

UDC 94(4)“1918/1920”

DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.15.204964

Dmytro BONDARENKO

Doctoral student, Department of Contemporary History, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at the University of Szeged (Hungary). SZTE Óthalmi diáklakások, Budapesti ut 7, Szeged, Hungary, postal code H-6728 (dbond70@gmail.com)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1608-1282>

ResearcherID: X-9811-2019(<https://www.researcherid.com/rid/X-9811-2019>)

Дмитро БОНДАРЕНКО

докторант кафедри новітньої історії Університету Сегеда (Угорщина), Будапештська дорога, 7, м. Сегед, Угорщина, індекс H-6728 (dbond70@gmail.com)

Бібліографічний опис статті: Bondarenko, D. (2020). The Downfall of the Russian and the Austro-Hungarian Empires, Bolshevism, The Monarchist Counter-revolution, and the Formation of the New Systems of International Relations in Central and Eastern Europe, 1918 – 1920. *Shidnoyevropeiskiy Istorychniy Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 15, 93–103. doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.15.204964

THE DOWNFALL OF THE RUSSIAN AND THE AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN EMPIRES, BOLSHEVISM, THE MONARCHIST COUNTER-REVOLUTION AND THE FORMATION OF NEW SYSTEMS OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE, 1918 – 1920

Abstract. *The aim of this article is to analyze the processes of the revolutionary disintegration of the Empires and the emergence of Bolshevism and the monarchist counter-revolution in the former Russian Empire and Austro-Hungary, as the historical phenomena. The research methodology is based on Leopold von Ranke's and John Tosh's principles of historical study, Pitirim Sorokin's and Oskar Jaszi's revolution theories, Max Weber's theory of state power, as well as theories of international relations, etc. The scientific novelty of this article is the analysis of the phenomena of Bolshevism and the monarchist counter-revolution against the background of the dissolution of the Empires and change of the international order after the First World War. The Conclusions.* The monarchist counter-revolution in Central and Eastern Europe emerged in Russia, Finland, and Hungary as a response to Bolshevism. The factors of the emergence of the monarchist counter-revolution were the following: the existence of strong monarchist traditions in the societies, the presence of the charismatic political and military leaders with monarchist views, and international military support (intervention) from the neighboring monarchies (the German Empire, the Kingdom of Sweden, the Kingdom of Romania). The peak of the monarchist counter-revolution in the former Russian Empire took place during the Brest-Litovsk system of international relations, where Germany played the dominant role. Consequently, the defeat of Germany in the First World War automatically led to the collapse of the Brest-Litovsk system and the monarchist counter-revolution in Russia. Although, the monarchist counter-revolution won in Hungary due to the Romanian intervention but the Kingdom of Hungary remained without a king because of the Allies' pressure. So the monarchist Brest-Litovsk system was replaced by the republican Versailles systems (in Eastern European case – Tartu-Riga system).

Key words: the Downfall of the Russian and the Austro-Hungarian Monarchies, the Dissolution of the Russian and the Austro-Hungarian Empires, Bolshevism, the Russian and the Hungarian Soviet Republics, the Monarchist counter-revolution in Central and Eastern Europe, The Kingdom of Finland, Regent Baron Karl Gustaf Mannerheim, the Kingdom of Hungary, Regent Miklós Horthy, the Ukrainian State, Hetman Pavlo Skoropadsky, the Almighty Don Host, Ataman Petr Krasnov, the Brest-Litovsk and the Versailles Systems of International Relations.

**ПАДІННЯ РОСІЙСЬКОЇ ТА АВСТРО-УГОРСЬКОЇ ІМПЕРІЙ,
БІЛЬШОВИЗМ, МОНАРХІЧНА КОНТРРЕВОЛЮЦІЯ
ТА ФОРМУВАННЯ НОВИХ СИСТЕМ МІЖНАРОДНИХ ВІДНОСИН
У ЦЕНТРАЛЬНІЙ ТА СХІДНІЙ ЄВРОПІ (1918 – 1920 рр.)**

***Анотація. Мета дослідження** – аналіз процесів революційного розпаду Імперій та виникнення більшовизму і монархічної контрреволюції як історичних феноменів в колишній Російській імперії та Австро-Угорщині. **Методологія дослідження** базується на принципах історичного аналізу Леопольда фон Ранке та Джона Тоша, теоріях революції Путирима Сорокіна та Оскара Яси, теорії державної влади Макса Вебера, а також теоріях міжнародних відносин тощо. **Наукова новизна** полягає у вивченні феноменів більшовизму та монархічної контрреволюції на тлі розпаду імперій та зміни міжнародного порядку після Першої світової війни. **Висновки.** Монархічна контрреволюція в Центральній та Східній Європі виникла в колишній Росії, Фінляндії та Угорщині як відповідь на більшовизм. Факторами виникнення монархічної контрреволюції були наступні: наявність міцних монархічних традицій у успіствах, наявність харизматичних політичних та військових лідерів з монархістськими поглядами та міжнародна військова підтримка (інтервенція) з боку сусідніх монархій (Німецька імперія, Королівство Швеція, Королівство Румунія). Пік монархічної контрреволюції в колишній Російській імперії спостерігався під час Брестсько-Литовської системи міжнародних відносин, де Німеччина відіграла панівну роль. Отже, поразка Німеччини у Першій світовій війні автоматично призвела до краху Брестсько-Литовської системи та монархічної контрреволюції в Росії. Водночас монархічна контрреволюція перемогла в Угорщині завдяки румунській інтервенції, проте Королівство Угорщина залишилося без короля через тиск з боку Союзників, що не бажали реставрації Габсбургів. Так, монархічну Брест-Литовську систему було замінено республіканською Версальською системою (у Східноєвропейському випадку – Тарту-Ризькою).*

***Ключові слова:** Падіння Російської та Австро-Угорської монархій, розпад Російської та Австро-Угорської імперій, Більшовизм, Російська та Угорська радянські республіки, Монархічна контрреволюція у Центральній та Східній Європі, Королівство Фінляндія, регент барон Карл Густав Маннергейм, Королівство Угорщина, регент Міклош Горті, Українська Держава, гетьман Павло Скоропадський, Всевелике Військо Донське, отаман Петро Краснов, Брест-Литовська та Версальська системи міжнародних відносин.*

The Problem Statement. The period of 1917 – 1920 in Central and Eastern Europe was characterized by a series of events and controversial processes, such as the revolutionary collapse of the Russian Empire and Austro-Hungary and the formation of the new nation-states in Central and Eastern Europe, the emergence of Bolshevism as a new challenge to the international relations, and the monarchist counter-revolution as a response to Bolshevism. All the above-mentioned processes occurred against the background of the final stage of the First World War and the establishment of the new world order.

It is only natural that as a result of the downfall of the Russian and the Austro-Hungarian Empires, the dynastic statehood was substituted by the nation-state, whereas, in the case of Central and Eastern Europe, Bolshevism suddenly emerged, as a new historical phenomenon, and tried to replace the nation-state by Soviet class state, i.e., the so-called dictatorship of the proletariat. In the new states of Central and Eastern Europe, the only national counter-revolution under effective international support could stop the enlargement of Bolshevism. In this regard, the monarchist counter-revolution was more effective in societies with monarchical traditions (Finland, Hungary). However, we should take into account the international circumstances and influence of the Great Powers on the newly independent states. For instance, if Germany during the Brest-Litovsk system of international relations supported the monarchical form of government in new states, then the Allies during the

Versailles system, on the contrary, preferred to establish the republican regimes in Central and Eastern Europe.

The Analysis of Sources and Recent Researches. First attempts to explain the origin and the trends of the revolution were made by Pitirim Sorokin (Sorokin, 1925) and Pavel Milyukov (Milyukov, 1927) in Russia, and by Oszkár Jászi (Jászi, 1924) in Hungary. In both countries, the peak of the revolution was related to the Bolsheviks coups and the establishment of the so-called Soviet power.

The Bolshevik revolution strived for expansion beyond the geographical boundaries of the nation to rebuild the world as a whole. It should be noted that the successful Bolshevik coups took place in Russia (November 7, 1917), Finland (January 27, 1918), Hungary (March 1, 1919) and Bavaria (April 7, 1919), and also Soviet power was established by the invasion in the following states: Ukraine (several times in 1918, 1919, 1920), Don (1918 and 1920), Latvia and Slovakia (for a short time in 1919). In this regard, the Bolsheviks even invented the concept of the so-called “export-revolution”. The Bolsheviks’ main goal was to destroy all nation-states and create the World Soviet Republic through the “export of revolution” or “triumphal march of Soviet power”. Thus, Soviet Russia became the base for the World revolution. The first analysis of Bolshevism as an international danger was conducted by Pavel Milyukov (Milyukov, 1920).

The counter-revolution process was analyzed by Nikolai Golovin (Golovin, 2011), Arsenyi Zajcov (Zajcov, 2006), Ernest von Wahl (von Wahl, 1936; von Wahl, 1937), Pavel Milyukov (Milyukov, 1927), Sergey Melgunov (Melgunov, 1929), Oskár Jászi (Jászi, 1924).

The very term *Monarchist counter-revolution* was invented by Leon Trotsky, and, initially, it had a pejorative meaning concerning some Russian Whites (Admiral Alexander Kolchak, General Nikolai Yudenich, General Eugene Miller) (Trotsky, 2015, p. 68). However, historians use this term to define a specific part of the White movement, which was eager to restore the monarchy (Ioffe, 1977; Zimina, 1989). Furthermore, Valentina Zimina and Yuri Grazhdanov used the term “*Germanophilic Monarchist Counter-revolution*” to define the restoration regimes in the Ukrainian State, the Almighty Don Host, the Crimea, the Baltic Duchy in 1918 (Zimina, 1989; Grazhdanov, & Zimina, 1997). Indeed, there were two types of the Russian monarchist movement of 1918 after the Brest-Litovsk peace treaty: the Germanophilic which tried to restore the monarchy in Russia through the German political and military support (for example, General Peter Krasnov, Prince Anatol von Liven, Duke Nicolas von Leuchtenberg, etc.) and the Ententophilic which relied on the Allies (for example, Generals Eugene Miller and Nikolai Yudenich, Admiral Alexander Kolchak, etc.).

The Publication’s Purpose. This article focuses on thinking afresh about the dissolution of the Empires and revolution-counter-revolution process and Anti-Bolshevik struggle in Central and Eastern Europe, or more precisely, in Russia, Finland, Ukraine, Don, Hungary, under the circumstances of the transformation of international relations from the Brest-Litovsk to the Versailles system (1917 – 1920).

Statement of the Basic Material. World War I became a final factor in the collapse of dynastic statehood in Central and Eastern Europe, videlicet, the Russian and the Austro-Hungarian Empires. In both cases, the abdication of the Emperor led to the disintegration of the Empire according to the principle of national self-determination: the nation became an object of loyalty and sovereignty instead of the throne (Malahov, 2005, pp. 30–37; von Wahl, 1937, pp. 8–9). For the nations, the abdication of the emperor automatically meant an exemption from the oath of allegiance to the throne (Zajcov, 2006, pp. 13, 34; von Wahl,

1937, p. 11). Generally, during 1918 – 1919 the collapse of both the above-mentioned Empires led to the formation of 33 new states on the territory of the former Russian Empire (January 1918) (Pipes, 1991, pp. 514–515) and 12 of the former Austro-Hungarian monarchy (November 1918). Furthermore, some parts of the territory of the former Empires were retroceded to the neighboring kingdoms such as Romania, Serbia, and Italy.

The disintegration of the Russian Empire (from 1 September 1917 – the Republic) de facto was realized by the Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia, issued by the Council of People's Commissars on 2(15) November 1917, i.e. by the new central government and took place after the abdication of the Emperor on 2(15) March 1917 and before the Armistice in Brest-Litovsk on 15 December 1917. In Austro-Hungary, on the contrary, the dissolution of the Empire occurred on 28–31 October 1918 (De Daruvar, 1974, pp. 67–68), i.e., before the abdication of the Emperor on 11 November 1918 and the Armistices (Padua on 3 November 1918 and Belgrade on 13 November 1918). The disintegration of the Empires was anchored in international law: the Russian – the Brest-Litovsk Treaty on 3 March 1918, and the Austro-Hungarian – the Treaty of Saint-Germain-en-Laye on 10 September 1919 and the Trianon Treaty on 4 June 1920.

Indeed, coming to power in Russia on 7 November 1917, and in Hungary on 21 March 1919, the Bolsheviks proclaimed the so-called dictatorship of the proletariat, i.e., they attempted to establish a class-state instead of the nation-state. More precisely, according to the Bolsheviks' doctrine, the working class should become an object of loyalty instead of the nation. In Vladimir Lenin's opinion, unconditional self-determination should be only the right of the proletariat (Pipes, 1997, pp. 42–43, 45), because the concept of nation is related to capitalism, consequently, a nation should disappear in socialism. Another clear example of the Bolshevik's approach toward the national self-determination issue was demonstrated by Christian Rakovsky during the Russian-Ukrainian Peace Conference in Kiev (May–August 1918). He stressed that the Russian Federative Soviet Republic was founded on the base of self-determination of Worker's Soviets (councils), not by nations. Thus, Soviet Russia recognized the right of self-determination only for the working class, therefore the territory of the Soviet Russian Republic could be spread wherever the Soviet power was established (Lupandin (Ed.), 1999, pp. 19, 37–38, 44, 63–70, 296).

Thus, the Bolsheviks' main goal was to destroy all nation-states and create the World Soviet Republic (Milyukov, 1925, pp. 185–187; Şişcanu, 2010, pp. 146–147). However, at the first stage, they were forced to comply with national demands and formally recognize the self-determination of nations, but then, at the second stage, they planned to enlarge the Soviet rule to the neighboring “bourgeois” and “counter-revolutionary” states (Diner, 2008, pp. 66, 77–78) through the so-called “export of revolution”. So, Soviet Russia and Soviet Hungary became the main threat to the World order after the end of the Great War. For example, Finland and Romania were enunciated by Leon Trotsky and Vladimir Lenin as “the territories of the Russian revolution” (Gromyko & Hvastov (Eds.), 1959, pp. 66–67; Lebedev (Ed.), 1971, pp. 17, 20), and the Russian troops encamped there were the so-called driving forces of Bolshevism's proliferation (Hitchins, 2011, p. 99; Svechnikov, 1923, pp. 39–40; Jussila, Hentila, & Nevakivi, 1995, p. 106; Lebedev (Ed.), 1971, pp. 13–14). As Maria, the Queen of Romania, noted: “*Bolshevism is the main threat at the present moment*” (Lebedev (Ed.), 1985, p. 190–191). A similar statement was made by Pehr Evind Svinhufvud, the head of the Finnish government in April 1918: “*The Finnish government considers Bolshevism as a threat not only to Finland but also to the whole world, therefore, it is inclined to oppose the Bolsheviks in Russia...*” (Holodovsky, 1975, p. 8).

Generally, the Bolsheviks' export of revolution amounted to the aggression against the neighboring states according to the classical scheme: undermining nation statehood from within by the so-called "Soviets" and "revolutionary committees" to make a coup d'état in the capital (for example, in Finland) or even in large provincial centers (in case of Ukraine, it was Kharkov), then "providing international military support" from Soviet Russia. For example, the so-called Finnish Socialist Workers' Republic was proclaimed on 27 January 1918, after the capture of Helsinki, by the Bolsheviks, who were reinforced by the Russian garrison and the Baltic Fleet. The power of the "Finnish Socialist Workers' Republic" was extended only to the southern regions of the country in which the Russian troops were deployed and existed only due to military aid from Soviet Russia.

The Commander-in-chief of the so-called Finnish Red Army (former lieutenant colonel of the Russian Imperial army) Mikhail Svechnikov remarked in his memoirs that the Finnish White Guard waged the war against the Russian 42nd Corps and the sailors of the Baltic Fleet, and the resistance of the Finnish Red Guard came to a naught after the Russian troops' withdrawal (Svechnikov, 1923, pp. 39–105, 107–108). Moreover, the Reds were compelled not only to repel attacks from the front, but also to suppress the insurrections in the rear, and the Finnish Red Guard was not adapted to this aim (Svechnikov, 1923, p. 111). At the same time, the Commander-in-chief of the Finnish White Army, Regent of the Kingdom of Finland, Baron Karl Gustaf Emil Mannerheim remarked: "*If we did not rise to the fight in 1918, Finland would at best become an autonomous region of the Soviet Union without any national freedom, any real statehood and we would not take stand among free nations*" (Mannerheim, 1999, p. 135). Indeed, the Bolsheviks planned to include Finland to "the federation of Soviet republics" (Jutikkala & Pirinen, 1974, p. 216).

In Central and Eastern Europe, the monarchist counter-revolution was brought about as a response to Bolshevism, primarily in Russia and Hungary. The factors of the emergence of the monarchist counter-revolution were as follows:

- Existence of the state's monarchical traditions, for example in Russia, Finland and Hungary;
- Presence of the charismatic political and military leaders with monarchical views: such as General Baron Karl Gustaf Emil Mannerheim, General Peter Krasnov, General Pavlo Skoropadsky, Admiral Miklós Horthy. Some new states with republican forms of rule became the bases of the monarchist counter-revolution in Russia (for instance, the Ukrainian State, the Almighty Don Host, Estonian Republic);
- International support from other monarchies, conducted by interventionist forces, for example, the German and the Austro-Hungarian Imperial troops in the former Russian Empire in 1918, and the Romanian Royal troops in Hungary in 1919.

The main difference between the monarchist counter-revolution and the republican one was the desire to restore the pre-revolutionary order, while the republican counter-revolution sought to establish a new form of government employing the Constituent Assembly, which had to be elected on the principle of universal suffrage. For example, Hetman Pavlo Skoropadsky and Ataman Peter Krasnov repealed all revolutionary laws, adopted not only by the Bolsheviks but also by the Provisional Government of Russia. They denied the very idea of the Constituent Assembly. In Finland, Svinhufvud's government went further by repealing not only revolutionary legislation but even the Constitution of 1809 and restoring the Constitution of 1772. At the same time, the Russian White government of Admiral Alexander Kolchak acted under the slogan of the election of the Constituent Assembly.

If the Bolsheviks usually seized power in capitals of the states, the monarchist counter-revolution used to emerge on the periphery, for example, Vaasa in Finland, Szeged in Hungary, Omsk in Russia.

In general, the monarchist counter-revolution in the new states of the former Russian and Austro-Hungarian Empires should be classified by two types: *the classical or national royalism*, i.e. the desire to retain the monarchy by either restoring the existing dynasty or choosing a new one to legitimate the new nation-state, as clear examples, Hungary in 1920 and Finland in 1918 before Mannerheim's Regency, and *the "export-monarchism"*, i.e. the desire to overthrow Bolshevism and to restore the monarchy in a neighboring state, for example, Germany in 1918 and Finland during Mannerheim's regency in Russia. Even the republican states such as the Ukrainian State, the Almighty Don Host, Estonian Republic tried to restore the monarchy in Russia (Mannerheim, 1999, pp. 177–178; Meri, 1997, pp. 118–119, 124–126, 128; Krasnov, 1991, pp. 215–216, 218, 220–223; Skoropadsky, 1994, pp. 11, 13, 15, 17, 27–28, 105–106; Ahtamzjan, 1963, pp. 99–100, 125, 139, 159; Kirby, 1979, p. 56; Zajcov, 2006, pp. 130, 132, 140, 148; Kenez, 1971, pp. 135, 140, 144–147, 162, 219–220, 238–240, 272).

As history had shown, in Finland, Latvia, and Estonia, the monarchist counter-revolution dominated during the first stage of the struggle against Bolshevism (the Kingdom of Finland (9 August 1918 – 17 July 1919) and the Grand Duchy of Livonia or the Baltic Duchy (12 April – 28 November 1918)), which then lost to the republican forces. As a result, the republics were proclaimed: in Latvia by the Declaration of Independence on 18 November 1918, in Estonia by the reaffirmation of the Manifesto of Independence on 15 May 1919, and in Finland by the adoption of new Constitution on 17 July 1919.

However, as it turned out, the uncompromising position of the Russian White's government, especially Supreme Ruler Admiral Alexander Kolchak, on the issues of recognition of the new states' independence and the delimitation of new frontiers forced the Finnish and Estonian troops to call a halt to their offensive towards Petrograd (Nelidov (Ed.), 1929, pp. 87, 93, 97–98, 100, 113–114, 117, 119–121, 135, 137–140). Thus, the restoration of the old regime in Russia did not take place. Furthermore, Finland and Estonia consented to the Soviet peace proposal (Vlasov & Vlasova, 2005, pp. 138–139). As Colonel Ernest von Wahl noted, the Russian White Forces, who showed the imperial and the great power's views, lost the Civil War against Bolshevism because of their unwillingness to recognize the new political reality after the collapse of the Russian Empire (von Wahl, 1937, pp. 12, 41, 54, 56).

The victory of the counter-revolution and the transition to the regime of restoration in each country had some particularities. For instance, after the Reds were defeated in Finland the Sejm proclaimed the Kingdom of Finland according to the Constitution of 1772 on 18 August 1918 and elected Prince Friedrich-Karl von Hessen-Kassel as a King of Finland Fredrik Kaarle on 9 October 1918. However, as a result of the defeat of Germany and the pressure from the Entente Fredrik Kaarle was forced to abdicate on 12 December 1918. Thus, the Kingdom remained without a king until the new Sejm adopted the republican Constitution on 17 July 1919. During this period General Baron Karl Gustaf Emil Mannerheim functioned as a Regent of the Kingdom of Finland (Ahtamzjan, 1963, p. 101; Mannerheim, 1999, pp. 142–143, 145–147, 151; Jussila, Henttilä, & Nevakivi, pp. 124–125; Punttila, 1975, pp. 112–113).

After Ukraine was liberated from the Bolsheviks by the German and the Austro-Hungarian troops General Skoropadsky's coup d'état was effected in Kiev on 29 April 1918. General Pavlo Skoropadsky was elected as the Hetman, and on that day Ukraine was titled

as the Ukrainian State instead of the Ukrainian People's Republic. The Hetman's foreign policy course was aimed towards the restoration of the monarchy in Russia. Especially it was demonstrated by the Manifesto on 15 November 1918.

During the peak of the Anti-Bolshevik war, the Don Krug (a quasi-parliament) elected General Peter Krasnov as the Ataman on 16 May 1918 and proclaimed the independence of Almighty Don Host on 18 May 1918 (Krasnov, 1991, pp. 191–198). Ataman Peter Krasnov continued the war against Bolshevism for the restoration of the monarchy in Russia.

Thus, restoration in Finland and Don was held by own forces. While, in Ukraine and Hungary, the counter-revolution was brought by bayonets of interventionist troops: the Germans and the Austro-Hungarians in Ukraine and the Romanians in Hungary.

It was the Entente pressure that forced two kingdoms (Finland and Hungary) to exist without their kings. In Finland, after the defeat of the German Empire in the First World War King Friedrich Karl abdicated on 12 December 1918 as a representative of the German (Hessen-Kassel) dynasty. On the same day, the Finnish parliament elected General baron Karl Gustaf Mannerheim, the Commander-in-chief of the Finnish National Army, as a Regent of the Kingdom of Finland (Mannerheim, 1999, pp. 142–143, 145–147, 151; Jussila, Hentila, & Nevakivi, 1999, pp. 124–125). The situation in Hungary was quite different: King Karl IV did not abdicate from the Hungarian throne, but he was faced with the strong opposition of the Entente to see any representative of the Habsburgs as the Hungarian legitimate sovereign (Ormos, 1990, pp. 334, 339, 343–344, 372). Finally, on 1 March 1920, the National Assembly elected Vice-Admiral Miklós Horthy, the Commander-in-chief of the Hungarian National Army, as a Regent of the Kingdom of Hungary (De Daruvar, 1974, p. 79; Horthy, 2000, pp. 130–131; Szilassy, 1971, p. 71).

It should be noted that the armed units of the Russian counter-revolution were formed on the territories of the above-mentioned states (the Kingdom of Finland, the Ukrainian State, the Almighty Don Host, the Baltic Dukedom (then the Estonian Republic)). However, in addition we should note another factor of the monarchist counter-revolution such as the interventionist power. For example, in the case of Russia and Ukraine, it was Germany, and, in the case of Hungary, Romania can be considered as such a power. Germany failed to restore the monarchy in Russia, while the restoration of the monarchy in Hungary took place due to the victory of the Romanian troops over the Hungarian Red army since the Hungarian Whites were very weak to operate effectively against the Reds (Bernad&Kliment, 2015, pp. 32, 34; Preda&Prodan, 2012, pp. 148, 156–157).

Generally, the defeat of the monarchist counter-revolution in Russia related to the defeat of Germany in the First World War. The Day November 11, 1918, Colonel Arseny Zaitsov called “the mourning day of the Russian counter-revolution”, since “the Armistice Day did not become the beginning of the world struggle against Bolshevism” (Zajcov, 2006, pp. 333–334). Pavel Milyukov also drew attention to the fact that the victory of the Entente did not allow to defeat the Reds (Milyukov, 1927, 16, 75). Such statements made sense because the pressure of the Allies led to King Friedrich Karl's abdication and to the downfall of two new states (the Ukrainian State and Almighty Don Host). The Allies also prevented Karol IV to return to his throne and Archduke Joseph Augustus to occupy the throne.

Thus, the culmination of the monarchist counter-revolution in Russia was during the Brest-Litovsk system of international relations, where the German Empire played a dominant role and tried to retain its influence in the Baltic-Black Sea region by the creation of new monarchies, ruled by the German dynasties: the Kingdom of Finland (King Friedrich Karl

von Hessen-Kassel), the Kingdom of Lithuania (King Wilhelm von Urach), the Baltic Duchy (Regent Adolf Friedrich Duke von Mecklenburg-Schwerin), and other buffer states between Germany and Soviet Russia under the German protectorate, such as the Ukrainian State, the Almighty Don Host. In contrast to Germany, the leading powers of the Entente, primarily France, Great Britain, and the United States, linked the recognition of the independence of the new states with the republican form of government, which, in turn, opposed the attempts of the restoration in Russia. For example, the Kingdom of Finland during the period of Karl Gustaf Mannerheim's regency before the proclamation of the republic had actively supported the Russian monarchical forces, but with the adoption of the new Constitution and proclamation of the republic, the country's policy in the "Russian question" changed: the government agreed to the proposal of Soviet Russia to conclude a peace treaty.

As a result of the defeat of Germany in World War I the Brest-Litovsk system in Central and Eastern Europe was replaced by the Versailles system (or the Riga-Tartu system in the case of Eastern Europe). There were several essential differences between these systems. Firstly, the Brest-Litovsk system was unipolar with one center of power – Germany, while the Versailles system was multipolar with France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain, and the USA as leading powers, and is based on the concept of Cordon Sanitaire (with regional key powers such as Finland, Poland, and Romania) against two Soviet states: Russia and Hungary (Kisinger, 1997, pp. 216, 290). Secondly, the ideology of the Brest-Litovsk system was conservatism and monarchism, while the ideology of the Versailles system was liberal democracy and republicanism. Thirdly, Germany as the only center of power was forced to squander its military potential to provide security to the buffer-states, which were more likely objects than subjects of international relations. Consequently, the defeat of Germany during the First World War automatically led to the destabilization and the collapse of the Brest-Litovsk system and, as a result, the enlargement of Bolshevism, that is why it was necessary to establish Cordon Sanitaire. The Versailles system demonstrated the absence of one superpower, and it prompted France and Britain to reinforce the defensive potential of the States of Cordon Sanitaire by providing military and technical support, for instance, Britain – to Estonia and Latvia, and France – to Poland and Romania (Hiden, Made, & Smith (Eds.), 2008, p. 17). As a result, new regional centers of power appeared claiming the role of independent units of international relations: Finland and Romania became the flanks of Cordon Sanitaire (the so-called shields for the Scandinavia and the Balkans), Poland was a center (shield of Central Europe). Thus, Finland occupied the most important strategic position in the Baltic and had the military potential for the occupation of Petrograd and the restoration in Russia in 1918 – 1919 (Holodovsky, 1975, p. 4). Romania fought Bolshevism on two fronts and was the key state of Cordon Sanitaire (Torrey, 2011, pp. 255, 334; Macmillan, 2003, p. 128).

The Brest-Litovsk Peace Agreement did not lead to real peace and stability of international relations in Eastern Europe. The main threat to international security was Bolshevism. That is why, to eliminate this threat, Germany considered the possibility of restoration of the monarchy in Russia under the conditions of retaining of the Brest-Litovsk system. In so far as the Russian monarchist counter-revolution developed in the territories occupied by Germany and in the newly independent states, oriented towards Germany (the Kingdom of Finland, the Ukrainian State, and the Almighty Don Host), the defeat of Germany in the First World War automatically led to the collapse of the Russian monarchist counter-revolution and the renunciation of the German dynasties in Finland and Lithuania.

The conclusions.

1. The First World War did not only lead to the downfall of the dynastic states in Central and Eastern Europe such as the Russian and the Austro-Hungarian Empires but also to the emergence of Bolshevism as a new threat to World Order;

2. Russia and Hungary became the bases for Bolshevism enlargement;

3. The Monarchist counter-revolution emerged as a reply to Bolshevism and to restore the international order and security of new states;

4. One of the important factors of the Monarchist counter-revolution was an intervention from the neighbor monarchies, for example, Germany to Russia and Romania to Hungary;

5. The peak of the Monarchist counter-revolution in Russia took place during the Brest-Litovsk system with the dominant role of Germany;

6. After the defeat of Germany, the Brest-Litovsk system of international relations was replaced by the Versailles system. The Allies' support to the Russian Republican Whites, whose slogan was "Unified and Indivisible Russia", led to the collapse of the monarchist counter-revolution in Russia, and, as a result, to the survival of the Bolshevik regime. Moreover, some new states (the Ukrainian State and the Almighty Don Host) lost their independence and disappeared from the map of Europe. Under these conditions, new regional powers (Finland and Romania) became the flanks of Cordon Sanitaire;

7. If in Finland the counter-revolution won due to its forces, in Hungary, the counter-revolution was carried by Romanian intervention because of the weakness of the Hungarian Whites.

8. The restored monarchies of Finland and Hungary existed without their kings because of the pressure from the Allies.

Acknowledgments. I really appreciate the opportunity to be one of the authors of *The East European Historical Bulletin*. I express my sincere gratitude to the editor of the journal.

I would especially like to thank Béla Tomka and Péter Bencsik, professors of the University of Szeged, for their help and valuable advice during my work on this article.

And I also thank Ludmila Tatsenko for her help and valuable advice while editing the text of this article.

The Funding. No financing has been provided for the author to make his study and prepare and publish this paper.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahtamzjan, A. (1963). *Ot Bresta do Kilja. Proval antisovetskoj politiki germanskogo imperializma v 1918 godu* [From Brest to Kiel. The Failure of Anti-Soviet Policy of the German Imperialism in 1918]. Moskva [Moscow]: IMO, 219 p. [in Russian]

Bernad, D., & Kliment, Ch. (2015). *Magyar Warriors. The History of the Royal Hungarian Armed Forces, 1919 – 1945*. (Vol. I). Solihull: Helion & Co. Ltd, 404 p. [in English]

De Daruvar, Y. (1974). *The Tragic Fate of Hungary*. München: Danubia-Druckerei, 236 p. [in English]

Diner, D. (2008). *Cataclysms. A History of the Twentieth Century from Europe's Edge*. Madison: the University of Wisconsin Press, VIII+322 p. [in English]

Golovin, N. (2011). *Rossijskaja kontrrevolyucija v 1917 – 1918 gg.* [The Russian Counter-revolution in 1917 – 1918]. (Vols. I–II). Moskva [Moscow]: Ajris Press, Vol. I, 564 p., Vol. II, 708 p. [in Russian]

Grazhdanov, Yu., & Zimina, V. (1997). *Soyuz orlov: Beloe Delo Rossii i germanskaya intervencija v 1917 – 1918 gg.* [The Alliance of the Eagles: the White Movement of Russia and the German Intervention in 1917 – 1918]. Volgograd: VAGS, 280 p. [in Russian]

- Gromyko, A., & Hvostov, V.** (Eds.) (1959). *Dokumenty vneshnej politiki SSSR [The Documents on the USSR Foreign Policy]*. (Vol.1). Moskva [Moscow]: Gospolitizdat, 772 p. [in Russian]
- Hidden, J., Made, V., & Smith, D.** (Eds.) (2008). *The Baltic Question During the Cold War*. New York: Routledge, 212 p. [in English]
- Hitchins, K.** (2011). *Ionel Bratianu. Romania*. London: Haus Publishing Ltd, XIII+219 p. [in English]
- Holodovsky, V.** (1975). *Finljandija i Sovetskaja Rossija 1918 – 1920 [Finland and Soviet Russia, 1918 – 1920]*. Moskva [Moscow]: Nauka, 265 p. [in Russian]
- Horthy, N.** (2000). *Memoirs*. Safety Harbor: Simon Pub., 348 p. [in English]
- Ioffe, H.** (1977). *Krah rossijskoj monarhicheskoj kontrrevoljucii [The Failure of the Russian Monarchist Counter-revolution]*. Moskva [Moscow], 320 p. [in Russian]
- Jászi, O.** (1924). *Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Hungary*. London: P. S. King and Son, XXIII+236 p. [in English]
- Jussila, O., Hentilä, S., & Nevakivi, J.** (1999). *From Grand Duchy to Modern State: A Political History of Finland Since 1809*. London: Hurst & Co. Ltd, 398 p. [in English]
- Jutikkala, E., & Pirinen, K.** (1974). *A History of Finland*. London: Heinemann Ltd., IX+291p. [in English]
- Kenez, P.** (1971). *Civil War in South Russia, 1918. The First Year of the Volunteer Army*. Berkeley, & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 351 p. [in English]
- Kinvig, C.** (2006). *Churchill's Crusade. The British Invasion of Russia, 1918 – 1920*. New York: Hambledon Continuum, XX+373p. [in English]
- Kirby, D.** (1979). *Finland in the Twentieth Century*. London: Hurst and Co., X+253p. [in English]
- Kissinger, H.** (1997). *Diplomatija [The Diplomacy]*. Moskva [Moscow]: Ladomir, 903 p. [in Russian]
- Krasnov, P.** (1991). *Vsevelikoe Vojsko Donskoe [The Almighty Don Host]*. *Arxiv Russkoj revoljucii [The Archive of the Russian Revolution]*. Vol. 5. (pp. 190–321). Moskva [Moscow]: Terra & Politizdat. [in Russian]
- Lebedev, N.** (Ed.) (1971). *Istorija Rumynii 1918 – 1970 [The History of Romania, 1918 – 1970]*. Moskva [Moscow]: Nauka, 742 p. [in Russian]
- Lebedev, N. (Ed.)** (1985). *Očerki politicheskoj istorii Rumynii (1859 – 1944) [The Essays on the Political History of Romania (1859 – 1944)]*. Chişinău: Ştiinţa, 479 p. [in Russian]
- Lupandin, O.** (Comp.) (1999). *Myrni peregovory mizh Ukrajyns'koyu Derzhavoyu ta RSFRR 1918 r. Protokoly ta stenogramy plenarnykh zasidan'. Zbirnyk dokumentiv i materialiv [The Peace Negotiations between the Ukrainian State and the RSFSR, 1918. The Protocols and Transcripts of the Plenary Sessions. The Collections of Documents and Materials]*. Kyiv, New York, Philadelphia: M. Kocz', 368 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Macmillan, M.** (2003). *Paris 1919. Six Months that Changed the World*. New York: Random House, 624 p. [in English]
- Malahov, V.** (2005). *Nacionalism kak politicheskaya ideologiya [Nationalism as a Political Ideology]*. Moskva [Moscow]: KDU, 318 p. [in Russian]
- Mannerheim, K. G.** (1999). *Memuary [Memoirs]*. Moskva [Moscow]: Vagrius, 512 p. [in Russian]
- Melgunov, S.** (1929). *Grazhdanskaya vojna v osveschenii P. N. Milyukova. (Po povodu "Rossiya na perelome")*. *Kritiko-bibliograficheskij ochrek. [The Civil War in Milyukov's view. (On "Russia at a Turning Point")*. *The Critique-Bibliographical Essay]*. Paris, 91 p. [in Russian]
- Meri, V.** (1997). *Karl Gustav Mannerheim – Marshal Finljandii [Karl Gustav Mannerheim – the Marshal of Finland]*. Moskva [Moscow]: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 208 p. [in Russian]
- Milyukov, P.** (1920). *Bolshevism: an International Danger. Its Doctrine and Its Practice through War and Revolution*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 304 p. [in English]
- Milyukov, P.** (1925). *Nacional'nyj vopros (Proishozhdenie nacional'nosti i nacional'nye voprosy v Rossii) [The National Question (The Origin of Nationality and National Issues in Russia)]*. Praha [Prague], 193 p. [in Russian]
- Milyukov, P.** (1927). *Rossiya na perelome: bolshevistskij period Russoj revoljucii [Russia at a Turning Point: the Bolshevik period of the Russian Revolution]*. (Vol. II). Paris, 290 p. [in Russian]

Nelidov, N. (Comp.) (1929). Kolchak i Finljandija [Kolchak and Finland]. *Krasnyi Arhiv – The Red Archive*, 2(33), 82–144. [in Russian]

Ormos, M. (1990). *From Padua to the Trianon, 1918 – 1920*. Boulder: Social Science Monographs, 410 p. [in English]

Pipes, R. (1991). *The Russian Revolution*. New York: Vintage Books, A Division of Random House, Inc., 976 p. [in English]

Pipes, R. (1997). *The Formation of the Soviet Union. Communism and Nationalism*. Cambridge & London: Harvard University Press, 392 p. [in English]

Preda, D., & Prodan, C. (2012). *Romania in WWI. A Concise History*. Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing, 187 p. [in English]

Puntila, L. (1975). *The Political History of Finland 1809 – 1966*. London: Heinemann Ltd, 248 p. [in English]

Șișcanu, I. (2010). R.A.S.S. Moldovenească – o replică a Careliei sovietice execută de Kremlin (1924) [Moldavian ASSR – Karelian Soviet Republic as the Creatures of the Kremlin]. *Analele Universității Dunărea de Jos din Galați – The Annals of the University of Lower Danube at Galati. Seria Istorie – History*, 9, 145–162. [in Romanian]

Skoropadsky, P. (1994). “Ukraina budet!” Iz vospominanij [“Ukraine Will Be!”]. From the Memoirs]. *Minuvshee – The Past*, 17, 7–115. [in Russian]

Sorokin, P. (1925). *The Sociology of Revolution*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., XII+428 p. [in English]

Svechnikov, M. (1923). *Revoljucija i Grazhdanskaja vojna v Finljandii 1917 – 1918 gody. (Vospominaja i materialy) [The Revolution and the Civil War in Finland, 1917 – 1918. (the Memoirs and the Materials)]*. Moskva [Moscow], Petrograd [Saint-Petersburg]: Gosizdat, IV+112 p. [in Russian]

Szilassy, S. (1971). *Revolutionary Hungary, 1918 – 1921*. Astor Park: Danubian Press, Inc, 143 p.

Torrey, G. (2011). *The Romanian Battlefield in World War I*. Lawrence: The University Press of Kansas, 440 p. [in English]

Trotsky, L. (2015). *Mezhdú imperializmom i revolyuciej [Between the Imperialism and the Revolution]*. Moskva [Moscow]: Direkt-Media, 249 p. [in Russian]

Vlasov, L., & Vlasova, M. (2005). *Mannerheim i Pol'sha [Mannerheim and Poland]*. Saint-Petersburg: Russkaja voennaja enciklopedija, 224 p. [in Russian]

von Wahl, E. (1936). *Vojna Belyh i Krasnyh v Finlandii v 1918 godu [The War between the Whites and the Reds in Finland in 1918]*. Tallinn, 94 p. [in Russian]

von Wahl, E. (1937). *Znachenie i rol' Ukrainy v voprose osvobozhdenija Rossii ot bol'shevikov na osnovanii opyta 1918 – 1920 gg. [The Significance and the Role of Ukraine in the Issue of Liberation of Russia from the Bolsheviks on the Basis of the Experience of 1918 – 1920]*. Tallinn, 72 c. [in Russian]

Zajcov, A. (2006). *1918: Ocherki istorii Russkoj Grazhdanskoj vojny [1918: the Essays on the History of the Russian Civil War]*. Moskva [Moscow]: Kuchkovo pole, 368 p. [in Russian]

Zimina, V. (1989). *Krah germanofil'skoj monarxicheskoj kontrrevolyucii na Yuge Rossii v gody Grazhdanskoj vojny i intervencii [The Failure of the Germanophilic Monarchist Counter-revolution in South Russia During the Civil War and the Intervention]*. Kalinin: KGU, 87 p. [in Russian]

The article was received on September 21, 2019.

Article recommended for publishing 20/05/2020.