

Krzysztof Latawiec

Maria Curie-Skłodowska University, Poland

ORCID: 0000-0003-2741-162X

krzysztof.latawiec@umcs.pl

Investigating the Position of Customs District Chief in the Kingdom of Poland in the Early 1850s*

*Institucja naczelnika okręgu celnego w Królestwie Polskim
na początku lat 50. XIX w.*

ABSTRACT

The way in which customs district chiefs functioned in the Kingdom of Poland in the early 1850 has not received much attention so far, either among traditional historians or researchers of administrative structures. The position of customs district chief was one of the most important posts in the customs administration of the Russian Empire. Clerks employed on this position were supervisors of institutions and structures of border guards operating on the border of the Romanov monarchy. Customs district chief would execute all the orders from the Foreign Trade Department of the Ministry of Finance as well as from other central administrative structures of the Russian state at that time. The present article took under close scrutiny archival and printed sources to arrive at the delineation of competences of customs district chiefs as introduced in the Kingdom of Poland in January 1851. Their rights and obligations, even though specified by a separate customs act prepared for the Kingdom of Poland, were identical with competences of clerks of the same kind operating in other parts of the Russian Empire. The findings of the study largely expand the state of knowledge on the operation of Russian administrative structures in the second half of the 19th century in the Kingdom of Poland, one of the provinces of the Romanov absolute monarchy.

Keywords: Kingdom of Poland; Russian Empire; customs administration; clerk

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS: Krzysztof Latawiec, PhD, Dr. Habil., Professor of the University, Maria Curie-Skłodowska University (Lublin), Faculty of History and Archeology, Plac Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej 4a, 20-031 Lublin, Poland.

* Project of the National Science Centre, Poland, decision no. 2015/19/B/HS3/01132, titled: "Customs administration in the Kingdom of Poland in the years 1851–1914. Competences – structures – people".

INTRODUCTION

The end of the 1830s brought to the Kingdom of Poland the first changes leading to the unification of the Kingdom of Poland and the remaining areas of the Russian Empire. After the parliament and armed forces had been dismissed, typically Russian administrative solutions began to be adapted to the Vistula Country. Territorial structures of the Ministry of Public Education and Ministry of Communication emerged this way. Nevertheless, the changes did not stop there. It was decided that a unified customs territory would have been created, which would result in dismissing the Polish customs administration and establishing a Russian equivalent in its place. In the following article, I will aim at answering a number of research questions, i.e.: What prompted the Russian authorities to dismiss the customs autonomy of the Kingdom of Poland? How did it happen that the Russian customs administration was introduced in the territories of the Kingdom of Poland while still preserving the influence of the Viceroy, Count Ivan Paskevich, on its operations? What was the role of the customs districts' chiefs in the functioning of the Russian customs apparatus, and what was the area of their responsibility? The analysis of the presented research issues is based on archival sources from the Russian State History Archives in St. Petersburg and the Latvian State History Archives in Riga, printed sources in the form of Russian customs acts and regulations, and the "Customs Act for the Kingdom of Poland", as well as the available publications on this issue.

RESEARCH AND RESULTS

Toward the end of the fourth decade of the 19th century, the Kingdom of Poland was significantly different from the remaining territories of the Russian Empire in terms of political system. After the fall of the November Uprising, the office of the Viceroy of the Kingdom of Poland was granted to Count Ivan Paskevich. All power was centred in his hands and guaranteed to him by the Organic Statute of the Kingdom of Poland from 1832, which he executed with the help of the established Chancellery of the Viceroy of the Kingdom of Poland, as well as central authorities in the form of government commissions already existing since 1816. The issue of the customs administration's functioning fell within responsibilities of the Governmental Commission for Revenues and Treasury in Warsaw. This situation was a result the autonomy maintained by the Kingdom of Poland, which was manifested by treating this territory as a separate customs area, separated from the rest of the Empire's territories by the customs border. Revenues from customs duties went to the treasury of the Kingdom of Poland.

They were mainly allocated to the maintenance of the local state administration and judiciary.¹

The exceptional situation taking place in the Kingdom of Poland lasted for almost two decades after the fall of the November Uprising. At this point, one should question the reasons for this state of affairs. Count Ivan Paskevich, as the governor of the Kingdom of Poland and Tsar Nicholas I's trusted man, could afford to carry out his own domestic policy in this part of Russia, which was consistent with the interests of Russia's autarchy. He had full control over the entire administrative apparatus due to structures of military and police administration that operated from 9/21 September 1831 (based on the instructions from 31 October/12 November 1831). Additionally, as the Viceroy, he could influence the selection of people for offices at all levels of the general and specialised administration.² Thus, the majority of initiatives of St. Petersburg's bureaucrats, gathered around Nicholas I and aiming at turning the Kingdom of Poland into a typical Russian province situated on the fringes of the Empire, was in the majority of cases neutralised by Count Ivan Paskevich's activities, undoubtedly protecting the importance of his station and influence.

Why did I. Paskevich oppose the rapid incorporation of the Kingdom of Poland to the Russian customs area? All indicates that preserving the autonomy in this area offered a chance to administer financial resources independent from the central authorities and deposited in Warsaw. Moreover, even though the budget of the Kingdom of Poland had to be accepted by the State Council in St. Petersburg in line with the Organic Statute, I. Paskevich managed to become independent of the Russian Empire's Ministry of Finance. This state of affairs satisfied I. Paskevich, a man with great political ambitions and unlimited power in the Kingdom of Poland. It seems that this was a factor which weighed into a relatively late termination of the customs independence of the Kingdom of Poland.

It is also not possible to remain indifferent to the presentations by the influential bureaucrats in St. Petersburg (in the form of projects willing to change the existing financial situation in the Kingdom of Poland). The floor on this matter was taken particularly by the Ministers of Finance, who were influencing Nicholas I to a greater or lesser extent. The Russian Empire – wishing to maintain its dominant position in the international arena and acting as Europe's gendarme – required huge

¹ See T. Demidowicz, *Statut Organiczny Królestwa Polskiego w latach 1832–1856*, “Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne” 2010, vol. 62(1), pp. 135–165; Ye. Pravilova, *Finansy imperii. Den'gi i vlast' v politike Rossii na natsional'nykh okrainakh. 1801–1917*, Moskva 2006, pp. 58–63.

² “Dziennik Urzędowy Województwa Mazowieckiego” 1831, no. 9, pp. 61–63; L. Gorizontow, *System zarządzania Królestwem Polskim w latach trzydziestych–pięćdziesiątych XIX wieku*, “Przegląd Historyczny” 1985, vol. 76(4), pp. 717–718. More broadly on the power of the Viceroy of the Kingdom of Poland after 1831, see L. Mażewski, *Namiestnik Królestwa Polskiego 1815–1874. Model prawny a praktyka ustrojowopolityczna*, Radzymin 2015, pp. 109–121.

financial means to pay for the armed forces. The extending bureaucratic machinery was also consuming considerable financial resources from the state budget. Therefore, in the second half of the 1830s, the first initiatives to abolish the customs independence of the Kingdom of Poland emerged.³ The perspective to take over full control of a relatively long section of the Empire's western border, which offered considerable revenues due to the customs duties resulting from an intensive trade with the Kingdom of Prussia and the Austrian Empire, was undoubtedly a factor supporting the implementation of the customs system's unification in Russia.

The first works leading to terminating customs independence of the Kingdom of Poland began at the beginning of the 1840s. It is interesting that it was not immediately decided that the rules of the Russian Customs Act from 1819 (numerously amended) should be extended to the territory of the Kingdom of Poland. It should be questioned why such a simple solution was not used. It is likely that I. Paskevich was the reason behind the development of the entirely new regulations. The Viceroy wanted to avoid a situation in which he would be deprived of any influence over the customs administration functioning in the Kingdom of Poland. Thus, he aimed at preparing a separate legal act regulating the activity of the customs apparatus, as well as the procedure of collecting customs duties. The issue of writing the Customs Act was handled by the "Committee for Removing the Customs Line between the Empire and the Kingdom of Poland", established especially for this purpose in 1845. It worked under the supervision of I. Paskevich, which gave him a chance to control and influence the final result of the activities.⁴ It should be added that the officials representing Duke I. Paskevich, delegated from the Governmental Commission for Revenues and Treasury, were actively taking part in consultative works and made comments on the already developed project.⁵ Duke I. Paskevich himself

³ H. Radziszewski, *Zniesienie linii celnej pomiędzy Królestwem Polskim a Cesarstwem Rosyjskim w roku 1850*, "Biblioteka Warszawska" 1907, vol. 266(796), p. 3; W.P. Tekely, *Polityczne i ekonomiczne przesłanki zniesienia granicy celnej pomiędzy Królestwem Polskim a Cesarstwem Rosyjskim*, [in:] *Studia z historii państwa, prawa i idei. Prace dedykowane profesorowi Janowi Malareczkowi*, eds. A. Korobowicz, H. Olszewski, Lublin 1997, p. 421.

⁴ Apart from I. Paskevich, the Committee included: Karol Nesselrode, Nicholas Orlov, Ignacy Turkuł, and Leoncjusz Samojłow. See R. Kołodziejczyk, *Miasta, mieszczaństwo, burżuazja w Polsce w XIX w. Szkice i rozprawy historyczne*, Warszawa 1979, p. 23. Moreover, a commission led by the DHZMF vice-director, DHZMF Charles Frederick Grosschopf, which included the representatives of the Governmental Commission for Income and Treasury, State Council, and the Ministry of Finance operated in St. Petersburg from 18/30 April 1846. See W.P. Tekely, *Polityczne...*, pp. 426–427; idem, *Rozmieszczenie komór celnych w Królestwie Polskim po zniesieniu granicy celnej pomiędzy Królestwem Polskim a Cesarstwem Rosyjskim*, [in:] *Z historii państwa, prawa, miast i Polonii. Prace ofiarowane profesorowi Władysławowi Ćwikowi w czterdziestolecie pracy twórczej*, eds. J. Ciągwa, T. Opas, Rzeszów 1998, p. 249.

⁵ W.P. Tekely, *Zniesienie granicy celnej pomiędzy Królestwem Polskim a Cesarstwem Rosyjskim – skutki dla Skarbu Królestwa (zarys problematyki)*, [in:] *Podstawy materialne państwa. Zagadnienia prawnohistoryczne*, eds. D. Bogacz, M. Tkaczuk, Szczecin 2006, pp. 104–105; idem,

made comments on the Act's project during the final stage of legislative works.⁶ Similar activity was undertaken by the other party representatives, i.e. the Russian Ministry of Finance and State Council, who participated in specific negotiations.⁷ Ultimately, the project of the Customs Act was accepted by Tsar Nicholas on 5/17 November 1850. The document was made public on 30 November/12 December of the same year.⁸

Even though the "Customs Act for the Kingdom of Poland" was signed by Nicholas I in mid-November 1850, it was in force only from 1/13 January 1851. Considerable part of its content was borrowed from the customs regulations which were in force for European trade in Russia's territory (codified in the Russian Empire's Book of Laws from 1842 and its supplements published between 1843 and 1848). It was reflected in the content of the Act's Article 183, which stated: "The customs service in the Kingdom of Poland remains under the authority of the Ministry of Finance, particularly of the Department of External Trade, on the same terms as the customs service in the Empire".⁹

There is one aspect that should also be noted. The Customs Act provisions also included completely new elements, reflecting the uniqueness of the administrative apparatus' organisation (emphasising the influence of the Viceroy of the Kingdom of Poland on some areas of the customs apparatus' activities) and the specificity in which the judicial organs operated in the territory of the Kingdom of Poland. The position of the Viceroy of the Kingdom of Poland toward the customs administration was outlined in the Customs Act's Article 184. It clearly emphasised that only the Viceroy's orders (as the representative of the administrative power in the Kingdom of Poland) were to be carried out strictly by the Russian customs administration in this territory.¹⁰

The new Customs Act provided for the functioning of three customs districts in the Kingdom of Poland: Virbalis, Kalisz, and Zawichost, within which a specific

Stanowisko Komisji Rządowej Przychodów i Skarbu w sprawie zniesienia granicy celnej pomiędzy Królestwem Polskim a Cesarstwem Rosyjskim, [in:] *Przez tysiąclecia. Państwo – prawo – jednostka*, eds. A. Lityński, M. Mikołajczyk, vol. 1, Katowice 2001, pp. 148–160.

⁶ Rossiyskiy Gosudarstvennyy Istoricheskiy Arkhiv [hereinafter: RGIA], fond 19, opis 3, delo 181, fol. 53–53v.

⁷ W.P. Tekely, *Zniesienie granicy...*, pp. 104–105.

⁸ Official printing of the Customs Act for the Kingdom of Poland was made in the DHZMF printing house in Petersburg. See *Polnoye Sobraniye Zakonov Rossiyskoy Imperii, sobraniye II* [hereinafter: PSZRI II], vol. 25, otdeleniye vtoroye, 1850, Sankt Peterburg 1851, no. 24598, p. 48. In the Kingdom of Poland, copies of the Customs Act (in both Russian and Polish) were printed in the Governmental Printing House at the Commission for Governmental Justice. See *Ustawa celna dla Królestwa Polskiego*, Warszawa 1851, hereinafter: UCKP.

⁹ UCKP, pp. 116–117; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, p. 71.

¹⁰ UCKP, pp. 116–117; "Dziennik Urzędowy Guberni Warszawskiej" 1851, no. 16, p. 365.

number of customs offices and units was to operate.¹¹ It also specified (Article 26) the issues of overseeing the management of administrative and territorial units of the Department of External Trade of the Ministry of Finance (DHZMF). In other words: “Each Customs District remains under the management of the District’s Chief who supervises all Customs Offices and Customs Units which belong to the District. The following officials are added to the above-mentioned Viceroy: Officials for special commissions, Secretary, and Scribes, the number of whom is indicated in full-time positions”.¹²

The very institution of the customs district chief emerged in the territory of the Russian Empire with a Decree on the implementation of a new customs administration for the European trade signed by Tsar Alexander I on 24 June/6 July 1811. This legal act introduced the institution of a customs district to the customs administration structures. Pursuant to its provisions, 11 customs districts were established along the entire border of the Russian Empire, across which the trade with European countries was carried out (Arkhangelsk, Saint Petersburg, Reval, Riga, Liepāja, Palanga, Radvýliv, Dubāsari, Odessa, Feodosia, and Taganrog).¹³ Then, the legal act, in paragraph 3, clearly defined the customs district organisation. Namely, each of the customs districts was managed by the customs chief. He supervised all the customs offices and customs units, and the customs guard military units operating in the territories of a given customs district.¹⁴

At the time of announcing the proclamation that established the institution of the customs district chief, the issue of supervising the customs administration in the Russian Empire was entrusted to the Trade Collegium. However, already on 25 June/7 July 1811, another legal act emerged, instituting a new internal structure of the Ministry of Finance. It brought into being the DHZMF. Its responsibilities included supervision of foreign trade as well as management of the customs administration in the entire Russian Empire.¹⁵ The DHZMF started operating only on 25 October/6 November 1811. This situation was caused by the need to properly

¹¹ UCKP, pp. 18–21; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, p. 51; *Svod Zakonov Rossiyskoy Imperii* [hereinafter: SZRI], *Svod uchrezhdeniy i ustavov tamozhennykh*, vol. 6, Sankt Peterburg 1857, pp. 12–13; K. Lyatavets, *Tamozhennyye uchrezhdeniya v Tsarstve Polskom v 50–60 gg. XIX veka*, [in:] *Istoriya torhivli, podatkov ta myta. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats*, ed. O.O. Dyachok, Dnipropetrovsk 2007, p. 125; G. Smyk, *Administracja publiczna Królestwa Polskiego w latach 1864–1915*, Lublin 2011, p. 280.

¹² UCKP, pp. 20–21; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, p. 51; K. Lyatavets, *op. cit.*, p. 127.

¹³ RGIA, fond 1152, opis 1, 1811 god, delo 42, fol. 14–15v; *Polnoye Sobraniye Zakonov Rossiyskoy Imperii, s 1649 goda* [hereinafter: PSZRI], vol. 31, 1810–1811, Sankt Peterburg 1830, no. 24684, pp. 681–684; D.S. Radaide, *Razvitiye tamozhennoy sistemy Rossii po yevropeyskoy granitse v 1811–1819 gg.*, “Uchenyye zapiski Tavricheskogo natsionalnogo universiteta im. V.I. Vernadskogo. Yuridicheskiye nauki” 2012, vol. 25(2), p. 351.

¹⁴ RGIA, fond 1152, opis 1, 1811 god, delo 42, fol. 14; PSZRI, vol. 31, 1810–1811, no. 24684, p. 681.

¹⁵ PSZRI, vol. 31, 1810–1811, no. 24688, pp. 740–741.

prepare the new institution at central level, which – without compromising the central administration management and the enforcement of customs duties – would effortlessly take over the responsibilities and issues of the decommissioned Trade Collegium.¹⁶

Adoption of the legal act establishing the institution of the customs district chief did not end the process of defining its rights and duties. In the following decades of the first half of the 19th century, a set of legal acts was adopted, which conferred new, extended, or specified the already existing rights and duties of the head of the customs district in the Russian Empire.¹⁷

Let us look at the process of selecting suitable people for the position of quite a high rank. The later part of the Customs Act included a regulation that specified clearly the procedure of appointing the customs district chief. Due to the rank of this position and the scope of rights and responsibilities defined for this office, it was decided that (Article 42) “due to the fact that the customs service requires experience from the Officials, none of the higher position in the customs, i.e. the position of the Districts’ Chiefs, (...) cannot be a person who had not previously served in the Customs Department”.¹⁸

This implied the necessity to appoint to the position only the officials who had experience in working in the structures of the customs administration. These requirements made it impossible to practise – very popular at that time in Russia – procedures of translocating either serving or retired officers to vacant positions in the civilian administration. These attempts were a panacea for the lack of people able to occupy the newly established full-time positions in various administrative structures.

Having experience in working for customs department was the most important requirement for a candidate applying for the position of the customs district chief.

¹⁶ Trade Collegium was closed on 8/20 November 1811. See PSZRI, vol. 31, 1810–1811, no. 24938, p. 942; PSZRI, vol. 32, 1812–1815, Sankt Peterburg 1830, no. 24955, pp. 13–14.

¹⁷ See Latvijas Valsts Vēstures Arhīvs [hereinafter: LVVA], fonds 545, apraksts 2, lieta 61, fol. 15, 18v; LVVA, fonds 545, apraksts 2, lieta 77, fol. 4–4v; RGIA, fond 19, opis 4, delo 9, fol. 17; RGIA, fond 1152, opis 1, 1819 god, delo 88, fol. 23v–25; PSZRI, vol. 34, 1817, Sankt Peterburg 1830, no. 26874, p. 342; PSZRI, vol. 36, 1819, Sankt Peterburg 1830, no. 28030, pp. 472–478; PSZRI, vol. 40, 1825, Sankt Peterburg 1830, no. 30446, pp. 417–419; PSZRI II, vol. 2, 1827, Sankt Peterburg 1830, no. 1282, pp. 645–647; PSZRI II, vol. 11, otdeleniye vtoroye, 1836, Sankt Peterburg 1837, no. 9620, pp. 116–117; SZRI, *Ustavy Kazennogo Upravleniya, chast’ vtoraya*, Sankt Peterburg 1832, p. 11; *Stat’i K Shestomu Tomu Svoda*, [in:] *Prodolzheniye Svoda Zakonov Rossiyskoy Imperii, izdaniya 1842 goda*, vol. 10: *S 1 Iyulya po 31 Dekabrya 1847 goda*, Sankt Peterburg 1848, p. 20; K. Latawiec, *Rosyjska straż graniczna w Królestwie Polskim w latach 1851–1914*, Lublin 2014, pp. 28–31.

¹⁸ UCKP, pp. 28–29; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, p. 52; E. Buchek, *O polozhenii sluzhashchikh tamozhennykh organovpo Tamozhennomu ustavu 1850 g. dlya Tsarstva Polskogo (1850–1868 gg.)*, “Leningradskiy yuridicheskij zhurnal” 2016, vol. 46(4), p. 11.

The aspect of order in the appointment to this position should also be noted. The Customs Act (Article 57) on this issue had the following provision: “The Districts’ Chiefs (...) will be appointed via the presentation of the Director of the Department of External Trade, made for the Ministry of Finance, with the mutual consent by the Minister and the Viceroy before the Supreme Decision”.¹⁹

The article with this provision clearly indicates that the nomination was dependent on the decision (acceptance of the candidate) by the Viceroy of the Kingdom of Poland. This is confirmed by Count I. Paskevich’s involvement in the final edition of the Customs Act, who aimed at minimalizing the limitation of his role in shaping the personnel policy of the most prominent positions in the customs administration in the Kingdom of Poland.

The Customs Act regulated the issue of the headquarters’ location for the customs district chiefs and their headquarters. It assumed that these officials would stay in a place where the major office was located in the area of a given customs district.²⁰ According to this provision, the chancelleries of the districts’ chiefs should be situated in places with the offices of the 1st class. However, this was not the case. The chiefs’ headquarters were located in the following manner: Virbalis District – in Łomża, Kalisz District – in Kalisz, and Zawichost District – in Zawichost.²¹

Key position in the customs management in the Kingdom of Poland belonged to those who were best paid. Rudimentary salary of 857.76 rubles per annum was to provide for basic living conditions. Moreover, each of the chiefs received an allowance for renting a business apartment (285.9 rubles per annum). People realised the difficulties associated with access to buildings owned by the state treasury, where it was possible to place the official we are interested in together with his potential family. Specificity of the position, which required to fulfil the supervising and controlling tasks, enforced the necessity to travel around the customs district territory, and therefore the legislator provided for these officials an assignment of another financial allowance (just as in the Empire) to cover the costs of business travels (285.9 rubles per annum). Apart from this, the man managing the customs district had at his own disposal a fund of 150 rubles for the chancellery expenses.²²

The customs district chiefs had the right to uniforms used in the structures of the Russian Ministry of Finance. Its style was defined in the Act of the Civil Service from 1842. The official uniform of the officials we are interested in was classified in the 5th category, alongside i.e. presidents of tax offices or those managing Offices

¹⁹ UCKP, pp. 34–35; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, p. 53.

²⁰ UCKP, pp. 134–135 PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, pp. 75–76.

²¹ RGIA, fond 19, opis 3, delo 956, fol. 319, 332, 353; UCKP, pp. 8–9.

²² A fund for chancellery’s expenses was usually spent on purchasing necessary stationery products. However, it could also be used to employ an additional scribe. See UCKP, pp. 84–85; *Prilozheniya*, [in:] PSZRI II, vol. 25, *otdeleniye vtoroye*, 1850, Sankt Peterburg 1851, pp. 245–246.

of the Bank of Trade in Moscow and Odessa.²³ It should be added that, similarly to the situation in the Empire, if the position of the customs district chief was taken held by a person who had been an officer of the Russian Army in the past, he also had the right to wear his military uniform.²⁴

It is also worth addressing the issue of financial awards. The previous section mentioned the additional income obtained by the customs district chiefs from funds received from customs duties (3% of the customs duty went to the state treasury). A regulation allowing for financial gain on this account was also included in the Customs Act (Article 129).²⁵ Taking into consideration the importance of the held position, the districts' chiefs could rely on a significant financial boost from this source. Moreover, there was a possibility to raise additional funds from savings made during the activities for the customs administration. Money that was not spent on the officials' salaries due to the vacancies was distributed among people who were actively working at the time. The decision to grant funds depended on the DHZMF director and the Minister of Finance.²⁶

The customs district chief could receive a financial award also for stopping smuggling. However, this was possible only when the head of the district participated in the mission to intercept contraband (i.e., managing the mission's course at the scene).²⁷

The post we are interested in belonged to the most important positions in the territorial structures of the customs administration. It is indicated by the Customs Act provisions, in which the tone for the sub-sections was specifically indicating the customs district chiefs (Articles 209–227). It defined the rights and duties of the heads of the customs districts. It is worth taking a closer look here at cases the officials had to work on in the three districts mentioned above. This is how Article 209 of the Act defined the position of the official were are interested in the management apparatus: “The Customs District Chiefs supervise and administer all the Customs Offices, Units, and border guards in the District assigned to them, they strictly observe the implementation of regulations, as well as ordinances of the Supreme Authority, and they are responsible for this”.²⁸

They had a supreme authority over the operating customs offices (offices, units), as well as the armed military formation – border guards. It is interesting that one more type of office was provided for in the territories of the Kingdom of Poland, i.e. customs communication points (*tamozhennyi perekhodnyy punkt*). Their existence

²³ UCKP, pp. 80–81; SZRI, *Svod uchrezhdeniy gosudarstvennykh i gubernskikh, chast' tretiya. Ustav o sluzhbe grazhdanskoy*, Sankt Peterburg 1842, pp. 419–420.

²⁴ UCKP, pp. 82–83.

²⁵ *Ibidem*, pp. 86–87, 100–103; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, pp. 65, 68.

²⁶ UCKP, pp. 98–99; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, p. 68.

²⁷ UCKP, pp. 612–613; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, p. 174.

²⁸ UCKP, pp. 128–129; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, p. 74.

depended on the needs associated with facilitating communication with people living in the areas near the border who worked in agriculture and trade.²⁹ They also had the administrative supervisions of the customs district chiefs. However, it should be added that the Storage Customs Office in Warsaw was excluded from the authority of the district's chiefs for it was directly managed by the DHZMF.³⁰

The heads of the customs districts were obliged to execute ordinances of the superior administrative bodies. It should not be surprising that the Act did not include a provision clearly defining these superior bodies. Taking into consideration that the suspension of the customs independence in the Kingdom of Poland was a kind of a compromise between Duke I. Paskevich and bureaucrats from St. Petersburg, it is necessary to outline these business relationships. As has already been mentioned, the customs district chief was a subordinate of the DHZMF in the Empire. Similar solution was of course used in the Kingdom of Poland, but this territory's rather unique specificity regarding the organisation of the administrative apparatus, as well as political conditions, was also taken into consideration. The customs district chiefs had to take into account the necessity to implement the decisions of the Viceroy of the Kingdom of Poland. Not to mention the establishment of the specific Customs Department of Chancellery of the Viceroy of the Kingdom of Poland on 1/13 January 1851. The officials we are interested in also had to be ready to keep in touch and cooperate with the military administration structures represented mainly by military chiefs (established in 1831) of five governorates of the Kingdom of Poland (of Augustów, Płock, Warsaw, Płock, and Lublin), who held a superior position in comparison with all the field structures of the civilian administration. One has to point out also the necessity of cooperating with structures at the governorate level of the civilian administration (governor, governorate authorities) in matters associated with conducting investigations about violating the Customs Act.³¹

The customs district chiefs had an absolute authority over all the officials employed in customs offices and border guard officers. They supervised proper execution of their duties. Similarly, they kept in mind to ensure that the process of collecting customs duties from people working in trade was carried out without any delays and that it was in line with the established regulations.³² If there were any circumstances impacting the limitation of trade (external factors beyond the control

²⁹ UCKP, pp. 14–15; A. Górak, K. Latawiec, *Rosyjska administracja specjalna w Królestwie Polskim 1839–1918*, Lublin 2015, p. 33.

³⁰ UCKP, pp. 20–21; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, p. 51; E. Buchek, *Pravila vzimaniya poshlin po obshchemu tamozhennomu tarifu po yevropeyskoy torgovle Rossiyskoy imperii i tsarstva Polskogo 1850 g. (1850–1857 gg.)*, "Leningradskiy yuridicheskiy zhurnal" 2016, vol. 46(4), p. 24; T. Demidowicz, *Statut...*, p. 161.

³¹ UCKP, pp. 118–119, 140–141; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, pp. 72, 77.

³² UCKP, pp. 128–129; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, p. 74.

of the district's chief or internal ones stemming from the customs offices' activity) or detrimental to public or private interests, the head of the district was obliged to identify the case and inform the DHZMF about the existing facts.³³

As has already been mentioned, a man managing the customs district had a direct administrative supervision over the subordinate offices. This supervision was carried out in a few ways. The first one regarded the management of correspondence received by the district's chief from the subordinate offices. Most often these included: reports informing about the fact of intercepting or confiscating the goods; accounts presenting activity of customs offices and customs units in a statistical manner (the amount of imposed customs duties, the value of the declared goods, etc.); documents on issues associated with customs supervision (information on resigning from or being appointed to a position by officials on leave, etc.); officials' individual requests.³⁴ In exceptional cases and in pressing matters, he resolved all disputes that took place in customs offices, the solution of which was not provided for in implementing rules issued by the DHZMF. However, he had to inform the superior authorities about issuing the decision. Procedure for proceeding in the cases of extraordinary importance was very different. An issue requiring resolution, which could not be decided on in the district's headquarter, was immediately directed via the district's chief (together with the opinion he had written) to the DHZMF where it was examined (after it was resolved, it was once again sent to a given customs office via the district's chief).³⁵

The second method for supervising the subjected customs offices by the custom district chiefs was to make direct inspections. Revisions of customs offices were to be done by them at least twice a year. This control was to include all the aspects associated with the customs office's activities (safekeeping of financial sums, officials' activities, records' keeping, etc.).³⁶ It is worth noting that there could also be a need for revision because of denunciation against a given customs office (Article 219). In this case, the head of the district was forced to inform the Viceroy of the Kingdom of Poland and the Minister of Finance about the incident. Apart from the revision, the two men could influence the introduction of special precautions to explain the entire situation.³⁷ Additionally, other circumstances (decrease in revenues in customs duties, complaints about violation of official duties by the officials, etc.) could influence the directive on extraordinary revision and take action against people guilty of breaking the law.³⁸ This issue was regulated in

³³ UCKP, pp. 130–131; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, p. 75.

³⁴ UCKP, pp. 130–131, 138–139; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, pp. 74–76.

³⁵ UCKP, pp. 138–139; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, p. 76.

³⁶ UCKP, pp. 134–135; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, p. 76.

³⁷ UCKP, pp. 136–137; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, p. 76.

³⁸ UCKP, pp. 138–139 PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, p. 76.

Article 220 of the Customs Act in the following words: “The Districts’ Chiefs who noticed negligence and malpractice in the Offices’ activities that cause damage to customs revenues, are required to order an investigation and suspend the guilty, and make a report to the Department of External Trade, and also inform the customs Department of the Chancellery of the Kingdom’s Viceroy; on the other hand, the Officials and Employees who were suspended are required to be kept away from the office and submitted to Court, about which the Department should be informed”.³⁹

What is more, the head of the district – having the information gathered as a result of revision or investigation procedure about the officials neglecting their official duties, who for various reasons could no longer hold the position or whose behaviour was not befitting the state administration’s functionaries – could lead to their dismissal (Article 221). If these officials were appointed to the position by the district’s chief, he had the right to make them redundant. In every other case, the dismissal was done by the DHZMF upon application of the head of the customs district.⁴⁰ Similarly to the Empire’s territories, the heads of the districts were obliged to immediately inform the DHZMF about the death of people who had held class positions in the subordinate structures.⁴¹

Addressing issues associated with the necessity to supervise and control the offices subordinate to the district’s chief, it should be emphasised that the officials we are interested in were not always implementing these tasks personally. The head of the district very often delegated supervising activities to the already mentioned officials for special assignments. They had broad prerogatives with respect to controlled offices due to the fact of implementing tasks entrusted to them by their superiors. In an extraordinary situation (absence of officials for special assignments caused by conducted investigations, illness, leave, vacancy; multitude of conducted control activities), the control functions could be implemented by secretary from the chancellery of the customs district chief.⁴² It should be added that the officials for special assignments very often carried out investigations aimed at finding the guilty of letting contraband through, later stopped deep into the Kingdom of Poland by people who were not employed in the civilian administration structures or by border guards.⁴³

It is noteworthy that the district chiefs were also authorised to control documents, which stemmed from the activities of customs offices subordinate to him or the border guard structures. All the accounting documents as well as the chan-

³⁹ UCKP, pp. 136–137; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, p. 76.

⁴⁰ *Ibidem*.

⁴¹ Information on an official’s death had to have an explanation of the death’s circumstances (time, place, reason). See UCKP, pp. 38–39.

⁴² *Ibidem*, pp. 138–141; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, pp. 76–77.

⁴³ UCKP, pp. 130–131; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, pp. 74–75.

cellery's tasks were subject to revision. When any irregularities were noticed in meeting the rules regulating the office management (bypassing regulations, failure to apply chancellery regulations, disorder in archived documents), the head of the customs district instructed the introduction of a recovery program, and he took action against those guilty of committing offences (reprimand, reproof, application for dismissal from service). He was obliged to inform the DHZMF about the existing irregularities. Additionally, he was also obliged each year to submit a report about office management to the management of the customs department in St. Petersburg.⁴⁴

Those who run customs districts had a possibility – although to a small extent – to shape the personnel policy in the offices subordinate to them. Customs offices often employed people for non-class or non-full-time positions. They were mainly represented by chancellery officials (scribes) and freelance writers. The officials we are interested in could apply to the DHZMF director to employ the representatives of this group on class and full-time positions, supporting it by the experience these people had after a longer period of work in the customs department.⁴⁵ Similarly, the customs district chiefs could fill the posts of customs superintendents who were auxiliary staff in offices and units.⁴⁶

As has already been mentioned, before 1850 the customs districts chiefs in the Empire had been given the right to grant leaves to their subordinate officials. These prerogatives were also given to the heads of three customs districts in the Kingdom of Poland. According to Article 83 of the Customs Act, they granted leaves to their subordinate officials, appointed to the posts by the DHZMF, for the period of 8 days. Others, who were granted the appointment from the district's chief, were entitled to a leave of up to 4 months. When granting leaves, the officials we are interested in were obliged to: inform the DHZMF about the fact of granting a leave; issue leave passports to officials who had transferred their position on the basis of transfer protocol; carry out a vacation policy so that it did not negatively impact the functioning of the office.⁴⁷

Having superior authority over their subordinate territory and all people employed in the customs administration bodies, the district chiefs could apply for awarding official ranks and other official awards (orders, medals, badges of honour, financial awards) to full-time employees of their chancelleries, customs offices, customs units and the border guard officers. They were obliged to direct suitable

⁴⁴ UCKP, pp. 136–137; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, p. 76.

⁴⁵ UCKP, pp. 34–35. Many people who were not educated that well started their work in the customs administration structures working as casually employed scribes who were later promoted to full-time positions of chancellery officials. See RGIA, fond 21, opis 11, delo 237, fol. 673–680, 754–757.

⁴⁶ UCKP, pp. 46–47.

⁴⁷ *Ibidem*, pp. 50–55; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, pp. 57–58.

requests regarding the awards to the DHZMF, because decisions on granting official rank or award were made in St. Petersburg by the Department of the Ruling Senate's Heraldry, Minister of Finance, and the reigning monarch. Before selecting the lower-rank border guards to the award, the district chiefs had been obliged to verify their conduct during their service so that the distinctions would be granted to people worthy of receiving this honour.⁴⁸

Duties of the customs district chiefs also included taking care of the state treasury's interests in court hearings on cases on violating the Customs Act (smuggling). Similarly to the situation in the Empire, the head of the district delegated one of his subordinate officials as his representative (a deputy) in the ongoing investigation (preliminary investigation) taking place outside of the structures of the customs administration (conducted by the structures of general administration or local criminal courts).⁴⁹

Analysing rights and duties of the customs district chiefs in the territories of the Empire before 1851, it was pointed out that there had been a necessity to take care of building infrastructure of the Customs Ministry by the officials we are interested in. These issues were also addressed in the Customs Act announced for the Kingdom of Poland. Regarding this matter, the Act (Article 216) stated the following: "The Chiefs of Districts watch over the good maintenance of customs buildings and border guards' houses. In the case of damaging the building they are – having received a report about it – obliged to make an inspection of the place in a stated order, and if it is not proven that the damage resulted from indolence or lack of supervision, and when a need for repairs arises, they should prepare a cost estimate and plan, and present it to the Department of External Trade; in turn, small reparations requiring haste and not exceeding the cost of one hundred rubles should be managed by them having informed the Department about it. Having discovered negligence in the maintenance of the buildings, they also report about it to the Department".⁵⁰

While implementing their duties on their subordinate building infrastructure, the customs district chiefs were obliged to file a report each year (on 20 January/ 1 February) about the condition of utility buildings in the areas administered by them. This documentation allowed the DHZMF to be aware of technical situation of buildings as well as a potential planning of expenses for the maintenance of this infrastructure in individual customs districts. Preparing the reports by the heads of the districts was only one of the tasks related to the supervision of buildings. The

⁴⁸ Appointment to an official rank or an award (order, medals) was granted on the basis of the tsar's supreme decision. See UCKP, pp. 54–55, 66–67; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, pp. 58, 61.

⁴⁹ UCKP, pp. 140–141; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, p. 77.

⁵⁰ UCKP, pp. 132–133; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, p. 75; "Dziennik Urzędowy Guberni Warszawskiej" 1851, no. 16, p. 366.

actual implementation of construction and renovation works was also interesting. The Kingdom of Poland had different building regulations from those that were in force deep in the Empire.⁵¹ All the erected buildings (private and state-owned) in the Kingdom of Poland were subject to construction supervision. These cases stayed within the jurisdiction of the operating provincial authorities, which (having been accepted by the Governmental Committee for Internal and Religious Affairs or General Council for Construction, Surveying, Roads and Rivers) approved architectural plans, construction cost estimates, and gave permission to start a construction investment.⁵² The customs district chiefs had to supervise the condition of buildings used by the customs ministry structures on an ongoing basis. In order to obtain funds for construction or renovation he was obliged to inform the DHZMF in advance, which granted relevant authorisation to undertake the works and planned costs associated with the infrastructure's development and maintenance. He could do it on the basis of documents issued by the governorate authorities with information on building's technical condition and potential costs of conducting the investment. The Customs Act recommended that the construction and renovation works should be carried out in April-September. Works were planned to be finalised towards the end of September at the latest so that the representatives of the governorate authorities could inspect them in accordance with the previously approved cost estimate of all the works.⁵³

Since 1851 the customs ministry structures in the Kingdom of Poland have not been owners of all the real estates and buildings where customs offices and branches of border guard were situated. This situation was a result of a few factors. The Governmental Commission for Revenues and Treasury did not manage to open its own building premises for the operating offices and units in the period when the Polish customs administration was operating. It was due to the unwillingness to spend funds for purchasing a real estate. Attempts were made to situate the customs offices in the buildings that belonged to the state treasury. However, not every town along the border had buildings that were in the hands of the state. For this reason, the Governmental Commission for Revenues and Treasury was in many cases dependent on leasing the estate together with buildings for purposes related to the activities of the customs administration. Since the Russian customs

⁵¹ From September 1820, the Kingdom of Poland commonly used *Przepisy ogólne Policji budowniczej dla miast w Królestwie Polskim* together with the later supplementary regulations. See *Zbiór przepisów administracyjnych Królestwa Polskiego. Wydział Spraw Wewnętrznych*, part 1: *Gospodarstwo miejskie*, vol. 2, Warszawa 1866, pp. 338–355; C. Krawczak, *Prawo budowlane na ziemiach polskich od połowy XVIII wieku do 1939 roku*, Poznań 1975, pp. 103–104.

⁵² See *ibidem*; T. Demidowicz, *Rada Ogólna Budownictwa, Miernictwa, Dróg i Splawów – najwyższe kolegium techniczne Królestwa Polskiego 1817–1867*, "Kwartalnik Historii Nauki i Techniki" 1992, vol. 37(2), pp. 85–91.

⁵³ UCKP, pp. 132–135; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, p. 75.

administration took the place of the dissolved Polish customs structures from 1/13 January 1851, it was forced to take over the same buildings. It is not without reason that the Customs Act included a provision that regulated the issue of leasing buildings for the purpose of operating offices. This matter was regulated as follows: “The Chiefs of the Districts have a right to approve contracts and agreements on renting houses for Customs offices and lower ranks of customs service, as well as on renting ships and carriers if the contract sum does not offer three hundred rubles; contracts for higher sums must be presented to the Department of External Trade. It is also recommended that the Chiefs of the Districts, under the responsibility, had the lease prices of accommodation, ships and carriers as moderate as possible and, if possible, favourable to the Treasury (...)”.⁵⁴

The above-mentioned provision gave the chiefs the right to approve of contracts and agreements linked with the lease of buildings and means of water transport. This latter issue was caused by the fact that the border of the Russian state, where the customs and border supervision in the Kingdom of Poland was carried out, ran across water reservoirs (lakes, rivers) and possessing these funds was necessary for maintaining the supervision over the trade that used rivers (Vistula, Warta, Niemen). The head of the district usually accepted the terms of contract’s project or agreement. Its finalization (contract conclusion) would take place with the use of the operating notary public office closest to the property’s location, which was covered by the agreement. The party representing the customs ministry was always a person who acted on the basis on authorization issued by the chief of the customs district. It should be added that the value of the contract or agreement had an impact on the entire process associated with finalizing the whole enterprise. In the case of concluding a contract of the value exceeding 300 rubles, one had to expect delays in finalizing the entire matter due to the necessity of presenting the contract to the DHZMF’s approval.

As has already been mentioned, the chiefs of the districts had prerogatives associated with managing the border guard structures as part of their competences. This formation started its activity in the Kingdom of Poland just like the Russian customs administration, i.e. on 1/13 January 1851. The Customs Act on this uniformed formation defined the scope of competences of the officials we are interested in in the following way: “It is a direct responsibility of the Chiefs of the Districts to accurately and cautiously protect the border at every point, deploy border guards in order to stop misappropriation according to the location of a place that requires a stronger or weaker supervision, and perform obligations strictly and without neglect by the border guard”.⁵⁵

⁵⁴ UCKP, pp. 134–135; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, p. 75.

⁵⁵ UCKP, pp. 128–131; SZRI, vol. 6, Sankt Peterburg 1857, p. 64; K. Latawiec, *Rosyjska...*, p. 138.

It was the chief of the customs district who was responsible for the location of border guard posts (being its supervisor)⁵⁶ so that they would protect the state border better from the inflow of contraband and reduce the threat of uncontrolled passenger traffic. It was meant to be facilitated by the establishment of mobile columns that operated, unpredictably for smugglers, in various points along the border as well as outside it.⁵⁷

The customs district chiefs acted as superiors to the commanding staff of the border guard (3 brigade commanders, 19 company commanders, 99 top-guards, 99 assistants to top-guards and 9 auxiliary officers).⁵⁸ However, all the decisions regarding this group were made by the DHZMF director, with the consent of the Minister of Finance and Viceroy of the Kingdom of Poland.⁵⁹ The officials we are interested in had a much more extensive range of powers with respect to lower-rank officers in the border guard (sergeant majors, horse and foot guards). These officers originated from military units of the Russian army. Soldiers were directed to the border guard mainly to serve for an appropriate amount of time intended for military duty. Soldiers who were on leave or already retired were also sent here. The customs district chiefs had the following powers (rights and duties) with respect to them: to replace foot guards with horse guards and vice versa; to direct guards who were unfit to implement custodian tasks due to physical disabilities (or chronic diseases) to the posts of watchmen in the customs offices and customs units; to make redundant and send to the disabled wards those who were unfit to implement custodian tasks due to permanent disability; to dismiss from service and send to the units of internal guards those who were burdened with bad addictions (questionable moral attitude) or who were committing offences; to make suitable annotations in service conditions' lists about committed crimes or undergoing investigations; to ensure the correct keeping of alphabetic lists of all the border guard officers who served in this formation; to send applications to the DHZMF for degradation of board guards who were noncommissioned officers but serving in the military in case they were meant to be sent to the internal guard; to inform the military chiefs of governorates about the fact of transfer, dismissal, and death of soldiers who were on leave, but who had done military service in the border guard; to present

⁵⁶ UCKP, pp. 24–25.

⁵⁷ *Ibidem*, pp. 130–131; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, p. 74.

⁵⁸ *Prilozheniya*, [in:] PSZRI II, vol. 25, p. 248.

⁵⁹ The heads of the customs districts had the right to translocate higher guards and their assistants from one place to another. The district's chief was obliged to inform the DHZMF about all these activities. Every death of a border guard officer also had to be immediately reported, together with the death's circumstances, to the DHZMF. See UCKP, pp. 38–39, 150–151; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, p. 79; K.E. Lyatavets, *Upravleniye delami Pogranichnoy strazhi v Tsarstve Polskom v 1851–1864 gg.*, [in:] *Regionalnoye upravleniye i problema effektivnosti vlasti v Rossii (XVIII – nachalo XXI veka)*, eds. Ye.V. Godovova, S.V. Lyubichankovskiy, Orenburg 2012, p. 150.

to the DHZMF the lists of border guards of lower-rank (at the request of brigade commander), who deserved to receive stripes or to have more stripes added; to submit to the DHZMF accounting documents regarding the treatment of lower-rank guards in medical care institutions (hospitals, lazarets, etc.).⁶⁰

The customs district chiefs also played a very important role in the matters associated with confiscating the goods which were detained on the basis of a decision made by customs office or customs unit in connection with suspicion of smuggling (violation of the Customs Act). Owners of the goods, or their proxies, had a right of appeal against the conclusion of the customs office which had issued the administrative decision on confiscating the goods. The appeal was submitted (within 7 days from the decision on the confiscation) directly to the chief of the customs district or via the suitable customs office. The head of the customs district was obliged to examine the entire case and, if necessary, he could also use detailed explanations prepared by the customs office which issued the decision on confiscating the goods. The opinion of the district's chief, together with all the documents, was sent (Article 994) to the Customs Department of Chancellery of the Viceroy of the Kingdom of Poland. In addition, the head of the district had to inform the DHZMF about the whole incident.⁶¹

Consideration should also be given to activities of the customs district chiefs regarding the approval of decisions on intercepting contraband. If the value of the intercepted goods was estimated in the range of 30 to 60 rubles, the decision of the customs office (office or unit) was approved by the head of the district in accordance with Article 1007 of the Customs Act.⁶²

Among powers of the officials, we are interested in one can also find those associated with dispensing awards to people who were not employed in the customs administration, but clearly contributed to ending smuggling. The customs district chief had the power to grant such an award of up to 90 rubles. If he had considered it was seemly to grant more than 90 rubles, he had to address the matter to the superior authorities (DHZMF).⁶³

Selling the goods was strictly related with the issue of pricing and confiscating the goods due to the violation of the Customs Act. If no protest was expressed with respect to the goods or if the appeal of the goods' owner was negatively considered, the confiscated goods were then sold at a public auction. The chief of the customs district had the right to announce an auction of goods if their value was estimated

⁶⁰ LVVA, fonds 545, apraksts 2, lieta 81, fol. 2; RGIA, fond 19, opis 4, delo 74, fol. 2; UCKP, pp. 44–47, 50–51, 74–75, 78–79, 96–97, 146–147, 150–151; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, pp. 62–63, 67, 78–79.

⁶¹ UCKP, pp. 560–561; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, p. 163.

⁶² UCKP, pp. 568–569; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, p. 165.

⁶³ UCKP, pp. 574–575; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, p. 166.

between 30 to 60 rubles. Moreover, he could choose where to sell them. If the value of the goods was estimated at 60 rubles or exceeded this value, it was then necessary to get a permission from the DHZMF.⁶⁴

The Customs Act for the Kingdom of Poland from 1850 defined rules for the functioning of the entire customs administration as well as the procedure for claiming customs duties in three customs districts situated in this territory. Nevertheless, the legislator anticipated a situation where it was necessary to supplement the Act with explanatory or completely new regulations (key for carrying out customs policy). Corrections to the Customs Act were possible due to a mutual agreement between the Viceroy of the Kingdom of Poland and the Minister of Finance.⁶⁵ The analysis of legal acts issued for the customs ministry after 1/13 January 1851 showed that by the time of issuing the amended Customs Act for the Russian Empire (in 1857), there had been several various regulations which in their content referred to the function of the institution of the chief of the customs district in the territories of the Kingdom of Poland.⁶⁶

Having presented the legal basis for the activities and scope of powers of the customs district chief in the Kingdom of Poland, consideration should be given to personnel policy in relation to this position in the first years of its functioning in the territory we are interested in. The necessity to guarantee an operating efficiency of the customs administration's bodies in the new territory required employment of officials with many years of experience in working for the field structures of the DHZMF. Therefore, when determining the personnel for the three posts of the chiefs of the customs districts after consulting the DHZMF Director, the Minister of Finance reached for people who guaranteed the precision and effectiveness of running customs offices. The full-time positions we are interested in were taken on 1/13 January 1851 by: Karl Leopold von Daehn (von Dehn) (1851–1854) – Virbalis Customs District, Paweł Edward Hackel (1851–1853) – Kalisz Customs District, and Dmitrij Prjanisznikow (1851–1863) – Zawichost Customs District. All the men had quite a lot of professional experience. P.E. Hackel, a Lutheran, son of a pastor from the Curland Governorate, before arriving in Kalisz and after leaving the Semyonovsky Life Guards Regiment in January 1831, he spent the next two decades holding various positions in the DHZMF field structures (including the last 14 years as the chief of the customs district in Arkhangelsk and Radziwiłłów). D. Prjanisznikow, an Orthodox, he came from the heritable nobility of the Oryol

⁶⁴ UCKP, pp. 588–591; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, p. 169.

⁶⁵ UCKP, pp. 116–117; PSZRI II, vol. 25, no. 24598, p. 71.

⁶⁶ LVVA, fonds 545, apraksts 2, lieta 81, fol. 19, 20v; RGIA, fond 19, opis 4, delo 74, fol. 27, 28v; RGIA, fond 21, opis 11, delo 318, fol. 12v, 30v; PSZRI II, vol. 26, otdeleniye pervoye, 1851, Sankt Peterburg 1852, no. 25050, p. 209; PSZRI II, vol. 27, otdeleniye pervoye, 1852, Sankt Peterburg 1853, no. 25944, pp. 47–77; PSZRI II, vol. 29, otdeleniye pervoye, 1854, Sankt Peterburg 1855, no. 28067, pp. 295–296, and no. 28488, pp. 741–742.

Governorate. From November 1822 for the next 18 years, he served in various military units of the tsarist army and in structures of the military administration. He started his work for the customs administration in November 1840. Just before the appointment to the full-time job as the chief of Zawichost Customs District, he had worked as a director of the Harbour Customs Office in Taganrog. The head of the Virbalis Customs District, K.L. von Daehn, was a Lutheran who came from an ennobled rank of the Grand Duchy of Finland and, just like his predecessors, he had several years of experience in serving the Russian armed forces. From mid-April 1844, he was the chief of Grodno Customs District. He played an important role in gathering the personnel for the Russian customs offices in the Kingdom of Poland in the last weeks of 1850.⁶⁷ As you can see, the first heads of the customs districts in the Kingdom of Poland belonged to a group of the most experienced officials that the DHZMF had at their disposal in the Russian Empire. It is noteworthy that their successors to these positions also belonged to a group of men with a suitable substantive and practical.

The above-mentioned arguments do not exhaust the topic of the chief's institution of the customs districts in the Kingdom of Poland at the beginning of the 1850s. Many issues about their daily lives and how they were perceived by Polish society are discussed in subsequent works. These are very important topics, which have already been pointed out in publications by Andrzeja Chwalba or Grzegorz Smyk.⁶⁸

CONCLUSIONS

The emergence of the institution of a customs district chief was a novelty in the territory of the Kingdom of Poland. In order to implement the unification postulates regarding the functioning of a uniform customs area, it was decided to introduce the already developed model of the administrative apparatus which was working on enforcing and executing customs duties in the Russian Empire for four decades. One of the key elements of this system was the customs district chief who had supreme authority over customs offices and border guard structures. The model of the Russian customs administration was integrated into the administrative landscape so that the Viceroy of the Kingdom of Poland, as the highest-ranking official in this

⁶⁷ K. Latawiec, A. Górak, J. Legieć, S. Bogdanow, *Naczelnicy organów rosyjskiej administracji specjalnej w Królestwie Polskim w latach 1839–1918. Słownik biograficzny*, vol. 2: *Ministerstwo Finansów*, Lublin 2016, pp. 91–93, 96–99, 125–128; K. Latawiec, *Personnel policy of the Foreign Trade Department of the Ministry of Finance in the Kingdom of Poland in the years 1850–1862*, "Historia i Świat" 2021, vol. 10, pp. 289–290.

⁶⁸ See A. Chwalba, *Polacy w służbie Moskali*, Warszawa 1999, passim; G. Smyk, *An Attitude of Polish Society Towards Russian Bureaucracy in the Kingdom of Poland after the January Uprising*, "Studia Iuridica Lublinensia" 2021, vol. 30(1), pp. 289–305.

territory, also had an influence on its activities. A clear manifestation of an attempt to emphasise a certain independence of the Viceroy of the Kingdom of Poland was to lead to the issuance of a separate customs act with a number of provisions presenting the differences of this area from the rest of the Empire's territories. The office of the customs district chief, introduced in January 1851, became permanent in the territory of the Kingdom of Poland, while the scope of his rights and responsibilities was extended and modified by successive legal regulations issued for the entire customs administration in the territory of the Russian Empire.

REFERENCES

Archival sources

- Latvijas Valsts Vēstures Arhīvs, fonds 545, apraksts 2, lieta 61.
Latvijas Valsts Vēstures Arhīvs, fonds 545, apraksts 2, lieta 77.
Latvijas Valsts Vēstures Arhīvs, fonds 545, apraksts 2, lieta 81.
Rossiyskiy Gosudarstvennyy Istoricheskiy Arkhiv, fond 19, opis 3, delo 181.
Rossiyskiy Gosudarstvennyy Istoricheskiy Arkhiv, fond 19, opis 3, delo 956.
Rossiyskiy Gosudarstvennyy Istoricheskiy Arkhiv, fond 19, opis 4, delo 9.
Rossiyskiy Gosudarstvennyy Istoricheskiy Arkhiv, fond 19, opis 4, delo 74.
Rossiyskiy Gosudarstvennyy Istoricheskiy Arkhiv, fond 21, opis 11, delo 237.
Rossiyskiy Gosudarstvennyy Istoricheskiy Arkhiv, fond 1152, opis 1, 1811 god, delo 42.
Rossiyskiy Gosudarstvennyy Istoricheskiy Arkhiv, fond 1152, opis 1, 1819 god, delo 88.

Literature

- Buchek E., *O polozhenii sluzhashchikh tamozhennykh organovpo Tamozhennomu ustavu 1850 g. dlya Tsarstva Polskogo (1850–1868 gg.)*, "Leningradskiy yuridicheskiy zhurnal" 2016, vol. 46(4).
Buchek E., *Pravila vzimaniya poshlin po obshchemu tamozhennomu tarifu po yevropeyskoy torgovle Rossiyskoy imperii i tsarstva Polskogo 1850 g. (1850–1857 gg.)*, "Leningradskiy yuridicheskiy zhurnal" 2016, vol. 46(4).
Chwałba A., *Polacy w służbie Moskali*, Warszawa 1999.
Demidowicz T., *Rada Ogólna Budownictwa, Miernictwa, Dróg i Sławów – najwyższe kolegium techniczne Królestwa Polskiego 1817–1867*, "Kwartalnik Historii Nauki i Techniki" 1992, vol. 37(2).
Demidowicz T., *Statut Organiczny Królestwa Polskiego w latach 1832–1856*, "Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne" 2010, vol. 62(1).
Gorizontov L., *System zarządzania Królestwem Polskim w latach trzydziestych–pięćdziesiątych XIX wieku*, "Przegląd Historyczny" 1985, vol. 76(4).
Górak A., Latawiec K., *Rosyjska administracja specjalna w Królestwie Polskim 1839–1918*, Lublin 2015.
Kołodziejczyk R., *Miasta, mieszczaństwo, burżuazja w Polsce w XIX w. Szkice i rozprawy historyczne*, Warszawa 1979.
Krawczak C., *Prawo budowlane na ziemiach polskich od połowy XVIII wieku do 1939 roku*, Poznań 1975.

- Latawiec K., *Personnel policy of the Foreign Trade Department of the Ministry of Finance in the Kingdom of Poland in the years 1850–1862*, "Historia i Świat" 2021, vol. 10,
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34739/his.2021.10.13>.
- Latawiec K., *Rosyjska straż graniczna w Królestwie Polskim w latach 1851–1914*, Lublin 2014.
- Latawiec K., Górak A., Legieć J., Bogdanow S., *Naczelnicy organów rosyjskiej administracji specjalnej w Królestwie Polskim w latach 1839–1918. Słownik biograficzny*, vol. 2: *Ministerstwo Finansów*, Lublin 2016.
- Lyatavets K., *Tamozhennyye uchrezhdeniya v Tsarstve Polskom v 50–60 gg. XIX veka*, [in:] *Istoriya torhivli, podatktiv ta myta. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats*, ed. O.O. Dyachok, Dnipropetrovsk 2007.
- Lyatavets K.E., *Upravleniye delami Pogranichnoy strazhi v Tsarstve Polskom v 1851–1864 gg.*, [in:] *Regionalnoye upravleniye i problema effektivnosti vlasti v Rossii (XVIII – nachalo XXI veka)*, eds. Ye.V. Godovova, S.V. Lyubichankovskiy, Orenburg 2012.
- Mażewski L., *Namiestnik Królestwa Polskiego 1815–1874. Model prawny a praktyka ustrojowo-polityczna*, Radzymin 2015.
- Pravilova Ye., *Finansy imperii. Den 'gi i vlast' v politike Rossii na natsional'nykh okrainakh. 1801–1917*, Moskva 2006.
- Radayde D.S., *Razvitiye tamozhennoy sistemy Rossii po yevropeyskoy granitse v 1811–1819 gg.*, "Uchenyye zapiski Tavricheskogo natsionalnogo universiteta im. V.I. Vernadskogo. Yuridicheskiye nauki" 2012, vol. 25(2).
- Radziszewski H., *Zniesienie linii celnej pomiędzy Królestwem Polskiem a Cesarstwem Rosyjskiem w roku 1850*, "Biblioteka Warszawska" 1907, vol. 266(796).
- Smyk G., *Administracja publiczna Królestwa Polskiego w latach 1864–1915*, Lublin 2011.
- Smyk G., *An Attitude of Polish Society Towards Russian Bureaucracy in the Kingdom of Poland after the January Uprising*, "Studia Iuridica Lublinensia" 2021, vol. 30(1),
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17951/sil.2021.30.1.289-305>.
- Tekely W.P., *Polityczne i ekonomiczne przesłanki zniesienia granicy celnej pomiędzy Królestwem Polskim a Cesarstwem Rosyjskim*, [in:] *Studia z historii państwa, prawa i idei. Prace dedykowane profesorowi Janowi Malarczykowi*, eds. A. Korobowicz, H. Olszewski, Lublin 1997.
- Tekely W.P., *Rozmieszczenie komór celnych w Królestwie Polskim po zniesieniu granicy celnej pomiędzy Królestwem Polskim a Cesarstwem Rosyjskim*, [in:] *Z historii państwa, prawa, miast i Polonii. Prace ofiarowane profesorowi Władysławowi Ćwikowi w czterdziestolecie pracy twórczej*, eds. J. Ciągwa, T. Opas, Rzeszów 1998.
- Tekely W.P., *Stanowisko Komisji Rządowej Przychodów i Skarbu w sprawie zniesienia granicy celnej pomiędzy Królestwem Polskim a Cesarstwem Rosyjskim*, [in:] *Przez tysiąclecia. Państwo – prawo – jednostka*, eds. A. Lityński, M. Mikołajczyk, vol. 1, Katowice 2001.
- Tekely W.P., *Zniesienie granicy celnej pomiędzy Królestwem Polskim a Cesarstwem Rosyjskim – skutki dla Skarbu Królestwa (zarys problematyki)*, [in:] *Podstawy materialne państwa. Zagadnienia prawno-historyczne*, eds. D. Bogacz, M. Tkaczuk, Szczecin 2006.

Legal acts

- "Dziennik Urzędowy Guberni Warszawskiej" 1851, no. 16.
- "Dziennik Urzędowy Województwa Mazowieckiego" 1831, no. 9.
- Polnoye Sobraniye Zakonov Rossiyskoy Imperii, s 1649 goda*, vol. 31, 1810–1811, Sankt Peterburg 1830.
- Polnoye Sobraniye Zakonov Rossiyskoy Imperii, s 1649 goda*, vol. 32, 1812–1815, Sankt Peterburg 1830.
- Polnoye Sobraniye Zakonov Rossiyskoy Imperii, s 1649 goda*, vol. 34, 1817, Sankt Peterburg 1830.
- Polnoye Sobraniye Zakonov Rossiyskoy Imperii, s 1649 goda*, vol. 36, 1819, Sankt Peterburg 1830.

- Polnoye Sobraniye Zakonov Rossiyskoy Imperii, s 1649 goda*, vol. 40, 1825, Sankt Peterburg 1830.
- Polnoye Sobraniye Zakonov Rossiyskoy Imperii, sobraniye II*, vol. 2, 1827, Sankt Peterburg 1830.
- Polnoye Sobraniye Zakonov Rossiyskoy Imperii, sobraniye II*, vol. 11, otdeleniye vtoroye, 1836, Sankt Peterburg 1837.
- Polnoye Sobraniye Zakonov Rossiyskoy Imperii, sobraniye II*, vol. 25, otdeleniye vtoroye, 1850, Sankt Peterburg 1851.
- Polnoye Sobraniye Zakonov Rossiyskoy Imperii, sobraniye II*, vol. 26, otdeleniye pervoye, 1851, Sankt Peterburg 1852.
- Polnoye Sobraniye Zakonov Rossiyskoy Imperii, sobraniye II*, vol. 27, otdeleniye pervoye, 1852, Sankt Peterburg 1853.
- Polnoye Sobraniye Zakonov Rossiyskoy Imperii, sobraniye II*, vol. 29, otdeleniye pervoye, 1854, Sankt Peterburg 1855.
- Stat'i K Shestomu Tomu Svoda*, [in:] *Prodolzheniye Svoda Zakonov Rossiyskoy Imperii, izdaniya 1842 goda*, vol. 10: *S 1 Iyulya po 31 Dekabrya 1847 goda*, Sankt Peterburg 1848.
- Svod Zakonov Rossiyskoy Imperii, Svod uchrezhdeniy gosudarstvennykh i gubernskikh, chast' tretiya. Ustavy o sluzhbe grazhdanskoy*, Sankt Peterburg 1842.
- Svod Zakonov Rossiyskoy Imperii, Svod uchrezhdeniy i ustavov tamozhennykh*, vol. 6, Sankt Peterburg 1857.
- Svod Zakonov Rossiyskoy Imperii, Ustavy Kazennogo Upravleniya, chast' vtoraya*, Sankt Peterburg 1832.
- Ustawa celna dla Królestwa Polskiego*, Warszawa 1851.
- Zbiór przepisów administracyjnych Królestwa Polskiego. Wydział Spraw Wewnętrznych, part 1: Gospodarstwo miejskie*, vol. 2, Warszawa 1866.

ABSTRAKT

Kwestia funkcjonowania naczelników okręgów celnych w Królestwie Polskim na początku lat 50. XIX w. jak dotąd nie cieszyła się zbytnio zainteresowaniem wśród klasycznych historyków i historyków ustroju administracyjnego. Stanowisko naczelnika okręgu celnego należało do najważniejszych etatów istniejących w administracji celnej na terenie Imperium Rosyjskiego. Urzędnicy zatrudnieni na tym etacie pełnili funkcję nadzorczą w stosunku do urzędów i struktur straży granicznej działających na granicy monarchii Romanowów. Naczelnik okręgu celnego wykonywał wszystkie zarządzenia Departamentu Handlu Zewnętrznego Ministerstwa Finansów, jak również przesyłał z innych centralnych organów administracyjnych ówczesnej Rosji. Na podstawie źródeł archiwalnych i drukowanych dokonano analizy zakresu kompetencji naczelników okręgów celnych wprowadzonych na terenie Królestwa Polskiego w styczniu 1851 r. Ich prawa i obowiązki, chociaż zostały określone przez odrębną ustawę celną opracowaną dla Królestwa Polskiego, były tożsame z kompetencjami analogicznych urzędników działających w innych częściach Imperium Rosyjskiego. Uzyskane wyniki badań znacznie poszerzają wiedzę o funkcjonowaniu rosyjskich struktur administracyjnych w drugiej połowie XIX w. na terenie Królestwa Polskiego, jednej z prowincji ówczesnej monarchii absolutnej Romanowów.

Słowa kluczowe: Królestwo Polskie; Imperium Rosyjskie; administracja celna; urzędnik