УДК 94(480)+94(47).083

J. Kortti

The Young Finns and the Finnish Parliamentary Reform of 1906

Introduction

> It is the time of rebirth here in Finland. Let us wipe out the old and replace it with the new. Times like these are times of activity and haste; the circumstances are more or less upside-down, as always when we need to move in a hurry. Therefore, it is quite natural that people are in bit of a bad mood and do not wish for anything but secure ground. People aim to conceptualise the concepts and to organize accordingly as soon as possible.
>
> *Pen-name Piiskuri*
> *Nuori Suomi, February 1906*[1]

After the Japanese attacked the Russian fleet at Port Arthur on 8 February 1904, the Tsarist system was confronted with a series of problems. The Russian forces suffered heavy defeats in the war, which led to a wave of strikes, peasant and military unrest, the assassination of Plehve, the Minister of the Interior, 'Bloody Sunday' in the Winter Palace on 22 January 1905, and finally the October Manifesto of 1905. One result of the revolution was the creation of the Duma in order to limit the autocracy of Tsar Nicholas II. The reform, however, was flawed from its inception and the unrest continued.

Meanwhile in the Grand Duchy of Finland, the unrest of the mother country resulted in a general strike, 'the great strike', on 31 October 1905 and the new parliament act on 20 July 1906. The strike ended the Russification period begun by Nicholas II in the February Manifesto of 1899. The Manifesto included several issues that underlined the imperial government's rights in Finland. It did not have the consent of Finland's own legislative bodies, which, in comparison with other parts of the Empire, had had a relatively independent role during the 'autonomy' era. The evil of 'oppression' was incarnated in the governor-general of Finland, Nikolay Bobrikov.

The significance of Russification in Finland was obvious to the Finnish elite of the time. The contemporary reactions of the intelligentsia during the era has had a central role in the Finnish sense of history. This is not only true for the elite, since the Manifesto largely created both passive and active resistance all over the country. This was manifested in the Great Petition. The Petition included more than half a million signatures, which were collected by university students within eleven days. Although the Emperor and the government ignored the Petition, it had an extraordinary symbolic significance not only for the resistance, but also for Finnish nationalism and Finnish history culture.

One marked significance of the Russification period in Finland was the reorganisation of the Finnish political party system in which the creation of a unicameral parliament was a key point. Finnish political life was significantly divided according to the views towards Russification — not as much towards the language (Fennomans and Svekomans) as before. The Finnish party was divided into the 'Old Finns' (the supporters of *Realpolitik* and compliance) and the 'Young Finns' (Constitutionalists). Soon the Constitutionalists were divided into Finnish and Swedish speakers and, moreover, into 'Sparrows' (left wing) and 'Swallows' (right wing).

After the great strike, the Finnish Senate, formed by Leo Mechelin, submitted the draft of a bill to establish a parliament based on general and equal suffrage. After debates, disputes, and deliberation, a unicameral 200-member parliament (*Eduskunta*) was created when the Diet, based on estates, passed the laws on 29 May 1906.

Previous study

The whole idea of the 'autonomy era' and its violation in the 'years of oppression' lasted rather unchanged in (nationalistic) Finnish history writing until the 1960s, when a new generation of historians[2] started to see 19th century Finland in a wider historical context. Finno-Russian relations in the cold war political context undoubtedly had an influence on this re-examination[3]. According to this view, the autocratic Russian Empire did not have a specific Finnish policy when the Grand Duchy was created, but Russians took different measures with Finland because of changes in world politics. After 1809, Russia mostly allowed the Finns to keep the same rights and privileges they had had during the Swedish era. Accordingly, Emperor Alexander I did not give 'autonomy' to Finns in 1809; the position was a Finnish reading created later in the century[4].

The background, phases, as well consequences of the events around the Parliament Act of 1906 have been analysed in several studies. After the Second World War, a kind of general study of the period is political scientist Jussi Teljo's *Suomen valtioelämän murros 1905–1908* (The turning point in Finnish governmental life 1905–1908), published in 1949[5]. The study particularly focuses on the actions of the 'Mechelin Senate' but also gives an overview of the factors that defined the essence of the development towards the famous constitutional Senate and later unicameral parliament.

After the 1960s and 1970s, couple of re-examinations and interpretations of this period could be mentioned — particularly from the viewpoint of the Young Finns. Vesa Vares covers the phases in his overview of the history of the Young Finns until 1918[6]. Seppo Zetterberg studies the period in his rich and detailed biography of Eero Erkko, the founder of the newspaper *Päivälehti* (later *Helsingin Sanomat*) as well as the Young Finns party[7]. The study that comes closest to the focus of this article is the doctoral thesis by Yrjö Larmola on the 'political Eino Leino', the national poet who was not only an active Young Finn during the period but also contributed to the discussion in newspapers and cultural periodicals[8]. The compilation thesis on the great strike *Kansa kaikkivaltias. Suurlakko Suomessa 1905* partly focuses on how the cultural intelligentsia responded to the strike[9].

In this article, I am particularly interested in how the Young Finns responded to the Parliament Act of 1906 and the first unicameral parliament elections in 1907: How did the literary cultural intelligentsia contribute to the societal upheaval and political turmoil, and how did the intelligentsia express its worldview(s) literarily? The main focuses are the Finnish cultural periodicals of the era, but I also refer to other activities of the elite.

The periodicals

The daily press and literature, especially the newly emerging form of the novel, were important media of the period; indeed, a great deal of research has already been done on both media. In contrast, cultural magazines and periodicals, usually having a small circulation, have not been as popular a mode of research as books and newspapers, although they have played a focal role among the cultural intelligentsia from time to time. Moreover, cultural periodicals can be seen as a marriage between literature and journalism. Overall, magazines have been essential for an individual or group to develop their ideas and worldviews[10].

The periodical *Valvoja* (Monitor) was founded as early as in 1880 by major figures among Finnish speaking academics. Some of them made their mark as politicians as well. The periodical was Finnish-minded and rather liberal, but Russification divided the editorial staff: the supporters of *Realpolitik* left, and constitutionalists took control. *Valvoja* widely dealt with governmental, societal, literary, and artistic issues. The main mission of the periodical was to enhance Finnish as a cultivated language,

but it featured many articles on international issues as well; *Valvoja* was open to the influence of European culture. As in the major Swedish-speaking periodical, *Finsk tidskrift,* history, literature and the arts were its central subjects[11].

Nuori Suomi (Young Finland, 1906–1907) was the chief organ of the Young Finns students, yet it was not an actual student paper. The weekly periodical was liberal, political, but included a rather diverse range of societal and cultural issues as well. It managed to have eminent academics and other cultural intellectuals as writers. In many ways, *Nuori Suomi* represented the left wing of the Young Finns[12]. *«Nuori Suomi»* was particularly critical towards those constitutionalists who had stuck to the Bobrikov era. According to a causerie of the paper, the Constitutional Club (*Perustuslaillinen klubi*), whose predecessor was the Young Finns Club (*Nuoren Suomen klubi*) led by Santeri Ivalo and Eero Erkko since the 1890s, had to move on and discuss other, more burning issues in 1906. The writer also emphasised that there were much more important issues at stake than people and their offices[13].

Sosialistinen aikakauslehti (Socialist Periodical, 1905–1908) also stems from the student circles. The young founders of the periodical, Edvard Gylling, O. W. Kuusinen, Yrjö Sirola, and Sulo Wuolijoki all became central figures of Finnish communism in the 1910s. *Sosialistinen aikakauslehti* was Marxist and revolutionist, but it also included cultural issues to a certain degree[14].

The great strike

What was particular for the Finnish version of the revolution of 1905 that was the great strike was not only a show of force of the socialist working class movement, but rather a heterogeneous and patriotic social movement including revolutionism, demands for democracy, constitutionalism, and freedom from the Russians or the bourgeoisie[15].

From the point of view of the press, the most concrete significance of the great strike was the end of the tight censorship that had started in 1899 and continued during the whole Bobrikov era. Censorship was an essential element in the maintenance of order and peace in Russia, but Finns wanted to gain more freedom for the press and more power in censorship matters for themselves. This led to a conflict with the Czarist government. Many newspapers such as *Päivälehti*, the chief organ of the Young Finns, were suspended in 1904. Albeit, censorship had already started to be relaxed before Bobrikov was assassinated in June 1904. However, censorship concerned mainly newspapers. The era was easier for periodicals and magazines[16].

This did not mean, however, that the periodicals did not have to face preventive censorship until the great strike. *Valvoja* wrote in the first 'free issue' at the end of 1905 how the editorial staff, under censorship, had to ponder on the right ways to say something so that the readers would understand. As a reader had told the editor, often the reason for succeeding in getting sensitive ideas through the censor was not only looser censorship of periodicals, but also the fact that censors were not clever — «civilized» — enough to understand what they actually approved[17].

The pen-name Spectator also discussed the significance of the recently ended great strike in the same article. He particularly gave credit to the working class movement in the strike. According to him, the «lower levels of society» showed that Finnish people were not wimpy. They acted in a determined and organised way during the strike while «our upper class alone lacked those abilities». That is why «we should express our sincere acknowledgement to the Finnish workers that the strike they created was solely political». According to Spectator, this was realized because the workers did not include economic demands in the demonstrations, and they understood to end the strike when the manifesto that met the collective requirements of the Finnish people was fulfilled[18].

Spectator also underlined that although the strike was not a complete revolution in the sense that it had dislodged the government, it meant a giant step towards universal suffrage already approved by the upper classes. The manifesto also contained the promise of a modern parliament to whom a government would be liable. These reforms were therefore remarkable achievements for the working class: «the safety net for the great unwashed». According to Spectator, bitterness and distrust had dissipated in people's minds in «this historical moment». The memory of the great unity of the people «will lead us to walk the road of evolution — not revolution. To achieve and strengthen the freedom of the Finnish people is now possible»[19].

The successor of Bobrikov, Governor General Obolenski made two different deals with the constitutionalists and Social Democrats during the great strike. To the former he promised to restore the situation to what it had been before the Bobrikov era and to the latter universal suffrage. These deals resulted in the November Manifesto, which ended the strike.

Although the aims of Finland's bourgeois constitutionalists and social democrats were mainly the same as in the earliest phase of the strike, the ending of the strike was not easy for Social Democrats. They were divided into revolutionary activists and to moderate workers' associations, who accepted the same aims as the constitutionalists. Revolutionary workers as well as bourgeois activists would have continued the strike to the point of revolution. The activist workers were particularly disappointed that their 'red manifesto' had been watered down, and they saw the November manifesto as a 'class manifesto'. The unrest took on the features of a 'street revolution', which resulted almost in an armed clash between revolutionary workers and the activist bourgeois students. But as O. Jussila has emphasised, «the main dividing line in the strike ran not between workers and bourgeoisie but between revolutionary activists and constitutionalists. The former included both bourgeoisie and workers, while the latter also contained Social Democrats». One of the outcomes of the strike, however, was that it increased the interest towards the Russian working glass movement among Finnish social democrats[20].

In the first sample issue of *Sosialistinen aikakauslehti* published soon after the great strike, many articles gave accounts of the political climate in Russia in regard to revolution. V. Igelström forecasted that Bernsteinian 'social revolutionists' would

disappear and Marxist social democrats would survive in Russia, but he did not believe that it would come true in his lifetime[21]. In the reviews of other papers, *Sosialistinen aikakauslehti* criticized the way in which the bourgeoisie patronized the workers' movement because it was influenced by Russia, although the constitutionalists, for instance, had had contacts with the *zemstvos*. The periodical also wrote that the bourgeoisie papers treated the great strike activity as though the workers were a baby with a sharp knife in its hand: it should be taken away but they did not dare to. The periodical simply hoped that that workers would be left alone because «if they are not provoked, they know how to use or not use a knife since the working class movement is no longer a child»[22]. In the following issues before the parliamentary act, *Sosialistinen aikakauslehti* discussed the possibilities of another strike from different points of view in several articles. The periodical particularly cast light on the possibilities of a strike in an international context[23].

Although the rising workers' movement was frightening in its fanaticism, the Young Finns thought the whole process and its achievements had been successful. They had been active and they believed their triumph would continue. The constitutionalists, particularly the left wing of the group soon to be called the 'Sparrows', supported social reforms, but their primary concern after the great strike was to get the same rights back that the Finns had had before the Bobrikov era. The social democrats instead wanted to be quick off the mark to fight their radical case for increasing democracy and enhancing social reforms. The Young Finns were optimistic but also slightly worried: were the people, who had proved to be hot-blooded, aware of the successes the (Young) Finns had achieved?[24]

Nevertheless, the youth of the Young Finns emphasised that it could take some time until the peasantry and the workers learned how to deal with freedom and responsibility[25]. On the other hand, K. J. Ståhlberg, who soon became a member of the Mechelin Senate and the leader of the 'Sparrows', wrote in *Valvoja* that the wealthy intelligentsia must finally understand that «they cannot secure the future and thorough progress of our nation alone». He pointed out that the wide stratum had equal needs[26].

The parliament reform

The aims of the stakeholders were different, and although it first seemed that the organised working class had lost the revolution whereas the constitutionalists had won, a real victory for the workers was achieved the following year with the parliament act granting universal suffrage. In addition, this change was sustained, unlike the ending of Russification, which began again after a couple of years[27].

After the Emperor had proposed the new parliament and suffrage act, the hearing of the act started in the Mechelin Senate on 3 May 1906. As J. Teljo has accounted, three characteristics of the Finnish universal suffrage reform can be highlighted as a «remarkable victory» for the constitutional Senate. Firstly, the reform was

a bold move away from the strictly restricted election system straight to universal suffrage. This is most concretely shown by the number of those entitled to vote: from 125 000 to 1 125 000 people. Secondly, the change in the structure of the parliament was equally radical: from four cameral divisions of the Diet (nobility, clergy, burghers and peasants) to a unicameral parliament. Thirdly, and most interestingly from the point of view of this article, all the above mentioned were achieved during the fiercest phase of the history of the Grand Duchy of Finland: «at the moment when the passionate political waves were high and the great unwashed made the national scene with their charged hopes and anticipations»[28].

A recent study has emphasized the changes in the mentalities of the Finns in those turbulent times. After the workers had performed, acted and expressed their demands in the strike, the system of estates ordained by God broke down once and for all. Therefore, if the great strike was not a revolution in the political sense, it brought about a revolution in the minds of contemporary Finnish people[29].

The suffrage reform was not an 'invention' of the great strike, however; it had been on the table since the 1880s. Eventually, it became void because of disagreements between the Swedish and Finnish speaking estates. In 1904–1905, there was a bill of suffrage reform in the Senate, but it too became void because the noble and bourgeoisie estates refused to make decisions on the societal situation they saw as illegitimate[30].

In the 25th anniversary issue of *Valvoja*, Valfrid Vaselius — one of the founders of the periodical, then Professor of Finnish and Nordic literature history — discussed universal suffrage from the point of view of his ideological basis, liberalism. An article published in *Helsingin Sanomat* earlier that year in which an academic stated that human beings had no natural rights fuelled his article. Vaselius instead saw that a civilised citizen must have freedom of speech, freedom of association and the right to representation. He emphasised that any community, but particularly a complex and diverse modern society, must be based on solidarity. Vaselius linked universal suffrage to the Finnish nation, language, culture and history: «Our national character, our whole history, our contemporary governmental standing, and our folklore all refer to the view in which human emotions, mutual help and the recognition of natural rights are the determining factors»[31].

After the great strike, the constitutionalists were divided not only into Swedish and Finnish speakers, but also in both groups into reformists and conservatives. The new parliament act in the Mechelin Senate was the most difficult for the Young Finns, who were divided into the 'Sparrows' and the 'Swallows'. Some of them supported the bicameral system. These included the former editor-in-chief of *Päivälehti*, Eero Erkko, who wanted to establish the same kind of government system as in the United States, where he had been in exile. Some defended all the attacks and amendments against the propositions of the government (Senate's 'finance department'), and some demanded smaller electoral constituencies. Finally, all the members of the party voted for the government even though some issues might have been against the convictions of some[32].

In *Nuori Suomi*, these difficulties appeared when a Young Finns' representative from Helsinki was elected to the extraordinary estate-based parliament in 1906. The Finnish-minded constitutionalists had unanimously chosen A. H. Karvonen, who was a 'Sparrow', but Edv. Polón, one of the electors in the parliament and a 'Swallow', proposed O. Groundstroem. After the Swedish speakers supported Groundstroem, he was elected. «Can the Young Finns count Mr. Pólon as a member of the party anymore?» asked lawyer O. Talas, a 'Sparrow' and a member of the editorial board of *Nuori Suomi*[33]. The editor-in-chief K. Blomstedt saw the constitutional party as behind the times in the new situation and suggested that Finnishminded constitutionalists should establish a new party, the Young Finns Party (The Young Finns were still a liberal «sub-department» of the Fennoman Party)[34]. As linguist Heikki Ojansuu wrote in *Nuori Suomi* in February 1906, the new societal situation where governmental, educational, legislation and economic issues were central, called for new kinds of parties, which could not be formed around such outdated issues as language[35].

Nuori Suomi supported universal suffrage, which was evident not only in the articles of the paper, but also in the paper's reports about different kinds of events. When the Philosophical Society of Finland met to discuss the reform, the paper wrote that K. R. Brotherus, who belonged to the editorial board of *Nuori Suomi*, criticised the introductory speech by the chairman of the society, Professor of Philosophy A. Grotenfelt. Brotherus, later Professor of Political Science, saw that, unlike Grotenfelt, there should not be restrictions in suffrage, and no special representatives of certain groups such as doctors, lawyers, ecclesiastics, or teachers since they represented all the people, not just themselves. All the members of the meeting also supported unicameralism, unlike Professor Grotenfelt, who «was inclined to accept bicameralism»[36].

However, during May 1906, *Nuori Suomi* also became worried about the unrest the social democrats had created among the workers. Although their duty was to organise the working population to fight their case, the class hatred their newspaper *Työmies* incited could mean that the workers could defeat their cause[37]. After the Sveaborg Rebellion, the military mutiny by the Russian soldiers in the Fortress of Sveaborg on 30 July 1906, many articles expressing worry appeared in *Nuori Suomi*. Writer I. Calonius (later Kianto) wrote: «I have to admit that a Finn in historical revolutionary days like this ends up with contradictory thoughts about what is his duty. For the first time, he notices that serving his fatherland is not the only sacred work on earth»[38].

Bitter election for the Young Finns

> Side by side walk a worker and a peasant, a workman and a nobleman. They all have a common title of honour, «citizen», which obliges them to work towards one goal, the best for this nation and its people...
> *Nuori Suomi. 1907. N 19*[39]

The switch from an estate-based parliament to a unicameral parliament meant that the electorate grew nine-fold. The first general election was held in March 1907. The largest party was the Social Democrats (37 per cent).The Old Finns was second (27 per cent) and the Young Finns obtained only 14 per cent of the votes. The rest of the votes went to the Swedish People's Party (*Svenska Folpartiet*) (13 per cent), the Agrarian Union (*Maalaisliitto*) (6 per cent) and the Christian Workers' Party (*Kristillinen työväenpuolue*) (2 percent). The turnout was 71 percent.

The result of the election was an unhappy surprise for the bourgeoisie. Firstly, no one thought that the Social Democrats would became so big, and secondly, the poor result for the Young Finns meant not only a great disappointment for the Young Finns themselves, but also for the Swedish speakers who were their allies. The Young Finns were not only disunited, but they had also underestimated the strength of the Social Democrats. In addition, the Agrarians took some of their votes in the countryside[40].

Nuori Suomi gave exposure to the «Radical constituency association», whose candidates were leftish liberals Professor W. Söderhjelm, painter E. Järnefelt, jurist J. Gummerus (in the Finnish speaking list) and library amanuensis G. Schauman (in the Swedish speaking list); yet the weekly denied that it was an official sympathizer of the association. The association supported antinationalism, democracy, and radical societal reforms to remove class boundaries and to separate the church from the state[41]. In other words, it came rather close to the policy of the Social Democrats.

However, *Nuori Suomi* hardly took part in the electoral campaign, and when the result of the election caused great disappointment for the Young Finns, *Ylioppilaiden Keskusteluseura* (Student Debate Association) was chastised for its lack of agitation. In *Nuori Suomi*, Ed. Järnström considered the reproof unfounded since «the first national duty of a student is not to act as a party agitator but to prepare himself as a free and independent citizen». Nevertheless, he admitted that the student association of the 'Old Finns', *Suomen Nuija*, had succeeded better in upholding party discipline in the election. *Nuori Suomi* certainly did not promote unity by supporting the Radical constituency association. In the same issue, the editorial staff of the paper resigned because they felt they did not have the full trust of the *Ylioppilaiden Keskusteluseura*, who also saw the policy of the paper as too radical. This included the editorial staff wanting to enter into an alliance with the Swedish speakers' student association, unlike the majority of *Ylioppilaiden Keskusteluseura*[42].

The criticism of the role of the Young Finns students in the election continued under the new editorial board. One solution suggested was to concentrate more on cultural matters: on educational (*Bildung*) and international-minded cultural activities among the liberal students[43]. In the later issues of 1907, *Nuori Suomi* judged the first steps of the new parliament according to how the parties operated there, criticizing particularly the Swedish speakers and the Old Finns. The growing power of the conservative forces was unsettling to the students[44]. The Young Finns Party — its leaders, newspapers, and writers — was also criticized. The divided party had to rally its troops in the new political environment[45].

The young intelligentsia was bewildered by discordant Finnish people: «The stormy days always churn the seas, lifting up all the bottom mud we do not recognize in ordinary conditions»[46]. Storm as a metaphor had already been widely used during the great strike — not only in the poems and fiction by such authors as E. Leino, A. Untola and I. Kianto, but also among working class writers and in contemporary newspaper and periodical articles[47].

After the great strike, many of the Young Finn writers worried about the political discord[48]. This concern can be found in the articles of *Nuori Suomi* as well: «There is a critical period in our country now when historical development seems to be off the usual track, swinging from one extreme to another»[49].

The Social Democrats headed the polls and became the largest socialist party in Europe. The party had enormous support from the countryside, and was actually the biggest rural party in the election. This unique result can be explained by structural factors: the landless population had grown rapidly in the late 19th century, and the market-oriented landowners were impoverishing crofters and other landless population. Nevertheless, the result even exceeded the expectations of the Social Democrats themselves. One of the main reasons for their success in the countryside was that the party managed to get the rural proletariat to the polls. Their success, however, could have been even bigger since the proportion of non-bourgeois was larger than the percentage of votes the Social Democrats received in the countryside. Voters did not choose their party based on social and economic issues alone, and some of the proletariat voters might have shunned the anti-religious image of the Social Democrats[50].

As *Nuori Suomi* wrote, social democracy was in the right place at the right time, promising bread instantly in 'frosty times' instead of the hazy ideas the intelligentsia had to offer: a materialistic worldview was successful among those with less education. Agitators with their red ties had replaced preachers with their simple black clothes (*körtit* i.e. Pietists, the representatives of the revivalist movement, a Lutheran religious movement), and instead of *Hallelujah* people sang *The Internationale*. These radical changes in Finnish societal conditions as well as the world views of the people had affected public life so drastically that it had, by degrees, lost the spirit and *joie de vivre* that characterised the fight before the great strike. Yet, despite all the «party humbug», the youth of the Young Finns still wanted to believe in the importance of educational work[51]. Nevertheless, the leaders and the agitators among the Social Democrats lacked the skills for educational and ideological work among their supporters in the provinces, which, according to *Nuori Suomi*, prevented them from becoming fully recognised as a worthy cultural movement[52].

Conclusion: Elite in times of change

The outcome of the Parliament act of 1906 was particularly problematic for the Young Finns, and it is well manifested in the cultural periodicals of the Finnish speaking liberals of the time. The result of the election was a great disappointment

if not a catastrophe for the party. Whereas the Old Finns and particularly the Social Democrats managed to get their message through especially in the countryside, the Young Finns, as a university-based, urban movement, did not. The Young Finns were stuck in the position before the great strike, when the party's policy was clear: to defend constitutionalism and to resist Russification. Nevertheless, after the strike its policy was somewhat unclear. The separation of the party into the conservatives and the left wing did not help the situation, quite the contrary. The party was divided into the more market oriented 'Swallows' and the more social reformist 'Sparrows'. Language issues also separated the Finnish liberals after the 'Swallows' started to cooperate with the Swedish speaking elite.

The 'Swallows' resembled German national liberals of the time and the 'Sparrows' British social liberals. In the context of the European liberals of the time, the Young Finns differed from the international sister parties in two senses. Firstly, because of the social structure of Finland the Young Finns lacked the large support of the urban middle class, which was a crucial stronghold of European liberals. Secondly, the Young Finns were significantly more nationalistic than their European liberal contemporaries[53].

The strong ties between the State and intellectuals have long historical roots in the history of Finnish intelligentsia, and they have lasted until the late 21st century. Intellectuals in Nordic countries have often been used in the service of society, but what is peculiar to the history of Finnish intellectual elite is that it must be seen in relation to Russia (and later, the Soviet Union). Moreover, the tradition of the Finnish intelligentsia is highly influenced by Hegelian philosopher and statesman J. V. Snellman (1806–1881), who promoted the idea of the authority of the state at the expense of the more liberal civil society[54].

This was evident in the years of 1905–1907. Although the Finnish liberal literary intelligentsia of the era was influenced by the European intellectuals, who saw intelligentsia as autonomous stratum — distance from the corridors of power — the Finnish men of letters had to identify with the state. In the era studied, this situation was difficult particularly during the turmoil when one of the most democratic parliament systems in the word was established in Finland over 110 years ago.

1 *Piiskuri*. Viikon varrelta // Nuori Suomi. 1906. N 7. S. 52–53.

2 See *Tommila P.* La Finlande dans la politique européenne en 1809–1815; *Polvinen T.* Die finnischen Eisenbahnen in den militärischen und politischen Plänen Russlands vor dem ersten Weltkrieg*; Korhonen K.* Suomen asiain komitea; *Jussila O.* Suomen perustuslait venäläisten ja suomalaisten tulkintojen mukaan 1808–1863; *Klinge M.* Kansalaismielen synty.

3 See e.g. *Meinander H.* Kansallisen katseen lumo.

4 Some historians, such as Heikki Ylikangas have pointed out that the idea of the exceptional position of the Finns was not only created by the Finns but it also met the Emperors' interests since the Empire's governance was so underdeveloped and backward at that time. Therefore, the Emperor made a virtue of necessity by letting the Finns (as well as other Russian provinces) continue their old governmental practices before the governmental modernization of Russia became necessary at the end of the century.

[5] *Teljo J.* Suomen valtioelämän murros 1905–1908.
[6] *Vares V.* Varpuset ja pääskyset.
[7] *Zetterberg S.* Eero Erkko.
[8] *Larmola L.* Poliittinen Eino Leino.
[9] *Haapala P. et al.* Kansa kaikkivaltias.
[10] *Kortti J.* Generations and Media History. S. 69–93.
[11] *Leino-Kaukiainen.* S. 405–411. *Tuusvuori.* Kulttuurilehti 1771–2007. S. 87–92, 166–167. On the background that lead to the founding of Valvoja, see *Juva.* Valvojan ryhmän syntyhistoria. S. 190–227.
[12] See *Tuusvuori J.* Kulttuurilehti 1771–2007. S. 186–187; *Kortti J.* Ylioppilaslehden vuosisata. S. 29–30; *Klinge M.* Harmo // Ylioppilaslehti. S. 9–11.
[13] *Piiskuri.* Viikon varrelta // Nuori Suomi. 1906. N 7. S. 52–53.
[14] See *Leino-Kaukiainen P.* Perinteiden vaalijat vastaan arvojen särkijät. 1991. S. 435–436.
[15] *Sulkunen I.* Suomi naisten äänioikeuden edelläkävijänä. S. 54.
[16] Only two periodicals during the Bobrikov era were suspended: the political satire magazine Matti Meikäläinen in 1899 for good, and «Finsk Tidskrift» by liberal Swedish speakers for three months in early 1902. *Leino-Kaukiainen P.* Sensuuri ja sanomalehdistö Suomessa vuosina 1891–1905 // Historiallisia tutkimuksia. 126. Helsinki: SHS, 1984. S. 22. See also the English summary. S. 363–370.
[17] *Spectator.* Kirje Helsingistä // Valvoja. 1905. N 10. S. 598.
[18] The pen-name *Spectator* was used by many in *Valvoja*, but in this article the writer is likely to be the linguist, folklorist and Young Finn politician E. N. Setälä, the editor-in-chief of *Valvoja* at that time. Spectator discussed particularly burning political issues in the capital Helsinki (*Leino-Kaukiainen P.* Perinteiden vaalijat vastaan arvojen särkijät. S. 410.)
[19] *Spectator.* Kirje Helsingistä. S. 600.
[20] *Soikkanen H.* Kohti kansanvaltaa 1. S. 78–92; *Jussila O.* Nationalismi ja vallankumous venäläis-suomalaisissa suhteissa 1899–1914. S. 65–86 (cit. 312).
[21] *Igelström V.* Suuren vallankumouksen kynnyksellä // Sosialistinen aikakauslehti 1905 (sample issue). S. 10–14. There was an article by revisionists (Bernstein) and Marxists (Kautsky) («Onko toivottavaa, että sosialidemokratia pääsee voitolle» (Sosialistinen Aikakauslehti. 1905 (sample issue). S. 17–20)).
[22] *Iro.* Katsauksia // Sosialistinen Aikakauslehti. 1905 (sample issue). S. 20–21.
[23] See i.e. «Suulakko eri maissa» // Sosialistinen Aikakauslehti. 1906 (sample issue II). S. 14–18.
[24] *Vares V.* Varpuset ja pääskyset. S. 81, 83.
[25] *S. S.* «Valtiopäivät» // Nuori Suomi. 1906. N 1. S. 4.
[26] *Ståhlberg K. J.* Kansamme tehtävä // Valvoja. 1905. N 11. S. 706–708.
[27] *Tikka.* Kun kansa leikki kuningasta. S. 267.
[28] «...hetkellä, jolloin poliittisten intohimojen laineet löivät korkeina ja kansan syvät rivit astuivat valtiollisen toiminnan näyttämölle jännittynein toivein ja odotuksin» (*Teljo.* Suomen valtioelämän murros 1905–1908. S. 44, 80).
[29] *Tikka M.* Mitä tapahtui. S. 15–41, 41.
[30] *Teljo J.* Suomen valtioelämän murros 1905–1908. S. 41–42.
[31] *Vaselius V.* Onko ihmisellä luontaisia oikeuksia? // Valvoja. 1905. N 11. S. 644–648 (citation, 648).
[32] *Teljo J.* Suomen valtioelämän murros 1905–1908. S. 76–77; *Zetterberg S.* Eero Erkko. S. 379–380.
[33] *O. T.* Helsingin kaupungin valtiomiesvaali // Uusi Suomi. 1906. N 2. S. 11.
[34] *K. B: dt.* Onko perustuslaillisen puolueen olemassaolo vielä suotava? // Nuori Suomi. 1906. N 4. S. 25–26.
[35] H.A.O. Mietteitä puolue-elämästä ja puolueista // Nuori Suomi. 1906. N 6. S. 44–45.
[36] «Kokouksia» // Nuori Suomi. 1906. N 7. S. 54–55.
[37] *Tuhkimo.*Viikon varrelta // Nuori Suomi. 1906. N 19. S. 148–150. On the reactions and activities of the students during and after the great strike, see *Klinge M.* K. T. P: stä jääkäreihin. S. 279–300.

[38] *I. C.* Suhteemme Venäjän vallankumoukseen // Nuori Suomi. 1906. N 27. S. 210–211.
[39] *Spes.* Eduskunnan kokoontuessa // Nuori Suomi. 1907. N 19. S. 149.
[40] *Teljo J.* Suomen valtioelämän murros. S. 134–139.
[41] Radikaalisia valitsijamiehiä. «Radikaalisen valitsijayhdistyksen ehdokkaat» // Nuori Suomi. 1907. N 6. S. 49–50; «Radikaalinen valitsijayhdistys» // Nuori Suomi. 1907. N 7. S. 53; Radikaalisen keskustoimikunnan vaalijulistus // Nuori Suomi. 1906. N 8. S. 65–66. See also *Larmola.* Poliittinen Eino Leino. S. 43.
[42] *Järnström Edv.* Ylioppilaat ja puolueagitatsiooni // Nuori Suomi. 1907. N 17. S. 133–134; *Kyrö Oiva R.* Nuoren Suomen Toimitus ja Ylioppilaiden Keskusteluseura // Nuori Suomi. 1907. N 17. S. 137; Lukijalle // Nuori Suomi. 1907. N 18. S. 139; *L. P.* Nuoren Suomen' toimituksen ero // Nuori Suomi. S. 155–156. See also *Larmola J.* Poliittinen Eino Leino. S. 43.
[43] *Spes.*Kirje maaseututoverille // Nuori Suomi. 1906. N 19. S. 151–152; *K.* Suomalaisesta sivistyksestä // Nuori Suomi. 1906. N 20. S. 157–158.
[44] *Eenokki.* Pakinaa viikon varrelta // Nuori Suomi. 1907. N 21. S. 168–169; *Argus.* Meidän 'kamarimme // Nuori Suomi. 1907. N 28. S. 227.
[45] *Nuori.* Nuorsuomalaisuudesta // Nuori Suomi. 1907. N 33. S. 265–266; *Toivoton.* Nuorsuomalaisuus herää // Nuori Suomi. 1907. N 36–37. S. 279; *Lie Kuka.* Pelastajat // Nuori Suomi. 1907. N 28–39. S. 286–287; *K.* Senaatti ja nuorsuomalainen puolue // Nuori Suomi. 1907. N 38–39. S. 287–288; *Lie Kuka.* Nuorsuomalainen sanomalehdistö nukkuu // Nuori Suomi. 1907. N 40–41. S. 296; *Ylioppilas.* Miksi nuorsuomalainen sanomalehdistö nukkuu? // Nuori Suomi. 1907. N 42–43. S. 305–306.
[46] «Myrskyiset ajathan aina myllertävät meret sekaisin ja nostavat esiin kaiken sen pohjamudankin, jota tavallisissa oloissa emme huomaa» (*H. K.* Julkinen elämämme // Nuori Suomi. 1907. N 26. S. 207–208).
[47] *Ojajärvi J.* Keväinen myrsky kirjallisuudessa. S. 199–221.
[48] Ibid. S. 211–212.
[49] *A. E.* Vapaamielisyys ja sosialistimme // Nuori Suomi. 1907. N 30. S. 239–240.
[50] *Soikkanen H.* Sosialismin tulo Suomeen. S. 363–364; *Alapuro R.* State and Revolution in Finland. S. 116–127.
[51] *H. K.* Julkinen elämämme // Nuori Suomi. 1907. N 26. S. 207–208; H. K. Julkinen elämämme II // Nuori Suomi. 1907. N 27. S. 216–217.
[52] *K.* Eräs valistustehtävä. Huomautus sosialisteillemme // Nuori Suomi. 1907. N 28. S. 225–226.
[53] *Vares V.* Varpuset ja pääskyset. S. 85–108.
[54] *Kortti.* Intellectuals and the State.

References

Alapuro R. State and Revolution in Finland. Berkely; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press, 1988.

Haapala P., Löytty O., Melkas K., Tikka M. Kansa kaikkivaltias. Suurlakko Suomessa 1905. Helsinki: Teos, 2008.

Jussila O. Suomen perustuslait venäläisten ja suomalaisten tulkintojen mukaan 1808–1863. Historiallisia tutkimuksia 77. Helsinki: Suomen historiallinen seura, 1969.

Jussila O. Nationalismi ja vallankumous venäläis-suomalaisissa suhteissa 1899–1914. Historiallisia tutkimuksia, 110. Helsinki: Suomen historiallinen seura, 1979.

Juva M. Valvojan ryhmän syntyhistoria // Turun historiallinen arkisto XI. Turku: Turun historiallisen Yhdistyksen julkaisu XI, 1951.

Klinge M. Kansalaismielen synty: Suomen ylioppilaiden aatteet ja järjestäytyminen ilmentämässä yleisen mielipiteen ja kansalaistietoisuuden kehittymistä v. 1853–1871. Helsinki, 1967.

Klinge M., Harmo M. Ylioppilaslehti. Helsinki: Gaudeamus, 1983.

Korhonen K. Suomen asiain komitea. Suomen korkeimman hallinnon järjestelyt ja toteuttaminen vuosina 1811–1826. Helsinki: Suomen historiallinen seura, 1963.

Kortti J. Generations and Media History// Broadband Society and Generational Changes Series: Participation in Broadband Society. Vol. 5 / Eds. L. Fortunati, F. Colombo. Frankfurt am Main; Berlin; Bern; Bruxelles; New York; Oxford; Wien: Peter Lang, 2011.

Kortti J. Ylioppilaslehden vuosisata. Helsinki: Gaudeamus, 2013.

Kortti J. Intellectuals and the state: The Finnish university intelligentsia and the German idealist tradition // Modern Intellectual History. 2014. N 11. P. 359–384.

Larmola Y. Poliittinen Eino Leino. Nuorsuomalisuus ja poliittinen pettymys Eino Leinon tuotannossa 1904–1908. Helsinki: Otava, 1990.

Leino-Kaukiainen P. Sensuuri ja sanomalehdistö Suomessa vuosina 1891–1905. Historiallisia tutkimuksia 126. Helsinki: SHS, 1984.

Leino-Kaukiainen P. Perinteiden vaalijat vastaan arvojen särkijät — kulttuuripoliittiset keskustelulehdet Finsk Tidskriftin perustamisesta 1950-luvulle // Suomen lehdistön historia 8: Aikakauslehdistön historia. Yleisaikakauslehdet / Ed. P. Tommila. Kuopio: Kustannuskiila Oy, 1991.

Meinander H. Kansallisen katseen lumo // Historian käyttö / Ed. A. Blåfield. Helsinki: Siltala, 2016. S. 63–77.

Ojajärvi J. Keväinen myrsky kirjallisuudessa // Kansa kaikkivaltias. Suurlakko Suomessa 1905 / Eds. P. Haapala, O. Löytty, K. Melkas, M. Tikka. Helsinki: Teos, 2008.

Polvinen T. Die finnischen Eisenbahnen in den militärischen und politischen Plänen Russlands vor dem ersten Weltkrieg. Lahti, 1962.

Soikkanen H. Kohti kansanvaltaa 1. Suomen Sosialidemokraattinen Puolue 75 vuotta, 1899–1937. Helsinki: Suomen Sosialidemokraattinen Puolue — Puoluetoimikunta, 1975.

Soikkanen H. Sosialismin tulo Suomeen. Helsinki: WSOY, 1961.

Sulkunen I. Suomi naisten äänioikeuden edelläkävijänä // Naiset eduskunnassa / Eds. I. Sulkunen, M. Lähteenmäki, A. Korppi-Tommola. Helsinki: Edita, 2006.

Teljo J. Suomen valtioelämän murros 1905–1908. Perustuslaillinen senaatti — viimeiset säätyvaltiopäivät — ensimmäinen eduskunta. Porvoo; Helsinki: Werner Söderström Osakeyhtiö, 1949.

Tikka M. Kun kansa leikki kuningasta. Suomen suuri lakko 1905. Helsinki: SKS, 2009.

Tikka M. Mitä tapahtui// Kansa kaikkivaltias. Suurlakko Suomessa 1905 / Eds. P. Haapala, O. Löytty, K. Melkas, M. Tikka. Helsinki: Teos, 2008.

Tommila P. La Finlande dans la politique européenne en 1809–1815. Helsinki, 1962.

Tuusvuori J. S. Kulttuurilehti 1771–2007. Helsinki: SKS, 2007.

Vares V. Varpuset ja pääskyset. Nuorsuomalaisuus ja Nuorsuomalainen puolue 1870 — luvulta vuoteen 1918. Helsinki: SKS, 2000.

Ylikangas H. Suomen historian solmukohdat. Helsinki: WSOY, 2007.

Zetterberg S. Eero Erkko. Helsinki: Otava, 2001.

Ю. Кортти. Младофинны и парламентская реформа 1906 г. в Финляндии

Отказу Великого княжества Финляндского от сословного сейма и переходу к однопалатному парламенту в 1906 г. предшествовал период так называемой русификации (1899–1905). Парламентская реформа, возможность осуществления которой появилась благодаря революционным процессам в Российской империи, привела к победе на выборах в однопалатный сейм конституционалистов — «младофиннов». В статье исследуется реакция либеральной финской интеллигенции на происходившие в княжестве события. Основными источниками служили публикации в периодической печати.

Ключевые слова: русификация, революция 1905 г., Великое княжество Финляндское, всеобщая забастовка, однопалатный сейм, либеральная интеллигенция, младофинны.

J. Kortti. The Young Finns and the Finnish Parliamentary Reform of 1906

The Finnish unicameral parliament — one of the most modern at the time — was established in 1906. All this took place after the period in which the Tsar — or Emperor as the Finns called him — the Russian governments and Russian nationalists had started the Russification (also known as the 'first years of oppression:' 1899–1905) of Finland, which aimed to limit the special status of the Grand Duchy of Finland. As part of the Russian

revolution of 1905, a general strike in Finland resulted in universal suffrage and the unicameral parliament. Although the strike and parliamentary reform were a victory for the constitutionalists (the 'Young Finns'), the first unicameral parliament election was a great disappointment for this elite. In this article, I examine how the Finnish liberal-minded intelligentsia responded to these turbulent times. The focus of the study is to show how the cultural elite contributed to societal upheaval and political turmoil. The main sources of the article are the Finnish cultural periodicals of the era.

Key words: Russification, Russian revolution of 1905, 'the great strike', unicameral parliament, parliamentary reform, liberal intelligentsia, the Young Finns, cultural periodical.

Kortti, Jukka, Associate Professor, Senior Lecturer Department of Political and Economic Studies Section of Social Science History, University of Helsinki, Finland.

E-mail: jukka.kortti@helsinki.fi