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4. Figures for Russia’s industrial proletariat broken down by size of employing enterprise may be found in L. F. Ugurov, “Chislennost’ i zhaslevoi sostav proletariata Rossii v 1900 i 1908 gg.,” in Voprosy istochnikovedenii istorii pervoi russkoj revolutsii [Moscow, 1977], p. 198. The towns with the largest number of industrial workers subject to factory inspection in 1908, in order, were Moscow, St. Petersburg, Lodz, Riga, Warsaw, Ivanovo-Voznesensk, Orekhovo-Zuevo, Odessa, Tver, and Saratov. Many enterprises, particularly in the textile and food-processing industries, were located in the countryside. Orekhovo-Zuevo was a textile mill settlement just east of Moscow which did not exist in 1908.


2.

Moscow

From Big Village to Metropolis

JOSEPH BRADLEY

If ever a city expressed the character and peculiarities of its inhabitants, that city is Moscow, the “heart of Russia,” in which the Russian “wide nature” [shirokai dusha] is abundantly obvious. The character, life, and tendencies of the people are seen in much greater purity here than in St. Petersburg and are much less influenced by Western Europe, though even Moscow is rapidly becoming modernized of late years.

The European or American tourist arriving in Moscow in 1913 might have had this passage from Baedeker’s Russia on his or her mind while descending from the train onto a crowded platform. Trite references to Russian character and to the differences between Moscow and St. Petersburg aside, the Baedeker guidebook suggested that there was a relationship between the “life and tendencies” of the people and the city in which they lived. In addition Baedeker stated that the city was rapidly becoming a modern metropolis, even in the eyes of Europeans, while at the same time it had not lost its old character and ways. Moscow conveyed the impression of a scruffy, backward, semi-Asiatic “big village” on the one hand and of a bustling, modern European city on the other.

Russians themselves were no less aware of the images of tradition and modernity and the rapid changes taking place in Moscow. The authors of a 1903 guidebook crowed:
Moscow

Moscow has been transformed completely from a big village . . . to a huge, crowded commercial and industrial city . . . adorned with museums, galleries, clinics, hospitals, charitable and educational institutions. 4

Not only had Moscow been "transformed," but in the view of these authors its notable features were no longer the "heavenly cathedrals, royal palaces, aristocratic mansions and innumerable shops and stores" that had impressed the author of an 1868 guidebook, but rather the physical artifacts of modernity—"museums, galleries, clinics, hospitals, charitable and educational institutions." A "civic" Moscow had been added to the earlier ecclesiastical, commercial, and "private" Moscow. A survey of Moscow's growth, economy, social structure, city government and cultural life will explain the images of tradition and modernity and show the evolution of civic consciousness in Moscow.

SETTLEMENT AND GROWTH

Founded in 1147 by the Suzdal' prince Iurii Dolgorukii, Moscow was initially no more than one of several outposts defending the western borders of the Suzdal' "lands." Yet the Kremlin, on a high bank at the confluence of the Moscow and Neglinnaia rivers, occupied a strategic location for the commerce and defense of northeastern Rus'. The Moscow princes were conveniently situated to control the trade routes from Central Europe and the Baltic to Asia via the Volga River and to collect duties from the surrounding peasants. A steadily increasing population of wholesalers, craftsmen, princes, boyars, ecclesiastical and monastic officials, and their servants provided the economic and social base for a strong and vital city. As a result, in a period of two centuries Moscow developed from a frontier post to a major administrative center, a hub of commerce and transport, and a center of production. The city was to retain this significance; one of the recurring images of late nineteenth-century Moscow is of its importance as a hub. As the saying went, "All roads lead to Moscow."

The city grew in concentric rings around its citadel and adjacent trading quarters called the Walled Town. Starting at the walls of the Kremlin itself in Red Square and extending into the Walled Town ran rows of shops and stalls, later called the Trading Rows (Torgovye riady) and now called the State Shopping Mall (GUM). The scruffiest of the stalls, ironically, were located in Red Square itself—ironically because the present-day authorities have imparted to the area outside the Kremlin walls a shrinelike atmosphere that it never had under the tsars. Behind the Trading Rows was a lowland (podol) along the Moscow River, this area was also known as the zariad’e and is now the site of the
Rossia hotel. Along the walls at the opposite end of the Walled Town stretched Moscow’s largest open-air market:

Every day from morning till night a most colorful and dirty crowd pushes and shoves. . . . The very essence of the flea market [literally “shoving market” (tolkuchi rynok)] lies in this dirty, unshaven, tattered, hideous crowd moving back and forth. Any poor man who can’t spend more than a ruble for a jacket or half a ruble for a pair of pants, or who needs an old cap for a few kopeks, can go to the flea market and immediately find everything. Because of this, rubbish worn only by lower orders of Muscovites, and rags and garbage that make you sick to look at, are bought and sold here.

By the end of the eighteenth century, the area of urban settlement extended in a radius of two to three miles from the Kremlin to the Garden Ring (Sadovoie kol’tsno). A ward named Gorod (literally “the City”) and known for its warehouses, shops, stores, and the stock exchange, contained the Walled Town. The other central wards were Tver’, Miasniki (literally “the butchers”), Iauza, Sretenka, Arbat, and Prechistenka (“the cleanest”). This area was Moscow’s nerve center, containing its government offices and institutions, stores, and best residences.

By the second half of the nineteenth century a central business district consisting of “the City,” Tver’, and Miasniki wards could be distinguished from the more residential wards of Arbat, Prechistenka, Sretenka, and Iauza. Within the central business district itself, “the City” and Miasniki were becoming the centers of Moscow’s wholesale and financial life, while the fashionable stores along Tverskaia and Kuznetskii Most made the Tver’ ward the city’s retailing center. The proximity within the central business district of fashionable stores and open-air markets with their colorful assemblage of hawkers, itinerant repairmen, wandering holy men, beggars, and peasants from far-off villages contributed to the dual image—sophisticated metropolis and big village—that Moscow conveyed. Nevertheless, despite the persistence of open-air markets and peddlers, the central business district was becoming less and less “villagelike” and more and more metropolitan. In the eyes of one Russian the change was reflected in changing retailing practices:

The old simple sign, usually black with gold letters that merely gave information rather than trying to attract attention, is being replaced by clamorous and colorful advertisements. Pressing against store windows, hanging above the sidewalks, on the empty walls of tall buildings and on roofs, these new kinds of signs gave the street a noisy and talkative appearance. Bright colors that strike the eye and involuntarily attract attention, ingenious figures and amusing inscriptions are visible everywhere.

Beyond the Garden Ring lay the city’s outskirts, “the other side of the tracks,” as the words “za sadovoe” expressed it. As early as the seventeenth century, settlements of potters, gold- and silversmiths, tailors, armorers, and postmen began to cluster along the major trading arteries and water basins and around the best-protected points outside the fortifications. Though separated from each other by vast expanses of truck gardens and meadows, these “settlement-villages” easily made commercial contact with the “market town” of the Walled Town. By the end of the nineteenth century the area of continuous urban settlement was slightly larger than that of Berlin and almost equal to that of Paris. In 1900 the outer districts contained the city’s largest factories and mills, all nine of its railroad stations, as well as its freight, lumber, and stockyards, two-thirds of its inhabitants, and more than 90 percent of its factory workers. Like the central business and residential districts, the outer wards were simultaneously villagelike and metropolis in appearance. Dark, unpaved streets along which limped the barefoot and the beggars flowed into bustling railroad station squares; vast tracts of undeveloped land surrounded gigantic mills; shanties devoid of running water or sewer connections shivered in the shadow of modern factory dormitories; and sleazy taverns, inns, and tea houses were down the road from fashionable suburban restaurants and cottages. On the whole, however, while the central districts suggested a wealthy and bustling European metropolis, the sprawling outskirts suggested poverty, backwardness, and dreariness.

By the beginning of the twentieth century, its one million inhabitants made Moscow the tenth most populous of the world’s cities and, among these ten, the fastest growing. In the half century preceding the outbreak of World War I, its size increased fourfold. During the period 1900–1914, Moscow’s growth rate was almost 4 percent per annum, on a par with that of New York. Like New York, Moscow was a city of immigrants: almost three-fourths of the city’s population had been born elsewhere. Moscow’s diversified economy beckoned immigrants, overwhelmingly ethnic Russians, from Moscow province and the neighboring provinces of Iaroslavl’, Vladimir, Riazan’, Tula, Kaluga, Smolensk, and Tver.’

The immigrant population looms much larger when we realize that the census measured a mobile population frozen at only one brief moment, in any given year, let alone during the period between censuses, the number of persons in the city was much larger. The two census years 1882 and 1902 show a remarkable consistency in the number—slightly more than 100,000—of arrivals during the preceding year. Considering that an undetermined number of additional immigrants entered the city but did not remain through the entire year, or were highly transient in their living habits upon arrival and therefore not counted, 100,000 to 150,000 immigrants may have come to Moscow.
every year during the last two decades of the nineteenth century. To put it differently, during this twenty-year period, two to three million immigrants, more than the entire population of Riazan’ Province in 1897, at one time or another came to the city. Many of Moscow’s newcomers remained transient residents: the median length of city residence for immigrants was approximately seven years, and the continued torrent of new arrivals from the countryside caused a slight decrease in this figure at the turn of the century.11

Who were these immigrants? More than two-thirds were peasants, preserving the data compilers of the 1902 city census to note lacquially: “The influx of immigrants is turning Moscow more and more into a peasant city.”12 The statisticians might have observed as well that Moscow was becoming a younger city: the median age of immigrants dropped from twenty-five in 1882 to twenty-two years later.14 Though the census showed a preponderance of men, more and more women were immigrating: the city had only 700 women per 1,000 men in 1871 but 839 women per 1,000 men forty years later.15 While many peasants lived and worked in Moscow, most retained some form of tie with their native village. Such ties and the bonds shared by fellow villagers (a phenomenon known as zemliachestvo) were evidenced not only in transience of city residence, but also in marriage patterns, hiring practices, and political action.16

Along with the press of numbers and the transience of the immigrant population, one of the severest hardships the laboring population faced was the appalling living conditions. By the end of the nineteenth century housing had become a major issue for the city administration. Congested living conditions and the seeming breakdown in family life suggested to the municipal authorities a breakdown in traditional morals.

During the building boom at the end of the century wood continued to be the primary construction material in the metropolitan area: the proportion of wooden buildings actually increased because of the nearly exclusive use of wood in the city’s rapidly growing suburbs. The continued use of wood for construction immediately suggests a predomiance of one- and two-story buildings. In 1882 fewer than five percent of the city’s residential buildings had more than two floors above ground. Thirty years later this proportion had increased almost threefold, and the 1915 guidebook breathlessly observed that four- and five-story buildings were growing “like mushrooms and radically altering the physiognomy of the city.”17 The fact remains, however, that on the eve of World War I seven out of every eight residential buildings were only one or two stories high.18

Although because of the high proportion of one and two-story structures the density of population per unit of land was relatively low in Moscow, subdivision of living space resulted in a high density per housing unit: 8.5 persons in 1912. This was far higher than Berlin (3.9 persons per housing unit), Vienna (4.2) or London (4.5).19 And it was not much of an improvement over the 1882 density figure of 8.9. The degree of congestion had remained essentially the same for three decades, despite a 43 percent increase in the number of occupied housing units during the decade 1902–1912 alone. With nearly as many residents per housing unit as the city proper, the suburbs, sprawling and village-like in outward appearance, were almost as densely inhabited.20

This housing market in turn affected other aspects of the urban environment for the laboring population, most notably family life. Little more than one-third of the city’s inhabitants lived with relatives. Among men, only slightly more than one-quarter lived with members of their own family, the lowest proportion recorded in any Russian city.21 The families of the remainder were elsewhere, usually back in the village but not infrequently in another part of Moscow itself. The compilers of the 1882 census frequently made unfavorable comparisons between Moscow and other European cities, notably Berlin; such comparisons are particularly revealing in the area of households. While more than three-quarters of all Berliners lived as part of a nuclear family (head of household, spouse, or child), less than one-third of all Muscovites did so. All family members (including lateral relatives) comprised 82.7 percent of Berlin’s population, more than twice the proportion of Moscow’s.22

Although an increasing number of skilled workers were settling in Moscow with their families, professionals regarded workers’ lives as family-less. According to the economist A. P. Chuprov, “The tremendous growth of the tavern trade in Moscow provides the only shelter for the large number of working people without families who, in the absence of other shelter, find refuge in the inns and drinking parlors.”23 A discussion of garden settlements for Moscow’s workers stated that “measures to improve the life of the workingman are tied most closely to the opportunity for a family life and a necessary prerequisite for the latter is something of comfortable and inexpensive home (ochag).”24

Not surprisingly, illegitimacy and high mortality were facts of life among the laboring population and causes of great concern to reformers. According to data supplied by zemstvo statistician P. I. Kurkin, during the ten-year period 1888-97, 56,631 out of 250,256 births in Moscow were illegitimate. Even allowing for the immigration of pregnant women from the countryside, at 22.6 percent, the illegitimacy rate in the city compared badly with a rate of 2.4 percent in Moscow province.25 Of equal concern to the authorities was the high rate of infant mortality and the slow drop in the overall death rate, from 27.1 per 1,000 population in 1870 to 24.2 forty years later. Altogether, in the half century between 1862 and 1912, the death rate dropped less than four
per 1,000, hardly a precipitous decline. Throughout the 1870s and 1880s, the death rate almost equaled the birth rate and in one year (1871) actually exceeded it. Moscow’s record lagged behind not only that of major European cities but that of St. Petersburg, hardly a model of a healthy city.25

A myriad of reports on the housing question as well as data extracted from the censuses point to an overall deterioration in the physical environment in general and in housing conditions in particular: the growth in housing stock could not keep pace with population growth; rents increased sharply at the end of the century, causing increased subdivision and overcrowding; families found it difficult to live together; and a growing number of flophouses catered to a homeless casual labor force. On the outskirts “nestled wild and criminal paupers” and in central neighborhoods the scruffy skid rows around Sukharev Tower, Smolensk Market, and the infamous Khitrov Market became eyesores that received mounting publicity.27 The authors of a 1913 compendium on municipal administration widely used by historians of the city summed up the different rates of change in housing:

Moscow has notably changed in appearance: New, multistoried buildings are going up where once stood wooden houses with gardens and overgrown yards; gardens disappear and courtyards became smaller. And these properties at least have plumbing and sewer lines and the buildings have electricity, telephones, indoor toilets and gas stoves. Naturally all of this is available for those who can pay a handsome price for an apartment. The mass of the propertyless population of course lives as it always has.28

Yet it would be an oversimplification to say that there were no improvements at all, even for the laboring population. Despite the tenaciousness of family ties, the continued importance of communal living arrangements, and the continued subdivision and overcrowding of units, more Moscow residents were becoming independent in their housing arrangements and an element of choice was increasingly entering the determination of housing. The decline in the number of persons dependent upon institutions or their employers for housing, and the increase in the number renting housing from private landlords, showed that a part of the laboring population was becoming free from at least one form of social control by the employer. Such independence may have been worth the price of the overly subdivided private apartments that were arguably worse than the best company housing. A striking factory worker who lived outside the company gates had less fear of losing the roof over his head as well as his wages or job than did his brothers living in factory dormitories. Likewise, despite the increased subdivision of private housing space, a recent Soviet study has documented that more of the better paid workers and their families

were able to rent an entire room for themselves rather than merely a “cot” or “corner.” The proportion of the factory worker’s budget allotted for food decreased, per capita meat consumption increased, and more and more workers ate with their families at taverns and cafeterias rather than in company canteens.29 Responsible for both deterioration and improvement in living conditions were the expanding but erratic economy and structural changes in the labor force.

THE ECONOMY AND THE LABOR FORCE

Although Moscow and its hinterland, Russia’s oldest manufacturing region, grew less rapidly than newer industrial centers during the boom of the 1890s, in the half century prior to World War I the Moscow region remained the Empire’s largest industrial region. Textiles had long been the major industry of Moscow and its hinterland, and the towns of Orekhovo, Shuia, Ivanovo-Voznesensk and Bogorodsk were synonymous with the nation’s textile industry. In addition to supporting large textile mills, Moscow’s hinterland sustained a lively cottage industry. Though cottage industries faced increasing competition from cheap, mass-produced and mass-marketed products, putting-out centers and workshops continued to coexist with the factories because of the availability of cheap peasant labor and the proximity of the Moscow market. Moscow’s huge retail market and the demand for both cheaply made goods and luxury items also attracted domestic workers and craftsmen from the villages.30

In “calico Moscow” approximately 150,000 persons made their living in the textile industry and in the clothing trades. In 1902 the 54,794 persons who worked in the textile factories constituted almost half of the city’s factory labor force. Large factories dominated the cotton industry, and to a lesser extent the wool and silk industries. Located primarily on the outskirts, the largest cotton mills such as the Prokhorov, Tsindel’, and Giubner mills combined many operations including spinning, weaving, printing, and dyeing. Such huge mills, and in particular Prokhorov, located in what became known as the “Red Presnia” district, were centers of neighborhood and workplace organizing in 1905 and 1917.31 By contrast, the clothing industry—that is, the production of apparel, footwear, and the like for the retail market—was characterized by small workshops of tailors, seamstresses, and shoemakers, located primarily in the central wards. Though textile factories dominated the industrial skyline, the city’s manufacturing base was becoming more diversified, and industries such as food processing, printing, metalworking, and machine tool were growing rapidly.
By the end of the nineteenth century, Moscow had a broad economic base not only in manufacturing but also in commerce, transport, and services. One of the fastest-growing branches of the economy was the lodging and restaurant business, employing 50,198 in 5,617 establishments by 1902. This sector included the operation of hotels, inns, furnished rooms, lodging houses, and eating and drinking establishments. The latter group included more than 600 taverns (traktiry), notorious establishments offering food, drink, and entertainment, usually in a series of connecting rooms. Although contemporary accounts frequently noted the sleaziness of taverns in the outer wards, taverns were scattered throughout the city. Traditionally the favorite eating and drinking places of the city’s merchants, by the beginning of the twentieth century the taverns had become a major source of entertainment for skilled workers and persons holding lower-level sales and clerical positions. The taverns, as well as inns and all-night tea houses, also provided shelter for a motley clientele of cab drivers, workers, newly arrived peasants, prostitutes, and thieves.

Wholesale and retail trade constituted the largest branch of commerce in Moscow; in 1902 more than 92,000 people earned their livelihood in more than 19,000 shops and stores. Moscow’s lively retail trade impressed Russians and foreigners alike: in 1902, 21 percent of Moscow’s population was engaged in commerce, a larger proportion than in St. Petersburg or Odessa; indeed, only Paris, among the major European cities, exceeded it. An 1895 economic survey noted that the annual Nizhniy Novgorod fair had become only a temporary extension of Moscow’s commercial activity. A British consular official stated:

Moscow is not only the centre of the vast tea trade of Russia but is also a great warehouse in which are collected various imported and homemade goods destined for the Far East, Siberia, Turkestan and Persia. It has become a halfway house for all travellers to Eastern Siberia and the want of proper hotel accommodation is already being felt. Every day new business premises are opened and picturesque old buildings are fast being replaced by large modern edifices. ... The population has risen to over 1,000,000 and I think this important business centre, the real commercial capital of Russia, deserves more attention from British manufacturers and capitalists than they at present bestow upon it.

Although the highly mechanized factory giants attracted a large share of the labor force, a concomitant expansion of small-scale manufacture of consumer goods and the enlargement of the market and of the monied economy multiplied employment opportunities in construction, trade, transport, services, and the professions. During the last two decades of the nineteenth century, the numbers employed in retail and wholesale sales as well as in transport and communications almost doubled, the number employed in the provision of lodging, food, and drink almost tripled. In addition, functional specialization in the economy, such as the separation of business from residence, separation of sales from production, and the concentration of sales in stores, was not widespread. Manufacturing and retailing, for example, were frequently conducted at the residence of the producer or merchant. Although by the end of the nineteenth century a distinct central business district had formed, most retail sales of essential commodities to the common people were widely dispersed throughout the city in open-air markets and undertaken by peddlers and street vendors. Hawkers and vendors, according to one observer, provided an essential function: “Since Muscovites are not able to conduct their affairs in a strictly rational (planeremo) way, they tend to chase around, this explains the abundance of traders and vendors who fill up the city’s streets.” In fact, although the downturn in the national economy beginning in 1900 and the scarcity and high cost of credit made it more difficult for marginal businesses to survive, the second economic boom beginning in 1908 caused an increase not only in the total number of businessmen, but especially in the number of self-employed whose ranks jumped by more than 70 percent. The impression that Moscow was a city of small-scale production and distribution was still valid at the beginning of the twentieth century and even beyond 1917 to the Civil War and the early years of the New Economic Policy.

Despite national trends toward bigness and concentration of enterprise, Moscow’s economy sustained a variety of organizational forms from modern stores and gigantic factories to street vending and sweated apparel manufacture. Modernization in Moscow took the form of a dual economy. At the apex stood large-scale institutions of banking, credit, and insurance and industrial magnates who controlled textile empires from Samarkand to St. Petersburg and owned plants and enterprises with large numbers of wage and salaried employees. At the bottom thrived the institutions of barter, haggling, and street vending and peasant entrepreneurs who controlled the carrying and hauling trades from Tver’ to Tula. The “two economies” were intertwined. Increased wealth and greater consumption at the apex of urban society stimulated production and distribution of consumer goods, often custom-made or luxury items. Increased use of money and greater purchasing power at the lower economic levels also hastened the growth of small-scale producers and retailers of ready-made articles who catered to a vast internal market of peasants in and near the city. As the national market grew, as large factories and the railroad penetrated the countryside, and as capitalism appeared to be giving the traditional economy in the village a mortal blow, the small-scale, informal economic organizations were still vital in the largest cities and, paradoxically, the metropolis was ideally suited to sustain them.

The greater advancement of European economies enabled approx-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Category</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>8,039</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5,903</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>14,632</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major proprietors, managers, officials</td>
<td>15,948</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>7,802</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>23,750</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All high white collar</td>
<td>24,877</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>15,705</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>40,582</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales-clerical</td>
<td>43,598</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4,231</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>47,829</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-professionals</td>
<td>8,576</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>7,769</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>16,345</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty proprietors, managers, officials</td>
<td>47,332</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>15,520</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>62,852</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All low white collar</td>
<td>99,506</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>27,520</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>127,026</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified white collar</td>
<td>14,107</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>20,647</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>34,754</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total white collar</td>
<td>118,280</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>61,872</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>180,152</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>112,881</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>21,360</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>134,241</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled and service</td>
<td>142,237</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>85,348</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>227,585</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled and menial service</td>
<td>71,663</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>45,714</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>117,377</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified blue collar</td>
<td>24,034</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>25,136</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>49,170</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total blue collar</td>
<td>350,815</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>176,988</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>527,803</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total white and blue collar</td>
<td>489,101</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>238,860</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>727,961</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>8,449</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4,156</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>12,605</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total labor force</td>
<td>497,554</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>243,016</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>740,570</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The City in Late Imperial Russia

#### TABLE 2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number employed</th>
<th>% Increase or Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales clerks</td>
<td>20,776</td>
<td>33,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors†</td>
<td>20,880</td>
<td>33,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooks, kitchen help</td>
<td>36,029</td>
<td>32,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building superintendents (dvorniki)</td>
<td>20,859</td>
<td>25,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weavers†</td>
<td>22,007</td>
<td>21,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office clerks</td>
<td>21,239</td>
<td>22,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cab drivers, draymen (izvozchiki)</td>
<td>19,638</td>
<td>23,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics, fitters (sfesari)</td>
<td>10,935</td>
<td>18,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>9,992</td>
<td>16,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalsmiths‡</td>
<td>6,888</td>
<td>13,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>10,557</td>
<td>12,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambermaids</td>
<td>13,569</td>
<td>12,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governesses, nursesmaids</td>
<td>10,407</td>
<td>10,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printers‡</td>
<td>5,493</td>
<td>10,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet makers‡</td>
<td>9,020</td>
<td>10,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiters, waitresses</td>
<td>5,455</td>
<td>10,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookkeepers, cashiers</td>
<td>4,237</td>
<td>9,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peddlers (raznochizhiki)</td>
<td>4,182</td>
<td>9,194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Perepis’ Moskvy 1897 g., Moskva, 1901, pl. 2, sect. 1, 46-115; pl. 3, sect. 3, 170-215.*

† Includes both "self-employed" and "worker." In 1912, however, figures for self-employed weavers, mechanics, shoemakers, and cabinetmakers are not available, making percentage increase slightly smaller than it would be otherwise.

‡ Includes guards, doormen.

§ Working non-precious metals, such as tinsmiths, wiremakers.

### Employment

A special study of the employment of the city's employers and the major concentration of its self-employed were first- and second-generation peasant immigrants. Although they appeared more frequently in the observations of contemporaries than in the advertising section of the city directory or in official listings of manufacturing and retail establishments, these small peasant producers, retailers, builders, and carters were ubiquitous. In all branches of manufacturing except textiles, peasants were the most numerous businessmen: in 1882, peasant ownership approached 54 percent of wood-processing establishments, 58.3 percent in the food industry, and 70 percent of the construction industry. In the various branches of retailing and services, peasant ownership reached 68 percent of the business of peddling, street vending, and hawking, and 88 percent of the carrying trades. A special study of the.

### Moscow

Carrying trades in the mid-1890s confirmed that peasants had virtually taken over the business: of 2,595 independent haulers, 2,255 or 86.9 percent were peasants. The tenacity, or perhaps more accurately the vitality, of the peasant entrepreneur in the metropolis confirms that small-scale organization was well suited to the vagaries of the Moscow market and the industrial cycle, to the demand for made-to-order and luxury items, and to the demand of a vast internal market of peasants in and around the city.

Although evidence such as structural change in the economy and peasant ownership suggests that Moscow's laborers could experience upward or at the very least lateral occupational mobility, other evidence suggesting downward mobility is too pervasive to ignore. To begin with, the indirect evidence for upward occupational mobility for some of the city's new arrivals concerns only those who stayed in Moscow. From 1882 to 1902 almost 100,000 left Moscow every year. Those who left probably had worse occupational prospects than those who stayed, and in many cases departure signified failure. Moves that did not improve job prospects or marketable skills, or that were the result of poor job prospects and few marketable skills, brought about an aimless drifting at the lower end of the occupational scale, a source of great concern among reformers.

Occupational immobility, downward mobility, and the aimless drifting at the bottom of the occupational ladder contributed to the growth of a casual labor force. Like Paris and London, Moscow during the second half of the nineteenth century had a chronic glut of unskilled laborers, employed intermittently or casually. In every trade, the nucleus of permanently or more or less permanently employed was surrounded by a casual fringe which worked on the waterfront, in transport, construction, the carting and hauling trades, in the wholesale markets, and as hawkers, messengers, vendors, draymen and laborers in low-grade and unhealthy factory jobs. Although reformers at the end of the nineteenth century decried the loss of craft skills, a large, economically marginal, reserve population in every sector of the economy from manufacturing to domestic service was vital to the metropolis at this stage of development and economic organization.

A booming but volatile metropolitan economy generated a rapidly growing but volatile labor force. More brains were needed than ever before, at the same time more brawn was needed to build, move, haul, and clean. Occupational stratification was becoming more and more complex, and the difference in skill levels and working conditions for the skilled metalworkers and the common laborers was increasing. Never had opportunities been greater for the skilled and enterprising, given that the position of the unskilled laborer is more precarious in a skilled, urban society than in an agrarian society, never had the consequences of missing those opportunities been more disastrous. What
CITY ADMINISTRATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES

The Russian city never attained the corporate autonomy and distinctiveness achieved over centuries by the European city. On the one hand, the Russian city was little more than an administrative extension of the central government, and the public services provided in the city were essentially those of the Ministry of Internal Affairs. On the other hand, the city was the permanent home of a small proportion of its residents; the majority were transients whose legal residence was in the village. Despite its size and economic importance, Moscow was no exception to this general rule. During the second half of the nineteenth century, however, the central government granted the city a measure of autonomy, and in turn the city began to assert a measure of distinctiveness from the surrounding villages. A major step in this process, of course, was the Municipal Statute of 1870.

After 1870 cities were governed by a policy-making council (duma) and an executive board (upravla), the mayor, elected by the city council for a four-year term, presided over both bodies. Many of Moscow’s mayors, such as Sergei M. Tretyakov (in office from 1876 to 1883), Nikolai A. Alekseev (1885–93), Konstantin Rukavishnikov (1893–96), and Nikolai I. Guchkov (1903–12), came from prominent merchant families. In 1905 the central government, increasingly mistrustful of liberals in local government, established the City Prefecture (Grado-nachal’stvo) and the Special Office for City Affairs, which paralleled and supervised many of the functions of the city council and executive board.

The city electorate was no more trusted than were its representatives. In 1870 the franchise was restricted by a two-year residence requirement and by property qualifications—ownership of real estate and purchase of commercial or manufacturing certificates. The property qualifications were broad enough, however, to give the franchise to “any male, even a peasant, who paid any other city taxes or fees including those amounting to as little as a ruble or two for a license to set up a stall in a street market.”22 In Moscow, for example, the electorate in 1884 numbered 18,000, that is, 2 percent of the population. By raising the property qualifications to ownership of real estate valued at a minimum of 3,000 rubles or to purchase of a commercial or manufacturing certificate costing 500 rubles or more, the 1892 Statute restricted the franchise in Moscow to 6,000 persons, considerably less than 1 percent of the population.23 But what was perhaps even more disturbing to the proponents of municipal self-government, less than one-quarter of those having the franchise in Moscow actually voted.24 In spite of this voter apathy, Moscow was considered to have Russia’s most active municipal government. Unlike St. Petersburg, whose city administration constantly operated in the shadow of a central government suspicious of local autonomy, Moscow was administered by civic-minded industrialists, businessmen, and professionals interested in expanding social services.25 During its first fifteen years, the city council opened schools and hospitals, began municipal public works projects such as street lighting and paving, water supply, and sewerage, and considered proposals for greater involvement in many areas of public health, housing, and urban transport.

Nevertheless, important social services, agencies, and institutions, including many hospitals, the Imperial Foundling Home, and the Workhouse, remained outside the jurisdiction of the municipality. Ultimate supervision of social services rested with the Ministry of Internal Affairs. In the late 1880s the Ministry released its control over many institutions and social services, thereby accelerating the trend toward municipal autonomy.26 Given that city officials in St. Petersburg reacted coolly to the devolution or municipalization of social services, Moscow became the leading Russian city in the movement for municipal autonomy, expansion of services, and civic vision.

The expansion of services was dramatic. Russia’s biggest cities spent the largest proportion of their budgets on health, education, and welfare. In Moscow, for example, expenditures in these areas increased from one-quarter of the budget in 1894 to almost three-fifths by 1913.27 Elementary schools and hospitals received the lion’s share of these expenses; expenditures in other areas such as poor relief, housing, and slum renovation were modest. In addition, the city began to operate its own bakery, slaughterhouse, pawnshop, and transport system, and in the 1890s the corresponding services expanded notably.

The city not only gained control over and expanded many services; it began to play a more activist and reformist role in the provision of these services. For example, under municipal control the Workhouse added a vocational center and emphasized job training, industriousness and “the creation of an intelligent, sober, literate, honest working-man—a goal dear to every Russian who wants to see our industry and productivity flourish.”28 Trying to inculcate the quintessential virtues of urban, Victorian society—self-reliance and self-improvement—the Workhouse and related agencies sponsored libraries, public readings, picture shows, and concerts.29 So publicized and controversial were these amenities that the conservative daily Moskovskie vedomosti described the institution as the “favorite child” of the “City Council windbags.” The newspaper insisted that the Workhouse should offer
more religion and fewer plays: "Theater, theater, everywhere the theater, even in the Workhouse a theater!"

In reality the "favorite child" of the city's activist professionals and reformers was not the Workhouse but the district guardianships of the poor, conceived as an agency that would transform the city's poor and the very concept of providing social services. Established in 1894, the guardianships decentralized poor relief in a manner patterned after the system in the German town of Elberfeld and admired by leading European welfare reformers such as Octavia Hill. The guardianships ran almshouses, free apartments, children's shelters and nurseries, workshops, cafeterias, a "food stamps" program, a Sunday shelter for women laborers, and employment offices. The linchpin of the system, as both proponents and critics agreed, was the volunteer case workers (sotrudniki), appointed by each district council, who did the real work of the guardianships. The use of volunteer case workers permitted a greater emphasis on "open" relief, that is, aid provided outside institutions such as hospitals and almshouses. Defenders of the guardianships claimed that this new decentralized, grass-roots organization had "enlisted widespread enthusiastic support" and had "rejuvenated welfare in the city." The success of the organization in Moscow was to have a demonstrable effect, and Moscow was already becoming a model for welfare organization for the entire Empire.

Despite greater autonomy and activism, expansion of services, and gains in areas such as public education, Moscow's social services could not deal adequately with the problems of all of its citizens. Like other Russian municipalities, Moscow faced a chronic shortage of funds, a situation exacerbated by the overall backwardness of the country. Taxing powers were limited by the city statutes, and as late as 1901 Moscow's governor-general rather disingenuously noted that the city still did not have its own income and had to rely on loans to cover not only operating expenses but also the budget deficit. In addition, some contemporaries charged that the city council, composed largely of property owners, failed to tax real estate even to the limits made possible by the municipal statute, but instead charged high prices for municipal services such as the bakery, stockyards, and streetcars. Since the state did not provide enough cheap credit, the city was forced to negotiate costly foreign loans. It was perhaps inevitable that deficits should build up despite increased revenues from the city's streetcars, during the period 1904-13 Moscow's deficit averaged almost one million rubles annually and reached two and three-quarter million rubles in 1913. Although the transfer of several welfare institutions to municipal management in 1888 increased the amount spent on welfare in Moscow from 51,308 rubles in 1881 to 244,432 in 1891, and again to 1,200,000 in 1913, the proportion of the total municipal budget devoted to welfare and poor relief barely increased. Private donations to specific charitable institu-

tions somewhat compensated for the modest amount of municipal expenditures, but the city lacked discretionary powers over these funds. Moscow easily ranked first among Russian cities in welfare expenditures, but its one ruble per capita did not compare favorably with the equivalent of three and one-half rubles per capita spent in Berlin.

Moreover, city officials feared that Moscow's social services would be overburdened by the needy from the villages and that easily available relief would attract immigrants. Accordingly, officials were reluctant to assume responsibility for providing relief to immigrants and limited access to certain social services. When the police proposed as early as 1865 that the city provide low-cost housing, the city council refused on the grounds that the potential beneficiaries were not "members of the city community" and were not "directly linked with the city's interest." Thirty years later the statute of the guardianships of the poor limited eligibility to "those born in Moscow or Moscow province and for those who have lived in the capital at least two years so that the establishment of the guardianships will not serve to further the influx of paupers from other provinces to Moscow." The attitude of Moskovskie vedomosti to theater in the Workhouse, cited above, reflected a widely shared conviction, even within the city council itself, that the provision of too many social services was both fiscally and politically ill advised.

On balance, by the beginning of the twentieth century, Moscow's city council had come far. Municipal expenditures increased eightfold in the forty years prior to World War I, and total expenditures outpaced population growth such that per capita expenditures tripled to twelve rubles in 1900. This still lagged behind Berlin's spending of the equivalent of thirty rubles per person, but given Russia's backwardness and the fiscal constraints imposed on municipalities by the Imperial government, as well as the latter's mistrust of local autonomy, this is not an entirely fair comparison. Even the mayor of Paris, visiting in 1911, was impressed with Moscow's public works projects. Moscow was considered the leader of Russian cities, and by the beginning of the twentieth century its increasingly civic-minded businessmen and professionals were more progressive than the officials of the central government in their vision of municipal improvement and reform.

TRANSFORMATION OF THE URBAN ENVIRONMENT

On the eve of the Great Reforms, Moscow, with a population of 300,000, was a placid city, bustling only by comparison with the small towns of central Russia. The city and its inhabitants were thought of in terms of associations defined by tradition, law, and service to the state:
hence the sobriquets “gentry Moscow,” “merchant Moscow,” “holy Moscow,” and “big village.” The homes of the gentry were the “gentry nests” in the Arbat and Prechistenka neighborhoods; a resident of one of these led “a patriarchal, expansive, landowner’s life transferred to the city.”70 In contrast, the homes of the reclusive merchants, many of whom were of peasant origin and were still Old Believers, were the “fenced-off castles” with guard dogs on the sleepy south side of the Moskow River. Organizations and societies, such as the English Club, the Society of Russian History and Antiquities, the Literary Society, and the Society of Amateur Naturalists, were few in number and essentially private in character. The Moskow Agricultural Society, organized in 1850, did organize exhibits and conferences for farmers and create the Moskow Literary Society in 1845 to sponsor lectures and publish books, but this kind of “outreach” activity was rare at mid-century. Even important merchant organizations like the Moskow Stock Exchange Society did not exist formally until 1870.

The sanctity, serenity, solitude, and sleepiness of holy, gentry, merchant, and peasant Moskow were broken here and there by a colorful and lively street and market life. Indeed, despite the disgust that mendicants and vagrants aroused among some well-heeled Muscovites, to others such street people remained a picturesque phenomenon, relics of the “patriarchal Muscovite” past, representatives of an unkempt rural Russia still untouched by civilization, and, to writers and artists of a populist bent, valuable as objects of study, if not actually possessors of some inner Russian virtue. A. Golitsynskii, a physician, writer, and classifier of Moskow’s street folk in the manner of his more celebrated English contemporary, Henry Mayhew, described one type of mendicant, the “cape woman,” almost always the widow of a lower civil servant “who had worked forty years for five rubles a month and died of pauperism, alcoholism and hemorrhoids.” The cape woman “has a strikingly supple character. The cape woman is created precisely for the proletariat: at the same time she can be a matchmaker, gossip, and make cosmetics; she is a devotee, a mourner, a sponger, a fortune-teller, a thief—everything you could want.”71 Throughout the nineteenth century rates of violent crime were lower in Moskow than in other Russian cities,72 and therefore, at mid-century, the street people were not objects of punishment or reform, but curiosities, even subjects of celebration. The composer Modest Musorgsky described his first trip to Moskow in 1859:

I ascended the “Ivan the Great” bell tower from the top of which I had a wonderful view. Roving through the streets I remembered the dictum “All Muscovites bear a distinctive hallmark.” This is certainly true of the common people. Nowhere else in the world could beggars and rogues of the same kind be found. They have a strange demeanor, a
was the art collection of the Tret’iakov brothers, given to the city in 1892 as the basis for the Tret’iakov Gallery. In the theater, a scion of the Alekseyev family of business and civic leaders, Konstantin Sergeevich, adopted the stage name Stanislavsky and, with the patronage of Savva Morozov, founded the Moscow Art Theater in 1898. Nikolai Riasanovskii of the prominent Moscow textile and banking family was a patron of the Art Nouveau decorative movement, collected French postimpressionists and Russian modernists, and edited and financed a lavishly prepared art journal with silks overlays and bindings of gold thread called Zolotoe runo [Golden Fleece]. In the decade before 1914, the Russian aesthetic could frequent the Free Theater and Art School, the Society of Amateur Musicians and Choralists, the Society of Free Aesthetics, and salons, clubs, and cabarets with names like the Golden Fleece, the Jack of Diamonds, the Blue Rose, the Bat, and the Bull’s-Eye. Moscow challenged accepted standards and demarcations among artistic fields not only of the Imperial Academy but of European traditions, prompting Sergei Diaghilev to observe that whatever was worth looking at came from Moscow, since St. Petersburg was still “a city of artistic gossiping, academic professors and Friday watercolor classes.”

If changes in Moscow’s intellectual and cultural life had been limited to the world of art and art patronage, a world increasingly self-conscious and elitist, the transformation of the urban environment at the turn of the century would have been confined to a thin veneer of aesthetes. But the artistic avant-garde was only the most vivid example of the profound transformation of the city from big village to cosmopolitan metropolis. Wealthy businessmen not only patronized the arts, but supported philanthropy, participated in the city council, and joined scholarly societies. In addition, professionals on the city council, like their brethren in the zemstvos, took an increasing interest in the city around them and, in the words of a leading Soviet historian of Moscow, “planned large-scale projects to improve the city radically and give it a European appearance.” Finally, private individuals were organizing in unprecedented numbers according to professional, occupational, and leisure interests. A brief look at Moscow’s societies and associations, its civic institutions, and its educational system will illustrate the transformative functions of the city.

Professional associations and scholarly societies began to spring up during the era of the Great Reforms and rapidly increased in number at the turn of the century in response to the increasing specialization in the professions and to the need of new fields of knowledge. For example, the medical community could look not only to the Pirogov Society of Russian Physicians, founded in 1883 and later a hotbed of liberal intelligentsia activism, but also to several more specialized associations—the Society of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (1887), the Society of Dermatologists (1891), and the Society of Pediatricians (1892). By the beginning of the twentieth century, older associations of the 1860s and 1870s such as the Archaeological Society (1864), the Society of Architects (1867), the Legal Society (1863), and the Moscow section of the Imperial Society of Russian Engineers (1870) were joined by the Society of Neurologists and Psychiatrists (1891) and the Aeronautical Society. Even more important than the associations of professionals for the dissemination of learning were the many amateur societies. For example, the Society of Amateur Artists (1861) sponsored exhibits and contests and organized the first All-Russian Congress of Artists in 1894, which discussed art theory, art education, and museum work. Other disseminators of urban culture were the Society of Amateur Naturalists, Anthropologists and Ethnographers (1863), the Society of Amateur Writers (Pisateli iz naroda, 1902), and the Society of Amateur Astronomers. The very existence of such associations in a culture not noted for its “joiners” reflected the great transformations already taking place in the city.

The effect of professional organizations was clearly felt in Moscow’s labor and union movement. Though waves of strikes hit the city and its hinterland in the years 1885–88 and 1893–98, in the decade before 1905 the per capita strike rate was among the lowest in Russia, and there was more unrest in the mill towns outside the city than in Moscow itself. Despite radical propaganda aimed at workers and rudimentary mutual aid organizations going back to the 1870s and 1880s, for a long time, as Robert Johnson argues, barriers separated workers from intellectuals, it was only after 1900 that the more independent, highly skilled, and craft-conscious workers such as those in the metal and printing trades were able to organize. The radicalization of labor in 1905 came about in part due to the organizing activity of liberal professionals interested in building a trade union movement and the dissatisfaction of white-collar employees such as pharmacy clerks and railroad and municipal employees. The Museum for Assistance to Labor, founded in 1901 by the Moscow section of the Imperial Society of Russian Engineers, became a focal point for progressively inclined professionals and representatives of craft and clerical groups, participated in the Zubatov experiment of “police socialism,” and organized public lectures and workers’ libraries. In 1905 the Museum sheltered the organizations and meetings of bakers, railway employees and municipal employees, organized the first All-Russian Conference of Representatives of Professional Unions, and even provided the hall for the first two meetings of what was to become the Moscow city soviet.

The Museum for Assistance to Labor was only one of many museums and exhibits through which Moscow’s educated classes tried to spread learning and culture to the general public. Many, such as the
Anthropology Exhibit of 1879, the Russian Exhibit of Industry and the Arts in 1882, the Historical Museum, the Museum of Cottage Industries, the Tret'yakov Gallery, and the Alexander III Museum of Fine Arts provided traditional functions of display. Others, as illustrated by the Museum for Assistance to Labor, avowedly promoted social change. Best known for its broad educational activities was the Museum of Science and Industry, built on the basis of the Russian Exhibit of Science and Industry in 1872 organized by the Society of Amateur Naturalists, Anthropologists and Ethnographers. With public lectures and Sunday tours, begun in 1878, the museum resembled an open university by the turn of the century. Indeed the Moscow Society of Free Universities, founded in 1906, ran classes on law, economics, literature, natural sciences, and medicine at the Museum, at first attended largely by the intelligentsia and lower level white-collar workers, these classes attracted more and more blue-collar workers.

But it was Moscow's educational system that was most remarkable for its attempts to reach the people of the city. Although the city had several long-established private and Imperial schools, after the Education Statute in 1864 the number of public schools grew quickly. In 1867 the first five public primary schools [all for girls] opened, and three years later the first public boys' school opened. The tuition of three rubles per year was waived for children of poor peasants. In the forty years after the first boys' school opened, an average of seven public schools opened per year; the number of pupils increased by more than one thousand per year, and the expenditures increased from 10,000 to more than two million rubles. On the eve of World War I, public school enrollment had jumped to almost 60,000 and the budget was 4.5 million rubles, during the period 1902-1912, one of the fastest growing occupational groups was teachers. Among the city's distinctions in primary education were special classes for slow learners, an innovation not yet widely practiced even in the West.

Though many who finished primary school then discontinued their schooling, a study of 7,546 graduates of the three-year public schools showed that 50 percent went on for further education. The city and private societies ran a network of general, vocational-technical, and business schools, many of which also organized adult education programs in the evenings and on Sundays. For example, both the Society of Russian Engineers and the Society to Promote Technical Knowledge (founded in 1869) ran mechanics' schools and sponsored public lectures and free drafting classes. In 1893 the latter Society opened correspondence courses, modeled after British and American self-education programs. The Moscow School of Engineering, which had started as a vocational school for the orphans of the Foundling Home in the 1830s, trained 1,389 engineers between 1871 and 1897 and won prizes at international exhibitions at Vienna and Philadelphia. Business schools, many of which opened in the 1890s and which demonstrate the commitment to education of the business community, also contributed to the rapid expansion of secondary education in Moscow. In 1897, for example, the banker Aleksei S. Vishniakov organized the Society for Commercial Education to train clerks already employed and to prepare young students for careers in business. Access to such secondary schools was by no means limited to boys, and indeed the Nicholas Business School for Women, the Moscow Business School for Women, the Arbat Vocational School, the General Courses for Women, and the Higher Agriculture Courses for Women were but a few of the growing number of institutions providing opportunities for women.

Education stood for culture, opportunity, and choice. A small but extraordinary example illustrates how far Moscow had come on the eve of World War I. In 1910 the city school commission sent a questionnaire to parents with children in primary schools to find out the type of post-primary education they wanted for their children. Of 40,000 parents solicited, 34,237 responded, itself a remarkable figure. Nine of every ten parents wanted further education for their sons and daughters, though the desirability of further education for the latter was frequently qualified by such phrases as "if it is affordable," "if it is free." The desirability of vocational and business subjects was not notably high and was lower than the desirability of courses in French and German. Indeed, though one might assume that poorer families would have perceived the vocational schools as offering better job preparation, enrollments in public secondary schools nearly equaled those in vocational schools. Several answers indicated that parents wanted their children to have not narrow vocational training but liberal arts and civic education [zhiznervedenie, grazhdanovedenie]. One's son should be a "worthy citizen" and one's daughter should raise her children "to recognize the dignity of the individual and to respect the rights of others." In both the intent of the questionnaire itself and in the hopes of some of the respondents, it is hard to imagine a more liberal spirit in any city.

CONCLUSION

Like metropolises in Europe and America at the time, Moscow seemed to its educated elite to offer the best as well as the worst of the modern urban, industrial world. Economic expansion and structural shifts coupled with unprecedented population growth and mobility created a dynamic urban environment. Although the common people had many reasons to despair, it could not be denied that Moscow provided unprecedented opportunity for natives and newcomers alike. The city's rapid growth and modernization provided hope that individual initiative and enterprise could triumph over sloth and lethargy.
In the great cities, Europeanized ways could now be mass marketed and, like the watchchains and table lamps that peasants took back to their native villages after sojourns in Moscow, spread beyond the thin layer of the Russian elite to the common people. Myriad schools, agencies, and institutions were attempting to forge "an intelligent, sober, literate, honest workingman" from the raw material of the immigrant peasant. Reformers believed that such a self-reliant workingman would resist the appeals of demagogues of the right and the left, enabling the city to avoid class strife.

In the mid-nineteenth century Moscow had been essentially a fragmented city of isolated communities separated by tradition, legal status, and service to the state. The city's sobriquets—"the gentry nests," "merchant Moscow," "holy Moscow," "big village"—aptly characterized these communities and suggest the nature of the barriers between them. The Great Reforms began to dismantle these divisions, and the boom in economic and cultural life beginning in the 1890s hastened the process. At the same time, new communities were evolving, based on profession, craft, workplace, and culture. In these emerging communities the older concept of corporate loyalty was combined with a new sense of individual dignity, self-worth, and autonomy. Daily life in the urban environment offered new opportunities for individual growth and development: wealthy businessmen patronized the arts and joined scholarly societies; artists rejected academic canons and began to experiment with light and color; professionals sought to spread education and culture among the lower classes; and skilled workers expanded their horizons through study groups and contact with the city's cultural life. An element of choice more and more entered daily life.

Not having been created by the state, the new urban groupings became increasingly resentful of the state's efforts to stifle initiative, limit choice, and circumscribe individual autonomy. The civic spirit was aimed at breaking down barriers among social and economic groups, not reinforcing them. Artists like Stamislavsky and patrons like Mamontov, Morozov, and Nikolai Riabushinskii fostered cooperation among the arts; the newspaper Utro Rossii and the Progressivist Party, both funded by Pavel Riabushinskii, sought to encourage contact among political and economic sectors; and the Museum of Science and Industry and the Museum for Assistance to Labor worked to bring the educated classes and the workers into contact with each other. This newfound sense of community and purpose gained momentum until it was stifled by the arbitrary constraints imposed by the central government following the revolution of 1905.

In the half century after the Great Reforms, the burgeoning population of Moscow experienced the breaking down of traditional barriers between older communities, the emergence of new groupings along occupational or special-interest lines, and a growing spirit of indepen-

dence on the one hand and community participation on the other. To be sure, just as the Imperial government retained a suffocating bureaucracy and arbitrary police, Moscow, too, retained some of its old boorishness, backwardness, and dreariness [particularly on the outskirts], and its atmosphere of village solitude. Still, by 1914, an expanding economy and labor force, wealthy businessmen, avant-garde artists, an activist city administration, progressive professionals, and skilled workers had transformed provincial and parochial Moscow into a cosmopolitan and civic-minded city. The big village had become a metropolis.
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12. PM 1882, II, pt. 1, 49–50; PM 1902, pt. 1, i, 8. See also my Muzhiik and Muscovite: Urbanization in Late Imperial Russia [Berkeley, 1985], chapter 4.
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BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

A myriad of publications on the Moscow City Council and Executive Board present a wealth of information on all aspects of city life. Of the five censuses taken at the turn of the century, the 1882 and the 1902 censuses, as well as the
two volumes of the 1897 census pertaining to Moscow, are remarkably detailed. In addition, the 1902 census was accompanied by a six-volume analysis of various aspects of city development, written by a colleague at the Institute of Urban and Housing Construction. Unfortunately, the final results of the 1920 census were never published, though parts are available in the Trudy Statisticheskogo otdela Moskovskoi gorodskoi upravy, in Statisticheskii ezhegodnik goroda Moskvy, and in Statisticheskii ezhegodnik Moskvy i Moskovskoi gubernii, a statistical yearbook of the city and province published in 1927.

In addition to publishing the city censuses, the council and executive board published statistical yearbooks, monthly bulletins, compilations of vital statistics, censuses of commerce and manufacturers, surveys of public health, welfare institutions and housing, and the annual reports of institutions managed by the municipality. Several publications came out serially, and many studies appeared in the organ of the city council, Izvestiia Moskovskoi gorodskoi dumy, published monthly in several parts from 1877 to 1879, with an irregular subject index published in 1909. Through these sources the historian can learn not only about municipal services, public health, housing and working conditions and poor relief, but also about the attitudes of the authorities and professionals toward social issues of the day. For the student who is unable to wade through all of the specialized municipal studies, two compilations of the city council provide an excellent introduction to municipal services: Sbornik ocherkov po gorode Moskve (1897) and Sovremennye khoziaistvo goroda Moskvy (1913).

The city's economy and its population had a close relationship with its hinterland, and studies of the Moscow province's economic activities as well as nationwide surveys illuminate this relationship. Particularly valuable are the Statisticheskii ezhegodnik Moskovskoi zemskoi upravy and the series Sbornik statisticheskikh svedeni Moskovskoi gubernii. Particularly useful are P. I. Kurkin's population study, Statistika dvizhenia naseleniia v Moskovskoi gubernii (1902), A. A. Bulgakov's study of peasant mobility, Sovremennye pervoizvestiya krest'ianskii (1905), D. N. Zhabkov's ethnographic study of urban-rural relations, Babiia storona (1891), and V. P. Semenov-Tian-Shanski's rich survey of Moscow's hinterland, Moskovskia promyshlennia oblast' v verkhnei povolzye (1899).

Although statistics and municipal reports give much valuable information, they do not give an impression of daily life. Descriptive, memoir, and fictional accounts bring the city to life. Old guidebooks and handbooks provide colorful descriptions of the city, walking tours through neighborhoods, and historical sketches of the city's development. The most comprehensive were Moskva: Putevoditel' i Posovke, published in 1915 and 1917 respectively. Equally rich is the handsome twelve-volume chronicle Moskva v ee proshlom i nastroiaschem (1910-1912), compiled by the dean of prerevolutionary historians of the city, Ivan E. Zabelin. Iz zhizni gorovoi Moskvy (1914), the memoirs of Ivan Slonov, an upwardly mobile Moscow businessman, describes the world of retailing in the 1780s and 1880s. The 1915 autobiography of Sergei T. Semenov, a peasant from Volokolamsk, Dvadsatip'atelet' v derev'ye, gives us occasional glimpses of the interaction between the urban and rural worlds. Skilled metal workers Semen Kanatchikov [Iz istorii moego bytia, 1929] and P. Timofeev [Chem zhivot zavodskii rabochii, 1906] left equally valuable accounts of the workaday world. Fiction and the "journalism of the streets" complement the picture of old Moscow and the daily lives of its laboring population. Best known are Vladimir Giliarovskii's Moskvich and Trushchobaye ludy [various editions], but also worthy of mention are the sketches of A. I. Levitov and M. A. Voronov, Moskovskie nary i trushchoby (1866), S. T. Semenov's short