

Chapter 2

Notes on Working-Class Culture in Late Imperial Russia

Yoshifuru TSUCHIYA

Introduction

Over the past three decades, the "culturist" approach has come to prevail in Western historical research on popular movements and working classes in Europe. This approach rejects the reduction of culture to social and economic conditions and makes much of cultural roles in historic transformations. For example, E.P. Thompson suggests that the working class was not automatically formed by changes in the economic structure and productive relations, but that it took form only when it achieved class consciousness through the experiences of struggle and protest. He considers that the working class emerged due to interactions between economic and cultural factors. Some younger researchers (such as G. Rude) not only emphasize the autonomy of culture, but also even claim that popular culture created the popular movement.¹

Needless to say, the formation of working classes cannot be attributed to culture alone; such an approach, however, appears to be somewhat useful in the study of Russian workers. Scholars in the former Soviet Union almost exclusively analyzed social and economic conditions in order to illustrate the formation processes of classes, and Western historiography has long paid much attention to the connection of workers with villages and stressed their peasant-like character. However, this emphasis in Western historical

research began to change early in the 1980s, and some recent studies seem to be more or less characterized by the forementioned style of approach.² This study is a modest attempt to analyze the world of Russian workers for the purpose of acknowledging their cultural autonomy and its changes.

1. Traditional Customs and their Social Functions

A typical Russian worker was born and raised in a rural area, and came to a city to work in a factory in his/her early teens. A detailed scrutiny of such workers' early lives in the countryside is beyond the scope of this study, but we may suppose that the customs, values, morals, behavior, and social bonds would remain intact even after his/her arrival in a new urban environment. According to Anne Bobroff, who studied the social bonding patterns of female workers in the central industrial region of Russia, there were differences in expected roles between boys and girls in childhood, and difference of gender had some influence on their future activities as workers.³ It is well known that *zemliachestvo* was an important bond which helped workers to enter urban life.⁴ Whether brought from the countryside or not, some traditional customs and rituals in workers' daily lives reinforced their social bonds, *sociabilite*, and their identities of belonging to certain communities.

The concept of *sociabilite* represents the interrelations of people who are connected by some particular social bond. Generally, people live in "multiple *sociabilite*" (from family to political party) and *sociabilite* ordinarily creates a certain community of interest. The community has specific unwritten rules and a self-controlling ability exercised by norms based upon these rules. When people are aware of the common norms among themselves, *sociabilite* becomes the basis of community.⁵ Such *sociabilite* as *zemliachestvo*, neighborhood, and some bonds in a workshop or factory which appear as workshop or factory "patriotism" have been hinted at in

Russian workers' history.⁶ This writer once pointed out that there were two important foci in the urban working class milieu: factory and neighborhood (or residential quarter).⁷

Among traditional customs and rituals, drinking and "collective fistfights" were very important in reinforcing the identities of workers. Educated Russians and consciously advanced workers regarded temperance as a mark of cultural development, but in the male brotherhood of workers the use of vodka was an essential sign of membership.⁸ As many workers' memoirs reveal, a new worker was required to treat his fellow workers to a bottle of vodka in a nearby tavern. This custom (called *prival'noe'*) prevailed among metal and textile workers. Comradely relations between the newcomer and his seniors were established only after *prival'noe* occurred. Following that, all possible cooperation and support was given to the newcomer, and he could depend on those. It was impossible to obtain such support without offering *prival'noe*,⁹ as Shapovalov described:

"If a new worker refused to offer *prival'noe*, even if he were to starve or die, other workers made him unable to remain in the factory by various harassments; on the gear of his machine a nut was put, his machine got broken, and he would be fired. Or they enjoyed the following activity: they secretly attached tails made of a piece of cloth or dirty dustcloth to the worker [who neglected *prival'noe* — Y.T.] and enjoyed watching him walking about in the workshop without noticing his own tails. Sometimes they set these tails on fire. When the worker was surprised and took the tails off, burning his hands, everyone threw ridicule upon him."¹⁰

This custom, which was part of the traditional drinking culture,¹¹ was firmly maintained, so that even if a new worker had spent all of his assets during his unemployment and had no money, he still had to practice *prival'noe*. If he had no money and could not borrow from anybody, he resorted to *peregonka*, — that is, he bought goods in the factory shop on credit, sold them to local shops at a discount of 40-50 %, and

got money to treat others with.¹² *Prival'noe* was not simply consumption of alcohol, but a distinctive ritual.

The abuse of alcohol had a bad influence on the lives of workers. Thus the habit of daily drinking at taverns, which David Christian defined as the "modern drinking culture," was the target of a sobriety movement led by reformist liberals, conscious workers, and socialists who wished to improve the quality of workers' lives. However, even daily drinking unrelated to rituals might strengthen the social and collective bonds among male workers.

In addition to *prival'noe*, collective fistfights are often also cited in workers' memoirs as important amusements. This traditional pastime, which originated in the sixteenth or seventeenth century,¹³ was mainly practiced during the winter, and remained common even in the early twentieth century.

The scenario of a collective fistfight was: two sides — for example one factory vs. another or one district vs. another — formed "a wall against a wall (*stenka na stenku*)" to struggle for control of a disputed no-man's-land.¹⁴ S. Kanatchikov (a worker at the Gustav List plant) wrote, "In the wintertime, when the Moscow River was frozen, we would go to the wall of the dike and had fistfights with workers from the Butikov factory. In the evening we would return home with our black eyes and our broken bloody noses."¹⁵ And V. Sergeevich, who worked at the Neva shipyard in Aleksandro-Nevskaia district of St. Petersburg, described the "wall" of Smolenskoe village against that of Mikhail ArkhangeP village.¹⁶

There were some rules among the fighters, — not to strike those who had fallen, not to hit an opponent in the eye, and to fight only with bare hands. During intense fighting, however, these rules were often violated; rocks and knives were used as weapons, and some men were killed or seriously wounded.¹⁷ The fight usually began with a young "wall" of teenage boys, followed by their seniors. The number of participants sometimes reached 500.¹⁸ A strong fighter was a hero respected by other workers.

As Daniel Brower pointed out, the level of violence in these fights appeared barbaric and epitomized the crude and backward aspects of popular life to any Russian for whom culture meant learning and rational discourse. However, what outsiders judged as uncivilized had a different meaning to workers. Although they were bloody and brutal, collective fistfights created bonds of comradeship which helped urban immigrants to form a community to which they could turn in times of need. This community gave them a sense of belonging to a place of their own in the city.¹⁹ Brower's claim is certainly relevant, although this writer cannot agree with his association of such fistfights with labor violence in Russia. Violence within a community, as an object of analysis, should be distinguished from that which was directed toward the world outside of the community.²⁰

Thus, customs and rituals such as *prival'noe* and collective fistfights, hand-in-hand with other factors of the urban milieu like communal residence, reinforced workers' bonds in a certain *sociabilite* and helped to form the workers' community. Such informal *sociabilite* and community were all the more important because most Russian workers had no formal organization before the first Russian revolution. (A very few examples of formal organizations through which workers reinforced their identities were: Khar'kov Mutual Aid Society, mutual aid organizations of printers in St. Petersburg, and the communal dormitory organized by bakers in St. Petersburg.) The forementioned customs and rituals were despised by educated society, but among workers they fulfilled certain social functions.

2. Workers' New Aspiration for Self-Enlightenment

Workers' lives did not remain entirely traditional. For example, by the end of the nineteenth century, workers' meals had already become "urbanized," characterized by the consumption of meat and tea independantly of particular religious opportunities.²¹ As to workers' manner of dress,

there indeed were peasant-style workers who wore rustic *rubashka* with a belt, and high boots into which the cuffs of their trousers were tucked. They also had their hair cut in the shape of an inverted bowl.²² Such styles rapidly became urbanized as workers became accustomed to their new environment.²³ According to Shapovalov, even among textile workers (known for their peasant-like way of life) the younger ones had already changed their hairstyles into urban styles, and they wore jackets on holidays.²⁴ Z.T. Trifonov, a worker at the Wagon works, dressed himself in the "German" style in order to gain admittance to the Summer Garden, after twice being refused admittance by policemen because of his disheveled clothes.²⁶

Among the new inclinations which were promoted in the industrial and urban milieu, the aspiration to enlightenment or self-education was highly important. While, as is well known, the workers' literacy rate was relatively high,²⁶ it is said that their literacy had been acquired before they came to the city.²⁷ This means that even in the countryside, boys especially might receive an elementary education, as some workers' memoirs reveal.²⁸

Michael Share has pointed out that when young, future members of the Central Workers' Circle of Petersburg regarded education as "the major vehicle for a release from their destination"; many had attended *zemstvo* or village schools, though all considered this education to be inadequate.²⁹ Trifonov was taught to read by his uncle, who was asked to teach the boy by Trifonov's illiterate mother who eagerly wanted to make him literate. At the same time, his elder sister was not allowed to learn despite her hope to do so, because "a girl need not go into the army." Trifonov's learning proved to be entirely inadequate when he entered a village school.³⁰

Thus boys had possibilities to learn even in the countryside and many future workers learned reading, writing, arithmetic, and religion. Girls had fewer opportunities to learn because at a rather early age they had to perform such

work as being nursemaids (*niania*) in order to augment family incomes.³¹ However, the earnest desire to learn might be encouraged in the city, where there were numerous institutions and opportunities for workers to study, such as evening-Sunday schools, various museums, libraries, popular reading meetings (*narodnoe chtenie*), and the like.

Some public and private initiatives to broaden elementary education began in the 1860s and early 1870s. They included the Sunday school movement, establishment of factory classes, the spontaneous movement for expansion of formal elementary education, and the new law promulgated in 1872 by the Ministry of Education for urban elementary education.³² Of course, these trends did not immediately transform the cultural outlook of urban workers, but in the 1870s there had already emerged the workers' intelligentsia. These were a small number of skilled worker who were distinguished from the rest of the urban working class by their level of literacy, social traits, economic and political positions, and their "urge to discover the outside world." They were generally apolitical, and merely sought the cultural and economic improvement of their current conditions.³³

In the 1870s, the inclination toward self-education was still limited to a very small percentage of workers — that is, the workers' elite. However, due to the growing number of full-time urban workers and the forementioned trends toward expansion of elementary education, more and more workers had availed themselves of educational opportunities by the end of the nineteenth century. Especially after the first Russian revolution, workers' aspirations for education and knowledge had become evident.

In 1900 the number of Sunday schools, which had been established by various groups and private interests, totaled 286 in 75 cities, with 50,000 students. In 1905, some 112,000 worker-students were learning in evening classes and special courses for workers.³⁴ In the Ligovskie evening classes in St. Petersburg, 686 students were present in 1906/1907 and 1,030 in 1907/1908. In the Prechistenskie courses in Moscow, 1,137

students were learning in 1906, and 1,500 in 1908; in subsequent years there were between 1,500 and 2,000 students. In the case of Prechistenskie, when each school year began, 3,000 or more hoped to enter the courses, but some had to be disappointed because of limited capacity.³⁶ A similar phenomenon was seen in the general situation of urban elementary education. According to Brower, economic opportunity provided a powerful incentive for expanded elementary education. There was a strong demand for free public (or parish) schooling. One simple indicator of this demand was the number of unsatisfied school applications in large cities. In Moscow in 1877 there were 600 more admission applications than openings; in 1890, despite a sevenfold increase in municipal expenditures on education, there were 2,600 excess admission applications. At the end of the 1890s, Kharkov's schools, which had doubled in number since 1893, still had to refuse admission to 500 children.³⁶

As is well known, the curriculum of evening classes and Sunday schools often contained political and social themes. V. Sergeevich wrote, "Lessons in the Sunday school (Smolenskaia school in the Neva district of St. Petersburg — Y.T.) were infused with political tendentiousness. Even in purely scientific subjects, much was spoken about politics. For example, the chemistry teacher often changed the topic from Lavoisier to the French Revolution... Thus, the school was a sort of local political club and a uniting focus."³⁷

For those workers who sought enlightenment and knowledge, however, it did not matter whether lessons at educational institutions were socialistic or not. Thus various initiatives taken by the government or liberal reformists could attract a considerable number of workers. For example, the popular reading meetings organized by the Sobriety Society in St. Petersburg were held on 1,032 occasions and attracted attracting a total of 182,200 participants (including many workers) in the years 1892-94. Similar meetings were held 3,711 times from 1906 to 1912, attracting a grand total of 429,500 participants.³⁸ Z.T. Trifonov offered unqualified

praise to N.A. Vargunin, a factory owner, and the Neva Society of Popular Entertainments he established.³⁹ According to a survey conducted among worker-students in 1910-1912, those who (rejecting a utilitarian purpose regarded multi-faceted general improvement as their main reason for studying comprised more than half of the respondents. At the same time, a fairly large number of workers demanded that evening classes should provide opportunities to continue learning in order to prepare for examinations for graduation from a secondary school, to acquire a teaching credential, or to become an agronomist.⁴⁰

After the first Revolution, new workers' organizations devoted to enlightenment and cultural growth appeared. These were called "workers' clubs." According to I.D. Levin, such clubs in St. Petersburg had three different origins: the initiatives of evening class workers, the personal initiatives of activists, and the initiatives of workers at one or more factories. Though these organizations were unstable and not always long-lived, they sponsored in various activities such as organizing evening classes, lectures, literary-musical parties, reading or drama circles, and the like.⁴¹

In any case, it is beyond doubt that a substantial number of workers participated in these educational organizations in large cities. It is true that many workers could not complete the regular course of evening or Sunday schools for various reasons, or were unable to pay the membership fees for workers' clubs. However, experiences in such organizations could not but influence the cultural conditions of workers.

3. Changing Attitude toward Religion among Workers

Life in urban and industrial environments and contacts with various educational entities seemed to contribute to the secularization of workers. For many workers who had just come to the city, religion was very important, although they often disliked priests. A. Buiko, a Putilov worker, noticed that religion or the "religious narcotic" had long captivated him.⁴²

Semen Kanatchikov first feared the pattern makers ("students" of the Gopper factory near his Gustav works) because they did not believe in God and might be able to shake his faith as well, which could have resulted in eternal hellish torments in the next world. On the other hand, he admired them because they were so free, so independent, and so well-informed about everything.⁴³

Religious sectarianism also flourished among urban workers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. On this point, Sergeevich has noted:

The workers' movement in the late nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries caused lively activity in various religious sects. At first sight, any connection between the workers' movement and religious sectarianism may seem strange, but it nevertheless existed. Restrained by the nets of ignorance and darkness, Russian workers could not and were afraid to break away from God and religion... On the other hand, it was also impossible to come to terms with religion as presented by priests. Churches and priests played a disturbing role in the workers' emancipation struggle... Sectarianism was the golden mean which was suitable, above all, for less advanced, less conscious masses. Here God was not denied and religion was admitted, but priests, Churches, and their regulations were not admitted.⁴⁴

While a teenage worker at the PaP cotton mill in St.Petersburg, A. Artamonov fell under the influence of a group of *worker-pashkovtsy*, that is, workers of some sect at the factory. He began to tell his shocked mother about his new beliefs: "that icons were thought up by people, that they were not necessary, that the Church should be in the soul of every individual, and that priests were deceivers, hawkers, and pharisees."⁴⁵

Thus religious sectarianism among workers appeared to be the product of a combination of their anti-clerical feelings and faith in God. At the same time, religious sectarianism played a certain role in weakening workers' religious faith. Again,

according to Sergeevich, "when I visited the meeting of *pashkovtsy* (for the first time — Y.T.), I decided to debate them if necessary, because I regarded myself as being well versed in the Bible. . . . At the meeting of *pashkovtsy*, I didn't hear anything abominable; on the contrary, many things seemed true. After that, I often attended their meetings, thought over what they said, and observed the reality. In my own notion of religion, a deep fissure gradually formed, and my belief in God slowly disappeared."⁴⁶

As regards the waning of religious faith among workers, it is plausible that scientific education in evening and Sunday schools or workers' circles, as well as revolutionary propaganda, played important roles. Courses in physics, geology, geography, astronomy, and other subjects were taught in those schools.⁴⁷ Trifonov referred to one particular lesson:

In the second year of the Smolensk evening-Sunday classes, A.A. Baikov, a young teacher, once brought a big human skeleton, a live frog, and a microscope. Comparing the structure of the frog's heart with that of the human, as well as circulation of blood, he said that humans might have evolved from such a frog, and in all cases, the nearest ancestors of humans were monkeys. Such a comparison inflicted a blow upon my religious faith. I became unsettled, and was about to leave the classroom in resentment, but a classmate kept me in the class. . . . The teacher disassembled the skeleton into parts and explained the significance of the inner mechanism of each bone... His clear, persuasive explanation gradually began to penetrate my consciousness. . . . When the class was over, I felt ashamed of thinking about leaving imprudently just to protect my own faith that God had created Adam.⁴⁸

Shapovalov associated his own loss of religious faith with his study of science: "comparing the conclusions of science to the stories of the Bible, I arrived at the definitive conclusion that there was no God, that God had not created man, but rather priests had thought up the concept of God to deceive the

people." A. Boldyreva stated that scientific answers to various questions aroused a worker's curiosity and "impelled him to seek answers to the questions that troubled him, not in priests' sermon, but in books."⁴⁹

Indeed, such a distinct departure from religious faith might have been limited to a small number of workers, but mass secularization of workers was indeed taking place. The propagandist S.G. Strumilin found few "church enthusiasts" among workers — religion was less important to them, he felt, than for village peasants. N. Krupskaja similarly noted that urban workers had less need for religion than did peasants; workers were more educated and more aware of the "practical application of knowledge."⁵⁰ When he talked with students of the Prechistenskie classes in June, 1910, Lev Tolstoy found that they had no religious view of their lives. The "religious seeking" of young workers was essentially a quest for new, non-religious, and ethical ideals which corresponded to their social and political aspirations. According to a young Tolstoian worker, S.T. Semenov, "what interests them are newspapers articles, current works of young writers, the factions in the State Duma, and national problems."⁶¹ This trend seemed to be more clearly shown in reading preferences as well.

Though many workers first began to read with religious books, their urban milieu was farremoved from that of the peasantry, and moral teachings in religious literature seemed implausible. Workers preferred secular to religious literature. As one indication, 22 percent of the holdings of the Pushkin Reading Room in St. Petersburg were religious in nature, but in 1888 only 2 percent of the books checked out came from this category.⁵² The traveling library of the Vladikavkaz Railroad received only 55 requests for religious-moral literature out of 15,319 total requests. The wane of religious faith among workers was noted everywhere in the reports of bishops after the first Revolution. They were inclined to think that this process could not be reversed because the idea of 1905 was too much alive in the workers' consciousness. As if to confirm this,

the percentage of religious literature in all publications decreased from 29 percent in 1901 to just 9 percent in 1913.⁵³

Of course, such attitudes toward religion and the popularity of secular literature did not always lead directly to an acceptance of socialism, although the departure from religious faith was often a step toward an "advanced and self-conscious" worker.⁵⁴ In one Petersburg workers' club, *Prosveshchenie*, requests for books in 1907-08 were as follows: social literature — 41 percent, and *belles lettres* — 42 percent; in 1908-09, 26 percent for the former and 55 percent for the latter; and in 1909-10, 17 percent for the former and 66 percent for the latter. During the time of what is termed "a reaction," there may be seen such a tendency of declining interest in social literature, i.e. social problems. That tendency was common in popular lectures as well.⁵⁵ And the mass circulation of detective stories ("*Pinkertonovshchina*") was such that a working-class newspaper associated such a phenomenon with the failure of the revolution and the breakdown of workers' organizations and democratic publications.⁵⁶

Generally speaking, working-class culture was comprised of old traditional popular culture and newer customs, values, morals, and attitudes formed in urban and industrial environments, and was created from their mutual interactions. Some traditional aspects were regarded as "dark," and the backwardness of the populace became the target of reformist and socialist enlightening activities. Even such "dark" aspects performed important social functions among workers, so they seemed difficult to eradicate. On the other hand, the new milieu in which workers came to live provided them with various opportunities (all the while their political, social, and economic conditions indicated their position in society), arousing their aspirations for new cultural attainments. On this point, both liberal reformists and socialists were successful to some extent, if not completely.

In order for Russian working-class culture to be fully illuminated, numerous questions remain to be analyzed: gender roles in workers' families, the socialist influence on

working-class culture, the relationship of working-class culture with bourgeois culture or peasant culture, shop floor culture, and so forth. When these problems are scrutinized, it would probably be shown that in the early twentieth century, workers possessed specific cultural characteristics different from those of the urban middle classes and village peasants.

Notes

- 1 This epitome is based upon Michio Shibata, "Josh6," *Minshu-Bunka, Series Sekai-shi he no Toi*, No. 6 (Tokyo, 1990), pp. 1-14.
- 2 For example, see David L. Ransel (ed.), *The Family in Imperial Russia* (Univ. of Illinois Press, 1978); Victoria E. Bonnell (ed.), *The Russian Worker: Life and Labor under the Tsarist Regime* (Univ. of California Press, 1983); Daniel R. Brower, *The Russian City between Tradition and Modernity 1850-1900* (Univ. of California Press, 1990); and Mark D. Steinberg, *Moral Communities: The Culture of Class Relations in the Russian Printing Industry, 1867-1907* (Univ. of California Press, 1992).
- 3 Anne L. Bobroff, "Working Women, Bonding Patterns, and the Politics of Daily Life: Russia at the End of the Old Regime," Ph.D. Dissertation (Univ. of Michigan, 1982).
- 4 On the role of *zemliachestvo*, see Robert E. Johnson, *Peasant and Proletarian: The Working Class of Moscow in the Late Nineteenth Century* (Rutgers Univ. Press, 1979). It should be noted that *zemliachestvo* did not always indicate the peculiar bonds of peasants.
- 5 Michio Shibata, *Pari-no Furansu Kakumei* [The French Revolution in Paris] (Tokyo, 1988), pp. 71-76. See also; Hiroyuki Ninomiya, "Josh.6," *Shakai-teki Ketsugo, Series Sekai-shi he no Toi*, No. 4 (Tokyo, 1989), pp. 1-14.
- 6 On neighborhood, see Laura Engelstein, *Moscow 1905: Working Class Organization and Political Conflict* (Stanford Univ. Press, 1982); on workshop and factory patriotism, see Steve A. Smith, "Craft Consciousness, Class Consciousness: Petrograd 1917," *History Workshop*, 11 (1981).
- 7 Yoshifuru Tsuchiya, "R6dosha-no Sekai: Peteruburugu ni okeru sono kOsatsu," [The Workers' World: The Theory Applied to StPetersburg], *Roshia-shi Kenkyu*, No. 40 (1984).
- 8 Brower, *The Russian City*, pp. 145-146.
- 9 For example, V. Sergeevich, *Zavod-Kuznitsa revoliutsii: Rabochii o starom i novom zhit'e-byt'e* (M., 1929), pp. 21-23; and P. Timofeev, *Chem zhiyet zavodskoi rabochii* (SPb., 1906), pp. 33-34.
- 10 A.S.Shapovalov, *Naputi k marksizmu* (L., 1926), p. 30.

- 11 David Christian, *Living Water: Vodka and Russian Society on the Eve of Emancipation* (Oxford Univ. Press, 1990), p. 75. According to Christian, traditional drinking cultures tended to be collective in their approach to drinking, while modern drinking cultures were (and are) more individualistic. In the traditional world, drinking was a social and ceremonial activity, shaped more by convention than by individual whim. Daily drinking in a tavern can be classified as "modern" rather than "traditional." The "modern" aspect of workers' drinking culture not only damaged their health, but also impacted their family finances. It was thus a very common scene that on payday, wives waited for their worker-husbands at the gate of the factory so that they might prevent their husbands from spending all their wages in taverns. See Bobroff, "Working Women, Bonding Patterns and the Politics of Daily Life," pp. 130-138. A.M. Buiko, *Put' rabochego: Vospominaniia Putilovtza* (L., 1964), p. 15; and Sergeevich, *Zavod-kuznitsa revoliutsii*, pp. 44-45.
- 12 On "peregodka" see Buiko, *Put' rabochego*, p. 15; and Sergeevich, *Zavod-kuznitsa revoliutsii*, pp. 21-22.
- 13 Brower, "Labor Violence in Russia in the Late Nineteenth Century," *Slavic Review*, 41 (3) (1982), p. 425.
- 14 Brower, *The Russian City*, p. 147.
- 15 Reginald E. Zelnik (trans. & ed.), *A Radical Worker in Tsarist Russia: The Autobiography of Semen Ivanovich Kanatchikov* (Stanford Univ. Press, 1986), p. 13.
- 16 Sergeevich, *Zavod-kuznitsa revoliutsii*, pp. 43-44.
- 17 Buiko, *Put' rabochego*, pp. 20-21.
- 18 Brower, "Labor Violence," p. 425 and Shapovalov, *JVa puti k marksizmu*, p. 24.
- 19 Brower, *The Russian City*, p. 148.
- 20 See also the critical comments by Johnson and Koenker — Robert E. Johnson, "Primitive Rebels? Reflections on Collective Violence in Imperial Russia," and Diane Koenker, "Collective Action and Collective Violence in the Russian Labor Movement," *Slavic Review*, 41,(3) (1982), pp. 432-435,443-448.
- 21 *Rabochii klass Rossii ot zarozhdeniia do nachala XX v.* (M., 1983), p. 249; Yoshimasa Tsuji, *Roshia Kakumei to Roshi Kankeino Tenkai* [The Russian Revolution and the Development of Labor Relations] (Tokyo, 1981), pp. 73-75; and M. Matossian, "The Peasant Way of Life," in Wayne S. Vucinich (ed.), *The Peasant in Nineteenth-Century Russia* (Stanford Univ. Press, 1968), pp. 12-14.
- 22 Zelnik, *A Radical Worker*, p. 8; on the urban hair styles, see pp. 20-21, and *Vospominaniia I. V. Babushkina 1893-1900* (L., 1925), pp. 36-40.

- 23 V.Iu. Krupianskaia, "Evoliutsiia semeino-bytovogo uklada rabochikh," in *Rossiiskii proletariat: Oblik, bor'ba, gegemoniia* (M., 1970), p. 281.
- 24 Shapovalov, *Naputi k marksizmu*, p. 86.
- 25 Z.T. Trifonov, "Vospominaniia," in *Avangard: Vospominaniia i dokumenty piterskikh rabochikh 1890-kh godov* (L., 1990), pp. 304-306.
- 26 For example, see S.N. Semanov, *Peterburgskie raboehie nakanune pervoi russkoi revoliutsii* (M.-L., 1966), p. 52.
- 27 Jeffrey Brooks, "Readers and Reading at the End of the Tsarist Era," in: William Mills Todd (ed.), *Literature and Society in Imperial Russia, 1800-1914* (Stanford Univ. Press, 1978), pp. 143-144.
- 28 Zelnik, *A Radical Worker*, pp. 3-4; Trifonov, "Vospominaniia," pp. 295ff; and Buiko, *Put' rabochego*, pp. 11ff.
- 29 Michael B. Share, "The Central Workers' Circle of St. Petersburg, 1889-1894: A Case Study of the 'Workers' Intelligentsia,'" Ph.D. Dissertation (Univ. of Wisconsin [Madison], 1984), pp. 136-137.
- 30 Trifonov, "Vospominaniia," pp. 295-296.
- 31 Bobroff, "Working Women, Bonding Patterns, and the Politics of Daily Life," pp. 178-180.
- 32 See, for example, Brower, *The Russian City*, pp. 154-155; L.M. Ivanov, "Ideologicheskoe vozdeistvie na proletariat tsarizma i burzhuzazii," in *Rossiiskii proletariat: Oblik, bor'ba, gegemoniia*, pp. 318-319, passim; Share, "The Central Workers' Circle of St. Petersburg," pp. 43-46; and Zelnik, "To the Unaccustomed Eye": Religion and Irreligion in the Experience of St. Petersburg Workers in the 1870s," *Russian History*, 16, nos. 2-4, 1989, p. 308.
- 33 Share, "The Central Workers' Circle of St. Petersburg," pp. 36, 40-41, 97.
- 34 Ivanov, "Ideologicheskoe vozdeistvie," p. 321. The number of students in four evening and Sunday schools along the Shlisserburg highway was as follows:

school year	males	females	total
1883/84	240	0	240
1884/85	309	165	474
1885/86	459	335	794
1886/87	508	316	824
1887/88	500	274	774
1888/89	498	298	796
1889/90	490	277	767
1890/91	708	256	964
1891/92	811	190	1,001
1892/93	691	163	854
1897/98	988	290	1,278

- E.Ia. Vainerman, "Obrazovatel'noi i kul'turnyi uroven' peterburgskikh rabochikh v 90-kh godakh XIX veka," *Uchenie zapiski Leningrad, gos. ped. in-ta im. A.I. Gertsena*, t. 78 (1948), p. 180.
- 35 I.S. Rozental', "Dukhovnye zaprosy rabochikh Rossii posle revoliutsii 1905-1907 gg.," *Istoricheskie Zapiski*, 107 (1982), p. 78.
- 36 Brower, *The Russian City*, pp. 157-158.
- 37 Sergeevich, *Zavod-kuznitsa revoliutsii*, p. 62.
- 38 Ivanov, "Ideologicheskoe vqzdeistvie," p. 331.
- 39 Trifonov, "Vospominaniia," pp. 304, 314-318. About Vargunin, see also Share, "The Central Workers' Circle of St. Petersburg," pp. 44-45 and Ivanov, "Ideologicheskoe vozdeistvie," p. 328.
- 40 Rozental', "Dukhovnye zaprosy rabochikh Rossii," p. 80.
- 41 I.D. Levin, *Rabochie kluby v dorevoliutsionnom Peterburge: Iz istorii rabocheho dvizheniia 1907-1914 gg.* (M., 1926).
- 42 Buiko, *Put' rabocheho*, p. 19.
- 43 Zelnik, *A Radical Worker*, pp. 27-28.
- 44 Sergeevich, *Zavod-kuznitsa revoliutsii*, pp. 51-52.
- 45 Cited in Deborah L. Pearl, "Tsar and Religion in Russian Revolutionary Propaganda," *Russian History*, Vol. 20, nos. 1-4, 1993, pp. 97-98.
- 46 Sergeevich, *Zavod-kuznitsa revoliutsii*, pp. 53-54.
- 47 On the programs in evening-Sunday schools, see Share, "The Central Workers' Circle of St. Petersburg," pp. 46-47; on the educational program of the workers' circle, also see, pp. 202-203.
- 48 Trifonov, "Vospominaniia," p. 307.
- 49 Pearl, "Tsar and Religion," pp. 105-106.
- 50 Ibid., p. 103.
- 51 Rozental', "Dukhovnye zaprosy rabochikh Rossii," p. 87.
- 52 Brooks, "Readers and Reading," p. 140.
- 53 Rozental', "Dukhovnye zaprosy rabochikh Rossii," pp. 86-87.
- 54 Pearl, "Tsar and Religion," p. 96.
- 55 I.D. Levin, *Rabochie kluby*, p. 116.
- 56 Rozental', "Dukhovnye zaprosy rabochikh Rossii," pp. 81-82.