvennoi dumy!

Pozvol’te mne, v kachestve ministra vnutrennikh del, dat’ vam kratkie ob’iasneniia po obsuzhdaemomu voprosu.”<sup>11</sup> (11.12.1909) He used it in his speech which contained only 500 words: “Gospoda chleny Gosudarstvennoi dumy!

Ia budu ves’ma kratok.”<sup>12</sup> (15.05.1910) He also employed the verb to disturb: “Gospoda! Ia ne budu dolgo utruzhdat’ vashe vnimanie.”<sup>13</sup> (20.03.1907) And he did not want to bore the assemblies with details: “Ia ne budu utomliat’ vas, gospoda, podrobnym vosproizvedeniem vsekh argumentov, kotorye vyskazyvalis’ tut protiv pravitel’stvennogo zakonoproekta.”<sup>14</sup> (20.02.1910) He used the verb *utomliat’* in six speeches, most of these times in connection to numeral facts: “V nastoiashchee

---

<sup>8</sup> One of the requests' title is “Stolypin's notes to Gurliand with the task of drafting articles for the press, presenting drafts, giving their views, etc. on various issues.” <https://www.prlib.ru/en/node/333581> [last accessed: 7 May 2019]

<sup>9</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 245.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid. Page: 171.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid. Page: 161.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid. Page: 206.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid. Page: 40.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid. Pages: 164-165.

vremia ia ne budu utomliat' vas izlozheniem tsifrovykh dannykh, ukazyvaiushchikh na to, chto shtatnye chiny etikh uchrezhdenii nakhodiatsia v gorazdo khudshikh usloviakh, chem mestnye chiny vsekh ostal'nykh vedomstv [...]."<sup>15</sup> (11.12.1909) Moreover, he used these negative oriented verbs (*utomliat'*, *utrzhdat'*) because he did not take the attention and interest of his audience for granted, since there were contrasting opinions at that time and he knew that collaboration for a common purpose was hard to achieve.

The beginning of a speech is fundamental to set the main topic and goals but the last part is the most meaningful, since it has to impress the audience: it strengthens the whole discourse, carries peculiar information and tries to affect emotions.<sup>16</sup> The speech he delivered on the 6<sup>th</sup> of March, 1907, after his opening speech of the Third Duma, is one of his most famous and appreciated because of its memorable end:

Эти нападки рассчитаны на то, чтобы вызвать у правительства, у власти паралич и воли, и мысли, все они сводятся к двум словам, обращенным к власти: «Руки вверх». На эти два слова, господа, правительство с полным спокойствием, с сознанием своей правоты может ответить только двумя словами: «Не запугаете», (*Аплодисменты справа*)<sup>17</sup> (06.03.1907)

This speech is one of the shortest of his career: It contains only 554 words and has not been prepared.<sup>18</sup> It was a supplement speech he decided to deliver after the debate in the Duma started to take an unexpected turn.<sup>19</sup> He set the two attitudes in opposition. As the words “Ruki vverkh” rang out, the center and the left wings were shocked and tried to hide themselves in their seats. At the end of the speech, after the powerful and firm words “Ne zapugaete”, there was silence.<sup>20</sup> People who witnessed this episode refer to it as a hilarious scene.<sup>21</sup> Stolypin’s Agrarian Reform announcement ended in a similar way: here, he compared again the two opposite

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibid. Page: 144.

<sup>16</sup> Krivososov, A. D. 2003. Page: 33-34.

<sup>17</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 32

<sup>18</sup> Strakhovsky, L. I. 1951. *Peter Stolypin: Progressive Statesman*. University of Toronto Press. Page: 250.

<sup>19</sup> He declares it at the beginning of the speech: “Gospoda, ia ne predpolagal vystupat' vtorichno pered Gosudarstvennoi dumoi, no tot oborot, kotoryi priniali preniia, zastavliaet menia prosit' vashego vnimaniia.” (06.03.1907) Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 31.

<sup>20</sup> To explain the enthusiasm that the whole speech created in Stolypin’s supporters and the speechlessness of his opponents, Maklakov even asserted that the “glorious final” was the lowest point of the whole speech, since it was flawless. Maklakov, V. A. 1939. *Pervaia gosudarstvennaia Duma (vospomnaniia sovremennika)*. Parizh: Imp. L. Beresniak. 12. Rue Lagrange. Page: 103.

<sup>21</sup> Podolinsky, S. S. 1971. *Russland vor der Revolution: die agrarsoziale Lage und Reformen*. Berlin Verlag. Page: 140.

positions within the Duma: he opposed his and his supporters' good will, to the radical spirit of the revolutionists. He wanted to point out good and evil:

Мы предлагаем вам скромный, но верный путь. Противникам государственности хотелось бы избрать путь радикализма, путь освобождения от исторического прошлого России, освобождения от культурных традиций. Им нужны великие потрясения, нам нужна Великая Россия!<sup>22</sup> (10.05.1907)

The last word is *Rossiiia*. He reached emotions by qualifying Russia as great as it has been in the past. Two further speeches ended with the word "Russia": His speech about Finland, delivered on the 5<sup>th</sup> of May, 1908,<sup>23</sup> and the one about peasantry on the 5<sup>th</sup> of December<sup>24</sup> of the same year. On the 1<sup>st</sup> of June, 1907, he ended his last speech of the Second Duma with the noun *gosudarstvo*<sup>25</sup> and on the 4<sup>th</sup> March, 1908, he concluded the speech to the 50th anniversary of the *Zemsky* Department of the Ministry of the Interior with the term *Rodina*<sup>26</sup> (written in uppercase). He ended at least 21 of his discourses with the concept of Russia or Emperor in the last two sentences. Sovereign or majesty are the last words in three of his speeches: In the presentation of the second Duma, on the 6<sup>th</sup> of March, 1907;<sup>27</sup> on the 13<sup>th</sup> of June, 1908,<sup>28</sup> when he spoke about the tasks of the maritime ministry and on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of May, 1909, in the speech about the freedom of religious believes, where he called him "Tsar' Pravoslavnyi".<sup>29</sup> In all of these performances, his intent is to animate the patriotic emotions of the listener: he ended his speeches with the incitation to the sense of unity and integrity of the Empire. On the 24<sup>th</sup> of May, 1908, he delivered a speech in which he insisted that Russia needed a well-organized maritime defense. He insisted until the end that he could not give up on an adequate sea protection of Russia's boundaries and employed a noteworthy motto: "Gospoda, v dele vossozdaniia nashego morskogo mogushchestva, nashei morskoi moshchi mozhet byt' tol'ko odin lozung, odin parol', i etot parol' – «vpered»."<sup>30</sup>

At the beginning of his speeches he underlined his responsibilities more than once with the pronoun *ia*. While there are at least ten which end with Stolypin using the pronoun you (*vy*) to underscore that the responsibility of further

---

<sup>22</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 54.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid. Page: 104.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid. Page: 127.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid. Page: 64.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid. Page: 79.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid. Page: 31.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid. Page: 123.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid. Page: 155.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid. Page: 111.

decisions lied in the hands of his audience, the target of his persuasive words. Here his target is the Soviet: “Takim tselym ia pochitaiu Rossiui. Preemstvennymi nositeliami takoi gosudarstvennosti ia pochitaiu russkikh zakonodatelei. Reshat’ vam, gospoda.”<sup>31</sup> (04.03.1911) The last word of a decision was in the Soviet’s and Duma’s hands, Stolypin could only give his opinions and statements. In his first speech as Minister of Internal Affairs, he addressed the Duma as liable for the modification of laws: “Eto moia rol’, a zakhvatyvav zakonodatel’nuiu vlast’ ia ne vprave, izmeniat’ zakony ia ne mogu. Zakony izmeniat’ i deistvovat’ v etom napravlenii budete vy.”<sup>32</sup> (08.06.1906) The country needed a devoted leader who had responsible and passionate representatives of the government at its basis.

### 1.3 Literary references and foreign languages

Since childhood, Stolypin’s relationship to literature has been very close. His family was constantly surrounded by literature: Lermontov’s maternal grandmother belonged to the Stolypins’ family, Stolypin’s mother was a friend of Gogol’, Stolypin’s father knew Tolstoi and Stolypin’s great-uncle was close to Speranskii.<sup>33</sup> In Lithuania, Stolypin’s family also held a close friendship with Czesław Miłosz’s family. The poet, who was born the year that Stolypin died, dedicated some verses of one of his poems to Stolypin and to his political concerns of his last year of life:

„Jeżdżono na podwieczorki, odwiedzano się często,  
Stołypin lubił młode Kunatówny.  
[...] W 1909 roku  
Wecia poślubiła studenta Politechniki Ryskiej.  
W 1911 przyjechała do Szetejń żeby mnie urodzić.  
Tego lata Stołypin pewno nie pojrzał na moją kołyskę,  
Zajęty był myślą: że Rosja na pewno zginie  
Jeżeli on, sam jeden, nie zdoła jej ocalić.  
Wkrótce potem, we wrześniu, w Kijowie pojechał do teatru  
I tam dosięgła go kula terrorysty.  
Nikt, nawet mój dziadek, nie odgadł co naprawdę się stało”.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibid. Page: 246.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid. Page: 16.

<sup>33</sup> Conroy, M.S. 1976. *Peter Arkad’evich Stolypin: Practical Politics in Late Tsarist Russia*. Boulder: Westview Press. Pages: 1-3.

<sup>34</sup> Miłosz, C. 2005. *Jasności promieniste i inne wiersze*. In: *Zeszyty Literackie*. (5) Page: 21.

Since Stolypin was surrounded by literature and the most successful Russian authors, he quoted literary works more than once in his speeches. Peasantry has always been an important matter for Stolypin: in his speech held on the 16<sup>th</sup> of November, 1907, as an answer to the assertion of Maklakov,<sup>35</sup> Stolypin stated that peasants without land properties are condemned to remain poor. In this concern, he quoted Dostoevskii's words of the novel *Zapiski iz Mertvogo doma* (*The House of the Dead*): "Mne, gospoda, vspomnilis' slova nashego velikogo pisatel'ia Dostoevskogo, chto «den'gi – eto chekanennaia svoboda»."<sup>36</sup> (16.11.1907) Through the whole novel, money is a constant concept. Money enables freedom. The protagonist of Dostoevskii's work is a prisoner in Siberia and just the fact of having some money in his pocket changes his attitude. In the character's point of view, having money enables him to buy alcohol and feel better. He can feel freer than he actually is.<sup>37</sup> Russia's peasants at that time were like prisoners. They had no rights or freedom and they could not see a better future. In Stolypin's words, this was the main reason for them to start following wrong paths. Another important matter in Stolypin's policy was the troubled relationship to Finland: to describe the unpleasant developments within the Empire he mentioned Mayne Reid. The author was very popular and appreciated in Russia,<sup>38</sup> since the Western American landscapes he portrayed could be compared with the country's Eastern regions and the exotic seduction they played in the imagination of Russian citizens.<sup>39</sup> But Stolypin did not recall Mayne Reid's works to introduce the exotic Siberian atmosphere, he mentioned him to picture the unruly situations between Russia and Finland. After 1905, Finland might have aspired to gain independence from what seemed a weakened Empire. Stolypin wanted to compare the bloody conflicts that could develop from Russia's opposition against Finland's separation, with the violent conflicts that Mayne Reid's characters fought in many of his adventurous tales:

---

<sup>35</sup> This speech has not been prepared by Stolypin and his speechwriter: Stolypin decided after Maklakov's performance to give a reply to him, this means that he released this discourse spontaneously.

<sup>36</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Pages: 69-70.

<sup>37</sup> Dostoevskii, F. M. 1881. *Zapiski iz Mertvogo doma. Izdanie piatoe*. Sankt Peterburg: Tipografiia brat Panteleevykh. Page: 21.

<sup>38</sup> Mayne Reid moved from Ireland to America in 1840 but has been more successful in the translated versions in Russia, than in the Anglo-sphere, where he remained almost unknown. Miłosz, C. 1977. *Emperor of the Earth: Modes of Eccentric Vision*. Los Angeles: University of California Press. Page: 145.

<sup>39</sup> Miłosz, C. 1977. Page: 156.

А так как горячие головы идут всегда впереди интеллигенции, идут, может быть, дальше, чем хотела сама создавшая их сила, то станут понятны и появление красной гвардии и Воймы, и наполненные оружием корабли, которые нам кажутся как бы страницей, вырванной из романов Майн Рида.<sup>40</sup> (05.05.1908)

Stolypin described the revolutionary and terroristic movements as “hotheaded” people that exceeded any limit. He wanted to establish fruitful communication and collaboration within the Empire. Besides Finland, the Polish regions of the Empire worried him also. In 1911, Stolypin stated that it was obvious that these regions needed a political support, since there was no cultural or historical unity within the population that lived in this area. Stolypin underlined that he did not blame the Polish natives for the misunderstandings, even if they were only able to dominate because they possessed the wealth and not because they had the right abilities or knowledge. In this relation, he compared two main protagonists of two different works of Molière to each other:

А так как в Западном крае такие немногочисленные, но влиятельные лица – поляки, и их все и вся со всех сторон толкают к отстаиванию своих национальных интересов, то понятно, что каждый вопрос в крае просачивается, пропитывается элементом своей собственной краевой политики. И самые умеренные люди, самые далекие от политики, не могут идти против течения и, сами того не замечая, делают политику, как мольеровский на этот раз уже не Диафорюс, а Журден, который, сам того не зная, делал прозу!<sup>41</sup> (01.02.1911)

Stolypin referred to those Poles who had no idea of politics but still acted like they were experts because of their family background. These people decided about the destinies of the Russian Empire inhabitants of the Polish provinces, in the same way as Jourdain actively pretended to act as a bourgeois in *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme*, and unlike Diafoirus of *Le Malade Imaginaire*, who limited his staging as a doctor to pure and deceitful words. Jourdain was taught how to move and speak in high society. He only staged his abilities and knowledge, while he did not even know elementary notions. That is why Stolypin compared him to the Polish rulers. Jourdain’s Master of Philosophy explained him that there are only two ways of speaking: weather in prose or in poetry. While Jourdain thought that he had to learn to speak in prose, he was already speaking it.<sup>42</sup>

Stolypin probably read and watched Molière’s works in the original language French, since he knew French, English and German and he was also

---

<sup>40</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 98.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid. Pages: 238-239.

<sup>42</sup> “By my faith, I have spoken prose for more than forty years without knowing it! I am greatly obliged to you for teaching me this. [...]” Molière, 1915. *The merchant gentleman (Le bourgeois gentilhomme)*. (M. Baker, Trans.) New York: French’s standard library edition. Page: 24.

acquainted with Polish.<sup>43</sup> These skills were of great advantage in the cultivation of relationships with other countries. It is reported that Kaiser Wilhelm II envied Russia for Stolypin's figure.<sup>44</sup> It also brought him approval because his predecessors did not have such skills: Witte knew little French and he had no German or English knowledge.<sup>45</sup> In his speeches, Stolypin often adopted foreign terms and quotations. In seven of his speeches, Stolypin used Latin common terms nine times: he employed "*bona fide*"<sup>46</sup> twice, "*ipso facto*"<sup>47</sup>, "*eo ipso*"<sup>48</sup> and "*ad majorem gloriam*"<sup>49</sup>, "*tertium non datur*"<sup>50</sup>, "*ars quvernandi*"<sup>51</sup> and "*quaestio facti*"<sup>52</sup> and "*in fraudem legis*",<sup>53</sup> in the same speech. In six performances, Stolypin added French words or phrases. He quoted Ekaterina the Great's motto "*Gouverner - c'est prévoir*"<sup>54</sup> twice. He also quoted Alexander II's words: "*On m'a escamote mon consentement*." Stolypin explained that Alexander II delivered these bitter words in 1860, referring to the monetary reform.<sup>55</sup> The definition "force majeure"<sup>56</sup> was employed in the Sovet and the word "*octroi*"<sup>57</sup> was used twice; once in the speech about road payment, and some days later, when they discussed the tariff fees. English political terms were employed three times: "self-government"<sup>58</sup>, "*Colonial Legislation Validity Act*"<sup>59</sup> and "*septimal act*"<sup>60</sup>. And he used a German definition once: in the speech about freedom of religions he used the term "*Konfessionslosigkeit*".<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> Tokmakoff, G. 1981. *P. A. Stolypin and the Third Duma: An Appraisal of the Three Major Issues*. Washington: University Press of America. Page: 21.

<sup>44</sup> B. I. Bok reported the German Emperor's words: "«Neobychaino schastlivyi den'. Nakonets ia uzna Stolypina. Esli by u menia byl takoi ministr, kak on, ia by pokazal, chto iz sebia predstavliaet Germaniia... K sozhaleniiu, vtorogo takogo cheloveka ne naiti»." Pozhigailo, P. A. (Ed.) 2008. Page: 32.

<sup>45</sup> Mehlinger, H. D. & Thompson, J. M. 1972. *Count Witte and the Tsarist Government in the 1905 Revolution*. Bloomington; London: Indiana University Press. Page: 20.

<sup>46</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 98 and 201.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid. Page: 130.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid. Page: 133.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid. Page: 141.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid. Page: 169.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid. Page: 246.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid. Page: 249.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid. Page: 249.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid. Page: 81 and 259.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid. Page: 217.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid. Page: 131.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid. Page: 165 and 172.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid. Page: 231.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid. Page: 215.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid. Page: 157.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid. Page: 153.

Stolypin's employment of Russian Emperors' historical words, quotations of literary works and usage of foreign words, denote his large language skills and education in various cultural areas, especially for what concerns the sphere of politics and legislation. These applications clarify his concepts, embellish his discourses and render them vivid, worthy of appreciation and credible.

## **1.4 Performance and personality**

Rhetoric has to be accompanied by good delivery skills: "volume, harmony and rhythm" are key elements of a successful performance. They are those characteristics of political speeches that are as meaningful as the words they denote, because they carry emotion. Not every orator is capable to control these facts. It could be hard to give the right shape to the voice and command excitement, anger, concern or grief, if the speaker feels pressure or is too much passionate about the topic he or she is discussing. The result is that his or her message is not correctly perceived or not even understandable: persuasion, the aim of rhetoric, has not been achieved.<sup>62</sup>

In relation to this assertion, there are two opposite episodes which had two of Stolypin's contemporaries as protagonists: the orators Aladin and Urusov. Aladin was considered by some, one of the most talented speakers of the First Duma, despite the fact that he was very rough. His arrogant behavior affected his vocabulary to the point that he could not control his own articulation anymore: his voice reached very acute levels that sounded unpleasant and made his message inappropriate.<sup>63</sup> It was in fact quite the opposite situation in the case of Prince Urusov. Prince Urusov gave an important performance, right after Stolypin's first speech as the Minister of Internal Affairs of the Empire, but he used a very soft tone that his performance resounded unambitious. This speech was actually of great historical relief but the audience could not figure it out, since it could not hear him nor understand the content of his discourse.<sup>64</sup> Therefore, oratory talent can also be recognized in the voice and tone control. It is of fundamental importance to change the "tone of the voice" and to take pauses in order to create

---

<sup>62</sup> Aristotle. 1926. *Art of Rhetoric*. (J. H. Freese, Trans.) Loeb Classical Library 271. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Page: 347.

<sup>63</sup> Healy, A. E. 1976. Page: 177.

<sup>64</sup> Pares, B. 1907. *Russia and Reform*. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company. Page: 553.

an interesting speech. Intonation creates order or fixes decisive points and, as short interruptions do, it catches the interest of the listeners and also helps them to understand if the orator has jumped to the next topic. Furthermore, these segments are also necessary for the audience to recompose the single parts of the discourse they just have listened to, and give a meaning to all of its single pieces. While the used language has to be “convincing, figurative and clear”.<sup>65</sup>

Stolypin’s contemporaries reported that he was a good orator: he was able to use the needed pauses and he employed selective and persuasive words, which were exposed with an extraordinary inner conviction.<sup>66</sup> Stolypin’s way to communicate was uncomplicated and clear: he avoided the use of abstract concepts.<sup>67</sup> His contemporaries were enchanted by his performing ability, since he did not have a lot of experience of holding speeches in front of a huge crowd of people with diverging ideas.<sup>68</sup> He had an innate talent. His first appearance in front of the tumultuous Duma, was described by many as flawless.<sup>69</sup> Even though, Stolypin gave the impression of improvisation he actually read his previously prepared discourses on his notebooks.<sup>70</sup>

All of Stolypin’s performances were acclaimed: it is reported that no member of the Duma has ever been encouraged with the same kind of enthusiasm.<sup>71</sup> Many of his speeches ended with “Prodolzhitel’nye rukopleskaniia sprava i v tsentre i golosa: bravo.” His speeches were especially appreciated by the right wing and also by the center who demonstrated their appreciation through “aplodismenty”, “rukopleskanie” and by shouting “bravo, bravo”, “verno, pravil’no”. The most “Burnye rukopleskaniia v tsentre i sprava” took place in Stolypin’s unprepared speech, in which he answered to Maklakov’s assertion. The left wing, his opponents, often shouted that they were against his words and decisions. In

---

<sup>65</sup> Krivososov, A. D. 2003. Page: 41.

<sup>66</sup> Mendeleev about Stolypin: “S nuzhnymi pauzami, s iarkim vydeleniem ot del’nykh slov i vyrazhenii. A glavnoe — s neobyknovennym pod”emom i temperamentom. So svoistvennym emu kakim-to osobym pridykhaniiem, kotoroe proizvodilo vpechatlenie zataennogo vnutrennego volneniia.” Pozhigailo, P. A. (Ed.) 2008. Pages: 56-57.

<sup>67</sup> Donald MacKenzie Wallace about Stolypin: “Unlike many of his countrymen, he never indulges in vague, philosophical phrases, but speaks simply, earnestly and to the point.” Conroy, M. S. 1976. Page: 26.

<sup>68</sup> Liubimov’s witness about the performance: “Kogda zhe ia v pervye uslyshal ego s kafedry Gosudarstvennoi dumy, ia priamo byl porazhen ego oratorskim talantom, pritom ne delannym, priobretennym opytom i dolgoi praktikoi, a neposredstvennym, tak skazat’ Bozh’ei milost’iu.” Pozhigailo, P. A. (Ed.) 2008. Page: 60.

<sup>69</sup> In Manning’s formulation, Stolypin is “an able actor”. Manning, R. T. 1982. *The Crisis of the old order in Russia: gentry and government*. Princeton University Press. Page: 270.

<sup>70</sup> Pozhigailo, P. A. (Ed.) 2008. Pages: 56-57.

<sup>71</sup> Pares, B. 1907. Page: 553.

certain occasions, they even intimated “na verevku” and more than once the chairman had to stop their outcries (“zvonok predsedatelia”). There were only few occasions where even the left wing supported Stolypin’s ideas, it mostly happened only for short parts and special topics within his speeches:

А между тем, правительство должно совершенно открыто заявить, что оно считает провокатором только такое лицо, которое само принимает на себя инициативу преступления, вовлекая в это преступление третьих лиц, которые вступили на этот путь по побуждению агента-провокатора. (*Возглас слева: верно!*)<sup>72</sup> (11.02.1909)

In many occasions, the left and the right wing interacted with each other: “Shum sleva; golosa sprava: tishe.” And also: “Golosa sleva: neverno; golosa sprava: verno; shum sprava.”<sup>73</sup>

Especially at the beginning of Stolypin’s career, his speeches were very contested and, more than once, he was constricted to repeat part of the sentences or even to stop. His first speech was interrupted with outcries about the *pogrom* in Białystok:

Затем меня упрекал г. Винавер в том, что я слишком узко смотрю на дело, но я вошел на эту кафедру с чистой совестью. Что я знал, то и сказал и представил дело таким образом, что то, что нехорошо, того больше не будет... (*шум; крики: а Белостокский погром?!*). Одни говорят – ты этого не можешь, а другие – ты этого не хочешь, но то, что я могу и хочу сделать, на то я уже ответил в своей речи. Упрек, который мне сделал г. Винавер, что я узко смотрю на вопрос, я не совсем понимаю. [...] Согласно понятию здравого правосознания, мне надлежит справедливо и твердо охранять порядок в России (*шум, свистки*). Этот шум мне мешает, но меня не смущает и смутить меня не может. Это моя роль, а захватывать законодательную власть я не вправе, изменять законы я не могу. Законы изменять и действовать в этом направлении будете вы (*шум крики: отставка!*).<sup>74</sup> (08.06.1906)

It was his first speech and they wanted his resignation.<sup>75</sup> At the end of the speech he commented on the noise and words of his opponents, admitting that they bother and annoy him but do not confuse his ideas. He kept his moderate way of behaving and stood firm in his convictions.<sup>76</sup> His second speech, only six days after the first, also ended in a similar way and he could not express his position until the end:

Затем, что касается нападков на те препятствия, которые встречали лица, работавшие в нынешнем году, то я должен напомнить, что мы переживали такое время погромов, страхов... (*шум*), что и наличность препятствий может быть легко

---

<sup>72</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 133.

<sup>73</sup> All the reactions of Stolypin’s audience to his performances, that have been reported in this paragraph, are taken from the complete collection of his speeches *Polnoe sobranie rechei 1906 – 1911*.

<sup>74</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 15-16.

<sup>75</sup> “[...] since the events in question took place before the Duma met, Stolypin was not under legal obligation to reply to this one.” Healy, A. E. 1976. Page: 203.

<sup>76</sup> “He answered interpellations with the utmost moderation, but with the utmost firmness; [...]” Pares, B. 1907. Page: 553.

понята. Затем скажу еще относительно тех лиц, которые, входя на эту трибуну слева, заявляли, что они не обладают ни самомнением, ни самообольщением; я скажу на их клеветы, на их угрозы, на их... (*шум, крики: довольно!*), на их угрозу захвата исполнительной власти (*шум, крики: довольно!*), что министр внутренних дел, носитель законной власти, им отвечать не будет... (*шум, крики: довольно! Белосток! Погромщик! Довольно! Долой!*).<sup>77</sup> (12.06.1906)

In his speech about the minorities in the Western regions, on the 7<sup>th</sup> of May, 1910, Stolypin was challenged by the outcries of the left wing. He immediately noticed them. Nevertheless, he firmly continued his speech. He also commented on the laughter that followed Kutler's untrue assertions about the budget of the State Duma, and described them as weapons whose use can sometimes be justified if the reported facts are untrue, as in Kutler's case:

Я должен сказать, что замечание это вызвало со стороны членов Государственной думы и аплодисменты, и смех. Против этого я ничего не имею. Смех – прекрасное оружие и бич, в особенности для правительства, и я думаю, что можно смеяться над человеком или учреждением, если они ставят себя в смешное положение. Было ли в данном случае такое положение? Было бы, если бы замечание члена Думы Кутлера было основано на фактах.<sup>78</sup> (20.03.1907)

Besides rhetorical talent and persuasive performances, there are other extra political facts that contribute to the success of a politician and make him or her trustful in front of his or her audiences' eyes. The first impression is of fundamental importance, since image is subject to quick judgment: personal features, height, age, smile, hair and dressing.<sup>79</sup> Stolypin was considered as a good looking and fascinating young man, different to his other predecessors.<sup>80</sup> The most of Stolypin's contemporaries described his manners and his behavior as very enjoyable, calm and patient, decent and dignified, gentle and kind, but also very firm and tenacious.<sup>81</sup> His background also helped him to appear as a trustful figure in front of his public: first of all his education and culture.<sup>82</sup> In the previous subchapter, it has already been noticed that Stolypin had a vast knowledge of cultural and political matters. His origins and his family life were also of huge importance in the gain of trust: his family was known for its devotion to the

---

<sup>77</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 20.

<sup>78</sup> Ibid. Page: 41.

<sup>79</sup> Charteris-Black, J. 2013. *Analysing Political Speeches: Rhetoric, discourse and metaphor*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. Page: 94.

<sup>80</sup> "Tall, with blue eyes and a black beard, a figure of immense charm and sensitive to form – so unlike the abrasive Witte – Stolypin was a discovery." Kotkin, S. 2015. *Stalin: Paradoxes of Power, 1878-1928*. Penguin: München. Page: 91.

<sup>81</sup> „Wir fühlten uns durch seine Persönlichkeit zur Verantwortung gezogen.“ Podolinsky, S. S. 1971. Page: 159.

<sup>82</sup> Manning, R. T. 1982. Page: 262.

Russian Empire<sup>83</sup> and Stolypin himself was a careful father to his children and a lovely husband.<sup>84</sup> This idyllic family life, made him very different to Witte, who had a tormented personal life that downgraded his reputation and most of all complicated his political ambitions.<sup>85</sup>

To sum up: a “good orator” has to own high morality and integrity.<sup>86</sup> Stolypin has been appreciated for his humanity, sympathy and compassion<sup>87</sup> and for his extraordinary courage.<sup>88</sup> Before being charged as a representative of the Russian Empire’s government, he personally faced crowds of furious and raging citizens more than once. The first to bring his personal testimony to the Emperor about Stolypin’s firm and fearless personality, was Trepov. From that moment, Stolypin’s political talent became evident to everyone.<sup>89</sup> During the rebellions of 1905 in Saratov, he was able to calm down protesting masses with simple but effective actions and honest and impactful words. Saratov had been his hardest challenge until that moment, since it was an area that was known to be a “red region” because of multiple upheavals, riots against noble properties and the considerable amount of poor people.<sup>90</sup> Stolypin achieved successful interactions and fruitful discussions with the most obstinate crowds, as it happened during the “Balashov incident”: he faced a tumultuous insurrection of agricultural workers alone, defenseless and weaponless.<sup>91</sup> While other governors escaped and never publically appeared, Stolypin placed himself in the middle of protests. He even challenged a violent orator, asking him to bear his coat during the speech he wanted to deliver. The man became calm and accommodated Stolypin’s command and the angry citizens were immediately charmed by Stolypin’s fearlessness and self-awareness.<sup>92</sup> In another occasion, Stolypin defended a police-man who had been the target of the crowd’s anger. Stolypin entered the crowd and screamed

---

<sup>83</sup> Among other things, his father served under the command of four Emperors: Tarquini, B. 2006. Page: 73.

<sup>84</sup> Conroy, M. S. 1976. Page: 26.

<sup>85</sup> Mehlinger, H. D. & Thompson, J. M. 1972. Page: 20.

<sup>86</sup> “[.] an orator should be a good man.” These are Marcus Cato’s words that Quintilian shares. Quintilian, 1871. *Quintilian's Institutes of oratory; or, Education of an orator. In twelve books.* (J. S. Watson, Trans.) London: Bell and Daldy. Page: 391.

<sup>87</sup> Differently to others, Stolypin knew that the protests were given by the peasants’ dissatisfaction because of their precarious conditions. Conroy, M. S. 1976. Page: 13.

<sup>88</sup> Pares, B. 1907. Page: 553.

<sup>89</sup> Healy, A. E. 1976. Page: 144.

<sup>90</sup> Tarquini, B. 2006. Page: 80.

<sup>91</sup> Macey, D. A. J. 1987. *Government and peasant in Russia, 1861 – 1906: the prehistory of the Stolypin reforms.* DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press. Page: 218.

<sup>92</sup> Manning, R. T. 1982. Page: 266.

they had to beat him, since he was the one who commanded the police-man to fulfill his duty.<sup>93</sup> His courage made the difference, while his rhetorical talent was accompanied by self-control and self-confidence and his performances were supported by his good reputation.

---

<sup>93</sup> Podolinsky, S. S. 1971. Page: 158.

## 2. Nonviolent rhetoric: Stolypin's values

### 2.1 Common sense and politeness

From the beginning of his career, Stolypin had to face adverse political conditions. To contrast this hostile atmosphere, he used a collaborative and conciliatory attitude, employing a majority of positively oriented terms. He asserted:

Правительству желательно было бы изыскать ту почву, на которой возможна была бы совместная работа, найти тот язык, который был бы одинаково нам понятен. Я отдаю себе отчет, что таким языком не может быть язык ненависти и злобы; я им пользоваться не буду.<sup>94</sup> (6.03.1907)

This permitted political confrontation and the consideration of all kind of perspectives within the government and the country. Different viewpoints are fundamental in a climate of collaboration: the noun *mnenie* (opinion) is used in 27 of Stolypin's speeches, the formulation *tochka zreniia* (point of view) in 24, while *s odnoi storony... a s drugoi storony* (on the one hand...on the other hand) is used in 35 of his discourses. Stolypin made clear: "Postaraius' vniknut' v sushchestvo vyskazyvavshikhsia mnenii, pamiatuiia, chto mneniia, ne soglasnye so vzgliadami pravitel'stva, ne mogut pochitat'sia poslednim za kramolu."<sup>95</sup> (10.05.1907) Contrasting opinions towards the government are not excluded *a priori*. This is one of the fundamental points of Gorsevki's description of nonviolent rhetoric.<sup>96</sup> Stolypin avoided the rise of non-productive arguments and conflicts and encouraged using common sense. His policy was prevalently nonviolent and it avoided scaring or menacing the counterpart: "Ne s ugrozoi, gospoda, ne s ugrozoi my shli siuda, a s otkrytyem zabralom zaiavili [..]."<sup>97</sup> (16.11.1907) He indicated more than once that the facts that he was presenting were not ought to offend or to accuse anybody.<sup>98</sup> As Prime Minister and Minister of Internal affairs, he had to illustrate and explain situations with objectivity: "Povtoriaiui, ia nikogo ne obviniaiui, ia rasskazyvaiui."<sup>99</sup> (7.05.1910) Stolypin kept the same attitude towards

---

<sup>94</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 32.

<sup>95</sup> Ibid. Page: 46.

<sup>96</sup> Nonviolent rhetoric "empathizes with, rather than demonizes, the opponent(s)". Gorsevski, E. W. 2004. *Peaceful Persuasion. The Geopolitics of Nonviolent Rhetoric*. Albany: State University of New York. Page: 75.

<sup>97</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 69.

<sup>98</sup> His aim is "to maintain both his own face and the face of the other participants." Goffman, E. 2011. *ON FACE-WORK. An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction*. In Archer, D. & Grundy, P. (Eds.) *The Pragmatics Reader* (pp. 275-281) London; New York: Routledge. Page: 276.

<sup>99</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 200.

Azef in the speech about his betrayal. Azef was an agent of the *okhrana* but at the same time a terrorist of the Socialist Revolutionary Party.<sup>100</sup> On the 11<sup>th</sup> of February, 1909, at the beginning of the speech, Stolypin stated that he waited before deciding to appear in front of the Duma, he wanted to have evidence in his hands and present the situation in a neutral way to avoid the obfuscating of the actual case:

Поэтому, господа, не ждите от меня горячей защитительной или обвинительной речи, это только затемнило бы дело, придало бы ему ведомственный характер; отвечая же лично на этот запрос, я хотел бы осветить все это дело не с ведомственной, не с правительственной даже, а с чисто государственной точки зрения.<sup>101</sup> (11.02.1909)

Some paragraphs after it, Stolypin stressed again that he was not going to accuse or defend Azef. He observed the situation and his protagonist from different perspectives in order to offer a complete and round image:

Кто же такой Азеф? Я ни защищать, ни обвинять его не буду. Такой же сотрудник полиции, как и многие другие, он наделен в настоящее время какими-то легендарными свойствами. Авторами запроса ему приписывается, с одной стороны, железная энергия и сила характера, при чем сведения эти почерпнуты из заметки «Нового времени», которой почему-то приписывается и придается чуть ли не официальный характер. С другой стороны, ему приписывается целый ряд преступлений, почерпнутых из источников чисто революционных.<sup>102</sup> (11.02.1909)

In this way Stolypin only tried to speak about objective facts, without giving personal opinions about the situation and about Azef himself, since he did not want to assume the part of the accuser and bring Azef or anybody else to be blamed and therefore lose his or her face. It would also damage Stolypin's calm and neutral image and further give rise to assumptions that he was not a right and fair Minister. Nonetheless, only presenting facts and never pointing the finger against him, Stolypin achieved to expose Azef's criminal attitude: he was a betrayer of the Empire and he was pronounced guilty. In any case, this speech brought an advantage to Stolypin's political activity, since, after that, the terrorist organizations started to feel vulnerable.<sup>103</sup> Even though he kept himself from blaming and accusing, in 1910, the situation became more and more adverse and he realized that his attitude might change: "[...] iz roli spokojnogo letopistsa ia dolzhen budu pereiti k roli obvinitelia."<sup>104</sup> (31.03.1910) In the previous chapter of

---

<sup>100</sup> Zenkovsky, A. V. 1986. *Stolypin: Russia's Last Great Reformer*. (M. Patoski, Trans.) Princeton: The Kingston Press. Page: 15.

<sup>101</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 133.

<sup>102</sup> Ibid. Pages: 133-134.

<sup>103</sup> Zenkovsky, A. V. 1986. Page: 17.

<sup>104</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 189.

this thesis, Stolypin commented on the Duma's laughter after Kutler's speech that contained incorrect affirmations and accusations about the budget of the State Duma. Moreover, Stolypin ended this speech with a joke about Kutler's assertions. These last words, intentionally gave rise to more laughter from the right benches:

Знать это господину Кутлеру следовало бы, так как перенесение кредита в общую смету было произведено тем Советом министров, председателем которого я не был, но членом которого состоял г. Кутлер. (*Смех на правых скамьях.*) Здесь был нанесен вверенному мне ведомству удар сильный и смелый, но пришелся он, воистину, не по коню, а по оглоблям. (*В зале движение, на правых скамьях смех и аплодисменты.*)<sup>105</sup> (20.03.1907)

In this case, Stolypin did not save Kutler's face, since he made fun out of him.

In other occasions, Stolypin went back to previous speeches delivered by other orators in order to show his appreciation and respect towards their words, opinions and political positions. Stolypin was actively collaborative and honoured his interlocutors. Especially in these cases, his will to preserve his and the other's *face* was very evident. This regard is the basis of interaction.<sup>106</sup> He referred to these orators as *dokladchik*, *predydushchii orator*, *orator Gosudarstvennoi Dumy*<sup>107</sup> or he called them by their surnames. Sometimes, he also reported their words by saying "s etoi kafedry [...] byla broshena fraza [...]".<sup>108</sup> Stolypin openly declared that he was very interested in the speeches of other orators: "Rech' kniazia L'vova gluboko menia zainteresovala – ona otnositsia k tomu vremeni, kogda prodovol'stvennaia kampaniia proshla blagopoluchno."<sup>109</sup> (12.06.1906) Stolypin was careful in his assertions and replies, since he did not want anyone to impair their profile, even though he kept his distinctive firmness. He resumed other orators' words and speeches in a polite way, never provoking speakers or members of the assemblies, trying to view their declarations only from the point of view of Russia's interests. His rhetoric is prevalently nonviolent.<sup>110</sup> In general, Stolypin did not impose his convictions, he did not force other people to have his same ideas.<sup>111</sup> To persuade his audience to follow certain directions, he gave

---

<sup>105</sup> Ibid. Page: 41.

<sup>106</sup> Goffman, E. 2011. Page: 277.

<sup>107</sup> In Stolypin, P. A. 2019. *Polnoe sobranie rechei 1906 – 1911*.

<sup>108</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 51.

<sup>109</sup> Ibid. Page: 20.

<sup>110</sup> Stolypin used "nonviolent pragmatism", since his rhetoric contains most of the points of "nonviolent rhetoric" that Gorsevski listed on page 75 of her work *Peaceful Persuasion. The Geopolitics of Nonviolent Rhetoric*. In this chapter, Gorsevski's nonviolent rhetoric will be central in relation to Stolypin's speeches.

<sup>111</sup> "Don't impose" is the first principle R. Lakoff mentioned in her "Rules of Politeness". Lakoff, R. 1973. *The logic of politeness; Or, minding your P's and Q's*. In: *Papers from the 9th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* (pp. 292–305). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society. Page: 298.

options that are meant to hit on its common sense and most of all on its sense of unity, as it will be further outlined in this chapter.

### 2.1.1 Peace and unity

Stolypin tried to avoid physical and rhetorical conflicts. His objectivity was ought to prevent war against other countries and to keep the Russian Empire united. In Stolypin's speeches, *mir* (peace) is a recurrent term, especially during the year 1908, when there were many fervent international quarrels. Russia was not ready for another war: it could have been deleterious for its economy, which was slowly recovering from the devastating consequences of the war Russia lost against Japan and that was one of the main causes that delivered the revolution of 1905.<sup>112</sup> In Stolypin's opinion, first of all, Russia had to solve its internal problems: develop the general system and promote stronger awareness and morality. Before the achievement of these goals, it was unnecessary and unworthy to get involved in conflicts that could not ensure Russia to place itself in an honourable position:

Нельзя, господа, идти в бой, надевши па всех воинов броню или заговорив всех их от поранений. Нельзя, господа, составлять закон, исключительно имея в виду слабых и немощных. Нет, в мировой борьбе, в соревновании народов почетное место могут занять только те из них, которые достигнут полного напряжения своей материальной и нравственной: мощи.<sup>113</sup> (5.12.1908)

If his advice was not followed, if Russia were to enter a conflict without previous ameliorations of the system, it would have been a huge defeat. Injured soldiers could not have built a strong country and laws would only have been successful if the country had a solid, powerful and flourishing basis. Stolypin highlighted his aversion to war starting three sentences in a row with banning words and two of them forming an anaphora. In this speech, Stolypin used the word *nel'zia* twelve times. He employed it more than 70 times in 25 speeches. He wanted to make clear which were the right decisions to take and which not. While Stolypin's purpose was to preserve peace, he was aware that the country had to be ready for any unpleasant event from the outside that could menace its freedom and its International importance and credibility: "Nesmotria na polnoe nashe miroliubie, ia dumaiu, chto takaia bespomoshchnost' ne sootvetstvuet mirovomu polozheniiu

---

<sup>112</sup> Tarquini, B. 2006. Pages: 61-62.

<sup>113</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 127.

Rossii.”<sup>114</sup> (24.05.1908) The first thing on Stolypin’s list was the development of Russia’s army and its defensive skills, as already stated in the subchapter 1.2. Besides the huge costs of the project, this proposal was essential to reassure the Empire’s protection but also to maintain the country’s historic and legendary past dignified:

Как бы ни было велико наше стремление к миру, как бы громадна ни была потребность страны в успокоении, но если мы хотим сохранить наше военное могущество, ограждая вместе с тем самое достоинство нашей родины, и не согласны на утрату принадлежащего нам по праву места среди великих держав, то нам не придется отступить перед необходимостью затрат, к которым нас обязывает все великое прошлое России.<sup>115</sup> (06.03.1907)

Russia’s dignity and international approval was constantly important in Stolypin’s speeches, also because he wanted other countries to be scared to initiate any kind of conflict against the Empire. Long-lasting peace would bring Russia to fulfil its development to a modern and wealthy country, which is why he asked more than once for several years of peace.<sup>116</sup> War could have been an obstruction for his reforms and it could have supported revolutionary plans. To prevent these disasters, he did not answer the international incomprehension and provocations, which arose between Russia and Bulgaria or Russia and Germany.<sup>117</sup> He also showed passivity to the annexation of Bosnia Herzegovina by Austria-Hungary. Stolypin was passionate towards solving these quarrels with moderation and collaboration between nations and he was convinced that an International Parliament was indispensable in solving these kind of controversies.<sup>118</sup> In 1911, the Emperor accepted Stolypin’s request and Russia started to develop the concept of an international collaboration.<sup>119</sup> In this year, international envy and fear towards Russia grew in parallel to Russia’s economic and military progress: England was in apprehension about its colonies and Germany was projecting expansion to Poland’s disadvantage. The Germans knew that this could constrict Russia to an armed reaction against them.<sup>120</sup> Already in 1908, Stolypin actually stated that Russia did not want or need other colonies: “Ne zabyvaite, gospoda, chto u Rossii net i ne budet drugikh kolonii, chto nashi dal’nevostochnye vladeniia

---

<sup>114</sup> Ibid. Page: 110.

<sup>115</sup> Ibid. Page: 30.

<sup>116</sup> In a French interview, Stolypin asserted that Russia needed at least ten years of peace. Tarquini, B. 2006. Page: 84.

<sup>117</sup> Zenkovsky, A. V. 1986. Pages: 14-15.

<sup>118</sup> Tarquini, B. 2006. Page: 82.

<sup>119</sup> Zenkovsky, A. V. 1986. Pages: 50.

<sup>120</sup> Ibid. Pages: 54-55.

iavliaiutsia edinstvennymi nashimi kolonial'nymi vladeniami, chto u nas net drugogo na vostoке vkhoda v more.”<sup>121</sup> (31.05.1908) World war was a constant menace.

The situation within the country continued to be unsteady. Stolypin insisted on internal peace and unity, starting from inside the Duma and the Sovet. He gave advice not to create disarray, but to persuade his audience that its wrong decision could destroy all the government's achievements obtained until that moment:

Я мог бы закончить, но я хотел бы, чтобы вы хорошо поняли, что я сказал все это не для того, чтобы создать с вами конфликт. Решение ваше свободно. Но не могу не повторить, что это решение, этот отказ будет остановкой, шагом назад в разрешении задачи, которая проводилась государством в продолжении многих лет.<sup>122</sup> (03.03.1908)

To enable communication, action and peace, he avoided polemics. He did not reply to negative attitudes and provocations:

Я поэтому обойду все те оскорбления и обвинения, которые раздавались здесь против правительства. Я не буду останавливаться и на тех нападках, которые имели характер агитационного напора на власть. Я не буду останавливаться и на провозглашавшихся здесь началах классовой мести со стороны бывших крепостных крестьян к дворянам, а постараюсь встать на чисто государственную точку зрения, постараюсь отнестись совершенно беспристрастно, даже более того, бесстрастно к данному вопросу.<sup>123</sup> (10.05.1907)

Stolypin promised to be as objective and impassive as possible, remarking it with an anaphora consisting of the repetition of the first six words of the negative oriented sentence. This was Stolypin's "Agrarian Speech", one of the most important and popular of his career, since he was the main supporter and defender of peasants' rights. Therefore, he used the first-person pronoun *я* 27 times in this speech, 16 of them start sentences. In the first part of the speech, its employment is visually very noticeable: almost every sentence starts with this pronoun. The first-person pronoun remarks commitment and responsibility.<sup>124</sup>

Peace is the basis for unity and unity preserves integrity.<sup>125</sup> In Stolypin's words: "[...] vlast' est' khranitel'nitsa gosudarstvennosti i tselosti russkogo naroda [...]"<sup>126</sup> (06.03.1907) Power is the protector of the Russian integrity but this is not enough. He considered that all the Russian citizens were ought to keep unity and

---

<sup>121</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 117.

<sup>122</sup> Ibid. Page: 77.

<sup>123</sup> Ibid. Page: 46.

<sup>124</sup> Beard, A. 2000. *The Language of Politics*. London : Taylor & Francis Routledge. Page: 45.

<sup>125</sup> "The word 'integrity' in English carries a meaning of completeness – the state of being whole and undamaged: 'the territorial integrity of the nation.'" Wortman, R. S. 2018. *The Power of Language and rhetoric in Russian Political History: charismatic words from the 18th to the 21st centuries*. London; New York: Bloomsbury Academic. Page: 159.

<sup>126</sup> Stolypin, P. A. Page: 32.

integrity within their fatherland. The aim could only be achieved if the Empire's population stuck together for this common goal:

Ведь Верховная власть является хранительницей идеи русского государства, она олицетворяет собой ее силу и цельность, и если быть России, то лишь при усилении всех сынов ее охранять, оберегать эту Власть, сковавшую Россию и оберегающую ее от распада.<sup>127</sup> (16.11.1907)

Stolypin used the term sons to define the Russian citizens: their mother is Russia. This metaphor strongly evokes familiar affection, protection and unity. In general, the metaphors' primary persuasive task is to emphasize emotions.<sup>128</sup> The terms *edinstvo* (unity) and *tselost'* (integrity) have been of great importance in Russian politics since Peter the Great.<sup>129</sup> The integrity of the Russian Empire was the highest priority, as the main existence of the country depended on it. The enormous dimensions of the country and the various cultures that still cohabit within it, made unity and integrity significant questions to be solved. The cultural meaning of these terms gained weight between and during the two revolutions of the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>130</sup> The concern around the Empire's unity and integrity was highlighted, after the revolution of 1905 menaced their preservation.<sup>131</sup> Stolypin used the noun *tselost'* seven times in five of his speeches. It was a central term which appeared six times in discourses Stolypin delivered in 1907, when he was at the beginning of his career as a Minister and the political situation was heavily adverse to him. The speech he held about the Agrarian Reform, in 1907, will be central in the subchapter 2.3, but it is also necessary to mention it at this point of the discourse, since, in Stolypin's opinion, the increase of the population and the peasants' poverty and their uncontrolled moving away from the lands, will bring the cities to collapse. It would have been a consequence that directly challenged Russia's integrity:

Временно будут увеличены крестьянские наделы, но при росте населения они скоро обратятся в пыль, и эта распыленная земля будет высылать в города массы обнищавшего пролетариата. Но положим, что эта картина неверна, что краски тут сгущены. Кто же, однако, будет возражать против того, что такое потрясение, такой громадный социальный переворот не отразится, может быть, на самой целостности России.<sup>132</sup> (10.05.1907)

---

<sup>127</sup> Ibid. Page: 71.

<sup>128</sup> Ungerer, F. & Schmid, H.-J. 2006. *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics*. London and New York: Routledge. Page: 153.

<sup>129</sup> Wortman, R. S. 2018. Page: 159.

<sup>130</sup> Ibid. Page: 159.

<sup>131</sup> Ibid. Page: 171.

<sup>132</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 49.

Another challenge for the country's integrity was the preservation of the external areas of the country, especially the Western provinces of the Empire which were represented by the Grand Duchy of Finland and the Polish regions. These areas are central in Stolypin's policy and their importance took even more significance through the Empire's Fundamental Laws: the first three articles had the integrity of Russia as a major topic. The first article said: "The Russian State is one and indivisible." The second article underlined Russia's sovereignty over Finland, while the third indicated the Russian language as the main national language.<sup>133</sup> In the opening speech of the Third Duma, in which Stolypin explained the government's proposal, he remarked that self-governments would be fundamental for proper and closer administration, support and control of the Western provinces:

Правительство надеется в скором времени предложить на обсуждение Государственной думы также проекты самоуправления на некоторых окраинах, применительно к предполагаемому новому строю внутренних губерний, причем идея государственного единства и целостности будет для правительства руководящей.<sup>134</sup> (16.11.1907)

Stolypin used the word *edinstvo* in four speeches. All of them are centred on the damaged relationships with the areas of Poland and Finland. *Edinstvo* is accompanied twice by the term *tselost'*. In 1911, when he remained almost alone in his political convictions, he used them to re-establish the sense of belonging to a huge country that needed better support for the Western issues:

Это ясно для всех почти лиц, знающих Западный край. Силою своего влияния – союзов, избирательных блоков, экономического если не давления, то авторитета – поляки, конечно, будут иметь возможность провести в земские гласные лиц им желательных, а парализовать же это, поставить этому предел выделением поляков в особую группу избирателей, правительство, как говорят, не имеет права, так как это нарушит будто бы целостность и единство Российской империи.<sup>135</sup> (04.03.1911)

In the same speech, he remarked on this sense of community and adds that strong will makes the difference. Stolypin often highlighted the importance of the country's will: it is based on national pride and faith. While the state is based on the power of cohesion: the rights of the whole are more important than those of the single individuals. The major goal is Russia as a whole:

---

<sup>133</sup> The first article: "The Grand Duchy of Finland, while comprising an inseparable part of the Russian State, is governed in its internal affairs by special decrees based on special legislation." The second article: "The Russian language is the common language of the state, and its use is compulsory in the army, in the navy and in all state and public institutions. The use of local (regional) languages and dialects in state and public institutions are determined by special legislation." <http://www.imperialhouse.ru/en/dynastyhistory/dinzak1/440.html> [last accessed: 7 May 1906]

<sup>134</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 67.

<sup>135</sup> Ibid. Page: 245.

Но можно понимать государство и иначе, можно мыслить государство как силу, как союз, проводящий народные, исторические начала. Такое государство, осуществляя народные заветы, обладает волей, имеет силу и власть принуждения, такое государство преклоняет права отдельных лиц, отдельных групп к правам целого. Таким целым я почитаю Россию.<sup>136</sup> (04.03.1911)

Stolypin presented the disastrous consequences that the elimination of these councils could have brought: “Etogo dostich’ legche, k etomu idut, i esli eto budet dostignuto, to v mnogostradal’nuiu istoriiu russkogo zapada budet vpisana eshche odna stranitsa – stranitsa russkogo porazheniia.”<sup>137</sup> (01.02.1911) If his suggestions of self-government in these regions were not followed, Russia would have suffer another defeat in the Western areas of the country. The result has been described as a page of a book about Russia’s history: the narration presents a chapter titled “defeat”. Stolypin already pictured the situation in a similar way, in 1910: he portrayed the Western area as a theatre in which a scene change takes place. This mutation is suddenly given by Polish representatives’ guiding these provinces. The Russian territory and culture would be unrecognizable as the theatre’s stage after the set’s transformation. Therefore, he asked the Duma to be objective in their judgment, keeping these developments and their national duties in mind:

Но, господа, будьте справедливы и отдайте себе отчет, рассудите беспристрастно, как отзовется на населении передача всех местных учреждений в руки местного населения. Ведь сразу, как в театре при перемене декорации, все в крае изменится, все будет передано в польские руки, земский персонал будет заменен персоналом польским, пойдет польский говор.<sup>138</sup> (07.05.1910)

In the same speech, these regions were described as nests. This image remarked the harmlessness of the Russian settlements that needed the country’s support to continue their lives with dignity and never forgetting their culture and language. By describing these settlements as places where familiar protection takes place, pathos was added. Self-governments are the best solutions to preserve the rights of this innocent population:

Конечно, господа, эти ячейки, эти гнезда были слабее, были разбросавшее, чем крепкие цитадели польской культуры, которые веками планомерно насаждались в западной России, и вот, когда наступило время для большей свободы и самостоятельности местных групп, [...] <sup>139</sup> (07.05.1910)

Russia should react before the Poles could definitely impose their culture: Russian natives have a right to protection.<sup>140</sup> In the speech about Finland, on the 5<sup>th</sup> of May,

---

<sup>136</sup> Ibid. Page: 246.

<sup>137</sup> Ibid. Page: 245.

<sup>138</sup> Ibid. Page: 196.

<sup>139</sup> Ibid. Page: 195.

<sup>140</sup> Ibid. Page: 205.

1908, Stolypin asserted that he wanted to avoid Russia's possibly becoming a "fertilizer" for nations with stronger will: "Da, gospoda, narody zabyvaiut inogda o svoikh natsional'nykh zadachakh; no takie narody gibnut, oni prevrashchaiutsia v nazem, v udobrenie, na ktorom vyrastaiut i krepnut drugie, bolee sil'nye narody."<sup>141</sup> In this speech, Stolypin clearly pointed out that there is a "Russian point of view" that is opposed to the Finnish conception of the situation: "Russkaia tochka zreniia sovershenno iasna. [...] Finliandtsy tolkuiliut inache."<sup>142</sup> It is not a coincidence that this speech contains words related to *mir* eight times, since Russia is neither a "a breeding ground" for other folks, nor itself a "culture-suppressor": "[...] no nuzhno verit', chto Rossiia ne kul'turogasitel', chto Rossiia sama smelo shagaet vpered po puti usovershenstvovaniia, chto Rossiia ne obrechena stat' lish' pitatel'noi pochvoi dlia chuzhikh kul'tur i dlia chuzhikh uspekhev."<sup>143</sup> (08.06.1910) Hope and national pride compose the right spirit. They are necessary to remain focused and continue on this path. Stolypin employed the adverb *vpered* nine times in six of his speeches. The adverb is employed four times in relation to the issues with Finland and it concerned the situation with the local councils three times. He used *vpered* also in an already-mentioned motto about the construction of the navy. In this speech, it carried a particular meaning, since it is employed as the last word of the discourse. Stolypin highlighted that they will walk straight in the direction of the renewal of the maritime means. He also used *vpered* in the description of Russia's direction concerning the peasantry's problem. These were the main questions that shook the most of Stolypin's policies and it is evident that the use of the adverb *vpered* showed his engagement to the realization of improvements: moving forward means to develop or change situations in a positive way. Stolypin wanted Russia to step forward: towards development. But there can also be different paths which go in two different directions as the political aims within the government did.<sup>144</sup> Stolypin presented two opposing paths which carried two different consequences:

[...] перед вами только два пути. Надо выбрать! Один путь – путь прежний: путь предоставления Финляндии свободного поступательного движения вперед в деле самоопределения своего положения в Империи, в деле самодовлеющего разрешения общих для Империи и для Финляндии вопросов. [...] Другой путь – поворот к

---

<sup>141</sup> Ibid. Page: 103.

<sup>142</sup> Ibid. Page: 101.

<sup>143</sup> Ibid. Page: 224.

<sup>144</sup> Goatly, A. 2007. *Washing the brain: metaphor and hidden ideology*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins. Page: 78.

решительной охране русских имперских интересов при сохранении полного уважения к финляндской автономии, к финляндским привилегиям.<sup>145</sup> (08.06.1910)

The second path is the one he chose and tried to persuade the Duma that it was the right, by adding that even if Finland remained under the Russian supremacy, the Finns would not lose their autonomy or their privileges. But alternatively Russia would have become a foreigner's land. For the audience it was not difficult to establish which path was right and which was wrong. Stolypin did not want to provoke neither the Finns nor the Poles and he explained that they did not have to fear Russians. One culture did not exclude the other:

Ведь после указа 12 декабря 1904 года и воспоследовавшего в разъяснение этого указа Высочайше утвержденного положения Комитета министров от 1 мая 1905 года, о котором тут упоминалось, представлялась возможность польскому населению идти вместе, идти рука об руку с русскими по культурному пути, по спокойному государственному руслу.<sup>146</sup> (07.05.1910)

Stolypin used the formulation *idti ruka ob ruki* (to go hand in hand) four times in his speeches. Again, he presented the situation with the image of a path or a journey, that could be stepped together in peacefulness. Moreover, the countries are portrayed as two individuals that can argue or be nice to each other: they convey the same characteristics as human beings. This metaphor helps to approach politics through the closest experience of human individuals – the body.<sup>147</sup> In Stolypin's speeches, hands are the most mentioned body parts: hands defend and protect, they are the shield of the body. Furthermore, hands represent action and power. With metaphors related to hands Stolypin wanted to underline the responsibilities and the duties of the subjects in question. Some days later after this speech about Poland, Stolypin insisted on the same point of peace and integrity in relation to the Grand Duchy of Finland. He commented that the invitation of Finnish representatives to the Duma and the Soviet had been an act of valuable fairness of the Russian leadership: "Priglasenie finliandskikh deputatov v Dumu i v Gosudarstvennyi sovet s reshaiushchim golosom – eto akt velichaishei spravedlivosti, no eto v to zhe vremia dokazatel'stvo (shum sleva; zvonok predsdatelia) edinstva Russkoi imperii."<sup>148</sup> (21.05.1910) Stolypin employed the term *spravedlivost'* (justice) ten times in seven of his speeches. Five of these speeches treated the issues with the Poles and the Finns. Stolypin respected

---

<sup>145</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 224.

<sup>146</sup> Ibid. Page: 200.

<sup>147</sup> Harvey, A. D. 2007. *Body Politic: Political Metaphor and Political Violence*. Cambridge scholars publishing. Page: 3.

<sup>148</sup> Ibid. Page: 219.

minorities, but the Russian sovereignty over Finland and the Polish areas that belonged to the Empire were more important to him. In order to convince his audience of his nonviolent intentions, he remarked that he did not want the oppression of other populations. His aim was only the Russian supremacy:

Мы обращаемся к вам не за жертвой, мы не требуем от вас угнетения другой, менее сильной народности – нет, господа. Правительство просит от вас лишь вашей нравственной поддержки в том деле, которое оно считает правым. Я уверен, господа, что вы отвергнете запрос; но вами, в ваших русских сердцах, будут найдены выражения, которые заставят, побудят правительство представить на ваш же суд законопроект, устанавливающий способ разрешения наших общих с Финляндией дел, законопроект, не нарушающий прав маленькой Финляндии, но ограждающий то, что нам всего ближе, всего дороже, – исторические державные права России.<sup>149</sup> (05.05.1908)

He put pathos in his words, appealing to moral and patriotic support. Patriotism in Stolypin's rhetoric, will be the main theme in the last subchapter of this thesis. The Russian sovereignty should not reanimate old hostilities between the Russian and the Polish folks, therefore Russia had to act cautiously and introduce proportional political representation:

Единственное ограничение, которое допускается по этой теории, – это ограждение государством отдельных племенных групп путем пропорционального представительства, так как иначе более сильные, более многочисленные группы поглотили бы, подавили бы более мелкие национальные группы, которые точно так же развились историческим путем.<sup>150</sup> (07.05.1910)

Gorsevski underlines that nonviolent rhetoric includes the preservation and evaluation of other cultures.<sup>151</sup> Stolypin highly appreciated and respected other countries and cultures: “Finliandiia protsvetaet, Finliandiia nikomu ne meshaet, i obostriat’ otnosheniia k nei – eto ili rokovaia oshibka, ili nedobrosovestnaia avantiura.”<sup>152</sup> (21.05.1910) He defined Finnish citizens as honest (*chestny*), educated (*kul'turnye*) and hardworking (*trudoliubivye*).<sup>153</sup> (05.05.1908) These adjectives are highly positive and describe Finland as a very honourable and respectable country. He also estimated the Polish citizens of the Western areas and their culture, since in that time he served in those Western provinces, he got to know the population and became a close friend of some of its inhabitants.<sup>154</sup>

---

<sup>149</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Pages: 103-104.

<sup>150</sup> Ibid. Page: 194.

<sup>151</sup> “Nonviolent perspectives include valuing the uniqueness of ethnic, religious, racial, and cultural groups and actively opposing ethnic cleansing.” Gorsevski, E. W. 2004. Page: 74. Nonviolent rhetoric includes that the orator is “cross-culturally respectful and aware” and that he “portrays all people as deserving human rights, equality, and respect” Gorsevski, E. W. 2004. Page: 75.

<sup>152</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Pages: 207.

<sup>153</sup> Ibid. Page: 95.

<sup>154</sup> Ibid. Page: 197.

Stolypin would never accept hate against Poles. Such a behaviour would not have been appropriate or dignified for Russia's dignity itself: "Ne nenavist', ne zhelanie nanesti poliakam naprasnoe oskorblenie rukovodit pravitel'stvom – eto bylo by ne tol'ko ne velikodushno, eto bylo by ne gosudarstvenno."<sup>155</sup> (30.05.1909) Stolypin tried to conduct an objective and neutral policy that respectfully regarded all social and cultural diversity within the Empire. This was also aimed to maintain peace and unity, which means to assure the absolute sovereignty to the Russian Empire.

But the Western boundaries were not his only obstacle on the preservation of Russia's wholeness: in his speech about the Amur railway, held on the 31<sup>st</sup> of March, 1908, he tried to convince his audience that the large Empire also needed a proper defence of its Eastern borders. Stolypin and Krivoshein, the "Chief Administrator of Agriculture and Land Tenure", personally travelled to Siberia. They witnessed the situation first-hand and realized how much potential these regions owned.<sup>156</sup> Stolypin was convinced that if the government would not decide to improve their street and railroad connections, revive and cultivate the Eastern regions land, the area would be victim of Russia's neighbours' expansions. The stationed army was not enough to preserve the expanded frontiers. Siberia needed more and better ways of communication:

Наши государственные границы равняются 18 000 верст. Мы граничим с десятью государствами, мы занимаем одну седьмую часть земной суши. Как же не понять, что при таких обстоятельствах первенствующей, главнейшей нашей задачей являются пути сообщения? Пути сообщения имеют значение не только стратегическое: не только на армии зиждется могущество государства; оно зиждется и на других основах. Действительно, отдаленные, суровые, ненаселенные окраины трудно защитить одними привозными солдатами.<sup>157</sup> (31.03.1908)

In the last paragraphs of this popular speech, he cited the Russian eagle which owns two heads, one looking to the right and one to the left, watching over the East and the West side of the country. Metaphorically, this double-headed eagle has more responsibilities and is stronger than the one-headed eagle. With this paragraph, Stolypin wants to emphasize the great past of the country, enforce Russian pride and display the importance of Russian unity and integrity:

Но не забывайте, господа, что русский народ всегда сознавал, что он осел и окреп на грани двух частей света, что он отразил монгольское нашествие и что ему дорог и люб Восток; это его сознание выражалось всегда и в стремлении к переселению, и в народных преданиях, оно выражается и в государственных эмблемах. Наш орел, наследие Византии, – орел двуглавый. Конечно, сильны и могущественны и одноглавые орлы, но, отсекая нашему русскому орлу одну голову, обращенную на

---

<sup>155</sup> Ibid. Page: 160.

<sup>156</sup> Zenkovsky, A.V. (1986) Pages: 20.

<sup>157</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 82.

восток, вы не превратите его в одноглавого орла, вы заставите его только истечь кровью.<sup>158</sup> (31.03.1908)

This whole speech is based on the concepts of unity and integrity and to reinforce them, Stolypin used the pronoun *my* (we) 31 times in this discourse. *My* creates a direct relationship of unity between him and the whole nation, besides remarking on the sense of commitment and responsibility of a group of people.<sup>159</sup> Stolypin highlighted the fact that Russia is a large country and Russian people themselves are Russia: “My granichim s desiat’iu gosudarstvami, my zanimaem odnu sed’muiu chast’ zemnoi sushi.”<sup>160</sup> (31.03.1908) If the country is in danger, everybody is; they are one thing. The lack of connections and communications within the Empire is accountable to all of them: “Kakim zhe obrazom my ne tol’ko zaseliat’, kakim obrazom my ser’ezno izuchat’ budem eti oblasti bez nalichiia dorog?”<sup>161</sup> (31.03.1908) All the members of the Duma – Stolypin too, since he used the pronoun *my* to denote the cohesion in taking decisions, will be guilty of the expansion of the neighbours: “Krai etot nel’zia ogorodit’ kamennoi stenoi. Vostok prosnulsia, gospoda, i esli my ne vospol’zuemsia etimi bogatstvami, to voz’mut ikh, khotia by putem mirnogo proniknoveniia, voz’mut ikh drugie.”<sup>162</sup> (31.03.1908) Given the enormous expansion of Russia the building of a wall would be impossible and ethically incorrect: the borders needed human presence to discourage foreigners to conquer the lands. The future of Russia’s integrity and existence was in their hands. In Stolypin’s words, to avoid responsibilities is to be a coward. It is a sin and a crime:

Я ничуть не хочу ослабить ответственности правительства, но я надеюсь доказать, что в некоторых случаях преступлением перед страной является не принятая вовремя на себя ответственность, а прикрытая боязнью ответственности бездеятельность.<sup>163</sup> (31.03.1908)

The term *otvetstvennost’* (responsibility) is used a lot by Stolypin. *Otvetstvennost’* is together with *poriadok* (order) and *zakon* (law) within the terms he emphasized and used the most. Even if he never directly employed the term responsibility in 1910, at the end of the speech held on the 24<sup>th</sup> of February, 1910, he tried to open the Soviet’s eyes about their liability towards the general conditions of the Russian

---

<sup>158</sup> Ibid. Page: 87-88.

<sup>159</sup> Beard, A. 2000. Page: 45.

<sup>160</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 82.

<sup>161</sup> Ibid. Page: 82.

<sup>162</sup> Ibid. Page: 86.

<sup>163</sup> Ibid. Page: 80.

road connections. The decisions of the assembly's members could have overcome their greatest enemy:

Поэтому, господа, я думаю, что к этому вопросу надо отнестись гораздо проще, надо просто использовать нашу высшую административную власть для начала первоначальной, крайне скромной борьбы с громадным нашим злом – бездорожьем.<sup>164</sup>

Stolypin quoted Napoleon's words: "Eshche Napoleon govoril, chto Rossiia otlichatsia ot drugikh gosudarstv tem, chto ona obladaet odnoi lishnei stikhiey i stikhiya eta – bezdorozh'e."<sup>165</sup> (20.02.1910) These conditions, could have been an advantage to Russia at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, during the *Otechestvennaia voina*, because they played a huge role in avoiding the French conquest of the Empire. The foreign soldiers were disoriented and Russia proudly rejected their invasion. But one century later, these streets could not be observed with the same pride: they symbolized Russia's backwardness. More than that, Russia needed road connections for the sake of the Empire's integrity. In the speech delivered on the 13<sup>th</sup> of June, 1908, Stolypin used the term *otvetsvennost'* 13 times. This employment was ought to stress the importance and need to build a new organized navy that was able to protect Russia's borders and its future. In the other speech he released in 1908, about the importance of the renewal and construction of the navy, he had already stated that if the Duma continued to avoid the restoration of the National fleet, it would be a disadvantage for the country and an advantage for the numerous enemies of the Empire. This avoidance is described as a "soft pillow" that made the foes sleep well and unconcerned: "Ved', gospoda, dlia lukavykh rabov vashe reshenie budet miagkoi podushkoi dlia sladkogo sna."<sup>166</sup> (24.05.1908) The Duma's irresponsibility made the enemies feel safe to gain advantages behind Russia's back. In the same speech, this avoidance is also explained with other words:

Господа, нельзя наказывать гимназиста, срезавшегося на экзамене, лишением его учебных книг, учебных пособий. (Смех слева; возгласы справа: bravo.) А вы делаете нечто подобное с флотом (рукоплескания справа и в центре)... и, может быть, делаете худшее.<sup>167</sup> (24.05.1908)

It is the wrong punishment to take all the books from a student that did not pass his or her exam. Without the proper materials, he or she has no possibility to study and get better to pass the exam in the future. In the same way, it is wrong towards

---

<sup>164</sup> Ibid. Page: 174.

<sup>165</sup> Ibid. Page: 166.

<sup>166</sup> Ibid. Page: 111.

<sup>167</sup> Ibid. Page: 111.

the fleet, to deny its improvement only because of its past defeats. On the contrary, the navy has the right to get these ameliorations because they are necessary. Without them any attempt to defend Russia would be in vain. Stolypin remarked the necessity to develop and protect Russia, restore its greatness and preserve its culture. The maritime defence issue is also described with medical metaphors, in order to add pathos to the importance of the government's responsibilities. Stolypin pictured the navy as an old man that urges a surgery: "Ochevidno, bol'shinstvo Gosudarstvennoi dumy khochet khirurgicheskim obrazom izbavit' morskoe vedomstvo ot oderzhimoi im bolezni."<sup>168</sup> (24.05.1908) The members of the Duma are the surgeons that have to be as careful as possible to keep the patient alive. It is a very serious question: the navy's existence literally relies on the Duma's decisions. Every decision has to be pondered and guided by their sense of conscience and patriotism:

Вы хирурги, собравшиеся вокруг одурманенного больного. Больной этот – флот, ошеломленный вашей критикой. Вы, господа, взяли ланцеты и режете его, потрошите его внутренности, но одна неловкость, одно неосторожное движение, и вы уже будете не оперировать больного, а анатомировать труп.<sup>169</sup> (24.05.1908)

With this metaphor, Stolypin displayed the importance of the navy for the country. If this sick part will be healed, the whole country will be saved. The state system has got human features, it has become a body.<sup>170</sup> As a human body, the nation is also composed of many different parts that function only in their wholeness. It could happen that at certain times one part could suffer an injury or a malfunction. The body needs an impetus from all of its healthy parts to heal its injured organ: in Stolypin's words, this means statehood. With this statement, he wants to reinforce the importance of the Empire's unity and integrity:

Господа, нельзя укрепить больное тело, питая его вырезанными из него самого кусками мяса; надо дать толчок организму, создать прилив питательных соков к больному месту, и тогда организм осилит болезнь; в этом должно, несомненно, участвовать все государство, все части государства должны прийти на помощь той его части, которая в настоящее время является слабейшей. В этом смысл государственности, в этом оправдание государства, как одного социального целого.<sup>171</sup> (10.05.1907)

---

<sup>168</sup> Ibid. Page: 110.

<sup>169</sup> Ibid. Page: 111.

<sup>170</sup> It may be called "body politic": "A nation regarded as a corporate entity; (with *the*) the state. Frequently with body contrasted with the head of state, or used in medical metaphors." Oxford English Dictionary: <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/273303?redirectedFrom=body+politic+#eid> [last accessed: 7 May 2019] In his work, Harvey tried to go back to the first associations between politics and the human body in *Body Politic: Political Metaphor and Political Violence*.

<sup>171</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 52.

It is evident that every time he employed this metaphor; he wanted to reinforce patriotism and the country's responsibilities. In this way he accomplished credibility and persuasion. The decision to enact laws under the article 87 were also justified by Stolypin with medical metaphors. He replied to those accusations that described the government as a person whose hands are covered with blood. The blood on the government's hands is apparently indicating its guilt: "My slyshali tut obvineniia pravitel'stvu, my slyshali o tom, chto u nego ruki v krovi, my slyshali, chto dlia Rossii styd i pozor, chto v nashem gosudarstve byli osushchestvleny takie mery, kak voenno-polevye sudy."<sup>172</sup> (13.03.1907) Russia is portrayed as a person that is able to develop feelings of shame and disgrace in relation to the painful situation that they were going through. For Stolypin's opponents, the enactment of article 87 was responsible for Russia's sufferings. At the end of this discourse, he returns to this concept and asserts that the representatives of the assembly have the power to decide about Russia's tranquillity. He affirmed that it has to be distinguished between blood that has been found on the hands of someone who is trying to save the injured entity, as in the surgeon paragraph above, and blood that is on the criminals' hands:

Господа, в ваших руках успокоение России, которая, конечно, сумеет отличить кровь, о которой так много здесь померилось, кровь на руках палачей от крови на руках добросовестных врачей, применяющих самые чрезвычайные, может быть, меры с одним только упованием, с одной надеждой, с одной верой – исцелить трудно больного.<sup>173</sup> (13.03.1907)

Stolypin wants to demonstrate who is good and who is evil and with this affirmation he discharges the government from the previous accusations of being guilty because of its blood-stained hands: the government is not the subject that caused the wound. The article 87 has been used for Russia's sake, this means that the government is the healer that tried to stop the bleeding body of the patient - Russia. Only the right decisions of the government would heal Russia from its illness.<sup>174</sup> As in the case of a human being suffering an illness, Stolypin put emphasis on spiritual related terms: hope (*upovanie, nadezhda*) and faith (*vera*). They are significant on a psychological basis, but they are not enough to heal the patient. In this speech, he used the noun *krov'* (blood) six times. The term is

---

<sup>172</sup> Ibid. Page: 37.

<sup>173</sup> Ibid. Page: 40.

<sup>174</sup> "Situatsiia predstavlena sleduiushchim obrazom: Rossiia – eto bol'noi, problemy – eto bolezni, pravitel'stvo – eto doktora, prinimaemye pravitel'stvom resheniia – eto protsess lecheniia." Makarova, V. V. (2012) *Ritoricheskii portret P. A. Stolypina: obraz Rossii v rechakh 1906–1911 godov*. In: *Nauchnyi dialog*, 8. (pp. 208-215) Page: 213.

employed with different aims in seven of his speeches. One of its primary use is to display the cruelty of revolutionary actions: “K sozhaleniiu, krovavyi bred, gospoda, ne poshel eshche na ubyl’ i edva li obyknovennym sposobom podavit’ ego po plechu nashim obyknovennym ustanovleniiam.”<sup>175</sup> (13.03.1907) That stands in opposition to his intentions of peace, unity and collaboration: “My khotim verit’, chto ot vas, gospoda, my uslyshim slovo umirotvoreniia, chto vy prekratite krovavoe bezumie.”<sup>176</sup> (13.03.1907) “My khotim verit’” underlined the collective hope of the government to obtain a reasonable response. The verb to want sounded like a self-imposition to believe that the opponents’ devastating action could not be real. Stolypin wanted to point out that the upheavals were senseless and that the ones who follow this bloody path lived in loneliness.

Stolypin also often described the country as a building. It strengthens the image of unity and integrity of the country:

Поставив на ноги, дав возможность достигнуть хозяйственной самостоятельности многомиллионному сельскому населению, законодательное учреждение заложит то основание, на котором прочно будет воздвигнуто преобразованное русское государственное здание.<sup>177</sup> (16.11.1907)

Here, the country has to stand on its feet but it is also a building that needs a strong basis which is represented by the legislative institution. At the beginning of the speech, Stolypin asserted that he is speaking “on behalf of the government” (*ot imeni pravitel’stva*).<sup>178</sup> He used this formulation four times at the beginning of three of his speeches. On the 1<sup>st</sup> of April, 1911, he used *ot imeni Soveta* (on behalf of the Sovet).<sup>179</sup> This is one more denotation of his will to show unity and integrity within the government.<sup>180</sup> The country is no more described as a human but as a building which is erected by many bricks and recalls to collaboration. Every single brick is important and has its own function in order to make the whole building stand and work correctly, as every single part of a body is important for the individual’s whole health. Wrong decisions are equivalent to the removal of a fundamental stone of this building that could signify the destruction of the whole, the disintegration of the integrity:

---

<sup>175</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 39.

<sup>176</sup> Ibid. Page: 40.

<sup>177</sup> Ibid. Page: 65.

<sup>178</sup> Ibid. Page: 64.

<sup>179</sup> Ibid. Page: 246.

<sup>180</sup> Meseniashina, L. A., Sharafutdinova, O. I., & Kusiaev, A. P. 2016. *Ritorika russkogo delovogo i politicheskogo diskursa. Kollektivnaia monografiia*. Cheliabinsk: Entsiklopediia. Page: 54-55.

Наконец, решение ваше для правительства, которому поведено создать план обороны государства, которое надрывается над этой работой, будет равносильно изъятию из создаваемого им здания одного из краеугольных, одного из самых важных камней.<sup>181</sup> (03.03.1908)

In Stolypin's words, his opponents wanted the removal of the bricks, they wanted this building to crash and become a ruin to create a whole new statehood on it:

Ведь тут, господа, предлагают разрушение существующей государственности, предлагают нам среди других сильных и крепких народов превратить Россию в развалины для того, чтобы на этих развалинах строить новое, неведомое нам отечество.<sup>182</sup> (10.05.1907)

These positions menace the country's peace, integrity and unity. They wish to destroy these concepts in order to establish new dispositions of the building of the country. Stolypin is confident that the Duma assembly is going to act responsibly in order to improve and restore the greatness of the country that is again described as a building: "My verim, chto vy skazhete to slovo, kotoroe zastavit nas vsekh stat' ne na razrushenie istoricheskogo zdaniia Rossii, a na peresozdanie, pereustroistvo ego ukrashenie."<sup>183</sup> (13.03.1907) Russia is the object that has to be built in a certain way by the administrator and his workers.<sup>184</sup> This metaphor is used by Stolypin to strengthen unity, integrity, collaboration and sense of responsibility. All of these terms can describe the function of a state. To obtain the assemblies' support, it was demonstrated that Stolypin gave a huge importance to these concepts, which are typical in persuasive political speeches. Moreover, he always gave two possible solutions, in order to remark the necessity of common sense decisions. Here, he produced the contraposition by creating two groups "My verim" and "chto vy skazhete [...]": one way of thought was clearly the best option in his point of view, the other was discredited by appointing it as bad for the country's sake. Every decision is justified by Russia's sovereignty. To sustain his thesis better, Stolypin often recurred to everyday life images, personifications and metaphors. Journey, building, body and medical metaphors were the most used in Stolypin's speeches.

---

<sup>181</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 77.

<sup>182</sup> Ibid. Page: 49.

<sup>183</sup> Ibid. Page: 40.

<sup>184</sup> Makarova, V. V. 2012. Page: 213.

## 2.2 Action and the importance of time

Stolypin is “a man of action”.<sup>185</sup> To force the concept that the country needed to take their responsibilities, he highlighted the importance of action in a given time. In the previous chapter, he described the Empire’s enemy as peacefully sleeping because they did not get advantages from the country’s irresponsibility. Now the country itself is described as sleeping. It is an animal in hibernation: “Esli my budem spat’ letargicheskim snom, to krai etot budet propitan chuzhimi sokami i, kogda my prosnemsia, mozhet byt’, on okazhetsia russkim tol’ko po nazvaniuu.”<sup>186</sup> (31.03.1908) Sleeping means to avoid decisions and actions, it stands for passivity and indifference to the Empire’s destiny. It means to remain immobile. In this concern, Stolypin once stated: “Narod sil’nyi i mogushchestvennyi ne mozhet byt’ narodom bezdeiatel’nym.”<sup>187</sup> (31.05.1908) On the 11<sup>th</sup> of December, 1909, he stressed that the government did not have to waste time by waiting, but rather that its duty was to act: “Buduchi khorosho znakom s etim polozheniem, ia schitaiu svoim dolgom, svoei obiazannost’iu zaiavit’ vam, gospoda, chto zhdat’ nel’zia.”<sup>188</sup> The situation in the Western provinces has been described as a theatre, where the foreigners take actions, or as a book which ends with another defeat. Here, to underline that Russia needed to act in order to give the right assistance to the Russian boundaries, he described the situation as an “historic hippodrome”. He rhetorically asked, if Russia had to be only an observer, or even a heartless bettor in these regions:

Достойна ли русского правительства роль постороннего зрителя, постороннего наблюдателя (*справа и в центре рукоплескания и голоса: браво*), стоящего на этом историческом ипподроме, или в качестве беспристрастного судьи у призового столба, регистрирующего лишь успехи той или иной народности?<sup>189</sup> (07.05.1910)

The government became only a spectator who witnessed changes within these provinces, therefore, Stolypin asked his audience, if Russia is really worthy of its given supremacy. On the first of April, 1911, Stolypin explained that the rejection of the bill he proposed would bring to “the collapse of a whole world of

---

<sup>185</sup> Conroy, M. S. 1976. Page: 17. In this, he differs completely from his predecessor Goremykin who was completely indifferent and passive to his duties: “In Goremykin’s view, since all authority centered in the Tsar, it was the obligation of the ministers simply to await and carry out the sovereign’s orders.” Healy, A. E. 1976. Page: 145.

<sup>186</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 82.

<sup>187</sup> Ibid. Page: 115.

<sup>188</sup> Ibid. Page: 163.

<sup>189</sup> Ibid. Page: 195.

concepts”.<sup>190</sup> The consideration about these different cultures would change and give more relevance to the Polish culture, enabling them to gradually change or even erase the Russian culture and language in these Empire’s regions. The non-intervention of the Empire in the Western areas would be a defeat on a rhetorical basis, on the “field of thoughts” for Russian pride. With words they would not achieve results, they would remain only as spectators. Stolypin wished that words became facts: “[...] потому, наконец, что уравниение прав христианства с остальными сословиями России должно быть не словом, а должно стать фактом.” (15.03.1910) He already formulated it in a similar way on the 16<sup>th</sup> of November, 1907, when he remarked that he did not want to waste time writing new speeches and the consequent feeding of inquiries, questions and accusations from his opponents. Stolypin did not want to formulate new promises, if the previous words were not developed into real actions. While politicians were wasting time in pure disputes, the country was struggling and waiting for new opportunities and proper laws. The government needed a strong will to obtain effective results:

Господа члены Государственной думы! Слушая раздававшиеся тут нарекания и обвинения против правительства, я спрашивал себя, должен ли я, глава правительства, идти по пути словесного спора, словесного поединка и давать только пишу новым речам в то время, как страна с напряженным вниманием и вымученным нетерпением ждет от нас серой повседневной работы, скрытый блеск которой может обнаружиться только со временем. И конечно, не для пустого спора, не из боязни того, что правительство назовут безответным, так же, как понапрасну называли его в прошлой Думе “безответственным”, выступаю я с разъяснением, но для того, чтобы повторно и сугубо выяснить, в чем именно правительство будет черпать руководящие начала своей деятельности, куда оно идет и куда ведет страну.

Только то правительство имеет право на существование, которое обладает зрелой государственной мыслью и твердой государственной волей.<sup>191</sup> (16.11.1907)

In this paragraph, the noun *pravitel'stvo* (government), as in almost every employment of this term in Stolypin speeches, is the subject and is presented as a human individual. The government is a “separate independent entity” and owns the major power.<sup>192</sup> Stolypin remarked again that moving forward stands for activity, that is necessary for the active reaching of common goals. In this process, Russia had to demonstrate its strong and mature state’s thought and will, otherwise the Empire would not exist anymore. Spiritual terms as will (*volia*), trust (*doverie*) and faith (*vera*), are often accompanied by adjectives as firm (*tverdyi*) and strong (*krepkii*), in order to describe the properties that a government (*pravitel'stvo*) and state (*gosudarstvo*) should own. These words create pathos. He

---

<sup>190</sup> Ibid. Pages: 254-255.

<sup>191</sup> Ibid. Page: 68.

<sup>192</sup> Meseniashina, L. A., Sharafutdinova, O. I., & Kusiaev, A. P. 2016. Page: 55.

portrayed the defeat<sup>193</sup> of the Russian consciousness that he was trying to restore, as a failure of beautiful words that were not followed by actions: “Pridavleno, pobezhdeno budet vozrozhdaishcheesia russkoe samosoznanie – i ne na pole brani, ne siloiu mecha, a na ristalishche mysli, gipnozom teorii i siloiu... krasivoi frazy!”<sup>194</sup> (01.02.1911) Stolypin remarked the importance of the pre-existent world of thoughts. With their promises, beautiful words hypnotised and then destroyed the current achievements of Russia. Stolypin proposed facts that would allow Russia to maintain the sovereignty over the Polish areas but with peaceful conditions. Beautiful and luxuriant phrases are often co-protagonists to the concept of action and time. To convince his audience that the loss of time is counterproductive, especially concerning the construction of a powerful navy, Stolypin quoted Peter the Great:

Никаких пышных фраз я произносить и не желаю, но в данную минуту мне припоминаются слова, сказанные создателем русского флота, все тем же Петром Великим, при котором впервые застучал топор русского строителя на русских верфях. Эти слова нам нужно надолго запомнить. Вот они: "Промедление времени – смерти безвозвратной подобно".<sup>195</sup> (03.03.1908)

He mentioned Peter the Great because he was the first who tried to modernize Russia as a whole but he especially gave new rise and dignity to the Russian navy: he has been successful in his aims and obtained the re-establishment of the Russian pride. Stolypin cited him in three speeches: on the Emperor’s example, he wanted to show that with little means but with strong will, passion and faith in Russia, they will achieve long-lasting successes: “Ved’ odin, s morskim flotom, postroennym pervonachal’no na presnoi rechnoi vode, s moriakami, im samim obuchennymi, bez sredstv, no s tverdoi veroi v Rossiю i ee budushchee shel vpered Velikii Petr.”<sup>196</sup> (05.05.1908) Unlike the previous example that illustrated the impossibility to employ only hope and faith to heal a patient, here, Stolypin wanted to point out that a profound faith can make the difference, if the Russian folk believed in its country as Peter the Great and as their ancestors did.

The present time has to be used to create a strong basis of constant development for the country’s future. Stolypin employed the formulation

---

<sup>193</sup> Stolypin describes this event as a defeat. Presenting it as a war is a choice that “dramatizes oppositions” and “emphasizes aggressiveness and seriousness of political debates, conflicts and elections” Semino, E. 2008. *Metaphor in discourse*. Cambridge; New York. Cambridge University Press. Page: 100.

<sup>194</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 245.

<sup>195</sup> Ibid. 2019. Page: 78.

<sup>196</sup> Ibid. Page : 103.

*nastoiashchee vremia* in 36 speeches. In his last speech, he affirmed that the next generation would not be ashamed of their Nationality anymore. He portrayed his strong will to create a better future for the next generations and he stated that the goals the government would soon achieve through the enactment of new laws, were his greatest pride. The present generation was accountable for the future generations. If Stolypin's generation did not benefit from the political changes, the next generation will: "Pobedil, kak vy znaete, istoricheskii smysl; brosheny byli semena novykh russkikh politicheskikh nachal, i esli ne my, to budushchie pokoleniia dolzhny budut uvidet' ikh rost."<sup>197</sup> (27.04.1911) He used the noun *pokolenie* (generation) seven times, at least in six of his speeches.<sup>198</sup> On the 31<sup>st</sup> of May, 1908, at the beginning of his popular speech, he explained that the future generations would still live in poverty because of Russia's debts:

Между тем правительство берется за случайное предприятие, идет против народной нужды, народной пользы и даже не считается и с будущими поколениями, которые никогда не выбьются из нищеты, раз мы отягощаем их гнетом нового непомерного долга.<sup>199</sup> (31.03.1908)

In Stolypin's opinion, his generation has not been a good example for the youth. To offer a better future to the following generations he had to stop the revolution, which is described as a disease that slowly brought demise to Russia. With this medical metaphor he wanted to demonstrate that force was the only solution. The country was in fact the body which was hosting this fiery sore. The medicine Stolypin proposed, was repression and the repetition of *tam* (there) clearly points out that, in his judgment, the only possible consequence of terroristic attempts is "ruthless punishment":

Вся наша полицейская система, весь затрачиваемый труд и сила на борьбу с разъедающей язвой революции – конечно, не цель, а средство, средство дать возможность законодательствовать, да, господа, законодательствовать, потому что и в законодательное учреждение были попытки бросать бомбы! А там, где аргумент – бомба, там, конечно, естественный ответ – беспощадность кары! И улучшить, смягчить нашу жизнь возможно не уничтожением кары, не облегчением возможности делать зло, а громадной внутренней работой.<sup>200</sup> (11.02.1909)

---

<sup>197</sup> Ibid. Page: 264.

<sup>198</sup> Obolensky: "Stolypin ochen' zadumyvalsia i o podrastaiushchem pokolenii. On soznaval, chto shkola malo davala liudei, predannykh rodine, ne vyrabatyvala voli, a vliianie sem'i znachitel'no oslabevalo. V novykh organizatsiakh molodezhi: v skautakh, sokolakh, razvedchikakh — on dumal naiti podderzhku etim nedostatkam i shel navstrechu etim techeniiam. Driablost', bezvolie, natsional'noe bezrazlichie, tsarivshie v masse vo vremena revoliutsii, pogubili Rossiuu. On predvidel eto." Pozhigailo, P. A. (Ed.) 2008. Page: 37.

<sup>199</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 80.

<sup>200</sup> Ibid. Page: 145-146.

Without this cure the country would not heal: laws would not be emanated and disorder would reign over the Empire. The sick country would perish. In Stolypin's opinion, this situation legitimates the use of harsher tones and of physical repressions. In this paragraph, Stolypin also used the building metaphor: he referred to real bombs that hit the buildings' fundamentals but he also alluded to the enemies' continuous rhetorical obstruction to the construction of laws. Both were deleterious. Stolypin called the bomb an argument because, in his opinion, the opposition was not able to argue properly but it was only able to start riots and upheavals and create political disorder. In Stolypin's words, the extremists tried to deprive Russia of its future. Another concern of the government was the preservation of workers' health and lives, especially of the youngest. Stolypin explained that the duration of labour had to be cut:

В целях охранения жизни и здоровья подрастающего рабочего поколения, установленные ныне нормы труда малолетних рабочих и подростков должны быть пересмотрены с воспрещением им, как и женщинам, производства ночных и подземных работ.<sup>201</sup> (06.03.1907)

The future and the past of a country go hand in hand: "Vy ne mozhete razorvat' i s proshlym Rossii."<sup>202</sup> (05.05.1908) The past is the basis for the present and the future, it belongs to the country's history. Further in this speech, he apologized for reminding his audience about Russia's past and the Russian blood that flew for the creation of a solid country with the supremacy over Finland. But in his opinion, the past does not have to be erased and forgotten: "Prostite, chto ia vspominaiu o proshlom, no i zabyvat' o nem ne prikhoditsia."<sup>203</sup> (05.05.1908) As stated, in this speech he recalled Peter the Great who created together with the "Russian blood" a sense of pride and belonging. History is a value that has to be respected and preserved: "V zhizni naroda polveka – mgnovenie. Sokhranit' zhiznennost' mogut lish' gosudarstvennye uchrezhdeniia, soznaiushchie eto i dorozhashchie sviaz'iu s proshlym i predaniiami, kotorye pridaiut etim ustanovleniiam istoricheskuiu tsennost'."<sup>204</sup> (04.03.1908) He employed the adjective *istoricheskii* (historical) 63 times in 20 of his speeches. He used this term at the end of nine of his speeches, since it evokes solemnity, it stresses the importance of the occasion or of the object it is denoting. Stolypin described the

---

<sup>201</sup> Ibid. Page: 28.

<sup>202</sup> Ibid. Page: 103.

<sup>203</sup> Ibid. Page: 103.

<sup>204</sup> Ibid. Page: 78.

time they were living in, as a “slishkom slozhnoe vremia”<sup>205</sup> (31.03.1910) and adds that in this “historical time” their good intentioned actions will be an answer in front of history.<sup>206</sup> (06.03.1907) There is also a tight connection between the past and the present time. This link is fundamental to understand future evolvments. Stolypin knew that his government was writing history itself and that all its actions and decisions would be significant for Russia’s future: “Dlia obshirnogo kraia eto mozhet byt’ povorot v ego istoricheskoi sud’be, dlia Rossii – eto, byt’ mozhet, predreshenie ee natsional’nogo budushchego.”<sup>207</sup> (01.04.1911) The preservation of the Russian soil is for him a national, cultural and historical mission, which is a form of respect towards their ancestors and their achievements and sacrifices: “[...] my dolzhny byt’ sil’ny na nashem Dal’nem Vostoke ne dlia bor’by, a dlia prikrytiia nashei natsional’noi kul’turnoi raboty, kotoraia iavliaetsia i nashei istoricheskoi missiei.”<sup>208</sup> (31.03.1908) In two further speeches, he stressed that the country has to learn from the past not only from Russia but also from the history of other countries: the past repeats itself in a circle, if they were not able to understand previous mistakes and act in the opposite direction. He took France’s past decisions as an example,<sup>209</sup> but also Germany’s, not only to show their national past, but also to demonstrate that Russia still lived in backwardly compared to Europe: “Gospoda, istoriia povtoriaetsia: “Berlin 60-kh godov proshlogo stoletii napominal soboi v bol’shoi mere v sanitarnom otnoshenii kartinu segodniashnego Peterburga.”<sup>210</sup> Stolypin also forecasted events in order to avoid undesired situations and episodes. He used the verb *predvidet’* (to forecast) 14 times in 11 speeches. In two of these speeches, he even quoted one of Ekaterina the Great’s popular French mottos. On the 31<sup>st</sup> of March, 1908, Stolypin used it for the first time:

Я же настаиваю на том, что правительство взвесило именно наше положение после дальневосточной войны, что правительство имело в виду мудрое изречение Екатерины Великой *gouverner c’est prévoir*, «управлять – это предвидеть». Правительство, прежде чем принять решение, имело в виду всю совокупность всех тех возражений, которые здесь были высказаны.<sup>211</sup> (31.03.1908)

---

<sup>205</sup> Ibid. Page: 187.

<sup>206</sup> Ibid. Page: 32.

<sup>207</sup> Ibid. Page: 255.

<sup>208</sup> Ibid. Page: 81.

<sup>209</sup> Ibid. Page: 69.

<sup>210</sup> Ibid. Page: 230.

<sup>211</sup> Ibid. Page: 81.

To be a good ruler means to take every possible scenario into account, considering every point of view and being prepared for any kind of event and danger. He borrowed her quotation once more, in his last speech in front of the controversial Duma:

Gouverner – *c'est prévoir* – говаривала еще Великая Екатерина, и, конечно, правительство, действующее не в безвоздушном пространстве, должно было знать, что придет час и оно столкнется с двумя самостоятельными духовными мирами – Государственной думой и Государственным советом.<sup>212</sup> (27.04.1911)

Stolypin mentioned Ekaterina the Great in five of his speeches. These quotations, as Peter the Great's words, give an historic and patriotic pathos to his speech. In his first speech as a representative of Goremykin's government, he already talked about forecasting, since he was aware that the majority of the Duma was adverse to him: "Ja predvizhu vozrazheniia, chto sushchestvuiushchie zakony nastol'ko nesovershenny, chto vsiakoe ikh primenenie mozhet vyzvat' tol'ko ropot."<sup>213</sup> (08.06.1908) To foresee means to take precautions even for situations that do not seem imminent:

"[...] можно предвидеть и наличность новых попыток приобретения земли силою и насилием. Я должен сказать, что в настоящее время опасность эта еще далеко, но необходимо определить ту черту, за которой опасность эта, опасность успешного воздействия на население в смысле открытого выступления, становится действительно тревожной."<sup>214</sup> (10.05.1907)

This is connected to Stolypin's already-mentioned rejection of the concept of inaction, which does not only mean to understand events on a present or historical basis but especially on a forecasting and preventive level.<sup>215</sup> This had a huge role in Stolypin's nonviolent rhetoric. As stated not only by many contemporaries of Stolypin but also by some historians, Stolypin's most important successes were the prevention and postponement of the First World War and the Russian Revolution of 1917. He repressed revolutionists and mediated within the international powers. In a letter to Alexander Bulygin, one of his predecessors on the Minister of Internal Affairs' chair, and dated 24<sup>th</sup> March, 1905,<sup>216</sup> Stolypin already wrote: "Luchshe predvidet' sobytiia, chem opravdyvat' usilenie vlasti dopushchennym besporiadkom. Mezhdru tem, nastoiashchee sostoianie derevni daet osnovanie

---

<sup>212</sup> Ibid. Page: 259.

<sup>213</sup> Ibid. Page: 14.

<sup>214</sup> Ibid. Page: 51.

<sup>215</sup> "It is pragmatic nonviolence in words, denigrating inaction, promoting, where possible, 'preventive' action." Gorsevski, E. W. 2004. Page: 94.

<sup>216</sup> Pozhigailo, P. A. (Ed.) 2008. Page: 294.

predvidet' vozmozhnost' krest'ianskikh besporiadkov.”<sup>217</sup> To forecast events, means to act in order to avoid their sorrowful consequences and find another solution before violent repressions were “necessary”.

## 2.3 Law, order and freedom

The revolution of 1905 was destructive but in the end it effectively achieved one major mutation: the Tsar, who found himself under heavy pressures, finally signed the October Manifesto.<sup>218</sup> Stolypin referred to this time as “velikiy istoricheskiy perelom”.<sup>219</sup> (06.03.1907) This change involved the establishment of a State Duma which was “a popularly elected legislative assembly” and in 1906, the Empire inaugurated its Fundamental Laws.<sup>220</sup> Russia finally became a Constitutional Monarchy, which at least enabled political argumentations.<sup>221</sup> Nevertheless, Russia remained a tumultuous centre for revolutionists: Stolypin’s first two years in office, were characterized by bloody revolts and terror acts. In August, 1906, the Social Revolutionaries organized a terrible attempt against Stolypin. It resulted in 27 deaths and 32 injured people, including two of Stolypin’s children. The Tsar was profoundly shaken and outraged by this disgrace and as a consequence, he decided to establish a law to decrease these acts of terrorism.<sup>222</sup> This emergency procedure was enabled by the article 87<sup>223</sup> of the Fundamental Laws of 1906. In effect of this

---

<sup>217</sup> Ibid. Page: 299.

<sup>218</sup> Moss, V. 2012. *The Fall of the Russian Empire: A Spiritual History*. Page: 251. From: [https://www.academia.edu/35479344/THE\\_FALL\\_OF\\_THE\\_RUSSIAN\\_EMPIRE\\_-\\_vol.\\_2\\_1905-1925](https://www.academia.edu/35479344/THE_FALL_OF_THE_RUSSIAN_EMPIRE_-_vol._2_1905-1925)

<sup>219</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 31.

<sup>220</sup> Healy, A. E. 1976. Page: 9.

<sup>221</sup> “[...] Nicholas finally accepted, albeit reluctantly, the deletion of the word ‘unlimited’ from the old formula defining the monarch’s power as ‘autocratic and unlimited’ [...]” Wortman, R. S. 2018. Page: 173.

<sup>222</sup> Avrekh, A. Ia. 1991. *P. A. Stolypin i sud'by reform v Rossii*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury. Pages: 20-21.

<sup>223</sup> “If extraordinary circumstances necessitate the introduction of a measure which requires legislative action when the State Duma is in recess, the Council of Ministers submits the measure directly to the Sovereign Emperor. Such a measure, however, cannot introduce changes into the Fundamental State Laws, or the Institutions of the State Council and State Duma, or in the Regulations on elections to the Council or the Duma. The force of such a measure will cease if the responsible minister or department head fails to introduce appropriate legislation in the State Duma during the first two months of its session upon reconvening, or if the State Duma or State Council refuse to enact it into law.” <http://www.imperialhouse.ru/en/dynastyhistory/dinzak1/760.html> [last accessed: 7 May 2019] In the praxis: “This decree gave provincial governors power to deal with terrorists who were caught redhanded. The accused were to be tried before military courts, they were not permitted any defense, and executed—in most cases the penalty—within twenty-four hours of the pronouncement of sentence.” Tokmakoff, G. 1981: Page: 13.

attempt, Stolypin gained public support and even in some cases the support of his opponents which led to a political advantage within his two areas of focus; law and order.<sup>224</sup> On the 13<sup>th</sup> of March, 1907, Stolypin held a speech about the decisions that had been taken in the time between the First and the Second Duma under this article. He justified this enactment:

Этот принцип в природе человека, он в природе самого государства. Когда дом горит, господа, вы вламываетесь в чужие квартиры, ломаете двери, ломаете окна. Когда человек болен, его организм лечат, отравляя его ядом. Когда на вас нападает убийца, вы его убиваете. Этот порядок признается всеми государствами.<sup>225</sup> (13.03.1907)

Here, he employed dangerous situations to justify the reactions that occur if a person finds him or herself facing those kind of events. Those escalations are obvious. Stolypin wanted to convince the Duma that the decisions he took under article 87 were also a natural response and a logical consequence to the serious and dangerous revolutionary attitude within Russia, since there was no cohesion in the assemblies and the government could not employ the laws that, in its judgment, were necessary to calm down the situation. This kind of argumentation is of “necessity”: in the rhetorician’s words, any other decision would be pointless and would inevitably lead to failure.<sup>226</sup> These consequences were not revenges: “*Ja govoril im, ia povtorial im, chto v politike net mesti, no est’ posledstviia.*”<sup>227</sup> (07.05.1910)

Laws were the centre of Stolypin’s policy. He invested a lot of effort in legality and legislation,<sup>228</sup> and in giving to the State Duma the shape of a serious place of confrontation and especially of a “genuine legislative institution”.<sup>229</sup> With his concept of action, Stolypin implied political decisions that generated laws and reforms. The government needed to apply the laws that did not already exist, before thinking of the creation of new laws. As the sentry, they had to try to defend the rights of Russian citizens by all already existing means and not wait for other tools:

Нельзя сказать часовому: у тебя старое кремневое ружье; употребляя его, ты можешь ранить себя и посторонних; брось ружье. На это честный часовой ответит:

---

<sup>224</sup> Tokmakoff, G. 1981: Page: 13.

<sup>225</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 38.

<sup>226</sup> Volkov, A. A. 2006. *Vidy ritoricheskikh argumentov*. From: [https://www.portal-slovo.ru/philology/37420.php?ELEMENT\\_ID=37420&PAGEN\\_1=5](https://www.portal-slovo.ru/philology/37420.php?ELEMENT_ID=37420&PAGEN_1=5) [last accessed: 7 May 2019]

<sup>227</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 202.

<sup>228</sup> Pares, B. 1907. Page: 563.

<sup>229</sup> Zenkovsky, A.V. 1986. Page: 6.

покуда я на посту, покуда мне не дали нового ружья, я буду стараться умело действовать старым (шум, смех).<sup>230</sup> (08.06.1906)

Power guaranteed rights and justice to the populations. The government relied on laws and was responsible for the preservation of the Empire's unity, integrity, peace and order. These were the perfect conditions for a collaborative development of successful legislative enactments:

Власть не может считаться целью. Власть – это средство для охранения жизни, спокойствия и порядка; поэтому, осуждая всемерно произвол и самовластие, нельзя не считать опасным безвластие правительства. Не нужно забывать, что бездействие власти ведет к анархии, что правительство не есть аппарат бессилия и искательства. Правительство – аппарат власти, опирающийся на законы, отсюда ясно, что министр должен и будет требовать от чинов министерства осмотрительности, осторожности и справедливости, но [также] твердого исполнения своего долга и закона.<sup>231</sup> (08.06.1906)

Stolypin employed the noun *zakon* (law) in every discourse he held, except in two very brief speeches delivered on the 20<sup>th</sup> of March, 1907, and on the first of June, of the same year. While he used the term *reform* 51 times in 19 of his discourses. An important point that regards his reforms, was education. He was convinced of the necessity of the reformation of the scholar system, since it was at the base of Russia's development:

Сознавая необходимость приложения величайших усилий для поднятия экономического благосостояния населения, правительство ясно отдает себе отчет, что усилия эти будут бесплодны, пока просвещение народных масс не будет поставлено на должную высоту и не будут устранены те явления, которыми постоянно нарушается правильное течение школьной жизни в последние годы, явления, свидетельствующие о том, что без коренной реформы наши учебные заведения могут дойти до состояния полного разложения.<sup>232</sup> (06.03.1907)

Economy could not develop if the government did not give the right importance to the education of the youth. The educational institution itself would vanish without proper improvement. Russia would remain a mediocre and backward country. Just in this introductory speech to the Second Duma, Stolypin used the noun *reform* 13 times. His most significant and widely recognized reformatory achievement has been the Agrarian Reform.<sup>233</sup> The country's welfare especially depended on the peasants, whose education and enlightenment was fundamental:

Но прежде чем говорить о способах, нужно ясно себе представить цель, а цель у правительства вполне определена: правительство желает поднять крестьянское

---

<sup>230</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 14.

<sup>231</sup> Ibid. Page: 14.

<sup>232</sup> Ibid. Page: 29.

<sup>233</sup> "A case in point was the agrarian law of November 9, 1906. If that law had not been enacted by Article 87, then, considering the debates which took more than three and a half years in the legislative institutions, one might say almost with certainty that the agrarian law would never have passed." Zenkovsky, A. V. 1986. Page: 28.

землевладение, оно желает видеть крестьянина богатым, достаточным, так как где достаток, там, конечно, и просвещение, там и настоящая свобода.<sup>234</sup> (10.05.1907)

The repetition of *tam* underlines that wealth is the main basis for enlightenment and freedom. The government's aim is the peasants' freedom, which could only be achieved if peasants had enough land and consequently money: "Pust' kazhdyi ustraivaetsia po-svoemu, i tol'ko togda my deistvitel'no pomozhem naseleniiu."<sup>235</sup> (10.05.1907) He summed up that he wanted to *free* the lower classes from poverty (*ot nishchenstva*), ignorance (*ot nevezhestva*) and lawlessness (*ot bespravii*)<sup>236</sup> (05.12.1908) He repeated the same concept with the same words on the 11<sup>th</sup> of February, 1909,<sup>237</sup> and on the 15<sup>th</sup> March, 1910.<sup>238</sup> Stolypin metaphorically viewed poverty as a prison from which peasants needed to be freed through the help of the Agrarian Reform. Peasants deserved freedom in order to become their own masters and begin a radical change in Russian agriculture. Freedom permits progress while imprisonment obstacles changes.<sup>239</sup> The peasants' liberty would be also an advantage for the landowners, since riots and pogroms would definitely stop. Peace and tranquillity will take their places:

Я думаю, что и землевладельцы не могут не желать иметь своими соседями людей спокойных и довольных вместо голодающих и погромщиков. Я думаю, что и все русские люди, жаждущие успокоения своей страны, желают скорейшего разрешения того вопроса, который несомненно, хотя бы отчасти, питает смуту.<sup>240</sup> (10.05.1907)

Stolypin tried to convince his audience about his rightness, asserting that it is evident that peasants' freedom affects the whole country. The Agrarian Reform is the basis for any other reform: "Lish' v sochetanii s sotsial'noi agrarnoi reformoi politicheskie reformy mogli poluchit' zhizn', silu i znachenie."<sup>241</sup> (15.03.1910) It is a fundamental reform because its enactment would prevent peasants from taking part to the revolutionary riots: they would be less impressionable by these violent movements, since they would be satisfied with their condition. They won't feel the need to revolt or to undertake criminal paths, they won't be slaves anymore: "Poka krest'ianin beden, poka on ne obladaet lichnoiу zemel'noiу sobstvennost'iu, poka

---

<sup>234</sup> Stolypin, P. A. Page: 51.

<sup>235</sup> Ibid. Page: 50.

<sup>236</sup> Ibid. Page: 126.

<sup>237</sup> Ibid. Page: 146.

<sup>238</sup> Ibid. Page: 175.

<sup>239</sup> Goatly, A. 2007. Page: 182.

<sup>240</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 46.

<sup>241</sup> Ibid. Page: 175.

on nakhoditsia nasil'no v tiskakh obshchiny, on ostanetsia rabom, i nikakoi pisanyi zakon ne dast emu blaga grazhdanskoi svobody.”<sup>242</sup> (16.11.1907)

Laws were not enough to calm down revolutionists. Stolypin stated that the government was therefore a “reactionary government”:

Во-первых, господа, совершенно несомненно, что правительство суровым образом и реагировало, и реагирует против революции; поэтому для революционеров и для лиц, сочувствующих или сочувствовавших им, настоящее правительство – правительство реакционное. Но точно так же известно, что правительство приняло на себя задачу установить прочный правомерный порядок, проводя одновременно реформы, предуказанные с высоты престола.<sup>243</sup> (31.03.1910)

Stolypin set up order through bloody repressions, justifying them by the necessity of the safeguarding of public order, legality and freedom:

В заключение повторяю, обязанность правительства – святая обязанность ограждать спокойствие и законность, свободу не только труда, но и свободу жизни, и все меры, принимаемые в этом направлении, знаменуют не реакцию, а порядок, необходимый для развития самых широких реформ (*шум*).<sup>244</sup> (08.06.1906)

Stolypin has been strongly contested because of the repressions he carried out. Rodichev conceived the expression “Stolypin’s necktie”<sup>245</sup> (*stolypinskii galstuk*) for which he had to apologize and was excluded from 15 meetings.<sup>246</sup> The highest representatives of the left wings perceived him as their most significant enemy. Short after Stolypin’s death, Lenin pictured him as “super-hangman” and “organizer of pogroms”.<sup>247</sup> In 1917, Stolypin’s memory was still alive in the leftist circles: Gor’kii assigned him the definition of anarchist because in his judgement, he was an enemy of the Duma, who persecuted revolutionists.<sup>248</sup> Stolypin tried to justify force demonstrating that within the country there were mainly two attitudes. As above, the government represented the good and its revolutionary opponents were the bad. The government put constant effort to change the country with proper laws and on the other side, the fervent will of its opponents’ was to create disorder and to avoid the creation of these laws, inciting the folk to bloody upheavals:

Правительство должно учитывать два явления: с одной стороны несомненное желание, потребность, стремление широких кругов общества поставить работу в государстве на правильных законных началах и приступить к правильному новому законодательству для улучшения жизни страны. [...] Но наряду с этим существует и

---

<sup>242</sup> Ibid. Page: 69.

<sup>243</sup> Ibid. Page: 187.

<sup>244</sup> Ibid. Page: 14.

<sup>245</sup> Healy, A. E. 1976. Page: 259.

<sup>246</sup> Avrekh, A. Ia. 1991. Page: 39.

<sup>247</sup> Strakhovsky, L. I. (1951) Page: 239.

<sup>248</sup> Gor’kii, A. M. 2000. *Nesvoevremennye mysli*. In: *Kniga o russkikh liudiakh* (pp. 433-559) Moskva: Vagrius. Page: 480.

другое: существует желание усилить брожение в стране, бросать в население семена возбуждения, смуты, с целью возбуждения недоверия к правительству, с тем чтобы подорвать его значение, подорвать его авторитет, для того чтобы соединить воедино все враждебные правительству силы.<sup>249</sup> (10.05.1907)

He steadily struggled to demonstrate, what in his opinion were dishonest propaganda and immoral behaviour of his opponents and, why the government was forced to repress them. He wanted to prove how the Social Labour Party openly motivated and encouraged the Russian folk to revolutionary revolts:

Я беру документ официальный – избирательную программу российской социальной рабочей партии. Я читаю в ней: «Только под натиском широких народных масс, напором народного восстания поколеблется армия, на которую опирается правительство, падут твердины самодержавного деспотизма, только борьбою завоеует народ государственную власть, завоеует землю и волю».<sup>250</sup> (13.03.1907)

In the discourse issued for the opening of the Third Duma, on the 16<sup>th</sup> of November, 1907, he underlined once more that the only solution was force and that the government was going to be intolerant to any kind of revolutionary endeavour operated by the left wing:

Для всех теперь стало очевидным, что разрушительное движение, созданное крайними левыми партиями, превратилось в открытое разбойничество и выдвинуло вперед все противообщественные преступные элементы, разоряя честных тружеников и развращая молодое поколение. *(Оглушительные рукоплескания центра и справа; возгласы «браво».)*

Противопоставить этому явлению можно только силу *(возгласы «браво» и рукоплескания в центре и справа)*.<sup>251</sup> (16.11.1907)

Stolypin remarked his concern for the “honest workers” and the “younger generation” in order to achieve pathos. By describing the revolutionary left wing in this way, he pointed out that they were not only his political opponents, they were also dangerous for the whole Empire and its future. Stolypin was actually justifying repressive actions as necessary for Russia’s sake.<sup>252</sup> Problems that seemed to affect only a part of the country became issues that challenged the whole Empire: Stolypin often legitimized his decisions and actions pointing out that otherwise all the Russian citizens would pay the consequences. The repressive results were already quite evident in 1908. Russian “workers, peasants, and student youth” started to be sceptical towards Socialist Revolutionaries and Social Democrats.<sup>253</sup> 1909 brought noticeable growth of agriculture<sup>254</sup> and economic matters to the

---

<sup>249</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 51.

<sup>250</sup> Ibid. Page: 39.

<sup>251</sup> Ibid. Page: 64-65.

<sup>252</sup> Meseniashina, L. A., Sharafutdinova, O. I., & Kusiaev, A. P. 2016. Page: 55-56.

<sup>253</sup> Zenkovsky, A. V. 1986. Page: 15.

<sup>254</sup> Strakhovsky, L. I. 1951. Page: 249.

country and the Russian people.<sup>255</sup> While internal problems and boycotts never stopped. Tolstói's death in November, 1910, gave rise to rough critics in the press and bitter students' demonstrations and strikes, which were exploited by the leftist parties in order to achieve long-lasting disorders and dissatisfaction.<sup>256</sup> Malcontent and social polemics were hard to defeat, especially if they were fed by other purposes. In 1910, Stolypin declared that revolutionists still insisted on riots that affected innocent citizens. Therefore, the government still had to use force:

Я не могу при этом открыто не заявить, что там, где революционная буря еще не затихла, там, где еще с бомбами врываются в казначейства и в поезда, там, где под флагом социальной революции грабят мирных жителей, там, конечно, правительство силой удерживает и удержит порядок, не обращая внимания на крики о реакции.<sup>257</sup> (31.03.1910)

Stolypin used to employ the term *tam* as a repetition, as pointed out in the previous examples. In this paragraph, he used it four times to highlight that to the numerous criminal activities of the revolutionists there was only one answer. He used the word *konechno* (certainly) to mark that the government's repression was obvious and necessary. From the beginning of Stolypin's political career until its end, besides the term repression, the term order (*poriadok*) had a relevant importance. In his first speech, on the 8<sup>th</sup> of June, 1906, Stolypin used terms related to *poriadok*, also such as *besporiadki* and *neporiadki*, up to 20 times. At the end of this speech, he claimed that maintaining order is a principle of common sense and justice: "Soglasno poniatiiu zdravogo pravosoznaniia, mne nadlezhit spravedlivo i tverdo okhraniat' poriadok v Rossii."<sup>258</sup> (08.06.1906) The emphasis is on the adverb *tverdo*, since the methods he used were severe and his attitude remained firm in his convictions. The term order was mostly used in the first two years of his career, since it was the period directly following the 1905 revolution. He employed the term in 33 of his speeches and mostly at the end so to highlight the question of disorders and also to reinforce that their consequence could only be and remain hard repression.

---

<sup>255</sup> Zenkovsky, A.V. 1986. Page: 20.

<sup>256</sup> Ibid. Page: 23-24.

<sup>257</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 188.

<sup>258</sup> Ibid. Page: 15-16.

## 2.4 Truth and honesty

In English, *pravda* is translated as *truth*, but in Russian it also bears the meanings of “justice, legitimacy, law, equity”. In the Russian culture and especially in politics, the term *pravda* is almost a sacred word. A person that owns and speaks the truth is considered to be a subject of high morality and spirituality. At some point, the Russian noun *pravda* even became a synonym of “divine justice” which the Emperor had to preserve through laws and decrees. While *istina* carried a meaning that is closer to reality than to other philosophical meanings.<sup>259</sup> In the present time, *pravda* and *istina* are considered synonyms.

Stolypin used *pravda* in 14 speeches. In the famous speech about the Amur railroad, he employed the term *pravda* the most: eight times. This speech contains Stolypin’s testimony of one of Mendeleev’s classes Stolypin attended in his first year as a student at the University of Saint Petersburg.<sup>260</sup> The scientist motivated his students to be able to distinguish between the truth that is only a result of impressions (*pravda*) and the real truth that derives from data (*istina*):

Говоря о видимых явлениях природы, знаменитый профессор предостерегал нас не поддаваться первым впечатлениям, так как видимая правда часто противоречит истине. "Ведь правда, неоспоримая правда для всякого непосредственного наблюдателя, – говорил Менделеев, – что солнце вертится вокруг Земли, между тем истина, добытая пытливым умом человека, противоречит этой правде". Насколько же соответствует истине, исторической национальной истине, та правда, которая только что развивалась перед вами с этого места?<sup>261</sup> (31.03.1908)

As Mendeleev encouraged his students to be able to observe the actual truth, Stolypin stimulated his audience to question the veracity of the national historical truth. Here, as in Mendeleev’s quotation, Stolypin used *pravda* and *istina* four times together or in relation to each other. Further in this speech, Stolypin asserted that in the claims of those people who were against the construction of the railroad, *pravda* and *istina* do not correspond to each other. Those assertions denoted the Russian Eastern regions as too cold to host life and, as a consequence, they judged further roads’ connections as unnecessary. Stolypin explained that the soil can be adapted and that in certain periods of the year temperatures reach higher levels than in the European part of Russia, therefore: “No tut, gospoda, takoe

---

<sup>259</sup> Wortman, R. S. 2018. Page: 134-135.

<sup>260</sup> “Divenne uno degli allievi preferiti di Mendeleev, e terminò gli studi con una tesi sulla valorizzazione del Sud della Russia.” Tarquini, B. 2006. Page: 77.

<sup>261</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 81.

nesootvetstvie mezhdou pravdoi i istinoi, chto ne trudno ee vosstanovit'.”<sup>262</sup>  
(31.03.1908) In the same speech, he wished that orators and other members of the Duma were honest about the reasons why they did not support the government:

Господа, мне кажется, что и то лицо, которое опровергает мотивы правительства, должно тоже представить вам верные основания своей аргументации; поэтому я полагаю, что оно должно входить на эту кафедру с проверенным багажом и то, что оно вам говорит, должно соответствовать не только правде, но и истине.<sup>263</sup>  
(31.03.1908)

He asserted that they should only bring facts that corresponded to both, *pravda* and *istina* into the assembly. *Pravda* and *istina* became real objects that a person can carry in a baggage, they became something tangible and heavy. They really do exist and render a person worthy of respect and credibility. In this way, Stolypin highlighted the concepts' value and importance. He wished that the Duma representatives properly honoured their duty and their country. Stolypin only wanted truth and verified data to be reported in front of the Duma, which is why he could not tolerate Kutler's false assertions about the budget of the State Duma. Stolypin decided to answer his claims only after an accurate review of the veracity of the allegations during a short break of the Duma meeting, since he also wanted to be honest towards the assembly. He released a brief unprepared speech. He reported and consequently denied Kutler's words:

Слушая его речь, я остановился на одном его упреке, а именно: «В то время, – говорит Кутлер, – когда манифестом Государя Императора была дарована полная свобода слова и свобода печати, в то самое время министерство внутренних дел увеличило оклад начальника главного управления по делам печати и его помощника». Кажется, я не ошибаюсь. Это было сказано именно так. (*Голоса справа: «да», «да».*) [...] В течение получасового перерыва мне трудно было проверить достоверность сказанного, но я все-таки это сделал и теперь могу сказать, что утверждения г. Кутлера не соответствуют действительности. Другого выражения я не могу подобрать.<sup>264</sup> (20.03.1907)

As already asserted in the subchapter 2.1, in this case, Stolypin gave up his policy of non-accusation and made fun out of Kutler's performance. Honesty of politicians and of other servants of the fatherland were fundamental in Stolypin's point of view. In his first speech in front of the Duma, he admitted that there could have been dishonest behaviours by some isolated officials – this implicated that the government was not aware of and accountable for it – but Stolypin adjusted the fact and cleared up that verifications were already in the process. He replied to the

---

<sup>262</sup> Ibid. Page: 83.

<sup>263</sup> Ibid. Page: 85.

<sup>264</sup> Ibid. Pages: 40-41.

accusations by saying that he entered the Duma with a clean conscience.<sup>265</sup> Stolypin used terms related to *sovest'* (conscience) in 14 speeches. Truth and verified data are at the basis of peaceful and respectful interaction within the government. Similarly as in the speech about Kutler, Stolypin affirmed that he needed time to formulate a reply for the Duma's request, since he wanted evidence and accurate information about the events that took place:

На заявленный мне запрос от 12 мая я не мог ранее ответить Государственной думе, так как считал необходимым отправить в некоторые города, где были беспорядки, особых уполномоченных мною лиц для проверки происшедшего. В настоящее время я получил все нужные сведения и могу дать подробные объяснения, но желал бы сначала совершенно ясно, определенно поставить те вопросы, которые, очевидно, интересуют Государственную думу.<sup>266</sup> (08.06.1906)

Two weeks after this speech, Stolypin held another analogous short declaration. Since his aim was peacefulness and quietness in the Russian political context, he could not express his thought about the question regarding the Duma member Sedel'nikov. Stolypin's spontaneous words would inflame the debate, since they would not be dictated by complete and verified data:

Таким образом, всякие объяснения с моей стороны были бы по необходимости теперь неполными, вследствие невыясненности еще события, вызвали бы только страстность прений, разожгли бы еще более страсти, тогда как в этом деле нужно спокойствие, необходимо проявить власть законную... (*шум и крики*), а не действовать под влиянием страстей.<sup>267</sup> (22.06.1906)

In "field of facts" and in the past, the answers to the state issues can be found: "A chtoby poluchit' otvet, pravil'nyi otvet na eti voprosy, otvet, otvechaiushchii nashim gosudarstvennym zadacham, neobkhodimo iskat' ego, gospoda, ne v abstraktnoi doktrine, a v opyte proshlogo i v oblasti faktov."<sup>268</sup> (07.05.1910) His whole policy has its basis in objectivity and in "the world of facts": "Ia ne khochu, gospoda, kasat'sia lichnostei; ne khotel by nikogo obviniat' i khotel by ostavat'sia v mire faktov, i v etoi oblasti ia dolzhen priznat', chto mnogoe obstoit neblagopoluchno."<sup>269</sup> (05.05.1908) Stolypin opposed to the "world of concepts" and "field of thoughts" introduced in the subchapter 2.2, the "world of facts" and the "field of facts". This could recall the Platonic concept of the Hyperuranion. As demonstrated, both of this worlds and fields carry an important meaning in Stolypin's point of view. Stolypin avoided offences and accusations as it has already been mentioned in this thesis. This in respect of the objective truth which played a

---

<sup>265</sup> Ibid. Page: 14-15.

<sup>266</sup> Ibid. Page: 9.

<sup>267</sup> Ibid. Page: 20-21.

<sup>268</sup> Ibid. Page: 195.

<sup>269</sup> Ibid. Page: 92.

huge role in Azef's betrayal speech, since the government was trying to figure out the verity about Azef's two-faced figure. Stolypin ended the speech by stating that they will work out the case, since the government owns the power and at the same time the truth: it stands on the right and just side, in opposition to those who were telling lies with the only goal to obtain power and disorder.<sup>270</sup> (11.02.1909) In the same discourse, Stolypin unfolded the definitions provocateur (*provokator*) and provocation (*provokatsiia*). He analysed their usage in the various speeches that were held in the assembly and illustrated the different meaning that revolutionaries and the government gave to these terms and why:

По революционной терминологии, всякое лицо, доставляющее сведения правительству, есть провокатор; в революционной среде (*возгласы слева*) такое лицо не будет названо предателем или изменником, оно будет объявлено провокатором.

Это прием не бессознательный, это прием для революции весьма выгодный.

Во-первых, почти каждый революционер, который улавливается в преступных деяниях, обычно заявляет, что лицо, которое на него донесло, само провоцировало его на преступление, а во-вторых, провокация сама по себе есть акт настолько преступный, что для революции не безвыгодно, с точки зрения общественной оценки, подвести под это понятие действия каждого лица, соприкасающегося с полицией. А между тем, правительство должно совершенно открыто заявить, что оно считает провокатором только такое лицо, которое само принимает на себя инициативу преступления, вовлекая в это преступление третьих лиц, которые вступили на этот путь по побуждению агента-провокатора.<sup>271</sup> (11.02.1909)

Stolypin wanted the assembly to know for which deceitful aim the revolutionists employed these terms and he wanted the audience to understand their usage in a proper way. Stolypin did not stand misunderstandings that could hinder the transparency of his policy: "Ia tol'ko khotel by ustranit' odno nedorazumenie, kotoroe, ostavshis' neustranennym, moglo by zatemnit' iasnost' dal'neishego moego izlozheniia."<sup>272</sup> (01.02.1911) Therefore, the background and the context of his speeches and arguments had to be as clear as possible:

Но раз такого рода доводы приводятся вновь как аргументы в пользу принятия запроса, запроса свойства, по моему мнению, небезопасного, то и мне придется коснуться двумя-тремя словами этих аргументов, дабы неправильностью фона, налагаемого на весь запрос, не была бы затемнена самая ясность рисунка.<sup>273</sup> (31.03.1910)

If a speech does not present its themes in a clear way and if it does not carry perspicuity, it is not successful, as it does not fulfil its persuasive task.<sup>274</sup>

---

<sup>270</sup> Ibid. Page: 146.

<sup>271</sup> Ibid. Page: 132-133.

<sup>272</sup> Ibid. Page: 238.

<sup>273</sup> Ibid. Page: 187.

<sup>274</sup> Aristotle. (J. H. Freese, Trans.) 1926. Page: 351.

## 2.5 Patriotism

The love towards one's own fatherland carries powerful and conflicting emotions with it. Stolypin often pointed out the shame he felt for Russia's political and social conditions. Most of the time, he used the term shame in relation to the words *Rossiia* or *rodina* (homeland). Stolypin employed the term *rodina* 18 times in twelve of his speeches, most of the time mentioning it as *nasha* (our), while he pronounced the word *Rossiia* in 32 of his speeches.<sup>275</sup> In the first chapter it has already been noticed that he ended at least 21 of his discourses with the concept of Russia or Emperor in the last two sentences. The shame he personally felt for his motherland was given by the backward country Russia constantly demonstrated to be: "Ia znaiu i pomniu tsifru 100 tysiach smertei ot kholery v nastoiashchem godu; ia chuvstvuiu bol' i styd, kogda ukazyvaiut na moiu rodinu, kak na ochag rasprostraneniia vsevozmozhnykh infektsii i boleznei."<sup>276</sup> (11.01.1911) He employed the first person pronoun – this is the only time he employed it in relation to *rodina* – to highlight his commitment to the sorrowful situation his country was living in, especially in the last year of his charge. In his last speech, he asserted that, thanks to the endeavour of the government, Russians won't be ashamed of their nationality in the future: "[...] v tom, chto my, kak umeem, kak ponimaem, berezhem budushchee nashei rodiny i smelo vbivaem gvozdi v vami zhe sooruzhaemuiu postroiku budushchei Rossii, ne stydiashcheisia byt' russkoi, i eta otvetstvennost' – velichaishee schast'e moei zhizni."<sup>277</sup> (27.04.1911) This accomplishment is given by a collective work: the pronoun *my* and the metaphor of the building stand for cohesion. The government metaphorically started to dig the soil at the basis of the building of the "future Russia" with bare hands. Pushing its nails into it stands for the firm conviction, commitment and pride that Russians felt for their fatherland. Shame developed into pride. This part of his speech sounded very solemn. Stolypin wanted his compatriots to recognize the importance and honour of being Russian. He compared it to the coveted privilege of being a Roman citizen, that brought a series of advantages to the person who owned this

---

<sup>275</sup> In her article *Ritoricheskii portret P. A. Stolypina: obraz Rossii v rechakh 1906–1911*, Makarova points out how many times Stolypin used "Russia" as an object or a subject, as a container, a metaphor or a personalization and which kind of synonyms he gave to it. Makarova, V. V. 2012. Pages: 208-215.

<sup>276</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 231.

<sup>277</sup> Ibid. Page: 264-265.

citizenship. If the Russian attitude towards their nationality changed, they would obtain the same rights:

Станьте сначала на нашу точку зрения, признайте, что высшее благо – это быть русским гражданином, носите это звание так же высоко, как носили его когда-то римские граждане, тогда вы сами назовете себя гражданами первого разряда и получите все права.<sup>278</sup> (16.11.1907)

When Russian citizens were proud of their fatherland and feel a proper statehood, freedom would be real and not only written: “Vot togda, togda tol’ko pisanaia svoboda prevratitsia i pretvoritsia v svobodu nastoiashchuiu, kotoraiia, konechno, slagaetsia iz grazhdanskikh vol’nostei i chuvstva gosudarstvennosti i patriotizma.”<sup>279</sup> (16.11.1907) Besides the feelings of pride and shame, Stolypin manifested also his pain. In more than one occasion, he stood up in order to defend the service of the police and in one of his speeches he defined himself hurt when officials were stereotyped as inhuman subjects that were only interested in fame and career, while in his opinion they served for Russia’s prestige:

Чиновник может быть и плох, может быть и хорош, а я думаю, что чиновник часто не меньше, а, может быть, и больше других трудится на пользу и на славу России. И, право, горько и больно слышать, когда рисуют по обычному шаблонному трафарету образ чиновника, стремящегося исключительно захватывать чины, ордена, оклады и лишённого всякого нравственного чувства.<sup>280</sup> (11.01.1911)

In Zenkovskii’s words, Stolypin was genuinely and passionately involved in the country’s affairs. During Stolypin’s Agrarian speech, Zenkovskii witnessed Stolypin’s pain and anxiety as he directed the last words of the speech to the left.<sup>281</sup> Stolypin portrayed them as the evil looking for Russia’s instability, while the government wanted Russia to be as great as it had been in the past: “*Velikaia Rossiia*”.<sup>282</sup> With these words, Stolypin wanted to demonstrate that his enemies did not love their fatherland, they strived personal achievements.

To strengthen the common aims of the country, he often employed the term *krov’*. Besides medical metaphors, the image of blood is also powerful to strengthen the Russian brotherhood: “Ne naprasno, ne bessmyslenno i ne bessoznatel’no byli prolity potoki russkoi krovi, utverdil Petr Velikii derzhavnye prava Rossii na beregakh Finskogo zaliva.”<sup>283</sup> (05.05.1908) Stolypin’s

---

<sup>278</sup> Ibid. Page: 71.

<sup>279</sup> Ibid. Page: 70.

<sup>280</sup> Ibid. Page: 232.

<sup>281</sup> Zenkovsky, A. V. 1986. Page: 107.

<sup>282</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 54.

<sup>283</sup> Ibid. Page: 103.

contemporaries had to honour the efforts of their ancestors, who died for their fatherland. The word blood highlighted that Russians were one. It stimulated patriotic feelings of pride towards their history. Stolypin used the term to remark that Russia's sovereignty over Finland is their right, it has literally been fought with blood.<sup>284</sup> As in previous occasions, the figure of Peter the Great symbolized Russian pride. In the same speech, again he mentioned the strong Russian ancestors' blood. The aims are the same as above, Russians are a huge family with a common goal:

Ведь кровь этих сильных людей перелилась в ваши жилы, ведь вы плоть от плоти их, ведь не многие же из вас отрицают отчизну (*рукоплескания справа и в центре*), а громадное большинство сознает, что люди соединились в семьи, семьи – в племена, племена – в народы для того, чтобы осуществить свою мировую задачу, для того, чтобы двигать человечество вперед.<sup>285</sup> (05.05.1908)

There was continuity within the generations: if their ancestors were able to show their strength, they could do the same, since they belonged to the same flesh and blood. To achieve state's goals and the general development of humanity the nation needed to stand together. The expression "ne mnogie zhe iz vas otritsaiut otchiznu" resounded as an offence to those who were still against the government's decision, he wanted to demonstrate that those people were alone and isolated and that it was abnormal to go against the own blood and family. Stolypin also employed other words denoting homeland: he used the noun *otchizna* only in this occasion, while he used *otechestvo* in four other speeches. Patriotism is honour and profound love, respect and sense of responsibility towards the own homeland. Stolypin used the term *patriotism* in seven speeches. Five of them were held in 1908. He expected the members of the Duma to take a conscientious and patriotic decision about the maritime defence: "Ia veriu, chto vashe reshenie, kakovo by ono ni bylo, budet prodiktovano vam veleniem vashei sovesti i tem chistym patriotizmom, [...] – etim i nichem bolee."<sup>286</sup> (24.05.1908) Voting against the construction of a new navy would mean to row against the country's sake. Stolypin was confident and trustful towards the government's members that they would act in the name of Russia. *Ia veriu* is used in four speeches and always in relation to the Duma's or Sovet's decisions. With these trusting words he put the responsibility into their hands. The establishment of

---

<sup>284</sup> Makarova, V. V. 2012. Page: 211-212.

<sup>285</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 103.

<sup>286</sup> Ibid. Page: 111.

*zemstvos* in the Western areas was also a patriotic decision: “Patrioticheskii poryv Gosudarstvennoi dumy v dele sozdaniia russkogo zemstva na zapade Rossii byl poniat, otsenen i sogret odobreniem Verkhovnoi vlasti.”<sup>287</sup> (27.04.1911) Stolypin took advantages with the use of the term related to patriotism: whoever went against his decisions became an enemy of the Empire. In the speech about Azef, Stolypin opposed to Azef’s disloyalty examples of police-men that demonstrated their honour and devotion towards their duty. In particular, he introduced the story of two officers he personally got to know in Saratov: “[...] ia pomniu, kak oni menia khladnokrovno prosili, chtoby, kogda ikh ub’iut, ia ozabotilsia ob ikh sem’iakh. I oba oni ubity, i umerli oni soznatel’no za svoego Tsaria i svoiu rodinu.”<sup>288</sup> (11.02.1909) These officers consciously died to protect their fatherland. They honoured it. The only aim of a state’s servant but also of any other kind of citizen should be the country’s interest: “A tak kak pravitel’stvo, razreshaia kazhdoe delo, dolzhno imet’ v vidu vsegda i prezhde vsego interesy Rossii, to pozornym ono schitalo by lish’ polnoe ravnodushie ili, skoree, malodushie – zabvenie ob etikh interesakh.”<sup>289</sup> (08.06.1910) His objective attitude has as its goal Russia’s sake. Political decisions are not ought to contain subjective preferences or oriented to any political wing:

Вам, господа, предстоит решить вопрос не субъективного чувства о том, органы ли самоуправления или правительство достойны большего сочувствия, – вам предстоит решить крупный социальный вопрос о государственном воздействии на условия существования экономически зависимых масс. Этот вопрос вы можете решить правильно с одной только точки зрения – с точки зрения государственной.<sup>290</sup> (11.01.1911)

None of the political convictions could give an appropriate answer to the Empire’s issues: “Oshibochno, gospoda, tochno tak zhe podkhodit’ k kazhdomu voprosu, primeriaia ego k sushchestvuiushchim obraztsam – liberal’nym, reaktsionnym ili konservativnym.”<sup>291</sup> (11.01.1911) Stolypin wanted to erase these political orientations, since they obstructed the peaceful communication within the Duma and the Sovet. In metaphors, these orientations became real directions. Right or left are only “misleading lights” which the travellers – the politicians – do not have to consider, if they want to achieve final success: “Mne predstavliaetsia, chto, kogda putnik napravliaet svoi put’ po zvezdam, on ne dolzhen otvlekat’sia

---

<sup>287</sup> Ibid. Page: 265.

<sup>288</sup> Ibid. Page: 145.

<sup>289</sup> Ibid. Page: 220.

<sup>290</sup> Ibid. Page: 234.

<sup>291</sup> Ibid. Page: 233.

vstrechnymi poputnymi ogniami.”<sup>292</sup> (16.11.1907) The stars stand for higher political accomplishment. The members of the government also embodied helmsmen that, as the just mentioned astronauts, did not have to lose their orientation, even if other paths or places could seem more seductive. They only have to trust the compass and keep their purpose in mind. Stolypin also displays them as firm and strong surveyors and sentries:

Мы – рулевые, стоящие у компаса, и должны смотреть только на стрелку, и как бы привлекателен, как бы соблазнителен ни был приветливый берег, но если по дороге к нему есть подводные камни, то курс мы будем держать стороною; мы – межевщики, которым доверены межевые признаки, и если они утрачиваются, мы будем на это указывать; мы – часовые, поставленные для охраны демаркационной линии, и свои ли, чужие ли будут ее нарушать, мы не будем малодушно отворачиваться в сторону.<sup>293</sup> (13.06.1908)

The only aim of these astronauts, helmsmen, surveyors and sentries was Russia’s sake. Stolypin belonged to these impartial travellers: in this paragraph, the pronoun *my* appeared six times. The direction is indicated only by the Emperor:

Но неужели забывают, господа, что наше правительство не может уклоняться то влево, то вправо (*слева движение; рукоплескания справа*), что наше правительство может идти только одним путем, путем прямым, указанным Государем и еще недавно названным им (*голоса справа: браво; рукоплескания*), недавно всенародно им признанным незыблемым?<sup>294</sup> (22.05.1909)

The Sovereign was of course the head of Orthodoxy: “Pomnite, chto veroispovednyi zakon budet deistvovat’ v russkom gosudarstve i chto utverzhdat’ ego budet russkii tsar’, kotoryi dlia s lishkom sta millionov liudei byl, est’ i budet Tsar’ Pravoslavnyi.”<sup>295</sup> (22.05.1909) As Stolypin stated, the Emperor was the only one who could save Russia and take the decisive and final decision, since God himself chose him for the highest office.<sup>296</sup> (16.11.1907) This is also written in the fourth article<sup>297</sup> of the Fundamental Laws of 1906. While the fifth article affirms: “The person of the Lord Emperor is sacrosanct and inviolable.”<sup>298</sup> That is how Stolypin considered him. The Tsar’ represented Russia. In his speeches, Stolypin mentioned him as *Gosudar’*, *Tsar’*, *Imperator*, *Velichestvo* or *Monarkh*. It is always written in uppercase initial letters. For Stolypin, all these nomenclatures are

---

<sup>292</sup> Ibid. Page: 72.

<sup>293</sup> Ibid. Page: 123.

<sup>294</sup> Ibid. Page: 155.

<sup>295</sup> Ibid. Page: 155.

<sup>296</sup> Ibid. Page: 68.

<sup>297</sup> “The Emperor of All the Russias possesses Supreme Sovereign Power. Obedience to His authority, not only out of fear, but in good conscience, is ordained by God Himself.” <http://www.imperialhouse.ru/en/dynastyhistory/dinzak1/441.html> [last accesses: 7 May 2019]

<sup>298</sup> <http://www.imperialhouse.ru/en/dynastyhistory/dinzak1/441.html> [last accesses: 7 May 2019]

Russia's synonyms.<sup>299</sup> The Tsar' personified the Empire: "Eto zhelanie, eto strastnoe zhelanie obnovit', prosvetit' i vozvelichit' rodinu, v protivnost' tem liudiam, kotorye khotiat ee raspada, eto, nakonets, predannost' ne na zhizn', a na smert' Tsariu, olitsetvoraiushchemu Rossiu."<sup>300</sup> (16.11.1907) From 1904 onwards, Nicholas II was concerned about the health of his last born Aleksei and the mental health of Tsaritsa Alexandra who blindly believed in Rasputin's magical powers that would heal the young Tsarevitch.<sup>301</sup> The mysterious healer was in contrast with Stolypin who was hindering Rasputin's actual aims.<sup>302</sup> Beyond all these issues and the drastic alteration of Nicholas II's attitude towards Stolypin in his last years of service, Stolypin continued to be devoted to his Emperor.<sup>303</sup> Stolypin was killed in Kiev, his last thought and gesture – "the sign of the cross" were dedicated to the Tsar.<sup>304</sup> It was a conscious demonstration of his unconditional fidelity and profound attachment towards his Emperor and homeland.

---

<sup>299</sup> Makarova, V. V. 2012. Page: 212.

<sup>300</sup> Stolypin, P. A. 2019. Page: 72.

<sup>301</sup> Moss, V. 2012. Page: 366

<sup>302</sup> Avrekh, A. Ia. 1991. Page: 202.

<sup>303</sup> Strakhovsky, L. I. 1951. 251-252.

<sup>304</sup> Ibid. Page: 239.

## Conclusion

The historical time in which Stolypin has served as Minister of the Internal Affairs and as Prime Minister of the Russian Empire, has been his greatest fortune but at the same time misfortune. In the moment in which the Emperor had familiar priorities, the revolutionary atmosphere was at its highest and Russia seemed to move backward, Stolypin was able to take the reins of the Russian politics. He differed from his predecessors and contemporaries in every aspect, from his lifestyle to his way of dressing, from his voice control to his language acquaintances. Stolypin faced adverse winds with prevention and action, common sense, objectivity, and the enactment of laws. But what made the real difference were his rhetoric and performance skills. He reached pathos and sense of statehood with his literary and historical quotations, well-structured metaphors, images taken from daily and common life experiences and stories from his personal past. The most impactful metaphors were those that recreated a medical context, in which Russia – now a person – is portrayed as an innocent patient or victim of controversial political decisions. This powerful technique evoked the audience's emotions and awoke its pride and patriotism.

Stolypin used a polite and respectful language, avoiding accusations and offences, promoting responsibility, empathy, honesty and sense of community. His rhetoric is prevalently collaborative, objective and impartial. Gorsevski listed all the typical attitudes in political nonviolent pragmatism and all of them are included in Stolypin's discourses. Stolypin employed a majority of positive oriented words. Terms of negative valence are mostly used in relation to revolutionary attempts: in the justifications he gave about the repression of the government against revolutionists and also in those occasions in which he wanted to create a contraposition between the government's means and goals and those of the extremists. The solutions that were offered by the government led to Russia's prosperity, while those of the enemies led to catastrophic scenarios and to Russia's final destruction. His target was expected to solve issues with common sense and responsibility, having as the only aim Russia's sake. Stolypin often highlighted that he did not impose his judgment; he gave his audience only the indispensable means to take the right decisions. Stolypin tried to legitimize some of his political

decisions using the concept of necessity, in the name of peace and order. He also justified repressions and other actions against revolutionists by underlining that their riots affect the whole country and the whole population, not only parts of it. The 1906 Fundamental Laws relied also on the basis of many of his decisions concerning integrity, sovereignty and the figure of the Emperor. Stolypin's personality and political attitude can be judged as controversial and incoherent in certain occasions, but his rhetorical power remains unquestioned.

## Bibliography

### Primary sources

Aristotle. 1926. *Art of Rhetoric*. (J. H. Freese, Trans.) Loeb Classical Library 271. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Dostoevskii, F. M. 1881. *Zapiski iz Mertvogo doma. Izdanie piatoe*. Sankt Peterburg: Tipografiia brat Panteleevykh.

Gor'kii, A. M. 2000. *Nesvoevremennye mysli*. In: *Kniga o russkikh liudiakh* (pp. 433-559) Moskva: Vagrius.

Maklakov, V. A. 1939. *Pervaia gosudarstvennaia Duma (vospominaniia sovremennika)*. Parizh: Imp. L. Beresniak. 12. Rue Lagrange.

Miłosz, C. 2005. *Jasności promieniste iinne wiersze*. In: *Zeszyty Literackie*. 5.

Molière, 1915. *The merchant gentleman (Le bourgeois gentilhomme)*. (M. Baker, Trans.) New York: French's standard library edition.

Quintilian, 1871. *Quintilian's Institutes of oratory; or, Education of an orator. In twelve books*. (J. S. Watson, Trans.) London: Bell and Daldy.

Stolypin, P. A. 2019. *Polnoe sobranie rechei 1906 – 1911*. Moskva: Iurait.

## Secondary sources

Avrekh, A. Ia. 1991. *P. A. Stolypin i sud'by reform v Rossii*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury.

Beard, A. 2000. *The Language of Politics*. London : Taylor & Francis Routledge.

Charteris-Black, J. 2013. *Analysing Political Speeches: Rhetoric, discourse and metaphor*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Conroy, M. S. 1976. *Peter Arkad'evich Stolypin: Practical Politics in Late Tsarist Russia*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Goatly, A. 2007. *Washing the brain: metaphor and hidden ideology*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Goffman, E. 2011. *ON FACE-WORK. An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction*. In: Archer, D. & Grundy, P. (Eds.) *The Pragmatics Reader* (pp. 275-281) London; New York: Routledge.

Gorsevski, E. W. 2004. *Peaceful Persuasion. The Geopolitics of Nonviolent Rhetoric*. Albany: State University of New York.

Harvey, A. D. 2007. *Body Politic: Political Metaphor and Political Violence*. Cambridge scholars publishing.

Healy, A. E. 1976. *The Russian Autocracy in Crisis: 1905 - 1907*. Hamden: Archon Books.

Kotkin, S. 2015. *Stalin: Paradoxes of Power, 1878-1928*. Penguin: München.

Krivososov A. D. 2003. *Osnovy spichraitinga*. Sankt-Peterburgskii gosudarstvennyi universitet.

Lakoff, R. 1973. *The logic of politeness; Or, minding your P's and Q's*. In: *Papers from the 9th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* (pp. 292-305). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Macey, D. A. J. 1987. *Government and peasant in Russia, 1861 - 1906: the prehistory of the Stolypin reforms*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press.

- Makarova, V. V. 2012. *Ritoricheskiĭ portret P. A. Stolypina: obraz Rossii v rechakh 1906–1911 godov*. In: *Nauchnyi dialog*, 8. pp. 208-215.
- Manning, R. T. 1982. *The Crisis of the old order in Russia: gentry and government*. Princeton University Press.
- Mehlinger, H. D. & Thompson, J. M. 1972. *Count Witte and the Tsarist Government in the 1905 Revolution*. Bloomington; London: Indiana University Press.
- Meseniashina, L. A., Sharafutdinova, O. I., & Kusiaev, A. P. 2016. *Ritorika russkogo delovogo i politicheskogo diskursa. Kollektivnaia monografiia*. Cheliabinsk: Entsiklopediia.
- Miłosz, C. 1977. *Emperor of the Earth: Modes of Eccentric Vision*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Pares, B. 1907. *Russia and Reform*. New York: E.P. Dutton & Company.
- Podolinsky, S. S. 1971. *Russland vor der Revolution: die agrarsoziale Lage und Reformen*. Berlin Verlag.
- Pozhigailo, P. A. (Ed.) 2008. *P. A. Stolypin glazami sovremennikov*. Moskva: Rosspen.
- Pushkarevskaja Naughton, Y., & Naughton, G. D. 2013. *Westward Went I in Search of Romance”: The Transnational Reception of Thomas Mayne Reid’s Western Novels*. 75 (2): pp. 142-157. Johns Hopkins University Press
- Semino, E. 2008. *Metaphor in discourse*. Cambridge; New York. Cambridge University Press.
- Sidorovnin, G. 2002. *P. A. Stolypin. Zhizn’ za otechestvo. Zhizneopisanie (1862 - 1911)*. Saratov: Kul’turnyi tsentr imeni P. A. Stolypina.
- Strakhovsky, L. I. 1951. *Peter Stolypin: Progressive Statesman*. 20 (3): pp. 239-253. University of Toronto Press.
- Tarquini, B. 2006. *Pëtr Arkadevič Stolypin: Il ministro dello zar che fu ucciso per la sua riforma agraria. E cambiò il corso della storia*. Napoli: Controcorrente.
- Tokmakoff, G. 1981. *P. A. Stolypin and the Third Duma: An Appraisal of the Three Major Issues*. Washington: University Press of America.

Ungerer, F. & Schmid, H.-J. 2006. *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics*. London and New York: Routledge.

Wortman, R. S. 2018. *The Power of Language and rhetoric in Russian Political History: charismatic words from the 18<sup>th</sup> to the 21<sup>st</sup> centuries*. London; New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Zenkovsky, A. V. 1986. *Stolypin: Russia's Last Great Reformer*. (M. Patoski, Trans.) Princeton: The Kingston Press.

## Webliography

Moss, V. 2012. *The Fall of the Russian Empire: A Spiritual History (1825-1925)*.

From:

[https://www.academia.edu/35479344/THE\\_FALL\\_OF\\_THE\\_RUSSIAN\\_EMPIRE -  
vol. 2 1905-1925](https://www.academia.edu/35479344/THE_FALL_OF_THE_RUSSIAN_EMPIRE_-_vol._2_1905-1925)

Oxford English Dictionary:

<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/273303?redirectedFrom=body+politic+#eid>

[last accessed: 7 May 2019]

Presidential Library:

Stolypin, P. A. 1906. *Notes Stolypin to Gurland with the task to compose articles for the press, to submit drafts, give their views, etc. on various issues*. From:

<https://www.prilib.ru/en/node/333581> [last accessed: 7 May 2019]

Presidential Library:

Stolypin, P. A. *Stolypin's notes to Gurland with the instruction to come up with an article against the opposition press attacking the Ministry of Education and give a certificate of projects for streamlining affairs in universities*. From:

<https://www.prilib.ru/en/node/333580> [last accessed: 7 May 2019]

Russian Imperial House:

<http://www.imperialhouse.ru/en/dynastyhistory/dinzak1/440.html> [last  
accessed: 7 May 2019]

Russian Imperial House:

<http://www.imperialhouse.ru/en/dynastyhistory/dinzak1/441.html> [last  
accessed: 7 May 2019]

Russian Imperial House:

<http://www.imperialhouse.ru/en/dynastyhistory/dinzak1/760.html> [last  
accessed: 7 May 2019]

Volkov, A. A. 2006. *Vidy ritoricheskikh argumentov*. From:  
[https://www.portal-  
slovo.ru/philology/37420.php?ELEMENT\\_ID=37420&PAGEN\\_1=5](https://www.portal-slovo.ru/philology/37420.php?ELEMENT_ID=37420&PAGEN_1=5) [last accessed: 7  
May 2019]

## Opera Slavica Coloniensia

Herausgegeben von Daniel Bunčić und Jörg Schulte  
Slavisches Institut der Universität zu Köln  
ISSN 2748-6060

<https://slavistik.phil-fak.uni-koeln.de/osc>

[https://kups.ub.uni-koeln.de/view/series/Opera\\_Slavica\\_Coloniensia/](https://kups.ub.uni-koeln.de/view/series/Opera_Slavica_Coloniensia/)

- |         |      |   |
|---------|------|---|
| Band 1  | 2015 | Anja Dillmann<br>„Wyślę ci maila“: Zur Belebtheitskategorie im Polnischen   |
| Band 2  | 2015 | Marharyta Schödder<br>Der Akzent von Germanismen im Russischen  |
| Band 3  | 2015 | Simone Maffezzoni<br>Das Rom der Dekabristen  |
| Band 4  | 2016 | Iana Elger<br>Zur Stellung von Präfixen im russischen Wortbildungssystem  |
| Band 5  | 2017 | Maxim Istomin<br>Von der Muse geküsst: Michelina in Brodskijs Werken und Leben  |
| Band 6  | 2017 | Anastasia Romanuk<br>Die Entwicklung der nominalen Distanzanrede im Russischen:<br>Rückgang der Verwendung des Vor- und Vatersnamens<br>und Vordringen des Vornamens? |
| Band 7  | 2013 | Anastasia Smirnova<br>Der Genitiv der Negation im Russischen  |
| Band 8  | 2016 | Tanja Keller<br>Wege der russischen Cicero-Rezeption  |
| Band 9  | 2017 | Sabina Stacenko<br>„Contes des fées“ und „Contes du feu [...]“<br>Das Genre des Märchens und A. S. Puškins „Povesti pokojnogo Ivana<br>Petroviča Belkina“             |
| Band 10 | 2018 | Michael Beckers<br>Titus Petronius und die slavischen Dichter   |
| Band 11 | 2019 | Giada Hitthaler<br>P. A. Stolypin and the renaissance of rhetoric   |
| Band 12 | 2019 | Petar Pejović<br>Kyrillisches und lateinisches Alphabet<br>in serbischsprachigen Linguistic Landscapes  |
| Band 13 | 2019 | Tamara Tanasijević<br>M. Ju. Lermontov and the science of passions  |
| Band 14 | 2020 | Jelena Apostolović<br>Srpska satirična uspavanka u kontekstu evropske književnosti  |
| Band 15 | 2020 | Michael Beckers<br>Die verlorenen Melodien slavischer romantischer Lyrik  |

- Band 16 2020 Isolde Ruhdorfer  
Akzent beim Schreiben?  
Untersuchung zum deutschen Schriftakzent in der russischen Kyrillica
- Band 17 2020 Željana Vukanac  
The history of the rondeau between East and West
- Band 18 2021 Ivana Dimitrijević  
Von der Chovevet Tsion zur Chalutsa  
Eine kulturgeschichtliche Studie (1897-1931)
- Band 19 2021 Puci, Joana  
Die ersten serbischen und griechischen Zeitschriften  
Kulturelle und sprachliche Zusammenhänge der Aufklärung
- Band 20 2021 Antonia Shevchenko  
Die vorwärtsgerichtete Diskursfunktion der  
Genitiv-Akkusativ-Opposition bei Verneinung im Russischen