



University
of Glasgow

Hay, Douglas Wilson (1983) *The development of the revolutionary movement in the south of the Russian empire, 1873-1883*. PhD thesis.

<http://theses.gla.ac.uk/2455/>

Copyright and moral rights for this thesis are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the Author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the Author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

THE DEVELOPMENT OF
THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT IN THE SOUTH OF THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE
1873 - 1883.

DOUGLAS WILSON HAY

SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
DEPARTMENT OF MODERN HISTORY
FACULTY OF ARTS.

OCTOBER 1983.

FOR
MY MOTHER AND FATHER.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF
THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT IN THE SOUTH OF THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE
1873 - 1883.

Table of Contents:

Title page	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Table of Contents	iii
Abbreviations and Notes	vi
Summary	viii
CHAPTER I. AN ANALYSIS OF THE PRESENT TREATMENT OF THE SUBJECT.	
1. An analysis of the present treatment of the subject	1
2. References	27
CHAPTER II. THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT IN THE SOUTH.	
1. Introduction	38
2. The anatomy of the Southern organisation	39
3. The organisation of the Southern supply of illegal literature	51
4. Finances	67
5. The place of the 'all-Russian' revolutionary organisations in the South	79
6. Summary	94
7. References	95
CHAPTER III. SOUTHERN REVOLUTIONARIES AND THEIR ACTIVITY AMONGST THE PEASANTRY, 1873 - 1876/7.	
1. Introduction	128
2. The ' <u>v narod</u> ' movement in the South	129
3. The involvement of Southern kruzshoks with the peasants ...	139
4. Tables 1 - 9 of the membership of kruzshoks, 1873 - 1876/7.	151
5. Summary	175
6. References	179

CHAPTER IV. SOUTHERN REVOLUTIONARIES AND POLITICAL TERRORISM,
1877 - 1883.

1. Introduction	193
2. Early examples of political terrorism	194
3. Examination of members of Southern kruzhoks, with special reference to 1877 - 1879	197
4. Tables 10 - 17 of the membership of kruzhoks, 1877 - 1879..	209
5. Reasons given by Southern revolutionaries for using political terrorism	231
6. Summary	243
7. References	245

CHAPTER V. SOUTHERN REVOLUTIONARIES AND THE URBAN WORKERS.

1. Introduction	255
2. The extent and nature of involvement with urban workers ...	256
3. Urban workers in the South	263
4. The attitude of the Southern revolutionaries towards the urban workers	266
5. Summary	273
6. References	274

CHAPTER VI. THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT AND LIBERAL SOCIETY
IN THE SOUTH, 1873 - 1883.

1. Introduction	280
2. Revolutionaries who had been liberals	281
3. Involvement of revolutionaries with liberal society	287
4. The attitude of Southern revolutionaries towards the liberals	297
5. Summary	306
6. References	307

CHAPTER VII. THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT IN THE SOUTH AND
UKRAINOPHILISM, 1873 - 1883.

1. Introduction	314
2. Aspects of the Ukrainophile movement	315
3. Southern revolutionaries who were associated with the Ukrainophile movement	323
4. Co-operation between the revolutionary and Ukrainophile movements	328
5. Attitudes to Ukrainian self-determination	332
6. Summary	340
7. References	341

CHAPTER VIII. CONCLUSIONS.

1. Conclusions	351
2. References	364

APPENDIX I. A Review of Statistical Studies of the Revolutionary Movement, 1873 - 1883	366
---	-----

APPENDIX II. A Select Index to References to the Main Southern Kruzhoks, mentioned in the Text	372
---	-----

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

1. Contemporary newspapers and journals	373
2. Published documents	374
3. Later writings by revolutionaries	378
4. Memoir material	379
5. Secondary works	387
6. Relevant general material	396

ABBREVIATIONS AND NOTES.

In the text, Zemlya i Volya, Narodnaya Volya and Chernyy Peredel denote the revolutionary papers of those names whereas, 'Zemlya i Volya', 'Narodnaya Volya' and 'Chernyy Peredel' are references to the revolutionary organisations which issued the papers.

The older version of the name D.T. Butsynsky is used here in preference to D.T. Butsinsky which has appeared in a number of Soviet works.

In the reference sections of the following chapters, apart from abbreviations in general use, the following have also been used:

Annals = Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S..

B. Bazilevsky (ed.) 'Gos Prestup' = B. Bazilevsky (V. Bogucharsky) (ed.)

'Gosudarstvennyya Prestupleniya v Rossii v XIX veke'

'Bio-Biblio Slovar' = F. Kon et al. (eds.) 'Deyateli revolyutsionnogo dvizheniya v Rossii. Bio-Bibliograficheskiy Slovar' ot predshestvennik dekabristov do padeniya tsarizma'

ch. = chast'

col. = column

doc. = document

k. = kniga

KiS = Katorga i Ssylka

'Literatura' = 'Literatura sotsial'no-revolyutsionnoy partii 'Narodnoy Voli'

'Materialy' = 'Materialy dlya istorii Russkogo Sotsial'no-Revolyutsionnogo dvizheniya'

A.M. Pankratova (ed.) 'Rabocheye Dvizheniye' = A.M. Pankratova (ed.) 'Rabocheye dvizheniye v Rossii v XIX veke. Sbornik dokumentov i materialov'

I.L. Rudnytsky (ed.) 'Symposium' = I.L. Rudnytsky (ed.) 'Mykhaylo Drahomanov.

A symposium and selected writings' in Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.. Spring 1952, vol. II, no. 1(3).

B. Sapir (ed.) 'Lavrov' = B. Sapir (ed.) 'Lavrov - Gody Emigratsii. Arkhivnyye materialy v dvukh tomakh'

B. Sapir (ed.) 'Vpered!' = B. Sapir (ed.) 'Vpered! 1873-1877. Materialy iz arkhiva Valeriana Nikolayevicha Smirnova'

'Svod' in Byloye 1907, no. 6. = 'Svod ukazaniy dannykh nekotorymi iz arestovannykh po delam o gosudarstvennykh prestupleniyakh. (May 1880 goda)' in Byloye 1907, no. 6.

'Svod"' in Byloye 1907, no.7 and 8. = 'Svod" pokazaniy dannykh nekotorymi iz arestovannykh po delam o gosudarstvennykh prestupleniyakh' in Byloye 1907, no.7 and 8.

v. = vypusk

S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' = S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Revolyutsionnoye Narodnichestvo 70-kh godov XIX veka. Sbornik dokumentov i materialov v dvukh tomakh'

In the tables which provide information on the members of the revolutionary kruzhoks and appear on pages 151 - 174 and on pages 209 - 230, the following abbreviations have been used:

Acad. = Academy.

Dvor. = Dvoryanin.

educ. o/s. S. = education outside the South.

gymn. = gymnasium.

h.e. = higher education.

Inst. = Institute.

Kamenets-Pod. = Kamenets-Podol'sky

Med.-Surg. Acad. = Medico-Surgical Academy.

Meshch. = Meshchanin.

N = North. (in the sense defined on page 26)

Petrov. Agric. Acad. = Petrovskaya Agricultural Academy.

prop. = propagandised.

rev. = revolutionary

S = South. (in the sense defined on page 26)

St.Pb. = St.Petersburg.

Tech. Inst. = Technological Institute.

Univ. = University.

Vet. Inst. = Veterinary Institute.

Summary of 'THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT IN THE SOUTH OF THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE, 1873 - 1883.'

The thesis is concerned with the central question of the revolutionary movement: why the methods used by the revolutionaries developed as they did? Specifically, it considers why the method of revolutionary action used by the Southern revolutionaries changed from one characterised by a weak interest in propagandising the peasantry to a full-blooded commitment to political terrorism, and why this change took place so early in the 1870's. The common explanation is that the revolutionaries chose their methods because of extrinsic factors: influence exerted by St. Petersburg and Moscow revolutionaries; the backwardness of the provinces; the lack of response from the peasants; persecution by the government, sparking off a violent response from the hot blooded Southerners. The thesis criticises some of these reasons and suggests alternatives.

Underpinning this 'common explanation' for its development is a particular understanding of the nature of the revolutionary movement itself. This understanding is examined in Chapter I since it implicitly denies the possibility of some of the other reasons for the development of the revolutionary movement which are advanced later.

Chapter II considers if the Southern revolutionary movement was 'backward', susceptible to influence from the North, and how this influence could have operated.

Chapter III and IV are mainly concerned to examine the composition of the kruzhoks involved in, respectively, propagandist activity amongst the peasants and political terrorism. Chapter III tries to assess and explain the limited nature of Southern involvement in the 'v narod' movement and to establish the characteristics of those kruzhoks which did or did not participate in it, 1873 - 1876/7. In Chapter IV those revolutionaries who chose political terrorism are studied. It emerges that a different type of revolutionary was attracted to this method of activity; the supporters of political terrorism were generally likely to be more 'provincial', less well educated etc., than their predecessors. However this does not establish any causal relationship between 'type' of revolutionary and method of activity, because activity amongst the peasants and political terrorism dominated the revolutionary movement

at different times during the decade under consideration, and so it may have been that the type of revolutionary that was prominent at the end of the seventies and the start of the eighties was unable for some reason to participate in rural propagandist activity at the beginning of the seventies. Consequently, particular attention is paid in Chapter IV to those revolutionaries who composed the first kruzhoks which turned to political terrorism, and to what they had been doing in the early seventies. Such analysis is of little value for the later kruzhoks since their members had usually been too young in the early seventies to have had the opportunity to go amongst the peasants. Wherever possible, the reasons which these revolutionaries gave for practising political terrorism, rather than propaganda activity amongst the peasantry, are also examined.

Chapter V, VI, and VII look at three areas in which the Southerners were heavily involved: propaganda amongst urban workers, liberal 'society' and Ukrainophilism, and suggest that the revolutionaries were influenced in their choice of revolutionary tactic by these groups.

The thesis is based on an extensive use of memoir material (although little reference has been made to two Southern memoir sources which have been grossly over-exploited), on published documents and on contemporary writings by the revolutionaries in their papers and elsewhere. The originality of the thesis lies however not so much in the material which sustains it as upon its subject and the treatment of that subject. The reasons for the revolutionary movement developing in the South in the way in which it did, over this eleven year period, has not previously been subjected to serious examination. Consequently, a number of those causes which are identified here - the relationship with Ukrainophiles, liberal society, kruzhoks' finances etc., - have also not been scrutinised in detail before. Soviet historians have examined the leadership of the Chaykovtsy, 'Zemlya i Volya' and the Executive Committee of 'Narodnaya Volya', but a systematic longitudinal study - within the severe limits imposed by the sources - of the membership of the kruzhoks which composed the revolutionary movement, is a new approach.

CHAPTER I. AN ANALYSIS OF THE PRESENT TREATMENT OF THE SUBJECT.

Interest in the 'narodnichestvo revolutionary movement' has been subject to considerable fluctuations, and the precise course of that interest has varied between Eastern and Western Europe. Now, one hundred years after the revolutionary movement has ceased to be of practical significance, the narodnichestvo ideology, with which it is associated, has attracted a more widespread interest than perhaps at any previous time.

In Eastern European countries, predominantly in Russia and Poland, these have always been phenomena which have occasioned considerable interest, despite a brief hiatus between the late 1930's and 1956. Before the October Revolution, tsarist historians claimed that the revolutionaries were merely murderers and criminals paid and directed by foreign powers. (1) The revolutionaries of this time were concerned to establish the relationship of their ideas to the principles of their predecessors in the 1870's. Russian liberal historians, and some East European historians, tended to concentrate upon the revolutionary movement as such, basing their studies mainly on the memoirs of the revolutionaries which appeared in the freer post-1905 atmosphere in journals such as Byloye. (2) Since 1917, Soviet historical work - other than the large amount of memoir material produced during the 1920's and 1930's in Katorga i Ssylka and Krasnyy Arkhiv - has focused overwhelmingly upon the question of the nature of the relationship of the narodnichestvo ideology of the 1870's to that of the 1860's, on the one hand, and to the ideology of the Social Democrats and subsequently the Communists, on the other. By 1938 this was decided in a manner unfavourable to the narodniks ; they were found to have been ideologically inferior to the men of the 1860's, and therefore implicitly hostile to Social Democracy. (3) Although the study of the seventies did not cease altogether, it was greatly diminished from 1938 until 1956 when the subject was 'officially' re-opened. Historical interest during the post-1956 period has remained much as before: the periodisation of the philosophical views of adherents of narodnichestvo, its relationship with the Enlightenment of the

1860's and with Marxism of the 1880's. (4) However there is a number of new elements. The motivation for the latest upsurge of interest is admitted to be, in part at least, the wish to discover if lessons may be drawn from the study of the narodnichestvo ideology which can be utilised in the contemporary debate concerning the course of events in 'underdeveloped' countries. (5) Also, there has been a new concern with the revolutionary movement - that is, the revolutionaries, their organisations, their programmes, their activities - and in 1961, Soviet historians set up a Group for the Study of the History of the Social Movement in Russia in the Post-Reform Period. (6) Some 'local' studies of the revolutionary movement have also appeared. (7) However the lack of interest in Soviet historical journals on the centenary of Aleksandr II's assassination may indicate a further development.

In the West, interest in this movement is of recent origin. Prior to 1905, with a few important exceptions (8), the revolutionary movement was regarded by visitors to Russia as part of that nihilist movement which was characterised by outlandish dress and behaviour(9). Not until after the 1905 Revolution were Western writers induced to seek a greater meaning in the preceding revolutionary history of the Empire, although no clear picture of the movement emerged. (10) The revolutions of 1917 almost obliterated the earlier revolutionary movement from the minds of the Western observers, many of whom could only explain them in terms of a major break with the past, linked with alien conspiracies. So meagre was the heritage of Western historical writings on the subject that the interest seems to be almost new when recommencing in Italy with the publication of Franco Venturi's work in 1952.(11) Since then, Western historians have concentrated upon the ideology and ideologists of the movement, as indeed did Venturi for a large part of his work.(12) One reason for the interest in this particular aspect of the movement, appears to be an almost universal belief that the ideology dealt with problems similar to those faced by educated minorities in contemporary 'developing' nations.(13) The logical development of this situation has occurred, and political scientists and sociologists have to some degree expropriated the subject in order to establish a

typological classification of 'populism'.(14) The revolutionaries themselves, being a specifically Russian historical phenomenon, and thus not having the comparative significance of the ideology, have assumed a secondary role in Western writings on the subject. To some extent the revolutionary movement of the seventies is touched upon by those interested in the study of the Bolshevik party (15), but even in this field, it is usually the inspiration for Lenin's view on the party, its organisation, the revolutionary élite and so forth, which is being sought in the writings of individual narodniks of the 1870's.(16)

From this brief survey it will be apparent that it has been the fate of the 'narodnichestvo revolutionary movement', in the historiography and literature of both Eastern and Western Europe, to be considered predominantly as a philosophical or political current of thought, and not as a revolutionary movement. Increasingly this current of thought is being studied in the light of the contemporary discussion on 'development', thus removing attention further from the Russian historical context of the 1870's to which the revolutionary movement was bound. A.Walicki gives the advice that we must make a "clear distinction between populism as such (i.e., populism as a current of thought) and the populist revolutionary movement - a distinction which should be made if we wish to avoid confusion."(17) The present study is unequivocally about the latter - the revolutionary movement. It is concerned with what the revolutionaries did, and when; with who they were, and, above all, with why they did what they did. To some extent we would wish to associate with the views expressed by O.H.Radkey when writing about the Social Revolutionary Party, that "too much attention has been paid to the ideology of movements and too little to their practice .." and "attention has been riveted upon the high-flown abstractions of a few individuals, and particularly upon the vastly overpublicised antitheses between East and West, instead of the conflict of social groups, national or class, Eastern or Western, out of which this vapour arises."(18) And yet, it is not possible, even once the distinctions have been made, and the preferences stated, to proceed. A study of the literature on the revolutionary movement shows clearly

that the revolutionary movement in Russia, 1873-1883, is the subject of a particular interpretation which inhibits, indeed prevents, the consideration of the movement as a social movement and the discussion of those questions about the revolutionaries which were outlined overleaf. The recognition of the existence of this interpretation does, incidentally, go a long way to explain the historiographical imbalance indicated previously.

This interpretation of the Russian revolutionary movement makes the philosophy of the movement, rather than the social and political environment, assume fundamental importance in the explanation of any aspect of the revolutionary movement. As a result of this interpretation, the distinction between the narodnichestvo ideology and the revolutionary movement has become blurred; the revolutionary movement has been treated as part of the philosophical history, without a separate existence. A number of writers have recognised the necessity of distinguishing between the two, and while this has been successfully and simply done in the case of the narodnichestvo ideology, it is a harder task to remove narodnichestvo ideology from the history of the revolutionary movement, for the links are far more subtle due to the particular interpretation of the revolutionary movement.(19) Four elements can be discerned in this interpretation : that the revolutionary ranks were composed of the 'intelligentsia'; that the different tendencies and groupings within the movement are explicable only in terms of imputed philosophical categories; thirdly, that the revolutionary movement had a 'passive' nature; fourthly, that the sequence of stages through which the revolutionary movement passed in St. Petersburg must have been repeated throughout the Empire.

The most pervasive element of this interpretation concerns the nature of the revolutionaries. They are considered to have been from the 'intelligentsia', or the 'raznochintsy intelligentsia'. The term intelligentsia appears to have come into common usage during the late 1860's.(20) Since then it has been variously defined. Occasionally, it is equated with the revolutionaries and the broad mass of their active and inactive sympathisers; usually it refers to the oppositional forces in general, or, simply educated society without the supporters of the autocracy. One writer has observed that, in view of this confusion, "Historians have little

reason to believe that the so-called intelligentsia corresponded to any real group of men in Russian society..." "it has been defined in so many ways and been the subject of such partisan debate that it has lost any objective meaning."(21) With regard to the raznochintsy, there also exists a multitude of meanings: men of all, or of no ranks, the déclassé elements of post-Reform society, men of petty-bourgeois origin etc.(22) It encompasses a group larger than, but not entirely subsuming, the intelligentsia or the revolutionary movement. In short, this term also "is virtually meaningless as an accurate description of a group in Russian society."(23) The relevant point here is that neither the intelligentsia nor the raznochintsy intelligentsia is counter-minous with the revolutionaries, and thus do not assist in defining them, for clearly that qualitative difference between a 'revolutionary intelligent' and a non-revolutionary one is crucial in this context.(24) The intelligentsia is invariably seen above all else as a group of people who shared ideas and it is these ideas which provide the cohesive and defining forces of the group. G.Fischer, for example, writes that "The criterion by which the intelligentsia was defined in the middle of the 19th century was a subjective one. It was their outlook or Weltanschauung."(25) Such an understanding of the intelligentsia is obviously extremely useful in the study of the intellectual history of Russia. It is rather less helpful when studying social or political history since the variety of trends and groups within the revolutionaries by definition, are already more or less explained in ideological terms, which condemns any social or political investigation to futility beforehand.

As might be expected, the writings of the revolutionaries are replete with evidence to substantiate the opinion that ideological commitment was indeed their raison d'être: the nineteenth century Russian revolutionaries delighted in representing themselves as selfless youths, motivated by idealism to advance the cause of the 'narod'. They frequently described each other as 'the best and the most noble' in Russian society. The disavowal by almost all the revolutionaries of any interest in the post-revolutionary future, and of their position in that future, adds force to the apparent nobility and selflessness of their aspirations. They

claimed to be fighting for the 'narod' against the autocracy; they neither appeared to represent any sectional interest nor to develop any programmatic differences which could be interpreted as such, rather than just disagreements over tactics. Further, the revolutionaries of the 1870's quickly passed into revolutionary mythology. As early as 1902, Lenin could accuse his colleagues of being ignorant of their real revolutionary heritage, and of having only a romantic notion about the narodniks.(26) Almost all parties, including the liberals and, of course, the Social Revolutionaries, looked to the revolutionaries of the 1870's, and found there some presage of themselves.(27) The men of the 1870's thus became devoid of any reality, and became only examples of selfless devotion to the narod, admired, in retrospect by almost everyone - save the most reactionary - for their intentions if not their methods. This is substantially the position of modern writings on the subject, both in the East and in the West of Europe and in North America. All of which makes it appear that the very existence of a 'revolutionary intelligentsia' can only be explained in the light of the revolutionary content of the philosophical currents of their time. However, it does seem unwise to accept so uncritically this evaluation, by the revolutionaries, of themselves.

It is implicit in the notion of the raznochintsy and, to a lesser extent in that of the intelligentsia, that individuals from different classes were present in the revolutionary movement, but not as representatives of those classes because, as has been discussed, the social basis is of very minor consideration by comparison with the over-riding importance of the ideology. Nevertheless, a number of indicators do exist which would seem to suggest that certain social groups had a predominant presence within the ranks of the revolutionary movement at different times. Such a situation would require some modification in the meaning of the term intelligentsia. Indications are provided in the memoirs of the revolutionaries themselves. Breshko-Breshkovskaya wrote that "the first detachments which went 'to the people' were almost exclusively the children of noble families, because of their higher educational preparation. The tiers-état had just begun to come forward in appreciable numbers.."(28)

Stepnyak and Lavrov both claimed that the revolutionaries who were tried in the trials of the supporters of 'Narodnaya Volya' were "men sprung from the people themselves ..." (29). Vera Figner observed, concerning the arrests which followed the v narod movement, that "it was as though a pestilence had swept through a certain social stratum ..." (30). The interested and not completely uninvolved observer, N. Mikhaylovsky coined the terms 'repentant noblemen' and 'enraged plebians' to describe different types of revolutionaries. (31) Subsequently, D. Mirsky wrote about the two social types represented in the revolutionary movement. One group was of déclassé gentry and conscience-stricken noblemen; their socialism was "purely altruistic and utopian". The second group was of mainly plebian origin, which had "a strong tendency towards purely educational works ..." (32).

Sociological work might also be relevant to this point, for it would seem to indicate that within the revolutionary movement of the 1870's was a number of fundamentally different types of oppositional movement - in terms of policies, tactics, organisation and personnel. (33) Further, that the different policies of different political groups tend to be related not only to the political and social context, but also to differentiated social support. (34)

It may be therefore, that there are sufficient grounds to look at social background when studying the revolutionary movement; that there is sufficient reason to accept as a working hypothesis that revolutionaries from sharply contrasting backgrounds may well have different perceptions of the world and that these could manifest themselves in different forms of revolutionary behaviour. It is not being suggested that social background was the main determinant, far less that it was the only one, but that it is one amongst a number of forces shaping the revolutionary's behaviour.

In view of the understanding of the revolutionary movement as being composed of the intelligentsia, it is logical that the revolutionaries should be discussed in terms of putative philosophical categorisations and allegiances. This is done on two levels: the thinkers who created the narodnichestvo philosophy which, it is assumed, motivated the revolutionaries - Mikhaylovsky, Chernyshevsky, Pisarev, Herzen etc., in various permutations - and secondly, the

thinkers who devised the tactics of the revolutionary movement - mainly Bakunin, Lavrov and Tkachev. The latter group constitutes the second theme of the traditional view of the revolutionary movement, but something should be said about the former.

In the writings of the 'motivators' of the movement there is little that is specifically revolutionary, which might explain why so few of the activists' memoirs mention these particular individuals as being important in the writer's conversion to the revolutionary path. Marx, J.S.Mill, German romantic writers such as Speelhagen, Garibaldi, Pisarev to a certain extent, and F.Lassalle, are as frequently, or more frequently, encountered in this context. Indeed as J.H.Billington has observed, both Soviet and Western historians have "collaborated in constructing a hagiography of early revolutionaries which includes only Herzen, Belinsky, Chernyshevsky, Dobrolyubov and Pisarev ... all these figures were either dead or in prison by the late sixties ..."(35) However it cannot be doubted that these men greatly influenced the general intellectual atmosphere of the Empire. This question of the source of the intellectual motivation of the revolutionaries might be set aside if it did not impinge upon the study of the revolutionary movement in at least two respects. Firstly, the movement has been defined in time by the influence of these ideologues amongst the revolutionaries. Thus F.Venturi terminates his study of the revolutionary movement at the time of the assassination of Aleksandr II on 1st March 1881, because he considered that the populist ideology, which for Venturi means Herzen's beliefs, lost its prominence after that time. Yet, Venturi knew that the revolutionary movement was to continue to be of importance for a number of years.(36) Similarly J.H.Billington considered that the populist movement existed until the 1890's because Mikhaylovsky continued to be a very influential thinker and for Billington, the philosophy of populism was in essence the creation of Mikhaylovsky.(37) Of course the revolutionary movement could not be seen as continuous during this period, as after the early 1880's, Mikhaylovsky's support was located amongst the liberals. In the Soviet Union the question of periodisation of the revolutionary movement - based on the influence of selected ideologues - has been highly developed. F.S.Tkachenko, Sh.M.Levin

and V.V.Shirokova, for example, believe that the movement should be considered as having stretched continuously from 1860 to 1880, because of the predominance during that time of the ideas of Herzen and Chernyshevsky amongst the revolutionaries.(38)

B.S. Itenberg would accept the significance of Herzen's call of 'V narod! K narodu!' in defining the movement but he draws a distinction between the movements of 1861 - 1873 and 1874 - 1879 on the basis of their scale and method.(39) R.V.Filippov, for the same reason, believes that the years from the appearance of the Ishutin group in 1863 until 1874 should be seen as a distinct epoch in the movement.(40) Others - the majority - subscribe to the view that the period of the 1870's and early 1880's was different from that of the revolutionary democrats of the 1850's and 1860's, and also from the 'liberal narodniks' of the 1880's and 1890's.(41) It will be appreciated that there can be little agreement on this question since some writers base their periodisation on the activities of revolutionaries, some on philosophical trends, and others on a combination of these two. This demonstrates the fashion in which the revolutionary movement has come to be regarded as part of the philosophical history of the period. Yet the revolutionary movement defines itself, and can be quantified, as stretching from approximately 1873 to 1883, regardless of the periodisation of the philosophy. The quantitative upsurge of the movement in 1873 can only signify a qualitative change in the 19th century revolutionary movement in the Russian Empire. It changed from a handful of minute groups into a substantial movement.(42)

Secondly, the insistence upon interpreting the movement in the light of ideologues obfuscates areas of concern within the revolutionary movement, if they were not reflected in the writings of the ideologues. For example, throughout the 1870's the idea of federation appeared in many of the demands by revolutionaries, as also was increasingly a call for independence for national minorities. S.M.Kravchinsky claimed that for him, the whole revolutionary movement had been about geographical federalism which he saw as the only true guarantee of personal freedom.(43) This

subject exercised the ideologues little. Conversely the idée fixe of Herzen or Mikhaylovsky was the obshchina or mir which did not possess quite the same primacy for the revolutionaries.

The second theme in the traditional view of the revolutionary movement has been mentioned previously: the division of the revolutionaries according to their adherence to the tactical principles of Lavrov, Bokunin or Tkachev. It should be repeated that these terms are largely putative. In other words, it is simply assumed that because some of the activists behaved in certain ways during the 1870's that they were guided in those actions by these thinkers. Little evidence exists to prove this in the majority of cases. However, assuming that the revolutionaries were 'intelligentsia', it is inevitable that the techniques of the study of philosophy will be used in the study of this social phenomenon. Even if these categories are accurate it would still not be known what they meant to the revolutionaries. The theory espoused by a group does not, after all, of itself, explain the appeal of the group to would-be members, nor does it indicate what the members believed significant and insignificant in its theory. In this vein, R. Wortman has written that as a result of the ignorance of the views of the rank and file revolutionaries, "one gains little appreciation of the populists as human beings and little understanding of what impelled them to embark on their seemingly futile course. As a result, populism appears fantastic and unreal ..." "Most created their own particular amalgam of ideas and attitudes and did so with an intensity and determination that is so far unexplained." "We do not know what was primary and what secondary in the populist mentality, what a vital and deep concern and what merely a strategic consideration." (44) A. Ulam has gone rather further and refers to the ideological "mish-mash" of the populist revolutionaries. (45) The evidence upon which judgements are made about the ideological commitments of the revolutionaries is, then, rather shaky.

The results of this are manifest in the confusion amongst historians about which revolutionary group adhered to which ideological mentor. In the case of Chaykovsky's kruzhek, for

example, V.Ya.Bogucharsky, V.I.Nevsky and Ye.A.Korol'chuk believe that it was Bakuninist.(46) N.K.Karatayev, S.S.Dmitriyev, D.Footman and S.V.Utechin have declared it to be Lavrovist.(47) V.O.Levitsky, M.V.Nechkina, Sh.I.Levin, G.Woodcock and I.Avakumovic believe that it stood between these two.(48) N.A.Troitsky takes the view that it was a unique combination of both trends.(49) The 'Narodnaya Volya' party, at the opposite end of the period under consideration, has been variously described as Bakuninist (50), pioneers of 'political realism'(51) and Jacobin(52). The last assertion is explicitly denied by one authority.(53) The 'Chernyy Peredel' group is evaluated as both Bakuninist(54), and Lavrovist(55). The ideological orientation of individuals has proven no more straightforward: P.B. Aksel'rod was classified by his Western biographer as a moderate Bakuninist in the spring of 1874 (56), whereas a friend of Aksel'rod - Breshko-Breshkovskaya - refers to him as "the leading Lavrovist in Kiev", in the same year.(57) Breshko-Breshkovskaya herself is generally considered to have been a Bakuninist since she was a prominent participant in the Kiev Commune. This is fundamentally contradicted by the outlook which she revealed during one of the discussions in the early seventies concerning whether revolutionaries should try to set up schools to educate peasant children. She supported the idea because she "knew how eagerly they aspired to even the most elementary knowledge."; without schools "it would be very difficult to inculcate, among illiterate people our socialistic views and our resolve to do away with the monarchy."(58) Even generalities seem equally difficult to agree upon. P.Pomper, A.Tun and Z.V.Pereshina concur that Bakuninism or Buntarism was very strong in the South of the Empire, after the failure of the y narod movement (59). A.B. Ulam and B.Sapir deny that Bakunin had any significant following in the South. Ulam believes that those revolutionaries who the first three historians would call Bakuninists were followers of Lavrov who hankered after heroism and violence.(60) No doubt it is rather unfair - and too easy - to isolate contradictory opinions in this way since they might reflect justifiable and genuine differences of opinion. Part of the difficulty lies in the lack of ideological clarity of the revolutionaries, as was indicated above, but a second

source of confusion resides in our not knowing precisely what is meant by Bakunist, Lavrovist or Tkachevist.

On the face of it, the contemporary meanings of the terms are obvious: they describe the interrelated philosophical and tactical opinions of Lavrov, Bakunin and Tkachev. Lavrov advocated the education of the masses by a group of critically thinking individuals, as a result of his subjectivist philosophy. The educated élite of Russian Imperial society, if it had a sufficiently acute moral sense, would realise that its intellectual advancement had been achieved at the price of the degradation of the narod. It would thus have acquired a debt which - given Lavrov's subjective philosophical notion of debt - it would feel was in its own interests to honour. Bakunin believed, as a result of his Hegelianism, absorbed in the Stankevich circle in Moscow, that the narod was always prepared for revolution and knew what it wished to achieve. The revolutionaries were only required to put the spark to this explosion. Tkachevists adhered to Tkachev's view that the Russian state was "suspended in air", that is, without any social basis. So, he advocated that a small band of revolutionaries should, and could, seize control of the state machinery by a coup, in conjunction with mass disorder. However these terms have not always possessed the above meanings, nor did Lavrov, Bakunin and Tkachev advance such clear programmes.

It would appear that the first time they were used with these contemporary meanings was by Plekhanov in 1884 in his pamphlet 'Our Differences'. In this work he defined the meanings, indicating presumably that, if they were not new, then they were not generally given the meanings which he imparted to them.(61) By the 1920's, they were widely used with Plekhanov's meanings, and it became common to associate the revolutionary groups of the 1870's with émigré thinkers. But when the terms were used in the 1870's - which was seldom - and during the subsequent two decades, they referred either to the émigré supporters of these men or to those who supported their publications, both within and without the Empire. In this second sense, Vperedist and Nabatist were more common terms, being the names of the papers with which Lavrov and Tkachev, respectively, were involved. Thus V. Figner defined the Lavrists as "... the group

which was centred around Lavrov and supported the journal Vpered! with money and literary material ..." (62) Lavrov used the term Bakunist to refer to the émigrés linked to and guided by Bakunin. (63) This group, incidentally, included not only, or even mainly, people from the Russian Empire but also followers from the Latin countries, particularly Italy. For those involved in the revolutionary world of the 1870's, Lavrovist and Tkachevist could also have insulting connotations. A Lavrovist could mean a student who talked eloquently about revolution, but did nothing; a Tkachevist was a dictatorial person. (64) To be a Vperedist or a Nabatist did not necessarily imply an ideological commitment. Lavrov had declared his resolve to make his occasional symposium and paper, Vpered!, the organ of all revolutionaries, and initially he offered three versions of a programme for the publication in order to attract as much support as possible. (65) In fact the only people who he was not willing to accommodate were the 'Jacobin socialists'. (66) On the editorial board of Nabat, there co-existed a number of different trends as well. What then were the 'real' views held by Bakunin, Lavrov and Tkachev on the question of the revolutionary movement?

Lavrov, in the early years of the decade, does indeed seem to have advanced the idea that the educated youths should prepare the 'narod' by peaceful propaganda for an eventual revolution. This was what the revolutionaries appeared to deduce from his 'Historical Letters' published in 1869 in Nedelya, although as Lavrov feared that this work would destroy his reputation as a serious philosopher, perhaps too much importance should not be attached to this as a reflection of his thought. (67) In 1873, Lavrov said that revolution would call for bloody sacrifice, but warned against using evil or harmful means - except in exceptional circumstances. (68) By 1875, he countenanced bloody retaliation to attacks on political prisoners. (69) In 1876 he parted company with the peaceful propagandists and in 1879, when the 'Narodnaya Volya' party was formed, he declared his sympathy for terrorism. (70) Rusanov, his friend and biographer, wrote that Lavrov had evolved from an opponent of terror into a defender. (71) But Lavrov himself, in his recollections of 1880 and 1881, declared that he had warned young Russian émigrés against the

tactical danger of terror, and said that the Executive Committee of 'Narodnaya Volya' must bear responsibility for its consequences.(72) By 1883 he was co-editor of Vestnik Narodnaya Volya, the organ of 'Narodnaya Volya' in exile. Lavrov's advice to the revolutionaries was thus not consistent or a logical result of his philosophy. Nor was it necessarily revolutionary, at least in the beginning, when it was a philosophy which could and was held amongst others by liberals and zemstvo workers. It is also extremely obvious that Lavrov followed, rather than guided the developments in the revolutionary movement.

The category of Bakuninist, which has been applied by different people to all stages of the movement, is on first glance possessed of a clear meaning. He advocated a spontaneous revolution by the peasantry; an event which would be sparked off by the revolutionary intelligentsia. He espoused the bunt; the pugachevshchina. This followed logically from his anarchist thought, for only by means of a popular revolt would the destruction of the state be assured and hence the freedom of the individual. In his own political activities and his writings he also advanced the opposite of this method, that is, the method of a small conspiratorial group directing events at the time of mass unrest. He wrote that: a real revolution does not need individuals standing at the head of it, but men hidden invisibly among the crowd and forming an invisible link between one crowd and another, and thus invisibly giving one and the same direction, one spirit and character to the movement.(73) These organizers were absolutely indispensable; "The workers are great in number, but numbers mean nothing if forces are not organized... Spontaneous movements of the masses of people ... (need to be)... well organized and directed by intelligent people...(in order to produce)... a formidable revolution."(74) In short, Bakunin was convinced that "the existing order could be effectively attacked only by underground mining and conspiracy", "...it was a conviction from which he never...swerved."(75) As he showed in his pamphlet 'The Peoples' Cause. Romanov, Pugachev or Pestel.', he was even willing to abandon the accompanying popular revolt; he would be willing to accept a dictator, even a Romanov, if such a person would guarantee to carry out revolutionary change.(76) This blatant

contradiction did not escape the notice of people at the time. The charitable ones, such as Lavrov, preferred to ignore it (77), others, such as Marx, used it to discredit and isolate the anarchist movement. Thus, in view of the fact that Bakunin advocated a wide range of tactics, the possibility of applying the term 'Bakuninist' to a range of the revolutionary organizations of the 1870's is comprehensible. At the same time it is devoid of any specific and absolute meaning.

It is difficult to disagree with the observation by Z.K.Ralli, made in 1875, that the revolutionaries 'created' Lavrov and Bakunin: "It was not Lavrov who created the youths of St.Petersburg and Moscow. It was not he who told them that it was time to begin action. On the contrary, it is this youth that has created Lavrov. It has dragged him from his world of transcendental metaphysics, and put him on to a more active and vital road. As for Bakunin and the enormous influence he is supposed to have on Russian youth, here again the report (i.e., the report of Count Pahlen Minister of Justice, on the v narod movement) is wrong and sees a highly exaggerated picture of what happened ... We do not want to do anything to diminish the significance of Bakunin as a strong personality and a great agitator, but we must point out that his influence on the Russian revolutionary movement was always fairly weak."(78) Lavrov acknowledged that the arguments between Lavrovists and Bakuninists in Switzerland "had little influence on revolutionary activity in Russia."(79)

In the case of Tkachev, the matter seems simpler; a fairly consistent body of advice was given to the revolutionaries by him. Unfortunately both Tkachev and Lavrov, who seldom agreed, concurred in the judgement that the paper to which the former contributed - Nabat - had almost no influence on the movement in Russia.(80) Tkachev believed however that the principles which he enunciated were, of their own accord, developing amongst the revolutionaries and that this included a considerable number of the Executive Committee.(81) He espoused the seizure of power by a small disciplined group of men at the time of mass disturbance, and consequently his name is most frequently associated with that of the

'Narodnaya Volya' party. There any similarity ends, for Tkachev strenuously opposed any attempt to use individual terror as a means of seizing power or of altering governments; he warned that such tactics "could only lead to the break-up of the revolutionary organizations by the police and to the overall weakening of the revolutionary movement."⁽⁸²⁾ Tkachev advocated a post-revolutionary mass terror in conjunction with propaganda in the event of counter-revolutionary attacks. This sequence of events which Tkachev proposed was condemned by 'Narodnaya Volya'. The difference between pre-revolutionary individual terror and post-revolutionary mass terror was no light matter for the revolutionaries. Because of Tkachev's refusal to approve the programme of the pre-revolutionary individual terrorists he, in September 1876, was forced by the other members of the Nabat staff to vacate his position as editor which he had held since November 1875 and to accept a co-editorship. In 1879, when events in the Empire demanded that an unequivocal line should be adopted, Tkachev was removed altogether by Kaspar Turski and the rest of the Nabat staff who favoured the widest use of terror, both mass and individual.⁽⁸³⁾

Neither Bakunin nor Lavrov was in the Empire during the 1870's. Bakunin had very little idea of developments there except in the versions rendered to him by S.Nechayev. Herzen, as early as 1847 had accused Bakunin of being out of touch with Russian reality.⁽⁸⁴⁾ Tkachev was in the Empire only during the first three years of the decade, and during that time was in exile in Veliki Luki. His views had such a small following in Russia that he received little of that vital flow of information about events within the Empire. In this respect, Lavrov, as editor of the fortnightly paper Vpered!, and of four of the five issues of the occasional symposium of the same name, was in an enviable position. He had a comparatively large network for providing information and distributing his journal. The result of this, as has been seen, was not that he could exert influence but that it allowed him the better to flow with the current of events proceeding within Russia. The meaninglessness of these categories of Lavrovism, Bakuninism and Tkachevism as accurate descriptions of the thought of the active revolutionaries has begun to gain recognition amongst Soviet historians. Neither

R.V.Filippov nor B.S.Itenberg use them because they feel that the revolutionaries in Russia had not developed sufficiently clear programmes to allow any identification of the source of their principles.(85)

The above discussion shows that there is no consensus amongst historians as regards the use of the terms Bakunist, Lavrovist or Tkachevist; that the body of theory which these labels are meant to describe contains contradictions which allow of a variety of interpretations, and that these thinkers had little opportunity to exercise any influence over the practices of the revolutionaries inside the Empire. The categorisation of the revolutionaries according to a supposed ideological commitment to Lavrovism, Bakuninism or Tkachevism does not form a sufficiently definite basis for the analysis of the revolutionary movement.

The revolutionaries themselves appear to have analysed their movement into groups according to the tactics which they espoused. V.Figner described the pre-1876 revolutionaries as being either Buntists or Propagandists.(86) Lavrov in 1876 distinguished, in the socialist opposition, the following : the legalists, who wanted socialism by gradual reform; the Jacobin socialists who looked to a violent seizure of power; the Populist experimenters who sought to arouse peasant revolts; Populist preparers who believed that it was necessary to conduct systematic work amongst the masses with the aim of making them aware of the desirability of socialism.(87) In 1878, P.B.Aksel'rod offered an analysis of the movement in four main factions - buntars, narodniks, propagandists and obshchinniks.(88) By 1881, Lavrov had revised his views to take account of new developments, and presented a prospect of four groups, which were the propagandists, the agitators, the organisers and the terrorists.(89) Looking back over the preceding ten years from the vantage point of 1883, G.Flekhanov gave a role-call of: the Vperedists ("the supporters of that publication working in Russia."), Rebels, Nabatists, buntars, narodniks, blanquists, 'Narodnaya Volya' and Lavrovists and Bakuninists.(90) Mostly these names are rough and transient descriptions of the tactics used by the various groups and the names are largely self-explanatory. Regarding the meaning of

'narodnik', R. Pipes has examined its meaning and demonstrates that the real definition of narodnik is essentially a tactical one.(91) Plekhanov's use of Lavrovist and Bakuninist has already been discussed.

The choice of tactics was not the result of philosophical allegiances, about which the great majority of revolutionaries knew very little indeed. Theory was not significantly developed until the 1880's, when clashes with the Social Democrats made it necessary. Precisely because of the paucity of articulate expressions of philosophical justifications for their particular forms of activity, among the active revolutionaries, the objective evidence of the various tactics which they adopted may be the best way to analyse the movement. However the undeniable fact that the revolutionaries were not overendowed with theoretical concepts should not be misconstrued as evidence that their tactics were dictated by nothing more significant than the exigencies of the moment. I. Berlin has written that "violent disputes took place about means and methods, and timing, but not about ultimate purpose."(92) When Plekhanov attacked 'Narodnaya Volya' in the lead article in the first number of Chernyy Feredel, "He took issue only on the revolutionary strategy." He "flung the same accusations at the autocracy as had his rivals."(93) The choice of tactic therefore was important to the revolutionaries. Anne Branfoot wrote in 1926, in 'A Critical Survey of the Narodnik Movement, 1861-1881', that "the choice of tactics was of primary importance. A difference in method very often implied a fundamental difference in outlook."(94) Indeed choice of tactics could confound and transcend philosophical orientation; Buntars, Lavrovists, Jacobinists, anarchists, Marxists when, for example, spreading propaganda amongst the peasants were for the duration of that activity, all 'propagandists'.(95)

The third and most important theme in works on the revolutionary movement concerns the view of how the development of the movement came about. The two themes discussed above - that the revolutionary movement was composed of a substantive and homogeneous group called the intelligentsia, and consequently that the putative philosophical categorisations are the only real ones - allows but one view to be taken of the development of the movement, namely that it can be

explained solely in terms of responses to external challenges. Thus, the change in the technicalities of the movement, that is, the organisation of the party, the switching from one tactic to another, the predominance in it at any given time of 'Bakuninism', 'Lavrovism' or 'Tkachevism', etc., cannot - given the above premises - be explained by reference to any internal dynamic but only as the results of stimuli external to the movement itself. This point, which never requires to be stated, will be apparent from the following characterisation of the traditional view. The movement began as an open propagandist movement with casual contacts between its participants rather than an organisation. This movement failed due to repression and to the lack of response from the peasantry, and consequently the 'Zemlya i Volya' party was formed. It was distinguished by greater organisation and by secrecy, but it continued agitational work amongst the peasants, in settlements, and carried out some acts of retaliatory violence. Due to the continued unresponsiveness of the peasants; increasingly violent repression by the state; and to the ignominy accruing to the autocratic government, (partly through its mishandling of the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878, and partly through the contradiction of providing Bulgaria with a constitution while denying one to the peoples of the Russian Empire), the revolutionaries were once again compelled to change their form of struggle. The product of this change was the 'Narodnaya Volya' party which subscribed to the view that it should kill the tsar in order to destroy the autocratic system, and should concentrate more attention amongst the more congenial atmosphere of the urban workers. The revolutionary movement was therefore, in this view, more acted upon than active.

The interpretation of events was of course precisely the one presented by the revolutionaries and their supporters at the time. The revolutionaries urged this view more stridently as the methods which they adopted became more extreme and increasingly unacceptable to many of the people whose sympathy they wished to gain. It was the argument used by the revolutionaries - such as A. Zhelyabov, N. Kibal'chich and A. Mikhaylov (96) - at their trials and subsequently (97). Lavrov and Tikhomirov assured the whole movement that terror was abhorrent to them and that they would gladly return to peaceful

propaganda if only the government would cease its persecution.(98) 'Narodnaya Volya' sought to assure Americans that it detested terrorism but found itself forced to use it because of government persecution.(99) The Italians, French and British were given the same assurances by Stepnyak, Kropotkin and others.(100) The most recent American history of the movement apparently concurs in this view and observes that very few would have turned to terrorism if the government had been less vicious in its treatment of the peaceful revolutionaries, and if the revolutionaries had not been so disappointed by the lack of response from the peasants to their call for revolution.(101) Yet, as A.Tun remarked at the time, on the basis of his acquaintance with many émigré revolutionaries in Switzerland, they were not averse to making Western readers believe that they only wanted a constitution and political freedom as an end in themselves, whereas they really were just means to an end.(102) Duplicity was not totally unknown to the revolutionaries.

The revolutionaries obviously would want to deny that terrorism was a principle of revolutionary activity; they had to claim that it was the product of conditions peculiar to the Russian Empire. The theoretical poverty of a large section of the movement lends credibility to this view. When the first major division occurred in the revolutionary movement with the conversion of part of the 'Chernyy Feredel' to social democracy, precisely this point was part of the initial polemic. Flekhanov in his brochure 'Socialism and the Political Struggle' of 1883, stated that 'Narodnaya Volya' had its method of struggle dictated by the exigencies of the moment without appreciating its true significance. He wrote: "the members of 'Narodnaya Volya' were only summing up the revolutionary experience of previous years; in raising the banner of political struggle, they only showed that they were not afraid of the conclusions and consciously continued to follow the road which they had stepped upon although they had an erroneous idea of where it led to."(103)

The 'passive' view of the revolutionary movement has much support and fits neatly with the other themes in the normal view of the movement. It is called into question here, for two reasons. The source of this interpretation resides in the rather suspect

area of polemics and propaganda; this of itself might justify its re-examination. More importantly, it cannot fully accommodate the reality of the situation, which was that at any one time, there existed a multiplicity of different groupings and policies within the movement. The revolutionaries were aware of a number of alternative courses which were available to them at any one time.(104) It is not the case that there was only one possible response to each set of external pressures.

The traditional image of the revolutionary movement is permeated with the idea of unity: unity in the type of revolutionary personnel, unity in ideological patterns and unified responses to external stimuli. Consistent with this, a unity of development throughout the Empire is also assumed and this constitutes the fourth and final theme which is to be examined here. This theme involved the belief that in all parts of the Empire the movement passed through the same sequence of stages as in St.Petersburg and did so largely under the influence and tutelage of the metropolitan revolutionaries. As Venturi expresses it: "The initiative was no longer to come from the provinces; the revolutionary movement of the 1870's began in St. Petersburg and spread out to the provinces, which found their natural place in a general current." After reviewing the events in the early seventies in the capital, he writes that "there occurred, though on a different scale, what had happened in the capital."(105) S.F.Kovalik, in his memoirs refers to Moscow and the other provinces receiving "a push from Peter" to start on the v narod movement.(106) Of a later stage in the movement's history, V.V.Shirokova writes that "The revolutionary movement in Kharkov at the end of the 70's developed as an integral part of the all-Russian movement, in close links with the Petersburg centre, under its leadership..."(107) One apparently minor deviation in this unity is recognised; namely that the southern part of the Empire transferred to terrorism before the remainder, although this early manifestation is generally viewed as having been rather incomplete and unsatisfactory. This recognition is sometimes rather reluctant, as can be seen from V.V.Shirokova: "The widespread opinion, that in the south the transition to political struggle began earlier, than in the north, is true only in relation to individual revolutionaries in the larger centres

(Kiev, Odessa). In Kharkov the majority of the members of the kruzhok up till autumn 1879 held to the narodnichestvo views and their recognition of the narodovol'chestvo tendency came under the influence of representatives of the Executive Committee ..."(108) Others, the majority, are less equivocal: V.A.Tvardovskaya boldly states that "The revolutionaries of the Southern kruzhoks were the first to start on the path of political struggle (end of 1877-beginning of 1878)."(109) This precocity of the South has been explained by reference to exceptional circumstances: the hot blood of the Southerners, the milder climate, the polyglot urban populations, the greater brutality of the authorities or inarticulate national grievances.(110) In this way it has been possible to accommodate the aberration within the scheme of a uniform pattern of development for the revolutionary movement.

However in connection with the fourth theme there are some warning signs which may justify a more circumspect approach to its acceptance as a fundamental and unquestioned premise. One general point is that research on other periods of the revolutionary movement has pointed to the importance of regional differences in terms of support and policies.(111) A second general consideration is suggested by M.R.Popov when he wrote that "the most untypical representatives of both tendencies in the organisation 'Zemlya i Volya' were in Petersburg."(112) Development in capital cities may well be more dynamic and progressive than developments in the provinces but it is unwise to assume that they would typify what was happening in the provinces in the absence of empirical evidence to that effect. A third factor is that the government found it worthwhile, for practical and political reasons, to encourage the belief that St.Petersburg was the centre of this evil conspiracy to subvert the state. The evidence which the prosecution uses at the Trial of the 193 is organised in such a way that the reader can only conclude that the revolutionary movement originated in a small number of groups in the capital which dispatched agents into the provinces where they successfully beguiled the unsophisticated inhabitants.(113)

The prime reason for doubting the accuracy of a unitary pattern

of development in the revolutionary movement between 1873 and 1883 is the weight of memoir material which points to continuous and varied differences in the way the Southern provinces developed. These differences are sufficiently extensive as to indicate that there was something more fundamentally distinctive about the development of the Southern revolutionary movement than can be accounted for by 'exceptional circumstances'. Vera Figner, for example, observed that "Until the end of 1876, the Russian revolutionary groups were divided into two main branches: the Propagandists and the Buntars. The former prevailed in the north, the latter in the south."(114) A. Fun believed that there was a similar geographical basis for support for the different tendencies embraced by the 'Zemlya i Volya' organisation.(115) P. Milyukov claimed quite bluntly that the 'Narodnaya Volya' party was almost entirely composed of Southerners.(116) Figner also recollected that "In contrast to the south, the question of organisation was seriously considered in the north, and its adequate solution proved of great service for the cause of the revolution, for it secured continuity, accumulation of experience, and the gradual development of a superior type of organisation."(117) Both Mikhaylov and Steblin-Kamensky observed the same difference between the north and the south of the Empire in this respect.(118) However the Soviet historian, S.N. Valk, writing in 1930, neatly summarised the whole matter: "The revolutionary movement of the 1870's developed for a long time in separate local channels, differing in character from one another, and only at the end of this decade were they united in an all Russian, and centralised party - 'Narodnaya Volya'. The traditional history of the revolutionary movement devotes little time, to be exact - it even ignored these local lines of development. It was interested in stages of development, which, it seemed, were experienced equally everywhere. This point of view now demands reconsideration."(119) As Valk indicates there were a number of different regions which experienced their own pattern of development, and not only the south. Poland (120), Byelorussia (121), Georgia(122), the Volga (123) etc., all made their distinctive contribution to the development of the movement.

The four themes in the traditional view of the revolutionary movement - that the revolutionaries belonged to the intelligentsia, that the revolutionaries can be allocated to ideological categories, that the movement had a passive nature and that the pattern of development witnessed in the capital was substantially repeated throughout the Empire - are deeply interconnected, and reinforce one another. It is not possible to call in question any one element without being involved in questioning the whole. In view of the high regard in which the concept of the Russian intelligentsia is held in both East and West, there is a strong disincentive to any questioning of the totality. However this framework imposes a homogeneity and unity upon the revolutionaries with regard to its personnel and beliefs, and upon the development of the movement both in time and space, which can only be accepted at the price of ignoring or obfuscating evidence of diversity.

The subject of the present study is the question of why the revolutionary movement in the South of the Russian Empire developed as it did. In examining the usual answer to the problem, and in considering alternatives and additions to it, lines of investigation were repeatedly halted by the implications contained in the four themes which underpin that answer. It was for this reason that it has been found necessary to isolate and to query these four premises in the first Chapter. It should be stressed that it is not the purpose of this thesis to undertake any further systematic examination of the historical validity of these premises. The thesis will only examine the account of the Southern revolutionary development to which they have given rise, and suggest modifications to it. However, in view of the criticisms made in the present Chapter, it does not seem necessary either to be constrained by these premises or subsequently to have to justify their absence from the present study. Thus, for example, it should now be possible to examine the actual nature of the composition of the revolutionary movement and to postulate that changes in that composition might well be a contributory cause of development in the movement. Equally, the revolutionaries will not be discussed in terms of their ideological classifications, nor will the movement's development be viewed through the prism of the Chaykovtsy- 'Zemlya i Volya' - 'Narodnaya

Volya' pattern which obtained in St. Petersburg.

In the usual account of the development of the movement in the South the four premises can be discerned, and it can be rendered as follows : The South was a backwater politically, and only had a slightly developed revolutionary movement. Thus, not till St. Petersburg, and to a lesser extent Moscow, provided the leadership did a v narod movement amongst the peasants start in this region. It began rather tardily and continued half-heartedly. Police persecution and the unresponsiveness of the peasants caused the revolutionaries to progress from an incipient Bakuninism to a more full-blooded variety, Buntarism. Frustration here, coupled with continued police harassment of the revolutionaries and of prisoners, brought about a rapid transition to terrorism which was further fuelled by specific factors such as passionate Southern temperaments and the climate. The movement was therefore much more significant in the South by the end of the period than it had been at the start. Having considered the themes which underpin this account in the present Chapter, the remainder of this study will consider individual parts of the account itself. Chapter II considers if the Southern revolutionary movement really was initiated and led by St. Petersburg through the same series of revolutionary stages as obtained in the capital. Chapter III, while confirming that the commitment to agitation amongst the peasantry was weak during the early stages of the revolutionary movement, suggests causes for this, apart from the supposed Southern 'backwardness' in revolutionary matters. Chapter IV examines the reasons for Southern revolutionaries turning to political terrorism: was it really because of police persecution and peasant unresponsiveness? This Chapter feels able to explore any changes in the social and educational composition of the support of different revolutionary policies. In the course of considering the reasons for changes in the revolutionary movement in the South, it became clear that a range of local factors, extrinsic and intrinsic to the revolutionary movement, must also be taken into account. Chapter V therefore examines the revolutionaries relations with the urban workers; Chapter VI, their contact with liberal society and, Chapter VII, their involvement with the Ukrainophile movement.

The dates which delimit the present study were dictated by the movement's own activities. There had, of course, been considerable activity before 1873 and there was considerably more in the 1880's than in the 1860's. However the intervening ten years, from 1873 till 1883, witnessed a considerable quantitative upsurge in revolutionary activity which, despite vicissitudes maintained itself for this period.

In the course of this study, 'South' will indicate the area which is the subject of investigation and which corresponds roughly to what, at the time, was referred to by most people as Little Russia and New Russia. It covered the following provinces and areas: Volynia, Podolia, Bessarabia, Kiev, Kherson, Chernigov, Podolia, Yekaterinoslav, Tauride, Kharkov, the Don Military Region and the Kuban District. Similarly, 'North' will denote the area outwith this. When 'south' or 'north' are used, they will have the normal geographical meaning.

2. References.

- (1) For example, S.S.Tatishchev 'Imperator Aleksandr II. Ego zhizn'i tsarstvovaniye' (1903).
- (2) For example, A.A.Kornilov 'Obshchestvennoye dvizheniye pri Aleksandre II. 1855-1881' (1909); B.B.Glinsky 'Revolyutsionnyy period russkoy istorii (1860-1881gg)' 2 tom (1913); L.Kulczycki 'Geschichte der russischen Revolution' 3 bande (1910-1911); A.Thun 'Geschichte der revolutionaren Bewegungen in Russland' 2 bande (1883; first Russian edition, 1903); V.Ya.Bogucharsky 'Aktivnoye Narodnichestvo semidesyatykh godov' (1912); V.Ya.Bogucharsky 'Iz istorii politicheskoy bor'by v 70-kh i 80-kh gg XIX veka' (1912)
- (3) J.Frankel 'Party Genealogy and the Soviet Historians' in Slavic Review Dec.1966, vol.25, no.4, pp.563-603.
- (4) J.E.Bachmann 'Recent Soviet Historiography of Russian Revolutionary Populism' in Slavic Review Dec.1970, vol.29, no.4, pp.599-612; I.V.Kuznetsov 'Istoriya S.S.S.R. Epokha Kapitalizma. 1861-1917' (1971) pp.161-173.
- (5) For example, A.Walicki 'The Controversy over Capitalism. Studies in the Social Philosophy of the Russian Populists' (1969) p.7; S.S.Volk 'Narodnaya Volya' (1966) pp.465-466; P.S.Tkachenko 'O nekotorykh voprosakh istorii narodnichestva' in Voprosy Istorii 1956, no.5, pp.36-37.
- (6) For a bibliography of the Group's work to 1964, see V.F.Zakharina (ed.) 'Obshchestvennoye dvizheniye v poreformennoy Rossii. Sbornik statey k 80-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya B.P.Foz'mina' (1965) pp.366-369.
- (7) For a list of studies of local revolutionary movements, published between 1956 and 1964, see V.F.Zakharina (ed.) 'Obshchestvennoye dvizheniye v poreformennoy Rossii' pp.375-376; also, B.S.Itenberg in Istoriya S.S.S.R. 1974, no.4, p.190; specifically on the Southern area, see Z.V.Pereshina 'Ocherki istorii revolyutsionnogo dvizheniya na yuge Ukrainy' (1975) pp.190-191.

- (8) A.Leroy-Beaulieu 'L'empire des Tsars et les Russes' tome II (1893, third edition).
- (9) G. Hume 'Thirty Five Years in Russia' (1914); A.Gallenga 'A Summer Tour in Russia' (1892)
- (10) This can be seen clearly by comparing the 1st or 6th editions of 1877 with the new edition of 1905 of D.Mackenzie Wallace's 'Russia' 2 vls. The former contain no mention of revolutionaries, indeed they comment upon the social harmony apparent in Russia (ibid, vol.I, p.442); the new edition devoted three chapters to them. See also B.Pares 'Russia and Reform' (1907); Y.Zilliacus 'The Russian Revolutionary Movement' (1905)
- (11) F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution. A History of the Populist and Socialist Movements in Nineteenth-Century Russia'(1960). Exceptions to this statement are: D.Footman 'Red Prelude' (1944); A.I.S.Branfoot 'A Critical Survey of the Narodnik Movement' Ph.D. Thesis. London University. (1926).
- (12) J.H.Billington 'Mikhailovsky and Russian Populism' (1958); R.Hare 'Portraits of Russian Personalities Between Reform and Revolution'(1959); E.Lampert 'Sons against Fathers. Studies in Russian Radicalism and Revolution' (1965); R.Wortman 'The Crisis of Russian Populism' (1967); P.Pomper 'Peter Lavrov and the Russian Revolutionary Movement' (1972); D.Hardy 'Petr Tkachev, the Critic as Jacobin' (1977); E.Acton 'Alexander Herzen and the role of the intellectual revolutionary' (1979); M.A. Miller 'Ideological Conflicts in Russian Populism: The Revolutionary Manifestoes of the Chaikovsky Circle 1869-74' in Slavic Review March 1970, vol.29, no.1, pp.1-21; R.Pipes 'Russian Marxism and its Populist Background' in The Russian Review Oct.1960, vol.19,no.4. On the other hand, the revolutionary movement is the subject of the study by R.E.Zelnic 'Populists and Workers' in Soviet Studies Oct.1972, vol.24, no.2, pp.251-269; A.V.Knowles 'The 'Book Affair' of the Chaykovsky Circle' in The Slavonic and East European Review Oct.1973, vol.51, no.125, pp.554-566; Pamela S.Mckinsey 'From City Workers to Peasantry' in Slavic Review 1979, vol.38, pp.629-649; A.Ulam 'In the Name of the People'(1977)

- (13) For example, I. Berlin 'Introduction' to F. Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p. xxix; J. H. Billington 'Mikhailovsky and Russian Populism' p. v; A. P. Mendel 'Dilemmas of Progress in Tsarist Russia' (1961) p. 3; S. V. Utechin 'Russian Political Thought. A Concise History' (1964) p. 147.
- (14) For example, P. Worsley 'The Third World' (1967) pp. 167, 172-173; J. H. Fautsky 'The Political Consequences of Modernization' (1972) p. 32, 120 note 22; G. Ionescu and E. Gellner (eds.) 'Populism. Its Meanings and National Characteristics' (1970) pp. 1-5.
- (15) For example, L. Shapiro 'The Communist Party of the Soviet Union' (1970) p. 9; J. L. H. Keep 'The Rise of Social Democracy in Russia' (1963); R. Schlesinger 'Preparatory period of the Revolutionary Party: Some Observations on Franco Venturi's Roots of Revolution' in Soviet Studies April 1963, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 447-459.
- (16) M. Pradwin 'The Unmentionable Nechayev' (1961); A. L. Weeks 'The First Bolshevik. A Political Biography of Peter Tkachev' (1968).
- (17) A. Walicki 'Russia' in G. Ionescu and E. Gellner (eds.) 'Populism. Its Meanings and National Characteristics' p. 64.
- (18) O. H. Radkey 'The Agrarian Foes of Bolshevism' p. ix.
- (19) A. Walicki 'The Controversy over Capitalism' p. 5; R. Pipes 'Narodnichestvo: A Semantic Inquiry' in Slavic Review Sept. 1964, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 441-458; B. P. Koz'min 'Iz istorii revolyutsionnoy mysli v Rossii' pp. 638-727.
- (20) M. Malia 'What is the Intelligentsia' in R. Pipes (ed.) 'The Russian Intelligentsia' p. 1.
- (21) D. R. Brower 'The Problem of the Russian Intelligentsia' in Slavic Review Dec. 1967, vol. 26, no. 4, p. 638.
- (22) For example, M. N. Pokrovsky 'A Brief History of Russia' vol. I, p. 165
- (23) D. R. Brower 'The Problem of the Russian Intelligentsia' in Slavic Review Dec. 1967, vol. 26, no. 4, p. 645.
- (24) H. Seton-Watson 'The Decline of Imperial Russia, 1855-1914' p. 21 note, writes about three classes of intelligentsia; "the professional class, the oppositional intelligentsia and the revolutionaries."

- (25) G.Fischer 'The Intelligentsia and Russia' in C.Black (ed) 'The Transformation of Russian Society. Aspects of Social Change since 1861.' p.254; D.R.Brower 'The Problem of the Russian Intelligentsia' in Slavic Review Dec.1967, vol.26, no.4, p.640; M.Malia 'What is the Intelligentsia' in R.Pipes (ed.) 'The Russian Intelligentsia' p.2. Most recently, A.B.Ulam has written that intelligentsia denotes "an attitude of alienation from and opposition to the existing system." A.B.Ulam 'Russia's Failed Revolutions. From the Decembrists to the Dissidents' p.71
- (26) V.I.Lenin 'Collected Works' vol.5, p.474,480 & 517.
- (27) R.Wortman 'The Crisis of Russian Populism' p.vii.
- (28) E.Breshko-Breshkovskaya 'Hidden Springs of the Russian Revolution' p.329.
- (29) 'Stepniak' 'Underground Russia' p.ix, for Lavrov's comment, and p.284 for Stepanyak's. F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.539, remarks on the influx of 'working class elements' at the end of the 70's.
- (30) V.Figner 'Memoirs of a Revolutionist' p.47.
- (31) A.B. Ulam 'In the Name of the People' p.209.
- (32) D.Mirsky 'Russia. A Social History' p.260. F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.596, claims that the revolutionaries who spread propaganda amongst the peasants in 1873-4, were from the upper classes, having been through school and university, but in subsequent stages of the movement, "there was a sizeable representation of all classes of the population except the peasants in the villages."
- (33) F.Gross 'The Seizure of Political Power in a Century of Revolution' pp.57,117-118,120.; C.Johnson 'Revolution and the Social System' pp.26-27; A.C.Janos 'Authority and Violence: The Political Framework of Internal War' in H.Eckstein (ed.) 'Internal War. Problems and Approaches' p.139.
- (34) R.Bendix 'Social Stratification and Political Power' in American Political Science Review 1952, no.46, pp.363-365; S.M.Lipset 'Social Stratification and Right-Wing Extremism' in British Journal of Sociology Dec.1959, vol.10, no.4.

- (35) J.H.Billington 'Mikhailovsky and Russian Populism' p.v;
In similar vein, O.H.Radkey 'The Agrarian Poes of Bolshevism'
pp.4-5, writes that "By some curious distortion of history
these men have figured as the founders of Populism whereas in
reality they contributed nothing more than inspiration and a
utopian ideology..."
- (36) F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.xxxii, p.l.
- (37) J.H.Billington 'Mikhailovsky and Russian Populism' p.v.
- (38) P.S.Tkachenko 'O spornykh problemakh istorii narodnichestva'
in Istoriya S.S.S.R. 1963, no.6, pp.76-84; Sh.M.Levin
'Revolyuetsionnoye narodnichestvo 70-kh godov v osveshcheniy
V.I.Lenina' in Istoriya S.S.S.R. 1962, no.2, pp.19-41;
V.V.Shirokova 'Yeshche raz o revolyutsionnykh demokratakh i
narodnikakh' in Istoriya S.S.S.R. 1962, no.3, pp.72-79.
- (39) B.S.Itenberg 'Dvizheniye Revolyutsionnogo Narodnichestva'
pp.40, 359-360.
- (40) R.V.Filippov 'Iz istorii narodnicheskogo dvizheniya na
pervom etape 'khozheniya v narod' 1863-1874'
- (41) G.I.Ionova and A.P. Smirnov 'Revolyuetsionnyye demokraty
i narodniki' in Istoriya S.S.S.R. 1961, no.5, pp.112-142;
J.E.Bachmann 'Recent Soviet Historiography of Russian
Revolutionary Populism' in Slavic Review Dec.1970, vol.29,
no.4, pp.599-612.
- (42) This argument is borne out by the work of N.A.Troitsky on
political trials in the seventies and eighties - see
'Tsarskiye sudy protiv revolyutsionnoy Rossii' pp.75-6,205,
336ff; 'Narodnaya Volya' pered tsarskim sudom' p.84ff.
- (43) S.N.Valk (ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.84, p.341.
- (44) R.Wortman 'The Crisis of Russian Populism' pp.vii-viii.
- (45) A.B.Ulam 'In the Name of the People' pp.235-236.
- (46) V.Ya.Bogucharsky 'Aktivnoye narodnichestvo semidesyatykh
godov' pp.166-167; V.I.Nevsky (ed.) 'Istoriko-revolyuetsionnyy
sbornik' 1926, tom III, p.15: Ye.A.Korol'chuk 'Severnyy
soyuz russkikh rabochikh' pp.33-34.

- (47) N.K.Karatayev (ed.) 'Narodnicheskaya Ekonomicheskaya Literatura' p.655; S.S.Dmitriyev (ed.) 'Ocherki istorii S.S.S.R. 1861-1904' p.175; S.V.Utechin 'Russian Political Thought' p.131; D.Footman 'Red Prelude' p.46,52: Footman says there were some Bakuninists, but Odessans were all Lavrovist.
- (48) V.O.Levitsky (V.Tsederbaum) 'Partiya 'Narodnaya Volya'' p.31; M.V.Nechkina (ed.) 'Istoriya S.S.S.R. tom II. Rossiya v XIX veka' p.586; Sh.M.Levin 'Obshchestvennoye dvizheniye v Rossii v 60-70 ye gody XIX veka' pp.362-363. G.Woodcock and I. Avakumovic 'The Anarchist Prince' p.127: Kropotkin was a Bakuninist, "the remainder of the Chaikovtzi tended towards Lavrov..." "And fundamentally the two ways of thought had much in common."
- (49) N.A.Troitsky 'Bol'shoye obshchestvo propagandy 1871-1874gg (tak nazyvaynnyye 'Chaykovttsy')' in Istoriya S.S.S.R. 1962, no.5, pp.74-91.
- (50) E.Yaroslavsky 'History of Anarchism in Russia' p.11,27; M.N.Fokrovsky 'A Brief History of Russia' tom I, p.195, described its members as 'Buntars' - a similar term.
- (51) V.Ya.Bogucharsky 'Iz politicheskoy bor'by v 70-kh i 80-kh gg XIX veka' p.472.
- (52) S.S.Volk 'Narodnaya Volya' pp.238-247. 'Blanquist' is sometimes used in place of Jacobin.
- (53) A.Weeks 'The First Bolshevik. A Political Biography of Peter Tkachev' p.27.
- (54) S.H.Baron 'Flekanov. The Father of Russian Marxism' p.45.
- (55) G.Lichtheim 'A Short History of Socialism' p.148.
- (56) A.Ascher 'Pavel Aksel'rod and the Development of Menshevism' p.24,29.
- (57) E.Breshko-Breshkovskaya 'Hidden Springs of the Russian Revolution' p.10,note.
- (58) Ibid., pp.12-13.
- (59) P.Pomper 'Peter Lavrov and the Russian Revolutionary Movement' p.139; A.Tun 'Istoriya Revolyutsionnykh Dvizheniy v Rossii' p.133; Z.V.Pereshina 'Ocherki Istorii Revolyutsionnogo dvizheniya na yuge Ukrainy' p.96.

- (60) A.B.Ulam 'In the Name of the People' p.210; B.Sapir (ed.) 'Vpered!' tom I, p.236. P.Avrich 'The Russian Anarchists' p.37, denies that any Bakuninist organisation existed in Russia until the 1890's. P.Fomper 'Peter Lavrov and the Russian Revolutionary Movement' pp.150-151 states that there were few Lavrovists in Russia thereby presumably contradicting the view of Ulam.
- (61) 'Our Differences' in M.T.Iovchuk (ed.) 'G.Flekhanov. Selected Philosophical Works' vol.I, especially pp.167-187. The ideas were also present in Flekhanov's 'Socialism and the Political Struggle' (1883) in ibid., especially pp.64-70
- (62) V.Figner 'Zapachatlennyy Trud' tom I, p.135.
- (63) B.Sapir (ed.) 'Vpered!' tom I, p.236.
- (64) A.Weeks 'The First Bolshevik. A Political Biography of Peter Tkachev' p.37 note 58.
- (65) G.M.Lifshits 'O trekh variantakh programy zhurnala 'Vpered!'' in V.F.Zakharina (ed.) 'Obshchestvennoye Dvizheniye v poreformennoy Rossii' pp.241-275.
- (66) B.Sapir (ed.) 'Vpered!' tom I, p.231.
- (67) J.P.Scanlan (ed.) 'Peter Lavrov. Historical Letters' p.37.
- (68) 'Vpered! Neperiodicheskoye Obozreniye 1873, tom I, ch.1, p.22,23.
- (69) 'Vpered! 1875, no.13, p.403.
- (70) P.L.Lavrov 'Sotsialisticheskoye dvizheniye v Rossii' in KiS 1925, k.14, p.55 and 56.
- (71) N.S.Rusanov 'P.L.Lavrov' in Byloye Feb.1907, no.14, pp.275-276.
- (72) P.L.Lavrov 'Pis'mo tovarishcham v Rossii' 1888,p.18
- (73) G.P.Maximoff (ed.) 'The Political Philosophy of Bakunin: Scientific Anarchism' p.320
- (74) Ibid., p.378. See also A.Lehning 'Bakunin's Conceptions of Revolutionary Organisations and their Role: A Study of His 'Secret Societies'' in C.Abramsky (ed.) 'Essays in Honour of E.H. Carr' pp.57-81.
- (75) E.H.Carr 'Bakunin' pp.182-183.
- (76) Ibid., p.226.
- (77) B.Sapir (ed.) 'Vpered!' tom I, p.231.

- (78) 'Zapiski ministra yustitsii grafa Palena. Uspekhi revolyutsionnyy propagandy v Rossii' 1875, Geneva, 2nd edition, p.17.
J.H.Billington 'Mikhailovsky and Russian Populism' p.vi remarks that neither Bakunin nor Lavrov "exercised more than a peripheral influence on internal Russian development. Thus, the widely accepted description of Russian radicalism in this period as the work of 'Bakuninists' and 'Lavrovists' is, at best, artificial and incomplete." G.Woodcock & I.Avakumovic 'The Anarchist Prince' p.109, "the part played by the emigration in directing the actual activities of circles at home was relatively slight..." "the young people within Russia ... had often no direct connection with the exiles and sometimes only a vague idea of their teachings." P.Pomper 'Peter Lavrov and the Russian Revolutionary Movement' p.153, judges that Lavrov's connection with Russian Lavrovism was tenuous and his relations with his 'supporters' were strained.
- (79) B.Sapir (ed.) 'Lavrov' tom II, doc.222, p.530.
- (80) Ibid., p.532: Nabst groups in Russia were "completely insignificant in numbers and influence..." D.Hardy 'Petr Tkachev, the Critic as Jacobin' p.289, confirms this view.
- (81) A.Weeks 'The First Bolshevik. A Political Biography of Peter Tkachev' p.51.
- (82) Ibid., p.59.
- (83) R.Theen 'Seizure of Political Power as the Prologue to Social Revolution: The Political Ideas of P.N.Tkachev in the early 1870's' in Canadian Slavic Studies Winter 1970, vol.4, no.4, pp.682ff.
- (84) E.H.Carr 'Bakunin' p.37.
- (85) B.S.Itenberg 'Dvizheniye Revolyutsionnogo Narodnichestva' pp.239-246. R.V.Fillipov 'Iz istorii narodnicheskogo dvizheniya na pervom etape 'khozhdeniya v narod' (1863-1874)' pp.84-113, and 'Ideologiya bol'shogo obshchestva propagandy (1869-1874)'
- (86) V.Figner 'Zapechatlenny Trud' tom I, p.137.
- (87) Vpered! 20/5 (1/6) 1876, no.34, col.318-319.
- (88) Obshchina 1878, no.8/9, p.22,31.
- (89) 'Neskol'ko slov ob organizatsii partii' in Chernyy Peredel 1881, no.3, quoted in P.Pomper 'Peter Lavrov and the Russian Revolutionary

- Movement p.207.
- (90) M.T.Iovchuk (ed.) 'G.Flekhanov. Selected Philosophical Works' vol.I, pp.57-122.
- (91) R.Pipes 'Narodnichestvo: A Semantic Inquiry' in Slavic Review Sept.1964, vol.23, no.3, p.458.
- (92) I.Berlin 'Introduction' to F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.xxviii.
- (93) R.Wortman 'The Crisis of Russian Populism' p.124.
- (94) Anne I.S.Branfoot 'A Critical Survey of the Narodnik Movement, 1861-1881' University of London, Ph.D. thesis (1926), p.290
- (95) G.V.Aptekman 'Obshchestvo 'Zemlya i Volya' 70-kh' p.180, observes that "all were then propagandists: both 'buntars' and 'lavrovists'." Lavrov wrote similarly in 1889: B.Sapir (ed.) 'Lavrov' tom II, doc.113, p.230. On an early Russian Marxist who spread propaganda amongst the peasants, see Vpered! tom III, v.1, p.120. (V.Frey).
- (96) Their speeches are printed in Vl.Burtsev (ed.) 'Za sto let' (1800-1896)' ch.I, pp.184-185 (Kibal'chich); pp.186-190 (Zhelyabov); p.192 (Mikhaylov). V.Levitsky (V.Tsederbaum) 'Partiya 'Narodnaya Volya'. Voznikoveniye, Bor'ba, Gibel'' p.64, claims that all narodovol'tsy appearing in court indicated government persecution as the reason for terror. The same argument was used in 'Pismo I.K. k Aleksandru III' in 'Literatura' pp.905-906
- (97) For example, M.Frolenko, writing his memoirs at the very end of 1928, insisted that they resorted to terrorism because government repression closed every other way; see M.R.Frolenko 'Sobraniye Sochineniy' tom I, pp.38-39.
- (98) P.I.Lavrov 'Zadachi sotsializma' in Vestnik Narodnoy Volyi 1883, no.1, pp.8-15; L.Tikhomirov 'Zaprosy Vremeni' in Vestnik Narodnoy Volyi 1885, no.4, pp.225-270.
- (99) See the statement made by 'Narodnaya Volya' following the attempted assassination of President Garfield in Vl.Burtsev 'Za sto let' (1800-1896)' p.180.
- (100) See Stepniak 'Underground Russia', for example, p.270; P.Uropotkin 'The Russian Revolutionary Party' in The Fortnightly Review vol.XXXI (new series), Jan.1 - June 1 1882,

- p.656,666; (P.Lavrov) 'La Justice en Russie' in Vanity Fair 14 April 1877, pp.224-225.
- (101) A.B.Ulam 'In the Name of the People' pp.232,238-240,242.
- (102) A.Tun 'Istoriya Revolyutsionnykh Dvizheniy v Rossii' p.234.
- (103) M.T.Iovchuk (ed.) 'G.Plekhanov. Selected Philosophical Works' vol.I, p.72.
- (104) See, for example, S.I.Bardina's speech at her trial, in B.Bazilevsky (ed.) 'Gos Prestup' tom II, pp.327-331.
- (105) F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' pp.469,470; similarly in J.H.Billington 'Mikhailovsky and Russian Populism' p.58.
- (106) S.F.Kovalik 'Revolutsionnoye Dvizheniye Semidesyatykh godov i protsess 193-kh' p.18.
- (107) V.M.Shirokova 'Vozniknoveniye Narodovol'cheskoy Organizatsii v Khar'kove' in 'Iz Istorii obshchestvennogo dvizheniya i obshchestvennoy mysli v Rossii' (1964) p.94.
- (108) Loc. cit.
- (109) V.A.Tvardovskaya 'Krizis 'Zemli i Voli' v kontse 70-kh godov' in Istoriya S.S.S.R. 1959, no.4, p.62; S.N.Valk in Foreword to VI.Debagory-Mokriyevich 'Ot buntarstva k terrorizmu' tom I, pp.6-7: "The idea of political struggle and the idea of terror was put forward first of all in the South, and mainly in Kiev..."
- (110) A.B.Ulam 'In the Name of the People' p.274.
- (111) I.Avakumović 'A Statistical Approach to the Revolutionary Movement in Russia 1878-1887' in The American Slavic and East European Review April 1959, vol.18, no.2, pp.182-186; D.Lane 'The Roots of Russian Communism' p.43; M.Perric 'The Social Composition and Structure of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party before 1917' in Soviet Studies Oct.1972, vol.24, no.2, pp.236-237; O.Radkey 'The Election to the Russian Constituent Assembly' p.38.
- (112) M.R.Popov 'Iz moyego revolyutsionnogo proshlago (1878-1879gg)' in Byloye 1967, no.7, p.276.
- (113) The prosecution material is contained in B.Bazilevsky (ed.) 'Gos Prestup' tomII and III
- (114) V.Figner 'Kapechatlennyy Trud' tomI, p.137. Similarly, O.V.Aptekman 'Obshchestvo 'Zemlya i Volya' 70-kh' p.277.

- (115) A.Tun 'Istoriya Revolyutsionnykh Dvizheniy v Rossii'
p.164.
- (116) F.Milyoukov 'Russia and Its Crisis' p.416,419.
- (117) V.Figner 'Zapechatlennyy Trud' tom I, p.138.
- (118) A.P.Fribyleva-Yorba and V.N.Figner 'Narodovolets Aleksandr Dmitriyevich Mikhaylov' p.98; (R.Steblyn-Yamensky) 'Grisoriy Anfomovich Popko' in 'Materialy' Oct.1893, tom 16, p.167.
- (119) S.N.Valk, Foreword to VI.Debagory-Mokriyevich 'Ot buntarstva k terrorizmu' tom I, p.3.
- (120) T.G.Snytko 'Russkoye Narodnichestvo i pol'skoye obshchestvennoye dvizheniye 1865-1881gg'
- (121) S.M.Baykov 'Svyazi narodnikov Belorussii s pol'skim revolyutsionerami' in V.A.D'yakov et al. (ed.) 'Svyazi revolyutsionerov Rossii v Pol'ski XIX-nachala XX v.' pp.104-114.
- (122) Z.L.Shvelidze 'Sodruzhestvo russkikh i gruzinskikh revolyutsionnykh narodnikov v 70-80-kh godakh veka' in 'Voprosy Istorii 1957, tom 12, pp.124-134.
- (123) V.N.Ginev 'Narodnicheskoye Dvizheniye v Srednem Fovolzh'ye'

CHAPTER II. THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT IN THE SOUTH

1. Introduction.

The traditional view of the revolutionary movement in the South stresses that the pattern of development witnessed in the capital was substantially repeated throughout the Empire, and that it did so largely under the leadership and direction of the St.Petersburg revolutionaries because of provincial backwardness. If this was indeed the case then, theoretically, at the organisational level, the mechanics of this leadership would have to operate through all or some of the following channels: St.Petersburg would instigate the formation of kruzhoks in the South whose prime organisational ties would be with St.Petersburg; control their literature and finances (and thus their thinking and action); and by binding these Southern kruzhoks, which it had created, into 'all-Russian' organisations it would direct them. This Chapter will consider the validity of each of these theoretical postulates insofar as they affected the South in 1873-1883.

2. The Anatomy of the Southern organisation.

This Section will consider the patterns of organisation amongst revolutionaries in the South from 1873-1883. Organisation within the South was based on the three educational centres of Odessa, Kiev and Kharkov. These three towns were not equally active throughout the whole period, and on the basis of the number of active revolutionary groups, different towns appear to have dominated at different times. Thus, during the v narod movement, 1874-1875, Kiev was the most active centre in the South and, within Kiev, the Kiev Commune set the pace. The Commune's members carried out propaganda work in the provinces of Kiev, Volynia, Chernigov, Poltava, Kherson and possibly Podolia as well as in the cities of Kiev, Chernigov, Odessa and others.(1) Its members were even active in the Northern provinces, as in the case involving Ye.Breshko-Breshkovskaya in Kursk province.(2) On the basis of the number of groups and the extent of their activity, Odessa emerges as the main centre of the South's revolutionary movement during the 'Zemlya i Volya' period, from 1876 to 1879.(3) Groups from Odessa set up branches in Kiev, Nikolayev, Kherson and all along the Black Sea coast from Odessa to Rostov.(4) However, as the decade progressed it becomes more difficult to associate particular groups, such as the Buntars, the kruzhek of I.M.Koval'sky, or that of V.Osinsky, with any specific town because their participants moved freely between Odessa, Kiev and, to a lesser extent, Kharkov. This development in itself may indicate a greater degree of organisation. During the last years of the period under consideration, when the 'Narodnaya Volya' Party was functioning, Kharkov seems to have experienced the greatest activity.(5)

The kruzheks in these three towns tried to exercise control over the surrounding regions; inspiring, organising and assisting groups. This can be exemplified in the case of Kiev. The first circle in the town of Chernigov developed in the spring of 1874 under the influence of G.G.Bozhko-Bozhinsky, a student of Kiev University, who was linked with the Kiev Commune. The circle was composed of people drawn from the local gymnasium and seminary, such as Ye.D.Imshenetsky, A.A.Karlovlch, V.D.Tishchenko and

Ye.I.Karchenko. At the beginning of 1875, Bozhko-Bozhinsky was arrested, and one of his seminarist friends, A.A.Karlovich, testified to the police that "this gentleman (Bozhko-Bozhinsky) was the breeding-ground of all ideas and doctrines connected with the kruzhek of seminarists and other people belonging to it. All the kruzhek endeavoured to digest (these 'ideas and doctrines'), and to carry them out..." Bozhko-Bozhinsky told his Chernigov comrades that he had been sent by the Kiev kruzheks to spread revolutionary propaganda for "the good of all mankind." "he familiarised the seminarists with revolutionary propaganda, and in addition, supplied books..."(6) Ye.Levental' of the Kiev Chaykovtsy also travelled to Chernigov in order to organise the students in May 1874.(7) During 1875, the Kievan kruzhek headed by I.F.Fesenko maintained strong links with Zhitomir.(8) Meanwhile, another Kievan, G.Vilents who was a student at the Kiev Technical Institute, organised a revolutionary kruzhek in Zhitomir, from amongst the senior classes of the gymnasium, which lasted until 1877.(9) In 1878 and 1879, the revolutionary kruzhek of I.Basov came to be called 'the Zhitomir-Kiev group' because a majority of members lived in the former town.(10) Close ties with Zhitomir were maintained by the combined 'Narodnaya Volya' and 'Chernyy Peredel' group in Kiev in 1879 and 1880.(11) Many other towns had similar links with the revolutionary kruzheks of Kiev. P.B.Aksel'rod formed a local kruzhek in Kamenets-Podol'sky from amongst gymnasists and seminarists in the summer of 1874 when he was a member of the Kiev Chaykovtsy.(12) V.I.Bychkov in 1881 also organised a kruzhek of seminarists in the same town, assisted by a local seminarist, M.Vaydvich.(13) This Kiev kruzhek led by V.I.Bychkov and I.Ya Levinsky which functioned from 1879 to 1881, directly controlled a group of revolutionaries in Nezhin, which included N.V.Aaronsky, G.Parkhomenko and others (14), as well as having links with revolutionary organisations in Kremenchug, Poltava and elsewhere.(15) Similar examples could be provided for each of the three centres. As time passed, the movement became more organised and by the time of 'Narodnaya Volya', according to V.N.Figner, "Each local group possessed its own sphere of influence."(16)

Repeatedly attempts were made to maintain communications between

the three main Southern centres themselves, especially by the students of the universities and colleges, but at times this went further and an effort was made to establish an organisation which would unite the whole of the Southern revolutionary movement. During the late 1860's the students kept in contact with each other in pursuance of their specifically student objectives and this continued into the early 1870's.(17) The task became more urgent as kruzhoks for self-education were replaced by ones with a more revolutionary purpose. This process can be seen at work when in February 1874, a self-education kruzhok was created amongst the students of Kharkov University. At the beginning of April 1874, S.F.Kovalik arrived to organise a revolutionary kruzhok which would join in the v narod movement. He succeeded in forming such a kruzhok from students' self-education kruzhoks and established links between it and kruzhoks in Kiev, Poltava and Odessa.(18) Likewise the Kiev Commune had links with the Zhebunev kruzhok in Odessa through Ivan Trezvinsky in particular, Ya.Stefanovich and S.Lur'ye.(19)

As early as 1873 an attempt was made to form an organisation to embrace those in the South who considered themselves to be revolutionary. S.A.Podolinsky, acting on behalf of the journal Vpered!, returned to the south of Russia in order to seek support for the publication. He recorded in his memoirs that "At this time the Kievans planned to construct a congress of representatives of some southern cities in Kiev, with the aim of forming a common organisation for propaganda amongst the narod, the collection of information and of funds for Vpered!, the distribution of publications from abroad etc... The Congress was in Kiev in November 1873. No delegate came from Kharkov, but from Odessa arrived Zhelyabov and people were present from Chernigov province, from the Crimea and other places. At the congress there were no disagreements and formal decisions were very quickly taken as regards organisation, the creation of a revolutionary fund, the distribution of publications." In the event little came of this congress and the idea of a revolutionary fund was hardly put into practice.(20) The Buntar kruzhok held two conferences for its supporters from all parts of the South; the first being in Kiev in March 1876 which twenty people were claimed to have attended in order to discuss the

plan for the Chigrin conspiracy (21), and a second during the winter of 1876-1877 (22). Apart from these meetings, the Buntars of Kiev, according to F.Venturi, were "in constant touch with other centres of Southern Russia, especially Odessa." (23) As with the example of the conference held to assist Vpered!, specific events could draw the Southern revolutionaries together. Thus, a general meeting was held to discuss the preparations for a demonstration by groups from Odessa and other Southern towns on the occasions of the hanging of I.M.Koval'sky.(24) Potentially more significant was the conference of Southern revolutionaries which was planned for Kiev at the beginning of 1879 in order to consider the "programme of revolutionary activities" worked out by V.Osinsky and V.K.Debagory-Mokriyevich. Mass arrests in Kiev prevented this meeting taking place.(25) The significance of such developments is brought out in D.T.Butsynsky's letter of 1880: "This intimacy of the youth of the three university towns gave some independence to the South in conducting revolutionary affairs in South Russia..."(26)

Of course, during the period of the party 'Narodnaya Volya', organisational links were stronger. In 1879 in Kharkov the 'Narodnaya Volya' kruzhok of P.A.Tellalov and I.I.Glushkov, "maintained links with the Kiev kruzhok headed by M.R.Popov and with the Poltavan revolutionaries.", and one of its members, V.Zhebunev went from Kharkov to Poltava to help organise the revolutionaries there. The Kharkov kruzhok also acted as the distribution point for various 'Narodnaya Volya' publications going to Southern towns.(27) With the decline and eventual disappearance of the Executive Committee of the Party, the South's separatist tendency became more marked.(28) Following the appearance of the 'South-West organisation of 'Narodnaya Volya' based in Kiev in 1884, in the autumn of the same year, after the arrest of Lopatin, an attempt was made by groups in the South to form a 'South-Russian Narodnaya Volya party' organisation.(29) By the beginning of 1885, a plan was well advanced to set up a South-Russian Central Group of the 'Narodnaya Volya' Party encompassing Yekaterinoslav, Odessa, Kharkov and the Crimea.(30) These developments owed much to the "Young' Narodnaya Volya' movement which demanded greater federalism in the party's organisation and greater activity

amongst the urban workers.

The view that the South was an organisational unit gains further support from the activity of revolutionaries amongst the urban workers of the South. The organisations which were formed express this regionalism in their programmes but also in their titles: the 'Union of Workers of South Russia', led by Zaslavsky, the 'Workers' Union of South Russia' founded by Shchedrin and Koval'skaya in 1880, and the 'Workers' Union of South Russia' which owed its brief existence in 1879 to P.B.Aksel'rod.(31)

The Southern revolutionaries did try to maintain communications amongst themselves and to form discrete Southern revolutionary organisations, both amongst themselves and amongst the urban workers. These organisations often proved unsuccessful and were always short-lived, as indeed was the case with most organisations amongst the revolutionaries in all parts of the Empire during the period under consideration. However the revolutionary movement in the South can be considered as a distinct unit mainly because from the early 1870's until the early 1880's it witnessed a continuous generation of revolutionary kruzhoks largely without any outside prompting. Below are listed the main kruzhoks in the three main centres of the South: Kiev, Kharkov and Odessa, from 1874 to 1884. These will be dealt with at length in later Chapters. Lesser kruzhoks and individual revolutionaries, whether in these towns or in other Southern towns, have been omitted but as was indicated above, it was these three main centres which provided leadership for the others.

It would not be possible to provide the exact dates - even if it was necessary for the present purpose - of the start and end of each of the kruzhoks. They were not formations which started at an inaugural meeting. The kruzhoks gradually emerged from amongst friends and/or fellow-thinkers. Their demise tended to be equally protracted and nebulous, unless the police made a particularly successful raid. The kruzhok was more likely to disappear because, over an extended period, a few members were lost in arrests, others moved to a different town, while some simply retired from revolutionary life.

KIEV.

- Kiev Commune. Started: emerged during 1873 (32)
Ended : late 1874
- Kiev Chaykovtsy. Started: Summer/autumn 1873 (33)
Ended : summer 1874.(34)
- I.F.Fesenko's kruzhek. Started: beginning of 1875
Ended : summer 1875.(35)
- Buntar' kruzhek headed by V.K. Debagory-Mokriyevich.
Started: 1875, probably in the autumn.(36)
Ended : end of 1876.(37)
- V.Osinsky's kruzhek, the 'Executive Committee of the Socialist
Revolutionary Party'.
Started: winter 1877/1878.(38)
Ended : January/February 1879.(39)
- I.I.Basov's kruzhek, the 'Kiev-Zhitomir' kruzhek.
Started: 1878
Ended : 1879.(40)
- The kruzhek of M.R.Popov and D.T.Butynsky, a joint 'Chernyy Peredel'
and 'Narodnaya Volya' kruzhek.
Started: September 1879.(41)
Ended : early 1880.(42)
- P.B.Aksel'rod's 'Workers' Union of South Russia'.
Started and ended in the summer of 1879.(43)
- N.P.Shchedrin and Ye.N.Koval'skaya's 'Workers' Union of South Russia'.
Started: Summer 1880
Ended : early 1881.(44)
- I.Ya.Levinsky and A.I.Bychkov's kruzhek, called the 'Terrorist group'.
Started: 1879.(45)
Ended : April-May 1882.(46)
- This kruzhek joined 'Narodnaya Volya' Party at the beginning of 1880
(47), and was linked to the Executive Committee at first by
S.S.Zlatopol'sky and later by P.V. Gortynsky (48).
- P.V.Gortynsky's kruzhek.
Started: autumn 1881.(49)
Ended : Spring 1882.(50)

F.V.Gortynsky was an agent of the Executive Committee and his kruzhek, according to A.N.Bakh, was the officially recognised 'Narodnaya Volya' local group, nevertheless, it clearly worked very closely with the rival kruzhek of Levinsky and Bychkov.(51)
A.N.Bakh's 'Narodnaya Volya' local central group.

Started: June 1882.(52)

Ended : April 1883.(53)

This kruzhek maintained links with the Executive Committee through V.Figner.(54)

'South-West Group of the Party Narodnaya Volya'

Started: January 1884.

Ended : March 1884.(55)

ODESSA.

Volkhovsky's kruzhek, the 'Odessan Chaykovtsy'.

Started: Autumn 1872/spring 1873.(56)

Ended : mid 1874.(57)

Ye.O.Zaslavsky's 'Union of Workers of South Russia'.

Started: end of 1874/beginning of 1875.

Ended : December 1875.(58)

Zhebunevs' kruzhek.

Started: September/November 1873.(59)

Ended : end of 1874.

I.M.Koval'sky's kruzhek.

Started: end 1876/middle 1877.(60)

Ended : 30th January 1878(o.s.)(61)

Bashentsev Group(or S.Ye.Lion's kruzhek).

Started: late 1874.

Ended : 1878.(62)

Buntar' kruzhek which included S.F.Chubarov and M.Frolenko.

This was a rather nebulous group which was closely associated with the Bashentsev and subsequently appears to have merged with V.Osinsky's kruzhek, the 'Executive Committee', in winter 1877/8.

Started: end of 1876.(63)

Ended : winter 1877/78.

V.Osinsky's kruzhek, the 'Executive Committee of the Socialist Revolutionary Party'.

Started: Winter 1877/78.

Ended : January/February 1879.(64)

'Narodnaya Volya' group formed by A.I.Zhelyabov, N.N.Kolodkevich and Vera Figner.

Started: Summer/Autumn 1879.

Ended : 1880.(65)

M.I.Drey and I.I.Svedentsev's local central group of 'Narodnaya Volya'.

Started: Summer 1880.(66)

Ended : Spring/Summer 1882.(67)

M.N.Trigoni represented the Executive Committee of 'Narodnaya Volya' until he was arrested in February 1882 whereupon, V.Figner took on this responsibility.(68)
'Narodnaya Volya's' local central group headed successively by N.M.Salova, V.I.Sukhomlin, B.D.Orzhikh, Yakov Barsky.

Started: middle 1882.(69)

Ended : middle 1884.

KHARKOV.

V.A.Danilov's kruzhek of students from Kharkov University.

Started: February 1874.(70)

Ended : Merged with other kruzheks in
April 1874.(71)

I.F.Tsebenko's kruzhek of students from Kharkov Veterinary
College.

Started: 1873.(72)

Ended : Merged with other kruzheks in
April 1874.(73)

S.F.Kovalik's kruzhek.

Started: April 1874.(74)

Ended : late 1874.

A.V.Andreyeva's kruzhek of students from Kharkov's Railway Technical
College.

Started: April 1874.(75)

Ended : late 1874.(76)

M.Popov's Kharkov-Rostov 'Zemlya i Volya' kruzhek.

Started: 1876.(77)

Ended : Spring 1877.(78)

D.T.Butsynsky's kruzhek.

Started: 1877.

Ended : 1878.(79)

Ye.Koval'skaya's kruzhek.

Started: February/March 1879.(80)

Ended : summer 1879.(81)

P.A.Tellalov and I.I.Glushkov's kruzhek

Started: August/first half of September
1879.(82)

Ended : End of November/beginning of
December 1879.(83)

G.D.Gol'denberg, according to V.A.Danilov, was the first to try to get this kruzhok to join the 'Narodnaya Volya', but he failed,(84) and it was not till September 1879 that A.Zhelyabov succeeded.(85) Thereafter P.A.Tellalov served as the agent of the Executive Committee.

V.A.Danilov's 'Narodnaya Volya' local central group.

Started: summer 1879

Ended : 1881.(86)

V.Figner's 'Executive Committee' of 'Narodnaya Volya'.

Started: end of 1882.

Ended : end of 1883.(87)

The preceding list is only of some of the most important kruzhoiks about which memoir material is available. It does not, perhaps, convey the depth or the extent of revolutionary activity. A police report on revolutionary activity amongst urban workers in Odessa and Kherson from 1877 to 1881, for example, mentions ten separate kruzhoiks, only two of which are included above.(88).

3. The organisation of the Southern supply of illegal literature.

An adequate supply of revolutionary literature was essential for the revolutionary kruzhoks and not just because it aided the members' intellectual development. A good supply of literature was necessary in order to attract recruits to a kruzhok.

I.P.Klemen'tev admitted that he had attended a revolutionary kruzhok amongst students of the Kharkov seminary in April 1874, but said that he "went to the meetings mainly in order to receive books, in which, so it seems to me, everyone, like myself, was much more interested than in the questions which were decided at the meeting." (89) Once a kruzhok had attracted a large following, it tended to have more money which in its turn could be used to purchase more literature, plan more activities etc.. Another benefit of a good supply of literature was that it could be sold to other kruzhoks in order to raise cash. (90) Again, independent access to this type of material allowed the Southern revolutionaries to read whatever they wished: nobody could censor their reading matter. Finally, that type of revolutionary literature which was designed for the narod was essential for propaganda work, especially in the early part of the period. Some of the literature used was in fact legally produced inside the Empire (91), but the sources of forbidden material which will be considered here were: the Russian émigré colonies, the presses inside the South, and thirdly, the North. Each of these sources will be considered in this section.

It might be expected that the South would have good contacts with the emigration as many of the émigrés were Southerners and some of these worked on the émigré presses. (92) However the emigration was not of continuous importance to the Southern revolutionaries throughout the whole period, and "beginning from 1876 the influence of emigrant literature ... declined." (93) During the period from 1873 to 1883, on the one hand, the émigré papers Vpered!, Obshchina and Rabotnik had ceased publication, while on the other hand, the revolutionary papers began to appear inside Russia: Nachalo, Zemlya i Volya, Narodnaya Volya etc.. With the collapse of the Executive Committee and the arrest of V.Figner in February 1883, the emigration and its publications again came to

assume an important position.

There were a number of routes by which literature could be brought directly from the émigrés into the South. The Black Sea ports, during the 1870's, handled as much shipping as the Baltic ports, and Odessa in particular was a cosmopolitan centre which provided the revolutionaries with international contacts.(94) One route therefore was by steamships, perhaps from London, via Constantinople to Odessa. The second was from Switzerland via Vienna to the Galacian frontier and on to Kiev. The last main route also went via Vienna but then to Bucharest, or some other Rumanian town, from where the transport would cross the Russian frontier, usually at Jassy, and proceed to Odessa. Combinations of these three routes were also possible.(95) The ways in which most of the Southern kruzhoks contrived to bring literature from abroad by way of these routes, and also how the paper Vpered! organised supplies of their product to reach the South, will be examined below.

The Odessan Chaykovtsy came to appreciate quickly the desirability of possessing their own route for obtaining illegal literature. As Langans recalled : "At the start of the formation of the kruzhok (i.e., the Odessan Chaykovtsy), we received publications from abroad through the Petersburg'ers, who had their own route across the frontier, or from the Kievans; with the increased need for books, this method, being slow and costly, seemed inconvenient, and that is why Chudnovsky was instructed to construct a new path through Austria, which was used with success.."(96) Another member, Makarevich, did however assist Chudnovsky.(97) To carry out his work, Chudnovsky went to Vienna where he stayed from 6 January to 31 July 1873 (98), and made arrangements with his friends in L'vov to get material to the Russian frontier (99). At Volochisk on the Austro-Russian border, it was to be taken across into Russia by a Jew, Jos' Eller, transferred to another Jew, Zeylikovich, who was to hand it to a certain Ivan Ivanovich in Odessa.(100) S.L.Chudnovsky came to specialise in this work, and F.Volkhovsky, the leader of the kruzhok, began to refer to him as his 'minister of communications'.(101) The arrests of various participants necessitated constant activity by Chudnovsky to find

replacements.(102) However, the route was a success, and even "the Moscow and Petersburg sections of the (Chaykovtsy) Circle ... were relying more and more on this way of entry."(103) An indication of the scale of the operation may be gained from the fact that on the 31 December 1873 the police seized one transport of books and pamphlets which contained 1,587 items, including 523 copies of 'Istoriya odnogo frantsuzskago krest'yanina', 92 copies of Vpered!, and 490 of 'O muchenike Nikolay'.(104) Chudnovsky did not confine himself to printed material, and in 1873 he and his L'vov friends again assisted the St.Petersburg Chaykovtsy when they "helped Kupriyanov ... to ship a printing press to Russia."(105) According to Chudnovsky, he used "the usual route ...", which was to cross the frontier at Podvolochisk, and he took this opportunity to arrange the transport of Vpered!, into Russia.(106)

The Kiev Chaykovtsy trod a similar road. In February 1873, S.Lur'ye took the responsibility for organising a route from abroad to Kiev, and to this end went abroad in the summer of 1873.(107) There appears to have been some co-operation between the Chaykovtsy and the Kiev Commune in this matter, for V.Debagory-Mokriyevich of the Commune assisted Lur'ye in 1874.(108) According to the former, "the transportation across the frontier of forbidden books and their storage." was the main activity of the Kiev Chaykovtsy from 1873 (109), which was certainly not the case with the Commune. There is reason to suppose that the Commune used professional smugglers to import some of their material. A letter found at the home of V.Il'yasevich, one of the Communards, gave the police the names of the smugglers who had brought revolutionary books for the Commune across the frontier near the small town of Radzivilov.(110) Debagory-Mokriyevich himself was believed to have had "direct relations with the emigrant Sazhin ..."(111) Indeed it was the involvement of the Commune with smugglers which led to the downfall of that group. Debagory-Mokriyevich went to Volochisk to engage a smuggler who had been recommended to him by Lermontov. The smuggler was given the Kiev address of N.Sudzilovsky where the books were to be sent. Unfortunately this address fell into the hands of the police who subsequently searched the members of the Commune.(112)

The kruzhok of the brothers A. and I. Pavlovsky, in Taganrog, which had been formed in the summer of 1874, also busied itself with the transporting of forbidden literature, and may also have had direct contact with Sazhin. Members of the kruzhok, had plans to transport illegal books from Bessarabia to Kharkov in July 1874. These were Zubkov and Litoshenko.(113) However, there is no evidence that they did establish a long-lasting route, although they did undoubtedly succeed in bringing in small quantities of material.(114)

The 'Union of Workers of South Russia', led by Ye.O. Zaslavsky had contacts with the emigration, in London at least. The route which was developed by the 'Union' was one which derived from Odessa's position as a sizeable commercial port. M. Lyakhovich was a stoker in the steam-ship 'Lazarev', which belonged to the 'Russian Shipping and Trade Company', and traded between Odessa and London. The police were convinced that he had been smuggling forbidden literature from London, in 1875, for the 'Union'.(115) When Lyakhovich was arrested and charged, he said that he had been given, on the first occasion, four books by two Russians - Pustov and Larionov - who lived in London. These books were to be delivered to Voloshchuk in Odessa. On subsequent occasions he made his delivery to Rybitsky, and it was the latter who introduced him to Zaslavsky, for whom Lyakhovich agreed to convey letters to Pustov in London. Lyakhovich claimed that he was paid for these services.(116) However there seems little doubt that Lyakhovich was an enthusiastic member of the 'Union', and supplied his colleagues with large numbers of illegal books. In the winter of 1875, he told another worker, Yakov Panteleymonov that he had brought on one particular trip 32 kilograms of books hidden amongst the coal, which remained undiscovered despite a search.(117) As a result of the activities of these men, adequate supplies of illegal literature were getting to Odessa, and through Odessa to neighbouring cities in the South, at this time.(118)

The revolutionary, G.A. Popko, spent a considerable part of his revolutionary career in smuggling literature into Russia. He had been a student at the law faculty of Odessa University since the second half of 1874 and drawn close to Ye. Zaslavsky. Amongst other things, Popko helped with transport between 1874 and 1875. At one

stage during these years he settled in Kishinev with the intention of organising and receiving a transport of books from across the border to which end he acquainted himself with a number of Jewish smugglers.(119) Later, in 1876, after the collapse of Zaslavsky's 'Union', Popko tried to establish a regular supply of books presumably for the Odessan kruzhok to which he now belonged, the Bashentsev. He, K.I.Grinevich and a third party had been returning to Russia after attending the Lavrovist Conference in Paris, in 1876, as the Odessan and Kievan delegates. They visited L'vov to get assistance with their plan. Grinevich then proceeded across the border where he was arrested at Radzivilov and found to be carrying a quantity of illegal literature.(120) Popko and the other delegate returned homesafely with their consignment. When Popko subsequently joined V.Osinsky's kruzhok, according to M.Frolenko, he was the one who conducted negotiations with smugglers in order to get a press and weapons.(121)

That the South was in communication with the emigration in 1877-78 is substantiated by the testimony given by F.Kuritsyn on the basis of his conversations with D.Lizogub while sharing a cell. Lizogub claimed that his kruzhok had a Jewish contact on the border at Volochisk, who conveyed anything to and from Russia - including "Stefanovich, Deych, Bukhanovsky, Vera Zsulich and others, and from abroad to Russia conveyed presses etc.."(122)

The kruzhok of I.M.Koval'sky in Odessa also had these contacts for, when the kruzhok was arrested in January 1878, 130 copies of Nabat were found; a paper for which Koval'sky had been writing articles. These papers had been smuggled into Russia by one of the kruzhok, N.A.Vitashevsky.(123) The kruzhok had received other material during the spring of 1877 from Warsaw revolutionaries who had imported it across the Polish-Austrian border.(124)

There is sufficient ground to believe the testimony of D.T.Butzynsky that due to the degree of internal organisation achieved in the South in the second half of the 1870's, that "the South independently, independent of Peter, ordered books from abroad..."(125) This relationship with the emigration was important for the movement not only for bringing in literature, but also for allowing the revolutionaries to send out information. Further, it was an activity of interest not only to revolutionaries,

but was done by more sober elements. Gr.Borzyakov recalled in his memoirs that at the home of Count Stroganov in Odessa there was a library of illegal books in 1881 which the Count had received from abroad and which he lent out to the students of a self-development kruzhok.(126)

Although the importance and necessity of transporting literature from abroad declined at the end of the seventies, the activity did not atrophy to the extent suggested by Ya.Stefanovich who claimed that the only attempt to use the Rumanian route, for example, between 1878-1880, was the well-known one by P.B.Aksel'rod in early August 1880 which led to the latter's arrest. He also stated that, as a result of the assassination of Aleksandr II, the Rumanian government expelled one of the two Russian colonies in Rumania, that at Jassy, leaving only the one at Tul'ch (Dubrudzh) which was of little significance.(127) However there is evidence to show that the kruzhoks of P.Sokol'sky and A.Frunze in Bessarabia in 1879 (128), and the Kievan 'Workers' Union of South Russia' in 1880 (129), were in contact with the Rumanian emigration and transported literature from there.

As the Soviet historian, T.G.Snytko, amongst others, has shown, literature came to the South via Poland.(130) This route was facilitated by the family and national connections of the Poles with a considerable section of the population of the Southern 'right-bank'. Those such as Florian Bogdanovich, a lecturer from L'vov Polytechnic, made an important contribution to the South's supply of illegal literature (131), but some, which was ultimately destined for the St.Petersburg revolutionaries, also came via the South (132).

The question of transporting literature to the South, and the importance of the South to the emigration, can be considered from the point of view of one of the papers: Vpered!. Due to the large number of Ukrainians who worked on this paper, S.A.Podolinsky appears to have been determined that the main route for Vpered! should be through the South. In September to November 1872, he spent six weeks in Russia discussing the practicalities of setting up an organisation for the distribution of Vpered! in the South. In Kiev, he met some Little Russians, after which he was able to

write that Vpered! "to a certain extent is able to count on one transport across the frontier (the most reliable of all existing at the present) and on one method of wide distribution in Southern Russia ..." "it is possible to count on provincial correspondence, two or even three transports across the frontier and, in particular, on energetic distribution since the latter is, to some extent, their speciality."(133) The émigrés were, of course, never able "to count" on any route, but nonetheless the transport of the programme of Vpered! to Russia in March 1873 was probably done by this route organised by F.V.Volkhovsky with whom the programme was found in March 1873.(134) This route was one which crossed into Russia at the Galacian frontier and required the help of Podolinsky's Ukrainian friends.(135) The route had to be constantly renewed, and already by 29th December 1873, N.G.Kulyabko-Koretsky was arranging a route for transport whereby "material was to be sent to L'vov and then smuggled into Russia via Jassy ..." (136)

Possibly a more successful route - as more material could be transported at each occasion - was that by sea from the Vpered! offices in London to Odessa. One of the Vpered! Commune in London, Ya.V.Voshchakin, reported that up till autumn 1876, regarding the use of sea routes to smuggle Vpered! into Russia, "we had relations only with steamships of the 'Russian Steamship and Trading Company', making trips between London and Odessa. Steamships of other companies making voyages between London and the Russian ports in the Baltic and White Seas very seldom visit here, and up till now we have still not been able to establish relations with them." He went on to report that members of Zaslavsky's kruzhek working on steamships had taken to Odessa "quite significant numbers of our publications and sometimes correspondence and even money was received by us."(137) However it was not only Zaslavsky's 'Union' which helped Vpered! financially. In 27th February 1877, N.G. Kulyabko-Koretsky reported that the Vpered! Commune in London had received 250 rubles from Southerners to help pay off its debts.(138)

Zaslavsky was also aware of the importance of opening up new routes; at the end of November 1875, he wrote to the editor of Vpered! acknowledging receipt of revolutionary literature, promised to send money and said that from spring 1876 he would organise a route through Constantinople.(139) This route was indeed established but

not till after Zaslavsky's arrest. I.M.Koval'sky used it to bring in copies of Vpered! and to send reports to the editors as well as to send out the manuscript of his book on 'Organisations of the Brigands and the Sectarrians'.(140) A discordant note arose when Koval'sky wrote to the editor, some time between December 1876 and January 1877, that Vpered! was reported to be planning to become more theoretical in nature despite the growing militancy of the youth in "Odessa, Kherson, Nikolayev and other of our southern cities ...", and he threatened that if this did come about, then his kruzhok would close the transport route through Constantinople, perhaps by withdrawing funds from B.A.Vaysman who was the Vpered! agent in Constantinople.(141) The route continued, in fact, till the end of 1877.(142)

Another route was from Rumania into Russia through Jassy. In a letter of 19th June/1st July 1875, N.G.Kulyabko-Koretsky revealed his plan to transport five poods of books from Bucharest to Russia via Jassy. If the transport was successful, "then all books could be sent by this route, which is particularly necessary in view of the disrepair of the northern route."(143) In March 1876, N.P.Zubko-Kodreanu who had himself organised large transports along this route during the second half of 1874, reported that K.A.Kats - who had been in Bessarabia since autumn 1875 (144) - was "working energetically and discreetly, and has got the first transport into Russia."(145) In the first quarter of 1878, I.A.Glashko was planning to use the Red Cross to transport 25 poods of Vpered! publications from Rumania into Russia - the Red Cross being there as a result of the war. Glashko contacted some Odessan who were in communication with the editors of Obshchina and undertook to include copies of that paper in the transport provided the Odessans assisted in the delivery of the Vpered! publications.(146) This particular scheme did not bear fruit.

The Southern routes may not have been as significant as the northern one (147), and there is no evidence that any of the Southern routes accounted for the major part of the 1,000 copies per issue of Vpered!, but it does appear to have been on a sufficient scale to meet the needs of the South. Some indication of the relative importance of the two areas may be gained from Smirnov's letter of 30 December 1875 when he writes that he made up 3 bundles

of literature to be taken to Russia, "Two for the north, one for the south, in all twenty-one poods." (148) Or alternatively, at the Paris Congress of 1876, when the delegates were planning a new (but never to be realised) periodical, it was agreed that Kiev and Odessa would each subscribe 1,000 rubles, while St.Petersburg contributed 4,000 rubles. In return for this 70 copies were to go to the capital and 50 were to be shared between Kiev and Odessa. (149) There seems to be grounds therefore to extend the evaluation of the Soviet historian, Z.V.Pereshina, to the whole of the South: "From the start of the seventies Southern Ukraine was an important centre of foreign links for the revolutionaries." (150)

The South also had facilities for printing its own literature which gave it the chance to express indigenous views cheaply. This is an area in which there was clear technical progress in the South during these years, with regard to the sophistication of the reproductive method, the distribution of the material and ambitiousness of the item to be produced. No paper lasted for long whether in the South, or in St.Petersburg or in the emigration.

From the end of 1872 to early in 1873, the Odessa kruzhek headed by F.V.Volkhovskiy produced a manuscript paper called Vpered, which lasted for eight numbers and appeared on a weekly basis. It was edited by the leader of the kruzhek and S.Chudnovskiy, D.Zheltonovskiy and I.M.Koval'skiy. It is believed to have been circulated not only in Odessa and Kiev, but also in St.Petersburg. (151) P.B.Aksel'rod, in Kiev, recollected that the fact "that in Odessa exists a revolutionary kruzhek, which is able to produce its own paper." had "great significance in our eyes". (152) Aksel'rod himself later encouraged a more modest project of this type. The Chernigov kruzhek of seminarists founded by Aksel'rod and G.G.Bozhko-Bozhinskiy in May 1874 produced two numbers of a manuscript journal which had a limited circulation. (153) By the end of 1874, Zaslavskiy's 'Union' was producing material on Zaslavskiy's own legally owned press. In Odessa the kruzhek of I.M.Koval'skiy possessed its small press on which two proclamations were produced. One of these was on the death of Luk'yanov of which 300 copies appeared (154) and the other about the spy Krayev. In fact it was while the members were printing a third leaflet, 'Golos chestnykh lyudey', that the police burst into

their flat and the kruzhok put up armed resistance to arrest.(155)

The Buntars required a press for the 'Chigrin⁶ Affair', and in the first half of 1876, Stefanovich had travelled from Yelisavetgrad to Kishinev to plead for the rapid delivery of a press through Rumania.(156) Eventually, Anna Makarevich managed to have a press smuggled from abroad to Kishinev where it was received by Deych and Stefanovich and taken to Kiev.(157) According to one source, the Buntars used this press to print two proclamations. One was distributed - on the occasion of the death of the worker Luk'yanov.(158) Certainly in September 1877 it printed the Ukaz used in the Chigrin⁶ Affair.(159) It may be that this was one of the presses alluded to be Lizogub when in conversation with F.Kuritsyn, in 1879. Kuritsyn reported that "Lizogub once said that they got from abroad some presses of the most advanced kind", "each of these presses ... cost 300 rubles."(160) When the Buntars were arrested the press escaped the police search.

Valer'yan Osinsky provided a new twist to the business of issuing leaflets, for he introduced the idea of including on them the name of the 'Executive Committee of the Russian Social Revolutionary Party' and the motif of the dagger and revolver. The printing of leaflets about the first two acts of this kruzhok in February and March 1878 - the attempts on Nikonov and Kotlyarevsky - was done in St.Petersburg.(161) G.A.Lopatin wrote: "I saw copies of the proclamation (about Nikonov) stuck up in Rostov, Odessa and Kharkov: the printing was very good. The paper poor."(162) At some time between March and May 1878, the kruzhok equipped itself with a press which was kept in Kiev and used it to print the rest of the kruzhok's leaflets but these were considered by L'ev Deych to have been "extremely primitive, coarse."(163)

Smaller groups also aspired to reach a wider audience. The combined kruzhok of M.R.Popov and D.T.Butsynsky, being respectively supporters of the 'Chernyy Peredel' and the 'Narodnaya Volya' parties in Kiev, tried to set up their own paper called Zemlya i Volya.(164) Similarly, the 'Workers' Union of South Russia' founded by N.P. Shchedrin and Ye.N.Koval'skaya in 1880 had its successful press which lasted for almost a year, called the 'Southern Russia Free Press'. It was manned by the workers P.O.Ivanov, V.E.Kizer and

A.I. Dollar and it printed proclamations such as 'Sud nad sotsialistami v Kieve', as well as 'Programma yuzhnogo rabocheho soyuza'.(165) It produced fifteen items in all, including one in late spring 1880, in Ukrainian, for the peasantry.(166)

The paper Narodnaya Volya received its main readership from amongst the educated classes, so the revolutionaries of that Party had the task of producing material for the working people as well as leaflets about specific and local issues. Thus the 'Narodnaya Volya' group of A.I.Bychkov and I.Ya.Levinsky which functioned in Kiev from 1879 until 1882, "arranged a press for the wider distribution of the 'Narodnaya Volya' views amongst the workers."(167) 'Narodnaya Volya's' press in Odessa in 1881 was also mainly concerned to print leaflets for the workers.(168)

The number of reproductive facilities increased in the early 1880's, so that the 'Narodnaya Volya' Party alone had in the South, two presses in Odessa in 1882; one in Kiev in 1882-1884; two in Kharkov in 1883; in 1884 there was one in Kiev and one in Rostov.(169) Some of these presses operated on a considerable scale. The first 'Narodnaya Volya' press in Odessa by the time of its seizure by the authorities in 15 February 1882, had produced 695 copies of different appeals and 191 copies of revolutionary brochures.(170) The second press, which was worked by S.P. Degayev, was discovered in December 1882.(171) The press in Kiev at the beginning of 1882 was that belonging to the kruzhek of I.Levinsky, A.Bogdanovich and A.Bakh but after the arrest of the first two in April 1882, the latter carried on. By the end of October 1882, Zakharin of the 'Narodnaya Volya' group had taken over and this press went on to print six different leaflets, two of which were in Ukrainian.(172)

Two presses existed in Kharkov in 1883, and one of these, that organised by V.Figner, had had a rather remarkable history, and became, once in Kharkov, in reality the official Executive Committee press. It had been constructed by the Grodno printer M.Yanchevsky in Warsaw and then moved to Kharkov where it was taken over by Figner, V.G.Ivanov and V.I.Chuyko, and housed in the flat of A.A.Osinskaya and F.V.Krilov who were also to do the printing.(173) Here the press was discovered by the authorities on 22 June 1883.

A.I.Nemolovsky had obtained materials for the press from St.Petersburg. (174) The other Kharkov press of this time was set up by V.S.Pankratov and V.Vol'nov.(175)

The following year in Kiev, an even more ambitious literary project was afoot, for the 'South-West Group of the Party Narodnaya Volya' planned to produce a journal called Sotsialist. A press was obtained in January 1884, the editor M.N.Vasil'yev was chosen, and on 18 February 1884 (o.s.), a 'Declaration' for the paper was printed and distributed. The paper itself however did not materialise as the press was seized in March 1884.(176)

The general movement of the Party's base of activities to the South was reflected also in its printing exploits. In the spring of 1884, a press in Rostov headed by A.Bukh and S.Ivanov printed a second copy of Narodnaya Volya No.10 in September 1884, having been given the manuscript by Lopatin.(177)

This section has only surveyed the presses of the 'Narodnaya Volya'; it has not included a number of others. For example, the 'Chernyy Peredel' press was set up in Kharkov at the end of 1883 and was manned by N.V.Iordana, I.L.Manucharov and A.Osloпов. This press produced a number of proclamations and three brochures before being seized on 11 January 1884.(178) A more interesting endeavour outside of the 'Narodnaya Volya' Party was the journal Rabochiy which was published in Rostov at the end of 1883. This was an hectographed publication by a group of Rostov workers headed by A.Karpenko and V.Kudryashov of which two issues may have appeared. (179) These, and other presses and hectographing machinery existed in the South during the period under consideration which gives a basis for the belief that the South could enjoy some measure of autonomy in this field of its activity.

A final source of literature which must be considered is that which came from the North, especially from St.Petersburg. This material could be of any of the three varieties mentioned above: émigré literature, 'home-produced', or legal. It is important to point out that the literature which came from the North did not necessarily come from Northern revolutionaries; it might, and often did, come from Southerners living in the North. Thus, even as early as the

first half of January 1871 during the students' congress in St.Petersburg it is clear that the South had independent contacts with the capital. S.Podolinsky describes how "the provincials did not want to leave without constructing closer links with Petersburg. These links the Kievans already had and at that time these were Ginzburg, Idel'son, Varzar, S.V.Mokiyevsky-Zubok and others, but besides these the Kievans and the Odessans acquainted themselves with the artillery officer Lobov and founded amongst themselves a small society for mutual information and advice."(180) Thus people from "the Ukraine who were living in St.Petersburg formed themselves into a separate group, connected with A.A.Lobov ..." This group was later headed by S.Ginzburg.(181) The Odessan kruzhok had another personal link with the St.Petersburg group of Southerners led by Lobov, in that Solomon L.Chudnovsky's brother Miron, was a member of Lobov's group, while Solomon was a member of the Odessan Chaykovtsy.(182) The Kharkov delegate, Ya.I.Koval'sky, also developed contacts with the capital, in the person of the Southerner Ginzburg, about whom he informed Ye.N.Koval'skaya and A.A.Aptekman on his return home.(183) These particular contacts continued till the second half of the 1870's, but others were constantly being developed.(184)

The Southern students who went for their education to St. Petersburg and Moscow usually formed a zemlyachestvo which united students from a particular province. Thus, O.V.Aptekman, when he went to the Medico-Surgical Academy, joined a zemlyachestvo which united the natives of Yekaterinoslav province.(185) M.R.Popov somewhat later joined one for natives of Yekaterinoslav and Astrakhan provinces in St.Petersburg (186), while A.F.Mikhaylov joined one at Moscow University for students from Stavropol'(187) In his history of the movement in the first half of the seventies, S.F. Kovalik comments that the zemlyachestvo maintained regular communications with the groups in their native cities, and "Thus was secured the largely uniform pace of the movement everywhere." (188) The zemlyachestvo provided a natural source of literature for the revolutionaries in the provinces. Also, the revolutionaries could profit from the fact that much of the literature which they used was legal. Thus S.S.Topchayevsky wrote to A.I.Mikhalevich,

who lived in the capital, asking for children's books for the peasants, and amongst other things, "a catalogue of books of any of the Petersburg book shops." (189) Southerners who visited the capital for some other reason would seldom fail to bring back some literature. (190) However, on a number of occasions Northerners were responsible for directly supplying the South with literature and the following section will examine this.

The earliest instance of Northerners supplying the South was perhaps the extension of the 'book affair' to the South which was arranged at the students' congress in St. Petersburg in January 1871. The second of the aims which the congress set itself was to set up "the book affair to provide material for agitation, and as a means of organisation on the basis which was practised in the north." (191) According to S.A. Podolinsky who was present at the conference as a Kiev delegate, "the construction of a general organisation for the distribution of books was achieved ..." (192) On returning from the congress, the Kharkov delegate Ya. I. Koval'sky reported to the group around Ye. N. Solntsevaya and at this meeting it was decided to set up a Kharkov section of the 'book affair'. "Work went at a quicker pace. Books were sold, sold like hot cakes and were spread vigorously around the University, Veterinary Institute, seminaries and in all the gymnasias: they circulated also to narod teachers and zemstvo activists who were interested in the cause. The books were sold at a reduced price." (193) In a letter of 7 February 1871, from V. Malyutin to Ye. Trofimova, the former explained how Ya. Koval'sky had said on his return from St. Petersburg that at least 200 rubles would be required to get the venture off the ground. Such was the enthusiasm that almost 600 rubles were raised by subscription and from students' kassas. (194)

The Kiev revolutionary kruzhek which contained Emme, Rashevsky etc., and came to be known as the Kiev Chaykovtsy, was "in close relations with the Chaykovtsy in St. Petersburg and receiving from them legal books for distribution ..." (195) Emme had in fact been one of the capital's delegates to the St. Petersburg Congress (196), but had moved to Kiev which no doubt facilitated the organisation of the 'book affair' there. However, it was not just the Chaykovtsy who tried to supply the provinces with literature. Lermontov's

kruzhok in St.Petersburg had connections with Volkhovsky in Odessa and with Debagory-Mokriyevich and Nikoliy Sudzilovsky in Kiev. "According to Rabinovich, Lermontov, at the end of 1873 sent him to Kiev to set up a book agency ..." (197) Further, the St.Petersburg kruzhok of Pavlovsky had contacts with the emigration and received books directly from abroad; from both London and Zurich, during 1874. One member of the kruzhok, N.A.Litoshenko, a student at the St.Petersburg Technical Institute, sent some of this material to the students in Kharkov. One of the recipients was G.Anan'yev a student at Kharkov University who got copies of Vpered! from Litoshenko, some of which he sold to fellow students Grodetsky, Krutikov and Barkov, in the spring of 1874. (198) Other works - by Flerovsky and Sokolov - were brought south and sold or given to the kruzhok which was set up by S.F.Kovalik in Kharkov. (199) Yet others were borrowed from Anan'yev's library by S.I.Korabel'nikov, a student at Kharkov Technical School. (200).

Sometimes literature from the North was accompanied by a Northern activist who wanted to organise the Southerners. Korabel'nikov with a number of other students in Kharkov joined a kruzhok formed by A.V.Andreyeva who arrived from Moscow, in May 1874. She brought with her a number of books which she distributed: books, for example, by Dobrolyubov and Flerovsky. Andreyeva and some of her kruzhok moved in May and June from Kharkov to Taganrog where they merged themselves and their library with those of the Pavlovsky kruzhok which had moved from St.Petersburg to Taganrog in order to carry out propaganda. (201) Similarly, in April 1874, S.F.Kovalik, under the pseudonym of Lukashevich, arrived in Kharkov from St.Petersburg with the intention of forming a kruzhok which would go v narod to spread propaganda. (202) Kovalik succeeded in this and returned to the capital. At the end of April he dispatched a member of his St.Petersburg kruzhok, Rabinovich, to Kharkov with a load of forbidden books. (203) These included Chernyshevsky, Marx, Lassalle and Bakunin, as well as propaganda literature such as 'Sten'ka Razin', 'Dedushka Yegor' and 'Istoriya frantsuzskogo krest'yanina'. (204)

The papers Zemlya i Volya, Narodnaya Volya and their various ancillary publications were almost all printed in St.Petersburg

and so had to be obtained by the Southerners in the same ways as previously. A.Volkenshteyn, for example, a former Kiev University student and subsequently a zemstvo doctor in Poltava brought large quantities of Zemlya i Volya from the capital to the South, especially to Osinsky's krvzhok where it was divided amongst the members for further distribution.(205) In 1879, the Kharkov revolutionaries found this further dissemination of the papers received from the capital comparatively easy, for "On the Kharkov railway line was a friendly conductor who carried the revolutionary publications to the Southern towns."(206)

4. Finances.

Money was essential for the revolutionary movement. As Vera Figner bluntly pointed out, in her memoirs: "without money, an illegal organisation, ... is able neither to exist nor to function." (207) This was even more true during the second half of this period than it is in general, for during that time more of the revolutionaries were following their occupation full-time and so had little opportunity to earn money by casual work as they had done in the period when their activity was propagandist. Thus Langans could claim that all but one of his kruzhek, in 1872, had earned their living by tutoring (208), as did A.Zhelyabov in Odessa (209) and Ye.Breshko-Breshkovskaya in Kiev (210), in 1873. A.A.Franzholi was able to earn a regular 25 rubles per month working in a chemist's shop, as an assistant, from which he could contribute towards the upkeep of his family. (211) By the end of the period, only N.I.Kibal'chich asserted, at his trial, that he was earning his own income - in his case through literary work. (212) While his income might have provided for his own needs, it could not have possibly covered his revolutionary expenses. Thus as the years past, the revolutionaries became more dependent on their kruzhek's resources for their livelihood.

Whereas the propagandist activity of the early seventies was 'labour intensive', the terrorist activities of the late 1870's and early 1880's were 'capital intensive'. D.Lizogub quoted the following costs which 'his' kruzhek had incurred: the murder of Mezentsev, 3009 rubles; the liberation of Malinka from Odessa prison, and the attempt to do the same for Osinsky each cost 3,000 rubles. (213) G.D.Gol'denberg told the police that his total expenses in killing Prince Kropotkin were 520 rubles, which had been supplied by A.Zubkovsky. (214) The Executive Committee of 'Narodnaya Volya' had to pay a rent of 1,200 rubles per year for the shop in Mala Sadova Street. (215) Clearly, the later revolutionaries dealt in large sums of money. A.Tun calculated that "Zemlya i Volya' had a total income of some 10,000 rubles. (216) The accounts of the Party show that 5,994 rubles 95 kopecks were spent between 31 October 1878 and 14 August 1879, alone. (217) Costs escalated even further and so too did the need for money. On the

basis of the acknowledgements printed in the publications of 'Narodnaya Volya' from 4 October 1879 to 20 August 1880 (o.s.) V.Ya.Bogucharsky calculated an income of 7,500 rubles.(218) A.Tun, using the same publications but for a later period found that, for the period from 1 March to 15 July 1881, the Party had received in donations c22,700 rubles; from 15 July to December 1881, 8,590 rubles; subsequent acknowledgements amount to 5,700 rubles.(219) 'Chernyy Peredel' was smaller and less wealthy but in numbers 2 to 5 of its paper appears acknowledgements for 15,488 rubles.(220) According to L.Tikhomirov, the daily pay of an agricultural worker in the South fluctuated from 60 kopecks to 5 rubles during these ten years (221), but even at the latter figure it can be seen that the revolutionary finances, even allowing for editorial exaggeration, were very substantial by comparison.

As far as the Southern kruzhdoks were concerned, their money could come from one of three sources which will be examined below: the revolutionaries themselves (from inheritances, relatives or from their own work); from wealthy sympathisers whose money was often given for a specific purpose; or from wealthier groups in the North, especially in St.Petersburg. In the absence of any of these, the fate of a kruzhdok would be that witnessed by P.B.Aksel'rod in 1880: "As far as I am able to gather from the Odessan narodniks, they are terribly poor and have no serious connections or activity." (222)

Kruzhdoks, deferring to their student origins, usually tried to organise a common kassa for which one of their number would have responsibility. This appears to have been reasonably satisfactory for the participants in a kruzhdok such as the Kiev Commune, where none of the members disposed of a great personal fortune and where the members did live together. It was less popular with others where members did not live together, had different ideas on revolutionary tactics and where some of the members felt that they were making disproportionately generous donations to the kassa. Clearly a kruzhdok in which one of the members was willing to donate his private fortune was very fortunate but there were a number of these.

At the Kiev Commune, Vera Verigo was appointed to look after the income and expenditure of the group. However, "The financial means of the Commune were rather limited." The kruzhok was almost "constantly in need of money", and members were "always engaged in finding ways to improve both their finances and also the finances of the Commune."(223) Each paid into the common fund as much as they could afford, for example N.Ya.Stronsky and A.Osmolovsky (224), but most seems to have been provided either by V.A.Benetsky (225) or V.Il'yasevich.(226) One of their number, Larionov, suggested robbing the post, or cheating a landowner, called A.I.Filipp - a relative of Breshko-Breshkovskaya - of 2-3,000 rubles.(227) In desperation Larionov tried to get a job as a volost' clerk so that he could get hold of blank passports and money.(228) According to the prosecution in the Trial of the 193, the Kiev Commune also "received money from Petersburg ...", possibly in 500 ruble amounts.(229) While no other source mentions this, it was undoubtedly the case that during 1874 the size of the Commune was considerably increased by an influx of Northerners and they no doubt brought with them money, some of which would have been contributed to the kassa.

Financial assistance from the capital was quite clearly the cement which held together the kruzhok of seminarists and students which S.F.Kovalik formed in April 1874 in Kharkov. I.P.Klement'yev, a pupil of the Kharkov seminary, testified that in April a Petersburger (S.F.Kovalik) addressed a group of Kharkov seminarists and students, and "The Petersburger said that those present at the meeting who decided to go v narod would be sent, from Petersburg, money and introductions to certain people living in different parts of Russia ..."(230) At the end of April 1874, Kovalik sent M.A.Rabinovich from the capital to the Kharkov kruzhok with money. Rabinovich "gave Barkov 256 rubles for the kruzhok, some blanks for false passports and some forbidden books ..." "Besides this, Rabinovich gave the Veterinary student, Yemel'yanov 120 silver rubles for his decision to join a Cossack regiment with the purpose of assisting the transport of books from abroad and of fleeing revolutionaries, and also 30 silver rubles for Spesivtsev." Barkov further testified at the Trial of the 193 that he also received a

letter from Kovalik in which the latter persuaded the kruzhok to act energetically, and promised further financial help and books.(231) Kovalik subsequently recalled that later in the year, when N.M.Barkov was in charge of the kruzhok, the organisation of the kassa was finally completed, and "Into the kassa went money from a lottery of different books, and from the sale of revolutionary works. In all, the kassa consisted of 170 rubles."(232) No doubt the books were supplied from the North.

Other kruzhoks were fortunate in the wealth of their own members. Thus, in the Kiev Chaykovtsy, the relative wealth of S.Lur'ye, V.G.Emme and G.Ye.Gurevich (233), contrasted with the poverty of others like P.B.Aksel'rod. The contemporaneous kruzhok in Odessa - the Zhebunevites - has been described as "one of the best supplied with material means", due to the wealth of G.S.Trudnitsky and of the Zhebunev family itself whose head was a Chernigov landowner.(234) Trudnitsky agreed to "give all his possessions and estate for the cause."(235) Simultaneously in Odessa, the kruzhok around F.V.Volkhovsky benefited from the generosity of one member, D.I.Zheltonovsky (236), and according to the prosecution in the Trial of the 193, another member, L.A.Dicheskulo, received 1,000 silver rubles during the course of the summer of 1874, part of which was given to the kruzhok.(237) This kruzhok had another source of financial support: Volkhovsky had the special responsibility of gathering money from those outwith the kruzhok, to which end he entered into relations "with the bureaucratic sphere."(238) Somewhat later, in Kiev, I.F.Fesenko's kruzhok in Kiev "existed exclusively" on the financial support of one of its members, D.Lizogub.(239)

Other kruzhoks were incapacitated by lack of funds. The sizeable Bashentsev kruzhok of Odessa was characterised by a devotion to impressive quarrels and to insignificant actions - amongst the peasants, at least. The only exceptions to be made would be with regard to two of its members, A.Medvedev (known as Fomin) and Ye.I.Rossikova, who were active amongst the peasantry largely due to the latter's financial resources.(240) The leader of a contemporaneous kruzhok in Odessa, I.M.Koval'sky, being an 'illegal', led a rather furtive and sorry existence. He survived

largely upon small sums of money raised for him by the students of Odessa and upon the free meals which he enjoyed at the students' communal flats.(241) Implicitly acknowledging the increasingly professional nature of the revolutionary movement by early 1878, I.M.Koval'sky tried to organise a general kassa in Odessa amongst the revolutionaries for revolutionary purposes, by levelling a 1 - 2% charge on any money made. This plan came to nothing because the revolutionaries had so little money since, being illegal, they could not find part-time work.(242) The importance of the North is highlighted in the case of the Kharkov-Rostov 'Zemlya i Volya' kruzhok, for here again was a poor kruzhok(243) which avoided the fate of others since it was in receipt of small subsidies from St.Petersburg.(244)

The financial predicament of the Buntars illustrates many of the points mentioned above about the financial history of kruzhoks in the middle of the seventies, 1875 - 1877. The kruzhok started to form in the middle of 1875. One of its members was S.F.Chubarov who disposed of a fortune of 10,000 rubles (245) and whose money was "the main source of our material means."(246) At least one revolutionary, N.V.Levchenko, lived off of Chubarov exclusively.(247) Rather imprudently, the kruzhok quarrelled with its benefactor who left in 1876.(248) Another blow fell during that year. N.N.Kharin of Kharkov had hoped shortly to inherit a fortune which one of his friends, D.Lizogub, believed to be over one million rubles, and which he intended to donate to the revolutionary cause.(249) Kharin had already given small amounts of money to local radicals, and the Buntars had hopes of partaking of his inheritance in due course. Kharin's father however, disapproving of his son's acquaintances, contrived to have him exiled to the northern province of Vyatka.(250) Even Lizogub proved a disappointment when approached for money in the winter of 1876/7, possibly due to his distrust of some of the Buntars.(251) Lizogub by this time was becoming deeply involved with the formation of 'Zemlya i Volya' in St.Petersburg and had decided to realise his Chernigov estates for the benefit of that organisation.(252) The Buntars were as a consequence of all this, extremely poor (253), living off of small sums sent by relatives and friends.(254) The Buntars had twice tried to obtain money from the capital so that they could proceed with some revolutionary

work. The first occasion was in May/June 1876 when Deych and N.K.Bukh had gone to St.Petersburg carrying with them letters of introduction from M.Kovalevskaya to her brother ('V.V. '), and to other people who could provide money. They were unable to find many who sympathised with their plan of revolutionary activities, and so received only 25 rubles from a certain Lishofayev.(255) Later, in the autumn 1876 M.Frolenko made a trip to the capital in search of money to buy arms for a bunt. Assistance was refused.(256) While there however Frolenko bought ten revolvers which "soaked up, if not all our resources, then a significant part of them."(257) Lack of money forced the majority of the members to disperse in order to find some income.(258) Three of the members, Deych, Ya.Stefanovich and I.V.Bokhanovsky, remained and, with some assistance from others, carried out the single act of any consequence performed by the Buntars - which has resulted in that kruzhok having an unjustifiably inflated reputation - the Chigrinⁱ Affair. The relevant point at issue here is the source of the money for this Affair, for as has been seen the Buntars themselves were impoverished and yet the Affair involved a considerable expenditure on a press, cash for the peasants and living expenses for the revolutionaries for the best part of a year.

The government at the time of the discovery and investigation of the Affair was in no doubt that the money had been supplied by liberal Ukrainian nationalists, as a result of testimonies and confessions obtained by the police.(259) These Ukrainian nationalists subsequently and repeatedly denied this, pointing to the incompatibility of a peasant bunt with their political philosophy.(260) L.Deych tells a different story altogether. According to him, Mark Natanson invited the three conspirators to St.Petersburg in order to join, on a federative basis, with the embryonic 'Zemlya i Volya' which was called the 'Soviet of the North'. The arrangement appears to have been curiously onesided, for while the "southerners remained entirely independent, autonomous in our undertakings and plans, but were obliged to inform the Soviet of the North about them, in general terms ...", "The Northern organisation for their part, was obliged to give us any kind of

assistance both material means and personnel."(261) Accordingly, Natanson gave them 2,000 rubles with the promise of 12 - 15,000 more to follow once the revolt had started. This was part of Lizogub's money.(262) Valer'yan Osinsky at his trial did indicate that some of the money, 900 rubles, for the Affair was provided by the "generals" i.e., the revolutionaries themselves.(263)

The winter of 1877/78 was a turning point and for a number of years the dispiriting effects of poverty were to be absent from the Southern revolutionary movement. The new phase was inaugurated by V.Osinsky, and the kruzhok which developed around him in Kiev and Odessa was one which had sufficient resources to fulfil its ambitions. It was able to contemplate, for example, bribing a clerk with 500 rubles in order to effect the escape of Fomin (264) from Kharkov prison, at a time when the local kruzhok led by D.T. Butsynsky, according to one of its members, did not have a kopeck to its name (265). The wealth of the Osinsky group derived from three sources. One was the fact that it had a number of wealthy members: Osinsky himself, A.Volkenshteyn (266), Chubarov (267), previously of the Buntars, and V.A.Malinka (268). It also had access to the considerable assets of D.Lizogub, for although he had been arrested in autumn 1878, Osinsky was able to get a share of Lizogub's money from 'Zemlya i Volya's' kassa where some had been deposited during 1877. Thus, the part of the money used to free Stefanovich and Deych from their Kievan prison came from St.Petersburg and was in all probability part of Lizogub's inheritance.(269) After Lizogub was arrested, he charged V.V.Drigo with the responsibility of realising the estate and passing the proceeds over to the revolutionaries. Drigo testified that during the period between the arrest of Lizogub and the arrest of Osinsky in January 1879, he sent directly to the latter in Kiev and Odessa, various sums of from 100 to 1,000 rubles totalling more than 5,000 rubles.(270) A third source of money for Osinsky's kruzhok, and ultimately a much more significant one, was sympathisers in 'society'. Osinsky had, and had deliberately cultivated, extensive contacts with society, as will be shown in Chapter VI, and this brought in considerable sums of money. Thus, for example, in the winter of 1877, Fomin in Kiev received on behalf of Osinsky, 1,000 rubles from Izbitsky which had

come from a sympathiser. Fomin simultaneously got 2,000 rubles from V.G.Velednitsky, which had also come from a supporter.(271)

The problem with money from sympathisers was that it was unpredictable, and often given with a stipulation that it must be used on a particular project.(272) The funds of those kruzhoks which were based upon the urban workers might be expected to have been founded on a more regular basis. The rules of Zaslavsky's 'Union' stipulated: "Point 8: Each member must contribute 25 kopecks per week to the Union's kassa." Failure to pay for 5 consecutive weeks would lead to expulsion from the 'Union'.(273) Point number 8 was in fact insisted upon.(274) In reviewing kruzhoks amongst Odessan and Kherson workers from 1875 to 1892, D.N.Nabokov of the Ministry of Justice observed that in each of the kruzhoks existed a kassa into which was to be put 4 - 5% of the weekly wage of each member, but as all kruzhoks suffered poverty and had to spend money on helping needy members they often could not stretch themselves to expenditure on revolutionary matters.(275) A number had sufficient left in their kassa to afford illegal literature.(276)

As the seventies progressed the revolutionaries' sphere of activity moved from the countryside into the towns, and as M.Frolenko pointed out "Financial means were easier to obtain from sympathisers in the towns than in the villages." It often happened that the money was given with the condition that it all must be spent on terrorism which would restrict those revolutionaries who might still wish to participate in agitation amongst the peasants.(277) With the end of the seventies, the Southern movement changed in another respect: from 1879 many of the Southern kruzhoks entered into the 'Narodnaya Volya' Party and so were operating within different financial situations. The rules of the Party laid down the financial duties and obligations of the member groups. In the rules for local Central Groups of 'Narodnaya Volya', the Central Group is declared to be "financially autonomous",(278) but the matter was too important to be left at that. In the document entitled 'Podgotovitel'naya Rabota Partii' which appeared in the spring of 1890, the local groups were warned that one of their duties was that they "must lay in supplies of material means..."(279) Further, it was considered desirable to "establish regular permanent payments from all members..."

to the Executive Committee.(280) According to A.Tun, the Executive Committee hoped to be given a definite and regular percentage of the income of the local groups.(281) A document of 1882, 'Ustav kruzhka partii 'Narodnaya Volya'', even attempted to lay down how a kruzhok would divide up its income: 60% was to go to the Party; 20% to help exiles; 10% on copying, circulation and mail; 10% for external expenses.(282) There would appear to be a movement over the years of the existence of the Party for the centre to try to exercise greater control over the finances of the provincial groups. The reality of the matter was of course slightly other than that which the centre might have wished. As the editors of 'Kalendar' Narodnaya Volya' warned in 1883, there never was a regular remittance from the provinces to the centre, rather there was "mutual help".(283) Thus, in contrast to the early years of this period when, as has been shown, sums of money came from St.Petersburg to the South, at the end of the period, money went from the South to the North, or was provided for the Executive Committee when it was itself involved in some task in the South. Thus during the 'Trial of the 17' in 1883, it emerged that at Kharkov on 13 November 1879 (o.s.) S.S.Zlatopol'sky gave G.Gol'denberg 300 rubles to take north in order to assist in the mine being prepared for an attempt on the life of the tsar in Moscow.(284) It was the same at the very end of the life of 'Narodnaya Volya' as at the start of its life: in 1884, A.N.Bakh went about setting up a 'Narodnaya Volya' group in Rostov. While not expecting to have a large amount of income he nevertheless promised the Administrative Committee to pass on as much as could be spared.(285) Subsequently A.N.Bakh was to find himself with a very considerable surplus of money and in October 1884 he claimed to have taken 1,000 rubles to Moscow with 10,000 more to follow.(286)

Some of the money remitted to the Executive Committee would find its way back to the South in so far as a number of Southern members of 'Narodnaya Volya' admitted in their trials that they were professional revolutionaries and lived upon money given to them by the Party. Of the Southerners at the 'Trial of the 17', for example, Ivan Kalyuzhnyy and Nadezhda Smirnitskaya, A.I.Lisovskaya and P.A.Tellalov all admitted that they lived off the Party.(287)

The greater daring of the revolutionaries caused them to revive plans for attacks on provincial treasuries and mail which had been suggested in the Kiev Commune six years before. The most successful and noteworthy of these was the robbery of the Kherson exchequer on 3 June 1879. F.Yurkovsky (subsequently known as 'Sasha the Engineer'), Yelena Rossikova, Tat'yana Morozov and L.D.Terent'yeva tunnelled into the Kherson exchequer and 'confiscated' 1,579,688 rubles and 75 kopecks. All but 10,000 rubles, which L.D.Terent'yeva took away to Odessa for use "in the struggle to free the narod", was recovered by the police.(288) The exact use to which the money was put is obscure, and in the copy of Narodnaya Volya No.8-9, which appeared on 5 February 1882, Terent'yeva found it necessary to deny that the 10,000 rubles had been spent on herself.(289) Yurkovsky took one ten ruble note with him to St.Petersburg where it remained as a sight-seeing attraction for some time.(290) According to M.R.Popov, the money was used by 'Narodnaya Volya'.(291) Other attempts followed. In September 1879, Okladsky and others planned to 'expropriate' the Kharkov exchequer (292) and from December 1880 to January 1881 Lebedeva, Frolenko, Fridenson and V.Merkulov tried to rob the Kishinev provincial exchequer.(293) Finally in 1882, S.Degayev, G.Chernyavskaya and Azarov (Nemolovsky) planned to rob Gori exchequer, but nothing came of this either.(294) The Kharkov post was a favourite target, and was attacked by revolutionary robbers on three occasions: on 17 October 1883 near Kharkov by P.Antonov, Ya.Berdichevsky, V.Pankratov and N.Martynov; secondly, following their unsuccessful foray of the week before, the above four plus V.Goncharov and P.Yel'ko tried again, with the result that Berdichevsky was killed on 24 October 1883; P.Antonov led the third attempt which was made by him, S.Kuzin and V.Livadin on 17 November 1884, four verst from Voronezh.(295) The Executive Committee of 'Narodnaya Volya' had of course declared long before that it had the right to 'confiscate' exchequer, postal and army funds (296), but the idea does appear to have been carried out more vigorously in the South than in the North.

In 1912, V.Ya.Bogucharsky criticised L.Tikhomirov for having suggested that the 'liberals' generously financed 'Narodnaya Volya'.(297) Certainly 'society' provided more money than was gained from robbery, in the South at least. This help could range

from the zemstvo doctor of Chernigov district, Aleksandr Bulich who gave 300 rubles towards the assassination of Prince Kropotkin (298), through the 100 rubles which M.F.Klimenko gave to Khalturin to allow him to buy a horse on which to escape after killing Strel'nikov,(299) to the thousand rubles which Frolenko was given for 'Narodnaya Volya', with the proviso that it must be used "to get him (the tsar) and for nothing else." (300) Money was not only given for use in terrorism, but also to assist in the general running of the Party. In April 1884, A.N.Bakh was trying to set up a press in Rostov, and had managed to raise 500 rubles from amongst local Party members which still left him short of 100 rubles. However, L.Kolegayev, a wealthy timber merchant arrived in Rostov and, hearing of the Party's predicament from a friend who was a member, provided the balance of the money. He even made plans to realise his 35,000 ruble estate over a two year period in favour of 'Narodnaya Volya'.(301)

Sympathisers could be fickle. When Vera Figner was in Kharkov in 1882/83 she found that "the resources of the provincial groups were meagre everywhere ..." and there was no financial help from St.Petersburg or Moscow.(302) She appealed to a Voronezh landowner, an ex-member of 'Freedom or Death', who had given Aleksandr Mikhaylov 23,000 rubles for 'Zemlya i Volya'. This barin refused to give Figner any money as he considered, quite sensibly, that 'Narodnaya Volya's' prospects at that time did not look good.(303) The 'Narodnaya Volya' group of Tellalov and Glushkov which had existed in Kharkov in the second half of 1879 had fa^rred better at the hands of the local liberals: V.A.Tikhotsky had obtained contributions from the local landowners, and P.Tellalov himself had collected 34 silver rubles each month from the wife of the chairman of the Kharkov law chamber.(304)

In the first five years of the period under consideration, money came from the Southern revolutionaries themselves, from the North, and, in the case of the Volkhovsky kruzhok, from 'society'. In the second five years - approximately from the time of the Osinsky kruzhok - despite greater financial outlays and the increasing impossibility of earning an income, the Southern revolutionaries possessed considerable sums of money. This greater financial strength

was not due to the kruzhoks having a larger number of wealthy members, although Lizogub's inheritance was important, nor was it due to larger amounts being remitted from the North, in fact money was often sent from the South to the North, nor was it due to revolutionary 'expropriations', which tended to be rather unproductive. It seems to have been due mainly to an increase in the financial support given by sympathisers in 'society'. This was facilitated now that the revolutionaries operated largely in towns. The money was however given under certain conditions and with certain expectations about how it should be used.

5. The place of the 'all-Russian' revolutionary organisations in the South.

Throughout the whole period there was evidence of the common historical phenomenon of hostility on the part of provinces towards the metropolis. The Southern revolutionaries therefore showed little relish for the prospect of being bound into an 'all Russian' organisation which would have its headquarters in St.Petersburg and which would involve the South in a loss of autonomy. A centralised party organisation was seen by many Southerners as simply meaning domination by St.Petersburg. This can be observed as far back as the students' congress of January 1871, when the suggestion by the Petersburgers to form a revolutionary association was not realised, "partly in consequence of the distrust of the provincials for the Petersburgers, but mainly because of the latter's tactlessness in appearing at the congress in too large numbers (7 people) and with a previously prepared programme." (305) The Odessan delegate, S.N.Yuzhakov, accused the Petersburgers of wanting to be 'the boss'. (306) Five years later at the Lavrovist Congress in Paris in November and December 1876, according to Steblin-Kaminsky, there was friction between the kruzhok of the capital and the provincials.(307) The minutes show that there was agreement that it was "premature, and even unnecessary to combine into one general kruzhok ..."; they would "enter only into federative relations for joint action for the cause, concerning socialist propaganda and agitation throughout Russia and for mutual help in all other affairs. Socialist literature, at the present time, is almost the only business common to the whole of Russia; therefore they resolved to bring it together under a direct organiser, appointed by the Congress."(308) The roughly contemporaneous kruzhok of the Buntars, especially their leader, V.Debagory-Mokriyevich, "did not particularly favour the socialists of the capital ...", or of Moscow either, and so it was only at times of extreme necessity that members of this kruzhok went to St.Petersburg. (309) Adam B.Ulam has speculated recently that the failure of 'The Northern Revolutionary Populist Group' to gain acceptance in the South for its programme was in part because these circles were "not enchanted by the idea of centralisation, i.e. control by the Petersburg group."(310) With the advent of 'Narodnaya Volya' the

question of greater centralisation was presented more forcibly, and the Southern kruzhoks struggled against it. A.Zhelyabov at his trial said that until about 1879 he had not seen any need for a strong organisation except for bringing books in from abroad, or for printing them in Russia. But once the party had set itself the aim of violent revolution, organisation was necessary.(311) Even once the necessity had been realised, "Dissatisfaction on the side of the local groups was frequent and originated, mostly, from a lack of tact by members, or agents, of the (Executive) Committee."(312) And, much "time and effort marked the Executive Committee's struggle with the autonomous tendencies of the Southern kruzhoks.", according to the recent work of V.A.Tvardovskaya.(313) The recalcitrance of the South grew and, by mid 1883, L.A.Tikhomirov was urging caution on M.N.Oshanina-Polonskaya in her dealings with the South, whose sensitivity he recognised, being from the Don himself. He advised her that she should, in conversation with the Southerners, stress "that socialism demands the economic unity of the North and South of Russia, and the revolutionary organisation - while a united enemy exists - also must be united as regards fighting forces: not Great Russians and not Little Russians, but non-nationalist all-Russians."(314) With the development of the 'Young Party 'Narodnaya Volya'', as a consequence of the defeat of 'Narodnaya Volya', provincialism was assisted by a strong reaction towards the development of a federalist structure for the Party.(315)

The history of the revolutionary movement is usually told in terms of the rise and fall of four organisations which operated on an empire-wide scale: the Chaykovtsy, 'Zemlya i Volya', 'Narodnaya Volya' and 'Chernyy Peredel'. Yet in view of the previous paragraphs and the inclination of the Southerners to go their own way it seems necessary to clarify the importance of these 'all-Russian' organisations for the South. Three questions are relevant: firstly, were the Southern branches of all-Russian revolutionary organisations created by their St.Petersburg centres?; secondly, once formed were they strictly organised and controlled from St.Petersburg?; and lastly, were the Southern branches the dominant kruzhoks in the South at any given time?

The thesis that the handful of 'Chaykovtsy' groups scattered throughout the Empire was in fact a federated all-Russian organisation properly named 'The Large Propaganda Society' is of relative modernity, and was first advanced in an elaborated form by the Soviet historian N.A.Troitsky in the early 1960's. Troitsky has written that the St.Petersburg kruzhok of 'Chaykovtsy' came into being in August 1871 and "After this, in the course of 1871 - 1873, on the initiative of the St.Petersburg Chaykovtsy, were created its federated societies which have been hitherto incorrectly called the 'Chaykovtsy'".(316) The two Southern branches of this Society were the one in Odessa-Kherson and the one in Kiev. There was also an agent of the Society - Lizogub - in Kharkov.(317) Troitsky based his claim, that the separate kruzhoks constituted a federated Society, in part upon the similarity of their organisational features: "the internal structure of the St.Petersburg group, were essentially a different character from, for example, the organisation of the anarchist kruzhok of S.F.Kovalik, L.S.Ginsburg or the so-called 'Kiev Commune'..." "The provincial kruzhoks - Moscow, Kiev, Odessa-Kherson, were constructed on the same organisational basis. All these kruzhoks, not only in ideology, but also in organisational aspects formed together with the St.Petersburg kruzhok a single federative society."(318)

On central control of the Society, Troitsky writes: "The relations between kruzhoks developed in the same way as relations between their members. All the kruzhoks were autonomous and were able to conform to local conditions, to take any decisions, but each of them was obliged to give systematically an account of its activities before the other kruzhoks. Admittance into one or other group of a new member was legitimised only with the consent of all kruzhoks. It was just the same for decisions of principle as for questions of business, not only within each kruzhok but also in the Society as a whole; the Chaykovtsy considered them absolutely binding on all members of the organisation. The common kassa and the right of transferring members from one kruzhok to another consolidated the organisational unity and equality of the kruzhok."(319) With the Chaykovtsy organisation "we do not have a number of kruzhoks, but a wide branching society - a unified number of kruzhoks."(320)

Troitsky believes that the federation was formed at the end of July and the beginning of August 1873, although P.B.Aksel'rod and other sources date this development slightly later in 1873.(321) He accepts that the two Southern kruzhoks came into existence some time prior to this (322), but implies that their creation, especially of the Odessa-Kherson one, owed a lot to the activity of Southerners who had previously been members of the St.Petersburg Chaykovtsy and who were acting with the co-operation of that group. Thus: "The rising of the Odessa group of Chaykovtsy was to a significant extent the result of the initiative and energy of F.V.Volkhovsky,.. in mid-July 1871, F.V.Volkhovsky, only just freed after the Nechayev case, straight from the dock, half-deaf, hardly moving, arrived ... (at the flat of the St.Petersburg Chaykovtsy)... with a proposal "to organise some dirty tricks against the government." The Chaykovtsy were very pleased with this suggestion and they "then arranged that Volkhovsky would organise the youth in Odessa."(323) "In the autumn of 1872, Volkhovsky arrived in Odessa and linked up with the local agent of the Chaykovtsy, S.L.Chudnovsky."(324) Regarding the Kherson kruzhok, Troitsky endorses the view that "the main organiser of the Kherson kruzhok from 1871 was Franzholi, around whom formed ... a kruzhok of like-minded people recognising him - tacitly - as their head and leader; Franzholi in 1870-1871, was acquainted in Petersburg with the Chaykovtsy and on returning to Kherson he did not break the links with them."(325) Even with the Kiev kruzhok, Troitsky sees the influence of the St.Petersburg Chaykovtsy. "The fore-runner of the group was a kruzhok for self-development founded in the summer of 1872 by P.B.Aksel'rod, S.G.Lur'ye and G.Ye.Gurevich, in which, at the end of 1872, joined V.G.Emme (a former member of the Natanson kruzhok), I.F.Rashevsky, N.A. Korotkevich and a certain Orlov and Rozhdestvensky." A leading role in the development of the kruzhok was played by Emme and Rashevsky who, even before the appearance of the kruzhok, were in close working relations with the Petersburg Chaykovtsy.(326)

Troitsky justifiably points to the involvement of St.Petersburg revolutionaries in the South at this particular period: the extent to which the generation of the Southern kruzhoks was begun on the initiative of the capital is less acceptable. As Lavrov remarked, Southern kruzhoks pre-1873 "were developing independently, being

at first only in very insignificant contact with the Petersburg kruzhoks and joining with them in closer links when already in a complete developed form."(327) The Odessan kruzhok "even before joining in the Society, had rules and even a special name - the Initiators' kruzhok."(328) To summarise, the Southern kruzhoks were not created by an 'all-Russian' organisation; they pre-dated it. Activists from the capital were involved in setting up these Southern kruzhoks, but they were not themselves directly carrying out instructions from the St.Petersburg centre, although occasionally in contact with it.

Moving to the question of the strictness of the organisation and control exercised by the St.Petersburg centre over the Southern kruzhoks associated with the Large Propaganda Society, Troitsky himself has written that they were autonomous although obliged to give a systematic account of their activities to the other kruzhoks and to obtain their consent before admitting new members.(329) Unfortunately he does not give any evidence that these Southern kruzhoks did meet in order to decide such matters. One of the members of the St.Petersburg Chaykovtsy wrote in his memoirs that links between the provincial kruzhoks and the St.Petersburg Chaykovtsy were based on equality, autonomy and a voluntary spirit which could be broken, but as they agreed on policy, they exchanged information, money and members.(330) The casualness of the whole relationship is conveyed by P.B.Aksel'rod, one of the Kiev Chaykovtsy, when he writes that the question of a general programme did not arise amongst the different kruzhoks; the members all knew each other well enough to know that they made common cause with the same aims and, more or less, in the same spirit.(331) It proved difficult enough to establish discipline within a kruzhok let alone from outside, as Volkhovsky discovered. N.V.Chaykovsky, himself, commented upon Volkhovsky's insistence upon discipline within the Odessa-Kharkov kruzhok.(332) Subsequently, B.B.Glinsky remarked that "In this kruzhok can perhaps be observed the appearance of party discipline ...It seems that the unusual conspiratorialness, with which all affairs of the kruzhok were conducted, for a long time safe-guarded its existence."(333) Lavrov rated this kruzhok as the "best organised kruzhok of the epoch before 1875 ..."(334) Finally however, Volkhovsky left the kruzhok because it would not

accept the discipline which he considered necessary for an efficient revolutionary organisation.(335)

Apart from its inappropriateness and the hostility which any such attempt would have engendered, there could be no strict control of the provincial kruzhoks by the St.Petersburg centre because of the flexibility of the membership of the former. Perhaps the least satisfactory element in Troitsky's thesis is his claim to be able to establish the precise membership of the kruzhoks, putting the members of Odessa-Kherson at 14 and that of Kiev at 12.(336) Sources indicate that members of the Chaykovtsy often participated in other kruzhoks; that members of other kruzhoks attended the Chaykovtsy meetings and that, in general, it is extremely difficult to be sure about which people were in fact members of the Chaykovtsy groups in the South. A. and I.I.Teftul and L.Troidansky are believed by some to have been members of the Odessa Chaykovtsy (337), while Ye.A.Dragopulo certainly participated in the reading of discussion papers at their meetings if he was not actually a member.(338) The case of I.M.Koval'sky to be included in the ranks of the Odessan Chaykovtsy - which Troitsky ignores - is argued strongly by Poglubko who points out that Koval'sky was a diligent participant in its activities both compiling papers and joining in their discussions.(339) The greatest source of doubt about the possibility of identifying exactly the membership of the Odessan Chaykovtsy is the closeness of its relationship with another kruzhok, the Zhebunevs . As the Soviet historian, Filippov writes: "in the spring of 1874 relations between Odessa 'Chaykovtsy' and the members of the Zhebunev kruzhok came, ... into a stage of very close mutual 'collaboration'."(340) Two members of the Zhebunev kruzhok became members of the Chaykovtsy: P.M.Makarevich joined the Zhebunevs in 1872 and the Chaykovtsy in autumn 1873; A.Makarevich (née Rosenshteyn) joined the former in 1872 and subsequently the Chaykovtsy.(341) I.I.Glushkov, the brother of Z.I.Zhebuneva was possibly also a member of both kruzhoks. (342) Some sources have most of the Zhebunev members being also Chaykovtsy, so that the former could not be said to constitute a substantive group after their return to Odessa.(343)

There was also only a very insubstantial division between the Kiev Chaykovtsy and the main kruzhok in that city, the Kiev Commune.

P.B.Aksel'rod, who may be considered as one of the leaders of the Kiev Chaykovtsy was treated by the Communards as one of themselves. (344) Conversely, Breshko-Breshkovskaya of the latter body attended the meetings of the Chaykovtsy.(345) The Kaminer sisters, Nadezhda and Avgustina, joined the Chaykovtsy in 1873, and in the spring of 1874 joined the Commune. The brothers Levental', Yeleazar and Nakhman, who joined the Chaykovtsy in 1873, joined the Commune the following year.(346) Ya.Stefanovich was active in both kruzhoks. (347) The important point is that membership of kruzhoks such as these discussed here, merely involved attendance and participation in the common kassa, it did not imply allegiance to a particular organisation. Under these circumstances it is impossible to conceive of the St.Petersburg centre being able to exercise any control. No doubt, as S.F.Kovalik wrote "Moscow, Kiev and Odessa found themselves in constant relations with them (i.e., the St.Petersburg Chaykovtsy) and often received directives from them.", but he could also write that as regard Kiev, "The revolutionary movement flowed in it independently, almost without any influence from the Petersburg kruzhoks ..."(348)

Neither of the two Chaykovtsy kruzhoks at present under consideration was the only kruzhok in its locality, nor in fact did it play the dominant role there. Neither - in their federated forms - lasted very long; at the most generous reckoning, no more than ten months. The Kiev Chaykovtsy was, as Troitsky acknowledges, "very insignificant both in the number of participants, and measured by the scale of activities ..."(349) According to Kovalik, it soon ceased to play a part in the movement.(350) This kruzhok was on the one side overshadowed by the larger and more vigorous 'Commune' and on the other incapacitated by its own internal discord. From an early date, the kruzhok experienced "serious divergences in views in 1873."(351) This became worse under the influence of radical youths returning from Switzerland but even more as a result of the influence of the works of Bakunin and Lavrov. The disagreements, according to P.B.Aksel'rod, arose between Emme and Rashevsky, whom he characterises as Lavrovists, and the Bakunists amongst whom he numbered himself and Stefanovich. The latter elements drew closer to their ideological sympathisers, the Kiev Communards, and left the Chaykovtsy.(352)

The situation as regards the Odessan Chaykovtsy would appear to be somewhat different. N.A.Charushin described it as "one of the most numerous and organised illegal kruzhoks, not only actively working amongst groups of intelligentsia but also amongst the workers." (353) Troitsky accords it the place of being "in second place in the Society, after the Petersburg kruzhok." (354) The same writer continued: "The provincial groups of the Society went v narod almost in their entirety, in the spring of 1874. Their active participants propogandised peasants in not less than twenty provinces." (355) It will be demonstrated in Chapter III that in fact few of the Odessan Chaykovtsy went v narod and that the kruzhok broke up rapidly after the departure of its leader Volkovsky which occurred in spring of 1874.

Only two of the Southern kruzhoks have been suggested to have been part of the 'Zemlya i Volya' party: Osinsky's and the Kharkov-Rostov kruzhok. N.A.Morozov, for example, refers to Osinsky as the Kiev representative of 'Zemlya i Volya'. (356) Undoubtedly, Osinsky had played a significant part in the foundation of the party in St.Petersburg in 1876 and had attended the meetings in January 1877 and in the winter of 1877/78. (357) However once he formed his own kruzhok in Kiev, from the winter of 1877/78, and began to be involved in revolutionary work, both he and the kruzhok acted with complete autonomy in the South. (358) Indeed Osinsky had made it clear to O.V.Aptekman before the meeting of 'Zemlya i Volya' in the winter of 1877/78, at which he was to press for the inclusion in the Party's constitution of a greater political element, that, if his proposal was rejected, he would leave the organisation and go South where his views had found acceptance. (359) It may well have been that during 1878 Osinsky no longer regarded himself as a member. Therefore the only 'Zemlya i Volya' kruzhok which it is necessary to consider is that of the Kharkov-Rostov kruzhok.

This kruzhok existed before the foundation of 'Zemlya i Volya'. In fact, the nucleus of the kruzhok had existed in St.Petersburg at least since autumn 1875. It consisted of M.Popov, Yemel'yanov, Tishchenko, I.Gartman, Bykovtsev and others. (360) After a number of them had been active v narod, they began to re-assemble in Rostov

during the summer of 1876, along with some new members. Meetings were held which involved about 15 people.(361) Although there was a substantial amount of contact during 1876 between these people and the capital, it was not until January 1877 that representatives went to St.Petersburg, accepted the rules and programme of the Party and "formally completed the union of the Kharkov-Rostov kruzhok with the Petersburg revolutionary - narodnik kruzhok. Thus was formed the 'Northern revolutionary - narodnichestvo' group, known from the second half of 1878 under the name of the 'Society 'Zemlya i Volya'". (362)

Included in the Society's rules was a section on the local groups: Point 28 - "Groups have complete independence in their local and internal matters."; Point 29 - "The internal organisation of each group can be different ..."(363) Such latitude may well help explain why "The energetic efforts of the Petersburg Centre of 'Zemlya i Volya' to strengthen its local organisation of necessity did not have success..."(364)

The question of the importance of the Kharkov-Rostov kruzhok within the South can be answered with some confidence in the negative. As can be seen from the list of kruzhoks in section 2 of this Chapter, the Kharkov-Rostov kruzhok was only one of a number extant at the time. Having joined 'Zemlya i Volya' in January 1877, it dispersed during the early spring of 1877 for propaganda work in the Caucasus, Volga or Kuban (365), and subsequently, following police persecution, most fled north, either to the St.Petersburg Centre, or to the 'Zemlya i Volya' settlement in Samara.(366)

The remarkable failure of 'Zemlya i Volya' to make any real impact on the South requires some consideration. As L.Tikhomirov wrote, it had "some weak off-shoots also in the south, but was wholly created by the north.", a judgement echoed by others (367). Even the names chosen for the organisation indicate a lack of relevance for the South; originally being called the 'Northern Revolutionary Populist Group', and from the summer of 1876 referred to as the 'North-Russian Society of 'Zemlya i Volya''. This was explained by one contemporary as follows: "They called themselves the 'North-Russian Society 'Zemlya i Volya'' to attribute to the region of its activities, and the districts of south-eastern Russia in which conditions of the way of life of the rural population

assumed forms characteristic of the Russian North."(368) Given this underlying attitude the Northerners would not have attached great urgency to the establishment of kruzhoks in the South and the fact that the only kruzhok was based in Kharkov and Rostov may well be significant, for the latter was regarded as a base for revolutionaries from the North who were going on to work in the Volga, Caucasus and Don.(369) 'Zemlya i Volya' attached little importance to the South, and it had little significance for the history of the Southern revolutionary movement.

With the third all-Russian revolutionary organisation, the 'Narodnaya Volya' Party, there are a number of important differences. This organisation was undoubtedly the dominant one in the South and had a lengthy period of existence. Equally distinctive is the fact that it did not have a centre in St.Petersburg as did the previous two organisations. The Executive Committee of the Party was able to move around the Empire, and concentrate on whichever part seemed to offer the best opportunity for revolutionary work. (370) It was often to be in the South and indeed some of its earliest activities were in the South during 1879, and some of its last activities were to be in Kharkov. A high percentage of those serving on the Executive Committee over the years of its existence were to be Southerners.

The first 'Narodnaya Volya' kruzhoks in the South had existed independently before entering into this all-Russian organisation (371), and were often rather reluctant so to do. Perhaps in recognition of the sensitivity of the Southerners about their autonomy and in anticipation of some difficulty in persuading them to give it up in favour of participation in a strong all-Russian organisation, the agents of the Executive Committee who were sent to accomplish this difficult task were almost all Southerners. A.I.Bychkov recalled the argument of his brother V.I.Bychkov, one of the leaders of the Kievan terrorist groups, with A.D.Mikhaylov, who arrived in Kiev in 1879. "Although V.I.Bychkov, like the majority of the Kievan groups, recognised the programme of the Executive Committee of the 'Narodnaya Volya' and was ready to unite in the struggle with the 'Narodnaya Volya' members, he in every way possible defended the independence of the groups from the Executive Committee.

Only in the beginning of 1880 did the Bychkov-Levinsky group unite with the Executive Committee, taking upon itself to obey the Executive Committee, uniting with it their forces and resources and worked out a common plan of action."(372) S.S.Zlatopol'sky, a Southerner, was accepted as the agent of the Executive Committee, in the autumn of 1881, to this group.(373) Later P.V.Gortynsky arrived from Moscow as the new agent of the Executive Committee in Kiev. The Levinsky kruzhok would not accept him and he set up his own kruzhok. Thus in January 1882, when A.N.Bakh returned to Kiev from exile, he found Gortynsky, as agent of the Executive Committee heading what he considered to be the officially recognised kruzhok, while the Levinsky kruzhok sought that recognition.(374) The Popov-Butsynsky kruzhok which existed from September 1879 until early the following year, joined the "'Narodnaya Volya' organisation on a federal basis, preserving its independence. The programme of the Executive Committee of the 'Narodnaya Volya' party was accepted by some members of the kruzhok with reservation, but in fact the kruzhok acted in the spirit of the programme."(375)

In Kharkov the Executive Committee experienced similar difficulty. According to G.Gol'denberg, he was given the responsibility of winning over the Kharkovites (376), which he tried to do in September 1879. Gol'denberg should have been a good choice for he was held in high regard by the Kharkov revolutionaries due to his attempt on the life of Prince Kropotkin, but V.A.Danilov recalls that he, Gol'denberg, did badly in the meeting summoned to hear him argue the case for joining the 'Narodnaya Volya' organisation.(377) About a week later, on 20 September 1879, there was a second meeting between around 40 of the local revolutionaries, mainly from I.I.Glushkov's kruzhok, and a number of Executive Committee agents, Kolodkevich, Barannikov, Presnyakov, Yakimova and Zhelyabov. Zhelyabov delivered a speech which decisively swayed the locals who subsequently joined the organisation.(378) I.I.Glushkov was arrested days later, at the beginning of October 1879, and P.A.Tellalov took over the leadership of the kruzhok simultaneously with being made an agent of the Executive Committee.(379) Even then he still found difficulty in convincing the Kharkov revolutionaries of the necessity of strict subordination to the Executive Committee.(380)

Odessa took somewhat longer to conform. A.Zhelyabov had been active here in the summer of 1879, organising the workers.(381) In the winter of 1879/80, V.Figner and N.N.Kolodkevich were involved in similar work.(382) M.N.Trigoni however appears to have been the man who brought the local revolutionaries into the Party's organisation, although there is little agreement about the date of this.(383) M.I.Drey reported that M.N.Trigoni came to Odessa at the beginning of 1880, as a 'Narodnaya Volya' agent: "Trigoni, from the remnants of former revolutionary organisations and from newly recruited people, formed a Central group ..., a workers' sub-group, and laid the basis of a military sub-group."(384) He still had the task of winning over the other kruzhoks in the city. One of these was the 'gorod' kruzhok, mainly of workers. According to D.N.Nabokov, Minister of Justice, to D.A.Tolstoy, the Minister of the Interior, this gorod kruzhok was, during the whole period of its existence, "the most lively centre of the revolutionary movement." "here in the winter of 1880 - 1881, Trigoni read to the meeting the programme of the Executive Committee, introduced members of the kruzhok into the details of the revolutionary movement, reported about the possibility of an imminent bunt, persuaded it to take the narodovol'tsy line, and promised the kruzhok the help of the Party of 'Narodnaya Volya'."(385)

The rules which the 'Narodnaya Volya' Party drew up for its local central groups were much more rigorous, in theory at least, than that of the previous all-Russian organisations which have been considered. Local groups were not going to initiate the revolution, but they would be indispensable to its success. In preparation for the revolution, the local groups would win positions in the administration and army, gain influence over the peasantry, meet with local liberals and constitutionalists, provide themselves with material resources and familiarise themselves with their respective regions.(386) The prohibitions were as formidable as the obligations. The local central group could not do the following without the permission of the Executive Committee: acts of terrorism against people of governor level and above, large robberies from the government, enter into relations with groups outside 'Narodnaya Volya', issue a party proclamation or a brochure on a matter of principle or start a paper, start a local insurrection,

or initiate systematic agrarian terrorism.(387) While the local group could recruit new members they could only become members after the Executive Committee had been informed about them and was satisfied.(388) The Group would be linked to the Executive Committee through an agent. (389) As has been discussed above, the local group also had to be prepared to give financial assistance to the Executive Committee. In the rules of the local central groups it was stated that such groups were "obliged to give the Executive Committee an account of their activities and, on the request of the Committee, provide all its moral and material forces." The Executive Committee was also empowered to extract any member for its own use.(390). In theory then the 'Narodnaya Volya' Party exercised very great control over the local groups. Yet given the facts of the situation: the voluntary nature of the association, the great distances involved between the Committee and the provinces and the imperfect means of communication available to the revolutionaries, central control was bound to be somewhat less onerous. Memoirs indicate that, in the minds of the activists, local kruzhoks maintained considerable independence. A.N.Bakh who was active in Kiev, Rostov and in the Caucasus recalled that while local groups had to give money and men to the Committee, and were not allowed to undertake large terrorist acts, or publish anything without the approval of the Committee, at the same time, in everything else the "local group was entirely autonomous." He also attached considerable significance to the fact that the agent of the Committee assigned to the local central committee did not have a decisive voice on that group.(391) Testifying more as a member of the Executive Committee than as a provincial, M.N.Polonskaya (Olovennikova), writing in 1893, remembered that the local group could not carry out terror or publish papers without the Committee's approval; that it was obliged to give the Executive Committee part of its money and personnel if requested and that it was required to give the Committee a report on its affairs, but otherwise the local group was independent.(392) Nonetheless, A.Zhelyabov was guilty of some exaggeration at his trial when he stated that "Each group is independent in the conduct of its affairs and has its own budget."(393)

Even if in reality the strictures on central control within 'Narodnaya Volya' lay lightly upon the shoulders of the local groups, it is noteworthy that provincial groups did join this organisation in such large numbers whereas they had been so markedly reluctant to involve themselves with the even less onerous obligation of participation in the Chaykovtsy and 'Zemlya i Volya'.

The fourth all-Russian revolutionary organisation was 'Chernyy Peredel'. Here again was an organisation which did not attach much significance to activity in the South. The name itself was chosen because "the term was understood amongst the peasants of Great Russia."(394) This was to become even more explicit as time passed for, in September 1880, in Chernyy Peredel No.2, appeared what was the new programme for the Party entitled: 'Programma Severno-russkago obshchestva 'Zemlya i Volya''. By way of an explanation of its name, the authors stated that we "name ourselves the 'North-Russian Society 'Zemlya i Volya' to signify the area of our activities and the regions of south-east Russia, in which the conditions of the way of life of the rural population take the form characteristic of the Russian north."(395) A position which is very reminiscent of that of 'Zemlya i Volya' itself four years previously.

'Chernyy Peredel's' presence in the South was negligible, except possibly in Kiev where there existed firstly a combined 'Chernyy Peredel' and 'Narodnaya Volya' group, and subsequently the Workers' Union organised by Ye.Koval'skaya and N.P.Shchedrin in 1880-1881. As regards the former, M.R.Popov the leader of the 'Chernyy Peredel' element of the combined group later wrote that they actually shared the narodovol'tsy programme and "it seems to me that if our Kiev kruzhok had not been destroyed shortly after this, then probably it would have finally united with the narodovol'tsy ..." (396) The existence of the second 'Chernyy Peredel' organisation was due to a strange combination of factors. Shchedrin and Koval'skaya had fallen out with the other members of the party over the new 'Chernyy Peredel' programme which was adopted shortly after it had suffered from a series of arrests in January 1880. These two members wanted a more anarchist programme which would stress economic terror. Determined to put their ideas into practice, they decided to go to Kiev, primarily because it was distant from St.Petersburg and Moscow

where the activities of a spy called Zharkov were making life very difficult for them.(397) Koval'skaya was of course a Southerner, which might have figured in their calculations. Elsewhere in the South, 'Chernyy Peredel' was of no importance. Of Kharkov in 1880, for example, P.B.Aksel'rod himself wrote: "In general there was no active supporter of the 'Chernyy Peredel' faction in Kharkov. In any case, the influence of this faction here was insignificant..."(398) However it is not the paucity of support for 'Chernyy Peredel' which is most relevant here but rather the extent to which that support was directed from sources outwith the South. A Soviet historian has summarised the Party's attitude to organisation: the 'Chernyy Peredel' did not recognise centralism, but believed in federalism. Relations between provincial groups and the centre were based on full equality and autonomy.(399)

Thus, of the four 'all-Russian' revolutionary organisations which existed, only one - 'Narodnaya Volya' - was significant for the history of the Southern revolutionary movement. A large number, probably the vast majority, of the kruzhoks in the South adhered to the Party. The centre may not have exercised strict control over local groups but the authority of the Executive Committee was recognised and as a consequence 'Narodnaya Volya' was the leading force in the South, as elsewhere, in the last five years of the period.

6. Summary.

This Chapter confounds the view that the South was backward, in fact there was an indigenous revolutionary movement in the South with a vigorous growth and the ability to develop a characteristic pattern of organisation, which included a tendency to form at first local, and then Southern organisations, without ties with St.Petersburg. Most of the important kruzhoks from 1873-78 had, to a greater or lesser extent, independent contacts with the emigration, which secured for them a sufficiency in literature. This had a significance beyond that of being able to read what they wanted; it encouraged membership and assisted finances. They were also increasingly able towards the end of the seventies to produce material on their own presses. Insofar as they relied upon the North for supplies of legal literature and, from 1879 onwards, for supplies of Narodnaya Volya, this did not necessarily mean a reliance upon Northerners, since there were Southerners living in the capital or in Moscow who could assist their colleagues in the South.

Financial control could influence revolutionary development by encouraging certain trends or, by stifling others. Yet there existed a number of different sources of money: the North, the ranks of the revolutionaries themselves, 'society'. Therefore it was impossible for any one source to be able to exercise a dominant control; as was seen, a kruzhok which was denied money by one source would try to seek it out from one of the other sources.

With the exception of the 'Narodnaya Volya' period, 'all-Russian' organisations had little significance for the development of the Southern revolutionary movement, and even in 1879 to 1883, Southern kruzhoks showed themselves independently minded and difficult to control.

7. References.

- (1) S.N.Valk (ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, pp.468-471. S.F.Kovalik 'Revolyutsionnoye Dvizheniye Semidesyatykh godov i protsess 193-kh' p.77 "As a revolutionary centre, Kiev had ... more significance than ... the old capital of Moscow."
- (2) B.S.Itenberg 'Dvizheniye Revolyutsionnogo Narodnichestva' p.325.
- (3) T.G.Snytko 'Russkoye Narodnichestvo i Pol'skoye obshchestvennoye dvizheniye 1865-1881 gg' p.177 writes, of late 1878 and 1879, "The centre of the revolutionary movement in the South of the Ukraine was Odessa."
- (4) I.Nikitin 'Pervyye Rabochiye Soyuzy i Sotsial-Demokraticheskiye organizatsii v Rossii 70-80ye gody XIXveke' p.39
- (5) V.Levitsky 'Narodnaya Volya i rabochiy klass' in KiS 1930, k.1, p.60, quotes the worker revolutionary, V.Pankratov, "In general Kharkov in this period (1883-4), was the centre of narodovol'tsy activity in the South." Kharkov was also the location of the Executive Committee from March 1882 to February 1883; see V.Figner 'Zapechatlennyy Trud' tom I, chapters 15,16 & 17. Even in early 1879, Zemlya i Volya no.4, was writing that, "Few cities are able to boast of a similar industry in revolutionary activity as Kharkov ..." see B.Bazilevsky (ed.) 'Revolyutsionnaya Zhurnalistsika semidesyatykh godov' p.233
- (6) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, doc.68, p.343, and 455.
- (7) Ibid., doc.69, p.345; B.Bazilevsky (ed.) 'Gos Prestup' tom III, pp.123-124, 124-125.
- (8) L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom I, p.128
- (9) T.G.Snytko 'Russkoye Narodnichestvo i Pol'skoye obshchestvennoye dvizheniye 1865-1881gg' p.174.
- (10) Loc.cit.
- (11) L.Berman 'Kievskiy Protsess 21-go v 1880 g' in KiS 1931, k.8/9 p.75.
- (12) P.B.Aksel'rod 'Perezhitoye i Peredumannoye' tomI, p.118.
- (13) V.A.Tvardovskaya 'Organizatsionnyye osnovy 'Narodnoy Voli'' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1960, tom 67, pp.128-129.

- (14) Ibid., p.122.
- (15) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, p.435.
- (16) V.A.Tvardovskaya 'Organizatsionnyye osnovy 'Narodnoy Volyi'' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1960, tom 67, pp.117-118. For the links and groups set up by the Odessan 'Narodnaya Volya' see S.S.Volk ''Narodnaya Volya', 1879-1882' p.271. On the continuing connection between Odessan and Kishinev kruzhoks, see I.G.Budak 'Obshchestvenno-politicheskoye dvizheniye v Bessarabiï v poreformennyi period' pp.191ff., 264. On Kharkov's links, during the 'Narodnaya Volya' period, see A.Bakh 'Vospominaniya Narodovol'tsa' (Prodolzheniye) in Byloye 1907, no.2, p.190, and V.Levitsky ''Narodnaya Volya' i rabochiy klass' in KiS 1930, k.1, p.60.
- (17) See for example, K.A.Poglubko 'Ocherki istorii bolgarorossiyskikh revolyutsionnykh svyazey (60-70ye gody XIX veka)' p.94 and S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, p.444.
- (18) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, p.454.
- (19) B.Bazilevsky(ed.) 'Gos prestup' tom III, p.125 and 136.
- (20) B.Sapir(ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, doc.15, p.53,54. P.B.Aksel'rod 'Perezhitoye i Peredumannoye' pp.103-104, also says that little came of this conference. According to R.B.Filippov 'Iz istorii narodnicheskogo dvizheniya na pervom etape 'khozheniya v narod' (1863-1874)' p.281, the conference took place in November 1873, whereas it is set in September 1873 by B.S.Itenberg 'Dvizheniye Revolyutsionnogo Narodnichestva' p.188. Itenberg believes that 7 delegates attended the meeting.
- (21) L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom II, p.45,52.
- (22) N.K.Bukh 'Vospominaniya' p.123.
- (23) F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.571.
- (24) Ye.Serebryakov 'Obshchestvo 'Zemlya i Volya'' in 'Materialy' tom II, May 1894, p.49. See also A.Shekhter 'Revolyutsionnaya Odessa 1877-78gg' in KiS 1923, k.6, p.49; Sh.M.Levin 'Dve Demonstratsii' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1955, tom 54, p.263
- (25) T.G.Snytko 'Russkoye Narodnichestvo i Pol'skoye obshchestvennoye dvizheniye 1865-1881gg' p.168. 'Iz knigi izdannoy Sekretno zhandarmarni' in Byloye Jan.1904, no.5, p.68, says that Debagory-Mokriyevich and V.Osinsky had drawn up this

- 'grandiose plan' in 1878. Debagory-Mokriyevich was arrested one week before the conference was to meet. This conference was originally scheduled to take place in August 1878 in Odessa but was postponed in order to organise the demonstration against Koval'sky's sentence - see (R.A.Steblyn-Yamensky) 'Grigoriy Anfomovich Popko' in 'Materialy' tom 16, Oct.1893, p.176. The conference was to have embraced Odessan terrorists, Buntars and the 'Zemlya i Volya' kruzhok from Kharkov.
- (26) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.30, p.131; the close ties of Butsynsky's own Kharkov kruzhok with other cities, especially Kiev, is confirmed by one of the members in V.S.Yefremov 'Malen'koye Delo' in Byloye 1907, no.5, p.83.
- (27) V.V.Shirokova 'Vozniknoveniye narodovol' cheskoj organizatsii v Khar'kove' in 'Iz istorii obshchestvennoy mysli i obshchestvennogo dvizheniya v Rossii' p.83, 89.
- (28) The tendency of Southern revolutionaries to try to set up separate organisations existed even when the 'Narodnaya Volya' party was at its zenith. For example, 'Ustav organizatsii Goroblagodatskikh rabochikh družhin taynogo obshchestva 'Narodnaya Volya'', probably written by V.A.Goncharov of Kharkov in 1879/80, stated that: "The task of the organisation consists in this, in order to create a south Russian organisation of city workers and rural peasants and to unite to this end the existing socialist kruzhoks, in all south-Russian provincial and uyezd cities, and also in industrial small towns and villages ..." see S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.87, p.350
- (29) A.Kulakov 'Iz vospominaniy o N.K.Sigide' in KiS 1929, k.11, p.134.
- (30) A.A.Kulakov 'Avtobiografiya' in KiS 1930, k.3, pp.168-169: the Committee members were to be - for Taganrog: Bogoraz, Orzhikh, Yasevich & Kulakov; for Odessa: Shternberg; for Yekaterinoslav: N.N.Shekhter; for Kharkov: Brazhnikov.
- (31) Zaslavsky's 'Union' had as the second point in its aims "the unification of workers of the South Russian region ..." See A.M.Pankratova(ed.) 'Rabocheye dvizheniye' tom II, ch.2 (1875-84), doc.51, p.105. The 'Union' established branches in Kharkov, Orle, Taganrog and Rostov - see ibid., doc 50, p.103. The 'Workers' Union of South Russia' in its declaration

of 14 March 1881, declared that it was taking on itself "the defence of the interests of all workers of the southern region ..." - ibid., doc.236, p.442.

Aksel'rod chose the name 'Workers' Union of South Russia', in part, because he wanted to stress his federalist ideas and he hoped to unite his Union with ones from other regions at some future date - see P.B.Aksel'rod 'Perezhitoye i Peredumannoye tom I, p.327.

- (32) N.A.Charushin 'O Dalekom Proshlom' p.356 note by Sh.Levin. Levin here claims that the Commune did not exist till the second half of 1873, whereas Charushin referred to the Commune existing in February 1873. B.Bazilevsky(ed.) 'Gos Prestup' tom III, p.101, says that it started in September 1873 but gradually developed over 18 months.
- (33) N.A.Troitsky 'Bol'shoye Obshchestvo Propagandy 1871-1874' p.23: in the summer of 1872, the original group was formed, but "approximately at the end of July to the beginning of August 1873 ..." it entered into "The final formation of the organisational links of the Kiev kruzhok with the Petersburg Chaykovtsy kruzhok ..."
- (34) P.B.Aksel'rod 'Perezhitoye i Peredumannoye' tom I, p.108.
- (35) Lev Deych 'Za Polveka' tom I, p.104
- (36) "The first societies of the so-called buntari (fanatics) of Kiev, Odessa and Kharkov, the fixed object of which was an immediate rising, date from the year 1875." Stepniak 'Underground Russia' p.33.
- Sh.M.Levin 'Obshchestvennoye dvizheniye v Rossii v 60-70-ye gody XIX veka' p.389: "the 'Southern buntars' 1875-1876 (successors of the Kiev Commune 1873-1874) ..." The foundation of the Kiev Buntars pre-dated L.Deych's joining, which took place in November 1875, see L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom I, p.232. Also, it was not until autumn 1875 that the leader, V.K.Debagory-Mokriyevich, returned to Russia, see 'Bio-Biblio. Slovar' tom II, v.1, col.337.
- (37) According to Deych, the Buntars broke up to allow the Chigrinⁱ Affair to proceed, (see L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom II, p.310). Deych, Malinka, Kostyurin and A.Makarevich stayed in Odessa (ibid., p.135). Others dispersed to Yelizavetgrad and

and subsequently to Kharkov (ibid., p.173)

Some of those who went to Odessa joined the Bashentsev, see M.Frolenko 'O Gol'denberge' KiS 1929, k.8/9, p.280.

- (38) S.S.Volk ''Narodnaya Volya' 1879-1882' p.67.
- (39) A.Pribylev 'In.Fed.Voloshenko' in KiS 1930, k.3, pp.141-142.
- (40) T.G.Snytko 'Russkoye Narodnichestvo i Pol'skoye obshchestvennoye dvizheniye 1865-1881gg' pp.174-5.
- (41) V.Levitsky (V.Tsederbaum) 'Partiya 'Narodnaya Volya'. Vozniknoveniye, Bor'ba, Gibel'' p.119.
- (42) Loc. cit.; S.S.Volk ''Narodnaya Volya', 1879-1882' p.268. L.Berman 'Kievskiy protsess 21-go v 1880g' in KiS 1931, k.8/9, pp.76-77, points out that the kruzhok suffered heavy losses through arrests in October and November 1879.
- (43) A.Ascher 'Pavel Aksel'rod and the Development of Menshevism' p.45.
- (44) R.M.Kantor 'Razgrom 'yuzhno-russkogo rabocheho soyuza' v 1880-1881 gg' in Krasnyy Arkhiv 1928, tom 30, p.210. The two founders were arrested on 22 October 1880. More arrests followed on 4/5 January 1881, but only on 28 April 1881 was the Union's press - called the 'South-Russian Free Press' - discovered by the police.
- (45) V.A.Tvardovskaya 'Organizatsionnyye osnovy 'Narodnoy Voli'' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1960, tom 67, p.122.
- (46) In April 1882, Levinsky and A.Bogdanovich were arrested and other arrests followed in May. A.N.Bakh claimed that he was the only survivor by June 1882. See A.N.Bakh 'Vospominaniya Narodovol'tsa (1882-1885 gg)' in Byloye 1907, no.1, p.119 and 120.
See also, S.Livshits 'Podpol'nyye Tipografii 60-kh, 70-kh i 80-kh godov' in KiS 1929, k.1, p.77
- (47) V.A.Tvardovskaya 'Organizatsionnyye osnovy 'Narodnoy Voli'' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1960, tom 67, p.123.
- (48) I.I.Popov 'Pamyati L.S.Zalkinda' in KiS 1929, k.11, p.173. See also S.S.Volk ''Narodnaya Volya' 1879-1882' p.268, who says S.S.Zlatopol'sky and N.N.Kolodkevich.
- (49) S.S.Volk 'Deyatel'nost' 'Narodnoy Voli' sredi rabochikh v gody vtoroy revolyutsionnoy situatsii 1879-1882' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1963, tom 74, p.208.

- (50) I.I.Popov 'Pamyati L.S.Zalkinda' in KiS 1929, k.11, p.173.
V.Gortynsky himself was arrested in Jan./Feb.1882 - see
A.N.Bakh 'Vospominaniya Narodovol'tsa (1882-1885gg)' in
Byloye 1907, no.1, p.119
- (51) A.N.Bakh 'Vospominaniya Narodovol'tsa (1882-1885 gg)' in
Byloye 1907, no.1, p.118
- (52) Ibid., p.120.
S.S.Volk ''Narodnaya Volya' 1879-1882' p.268 says that it
started in Feb/March 1882, whereas he claims it was in the
summer of 1882 in his article 'Deyatel'nost' 'Narodnoy Voli'
sredi rabochikh v gody vtoroy revolyutsionnoy situatsii
1879-1882' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1963, tom 74, p.208.
- (53) I.I.Popov 'Pamyati L.S.Zalkinda' in KiS 1929, k.11, p.173.
- (54) A.N.Bakh 'Vospominaniya Narodovol'tsa (1882-1885 gg)' in
Byloye 1907, no. 1, p.121.
- (55) V.Pankratov 'K Protsessu 12-ti 1884g v Kiev' in Byloye 1907,
no.2, p.297,303.
See also S.N.Valk ''Sotsialist', organ yugo-zapadnoy gruppy
partii 'Narodnoy Voli' in Krasnyy Arkhiv 1929, tom 33, p.205.
- (56) N.A.Troitsky 'Bol'shoye Obshchestvo Propagandy 1871-1874gg'
p.24. See also Sh.Levin in N.A.Charushin 'O Dalekom Proshlom'
p.357 who says that the Odessan kruzhok only achieved "a
settled formation ..." in the summer of 1873.
- (57) N.A.Charushin op.cit. p.357 note.
- (58) B.S.Itenberg 'Vozniknoveniye Pervoy Proletarskoy organizatsii
v Rossii - 'Yuzhnorossiyskogo Soyuza Rabochikh'' in
Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1953, tom 44, p.106,108 (definitely
formed by spring 1875), p.111 (destroyed). Zaslavsky had been
active in Odessa long before the end of 1874 - see p.104.
- (59) See 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.2, col.410-415. The kruzhok
had, of course, existed before this and had been formed in
Switzerland - See J.M.Meijer 'Knowledge and Revolution: The
Russian Colony in Zurich 1870-1873' pp.53-64.
- (60) N.Vitashevsky 'Pervoye vooruzhennoye soprotivleniye - pervyy
voyenny sud' in Byloye 1906, no.2, pp.223-224.
- (61) The kruzhok was arrested after armed resistance. The incident
is described in various sources including: Ye. Serebryakov

- 'Obshchestvo 'Zemlya i Volya'' in 'Materialy' tom 11, May 1894, p.42.
- (62) M.Frolenko 'Obshchestvo Narodnogo Osvobozhdeniya' in KiS 1932, k.43, p.88.
- S.Ye.Lion did not join the kruzhok until spring 1877, although secondary sources frequently refer to 'Lion's kruzhok'; see S.Ye.Lion 'Ot propagandy k terroru. (Iz Odessikh Vospominany semidesyatnika)' in KiS 1924, k.12, p.14. A.N. Pribylev 'In. F. Voloshenko' in KiS 1930 k.3, p.139, says that the Bashentsev disintegrated when Voloshenko and Popko left at the end of 1877.
- (63) See note 37.
- (64) See note 39.
- (65) S.S.Volk 'Deyatel'nost' 'Narodnoy Voli' sredi rabochikh v gody vtoroy revolyutsionnoy situatsii 1879-1882' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1963, tom 74, p.208.
- (66) S.S.Volk "Narodnaya Volya' 1879-1882" p.263 and M.I.Drey 'Strel'nikovskiy protsess' v Odesse v 1883 godu' in KiS 1924, k.9, p.46.
- (67) S.S.Volk "Narodnaya Volya' 1879-1882" p.270. V.Figner 'Zapechatlyenny Trud' tom I, p.291, says that it "existed till mid 1882."
- (68) M.N.Trigoni had been in Odessa since the start of 1880 as Executive Committee agent and played a large part in setting it up; see M.I.Drey 'Strel'nikovskiy protsess' v Odesse v 1883 g' in KiS 1924, k.9, pp.46-47.
- (69) S.S.Volk "Narodnaya Volya' 1879-1882" p.270. Although starting in the middle of 1882, its size appears to have been considerably increased by the addition of many new members to the Central Group in autumn 1882; see B.D.Orzhikh 'V ryadakh 'Narodnoy Voli'' in A.V.Vakimova-Dikovskaya et al. (ed.) 'Narodovol'tsy Sbornik III' p.85. See ibid., pp.89-90 for changes in the leadership of the kruzhok.
- (70) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, p.454.
- (71) B.S.Itenberg 'Dvizheniye Revolyutsionnogo Narodnichestva' p.331
- (72) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, p.454.
- (73) See note 71.

- (74) See note 71.
- (75) B.S.Itenberg 'Dvizheniye Revolyutsionnogo Narodnichestva' p.335.
- (76) In August 1874, the members left Khar'kov for Taganrog, where they joined with Pavlovsky's kruzhok, see S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, doc.63, p.332.
- (77) O.V.Aptekman 'Obshchestvo 'Zemlya i Volya' 70-kh' p.187; Aptekman joined the kruzhok in August 1876, see ibid., p.84. See also F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.569.
- (78) The kruzhok broke up in spring 1877 due to pressure from the police in Rostov. Members dispersed to the Caucasus, the Kuban, Samara and to St.Petersburg. See 'Iz vospominaniy L'va Gartmana' in Byloye Feb.1903, no.3, p.182; M.Popov 'Iz moyego revolyutsionnogo proshlago. (Ocherk pervyy)' in Byloye 1907, no.5, p.296.
- (79) V.V.Shirokova 'Vozniknoveniye narodovol'cheskoy organizatsii v Khar'kove' in 'Iz istorii obshchestvennoy mysli i obshchestvennogo dvizheniya v Rossii' p.67 and S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, p.446.
- (80) V.V.Shirokova op.cit. p.73.
- (81) Ibid., p.74.
- (82) Ibid., p.81.
- (83) Ibid., pp.90-91, 65; see also S.S.Volk ''Narodnaya Volya' 1879-1882' p.271.
- (84) V.A.Danilov 'Iz Vospominaniy. (Protsess Sytsyanko, 1879-1880)' in Byloye 1907, no.8, p.230. It was Gol'denberg's subsequent betrayal which led to the arrest of most of the kruzhok.
- (85) S.S.Volk ''Narodnaya Volya' 1879-1882' p.271.
- (86) See V.A.Danilov 'Iz Vospominaniy' Byloye 1907, no.8, pp.229-240.
- (87) See V.I.Chuyko 'K protsessu chetyrnadtsati' in A.V.Yakimova-Dikovskaya et al.(ed.) 'Narodovol'tsy Sbornik III' p.185. Figner herself was arrested on 10th February 1883 (o.s.) but the kruzhok continued till arrested on 22 June 1883.
- (88) A.M.Pankratova (ed.) 'Rabochiye Dvizheniye' tom II, ch.2, doc.263, p.497.
- (89) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, doc.64, p.335. See also a similar testimony by Yurkevich in B.Bazilevsky (ed.) 'Gos Prestup' tom III, p.82. K.A.Poglubko 'Ocherki istorii bolgaro-rossiyskikh revolyutsionnykh svyazey.' p.109, tells how the

library possessed by the Odessan Chaykovtsy attracted Odessan student youth.

- (90) For example the Barkov-Govorukh kruzhok of Kharkov University students in 1873-1874 raised 175 silver rubles through the sale of legal and illegal books to students. See B.Bazilevsky (ed.) 'Gos Prestup' tom III, p.92.
- (91) Legal literature was very important throughout the period, 'N.L.Gekker 'Revolutsionnyye kruzhki v Berdyanske (1878-79)' in KiS 1924, k.11, p.101, recalls that even at the end of the seventies, the influence of illegal works was secondary to the influence of legal literature, the better journals and the works of Lavrov and N.K.Mikhaylovsky.
- (92) Perhaps the most impressive demonstration of the South's personal contact with the emigration is that one half of the students at Zurich University and Polytechnic, from 1868 to 1874 came from the South, and Odessa provided more students to Zurich University than any other single town in the Empire. These students were frequently involved with Lavrov and Bakunin. See J.M.Meijer 'Knowledge and Revolution: The Russian Colony in Zurich 1870-1873.' Appendix, pp.208-215, 24,53. From amongst these, many returned to Russia as revolutionaries.

Southerners contributed significantly to the papers. S.A.Podolinsky wrote in his memoirs,(c1880): "The editorial office of Vpered! especially in the first two years of the existence of the journal (1873-1874) was in close relationship with the Southern kruzhoks, which explains both the history of the foundation of Vpered! and the composition of its workers in the first years." "In this period (i.e. 1873-1874) the Petersburgers rendered neither literary nor financial help. ... Thus in this period the workers of Vpered!, apart from Lavrov and Smirnov, were all of Ukrainian origin and the largest part of the correspondence also dealt with Southern Russia." See B.Sapir(ed.) Vpered! tom II, doc 15, pp.52-53.

Amongst the numerous Southerners connected with Obshchina might be mentioned the following: M.Gellis and I.Fuks who

emigrated in 1874 and became typesetters in Geneva for Obshchina before returning to form a workers' kruzhok in Odessa. (see 'Bio-biblio Slovar' tom II, v.1, col.251; v.4, col.1859) Ye. Levental', who had been in the Kiev Chaykovtsy in 1873 and the Kiev Commune in 1874, emigrated in October 1874 to become one of the editors of Obshchina. (see S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' p.503.) Another former member of the Chaykovtsy, from Odessa, Stenyushkin, later associated with the group around Obshchina. (see B.Sapir(ed.) 'Lavrov' tom I, doc.323, p.540) The ubiquitous Z.K.Ralli was one of the Southerners who fled abroad after the student disorders of 1869 in St.Petersburg and became one of the editors of Obshchina and of Rabotnik. (see 'Bio-biblio Slovar' tom II, v.3, col.1308-1310). Other Southerners N.A.Zhebunev and Z.I.Zhebuneva went to assist in the printing of Rabotnik along with Zhukovsky, El'snits and Goldenberg, see B.Sapir (ed.) 'Lavrov' tom I, doc.121, p.225 and doc.131, p.243.

- (93) A.Tun 'Istoriya Revolyutsionnykh Dvizheniy v Rossii' p.202. V.Figner 'Zapechatlennyy Trud' tom I, p.245, writes that in 1876, "ended the importance of the Russian emigration for revolutionary Russia ...", because of the development of 'Zemlya i Volya'. Perhaps 1876 is rather premature, for Obshchina appeared during 1878. Ya.V.Stefanovich, writing a description, in 1882 for Fleve, of the emigration in the late '70's, remarks: "At the present time, the emigration does not represent a compact whole, as it did in the period beginning in 1873 and ending around 1878. At that time the initiative in the revolutionary movement belonged to it ..." see F.Pokrovsky (ed.) 'Russkaya Revolyutsionnaya Emigratsiya. Zapiska Ya.V.Stefanovicha' in Byloye 1921, no.16, p.76. The emigration regained some of its importance after 1st March 1881, see M.N.Polonskaya (Olovennikova) 'K istorii partii Narodnoy Voli. 'Pokazaniya' (1893), reprinted in Byloye 1907, no.5, p.8.
- (94) B.S.Itenberg 'Vozniknoveniye pervoy proletarskoy organizatsii v Rossii - 'Yuzhnorossiyskogo soyuza rabochikh' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1953, tom 44, pp.96-97. Sevastopol',

as well as Odessa, was used to bring in material, see for example, V.Pankratov 'Iz deyatel'nosti sredi rabochikh v 1830-84gg' in Byloye 1906, no.3, p.251.

- (95) For more information on these routes, see B.Sapir (ed.) 'Vpered!' tom I, pp.314-320. For details of the routes through Bessarabia, see I.G.Budak 'Obshchestvenno-politicheskoye dvizheniye v Bessarabii v poreformenny period' pp.196-201,271. Southern transport routes had of course existed before the period presently under consideration; for information on a slightly earlier episode, see B.S.Itenberg 'Rasprostraneniye izdaniy Russkoy seksii I Internatsionala v revolyutsionnom podpol'ye Rossii.' in Voprosy Istorii October 1962, no.10, pp.40-49, and O.D.Sokolov 'Novyye materialy o rasprostraneniye idey I Internatsional v Rossii.' in Voprosy Istorii 1959, no.1, pp.201-203.
- (96) Quoted in P.L.Lavrov 'Narodniki-Propagandisty 1873-78 godov' p.220.
- (97) B.Bazilevsky (ed.) 'Gos Prestup' tom III, pp.137-138.
- (98) Ibid., p.140.
- (99) N.A.Charushin 'O Dalekom Proshlom' p.160
- (100) B.Bazilevsky (ed.) 'Gos Prestup' tom III, pp.138-139 and p.127.
- (101) N.A.Troitsky 'Bol'shoye Obshchestvo Propagandy, 1871-1874gg' p.39.
- (102) A.V.Knowles 'The 'Book Affair' of the Chaykovsky Circle' in The Slavonic and East European Review Oct.1973, vol.51,no.125, pp.559-560, narrates the developments from the autumn of 1873.
- (103) Ibid., p.559. Lermontov, in 1873, used a Southern route to bring in material from Sazhin for his St.Petersburg kruzhek - See B.Bazilevsky (ed.) 'Gos Prestup' tom III, p.40.
- (104) B.Bazilevsky (ed.) op.cit. tom III, p.139.
- (105) N.A.Charushin 'O Dalekom Proshlom' p.184.
- (106) S.Chudnovsky 'Stranichka iz vospominaniy' in Byloye 1907, no.5, p.288.
- (107) N.A.Charushin 'O Dalekom Proshlom' p.156; P.B.Aksel'rod 'Perezhitoye i Peredumannoye' p.101. See also S.F.Kovalik 'Revolyutsionnoye Dvizheniye Semidesyatykh godov i p^rotsess 193-kh' p.127, where he recounts how Lur'ye was assisted by

the brothers Pavlovsky. The Pavlovsky kruzhok moved from St. Petersburg to Taganrog in summer 1874 and later joined with Andreyeva and her small Kharkov kruzhok. It had independent contact with Sazhin. See B.Bazilevsky 'Gos Prestup' tom III, p.78.

- (108) P.B.Aksel'rod op.cit. p.120
- (109) V.Debagory-Mokriyevich 'Vospominaniya' p.46.
- (110) B.Bazilevsky (ed.) 'Gos Prestup' tom III, p.104. Gorinovich also testified that the Commune had obtained revolutionary books from abroad through smugglers, loc.cit..
- (111) Ibid., p.40.
- (112) See I.I.Popov 'Nikolay Konstantinovich Russel' - Sudzilovsky' in KiS 1930, k.6, p.171.
- (113) B.Bazilevsky (ed.) 'Gos Prestup' tom III, p.88,78.
- (114) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, doc.63, p.333, for some of the material which the Pavlovsky kruzhok brought into Russia. A Moscow kruzhok also brought in books through Bessarabia in the summer of 1874. See Z.K.Ralli 'N.P.Zubko-Kodreanu' p.10.
- (115) A.M.Pankratova (ed.) 'Rabocheye dvizheniye' tom II, ch.2 (1875-84), doc.53, p.112; doc.56, p.118 and doc.61, p.131.
- (116) Ibid., doc.65, p.151.
- (117) Ibid., doc.65, p.156.

For further information on the contacts between the Union and the emigration in London, see B.S.Itenberg 'Yuzhno-Rossiyskiy Soyuz Rabochikh. Vozniknoveniye i Deyatel'nost' pp.146-152. Other sailors, e.g., I.F.Lyashenko, also brought revolutionary material back from London - see S.N.Valk (ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, p.470. See also B.Sapir (ed.) 'Vpered!' tom I, pp.387-388 note 118 for a list of sailors involved in this traffic.

- (118) P.Vladychenko 'Famyati Uchitelya i pogibshikh druzey' in KiS 1923, k.5, p.31.
- (119) 'Grigory Anfomovich Popko' in 'Materialy' tom 16, October 1893, p.166
- (120) Ibid., pp.168-9. The L'vov friends were S.Yastremsky, A.P.Ch--n", Lyakotsky, Pavlik. On Grinevich's arrest, see 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.1, col.316.

- (121) M.Frolenko 'I.M.Koval'skiy. Zametka po povodu stat'i S.Ye. Liona' in KiS 1924, k.12, p.28.
- (122) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.29, p.125.
- (123) M.Frolenko 'Obshchestvo Narodnogo Osvobozhdeniya' in KiS 1932, k.3, p.90 and 91.
- (124) P.L.Lavrov 'Narodniki-Propagandisty 1873-78 godov' p.189, note.
- (125) S.N.Valk (ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.30, p.131.
- (126) Gr.Borzyakov 'Revolyutsionnaya Molodezh' v Odesse v 1882-1884 gg' in KiS 1929, k.8-9, p.131
- (127) F.Pokrovsky (ed.) 'Russkaya Revolyutsionnaya Emigratsiya. Zapiska Ya.V.Stefanovicha' in Byloye 1921, no.16, p.83.
- (128) P.S.Tkachenko 'Revolyutsionnaya narodnicheskaya organizatsiya 'Zemlya i Volya'' p.190. I.G.Budak 'Obshchestvenno - politicheskoye dvizheniye v Bessarabii v poreformenny period' pp.196-201, 205-215, argues that the transport of books, type and revolutionaries across the Rumanian-Bessarabian border was of considerable significance, particularly from 1877/78 to the early 1880's.
- (129) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.43, p.379, note 105; Ye.Koval'skaya 'Yuzhnyy Rabochiy Soyuz v 1880-81gg' in Byloye Feb.1904, no.6, pp.36-37.
- (130) See T.G.Snytko 'Russkoye Narodnichestvo i Pol'skoye obshchestvennoye dvizheniye 1865-1881 gg.'
- (131) Ibid., pp.170-171.
- (132) Ibid., see for example p.196. On the use of the Rumanian route to bring in literature for the St.Petersburg revolutionaries, see I.G.Budak 'Obshchestvenno-politicheskoye dvizheniye v Bessarabii v poreformenny period' pp.114 ff.
- (133) B.Sapir (ed.) 'Lavrov' tom II, doc.28, p.39,40. Podolinsky did prove to be correct on the matter of correspondence, see Z.V.Pereshina 'Ocherki Istorii Revolyutsionnogo dvizheniya na yuge Ukrainy. (k 100-letiyu 'Yuzhnorossiyskogo soyuza rabochikh')'. pp.102-103, on the importance of Southern correspondence for Vpered!
- (134) B.Bazilevsky (ed.) 'Gos Prestup' tom III, pp.137-140; J.Meijer 'Knowledge and Revolution' p.98. P.B.Aksel'rod 'Perezhitoye i Peredumannoye' k.I, p.106 describes Zheltonovsky, who he met

in autumn 1873, as being "the delegate from the Odessan revolutionary kruzhok issuing Vpered." Zheltonovsky was in fact in Volkhovsky's kruzhok.

- (135) B.Sapir (ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, docs. 199,200, pp.422-427.
- (136) Ibid., tom II, doc.169, pp.374-375.
- (137) Ibid., tom II, doc.66, p.227.
- (138) Ibid., tom II, doc.139, p.317.
- (139) Ibid., tom II, doc.158, p.347.
- (140) Ibid., tom I, p.320.
- (141) Ibid., tom II, doc.166, p.356.
- (142) Ibid., tom I, p.320.
- (143) Ibid., tom II, doc.170, p.376.
- (144) Ibid., tom II, doc.159, p.347.
- (145) Ibid., tom II, doc.160, p.348.
- (146) Ibid., tom II, doc.153, p.338, and doc.154,p.341. B.Sapir in 'Vpered!' tom I, p.296 says that this particular project came to nothing. Z.K.Ralli 'N.P.Zubko-Kodreanu' p.13, tells how Zubko-Kodreanu had already used a similar plan for distributing Obshchina amongst the Russian army officers and doctors in Bessarabia to get that paper into Russia. For a detailed account of the important revolutionary activity of N.B.Kubku-Kodreanu, with special reference to his 'transporting' activity, see I.G.Budak 'Obshchestvenno-politicheskoye dvizheniye v Bessarabii v poreformenny period' pp.96-146.
- (147) B.Sapir (ed.) 'Vpered!' tom I, p.315, "the bulk of its publications found their way into Russia by what was called this 'northern route',..." For a summary of the transport of Vpered! to all parts of Russia, see ibid., pp.315-320.
- (148) B.Sapir (ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, doc.58, p.198.
- (149) Ibid., tom II, doc.67, pp.242-243.
- (150) Z.V.Pereshina 'Ocherki Istorii Revolyutsionnogo dvizheniya na yuge Ukrainy.' p.100. I.G.Budak 'Obshchestv^{enn}-politicheskoye dvizheniye v Bessarabii v poreformenny period' pp.183,205-215, 232,271, shows that Bessarabian kruzhoks had sufficient supplies of illegal revolutionary literature.
- Independent contact with the emigration was important not only because it provided Southerners with free access to supplies

of literature but also because it allowed them to publish their views. Ye.Zaslavsky placed the following articles with Vpered! : 'Iz Odessy' 1875 no.20; 'Udesskiy proletariat' 1875 no.3; 'Otryvok iz pis'ma' 1875 no.20 (B.S.Itenberg 'Vozniknoveniye pervoy prol. organizatsii' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski tom 44, p.123 note 179.) Other Southerners such as I.Ya.Chernyshev, G.Fomichev, A.Drizo and S.Shneye all wrote for the same paper, Vpered!. (see Z.V.Pereshina 'Ocherki Istorii Revolyutsionnogo dvizheniya na yuge Ukrainy' p.103). I.M.Koval'sky wrote extensively on the religious sects in the South. Apart from an article in Nachalo no.2, he placed two articles in Obshchina (no.3-4, p.29 and no.8-9, p.4) (see F.L.Lavrov 'Sotsialisticheskoye dvizheniye v Rossii' in KiS 1925, tom 14, p.62) Koval'sky's main work on this subject - 'Ratsionalizm na yuge Rossii' - was sent to Nabat for publication, which that paper failed to do. (see Ye.Kusheva 'Iz Istorii 'Obshchestva Narodnogo Osvobozhdeniya'' in YiS 1931, no.4, p.47.) A number of members of this kruzhok were also closely associated with the Nabat group (see A.Weeks 'The First Bolshevik. A Political Biography of Peter Tkachev' p.58 and 70, note 47. and F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.809.) N. and Z.Zhebunev wrote an article for Rabotnik no.1, 1875. (Z.V.Pereshina 'Ocherki Istorii Revolyutsionnogo dvizheniya na yuge Ukrainy' pp.104-105.) etc.

- (151) K.A.Poglubko 'Ocherki istorii bolgaro-rossiyskikh revolyutsionnykh svyazey (60-70-ye gody XIX veka)' p.108.
- (152) P.B.Aksel'rod 'Perezhitoye i Peredumannoye' p.100
- (153) S.N.Valk (ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, p.455. Part of one number of the paper is reproduced as doc.12 in this volume, pp.136-144.
- (154) N.Vitashevsky 'Pervoye vooruzhennoye soprotivleniye - pervyy voyenny sud' in Byloye 1906, no.2, p.228.
- (155) Ibid., p.227.
- (156) L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom II, p.73.
- (157) Ibid., p.159,310
- (158) B.B.Glinsky 'Revolutsionnyy Period Russkoy Istorii.(1860-1881gg)' p.274.
- (159) V.Debagory-Mokriyevich 'Vestnik Narodnoy Voli no.3, 1884, p.79.
- (160) S.N.Valk (ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.29, p.11?

- (161) (R.A.Steblyn-Famensky) 'Grigoriy Anfomovich Popko' in 'Materialy' tom 16, Oct.1893, p.172, pp.174-5.
- (162) B.Sapir (ed.) 'Lavrov' tom I, doc.320, p.531.
- (163) L.Deych 'Valer'yan Csinsky (k 50-letiyu ego kazni)' in KiS 1929, k.5, p.28.
- (164) V.A.Dvardovskaya 'Organizatsionnyye osnovy 'Narodnoy Voli'' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1960, tom 67, pp.121-122. I.K.Ivanov and V.V.Levinson worked on this press, see S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, p.423.
- (165) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, p.402.
- (166) S.Livshits 'Podpol'nyye Tipografii 60-kh, 70-kh i 80-kh godov' in KiS 1929, k.6, p.53. There is some disagreement about the date on which the press was captured by the police. S.Livshits, says 28th February 1881 (see ibid., p.52), while R.M.Kantor ('Razgrom 'Yuzhno-russkogo rabocheho soyuza' v 1880-1881gg' in Krasnyy Arkhiv 1928, tom 30, p.210) says that the press was destroyed on 28th April 1881.
- (167) S.Livshits 'Podpol'nyye Tipografii 60-kh, 70-kh i 80-kh godov' in KiS 1929, k.1, p.64.
- (168) V.Figner 'Zapechatlennyy Trud' tom I, p.292.
- (169) S.Livshits 'Podpol'nyye Tipografii 60-kh, 70-kh i 80-kh godov' in KiS 1929, k.1, p.64.
- (170) Ibid., pp.75-76. It was operated by V.Georgiyevsky and E.Svitych. For the sake of comparison, most of 'Narodnaya Volya's' centrally produced items had 3,000 copies printed. (See 'Kalendar' Narodnoy Voli na 1883 god' p.163) The largest Southern printing appears to have been 1,000 copies of 'K russkomu obshchestvu' hectographed by the Central Group of Narodnaya Volya' in Odessa. (See B.D.Orzhikh 'V ryadakh 'Narodnoy Voli'' in A.V.Yakimova-Dikovskaya(ed.) 'Narodnaya Volya Sbornik III' pp.85-86.
- (171) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, p.409.
- (172) S.Livshits 'Podpol'nyye Tipografii 60-kh, 70-kh i 80-kh godov' in KiS 1929, k.1, pp.77-78.
- (173) L.Blit 'The Origins of Polish Socialism' p.85.
See also S.M.Baykov 'Svyazi narodnikov Belorussii s pol'skim' in V.A.D'yakov et al. (ed.) 'Svyazi revolyutsionerov Rossii i

Pol'shi XIX - nachalo XX v. p.112. S.Livshits in 'Podpol'nyye Tipografii 60-kh, 70-kh i 80-kh godov' in KiS 1929, k.1, p.78 says that the press came to Kharkov in February 1883, and that it had been brought by M.Yanchevsky.

(174) S.N.Valk (ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, p.410. This press was going to be used to print Narodnaya Volya no.10, but in the event the press was captured before the operation began. It had originally been intended to print No.10 on the Odessa press operated by S.Degayev and mentioned in note (171). On this see S.N.Valk ''Socialist', organ yugozapadnoy gruppy partii 'Narodnoy Voli'' in Krasnyy Arkhiv 1929, tom 33, p.204. Eventually No.10 was published in Rostov in September 1884 - almost two years after Degayev's arrest.

(175) S.Livshits 'Podpol'nyye Tipografii 60-kh, 70-kh i 80-kh godov' in KiS 1929, k.1, p.79. On it was printed a proclamation on the death of Sudeykin, a letter by Myshkin and part of Listok Narodnaya Volya.

(176) See S.N.Valk ''Socialist', organ yugo-zapadnoy gruppy partii 'Narodnoy Voli'' in Krasnyy Arkhiv 1929, tom 33, pp.204-211; p.206 gives the editor and a copy of the 'Declaration'. S.Livshits 'Podpol'nyye Tipografii 60-kh, 70-kh i 80-kh godov' in KiS 1929, k.2, p.62. States that the press was organised by M.Shebalin and P.F.Bogoraz in Kiev and lasted from January until March 1884. Apart from the 'Declaration', the press did produce 'Zayavleniye ot Yuzhno-Russkoy boyevoy družiny' concerning the murder in Kharkov on 8 January 1884 of the spy Shkryaby.

On the trial of those involved in 'South-West Group of 'Narodnaya Volya' in 1883/4, see M.P.Sh. 'Frotsess dvenadtsati narodovol'tsev v Kiev v 1884 godu' in A.V. Yakimova-Dikovskaya et al. (ed.) 'Narodnaya Volya pered tsarskim sudom' tom II, pp.18-25.

(177) S.Livshits 'Podpol'nyye Tipografii 60-kh, 70-kh i 80-kh godov' in KiS 1929, k.2, p.64.

The final issue of Narodnaya Volya - No.11/12, was also printed in the South, in November 1885. It was printed in the 'Narodnaya Volya' press in Taganrog with a lead article by Shternberg. See Z.V.Kogan 'O Rabote TaganrogsКОЙ i NovoCherkasskoy tipografiya

- partii 'Narodnaya Volya' in A.V.Yakimova-Dikovskaya (ed.)
'Narodnaya Volya Sbornik III' p.183,184.
- (178) S.Livshits 'Podpol'nyye Tipografii 60-kh,70-kh i 80-kh godov'
in KiS 1929, k.2, p.49.
- (179) ''Rabochiy' - Rostovskiy Zhurnal 1883 goda' with a foreword by
V.Nevsky and an afterword by S.Valk in Literaturnoye Nasledstvo
1932, no.2, p.75.
- (180) B.Sapir (ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, doc.15, p.52.
- (181) Ibid., tom I, p.242.
- (182) 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.4, col.1972-1973.
- (183) Ye.N.Koval'skaya 'Moi vstrechi s S.L.Perovskoy' in Byloye
1921, no.6, p.42.
- (184) For example, A.A.Franzholi in 1874 had contacts with A.Ya.
Sidoratskaya (Obodovskaya) and A.O.Lukashevich.
- (185) On O.V.Aptekman's activity in this zemlyachestvo, see 'Iz
istorii revolyutsionnogo narodnichestva 'Zemlya i Volya'
70-kh godov' p.35. Similarly Dolgushin's kruzhok began as a
group of Siberian students.
- (186) M.Popov 'Iz Moyego Revolyutsionnogo Proshlago. (Ocherk Pervyy)'
in Byloye 1907, no.5, p.271. This zemlyachestvo was also in
contact with Kiev, Kharkov and Rostov.
- (187) A.Popov 'Adrian Fedorovich Mikhaylov' in KiS 1929, k.10, p.178.
- (188) S.F.Kovalik 'Revolyutsionnoye Dvizheniye Semidesyatykh godov
i protsess 193-kh' p.125. On the widespread nature and
importance of this type of student organisation see also:
M.A.Timofeyev 'Ferezhitoye' in KiS no.8-9, 1929, p.98; and
'Feterburgskiya studencheskiya zemlyachestva v polovine 80-kh
godov i ikh znachenije' in 'Materialy' 1895 tom 10.
- (189) S.N.Valk (ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, doc.48, p.287.
- (190) For example, G.A.Popko, when in St.Petersburg, at the end of
1875, to take part in negotiations between the Odessan kruzhok
and the St.Petersburg Lavrovists concerning a merger, took the
opportunity to furnish himself with some revolutionary
literature before starting back to Odessa. See, 'Grigoriy
Anfomovich Popko' in 'Materialy' tom 16, October 1893, p.166.
- (191) S.N.Valk (ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, doc.24, p.216.
- (192) B.Sapir (ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, doc.15, p.52.

- (193) O.V.Aptekman 'Obshchestvo 'Zemlya i Volya' 70-kh godov' p.57.
Langans confirms this, see P.L.Lavrov 'Narodniki-Propagandisty 1873-1877gg' p.45.
- (194) Ya.D.Baum 'F istorii khar'kovskikh revolyutsionnykh kruzhkov nachala 70-kh gg' in KiS 1931, k.4, pp.128-129.
- (195) S.F.Kovalik 'Revolyutsionnoye Dvizheniye Semidesyatykh godov i Protsess 193kh' p.78. See also P.L.Lavrov 'Narodniki - Propagandisty 1873-1877gg' p.49.
- (196) S.N.Valk (ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, doc.24, p.216.
- (197) B.Bazilevsky (ed.) 'Gos Prestup' tom III, p.40.
- (198) Ibid., p.84,88.
- (199) S.N.Valk (ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, doc.64, p.337.
- (200) Ibid., doc.63, p.327.
- (201) Ibid., doc.63, p.330,333.
- (202) S.N.Valk (ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, doc.64, p.335.
- (203) B.Bazilevsky (ed.) 'Gos Prestup' tom III, p.93.
- (204) S.N.Valk (ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, doc.64, p.337.
- (205) 'Iz knigi, izdannoy Sekretno zhandarmami' in Byloye Jan.1904, no.5, p.63; 'Svod'" in Byloye 1907, no.7, p.154.
- (206) V.V.Shirokova 'Vozniknoveniye narodovol'cheskoy organizatsii v khar'kove' in 'Iz istorii obshchestvennoy mysli i obshchestvennogo dvizheniya v Rossii' (1964), p.50.
See also P.S.Tkachenko 'Revolyutsionnaya Narodnicheskaya organizatsiya 'Zemlya i Volya'' p.189.
- (207) V.Figner 'Zapechatlenny Trud' tom I, p.332.
- (208) P.L.Lavrov 'Narodniki-Propagandisty 1873-78 godov' p.45.
- (209) (L.Tikhomirov) 'Andrey Ivanovich Zhelyabov' p.9.
- (210) E.Breshko-Breshkovskaya 'Hidden Springs of the Russian Revolution' pp.12-13.
- (211) (N.Morozov) 'Nekrolog A.A.Franzholi i Ye.F.Zavadskoy' in Vestnik Narodnoy Voli No.1,1883,p.203. Franzholi raised 400 rubles in 1878 through readings and writings about his experiences in jail and v narod, to audiences in Kiev and Odessa; see ibid., p.206.
- (212) 'Pokazaniya Pervomartovtsev' in Byloye 1918, no.4/5, p.291.
- (213) S.N.Valk (ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.29, p.113,115,117.
According to N.Bogoslavsky, the Mezentsev killing cost 2,000

- rubles, see 'Svod"' in Byloye 1907, no.8, p.115. In Stepniak 'Underground Russia' p.156, is recounted how the Moscow mining and the two other attempts on the tsar's life during November 1880 cost £3-4,000; the attempt to free prisoners from Kharkov prison, £600.
- (214) 'Svod"' in Byloye 1907, no.8, p.95.
- (215) 'Protsess 17-ti narodovol'tsev v 1883 godu' in Byloye Oct. 1906, no.10, p.207.
- (216) A. Tun 'Istoriya revolyutsionnykh dvizheniy v Rossii' p.221.
- (217) Quoted from 'Arkhiv 'Zemli i Voli' i 'Narodnoy Voli'' by F. Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.658.
- (218) V.Ya.Bogucharsky 'Iz istorii Politicheskoy Bor'by v 70-kh i 80-kh gg XIX veka' pp.238-239.
- (219) A.Tun 'Istoriya revolyutsionnykh dvizheniy v Rossii' p.300, note 3.
- (220) Ye.R.Ol'khovskiy 'K istorii 'Chernogo Peredela' (1879-1881gg)' in V.F.Zakharina et al.(ed.) 'Obshchestvennoye dvizheniye v poreformennoy Rossii'. p.144.
- (221) L.Tikhomirov 'Sovremennoye Obozreniye' in Vestnik Narodnoy Voli no.2, 1884, pp.147-148.
- (222) S.N.Valk (ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.42, p.164.
- (223) B.Bazilevskiy (ed.) 'Gos Prestup' tom III, p.105.
- (224) 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.3, col.113; v.4, col.1629.
- (225) Ibid., p.105,120; S.N.Valk (ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, doc.39, p.270. B.Bazilevskiy(ed.) op.cit. p.105,120.
- (226) B.Bazilevskiy (ed.) op.cit., p.105,115.
- (227) Ibid., p.106; S.F.Kovalik 'Revolutsionnoye Dvizheniye Semidesyatykh godov i protsess 193-kh' p.81, denies the incident concerning Filipp.
- (228) B.Bazilevskiy (ed.) op.cit., p.113.
- (229) Ibid., p.105.
- (230) S.N.Valk (ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, doc.64, p.338. See also B.Bazilevskiy (ed.) 'Gos Prestup' tom III, p.91.
- (231) B.Bazilevskiy (ed.) op.cit., p.93.
- (232) S.F.Kovalik 'Revolutsionnoye Dvizheniye Semidesyatykh godov i protsess 193-kh' p.89; B.Bazilevskiy (ed.) op.cit., p.92 says the kassa contained 175 silver rubles.

- (233) N.A.Troitsky 'Bol'shoye obshchestvo propagandy 1871-1874' p.42.
- (234) L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom I, p.251. Deych maintains that another member, A.M.Makarevich, had wealthy parents.
- (235) S.Kovalik 'S.A.Zhebunev' in KiS 1924, k.12, p.245.
- (236) See note 233.
- (237) B.Bazilevsky (ed.) 'Gos Frestup' tom III, p.130.
- (238) N.A.Troitsky 'Bol'shoye obshchestvo propagandy 1871-1874' p.39.
- (239) L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom I, p.136.
- (240) P.Shchegolev 'Aleksy Medvedev' in 'KiS' 1930, k.10, p.92.
- (241) V.Illich-Svytch 'Moye znakomstvo s I.M.Koval'skim' in Byloye 1906, no.8, p.147.
- (242) M.Frolenko 'Obshchestvo Narodnogo Osvobozhdeniya' in KiS 1932, k.3, p.89. About Odessa in 1878: "Of money there was a great scarcity at this time." (Ibid., p.96)
- (243) O.V.Aptekman 'Obshchestvo 'Zemlya i Volya' p.187. See also (L.Gartman) 'Iz Vospominaniy L'va Gartmana' in Byloye Feb. 1903, no.3, p.181. The kruzhok had some money either from Yu.Tishchenko or from Gartman's income as a zemstvo teacher.
- (244) V.R.Leykin and N.L.Pivovarsky (eds.) 'Arkhiv 'Zemli i Voli' i 'Narodnoy Voli'' p.98: 20 rubles to Kharkov 'Zemlya i Volya'; 10 rubles to N.P.Moshchenko etc..
- (245) L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom II, p.55.
- (246) Ibid., tom I, p.281 and tom II, p.264.
- (247) 'Svod'" in Byloye 1907, no.7, p.146. P. and N.Levchenko, in 1877, opened a workshop in Kiev with money from Chubarov, see 'Iz knigi, izdannoy sekretno zhandarmami' in Byloye Jan.1904, no.5, p.66.
- (248) L.Deych 'Valer'yan Osinsky (K 50-letiyu ego kazni)' in KiS 1929, k.5, p.10.
- (249) S.N.Valk (ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.29, p.124.
- (250) L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom II, pp.259,260-261 and tom I, pp. 294-295.
- (251) Ibid., tom II, pp.89-90
- (252) For a summary of the fate which befell Lizogub's money, insofar as it is known, see A.V.Yakimova-Dikovskaya 'Dostavleniye Sredstv Sotsial'no-Revolyutsionnoy Partii' in A.V.Yakimova-Dikovskaya et al.(ed.) 'Narodnaya Volya pered tsarskim sudom' p.35; also V.F. 'Iz arkhiva L.Tikhomirova' in Krasnyy Arkhiv

- 1924, tom 6, p.159; A.Tun 'Istoriya revolyutsionnykh dvizheniy v Rossii' p.300; L.Deych 'Valer'yan Osinsky' in KiS 1929, k.5, note pp.12-13; Narodnaya Volya No.5, 5th Feb. 1881 in 'Literatura' p.372.
- (253) M.Frolenko 'Obshchestvo Narodnogo Osvobozhdeniya' in KiS 1932, k.3, pp.96-97. On the buntars chronic lack of funds, see V.Debagory-Mokriyevich 'Ot buntarstva k terrorizmu' tom I, p.270.
- (254) L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom II, p.263.
- (255) Ibid., tom II, p.93, pp.115-116.
- (256) F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' pp.571-572.
- (257) L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom II, p.235. Adam B.Ulam 'In the Name of the People' p.247, says 20 revolvers and he claims that Frolenko got 500 rubles from St.Petersburg with which to buy them. V.Debagory-Mokriyevich 'Vospominaniya' p.156 refers to 30 "worthless revolvers". The point is however that St. Petersburg was not willing to help.
- (258) L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom II, pp.264-265. Debagory-Mokriyevich went further and claimed that one reason for the break up of the kruzhok was lack of money, the other being a loss of faith in possibility of a bunt, quoted in ibid., p.312.
- (259) 'Svod' in Byloye 1907, no.6, p.129 : says that V.Mokriyevich was given 1,500 rubles for a bunt. 'Svod' in Byloye 1907, no. 7, p.142.
- (260) For example, A.A.Rusov and F.K.Volkov 'Primechaniya k chasti 'Svoda'', kasayushcheysya soobshchestva ukrainofilov' in Byloye 1907, no.6, p.159, note 37. More recently, Daniel Field in 'Rebels in the Name of the Tsar' p.205, n.29, dismisses this suggestion also - without any reason being given.
- (261) L.Deych 'Valer'yan Osinsky (K 50-letiya ego kazni)' in KiS 1929, k.5, p.11.
- (262) Ibid., p.13.
- (263) 'Protsess Sotsialistov V.Osinskago ...' 5 May 1879, p.17.
- (264) V.S.Yefremova 'Malen'koye Delo' in Byloye 1907, no.5, p.86.
- (265) Ibid., p.88.
- (266) 'Svod' in Byloye 1907, no.8, p.98.
- (267) S.Chubarov was the illegitimate son of a Penza landowner. When

- their father died, Chubarov's half-brother inherited but made provision for him by regular sums of money that "were used in the cause of our kruzhok, which, it seems, was the main source of our material means." L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom I, p.281. This referred to late 1875 or early 1876. Deych thought that Chubarov was worth about 10,000 rubles. (ibid., tom II, p.55)
- (268) Viktor Malinka (called Khoma) was the son of a very wealthy Poltavian landowner and joined the Buntars in late 1875 or early 1876, (see L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom I, pp.286-287), and he advocated terrorism (ibid., p.288). Debagory-Mokriyevich claims that Malinka contributed 3,000 rubles to the revolutionary kassa; see V.Debagory-Mokriyevich 'Vospominaniya' p.294
- (269) S.N.Valk (ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.29, p.111.
- (270) See note 213. Osinsky still asked for money from 'Zemlya i Volya'. In October 1878 he sent a letter to the Central Group of 'Zemlya i Volya' in St.Petersburg in which he "asked for money and demanded that the 'centre' quickly settle this matter with Dmitry Lizogub." see O.V.Aptekman 'Obshchestvo 'Zemlya i Volya'' p.331.
- (271) P.Shchegolev 'Aleksey Medvedev' in KiS 1930, k.10, p.95. Lizogub appears to be referring to Osinsky's kruzhok when he talked of, in Kuritsyn's words, "collection which derived from the wide contacts with sympathisers." see S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.29, p.112; "Valerian Osinsky was one of the most famous collectors of money." Stepniak 'Underground Russia' p.88.
- (272) For example, when L.F.Nikiforov gave 100 rubles, by way of V.Zasulich, to the revolutionaries towards the cost of freeing Deych and Stefanovich from prison, see L.Deych 'Valer'yan Osinsky' in KiS 1929, k.5, p.22.
- (273) A.M.Pankratova (ed.) 'Rabocheye Dvizheniye tom II ch.2, doc.51, p.105.
- (274) Ibid., doc.61, p.128.
- (275) Ibid., doc.263, p.499.
- (276) Ibid., doc.263, p.500,501.
- (277) M.F.Frolenko 'Lipetskiy i Voronezhskiy s"ezdy' in Byloye January 1907, no.1/13, p.85.

- (278) 'Ustav mestnoy tsentral'noy gruppy partii 'Narodnoy Voli'
in Byloye Dec.1906, no.12, p.35.
- (279) 'Podgotovitel'naya Rabota Partii' in 'Literatura' p.872.
- (280) Ibid., p.871.
- (281) A.Tun 'Istoriya revolyutsionnykh dvizheniy v Rossii' p.252.
- (282) S.N.Valik (ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.55, p.220.
- (283) Note by the editors of 'Kalendar' Narodnoy Voli na 1883 god
in 'Literatura' p.871.
- (284) 'Protsess 17-ti narodovol'tsev v 1883 godu' in Byloye October
1906, no.10, p.204,242; Vestnik Narodnoy Voli 1883, no.1, p.151;
Zlatopol'sky claimed that the sum involved was 500 rubles.
- (285) A.Bakh 'Vospominaniy Narodovol'tsa (Prodolzheniye)' in Byloye
1907, no.2, p.203.
- (286) A.Bakh 'Vospominaniy Narodovol'tsa' in Byloye 1907, no.3,
pp.205-206. Lopatin's version of events is somewhat different
in detail: Bakh, he said, gave him 200 rubles and later 300
rubles but the latter was returned. See German Lopatin 'Po
povodu 'Vospominaniy Narodovol'tsa' A.N.Bakha' in Byloye 1907,
no.4, p.299.
- (287) Eg., P.A.Tellalov, A.I.Misovskaya, Ivan Kalyuzhnyy, Nadezhda
Smirnitckaya; see 'Protsess 17-ti narodovol'tsev v 1883 godu'
in Byloye October 1906, no.10, p.226,231,240.
V.Ya.Bogucharsky 'Iz istorii politicheskoy bor'by v 70-kh i
80-kh gg XIX veka' p.239 calculates that each would have
needed "at least" 40 rubles per month. The Shchebalins,
husband and wife, lived off of 40-50 rubles per month, in
Kiev in the early 1880's, provided by his brother; see
'Obvinitel'nyy Akt' in Vestnik Narodnoy Voli 1886, no.5, p.64.
- (288) See A.V.Yakimova-Dikovskaya 'Protsess Dvadtsati Narodovol'tsev'
in A.V.Yakimova-Dikovskaya et al.(ed.) 'Narodnaya Volya pered
tsarskim sudom' tom I, pp.94-95; 'Protsess 20-ti narodovol'tsev
v 1882' in Byloye January 1906, no.1, p.240 and pp.238-240.
On L.D.Terent'yeva, see E.S.Ivanovskaya 'L.D.Terent'yeva' in
KiS 1931, k.3, pp.145-148.
- (289) Narodnaya Volya no.8-9, 5 Feb. 1882, in 'Literatura' p.591.
- (290) O.Lyubatovich-Dzhabadari 'Dalekoye i Nedavneye (okonchaniye)'
in Byloye 1906, no.6, p.109

- (291) M.R.Popov 'Iz moyego revolyutsionnago proshlago (1878-1879gg)' in Byloye 1907, no.7, p.277.
- (292) Adam.B.Ulam 'In the Name of the People' p.321.
- (293) A.V.Yakimova-Dikovskaya et al. (ed.) 'Narodnaya Volya pered tsarskim sudom' tom I, p.100; see also 'Protsess 20' in Byloye January 1906, no.1.
- (294) A.V.Pribylev 'Protsess 14 Narodovol'tsev v 1884 godu' in A.V.Yakimova-Dikovskaya et al.(ed.) 'Narodnaya Volya pered tsarskim sudom' tom I, p.148.
- (295) S.Valk 'P.L.Antonov v Petropavlovskoy kreposti' in Krasnyy Arkhiv 1928, tom 31, p.114 note 5.
- (296) A.Tun 'Istoriya revolyutsionnykh dvizheniy v Rossii' p.299.
- (297) V.Ya.Bogucharsky 'Iz Istorii Politicheskoy Bor'by v 70-kh i 80-kh gg XIX veka' p.238.
- (298) A.V.Yakimova-Dikovskaya et al.(ed.) 'Narodnaya Volya pered tsarskim sudom' tom I, pp.18-19.
- (299) A.V.Yakimova-Dikovskaya 'Protsess Dvadtsati Narodovol'tsev' in A.V.Yakimova-Dikovskaya et al. (ed.) 'Narodnaya Volya pered tsarskim sudom' tom I, p.134; 'Protsess 17-ti narodovol'tsev v 1883 godu' in Byloye Oct.1906, no.10, p.234. Other examples of donations being made to the revolutionary movement are contained in police records. For example, in 1879 the Gamaley family gave Gol'denberg 300 rubles, see 'Svod'" in Byloye 1907, no.8, pp.122-123; 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom III, v.2, col.714-718.
- (300) Quoted in Adam B.Ulam 'In the Name of the People' p.345.
- (301) A.N.Bakh 'Vospominaniya Narodovol'tsa. (Frodolzheniye)' in Byloye 1907, no.2, p.206, pp.209-210, pp.213-214.
- (302) V.Figner 'Zapechatlennyy Trud' tom I, pp.331-332.
- (303) Ibid., p.333,337. On this occasion, the Party was rescued by 8,000 rubles from the exile, Ye.Subbotina - see Ibid., p.332 & 337.
- (304) V.V.Shirokova 'Vozniknoveniye Narodovol'cheskoy Organizatsii v Khar'kove' in 'Iz istorii obshchestvennogo dvizheniya i obshchestvennoy mysli v Rossii' (1964) p.84.
- (305) B.Sapir(ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, doc.15, p.52.
- (306) S.N.Valk (ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, doc.24, p.216.
- (307) (R.A.Steblyn-Kamensky) 'Grigoriy Anfomovich Popko' in 'Materialy'

- tom 16, Geneva, Oct.1893, p.168. Steblin-Kamensky writes that apart from policy differences, the Southern delegates believed that the Petersburgers had tried to finish the conference's official work before they, the Southern delegates from Kiev and Odessa, could arrive. After the end of the conference, the Kiev and Odessa kruzhoks were entirely separate from the St.Petersburg group. (ibid., p.169)
- (308) B.Sapir (ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, doc.67, pp.244-245.
- (309) I.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom II, p.92,99.
- (310) Adam B.Ulam 'In the Name of the People' p.247. There may well be truth in this, but as will be shown in Chapter III, another reason was that the 'Zemlya i Volya' did not see the South as an important area for it to penetrate.
- (311) 'Iz rechey na sude A.K.Zhelyabova, N.I.Kibal'chicha i S.L. Perovskoy' in Byloye March 1906, no.3, p.66. See also : (I.Tikhomirov) 'Andrey Ivanovich Zhelyabov' p.24 "Zhel(yabov) was not at this time (1879) an especially ardent centralist, although he recognised the necessity of discipline and a large amount of subordination."
- (312) M.N.Polonskaya (Olovennikova) 'K Istorii partii Narodnoy Voli' 'Pokazaniya' (1893) in Byloye 1907, no.5, p.5. "These ideas (rigid centralisation of the party) undermined the former revolutionary views, caused the socialistic and federalistic traditions of the organisation to totter ..." V.Figner 'Memoirs of a Revolutionist' p.77.
- (313) V.A.Tvardovskaya 'Organizatsionnyye osnovy 'Narodnoy Voli'' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1960, tom 67, p.123. In view of this, it is difficult to accept S.S.Volk's reference to the "Unconditional obedience of the local groups and circles ..." before the 1st March 1881 - see S.S.Volk 'Narodnaya Volya, 1879-1882' p.265.
- (314) B.Sapir (ed.) 'Lavrov' tom II, doc.69, p.104.
- (315) For the Declaration of the 'Young Party 'Narodnaya Volya'', see Vestnik Narodnoy Voli 1885, no.4, pp.239-240.
- (316) N.A.Troitsky 'Bol'shoye obshchestvo propagandy 1871-1874gg. (tak nazyvayemyye 'chaykovtsy')' in Istoriya S.S.S.R. 1962, no.5, p.79. The American historian M.A.Miller accepts Troitsky's

thesis: "This circle (i.e., the St.Petersburg Chaykovtsy) succeeded in building a truly nation-wide network of affiliated groups ..." See Martin A. Miller 'Ideological Conflicts in Russian Populism: The Revolutionary Manifestoes of the Chaikovsky Circle 1869-74' in Slavic Review March 1970, vol.29, no.1, p.1. Not all Soviet historians accept the thesis; for example I.V.Kuznetsov 'Istoriya SSSR. Epokha kapitalizma. (1861-1917gg)'; The Large Propaganda Society "was not a system of formal organisation although all kruzhoks in it temporarily maintained quite close links with each other. The thesis of the federal structure of this society, which was developed by N.A.Troitsky, has little basis; the organisation of the kruzhoks did not develop quite that deeply."

- (317) N.A.Troitsky 'Bol'shoye obshchestvo propagandy 1871-1874gg' in Istoriya S.S.S.R. 1962, no.5, p.91; 'Bol'shoye Obshchestvo Propagandy 1871-1874gg' p.84, give membership of each group.
- (318) N.A.Troitsky 'Bol'shoye obshchestvo propagandy 1871-1874gg' in Istoriya S.S.S.R. 1962, no.5, p.77.
- (319) Loc. cit.
- (320) Ibid., p.78.
- (321) N.A.Troitsky 'Bol'shoye Propagandy/Obshchestvo' p.25 for Odessa, and p.23 for Kiev. P.B.Aksel'rod 'Perezhitoye i Peredumannoye' p.106 dates the federation of the 4 kruzhoks as autumn 1873; Sh.M.Levin in N.A.Charushin 'O Dalekom Proshlom' note on p.160 quotes N.Chaykovsky and Langans that the Odessa kruzhok did not enter a federation with the Chaykovtsy of St.Petersburg until late summer/early autumn 1873.
- (322) N.A.Troitsky op.cit., dates the foundation of the Odessa kruzhok as autumn 1872 (pp.24-25); Kherson as summer 1871 (p.25); Kiev in the summer of 1872 (p.23).
- (323) Ibid., p.24.
- (324) Ibid., pp.24-25.
- (325) Ibid., p.18.
- (326) Ibid., p.23.
- (327) P.I.Lavrov 'Narodniki - Propagandisty 1873-78 godov' p.43.
- (328) N.A.Troitsky 'Bol'shoye Obshchestvo Propagandy 1871-1874gg' pp.37-38.

- (329) N.A.Troitsky 'Bol'shoye Obshchestvo Propagandy 1871-1874gg' in Istoriya S.S.S.R. 1962, no.5, p.77.
- (330) N.A.Charushin 'O Dalekom Proshlom' p.188.
- (331) P.B.Aksel'rod 'Perezhitoye i Peredumannoye' p.107
- (332) N.V.Chaykovsky 'F.V.Volkhovsky' in Golos Minuvshago 1914, no.10, p.233.
- (333) B.B.Glinsky 'Revolyutsionnyy Period Russkoy Istorii (1861-1881gg)' p.19.
- (334) P.L.Lavrov 'Narodniki - Propagandisty 1873-78 godov' p.293.
- (335) Ibid., p.294.
- (336) N.A.Troitsky 'Bol'shoye Obshchestvo Propagandy 1871-1874gg' p.24.
- (337) Ibid., p.25.
- (338) K.A.Poglubko 'Ocherki istorii bolgaro-rossiyskikh revolyutsionnykh svyazey (60-70ye gody XIXveka)' p.108.
- (339) Ibid., pp.106-107.
- (340) R.V.Filippov 'Iz istorii narodnicheskogo dvizheniya na pervom etape 'khozheniya v narod' (1863-1874)' p.281. B.B.Glinsky 'Revolyutsionnyy Period Russkoy Istorii (1861-1881gg)' makes the same point on p.20.
- (341) 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.3, col.842,844; S.N.Valk (ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, p.505;
P.L.Lavrov 'Narodniki-Propagandisty 1873-78 godov' pp.219-220 stresses the ideological difference between the Makarevichs and the Odessa Chaykovtsy. Nonetheless they were "accepted unanimously into the kruzhok."
- (342) 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.1, col.269-270.
- (343) 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.2, col.411-414, states that S.A.Zhebunev joined the Volkhovsky kruzhok at the beginning of 1874 as did Z.I.Zhebuneva, while N.A.Zhebunev established contact with them in December 1873 as did M.A.Zhebuneva in November 1873. According to D.Footman 'Red Prelude' pp.53-54, A.I.Zhelyabov was a member of Makarevich's kruzhok of propagandists. This is confusing if the Makarevich's belonged to both the Zhebunevites and the Odessan Chaykovtsy.
- (344) N.A.Troitsky 'Bol'shoye Obshchestvo Propagandy 1871-1874gg' p.39 and E.Breshko-Breshkovskaya 'Hidden Springs of the Russian Revolution.' p.10, note.

- (345) E.Breshko-Breshkovskaya op.cit. p.11, relates how, on his own authority, Aksel'rod invited her to a meeting which was "to consist exclusively of members of the Chaykovsky organisations.."
- (346) S.Valk (ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, doc.39, p.270; P.F.Larionov testified that Kaminer and Levental' often spent the night at the Commune. See also E.Breshko-Breshkovskaya 'Hidden Springs of the Russian Revolution p.10.
- (347) E.Breshko-Breshkovskaya op.cit. pp.29-31.
- (348) S.F.Kovalik 'Revolyutsionnoye Dvizheniye Semidesyatykh godov i protsess 193-kh' p.68,77.
- (349) N.A.Troitsky 'Bol'shoye Obshchestvo Propagandy 1871-1874' p.23; R.V.Filippov 'Iz istorii narodnicheskogo dvizheniya na pervom etape 'khozheniya v narod' (1863-1874)' p.285: "absolutely without success".
- (350) S.F.Kovalik 'Revolyutsionnoye Dvizheniye Semidesyatykh godov i protsess 193-kh' p.78.
- (351) P.B.Aksel'rod 'Perezhitoye i Peredumannoye' p.103.
- (352) Ibid., p.108,109 & 119.
- (353) N.A.Charushin 'O Dalekom Proshlom' p.159
- (354) N.A.Troitsky 'Bol'shoye Obshchestvo Propagandy 1871-1874gg' p.37.
- (355) Ibid., p.73.
- (356) N.A.Morozov 'Vozniknoveniye 'Narodnoy Voli'' in Byloye 1906, no.12, p.4. The Soviet historian P.S.Tkachenko in 'Revolyutsionnaya Narodnicheskaya Organizatsiya 'Zemlya i Volya' p.180 claims that the Petersburg Centre of 'Zemlya i Volya' sent letters to many Southern kruzhoks "appealing to them to send their representatives for negotiations etc.... A large part of the Southern kruzhoks placed themselves in federative relations with 'Zemlya i Volya'." He presents no proof of this. Later he writes that the Centre had contact with Kiev in the summer of 1876 "But these contacts were sporadic and individual, based more on technical collaboration than on a real political agreement." "... the Southern buntars stood aloof and declined to accept the programme of the central organisation of 'Zemlya i Volya'" (p.180) Ye.Serebryakov 'Obshchestvo 'Zemlya i Volya'' in 'Materialy' tom 11, May 1894,

p.15 likewise refers to negotiations, in the winter of 1876/7 with the Kievan and Odessan revolutionaries but says that there was no union only "the establishment of close federative relations." F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.570, writes that St.Petersburg "made contacts, as early as 1876, with Odessa and Kiev, the two main centres of the 'rebels'."

- (357) Ye.Serebryakov 'Obshchestvo 'Zemlya i Volya'' in 'Materialy' tom 11, May 1894, pp.6, 33-34.
He had also been involved in the Rostov end of the Khar'kov-Rostov kruzhok; see 'Iz vospominaniy L'va Gartmana' in Byloye Feb.1903, no.3, p.181; M.R.Popov 'Iz moyego revolyutsionnago proshlago' in Byloye 1907, no.5, pp.273,283-284.
- (358) M.N.Polonskaya (Olovennikova) 'K Istorii partii Narodnoy Voli. 'Pokazaniya'' (1893) in Byloye 1907, no.5,p.4.
N.A.Morozov 'Vozniknoveniye 'Narodnoy Voli'' in Byloye 1906, no.12,p.18. T.G.Snytko 'Russkoye Narodnichestvo i Pol'skoye obshchestvennoye dvizheniye 1865-1881gg' p.164.
- (359) O.V.Aptekman 'Iz istorii revolyutsionnago narodnichestva. 'Zemlya i Volya' 70-kh godov' p.136.
- (360) M.Popov 'Iz moyego revolyutsionnago proshlago' (Ocherki pervyy)' in Byloye 1907, no.5, p.274.
- (361) 'Iz Vospominaniy L'va Gartmana' in Byloye Feb.1903, no.3, p.181 and M.Popov op.cit., pp.276-279.
- (362) O.V.Aptekman 'Obshchestvo 'Zemlya i Volya'' pp.188,198-199.
- (363) V.R.Leykin and N.L.Fivovarsky (ed.) 'Arkhiv 'Zemli i Voli' i 'Narodnoy Voli'' p.69.
- (364) P.S.Tkachenko 'Revolutsionnaya Narodnicheskaya Organizatsiya 'Zemlya i Volya'' p.191.
- (365) 'Iz Vospominaniy L'va Gartmana' in Byloye Feb.1903, no.3, pp.182-183.
- (366) M.Popov 'Iz moyego revolyutsionnago proshlago (Ocherki pervyy)' in Byloye 1907, no.5, p.296.
- (367) (L.Tikhomirov) 'Andrey Ivanovich Zhelyabov' pp.16-17; V.Levitsky (V.Tsederbaum) 'Partiya 'Narodnoy Voli'. Vozniknoveniye, bor'ba gibel'' p.48: "'Zemlya i Volya' acted mainly in the limits of Great Russia ...": M.F.Frolenko 'Lipetskiy i Voronezhskiy s"ezdy' in Byloye Jan.1907, no.1/13, p.67, writes that 'Zemlya i Volya' was the most influential and leading party in the north in 1879;

A. Tun 'Istoriya revolyutsionnykh dvizheniy v Rossii' p.221 comments that 'Zemlya i Volya' was "wholly created in the North." It is also clear that A.Zhelyabov too considered 'Zemlya i Volya' to be Northern: speaking of the development of political terrorism, he said "I knew that in other places comrades worried about the same thing, in particular in the north, and that in the north this question had even given rise to a split in the secret society, the organisation 'Zemlya i Volya' ..." quoted in A.V.Yakimova-Dikovskaya et al. (ed.) 'Narodnaya Volya v Dokumentakh i Vospominaniyakh' pp.55-56. V.Figner 'Memoirs of a Revolutionist' p.66, observed that from the end of 1876 until the Voronezh conference, in the summer 1879, the revolutionary party had "shown no desire to unite into one all-Russian organisation ...", although 'Zemlya i Volya' was organised in the north. Not only was it a Northern organisation, but it concentrated its activity there: N.A.Morozov 'Vozniknoveniye 'Narodnoy Voli'' in Byloye 1906, no.12, p.9, relates that 'Zemlya i Volya' activists wanted the conference of June/July 1879 to be held in a town in central Russia - possibly Tambov - so that they could get there more easily. Also F.S.Tkachenko 'Revolyutsionnaya narodnicheskaya organizatsiya 'Zemlya i Volya'' p.80, confirms that the main area of activity was in central Russia.

- (368) Ye.Serebryakov 'Obshchestvo 'Zemlya i Volya'' in 'Materialy' tom 11, May 1894, p.9 note.
- (369) M.Popov 'Iz moyego revolyutsionnago proshlago. (Ocherk pervyy)' in Byloye 1907, no.5, p.293. "Rostov was the main point to which youths, arriving from the university cities, received their revolutionary baptism and set off v narod." Many stopped off at the flat used by the kruzhok.
- (370) 'Podgotovitel'naya Rabota Partii' in 'Literatura' p.870 & note.
- (371) Similarly, with the military groups; they arose independently in the south, and were not linked with the capital before the end of 1881 see Sh.Yu.Ashenbrenner 'Voyenno-revolyutsionnaya organizatsiya partii Narodnoy Voli' in KiS 1923, k.7,p.79.
- (372) V.A.Tvardovskaya 'Organizatsionnyye osnovy 'Narodnoy Voli'' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1960, tom 67, p.123.

- (373) S.S.Volk 'Deyatel'nost' 'Narodnoy Voli' sredi rabochikh v gody vtoroy revolyutsionnoy situatsii 1879-1882.' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1963, tom 74, p.208 says that Gortynsky's group was formed in the autumn of 1881.
- (374) A.N.Bakh 'Vospominaniya Narodovol'tsa. (1882-1885gg)' in Byloye 1907, no.1, p.118.
- (375) V.A.Tvardovskaya 'Organizatsionnyye osnovy 'Narodnoy Voli'' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1960, tom 67, pp.121-122.
- (376) 'Svod'' in Byloye 1907, no.8, p.110. Also A.V.Yakimova-Dikovskaya 'Protsess Dvadtsati Narodovol'tsev' in A.V.Yakimova-Dikovskaya et al. (ed.) 'Narodnaya Volya pered tsarskim sudom' tom I, p.130.
- (377) V.A.Danilov 'Iz Vospominaniy (Protsess Sytsyanko, 1879-1880)' in Byloye 1907, no.8, p.230.
- (378) V.V.Shirokova 'Vozniknoveniye narodovol'cheskoy organizatsii v Khar'kove' in 'Iz istorii obshchestvennoy mysli i obshchestvennogo dvizheniya v Rossii' p.84.
- (379) Ibid., p.87, 89.
- (380) Ibid., p.88.
- (381) S.S.Volk 'Deyatel'nost' 'Narodnoy Voli' sredi rabochikh v gody vtoroy revolyutsionnoy situatsii' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1963, tom 74, pp.208-209.
- (382) F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.705.
- (383) S.S.Volk 'Narodnaya Volya, 1879-1882' p.270. M.N.Trigoni arrived in the summer of 1880.
- (384) M.I.Drey 'Strel'nikovskiy Protsess' in A.V.Yakimova-Dikovskaya et al. (ed.) 'Narodnaya Volya pered tsarskim sudom' tom II, p.9.
- (385) A.M.Pankratova (ed.) 'Rabocheye Dvizheniye' tom II, ch.2, doc.263, p.500.
- (386) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.45, 'Podgotovitel'naya Rabota Partii', Spring 1880, p.179.
- (387) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.50, 'Obshchiye nachala organizatsii' p.211.
- (388) Ibid., p.210
- (389) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.49, 'Ustav Iсполnitel'nogo komiteta' (winter 1879/80), pp.205-206.
- (390) 'Ustav mestnoy tsentral'noy gruppy partii 'Narodnoy Voli'' in Byloye 1906, no.12, p.34.

- (391) A.N.Bakh 'Vospominaniya Narodovol'tsa (1892-1895gg)' in Byloye 1907, no.1, pp.121-122.
- (392) M.N.Polonskaya (Olovennikova) 'K Istorii Partii Narodnoy Voli. 'Pokazaniya' (1893)' in Byloye 1907, no.5, p.5.
- (393) 'Pokazaniya Pervomartovtsev' in Byloye 1918, no.4/5, p.281.
- (394) Ye.R.Ol'khovskiy 'K istorii 'Chernogo Peredela' (1879-1881gg)' in V.F.Zakharina et al. (ed.) 'Obshchestvennoye dvizheniye v poreformennoy Rossii' p.129.
- (395) 'Iz Programmnykh Statey 'Chernogo Peredela'' Geneva 1903, p.3, note. The previous year, 1880, P.B.Aksel'rod of 'Chernyy Peredel' drew up a 'Programme of the Great Russian Party of Socialist-Federalists' which was only meant to cover areas where the obshchina landholding was prevalent. See N.Sergiyevskiy 'Chernyy Peredel' i narodniki 80-kh godov' in KiS 1931, k.1(74), pp.16-17.
- (396) M.R.Popov 'Iz moyego revolyutsionnogo proshlago (1878-1879gg)' in Byloye 1907, no.7, p.271,272.
- (397) Ye.Koval'skaya 'Yuzhnyy Rabochiy soyuz v 1880-81gg' in Byloye February 1904, no.6, p.34.
- (398) P.B.Aksel'rod 'Perezhitoye i Peredumannoye' p.336.
- (399) Ye.R.Ol'khovskiy 'K istorii 'Chernogo Peredela' (1879-1881gg)' in V.F.Zakharina et al. (ed.) 'Obshchestvennoye dvizheniye v poreformennoy Rossii' p.137.

CHAPTER III. SOUTHERN REVOLUTIONARIES AND THEIR ACTIVITY AMONGST
THE PEASANTRY, 1873 - 1876/7.

1. Introduction.

This Chapter examines the development of the revolutionary movement in the South from 1873 - 1876/7, when the main form of revolutionary activity was what is known as the v narod movement.

The South at this time is generally believed to have contributed little (see Appendix I), and to have abandoned this activity earlier than was the case in other parts of the Empire. The traditional interpretation explains this development by reference to the 'backwardness' of the Southern revolutionary movement, and its having to be pushed forward by the leadership of St. Petersburg. In view of Chapter II - where it was seen that the South had a lively revolutionary movement, and where doubt was cast on the reality of the St. Petersburg leadership - this explanation seems unconvincing. The present Chapter endeavours to establish why the Southern contribution was limited, and in doing so it sets aside the view that the revolutionaries were of the intelligentsia, and examines the social and educational backgrounds of the participants when this seems to offer a partial explanation for the development of the movement at this stage in its history.

2. The 'v narod' movement in the South.

There is very definite support for the view that activity amongst the peasants did not last long in the South. Most sources date the end of widespread activity amongst the peasants as the end of 1876 or the beginning of 1877. Writing in 1880, D.T. Butsynsky noted that while going v narod was continuing at the end of 1875, by "the end of 1876 much was already heard of the unsatisfactory results of propaganda in the villages." and "The major part of the youths began to regard v narod sceptically." (1)

V. Debagory-Mokriyevich, in 1883, recalled that "it was not difficult to notice, even in 1876, a significant cooling off in activities amongst the narod." and "In 1877 v narod was already thought of as something that had happened long, long ago and nobody wanted to repeat it." (2) The precise timing no doubt varied from one centre to another, so whereas M. Frolenko could say of Kiev in 1876, that "the propaganda phase was definitely over and everything was directed towards organising an armed group in order that once the peasants rose we would join them and lead the rebellion." (3); N. Vitashevsky thought that it was not till mid 1877 that propaganda was discredited in the eyes of the Odessan revolutionaries and even then propagandists like Fomichev and G. Popko continued to visit the villages with their propaganda. (4)

Interest in activity amongst the peasants did not cease abruptly. Some groups had embarked upon long-term projects which they believed would bear fruit, as was the case for example, with Ya. Stefanovich, L. Deych and I. Bokhanovsky who, from May 1876 until October 1877, were involved in their conspiracy amongst the Chigrin peasants. (5) Equally, some individuals had a personal commitment to this type of work which they refused to question. Fomin, whose real name was Aleksey Medvedev and who came from Smolensk province, went amongst the peasants from the spring till the autumn 1876, during spring 1877 and again in autumn 1877, only reluctantly calling a temporary halt in order to participate in an attempt to free those accused in the Trial of the 193; an attempt which led to his own arrest. (6)

The dating of the move away from the peasants is also made difficult by those revolutionaries who, while realising that propaganda

amongst the peasants was to no avail, did not draw the conclusion that they should abandon them as revolutionary allies, but instead reassessed their own suitability, thereby taking themselves down paths far from the peasantry. Thus, K.I.Grinevich, one of the Kiev delegates to the Lavrovist Congress in Paris in November and December 1876, told the meeting that the Kievans, at that time, were already talking of "the fiasco of 1873/4" which nobody wanted to repeat. However Grinevich explained that the fiasco was mainly due to the fact that whereas those people who had been active in the revolutionary movement before 1873 worked well amongst the peasants, the new recruits soon abandoned their revolutionary convictions once in the villages and far from their student kruzhoks. Therefore he announced, Kievan Lavrovists intended to concentrate no longer on the peasantry, but on the practical education of the youths of the cities: in each of the cities such as Poltava, Kremenchug, Luben, Chernigov, Nezhin and Yekaterinoslav, they had one or two people who would train selected youths up to a standard - including the acquisition of a skill or trade - which would enable these youths subsequently to go amongst the peasantry.(7) Alternatively, the reassessment of the value of propaganda amongst the narod could lead to a change of tactics which in most cases led to a passivity on the part of the revolutionaries. These revolutionaries believed that they had made a tactical mistake which I.M.Koval'sky described in December 1877 as not trying "to become intimate with the narod on the basis of reality ..."(8) The point was clarified by Ya.Stefanovich in his article 'Nashi zadachi v sel'e' in Obshchina, the following year. He wrote that the revolutionaries should ascertain and then espouse the views and aspirations of the peasants, rather than try to teach them socialism "because it (i.e., socialism) does not have a basis in the Russian narod, as it is at the present."(9) A very small number of revolutionaries interpreted this as a reason for trying to provoke a bunt - as in the case of the Chigrin conspiracy - but for the majority it meant that they should wait passively in the towns until the peasants chose to manifest their own genuine aspirations.(10)

A final reason why it is difficult to be precise about the time of the abandonment of mass activity amongst the peasantry is what

might be termed 'organisational inertia'. Members of organisations would retain and formally acknowledge the rules of the organisations even when the rules were no longer being put into practice. Thus the Bashentsev kruzhek which functioned in Odessa from 1874 till 1878, had possessed three rules since its inception, which stressed the kruzhek's commitment to propaganda work amongst the peasants. Despite the fact that only two or possibly three members were actively engaged in this pursuit, the kruzhek added a fourth rule in the spring of 1877 which, while allowing for exceptions, declared that three of the members of the kruzhek must, without fail, be v narod at any time. The addition of this rule followed upon the entrance into the kruzhek of a number of new recruits to the revolutionary cause: D.A.Tatarenko, P.T.Klimovich, N.A.Beverley, S.Ye.Lion and Zhandozhevsky.(11) S.Ye.Lion therefore began his revolutionary work with activity amongst the peasants in a village some 30 versts from Odessa, where he worked on a tobacco plantation during June and July 1877.(12) Another member of the Bashentsev has left her recollections of the marginal importance of activity amongst the peasants for the kruzhek: "Our group organised some khutors, where Zheltanovsky, Tal'chinskaya and others settled." However the group was simultaneously conducting propaganda in the villages, city, fabriki, zavod, work-shops, and amongst the youths.(13)

Another example of 'organisational inertia' is provided by the 'Narodnaya Volya' Party itself, since it persisted in theory in giving the peasantry an importance which its practice denied to them. This affected the Southern groups which decided to enter the party, because the document on 'Preparatory Work of the Party' specified that the second obligation which was laid upon the local groups of the Party was to gain "influence amongst the peasantry", and while "not conducting mass propaganda, must however meet with the best of the peasants, turn them as far as possible into conscious supporters of the Party, (and) familiarise them with its aims."(14) Yet, of the list of eleven provinces where recent research has identified any narodovol'tsy propaganda as having taken place amongst the peasants, only two - Kharkov and the Don region - are in the South.(15) This ambiguous attitude of the narodovol'tsy towards the peasantry can be seen in Kharkov, for example, where "Many of the members of the

kruzhok (i.e., the Glushkov-Tellalov 'Narodnaya Volya' group, in 1879) still supported Zemlevol'tsy views; P.Tellalov himself thought of setting up in a village."(16) However when two members, Filippov and Kashintsev, considered abandoning university in order to prepare for work in the village, pressure was brought to bear on them to remain in Kharkov and to continue with the more pressing work required by the Party.(17) In Odessa, M.N.Trigoni, the Executive Committee's agent in Odessa, and himself a Southerner, manifest the same sentimentality when he tried to create links with village teachers and others of the village intelligentsia in order to become active in the villages.(18) Yet Vera Figner, who was closely associated with Trigoni at this time and was to take over from him when he was arrested, recorded that "The Odessan narodovol'tsy had no direct links with the peasantry..."(19)

Thus, although after 1877, groups continued to include activity amongst the peasants as a prominent element in their programmes(20), although leaders continued to speak favourably in support of it and although kruzhoks would sometimes assist those wishing to become active propagandists in the villages (21), few revolutionaries actually did play any part in the Southern villages (22). This contrasted sharply with the experience of the rest of the Empire where, as V.Bogucharsky notes: "In the North and in Central Russia, it (i.e., v narod) was still alive to a significant measure in 1878, and in the first half of 1879."(23)

Before considering in the following section which members of the various kruzhoks did go v narod prior to 1876/7, it is necessary to clarify what is meant by the term v narod. Some actions cannot be considered examples of activity amongst the peasantry. The spreading of propaganda amongst urban workers does not qualify. It also does not include 'preparatory' work either in town or country; that is, work carried out in order to prepare the revolutionaries for the task of going amongst the peasants. This might be done to help them to acquire the appearance and manners of peasants or to equip them with a skill which would allow the revolutionary to travel about the country without attracting suspicion. The reason why these must be excluded from the meaning of v narod is because some of those who

involved themselves with preparatory work did not subsequently spread propaganda amongst the peasants.(24) Another group which will be discounted is that of which the paper Zemlya i Volya wrote in 1879: those who went amongst the people because they "wanted to study it and to make themselves narod-ish", but not to rouse it to revolt.(25) Equally unacceptable is that small number of revolutionaries who used the villages as a place in which to rest or hide, away from the hectic atmosphere of the urban revolutionary movement. Such was the case with G.Popko whose biographer wrote that in "the summer of 1878 Popko was drawn to the village, went to rest, to calm down..." and so he went to a village in Kharkov province.(26) Conversely it is necessary to include activity amongst some fabrika workers since, especially in the case of sugar fabriki, the labour force was peasant and seasonal.(27) The distinction is therefore between activity taking place in the countryside rather than in the towns, not necessarily one between an agricultural and industrial environment. Activity 'v narod' must be amongst peasants in a rural setting, even if in fabriki, and must include involvement with the peasantry, with the intention of educating them possibly for some long term revolution, or raising a revolt in the near future either on the basis of attributed peasants demands or on the basis of real grievances. This definition covers both settled and flying propaganda.(28)

A very significant number, probably the majority, of Southern revolutionaries who went 'v narod' in the South and who are considered in the following section, did so amongst peasants who belonged to religious sects. The Fesenko kruzhok in Kiev, fifteen in number, engaged in "theoretical preparation for activity amongst supporters of the rationalist sects."(29) When this kruzhok did go amongst the peasants, it divided into three parts: those going amongst the Begunov sect around Tsaritsyn on the Volga - a sect which refused to recognise the government, pay taxes or do military service; those who - mainly Ukrainians - went amongst the Shtundists which was a recently formed sect in Yherson and Kiev provinces; and Fesenko, Deych and Shepansky, who went amongst the Molokane.(30) The Kiev Commune also had in its number those who were active amongst the sects, albeit less

single-mindedly than the Fesenko kruzhok. Breshko-Breshkovskaya and Ya.Stefanovich went amongst the Shtundists of Kherson province (31), while I.I.Kablits had a deep belief in the importance of the Raskol and the sectarians because of their "significance as a protest against the existing state regime." (32) Finally in Kiev, amongst the Buntars a number had also been active amongst the sects: Frolenko, amongst the Begunov in the Urals (33), and I.V.Drobyazgin, who believed that the sects were the most receptive ground for socialism (34).

S.F.Kovalik's student kruzhok in Kharkov testifies to the same interest. V.A.Danilov was one of the leading members of the kruzhok and "ever since he had been a student at the Zurich Polytechnic, his main idea had been to bring the people to revolution through the sects." (35) On his way to Kharkov, he was helped by a woman teacher - M.A.Shaverdova-Nikitina - to spread propaganda amongst the Molokane in the village of Vorontsov near Tiflis. (36) Once in Kharkov he told his colleagues about this exploit and claimed that he had found the peasants wanting the land to be divided and the pops and the tsar removed. (37) This personal testimony no doubt encouraged others to turn their attention to the sects. From this kruzhok, N.M.Barkov and A.S.Yemel'yanov spread propaganda in the Don amongst the Old Believers, who according to Barkov, were "so strongly opposed to the government, that in two or three years they would revolt ..." (38)

It was Odessa, and nearby Nikolayev, which produced the greatest concern with the sects - especially the Shtundists - and the man - I.M.Koval'sky - who was most articulate in his belief in the revolutionary potential of the sects. In 1874, Koval'sky was arrested along with F.Yurkovsky for his activity amongst the Shtundists, but was freed before the Trial of the 193. (39) Then they resumed work amongst the sects. N.K.Bukh, writing of 1875 and discussing the different groups in Odessa, refers to the "three man kruzhok of Ivan Koval'sky, Drobyazgin and Yurkovsky." (40) all of whom were active amongst the sects. Frolenko, in 1875, joined them in spreading propaganda amongst the sects. By then the group had moved to Nikolayev and had expanded to include some Chaykovtsy and Saveli Zlatopol'sky, "This propaganda amongst the sects continued through 1875." (41) Koval'sky, according to Frolenko, was a Scriptural expert and conducted most of the discussions with the peasants. Frolenko met Koval'sky in Odessa, at the end of 1876, and

"... I saw that he continued once more with 'the cause' amongst the city of Odessa Shtundists..."(42) The city of Odessa Shtundists in fact came in for more attention than their counterparts in Nikolayev, and not just from Koval'sky. In the mid seventies, Frolenko had gone to Rumania to try to raise money with which to start a revolt amongst them - much to the annoyance of the Odessan Chaykovtsy.(43) Thereafter, they were a subject of interest for the Bashentsev.(44) One of the other kruzhoks in Odessa, which the police referred to as the Sloboda kruzhok, according to a police report "only had relations with the Shtundists and some of its members belong to the Shtund..."(45)

This interest in the religious sects was not peculiar to the South and was occasionally urged at an 'all-Russian' level. Thus, the 'Zemlya i Volya' programme advocated "closeness, and even merging, with those sects of a religio-revolutionary character hostile to the government .."(46) In that Party's paper Zemlya i Volya No.5, for February 1879, the editors wrote that: "The revolutionary party must seek support amongst all protesting elements of the narod, must involve them in the movement and make them collaborators. In this connection especially valuable are the extreme sects of Raskol, cossacks etc.."(47) The 'Narodnaya Volya' likewise began to look to the sects as a source of revolution, once the Party began to be weakened by arrests.(48)

The motivation for the interest which the revolutionaries manifest in the sects varied. I.M.Koval'sky wrote a number of pieces on the phenomenon.(49) However, S.S.Zlatopol'sky summarised Koval'sky's interest: "The practical activity of Koval'sky expressed itself exclusively in the study of Shtundism, as an independent spiritual - moral movement of the Little Russian narod, in a search for the reason for its appearance and the extremely rapid dissemination of its teaching." Zlatopol'sky appears to have shared this view of the nature of the sects.(50) I.F.Fesenko's position was somewhat different. He considered himself an expert on peasants and thought it nonsense that the Russian narod was everywhere ready to revolt. The one exception, he believed, was the rational religious sects.(51) The Minister of Justice, D.N.Nabokov, was probably expressing the erroneous conviction of the majority of those revolutionaries who were active amongst the

sects, in one of his reports, when in reviewing the years of revolutionary activity from 1875 to 1882 in Odessa by the intelligentsia, he noted that they had paid particular attention to the Shtundists: "who more than others showed themselves suitable for criminal purposes and yielding easily to propaganda, as a consequence of a belief in a dogma about the social and economic equality of all people."(52)

It may be that the existence of such sects in the South amongst the peasantry, with their supposed belief in dogmas about equality, went some way towards compensating for the absence or inadequacy of the obshchina in the South; that is, of the village organisation which lay at the foundation of the narodnichestvo ideology. This deficiency of the South - whatever its validity - was widely acknowledged. P.L. Lavrov writing in 'Kalendar' Narodnoy Volya na 1883g.', remarked that "historical circumstances had developed sufficiently strong peculiarities of culture and language to force this form of landholding (i.e., the obshchina) to vanish - precisely in the Ukraine..", but he maintained that "the population aspired to it even in the 18th century..."(53) Within the Empire, the revolutionaries also realised that obshchina landholding was not universal. The two programmes of 'Zemlya i Volya' said that the Empire should be broken up, and that two thirds of the land would be held on the basis of the obshchina.(54) According to the Party's paper Zemlya i Volya No. 3, "The alien influence on them (i.e. the Little Russians) of the Polish culture has already destroyed their land obshchina some centuries ago... Meanwhile the rumpus caused by the Chigrin^l Affair began precisely from the wish of the peasants to introduce the obshchina for themselves."(55) 'Narodnaya Volya' considered that after the revolution, "Each separate area (of the Empire) would give the land to be used by the obshchina or by individual people..."(56) This point was reinforced by A.D.Mikhaylov when he spoke of the post-revolutionary transfer of land "in Great Russia to the possession of the obshchina, and in the other parts of Russia in conformity with the existing local traditions and wishes."(57)

The Southerners themselves recognised this problem. Ya.Stefanovich writing in the émigré paper Obshchina - which itself took the position that only in Great Russia would landholding be based on the obshchina (58)

- in 1878, conceded that in Little Russia obshchina landholding existed in only a small percentage of districts, although he believed that it had been general once, and, given the right state assistance, it would re-assert itself.(59) Another Southerner, Lev Tikhomirov, in his book 'Russia. Political and Social', written in 1886, observes at one point that amongst the Little Russians, "the commune exists to a very slight extent.", before passing on to deal with the sectarians who "are the most advanced portion of the people. They know how to read and write, and are wonderfully well up in Scripture."(60) Thus, although a revolutionary's analysis might conclude that the obshchina had vanished, was in the process of disappearing or was merely suppressed, it was clear that the southern part of the Russian Empire was not the most desirable area for activity amongst the peasantry.

A further obstacle to activity which existed amongst Southern peasants was that of language, and this practical difficulty may well explain why considerable numbers of those revolutionaries who did agitate amongst the peasants chose to do so outside the South. Many of the revolutionaries could not speak the Little Russian language of the villages and so had an obvious difficulty in persuading their inhabitants of the need for a revolution. When Breshko-Breshkovskaya went amongst the peasants, her knowledge of the language was so inadequate that she had to try to pass herself off as a Great Russian.(61) Vera Zasulich, herself from the Northern province of Smolensk, could do nothing useful in the Southern villages because of it.(62) On the other hand, V. Debagory-Mokriyevich was much valued when, in 1874, he planned to go to the provinces of Podolia, Volynia and the southern part of Chernigov, for he not only knew these places, but "since he spoke the Little Russian language, he could approach the natives easily."(63) The Ukrainophile, S.A. Podolinsky, wrote in amazement to V.N. Smirnov, on 17 May 1875, of the examples which he knew of Great Russians going amongst the peasants without knowing the Ukrainian language.(64) Equally inhibiting for the members of the Odessan Chaykovtsy was, when preparing themselves for going to the people, they found that they had no books in Little Russian; there "was not a single brochure which would clearly and in the narod's own métier tell the narod the basic principles of socialism...", so

F.Volkhovsky wrote a suitable brochure in Little Russian.(65) Another member of the kruzhok, O.I.Razumovskaya translated another, 'Istoriya odnogo krest'yanina', into Ukrainian.(66) This problem of language was faced by all kruzhoks.(67)

The South therefore was not the most propitious area in which to carry out propaganda activity amongst the peasantry, and this may partly explain the limited nature of activity by Southern revolutionaries between 1873 and 1876/7. It may also explain why the South was not more attractive to revolutionaries from outside, for, as S.F.Kovalik wrote in his memoirs, in summarising the events of summer 1874: "From Petersburg, the revolutionaries moved to the country or locality, where they had some chance connection, others - the majority - to the Volga, where they hoped to find the most favourable point for revolutionary activities, thirdly - the smallest group - was directed to the South - mainly to Kiev ..."(68)

3. The involvement of Southern kruzhoks with the peasants.

The purpose of this section will be to examine the extent of the involvement of the various kruzhoks with the peasants from 1873 - 1876/7, and to suggest reasons for the limited nature of that involvement. The kruzhoks to be examined only constitute a sample of those in existence at the time: they are the ones in the three main Southern towns about which sufficient is known to allow conclusions to be drawn concerning their behaviour during these years. The kruzhoks to be considered are :

Kiev

1. the Kiev Commune
2. the Kiev Chaykovtsy
3. the Buntar kruzhok around V. Debagory-Mokriyevich, including the Odessans around S. Chubarov.

Odessa

1. the Zhebunev kruzhok
2. the Odessan Chaykovtsy
3. the Bashentsev kruzhok

Kharkov

1. S.F. Kovalik's student kruzhok
2. A.V. Andreyeva's kruzhok
3. the Kharkov-Rostov 'Zemlya i Volya' kruzhok.

It is proposed to examine the membership of each of these kruzhoks on five issues:

1. Did the member go v narod in the sense defined?
2. Was the member a native of the South?
3. Had the member received higher education?
4. Had the member been educated outwith the South?
5. What was the rank of the member's father?

Apart from where otherwise stated, the information about members is derived from 'Deyateli Revolyutsionnogo Dvizheniya v Rossii. Bio-Bibliograficheskiy Slovar'' tom II, vypusk 1 - 4 and tom III, vypusk 1 - 2.

According to the modern Soviet historian, B.S. Itenberg, "In the south of Russia, revolutionary propaganda amongst the narod was principally conducted by the kruzhok called the 'Kiev Commune'." (69)

This kruzhek was also one of the largest, a fact which was partly the result of the casualness with which membership was regarded. In Table 1.i-iv, 37 people are listed as having been 'members' of the Commune at some time and with varying degrees of involvement. Fifteen of the 37 definitely spread propaganda amongst the peasantry, while eleven did not because they were agitating amongst workers in the towns, merely studying the peasants or, in a few cases, decided to withdraw from revolutionary activity altogether. Of the remaining eleven, there is not sufficient evidence to be completely certain, but three of them (Khod'ko, V.II'yasevich and Frost) very probably did spread propaganda while another three were, albeit briefly, out in the countryside along with people who did spread propaganda (K.Sudzilovskaya, L.A.Tetel'man and M.F.Tsvineva).

The place of origin of 28 of the members is known. Fourteen came from outside the South, although four of these moved into it while very young: the three Verigo sisters and M.A.Kalenkina. A further six came from provinces contiguous to the South. The Commune would appear therefore to be predominantly Southern. However from an educational point of view this is certainly not the case. In considering the 27 individuals whose educational background is established, the majority had enjoyed some education beyond the level of a gymnasium, and those who had not were usually women, whose access to higher education was severely limited. Only eleven of the 27 were educated exclusively in the South, but at least three of these had spent lengthy periods in the capital amongst student kruzheks (Breshko-Breshkovskaya, Rogacheva and Kablits). There were very strong links between the Commune and the student kruzheks in the North and, as has been indicated in Chapter II, the latter may well have helped financially. Indeed six of the members of the Commune constituted the major part of a kruzhek which was formed in St.Petersburg in 1873. In that year, Kablits and I.Ya.Chernyshev had left S.F.Kovalik's kruzhek in the capital and set up another which embraced N.Ya.Stronsky, T.P.Stronskaya, Vera Rogacheva and K.Frost, and came to be called the vspyshkopuskateli.(70) They believed that the educated youth had nothing to teach the narod and that the narod was actually ready for revolt, only awaiting the 'lighted match' which would start the conflagration. They supported the notion of provoking local bunts which would initiate a general

rising, but if they failed to do so, then at least the abortive bunts would provide good educative experiences for the peasantry.(71) The majority of the members of the kruzhek decided to go to Kiev and to join the Commune.(72) With one possible exception they proved themselves vigorous propagandists amongst the peasants.

If the Commune is noteworthy because of its close involvement with the youth of the North, it is even more outstanding as an example of social homogeneity. It shows itself to have been overwhelmingly dvoryanstvo in composition: 23 from 34 were the children of dvoryane of some rank, while another two were the offspring of honoured citizens, two of kupets, two of a doctor, etc. Four of the Commune were Jewish (the Kaminer sisters, Levental' and L.A.Tetel'man) of whom possibly only one - but probably none - was involved with the peasants.

Simultaneously in Kiev existed the Kiev Chaykovtsy (See Table 2. i-ii). This kruzhek of 12 people, some of whom were also members of the Commune, was, according to R.V.Filippov, "Far less significant in the sense of direct propaganda amongst the peasants ..." than the Commune, and its members "formed, essentially, a part of some attempts undertaken by the 'Kiev Commune' ..." Its "Attempts at propaganda seem to have been completely without success."(73) In fact, only two of the 12 appear to have agitated amongst the peasants: S.Kaminer and Ya.V.Stefanovich, the latter being only fleetingly a member.(74) The others were busy with preparatory work in the fabriki of Kiev or spreading literature amongst the artel workers.(75) The kruzhek also managed to contribute to the establishment of the Chernigov kruzhek of students which however proved ephemeral since it ended with the start of the summer holiday without any of its members going to the peasants.(76) In searching for reasons for the lack of achievement manifest by this kruzhek, B.S.Itenberg has suggested that the 'genuine' revolutionaries - Volodkevich and Stefanovich - were not in the kruzhek for long, and the rest "...Lur'ye, Gurevich, Emme, Rashevsky, the brothers Levental' and the sisters Kaminer - were intelligent and talented but lacked either stoicism or revolutionary enthusiasm..."(77) This however seems a rather incomplete explanation.

At least seven of the members were Jewish, a fact which might be of importance in explaining a reluctance to participate in rural

agitation since the peasantry was widely believed to be hostile to the Jews and in fact the revolutionaries were quite willing to play on such prejudice themselves. This was the case with members of S.F.Kovalik's kruzhek who urged the peasants to slaughter the pans and the Jews and to take over from the tsar.(78) As a consequence of the Jewish element of the kruzhek, it was socially much less dominated by dvoryane than the Commune. Only three of the twelve members were the children of dvoryane.

Like the Commune, the Kiev Chaykovtsy was largely composed of Southerners who had had higher education: 8 came from the South, and a further 3 came from a contiguous province; 9 of the 11 had had higher education. In striking contrast to the Commune, was the lack of contact between the Kiev Chaykovtsy and the St.Petersburg student kruzheks. Only one had studied in the capital, Emme, although one, Rashevsky, but possibly more (79), had been involved with student kruzheks there. The contact with the North was sufficient to allow books to be obtained from there, but it was on the whole tenuous. A further 3 members had studied abroad.

After the disappearance of the Commune and of the Chaykovtsy in Kiev, the Buntar kruzhek emerged within a year. A number of the members tended to live more in Odessa than in Kiev and, as a consequence of disagreements, had by 1877 come to form an independent group of Buntars. However, to avoid repetition all members of the Buntars have been included in Table 3.i-iii. The members of the Odessan group include: S.F.Chubarov, M.Frolenko, I.V.Drobyazgin, I.Ya.Davidenko, O.Pogozhel'skaya and V.Kostyurin.

According to one of the members, L.Deych, the Buntars, during 1875 and 1876, consisted of eighteen members; 14 men and 4 women.(80) In March 1876, he relates that the kruzhek held a congress at Yelizavetgrad (to discuss the Chigrin Affair) involving twenty revolutionaries.(81) No doubt the composition of the Buntars, like most kruzheks at this time, was fluid and changed over the period of its existence from 1875 to 1877.(82) Many of those named below will be recognised from the preceding history of the Kievan and Southern revolutionary movements. Five had been in the Kiev Commune; V.F. Kostyurin had participated in the Odessan Chaykovtsy, while A.M. Makarevich had been active in both the Odessan Chaykovtsy and the

Zhebunev kruzhok. Almost all the others had revolutionary experience of some kind before joining the Buntars. Perhaps only six - L.Deych, V.Debagory-Mokriyevich, Ya.Stefanovich, I.Drobyazgin, I.Khod'ko, N.K.Bukh - had been active amongst the peasants before joining the Buntars. This tends to disprove F.Venturi's statement that the members "had been driven by disappointment at the outcome of the propaganda campaign to the idea of a peasant revolution." (83), if he meant it in a personal sense. A further 5 involved themselves in this activity after joining. Despite the existence of such a large number of experienced people in the Buntars, the kruzhok did very little during its three year existence. It is true that between 1876 and autumn 1877 Stefanovich, Deych and Bokhanovsky were able to organise a thousand peasants in twelve districts of Chigrin before being arrested in October 1877. Simultaneously, Debagory-Mokriyevich, M.Frolenko and I.Drobyazgin tried to raise a peasant rebellion in Kanevsky uyezd, Kiev province.(84) Although other members of the Buntars provided marginal assistance, I.Deych admitted that only Stefanovich, Mokriyevich and Drobyazgin were really involved with the peasants.(85) It is also true that numbers of the Buntars did settle in the villages, but the purpose of this was so that they would be at their stations when the bunt began. As Frolenko wrote later, the Buntars had no thought of propagandising the peasants around their settlement - they were there to provide a refuge and to observe the peasants; they were there in 'a military capacity'.(86) However even these settlements did not last for long (87), and apart from the Chigrin Affair, the main activity of the Buntars during the years of their existence was their efforts to free revolutionaries from jail and the attempt to kill N.Gorinovich, for they were not even active amongst the student youths or the urban workers.(88)

Superficially there is considerable similarity between the membership characteristics of the Buntars and the Commune. In both cases the membership was predominantly Southern (14 out of 19) and the children of dvoryane (12 out of 20), but it did not have one characteristic of the Commune's membership: very close contacts with the students of St.Petersburg and Moscow. Only seven of the Buntars had received some part of their education in the North or abroad although the great majority had been through some form of higher

education and those who were not, were mostly women. Contacts with the North were not only scarce, they were also bad. As has been mentioned in Chapter II, there was considerable hostility towards the revolutionaries of the capital amongst members of this kruzhek. Financial assistance was not forthcoming from the capital since there was little support for the aims of the Buntars. Indeed lack of money must have been the main reason for the inactivity of the Buntars, as Debagory-Mokriyevich admitted.(89) The absence of financial assistance from the North would not have mattered had help been forthcoming from other Southern kruzheks. The Buntars however were condemned by almost all the leading Southern revolutionaries of that time: Fomin (90), Zaslavsky (91), I.F. Voloshenko (92), A.Zhelyabov (93), I.M.Koval'sky (94), F.Volkhovsky (95), N.I.Kibal'chich (96), G.A.Fopko (97), Zhebunev (98) etc..

In Odessa at the start of the period under consideration, there were two groups functioning: the Zhebunevs' kruzhek and the Odessa Chaykovtsy led by F.Volkhovsky. The boundary between the two groups was rather nebulous and there was considerable intermixing of the two groups.(99) The kruzhek of the Zhebunevs was unusual, primarily because it took shape abroad in Zurich.(100) (See Table 4.i-ii) Eight of the eleven members had studied in Zurich, although more had stayed there, and, after a spell in France for some of the members, the kruzhek reassembled in Russia late in 1873. Between then and the end of 1874, most of the kruzhek participated in the 'v narod' movement, usually as rural teachers. One who did not become involved with the peasants was A.M.Makarevich who was at least certainly involved in propaganda work amongst Odessan workers. Indeed most of the propaganda work by Odessan revolutionaries was the responsibility of this kruzhek, for it dominated activity in Odessa in much the same way as the Commune did in Kiev.

Only one of those listed as members was definitely not Southern, T.A.Kvyatkovsky, but his links with the kruzhek, on return to Russia, proved to be fragile. Equally, the kruzhek was overwhelmingly composed of children of dvoryane, the product of higher education and, as indicated in Chapter II, financially secure. The Zhebunevites were very well connected with the centres of revolutionary thinking.

Most of the members had been educated in St.Petersburg or Moscow - four having been at the Petrovskaya Agricultural Academy in Moscow - where they had been involved with revolutionary kruzhoks. Significantly when two of the members returned to Russia from Switzerland, Kobiyev and S.Shebunev, their first action was to visit Moscow to resume contacts.(101) While in Zurich the kruzhok had been involved with the Russian colony and was at least aware of the controversies raging there.

A considerable number of the individuals who made up the Gleason kruzhok of Chaykovtsy, which was located in Odessa, were experienced revolutionaries before joining the kruzhok.(See Table 5.i-ii) Some had been involved with Nechayev (Antonova, Volkhovsky and Golikov), while others, such as A.Zhelyabov had been leaders of student disorders in the early seventies, and still more (S.Chudnovsky, A. and P.Makarevich) had participated in revolutionary kruzhoks abroad. This contrasts with the poverty of the kruzhok's contribution in the field of peasant agitation, for only three of the fourteen members can be confidently identified as having been active in that area. In the case of an other, P.M.Makarevich, such activity may have taken place prior to his joining the kruzhok, while if A.I.Zhelyabov was ever involved in peasant agitation, it must have taken place after the kruzhok disappeared. The paucity of this type of activity may have been the result of a decision taken by the kruzhok: Volkhovsky had suggested that the kruzhok should be called the 'kruzhok of initiators', and should set itself the task of initiating and organising kruzhoks in the South which would be directly active amongst the peasants. Thus, the kruzhok "must direct its efforts mainly towards agitation and propaganda amongst the intelligentsia, to supply those wishing to work v narod with books and other aids, and only part of its force must be devoted to direct action v narod." Zheltonovsky and Chudnovsky supported this plan, while others felt they should limit themselves initially to activity amongst the intelligentsia but that peasant agitation must be recognised as their ultimate aim and that propaganda amongst the urban workers was also important.(102) The upshot of this discussion was, in the assessment of S.F.Kovalik, that the kruzhok was notable only for its intense activity amongst the workers, to which end they had constructed small groups where the members

secretly "developed the workers, prepared them for the revolution."(103) This is an exaggeration for, as has been indicated in Chapter II, the kruzok contributed mightily to smuggling illegal literature from abroad - a task which occupied Chubarov, Makarevich, Zhelyabov and others - as well as producing its own manuscript journal.

In many respects this kruzok's membership was similar to that of others in the South at this time, such as the Commune or the Zhebunevs which were vigorous in propagandising the peasants. Thirteen of the members' province of origin can be identified and of these, eleven were Southern. The kruzok had very strong links with the kruzoks of the North, apart from contacts arising from their association with the Chaykovtsy. Seven of the fourteen members had studied in higher educational institutions in St. Petersburg or Moscow - four of them at Moscow's Petrovskaya Agricultural Academy - and had been involved with students' kruzoks while there. Apart from two of the female members, all had had higher education. Like the Zhebunev kruzok, the Volkhovskiy kruzok also had sufficient financial resources, especially after June 1874 when Dicheskulo inherited money (104), and of literature. Socially it differed: only five of eleven were children of dvoryane, the others being from meshchanstvo, peasant, kupechestvo or clerical backgrounds. In this respect the Odessan Chaykovtsy had something in common with the Kievian Chaykovtsy.

The Bashentsev kruzok is believed to have existed for some three years, from the end of 1874 until the start of 1878, and inevitably during this time its membership did not remain constant. (See Table 6. i-iv) From the Table below, the following were members for only a short time: F.A.Shcherbin and I.A.Veru (105), Ye.Vuzhakova, A.V.Chernyavskaya, I.I.Dobrovol'skiy, F.T.Klimovich, Phandozhevskiy, P.Ul'yanov and Ye.Pobedonostsev (106), D.A.Titorenko, N.A.Beverley and von Ru (107). However, taking the composition as a whole, some nine members from twenty-five were active amongst the peasants - pre-eminently, A.Medvedev (Fomin) and Ye.Rossikova - which was at least matched by the number who were involved with propaganda activity amongst urban workers, often as part of Zaslavskiy's Union. This latter involvement may help to explain the composition of the kruzok which was, as A.

Shekhter recalled, one of "many workers and some intelligentsia."(108) As regards social status, from twenty-five identified individuals only

eight were descended from dvoryane and five of them were amongst the short term members; this element was, then, rather less in the Bashentsev than in other groups considered. Possibly as a concomitant of this social factor, contact between this kruzhok and the North was not extensive: seven can be identified as having been educated in Moscow or St.Petersburg. Most of the members of the kruzhok had been born in the South - fifteen from nineteen. The kruzhok had little money but it did have contact with the emigration - G.Popko, for example, attended the Lavrovist congress in Paris as the delegate of this kruzhok - and it also made efforts to supply itself with illegal literature smuggled in from abroad.(109) Shekhter characterised the Bashentsev as a kruzhok whose leaders stood on the boundary between two epochs - the narodnichestvo faith in the peasants and the epoch which closed with the formation of 'Narodnaya Volya' and 'Chernyy Peredel'.(110) As regards the composition of the kruzhok she was correct, for the Bashentsev manifest to a degree many of those features which were commonplace in those kruzhok which will be considered in the following Chapter concerning the period 1877-1883.

'Kovalik's student kruzhok' in Kharkov emerged from a union of a number of existing kruzhoks: the self-education kruzhok of students at Kharkov University, which had functioned since February 1874; students from Kharkov seminary and a small part of the kruzhok at Kharkov Veterinary Institute which originated in 1873. (See Table 7. i-iv.) Few of the last kruzhok joined Kovalik, and most of those who did not, appear to have been associated with the revolutionary Ukrainophile kruzhok led by F.S.Tsebenko and M.M.Serebryakov which was at the time providing a free school for the poor of Kharkov.(111) Kovalik's kruzhok was led, in his absence, at first by Yu.N.Govorukha-Otrok and then after his departure from the revolutionary movement, by N.M.Barkov. The kruzhok had taken shape by April 1874.(112) The kruzhok concentrated in the first place upon persuading as many of the seminarists to join them as possible and then upon preparing them to go amongst the peasants. It held meetings to which, according to I.P.Klement'yev, around thirty seminarists might come.(113)

Many years later, Ye.N.Koval'skaya criticised S.F.Kovalik for suggesting that his kruzhok was the one which aroused Kharkov youth from 'a slumber'. She pointed out that other kruzhoks had existed

before Kovalik's arrival, that they had supplies of literature and that anyway, his kruzhek had not done a great deal, and Barkov and Govorukha-Otrok, when arrested, both disgraced themselves.(114) The lack of activity by the majority of members is borne out by the information in the table below; only ten from thirty-one appear to have participated in the 'v narod' movement: it was one thing to get students to attend meetings, quite another to persuade them to risk revolutionary activity. Kovalik himself later admitted that the initial upsurge of enthusiasm had been "a temporary exaltation, and not the product of conviction." "The kruzhek as a whole did not proceed to practical activity..."(115) However within the kruzhek, it was the seminarists who proved particularly resistant to the call for agitation amongst the peasants and although at least half of the members listed below were seminarists only one, M.F.Spesivtsev, spread propaganda amongst the peasants. If the seminarists are put to one side, the kruzhek's activity seems more creditable, - nine out of twelve or thirteen. The seminarists preferred to go home when the summer holiday arrived and refused to agitate although being willing to spend some time studying the peasantry. N.M.Barkov, himself from Kharkov University, subsequently dismissed the seminarists as "not capable of being revolutionaries."(116) A.V.Andreyeva considered them 'milksops' (117).

Of the fifteen members whose province of origin can be established, six came from outwith the South, but since most of the remaining seventeen whose origins are not known were seminarists, who would most probably have lived in the South, the kruzhek was probably dominated by Southerners as were the other kruzheks examined here. Unlike some other kruzheks in the South, very few of this kruzhek had been to a higher educational institution in the North; a consequence of the greater youth of this kruzhek. Nonetheless there were considerable links between it and St.Petersburg as has been indicated in Chapter II. M.A.Rabinovich, G.Lebedev and P.O.Maksimov maintained contacts and helped supply Kharkov with money and literature. Socially the kruzhek is interesting since the seminarists were almost all sons of clerics while the children of dvoryane predominated amongst the Kharkov University students.

The Andreyeva kruzhek was unusual in that its instigator was a woman who, coming from Moscow, organised a group which included four

students from Kharkov's Technical Railway School. (See Table 8.i.) She provided reading material and led discussions which concentrated on the need to go 'v narod'. In the summer of 1874, the members made their way separately to Taganrog where they joined with the kruzhek led by associates of Andreyeva - the brothers I. and A. Pavlovsky - which was composed of youths from the local gymnasium. (118) The Pavlovskys were unusual, as well, in that they were the sons of a Jewish Taganrog merchant and one of them, Aaron, had already carried out propaganda work amongst the peasants. The elder brother Isaac had been, for a time, a student at St. Petersburg's Medico-Surgical Academy which was where he had met Andreyeva. (119) None of the members of Andreyeva's group, apart from herself, appears to have been active in the villages. They were however involved in spreading propaganda amongst the railway workers, who were perhaps more accessible given the background of these revolutionaries.

The Don area had witnessed a fairly lively activity amongst the peasants. There had been the group called Nashi, established by the Zubrilov brothers, Dubrovin and P.I. Mozgovoy to propagandise the narod (120), as well as the Pavlovsky kruzhek, mentioned above (121). The kruzhek which is commonly referred to as the Kharkov-Rostov kruzhek, although it mainly functioned in the latter, came into existence here around April 1876. In January 1877 many of its members travelled to St. Petersburg and were involved in the foundation of 'Zemlya i Volya'.

The kruzhek was unusual in a number of ways. One was that some time after it was formed, it became aligned with 'Zemlya i Volya'; the only one so to do in the South. It was also distinguished from those considered so far in that all the members went amongst the peasantry and, with probably one exception, spread propaganda there. This to some extent no doubt reflects the ageing of the revolutionary movement, because almost all this kruzhek's participants had revolutionary pasts and already had identified themselves as propagandists amongst the peasantry and had been involved in such activity. This degree of commitment no doubt drew them together in the first place and subsequently led them to unite with 'Zemlya i Volya' and to participate in the 'Zemlya i Volya' settlements during 1877 and 1878. These settlements were all outwith the South - in Saratov, Tambov etc.. It is noteworthy that almost all the work which the

participants of the Rostov-Kharkov kruzhek had done before joining together, and which they did when a group, was also done outwith the South. This can be seen from Table 9.i., but is also testified to by Aptekman and Gartman (122). This of course was not unknown, for, from the start, some of the Southerners had been involved in propaganda work outside the South.

There would appear to be more of a social mix in this kruzhek than in most of those considered so far, although it paralleled that of the 'Zemlya i Volya' as a whole (123). This again probably reflects the fact that its members were people who had gone through the filtering process of 1874-6 and had survived with a personal commitment to propaganda amongst the peasants. Nonetheless, as has been becoming more obvious with each group considered, the extent of involvement with activity amongst the peasants by Southern kruzheks was in part related to the extent of involvement with St.Petersburg and Moscow and with people from those places. Although six of eight identified members were Southern, five of the members had been educated in St.Petersburg while a further four, who had been educated at Kharkov's Veterinary Institute, had been in contact with S.F.Kovalik's Northern-inspired kruzhek which was discussed above.

With the exception of L.Gartman and A.I.Barannikov, who moved on to become members of 'Narodnaya Volya', all remained committed to rural agitation and subsequently joined 'Chernyy Peredel' or as with Tishchenko, Moshchenko and Khotinsky, withdrew from revolutionary involvement.(124)

4. Tables 1-9 of the membership of kruzhoqs, 1873-1876/7.

<u>KRUZHOK: KIEV COMMUNE</u>		<u>TABLE 1.i.</u>		
<u>MEMBER'S NAME.</u>	<u>ACTIVITY AMONGST PEASANTS.</u>	<u>PROVINCE OF BIRTH.</u>	<u>PLACE OF EDUCATION.</u>	<u>FATHER'S RANK.</u>
.....
1. Ye. Breshko-Breshkovskaya (125)	Yes	Vitebsk (N) Brought up in Chernigov.	Gymn.	Dvor.
2. Olga K. Ivanova (125)	No. Died early in 1874 (125)	Vitebsk (N) Brought up in Chernigov.		Dvor.
3. M.A. Kalenkina (Kolenkina) (125)	No (132)	Tambov (N) Brought up in Kuban.	Kiev Univ. Midwifery course	Meshch.
4. V.F. Fischer (125)	Yes (133)	Orel (N)	St.Pb. Gymn.; St.Pb. Med-Surg. Acad.; Kiev Univ.; Vienna	Dvor.
5. S. Speyer (125)	No (133)			
6. S.F. Kovalik (125)	Yes	Poltava (S)	Moscow and Vilno Gymn.; St.Pb. Univ.; Abroad	Dvor. A retired Colonel and Landowner
7. V. Debagory-Mokriyevich (125)	Yes (133)	Chernigov (S)	Nemirov. and Kamenets - Pod. Gymn.; Kiev Univ.; U.S.A. and Zurich	Dvor.
8. N. Sudzilovsky (125)	Yes (139)	Mogilev (N)	Mogilev Gymn. St.Pb. Univ.; Kiev Univ.	Dvor.
9. Nadezha Sudzilovskaya (125)	Yes	Mogilev (N)	At home	Dvor.
10. Ya. Stefanovich (125)	Yes (132,133)	Chernigov (S)		Priest.

KRUZHOK: KIEV COMMUNE

TABLE:1.ii.

MEMBER'S NAME	ACTIVITY AMONGST PEASANTS.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
11. P.F.Larionov (125)	Yes (135)	St.Pb. ?		Honoured citizen.
12. V.A.Benetsky (126)	No (133)		Kiev Univ.	Dvor.
13. N.Ya.Stronsky (126)	Yes (137)	Poltava (S)	Poltava Gymn.; St.Pb. Tech. Inst.	Dvor.
14. T.P.Stronskaya (126)	Yes (136)	Novgorod (N)	St.Pb. Girls' boarding school.	Dvor.
15. I.Khod'ko (Khot'ko) (126)	Probably yes	Kiev (S)	Odessa Univ.	Dvor.
16. V.G.Kukushkin (126)				? Metal- worker.
17. L.Il'nitsky (126)				
18. I.O.Pol'geym (126)	Probably not. Kept books for Communards.	Podolia (S)	Kamenets-Pod. Gymn.; Kiev Univ. Midwifery course.	Dvor.
19. N.Kaminer (126)	No Did 'preparatory work'	Kiev (S)	Kiev Gymn.; Zurich Univ.	Zemstvo doctor.
20. A.Kaminer (126)	No Did 'preparatory work'	Kiev (S)	Kiev Gymn.; Zurich Univ.	Zemstvo doctor.

KRUZHOK: KIEV COMMUNE

TABLE: I.iii.

MEMBER'S NAME.	ACTIVITY AMONGST PEASANTS.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
21. N.Levental' (126)	No Did 'preparatory work'.	Mogilev (N)	Mogilev Gymn.; Kiev Univ.	Teacher at a Jewish school.
22. V.Il'yasevich (127)	Probably yes (140)			Dvor.
23. A.Volkenshteyn (127)	? Allowed propaganda on her estate.	? (S)	Kiev Univ.	Dvor.
24. I.D.Trezvinsky (127)	Yes (138)	Kiev (S)	Kiev Gymn.	Priest.
25. N.Ye.Gorinovich (127)	Yes (134)	Podolia (S)	Kiev Gymn.	Honoured citizen.
26. I.Ya.Chernyshev (127)	Yes (137)		Kiev Gymn.; Kiev Univ.; St.Pb.Tech. Inst.; Switzerland.	Dvor.
27. V.P.Rogacheva (127)	Yes (136)	Orel (N)	Orel Gymn.	Dvor.
28. L.A.Tetel'man (127)	? Allowed propagandists to stay on his estate.	Podolia (S)	Odessa Gymn.; Moscow Univ.; St.Pb.Med.- Surg.Acad.; Kiev Univ.	Kupets.
29. M.F.Tsvineva (Tsveneva?) (127)	No Did 'preparatory work.' (Died in winter of 73/74?)	Pskov (N)	Pskov Gymn.; St.Pb.	Dvor.
30. A.Drobysch- Drobyshevsky (127)	Yes (134)	Mogilev (N)	Novgorod Gymn.	Dvor.

KRUZHOK: KIEV COMMUNE

TABLE: 1.iv.

MEMBER'S NAME.	ACTIVITY AMONGST PEASANTS.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
31. K.Frost (127)	? Did preparatory work.		St.Pb. Gymn.; St.Pb. Tech. Inst.	
32. S.Lur'ye (128)	No		Nizhin Gymn.; Kiev Gymn.; Kiev Univ.	Kupets.
33. L.Shramkov (129)	No (133)			Dvor.
34. A.Osmolovsky (130)		Kiev (S)		Dvor.
35. I.I.Kablits (130)	Yes	Kovno (N)	Kiev Gymn.	Dvor.
36. A.I.Filipp (127)	No. Allowed her estate to be used by propagandists	Vitebsk (N) Brought up in Chernigov		Dvor.
37. I.V.Bokhanovsky (131)	No	Poltava (S)	Kiev Univ.	Dvor.

	18 from 32 were active =56.3%	14 from 28 were Southern =50%	18 from 27 had h.e. = 66.7% 16 from 27 had someeduc. o/s. S. = 59.3%	23 from 34 were children of dvor. = 67.6%

KRUZHOK: KIEV CHAYKOVTSY

TABLE: 2.i.

MEMBER'S NAME.	ACTIVITY AMONGST PEASANTS.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
1. P.B.Aksel'rod (141)	No Searched for a robber, and then fled abroad. (142)	Chernigov (S) (142)	Gymn. education (142)	Poor Jewish innkeeper.
2. G.Ye.Gurevich (141)	No Prop. in Kiev artels.	Mogilev (N)	Germany; Kiev Univ.	Wealthy Kupets.
3. A.I.Kaminer (Tishchenko) (141)	No	Kiev (S)	Kiev Gymn.; Zurich Univ.	Zemstvo doctor.
4. N.I.Kaminer (141)	No	Kiev (S)	Kiev Gymn.; Zurich Univ.	Zemstvo doctor.
5. S.I.Kaminer (141)	Yes	Kiev (S)	Kiev Gymn.	Zemstvo doctor.
6. N.N.Kolodkevich (Kolotkevich) (141)	No (143)	Chernigov (S) (143)	Kiev Univ. (143)	Dvor. (143)
7. L.(Ye.)Levental' (141)	No Prop. in Kiev Artels and preparatory work.	Mogilev (N)	Mogilev Gymn.; Kiev Univ.	Teacher.
8. N.Levental' (141)	No Prop. in Kiev Artels.	Mogilev (N)	Mogilev Gymn.; Kiev Univ.	Teacher.
9. S.G.Lur'ye (141)	No Prop. in Kiev Artels		Nizhin Gymn.; Kiev Gymn.; Kiev Univ.	Kupets.
10. I.F.Rashevsky (141)	No Prop. in Kiev Artels.	Chernigov (S)	Kiev Univ.	Dvor.

KRUZHOK: KIEV CHAYKOV'SY.

TABLE: 2.ii.

MEMBER'S NAME.	ACTIVITY AMONGST PEASANTS.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
11. Ya.V.Stefanovich (141)	Yes	Chernigov (S)		Priest.
12. V.G.Emme (141)	No Prop. in Kiev Artels.	Chernigov (S)	St.Pb.Univ.; Kiev Univ.	Dvor.
	2 from 12 were active = 16.7%	8 from 11 were Southern = 72.7%	9 from 11 had h.e. = 81.8% 7 from 11 had some educ. o/s S. = 63.6%	3 from 12 were children of dvor. = 25%

KRUZHOK: BUNTARS.

TABLE: 3.i.

MEMBER'S NAME.	ACTIVITY AMONGST PEASANTS.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
1. L.Deych (144)	Yes (summer 1875)	Podolia (S) (149)		Kupets. (149)
2. V.Debagory- Mokriyevich (144)	Yes	Chernigov (S)	Nemirov.Gymn.; Kamenets-Pod. Gymn.; Kiev Univ.; U.S.A. and Zurich	Dvor.
3. L.P.Vorontsova (Barysheva) (144)	No	Yekaterin- oslav (S)	Odessa Gymn.	Dvor.
4. V.I.Zasulich (144)	Yes	Smolensk (N) (150)	St.Pb. (150)	Dvor. (150)
5. Ya.V.Stefanovich (144)	Yes	Chernigov (S)		Priest.
6. V.P.Iepeshinsky (144)	No? Did 'preparatory work' in St.Pb.		St.Pb. Med.- Surg. Acad.	
7. M.P.Kovalevskaya, (née Vorontsova) (144)	No	Yekaterin- oslav (S)	At home; Odessa Inst.	Dvor.
8. A.M.Makarevich (née Rozenshteyn) (144)	No Prop. Odessan workers.	Tauride (S)	Simferopol' Gymn.; Zurich Univ.	Kupets and honoured citizen.
9. M.A.Kolenkina (144)	No	Tambov, (N) brought up in Yuban	Kiev Univ. midwifery course.	Meshch.
10. M.Frolenko (144)	Yes	Kuban (S) (151)	St.Pb.Tech. Inst.; Moscow Petrov. Agric. Acad. (151)	Sergeant- Major, Military doctor. (151)

KRUZHOK: BUNTARS

TABLE: 3.ii.

MEMBER'S NAME.	ACTIVITY AMONGST PEASANTS.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
11. I.V.Bokhanovsky ('Khokhol') (144)	Yes	Poltava	Kiev Univ.	Dvor.
12. S.F.Chubarov ('Kapitan') (144)	No 'preparatory work' in St.Pb.	Penza (N)	Voronezh Cadet School; Moscow Univ.; St.Pb.Univ.	Dvor.
13. I.V.Drobyazgin (144)	Yes	Kherson (S)	Odessa Seminary.	Village Deacon
14. V.F.Kostyurin (144)	No 'preparatory work' in Odessa.	Kherson (S)	Odessa Univ.	Dvor.
15. F.Kuritsyn (144)	No	Moscow (N)	Kharkov Vet. Inst.	
16. S.Yastremsky (144)	No	Kharkov (S)	Kharkov Gymn.; and Univ.	Dvor.
17. S.Lur'ye (144)	No (148)		Nizhin Gymn.; Kiev Univ.	Kupets.
18. V.Malinka (Khoma) (144)	Yes	Poltava (S)	Poltava Gymn.; Odessa Univ.; Kiev Univ.	Dvor.
19. I.Khod'ko (145)	Yes	Kiev (S)	Odessa Univ.	Dvor.
20. N.F.Bukh (145)	Yes	Kaluga (N)	Ufa , Penza, Samara, St.Pb. Military School; St.Pb.Med.-Surg. Acad.	Dvor.

KRUZHOK: BUNTARS.

TABLE: 3.iii.

MEMBER'S NAME.	ACTIVITY AMONGST PEASANTS.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
21. P.O.Rokhal'sky (146)			Poltava Gymn.	Dvor.
22. I.Ya.Davidenko (147)	Yes	Kiev (S)	Kiev Gymn.	Military clerk.
23. O.Pogozhel'skaya (147)				

	11 from 21 were active = 52.4%	14 from 19 were Southern. = 73.2%	14 from 20 had h.e. = 70% 7 from 20 had some educ. o/s S. = 35%	12 from 20 were children of dvor. = 60%

KRUZHOK: ZHEBUNEV.

TABLE: 4.i.

MEMBER'S NAME.	ACTIVITY AMONGST PEASANTS.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
1. N.A.Zhebunev (152)	Yes	Yekaterinoslav (S)	Zurich	Dvor.
2. V.A.Zhebunev (152)	Yes	Yekaterinoslav (S)	Moscow boarding school; Kharkov Gymn.; Moscow Petrov Agric.Acad.; Odessa Univ.; Zurich	Dvor.
3. S.A.Zhebunev (152)	Yes	Yekaterinoslav (S)	Moscow boarding school; Kharkov Gymn.; Zurich	Dvor.
4. L.N.Zhebunev (152)	No	Yekaterinoslav (S)	Home; Moscow Petrov Agric. Acad.; Zurich	Dvor.
5. Z.I.Zhebuneva (née Glushkova) (152)		Kharkov (S)	Zurich Univ.	
6. A.M.Makarevich (Rozenshteyn) (152)	No Prop. Odessan workers.	Tauride (S)	Simferopol' Gymn.; Zurich Univ.	Kupets and honoured citizen.
7. P.M.Makarevich (152)	Yes ?	Kherson (S)	Kharkov Gymn.; Moscow Petrov Acad.; Moscow Univ.; Zurich	Dvor.
8. T.A.Vvyatkovsky (152)	Yes	Tomsk (N)	St.Pb.Univ.; St.Pb. Tech.Inst.; Novgorod; Zurich.	Dvor.
9. G.Kobiyev (152)	Yes	(S ?)	Stavropol' Gymn.; Moscow Petrov Agric. Acad.; Zurich	Dvor.
10. M.Blinova (152)	Yes	(S ?)	Kharkov Gymn.; Zurich.	Dvor. (Provincial Secretary.)

KRUZHOK: ZHEBUNEV.

TABLE: 4.ii.

MEMBER'S NAME	ACTIVITY AMONGST PEASANTS.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
11. G.S.Trudnitsky (152)	Yes	Yekaterinoslav (S)	St.Pb.Univ.; Zurich	Dvor.

	8 from 10 were active = 80%	10 from 11 were Southern = 90.9%	All had h.e. = 100% All had some educ. o/s. S. = 100%	9 from 10 were children of dvor. = 90%

KRUZHOK: ODESSA CHAYFOVTSY.

TABLE: 5.i.

MEMBER'S NAME	ACTIVITY AMONGST PEASANTS.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
1. F.V.Volkhovsky (153)	No	Poltava (S)	St.Pb.Gymn.; Odessa Gymn.; Moscow Univ.	Dvor.
2. M.Antonova (Volkhovskaya) (153)	No	Moscow (N)	Moscow Gymn.	Meshch. Illegitimate daughter of a Dvor.
3. L.I.Golikov (153)	No Prop. Workers' Artels.	Kherson (S)	Nikolayev Gymn.; Moscow Petrov Agric. Acad.	Dvor.
4. L.A.Dicheskulo (153)	Yes	Kherson (S)	Uman; Moscow Petrov Agric. Acad.	Dvor.
5. D.I.Zheltonovsky (153)	No		Odessa Univ.	
6. A.I.Zhelyabov (153)	No Prop. Odessan workers.	Tauride (S)	Kerch Gymn.; Odessa Univ.	Peasant.
7. V.F.Kostyurin (153)	No Prop. Odessan workers.	Kherson (S)	Odessa Univ.	Dvor.
8. A.M.Makarevich (née Rozenshteyn) (153)	No Prop. Odessan workers.	Tauride (S)	Simferopol' Gymn.; Zurich Univ.	Kupets and honoured citizen.
9 F.M.Makarevich (153)	Yes ? Prop. Odessan workers.	Kherson (S)	Kharkov Gymn.; Moscow Petrov Agric. Acad.; Zurich	Dvor.
10. O.I.Razumovskaya (Zheltonovskaya) (153)		Podolia (S)	Kamenets-Pod. Gymn.	Priest.

KRUZHOK: ODESSA CHAYKOVTSY.

TABLE: 5.ii.

MEMBER'S NAME	ACTIVITY AMONGST PEASANTS.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
11. I.P.Stenyushkin (153)	No Worked in blacksmiths in Odessa	Perm (N)	Moscow Petrov Agric. Acad.	'a village resident'
12. S.L.Chudnovsky (153)	No	Kherson (S)	Kherson Jewish school; Kherson Gymn; Odessa Univ.	Kupets.
13. M.-V.R.Langans (153)	Yes (155)	Kherson (S)	St.Pb.Tech. Inst. (154)	Austrian subject.
14. A.A.Franzholi (153)	Yes (156)	Kherson (S)	Kiev Univ.; St.Pb.Tech. Inst. (156)	

	4 from 13 were active = 30.8%	11 from 13 were Southern = 84.6%	12 from 14 had h.e. = 85.7%; 9 from 14 had some educ. o/s. S. = 64.3%	5 from 11 were children of dvor. = 45.5%

KRUZHOK: BASHENTSEV.

TABLE: 6.i.

MEMBER'S NAME	ACTIVITY AMONGST PEASANTS.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
1. S.Ye. Lion (157)	Yes (160)	Bessarabia (S)	Odessa Univ.	Kupets.
2. G.I.Fomichev (157)	No Prop. Odessan workers.	Kherson (S)	Odessa Seminary; Odessa Univ.	Deacon.
3. D.Zheltonovsky (157)	Yes (157)			
4. A.P.Koltanovsky (157)		Kiev (S)	Odessa Univ.	Priest.
5. G.Popko (157)	Yes	Kuban (S)	Stavropol' Seminary; Moscow Petrov. Agric. Acad.; Odessa Univ.	Priest.
6. S.I.Feokhari (157)	No Prop. Odessan workers and soldiers.	Kherson (S)	Educated at home; Art School	Greek subject; son of poor landowner.
7. M.V.Teterka (157)	No (166)	Kherson (S) (166)	None (166)	Worker (166)
8. M.R.Popov (157)	Yes (168)		Yekaterinoslav Seminary; St.Pb. Med.- Surg. Acad. (168)	Priest. (168)
9. M.Kudrichenko (157)				
10. T.S.Dukin (157)	No	Kherson (S)	Odessa Railway school.	Turkish subject; Railway worker.

KRUZHOK: BASHMENTSEV

TABLE: 6.ii.

MEMBER'S NAME	ACTIVITY AMONGST PEASANTS.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
11. Dukin (Sister of above) (157)	No	Kherson (S)		Turkish subject.
12. Dukin (Sister of above) (157)	No	Kherson (S)		Turkish subject.
13. Klyuge (157)				
14. V.Merkulov (157)				Worker
15. Tul'chinskaya (157)	Yes (157)			
16. S.Orzhik (157)				
17. A.Shekhter (157)				
18. A.F.Medvedev (Fomin) (158)	Yes (158)	Smolensk (N) (158)	Local Uyezd school	Of poor parents Meshch.
19. Ye.N.Yuzhakova (158)	No	Kherson (S)	Home education Zurich	Dvor.
20. A.V.Chernyavskaya (née Poltoranova) (158)	No	Siberia (N)	Smolny Institute	Dvor.

KRUZHOK: BASHENTSEV

TABLE: 6.iii.

MEMBER'S NAME	ACTIVITY AMONGST PEASANTS.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
21. F.A.Shcherbin (158)	No Active amongst urban workers. (161)	Kuban (S)	Moscow Petrov Agric. Acad.; Odessa Univ.	Priest.
22. I.A.Veru (158)	No (161)			
23. I.I.Dobrovol'sky (158)	Yes (162)	Novgorod (N)	Gatchin Inst.; St.Pb. Med.- Surg. Acad.	Dvor. Zemstvo doctor.
24. Ye.I.Rossikova (née Vitten) (158)	Yes (163,170)	Tauride (S)	Odessa Inst.	Dvor.
25. I.F.Voloshenko (158)	No ? (164)	Tauride (S) (Then Kuban) (167)	Kharkov Gymn.; Odessa Univ.	Dvor.
26. M.D.Terent'yev (158)	Yes (165)	Kherson (S)	Odessa Gymn.	Dvor.
27. D.A.Tatarenko (Titorenko) (158)				Dvor.
28. P.T.Klimovich (158)	No (162)		Odessa Univ.	Priest.
29. N.A.Beverley (Zhuk) (158)			St.Pb.Tech. Inst.	Dvor.
30. Von Ru (158)				

KRUZHOK: BASHENTSEV.

TABLE: 6.iv.

MEMBER'S NAME	ACTIVITY AMONGST PEASANTS.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
31. Khandozhevsky (G.V.) (158)	No (162)		Odessa Univ.	Priest.
32. P.Ul'yanov (159)	No ?		Stavropol' Seminary; Odessa Univ.	
33. Ye.I.Pobedonostsev (159)	No ?	Tauride (S)	Stavropol' Seminary; Odessa Univ.	Priest.
34. P.Ivanovskaya (159)	No (169)	Tula (N) (169)	St.Pb. (169)	Priest.

	9 from 25 were active = 36%	15 from 19 were Southern = 78.9%	14 from 22 had h.e. = 63.6% 8 from 22 had some educ. o/s. S. = 36.4%	8 from 25 were children of dvor. = 32%

KRUZHOK: KOVALIK

TABLE: 7.i.

MEMBER'S NAME	ACTIVITY AMONGST PEASANTS.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
1. I.P.Klement'yev (171)	No	Kharkov (S)	Kharkov Seminary; Uman Agric. School.	Priest.
2. M.F.Spesivtsev (171)	Yes (176)		Kharkov Seminary.	Deacon.
3. A.V.Popov (171)	No	Vologod (N)	Kharkov Seminary; Kharkov Univ.	Priest.
4. N.N.Popov (171)	No	Kursk (N)	Kharkov Seminary	Deacon
5. P.A.Fomin (171)	No		Kharkov Seminary; Kharkov Univ.	Priest.
6. M.Fomin (171)				
7. D.Dikarev (171)	No		Kharkov Seminary	
8. P.P.Danilov (171)	No		Kharkov Seminary	Priest.
9. M.Pertsev (171)	No		Kharkov Seminary	Deacon
10. V.Belyayev (171)	No		Kharkov Seminary; Kharkov Vet. Inst.	Priest.

KRUZHOK: KOVALIK

TABLE: 7.ii.

MEMBER'S NAME	ACTIVITY AMONGST PEASANTS.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
11. I.Veselovsky (171)	No	Kharkov (S)	Kharkov Seminary,	Priest
12. N.Moiseyev (172)	No		Kharkov Seminary; Kharkov Univ.	
13. P.A.Titov (172)	No		Kharkov Seminary,	Deacon
14. I.A.Titov (172)	No		Kharkov Seminary,	Deacon
15. I.Greko (v ?) (172)	No	Kharkov (S)	Kharkov Seminary.	Priest.
16. I.Inokov (172)	No		Kharkov Seminary.	
17. M.Fedorovsky (172)	No	Kharkov (S)	Kharkov Seminary; Kharkov Univ.	Dvor ? Landowner
18. Yu.N.Govorukha- Otrok (173)	No ?	Kursk (N)	Kharkov Gymn.; Kharkov Univ.	Dvor.
19. N.Krutikov (173)	No		Kharkov Univ.	
20. N.M.Barkov (173)	Yes (176)	Kursk (N)	Kharkov Univ.	Dvor.

KRUZHOK: KOVALIK

TABLE: 7.iii.

MEMBER'S NAME	ACTIVITY AMONGST PEASANTS.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
21. Kulashko (173)	Yes (176)		Kharkov Univ. ?	
22. A.S.Yemel'yanov (173)	Yes	Don Region (S)	Novocherkassk Seminary; Kharkov Vet. Inst.	Priest
23. M.Lishafayev (173)	No	Voronezh (N)	Kharkov Vet. Inst.	
24. V.A.Danilov (173)	Yes	Kharkov (S)	Moscow Petrov Agric. Acad.; St.Pb.; Zurich	Dvor.
25. K.A.Kats (173)	Yes (176)	Yekaterinos- lav (S)	Kharkov Univ.	Kupets.
26. P.D.Arsen'yev (173)	No		Kharkov Univ.	
27. A.M.Kalyuzhnyy (174)	Yes (176)	Poltava (S)	Poltava Gymn.; Kharkov Univ.	Dvor.
28. K.Sindeyev (174)	Yes (176)	Kharkov (S)	Kharkov Vet. Inst.	Dvor.
29. G.P.Dyukov (174)	No		Kharkov Seminary; Kharkov Univ.	Deacon.
30. G.Lebedev (Dolinsky) (175)	Yes		Kharkov Univ. or Vet. Inst.	

KRUZHOK: KOVALIK

TABLE: 7.iv.

MEMBER'S NAME	ACTIVITY AMONGST PEASANTS.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
31. A.L.Grodetsky (175)	No		Kharkov Univ.	Dvor.
32. P.D.Maksimov (175)	Yes	Kursk (N)	Poltava Gymn.; St.Pb. Med.- Surg. Acad.	Dvor.

	10 from 31 were active = 32.3%	9 from 15 were Southern = 60%	20 or 21 from 31 had h.e. = 64.5 or 67.7%; 2 from 31 had some educ. o/s. S. = 6.5%	8 from 23 were children of dvor. = 34.8%

KRUZHOK: A.V.ANDREYEVA

TABLE: 8.i.

MEMBER'S NAME	ACTIVITY AMONGST PEASANTS.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
1. A.V.Andreyeva (177)	Yes Kursk,Kharkov	Moscow (N)	Moscow	Dvor Provincial Secretary.
2. S.I.Korabel'- nikov (177)	No Prop.Railway workers.		Kharkov Technical Railway School.	Dvor.
3. F.O.Yurkevich (177)	No	Kiev (S)	Kharkov Technical Railway School.	Kupets.
4. A.Dzyubin (177)		Kharkov (S)	Kharkov Technical Railway School.	
5. S.I.Skvortsov (177)	No Prop. Workers on Kursk- Kharkov-Azov Railway.		Kharkov Technical Railway School.
	1 from 4 was active = 25%	2 from 3 were Southern = 66.7%	None had h.e. = 0%; 1 from 5 had some educ. o/s. 3 = 20%	2 from 3 were the children of dvor. = 66.7%

KRUZHOK: ROSTOV-KHARKOV

TABLE: 9.i.

MEMBER'S NAME	ACTIVITY AMONGST PEASANTS.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
1. C.V.Aptekman (178)	Yes Pskov, Penza	Yekaterin- oslav (S)	Elementary Jewish School; Yekaterinos- lav Gymn.; Kharkov Univ.; St.Pb. Med.- Surg. Acad.	Meshch
2. Yu.M.Tishchenko (Titych) (178)	Yes Tambov	Tauride (S)	Simferopol' Gymn.; Kerch Gymn.; Mining Inst. in St.Pb.	Dvor.
3. N.P.Moshchenko (Khokhol) (178)	Yes Don, Saratov	Kharkov (S)	Kharkov Seminary; Kharkov Vet. Inst.	Priest.
4. M.R.Popov (178)	Yes (182)		Yekaterin- oslav Seminary; St.Pb. Med.- Surg.Acad. (174)	Priest. (182)
5. L.N.Gartman (179)	Yes Crimea, Kuban, Saratov.	Arkhangel (N)	Arkhangel Gymn.	Meshch.
6. A.S.Yemel'yanov (A.P.Bogolyubov) (179)	Yes Don, Voronezh	Don (S)	Novocherkassk Seminary; Kharkov Seminary; Kharkov Vet. Inst.	Priest.
7. F.I.Mozgovoy (179)	Yes Don, Voronezh	Don (S)	Novocherkassk Gymn.; Kharkov Vet. Inst.	Dvor.
8. N.P.Bykovtsev (179)	Yes Don		Kharkov Vet. Inst.	Priest.

KRUZHOK: ROSTOV-KHARKOV

TABLE: 9.i. cont'd...

MEMBER'S NAME	ACTIVITY AMONGST PEASANTS.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
9. A.I.Barannikov (180)	Yes ? Nizhgorod, Voronezh (181)	Kursk (N)	Orel Gymn.; Military School in St.Pb.	Dvor.
10. A.A.Khotinsky (180)	Yes Simbirsk, Saratov 	Tauride (S) 	Simferopol' Gymn.; St.Pb.Med.- Surg.Acad. 	Kupets.
	9 or 10 from 10 were active = 90% - 100%	6 from 8 were Southern = 75%	8 from 10 had h.e. = 80%; 6 from 10 had some educ. o/s. S. = 60%	3 from 10 were children of dvor. = 30%

5. Summary.

This Chapter substantiates that part of the 'traditional' view of the revolutionary movement which maintains that there was a lack of Southern enthusiasm for propaganda amongst the peasantry. Activity amongst the peasants in the South was indeed short lived, although it did not stop abruptly any more than it had started abruptly. In a typical Southern kruzhek of the period 1873/4 - 1876, 47.7% of the members would have been involved in agitation amongst the peasants. However this statistic does not mean that the other members were inactive, rather it indicates that half of the participants in revolutionary kruzheks at this time preferred other forms of activity: the transport of literature, agitation amongst the urban workers, or indeed amongst their fellow students. It is true that there are few instances of open refusal to undertake rural agitation, but then such articulation was seldom necessary since in many cases there was not anyone urging members so to do.

Part of the explanation for a disinclination to this type of revolutionary activity may lie in the practical problems which faced those considering such a project in the South. The obshchina was widely believed not to exist in the South. The presence of peasant religious sectarianism should have gone some way towards compensating for this deficiency, but clearly it did not do so entirely. Approaching the peasants through their religious convictions necessitated a willingness on the part of the revolutionary to take these convictions seriously which some perhaps could not do. Another practical difficulty arose because of the Little Russian language, which rendered much of the narod publications useless.

However, these practical points do not explain the considerable differences in support for agitation amongst the peasants shown by specific groups, which in this period could vary from 16 - 100% of the membership. The kruzheks which were most devoted to rural agitation at that time of the v narod movement of 1874, were the Kiev Commune and the Zhebunev kruzhek: 56.3% of the Commune, and 30% of the Zhebunev kruzhek participated in this movement. Both were dominated by the children of dvoryane (67.6% and 90% respectively), and most of their members had enjoyed higher education (66.7%, 100%). In both cases the

majority of the members had received part of their education in the North or abroad (59.3%, 100%).

The contemporaneous kruzhek led by S.F.Kovalik contributed only one third of its membership to the villages, although many of its members had higher education (67.7%). However, unlike the two kruzheks discussed above, very few of the Kovalik kruzhek's members had had any education outside of the South (only 6.5%), perhaps because a minority (34.8%) were the children of dvoryane. In some respects, the Andreyeva kruzhek manifest a similar profile: only 25% of the membership went amongst the peasants and only 20% had had any education outside the South, although the majority of identified members were the children of dvoryane.

A comparison between the Commune and the Zhebunev kruzhek on the one hand, and the Kovalik and Andreyeva kruzheks on the other hand, may be important. The latter pair of kruzheks was organised and financed by Northern sources but achieved little; the former pair was indigenous, although having close contacts with the North, but it contributed greatly to agitation amongst the peasants. It would appear therefore that the crucial factor may have been the extent to which Southern revolutionaries had been to the North or abroad and personally experienced the ideas current there and then subsequently returned to the South where they endeavoured to implement them. As a centre of ideas, the North was successful but as an organisational centre it was a failure. It may also be that it tended to be the children of dvoryane who had the opportunity of making this pilgrimage to the North or abroad, there to immerse themselves in the progressive ideas, although as was the case with the Andreyeva kruzhek the children of dvoryane did not or could not always take this opportunity.

This tentative correlation of parental status, personal experience of the North and subsequent activity amongst the peasants would have to be qualified in the case of the Kiev Chaykovtsy. Here, despite the fact that 63.6% of the identified members had followed some part of their education at the prestigious centres in the North and abroad, only 25% were children of dvoryane and only 16.8% subsequently became involved in agitation amongst the peasants. The fact that more than half the kruzhek was Jewish may be the significant point here, since many Jews were reluctant to go into what they considered was for them an extremely hostile rural environment. Equally, being Jewish rather

than the children of dvoryane, the members were very much less likely to have access to the estates of relatives or friends, which was how many of the rural agitators did begin their work.

The presence of a majority of Jewish members was not the only factor which could negate the correlation suggested above. From the Odessan Chaykovtsy, 64.3% had had some of their education in the North or abroad and a sizeable minority (45.5%) were the children of dvoryane, but only 30.8% subsequently went amongst the peasants. However, the kruzhek had made a decision to be 'initiators' of other kruzheks which would be involved in rural agitation. Also, the lack of access to the estates of family and friends for slightly more than half the membership may be a consideration, but this should not be exaggerated. Only 30% of the 'Zemlya i Volya' Kharkov-Rostov kruzhek were children of dvoryane, but probably all the members went amongst the peasants albeit outside the confines of the South and on the settlements organised by the 'Zemlya i Volya' party. However the other element of the correlation is sustained by this kruzhek, since the high percentage of activists which it provided is matched by the fact that 60% of the kruzhek had pursued part of their education outside the South.

Clearly then, a consideration of parental status and place of education is not an unerring guide to the subsequent degree of activity amongst the peasants by any particular kruzhek. Other factors enter into the equation. These include the effects of the scale of finances of any kruzhek, the supply of literature and leadership, as well as the influences exerted on the revolutionaries by liberals and Ukrainophiles which will be considered in later Chapters.

After the 'v narod' movement of 1874, the Bashentsev and Buntar kruzheks arose. Neither contributed significantly to rural agitation regardless of what their members had done previously. Neither had close relations with the North and neither had a high percentage of members who had had part of their education outside the South (Bashentsev - 36.4%; Buntars - 35%). However while the presence of the offspring of dvoryane was correspondingly low in the Bashentsev (32%), it was high in the Buntars (60%). For them both, as was discussed in Chapter II, the lack of money was a serious constraint on any activity, especially by the latter, for most of their existence.

In considering the general characteristics of the revolutionary kruzhoks which were active at this time, 1873/4 to 1876, the analysis of the membership of the kruzhoks confirms their status as intellectuals - insofar as 68.4% of the members of an average kruzhok had received higher education - if not as intelligentsia. The possibility of a relationship between parental status and attendance at educational establishments abroad or in the North is also suggested by the figures for the characteristics of an average kruzhok: 50% of the members of an average kruzhok were the children of dvoryane, while 49.6% of the members would have had some education outside the South.

6. References.

- (1) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.30, p.126,127. I.G.Budak 'Obshchestvenno-politicheskoye dvizheniye v Bessarabii v poreformenny period' p.254, states that in that province there was no real evidence of any 'v narod' activity in 1874 and little subsequently.
- (2) V.Debagory-Mokriyevich 'Iz vospominaniy Russkogo Sotsialista (ot kontsa 1877g do vesny 1879g) in Vestnik Narodnoy Voli no.3, 1884, p.92,93.
- (3) M.Frolenko quoted in A.Ulam 'In the Name of the People' p.247; see also M.F.Frolenko 'Lipetskiy i Voronezhskiy s"ezdy' in Byloye Jan.1907, no.1/13,p.80, where he refers to the south having abandoned settlements amongst the peasants by 1876.
- (4) N.Vitashevsky 'Pervoye voruzhennoye soprotivleniye - pervyy voyenny sud' in Byloye 1906, no.2, p.221. Alternatively, P.Ivanovskaya, returning to Odessa in September/October 1876, observed that "Many of the southern populists had already begun to lose faith in the efficacy of socialist propaganda amongst the peasantry..." Quoted in B.A.Engel and C.N.Rosenthal (eds.) 'Five Sisters: Women Against the Tsar' p.112.
- (5) For information on the Chigrin Affair, see D.Field 'Rebels in the Name of the Tsar'.
- (6) P.Shchegolev 'Aleksey Medvedev' in KiS 1930, k.10, pp.86-87, 89-90, 92-93.
- (7) B.Sapir(ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, doc.67, pp.231-232.
- (8) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.23, p.82.
- (9) 'Nashi zadachi v sele' in Obshchina no.8-9, 1878, p.33.
- (10) L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom II, p.311, says of the Kiev Buntars, with whom he was associated, that the two years of their existence (1876-77) passed "almost completely without activity ..", see also p.248.
- (11) P.Shchegolev 'Aleksey Medvedev' in KiS 1930, k.10, p.86,93,92.
- (12) S.Ye.Lion 'Ot propagandy k terroru (Iz odesskikh vospominaniy semidesyatnika)' KiS 1924,k.12, p.15.
- (13) A.Shekhter 'Revolyutsionnaya Odessa 1877-78gg (k kharakteristike Iiona i Fomicheva)' in KiS 1923, k.6, p.45.

- (14) 'Literatura' p.872,873. Other articles defining 'Narodnaya Volya's' official position on the peasantry are to be found in Narodnaya Volya No.10. September 1884.
- (15) S.L.Kvenchik 'Iz istorii narodovol'cheskoy propagandy sredi krest'yanstva posle 1 marta 1881 g' in V.F.Zakharina(ed.) 'Obshchestvennoye Dvizheniye v poreformennoy Rossii' p.108.
- (16) V.V.Shirokova 'Vozniknoveniye Narodovol'cheskoy Organizatsii v Khar'kove' in 'Iz istorii obshchestvennogo dvizheniya i obshchestvennoy mysli v Rossii' (1964) p.79, relates that A.Sytsyanko of this kruzhok conducted propaganda amongst peasants in the summer of 1879.
- (17) Ibid., p.82.
- (18) V.Levitsky (V.Tsederbaum) 'Partiya 'Narodnoy Voli'. Vozniknoveniye, Bor'ba, Gibel'. p.117 and note.
- (19) V.Figner 'Mikhail Nikolayevich Trigoni' in Golos Minuvshago 1917, no.7/8, p.203. The nearest the Odessan 'Narodnaya Volya' appear to have come to agitating amongst the peasants was when it sent "members away to start propaganda in the suburbs of Odessa in a carpenter's artel which visited the villages." See V.A. Tvardovskaya 'Organizatsionnyye osnovy 'Narodnoy Voli'' in 'Istoricheskiye Zapiski' 1960, tom 67, p.125.
- (20) The programme of the kruzhok led by Ye.Koval'skaya in Khar'kov, for example, had agreed that its members must primarily be occupied with workers and then with activity in the villages. See V.V.Shirokova in 'Iz istorii obshchestvennogo dvizheniya i obshchestvennoy mysli v Rossii' (1964) p.73.
- (21) For example, the Vittenberg kruzhok in Nikolayev which was mainly involved in sending propagandists to neighbouring villages and in direct agitation amongst zavod workers and sailors. See A. Semenov 'Solomon Vittenberg. (Materialy k biografii)' in Byloye 1925, no.34(6), pp.63-64.
- (22) The cases encountered after 1877 of activity amongst the peasants are usually of individual propagandists, D.T.Butsynsky however recorded that at the start of 1878 twelve people left Khar'kov for the Volga and the Don. See, S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.30, p.132.

- (23) V.Bogucharsky 'Aktivnoye Narodnichestvo Semidesyatykh Godov' pp.257-258.
- (24) In the Kiev Commune, for example, the three Kaminer sisters and the two Levental' brothers sought work in workshops around Kiev so as to toughen themselves and gain skills. None subsequently spread propaganda amongst peasants in the villages. See E.Breshko-Breshkovskaya 'Hidden Springs of the Russian Revolution' p.28. To facilitate the acquisition of farming skills the revolutionaries tried on a number of occasions to acquire farms, see for example, S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, doc.40, p.271, and note 138.
- (25) Lead article in Zemlya i Volya No.5, 8th Feb.1879, in B.Bazilevsky (ed.) 'Revolyutsionnaya Zhurnalistika semidesyatykh godov' p.236. O.V.Aptekman 'Obshchestvo 'Zemlya i Volya' 70-kh' p.138, writes that "many went not with revolutionary aims: they went to find out about the narod, to test their strength, to teach themselves to work etc..". See also V.Debagory-Mokriyevich 'Vospominaniya' p.10; A.Tun 'Istoriya Revolyutsionnykh Dvizheniy v Rossii' p.137, 140. Sh.M.Levin 'Obshchestvennoye Dvizheniye v Rossii v 60-70ye gody XIX veka' p.365 refers to revolutionaries going amongst the narod "for reconnaissance", one of whom was Ye.Zaslavsky (*ibid.*, p.435). Breshko-Breshkovskaya wrote that she had no need to go among the peasants to study their way of living since she knew about it having already been involved with the educational activities of a zemstvo, see E.Breshko-Breshkovskaya 'Hidden Springs of the Russian Revolution' p.21.
- (26) (R.A.Steblin-Famensky) 'Grigoriy Anfomovich Popko' in 'Materialy' Oct.1893, tom.16, p.175. Gostintsev of 'Zemlya i Volya' owned a khutor in the Don which was used as a refuge, see M.Popov 'Iz moyego revolyutsionnago proshlago' in 'Byloye' 1907, no.5, p.295.
- (27) For example, E.Breshko-Breshkovskaya 'Hidden Springs of the Russian Revolution' pp.31-34.
- (28) On the controversy over 'flying' versus 'settled' propaganda amongst Southern kruzhoks, see for example, the 1874 discussion in Kharkov between Korabel'nikov, A.V.Andreyeva and A.Z.Dzyubin in S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, doc.63, p.327,333. On the question of the desirability of attaining 'a position' from which to influence the peasants, Aksel'rod and Zhelyabov disagreed; see

- P.B.Aksel'rod 'Perezhitoye i Peredumannoye' pp.103-104.
- (29) L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom I, p.111.
- (30) Ibid., p.161,163.
- (31) E.Breshko-Breshkovskaya 'Hidden Springs of the Russian Revolution' p.38.
- (32) V.Figner 'Zapechatlenny Trud' tomI, p.149.
- (33) L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom I, p.278.
- (34) Ibid., tom I, pp.283-284.
- (35) F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.578. S.F.Kovalik 'Revolyutsionnoye Dvizheniye Semidesyatykh godov i protsess 193-kh' p.90.
- (36) B.Bazilevsky(ed.) 'Gos Prestup' tom III, p.98,99.
- (37) S.F.Kovalik 'Revolyutsionnoye Dvizheniye Semidesyatykh godov i protsess 193-kh' p.140.
- (38) B.Bazilevsky(ed.) 'Gos prestup' tom III, p.93.
- (39) F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.598. At the same time - the end of 1874 - T.A.Kvyatkovsky, a member of Zhebunev's kruzhok in Odessa, became involved in propaganda amongst the rationalist sects. See, 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.2, col.560.
- (40) N.K.Bukh 'Vospominaniya' p.108.
- (41) M.F.Frolenko 'Sobraniye Sochineniy' tom I, p.119,pp.120-23; also M.F.Frolenko 'Obshchestvo Narodnogo Osvobozhdeniya' in KiS 1932, k.3, pp.80-89.
- (42) M.F.Frolenko 'I.M.Koval'sky. Zametka po povodu stat'i S.Ye.Liona' in KiS 1924, k.12, p.25.
- (43) M.F.Frolenko 'Sobraniye Sochineniy' tom I, p.125.
- (44) A.Shekhter 'Revolyutsionnaya Odessa 1877-78 gg' in KiS 1923, k.6, p.49; S.Ye.Lion 'Ot propagandy k terroru' in KiS 1924, k.12, p.19. On I.F.Voloshenko's discussions with Odessan Shtundists, see O.V.Aptekman 'Obshchestvo 'Zemlya i Volya' 70 kh' p.305.
- (45) A.M.Pankratova (ed.) 'Rabocheye dvizheniye' tom II, ch.2, doc.263, p.502.
- (46) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Arkhiv 'Zemlya i Volya' i 'Narodnaya Volya'' p.56.
- (47) Zemlya i Volya No. 5, 8th February 1879, in B.Bazilevsky(ed.) 'Revolyutsionnaya Zhurnalistska semidesyatykh godov' p.240.
- (48) V.Levitsky (V.Tsederbaum) 'Partiya 'Narodnaya Volya'. Vozniknoveniye, Bor'ba, Gibel'' p.177.
- (49) See for example, article on protesting groups in Zemlya i Volya No. 5, 8th February 1879, in B.Bazilevsky(ed.) 'Revolyutsionnaya

Zhurnalistika semidesyatykh godov' pp.240-244. Koval'sky wrote a work called 'Ratsionalizm na yuge Rossi' and sent it to Nabat who did not publish it. Ye.Kusheva 'Iz Istorii 'Obshchestva Narodnogo Osvobozhdeniya' in KiS 1931, k.4, p.47. Under the name of Yemel'yanov, he wrote articles about the sects in Otechestvennye Zapiski 1878, nos.iii and v, see L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom II, p.185, and F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.810 note.

- (50) S.Valk 'Iz narodovol'cheskikh avtobiograficheskikh dokumentov' in 'Krasnyy Arkhiv' 1927, tom 20, p.229.
- (51) L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom I, p.96,102.
- (52) A.M.Pankratova(ed.) 'Rabocheye dvizheniye' tom II, ch.2, doc.263, p.498.
- (53) P.L.Lavrov 'Vzglyad na proshedsheye i nastoyashchey Russkogo sotsializma' in 'Kalendar' 'Narodnoy Voli' na 1883g.', reprinted in B.Sapir(ed.) 'Lavrov' tom II, doc.222, pp.513-514. A. Tun 'Istoriya revolyutsionnykh dvizheniy v Rossii' p.157, points out the inappropriateness of the talk about obshchinas for "cossacks, Little Russians and White Russians where the homestead ownership of land predominates..." I.G.Budak 'Obshchestvenno-politicheskoye dvizheniye v Bessarabii v poreformenny period' p.402, writes that the Bessarabian revolutionaries found the idea of a transition to socialism through the peasant obshchina to be meaningless because the obshchina was not the normal form of landholding there.
- (54) S.M.Valk(ed.) 'Arkhiv 'Zemlya i Volya' i 'Narodnoy Voli' pp.53-54, for the first programme; p.58, for the second programme.
- (55) Zemlya i Volya No.3, 15th January 1879, in B.Bazilevsky(ed.) 'Revolyutsionnaya Zhurnalistika semidesyatykh godov' p.154.
- (56) 'Programma Rabochikh Chlenov Partii 'Narodnoy Voli' in 'Literatura' pp.878-886.
- (57) A.P.Pribyleva-Korba and V.N.Figner 'Narodovolets Aleksandr Dmitriyevich Mikhaylov' p.108. S.M.Kravchinsky also said that the commune did not exist amongst the 'Ruthenians' by which he meant 'Southern Russians', see Stepniak 'The Russian Peasantry. Their Agrarian Conditions, Social Life and Religion.' vol.I, pp.8, 126-127 & vol.II, p.553.

- (58) F.L.Lavrov 'Sotsialisticheskoye dvizheniye v Rossii' in KiS 1925, no.14, p.52.
- (59) 'Nashi zadachi v sele' in Obshchina 1878, no.8/9, p.35. S.A.Podolinsky considered the obshchina to have been distorted in the South, see B.Sapir(ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, doc.209, p.454. The position of the obshchina in the South had been highlighted in Lev Kotelyansky's article 'Ocherki podvornoy Rossii' in Otechestvennyye Zapiski in September 1878, see R.Wortman 'The Crisis of Russian Populism' pp.29-30.
- (60) L.Tikhomirov 'Russia. Political and Social' vol.1, p.157,191.
- (61) Ye.Breshko-Breshkovskaya 'Vospominaniya Propagandistki' in 'Bylove' May 1903, no.4, p.31.
- (62) L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom II, p.258.
- (63) E.Breshko-Breshkovskaya 'Hidden Springs of the Russian Revolution' p.29.
- (64) B.Sapir(ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, doc.206, p.442.
- (65) F.L.Lavrov 'Narodniki-Propagandisty 1873-78 godov', p.220. A. Tun 'Istoriya Revolyutsionnykh dvizheniy v Rossii' p.158 writes that much of the propaganda was inappropriate; it did not use the Little Russian folk heroes, and was often not in Ukrainian.
- (66) 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.3, col.1305.
- (67) (Z.K.Ralli-Arbore) 'N.F.Zubko-Kodreanu' p.12, shows the absence of narod literature in the appropriate language for peasants in Bessarabia.
- (68) S.F.Kovalik 'Revolyutsionnoye Dvizheniye Semidesyatykh godov i protsess 193-kh' p.133, emphasis added.
- (69) B.S.Itenberg 'Nachalo massovogo khozhdeniya v narod' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1961, tom 69, p.171.
- (70) B.Bazilevsky(ed.) 'Gos Prestup' tom III, p.54.
- (71) N.A.Charushin 'O Dalekom Proshlom' p.201.
- (72) S.F.Kovalik 'Revolyutsionnoye Dvizheniye Semidesyatykh godov i protsess 193-kh' p.66,79,80.
- (73) R.V.Filippov 'Iz istorii narodnicheskogo dvizheniya na pervom etape 'khozhdeniya v narod' (1863-1874)' p.285.
- (74) N.A.Troitsky 'Bol'shoye Obshchestvo Propagandy 1871-1874' p.24.
- (75) For a description of their preparatory work, see E.Breshko-Breshkovskaya 'Hidden Springs of the Russian Revolution' p.26.

- (76) R.V.Filippov 'Iz istorii narodnicheskogo dvizheniya na pervom etape 'khozheniya v narod' (1863-1874)' p.237.
- (77) N.A.Troitsky 'Bol'shoye Obshchestvo Propagandy 1871-1874' p.39. N.A.Charushin 'O Dalekom Proshlom' pp.155-156, indicated that Emme and Rashevsky devoted a lot of their time to studying for their university examinations.
- (78) B.Bazilevsky(ed.) 'Gos Prestup' tom III, p.95.
- (79) On Emme and Rashevsky's contact with St.Petersburg, see P.B. Aksel'rod 'Perezhitoye i Feredumannoye' p.100. The Levental's may also have been in contact with the capital, see N.A.Charushin 'O Dalekom Proshlom' p.355, note.
- (80) L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom I, p.270.
- (81) Ibid., tom II, p.49,52.
- (82) M.Frolenko 'Sobraniye Sochineniy' p.130.
- (83) F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.570.
- (84) See N.K.Bukh 'Vospominaniya' p.106, and O.V.Aptekman 'Iz istorii revolyutsionnogo narodnichestva obshchesta 'Zemlya i Volya'' p.122. Later, in August 1879, M.R.Popov, Stefanovich and Deych considered rousing the Chigrin peasants again, but decided that it would be futile, see 'Iz avtobiografii M.R.Popov' in Byloye 1925, no.29(1), p.74.
- (85) L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom II, p.56; F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.581. S.A.Fodolinsky had informed F.I.Lavrov that the Buntars were charlatans because they were doing nothing but not admitting it; see B.Sapir(ed.) 'Lavrov' tom I, doc.307, p.502.
- (86) M.Frolenko 'Lipetskiy i Voronezhskiy s"ezdy' in Byloye Jan.1907, no.1/13, pp.80-81 note; L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom II, p.67 relates that the Buntars had "as little contact with the peasants as possible..."; F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.580.
- (87) L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom II, p.70; they only lasted from May 1876 to spring 1877.
- (88) Ibid., p.248.
- (89) Debagory-Mokriyevich said that kruzhek broke up because of lack of money and loss of faith - see L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom II, p.312 - Deych criticises this view claiming the reason was to facilitate the Chigrin Affair - ibid., p.310.
- (90) P.Shegolev 'Aleksey Medvedev' in KIS 1930, k.10, p.97.

- (91) P.Vladychenko 'Pamyati Uchitelya i Pogibshikh družey' in KiS 1923, k.5, p.36.
- (92) A.Pribylev 'In.Fed.Voloshenko' in KiS 1930, k.3, p.138.
- (93) M.F.Frolenko 'Sobraniye Sochineniy' tom II, p.12; M.F.Frolenko 'Lipetskiy i Voronezhskiy s"ezdy' in Byloye Jan.1907, no.1/13, p.69.
- (94) N.Vitashevsky 'Pervoye vooruzhennoye soprotivleniye - pervyy voyenny sud' in Byloye 1906, no.2, p.222; M.F.Frolenko 'Sobraniye Sochineniy' p.126.
- (95) P.B.Aksel'rod 'Perezhitoye i Peredumannoye' p.117.
- (96) 'N.I.Kibal'chich i Imp. Aleksandr III, 2 April 1881' in Byloye 1917, no.3, p.33.
- (97) 'Grigoriy Anfomovich Popko' in 'Materialy' tom 16, Oct.1893, p.167.
- (98) Z.V.Pereshina 'Ocherki Istorii Revolyutsionnogo Dvizheniya na Yuge Ukrainy' pp.95-96. For evidence of a general hostility towards the Buntars in Yharkov, in 1876, see S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.30, p.126.
- (99) R.V.Filippov 'Iz istorii narodnicheskogo dvizheniya na pervom etape 'khozhdeniya v narod' (1863-1874)' p.279, writes: "In the spring of 1874 relations between Odessa 'Chaykovtsy' and members of the Zhebunev kruzhok actually became one of very close mutual collaboration." 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.1-4, identifies almost all the Zhebunev members as also members of the Volkhovsky kruzhok.
- (100) J.F.Meijer 'Knowledge and Revolution: the Russian Colony in Zurich 1870-1873' pp.72-74.
- (101) 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.2, col.412,589.
- (102) P.L.Lavrov 'Narodniki-Propagandisty 1873-78 godov' p.215. Perhaps it is in light of this decision, rather than any possible personal inclination, that should be seen the fact that A.Zhelyabov, on joining the kruzhok, was involved in "socialist propaganda at first amongst the intelligentsia and then primarily amongst the workers of the Odessa zavods." see, 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom III, v.2, col.1405-1406.
- (103) S.F.Kovalik 'Revolyutsionnoye Dvizheniye Semidesyatykh godov i protsess 193-kh' p.83.

- (104) 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.1, col.353.
- (105) These soon left the movement, see P.Shchegolev 'Aleksey Medvedev' in FiS 1930, k.10, pp.85-86.
- (106) These soon left the movement, see A.Pribylev 'In.Fed.Voloshenko' in KiS 1930, k.3, p.138. According to P.Shchegolev (KiS 1930, k.10, p.101), I.I.Dobrovol'sky, P.T.Flimovich and Khandozhevsky left the movement on hearing of I.M.Koval'sky's armed resistance in January 1876. Dobrovol'sky was out of jail on bail at the time - January till May 1876 - see 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.2, col.358.
- (107) P.Shchegolev 'Aleksey Medvedev' in KiS 1930, k.10, pp.85-86,88,92. According to this source, Titorenko, P.T.Klimovich, N.A.Beverley, von Ru and Khandozhevsky, did not join until spring 1877, that is, shortly before the Bashentsev broke up.
- (108) A.Shekhter 'Revolyutsionnaya Odessa 1877-78 gg' in KiS 1923, k.6, p.45.
- (109) G.Popko, for example, organised the transport of books from abroad through Kishinev in 1875/6, see 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.3, col.1230.
- (110) A.Shekhter 'Revolyutsionnaya Odessa 1877-78 gg' in KiS 1923, k.6, p.44.
- (111) 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.4, col.1473.
- (112) B.S.Itenberg 'Dvizheniye Revolyutsionnogo Narodnichestva' p.331.
- (113) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, doc.64, p.336; see also S.F.Kovalik 'Revolyutsionnoye Dvizheniye Semidesyatykh godov i protsess 193-kh' p.57.
- (114) S.F.Kovalik op.cit., p.87 note. B.S.Itenberg 'Dvizheniye Revolyutsionnogo Narodnichestva' p.331, follows Kovalik rather than Koval'skaya in talking about the tranquility of Kharkov before the arrival of the former.
- (115) S.F.Kovalik op.cit., p.89,90,88.
- (116) B.Bazilevsky(ed.) 'Gos Prestup' tom III, p.94.
- (117) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, doc.63, p.329.
- (118) B.S.Itenberg 'Dvizheniye Revolyutsionnogo Narodnichestva' p.336.
- (119) 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.3, col.1130-1132.
- (120) Ibid., tom II, v.2, col.473-475.
- (121) Ibid., tom II, v.3, col.1130-1131.

(122) O.V.Aptekman 'Iz istorii revolyutsionnago narodnichestva 'Zemlya i Volya' 70-kh godov' p.84, says that the kruzhok did propaganda work "far and wide on the Novorossia border, the Don Military Region, Kuban and part of the Urals." L.Gartman ('Iz vospominaniy I'va Gartmana' in Byloye Feb.1903, no.3, pp.182-183.) provides the following information on areas of propaganda in early spring 1877: Yemel'yanov and Tishchenko in the Caucasus; Mozgovoy to the Volga; Moshchenko and Bykov-tsev to the estate of a liberal landowner in the Kuban.

(123) See P.S.Tkachenko 'Revolyutsionnaya Narodnicheskaya Organizatsiya 'Zemlya i Volya' (1876-1879gg)' p.78:

<u>dvoryane</u>	34%	<u>dukhovenstvo</u>	1%
<u>meshchane</u>	12%	workers	6.5%
peasants	2.2%	<u>kupets</u>	4.5%
officer rank	5.6%		

(124) O.V.Aptekman 'Iz istorii revolyutsionnago narodnichestva 'Zemlya i Volya' 70-kh godov' pp.202-203.

Likewise, the majority of members of I.F.Fesenko's kruzhok "absolutely refused any underground, anti-government activity.", after the kruzhok had abandoned propaganda activity amongst the peasant religious sects. (See, L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom II, pp.312-313.) S.Lion also refused to make this transition from rural agitation to political terrorism. He continued to believe that "A constitution does not feed the narod"... "The whole existing regime is worthless, it must be destroyed." He devoted himself to activity amongst the urban workers. (See A.Shekhter 'Revolyutsionnaya Odessa 1877-78gg' in Kis 1923, k.6, pp.44-45.) V.Debagory-Mokriyevich did not become a political terrorist either, remaining a 'narodnik'.

(125) E.Breshko-Breshkovskaya 'Hidden Springs of the Russian Revolution' p.3,25,29,30.

(126) S.W.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, doc.39, p.270; L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom II, p.129.

(127) B.Bazilevsky(ed.) 'Gos Frestup' tom III, p.103.

(128) Vl.Burtsev(ed.) 'Za sto let (1800-1896)' ch.2, p.82.

(129) B.S.Itenberg 'Dvizheniye Revolyutsionnogo Narodnichestva' pp.322-323.

- (130) T.G.Snytko 'Russkoye Narodnichestvo i Pol'skoye obshchestvennoye dvizheniye 1865-1881gg' p.143.
- (131) 'Bio-Biblio Slovar'' tom II, v.1, col.138,139.
- (132) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, doc.40, pp.271-272.
- (133) Speyer, Benetsky and Shramkov gave up the Commune after a short time and after the first and last had done a period of observation of the peasants. B.S.Itenberg 'Dvizheniye Revolyutsionnogo Narodnichestva' pp.322-323. E.Breshko-Breshkovskaya 'Hidden Springs of the Russian Revolution' pp.28-29.
- (134) Conducted propaganda amongst workers in a sugar zavod: S.N. Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, p.468.
- (135) Loc. cit..
- (136) B.S.Itenberg 'Nachalo massovogo 'khozhdeniya v narod'' in 'Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1961, tom 69, pp.171-172.
- (137) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, p.469.
- (138) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, doc.66, pp.341-343.
- (139) Sudzilovsky went 'v narod' for a short period in Anan'yev uyezd of Kherson province; see I.I.Popov 'Nikolay Konstantinovich Russel'-Sudzilovsky' in KiS 1930, k.6, p.177.
- (140) B.S.Itenberg 'Nachalo massovogo 'khozhdeniya v narod'' in 'Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1961, tom 69, p.172, note 168.
- (141) The membership used here is that provided in N.A.Troitsky 'Bol'shoye Obshchestvo Propagandy 1871-1874' p.24.
- (142) 'Bio-Biblio Slovar'' tom IV, v.1, col.44-46. A.Ascher 'Favel Aksel'rod and the Development of Menshevism' especially pp.20-21.
- (143) 'Sovetskaya Istoricheskaya Entsiklopediya' tom 7. N.N.Kolod'kevich appears not to have done any propaganda work until 1875 when he spread propaganda amongst workers in Kiev; see M.Frolenko 'Dopolnitel'nyya svedeniya o protsess 20-ti' in Byloye 1906, no.6, p.297.
- (144) L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom I, p.237,253,254,280,282,283,285,289, 294,295,286. See also F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' pp.570-571.
- (145) N.K.Bukh 'Vospominaniya' p.123.
- (146) 'Svod'' in Byloye 1907, no.7, p.146; 'Bio-Biblio Slovar'' tom II, v.3, col.1363.
- (147) T.G.Snytko 'Russkoye Narodnichestvo i Pol'skoye obshchestvennoye dvizheniye 1865-1881gg' p.177,181.

- (148) L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom I, p.295: although enthusiastic about going 'v narod', he did not, as he manned the information bureau for the revolutionaries.
- (149) 'Sovetskaya Istoricheskaya Entsiklopediya' tom 5.
- (150) Loc.cit.
- (151) Ibid., tom 15.
- (152) B.Bazilevsky(ed.) 'Gos Prestup' tom III, p.125; R.V.Filippov 'Iz istorii narodnicheskogo dvizheniya na pervom etape 'khozhdeniya v narod' (1863-1874)' p.279. K.A.Kats and I. Glushkov also seem to have reasonable claims for inclusion in the Zhebunev kruzhok, see S.Kovalik 'S.A.Zhebunev' in KiS 1924, no.12, p.245; B.Bazilevsky(ed.) op.cit., p.126,127,130.
- (153) N.A.Troitsky 'Bol'shoye Obshchestvo Propagandy 1871-1874gg' p.84.
- (154) V.Prokof'yev 'Zhelyabov' p.354.
- (155) P.L.Lavrov 'Narodniki-Propagandisty 1873-78 godov' p.221; N.A.Charushin 'O Dalekom Proshlom' p.357 note; S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, p.467, describe Langans activities amongst the peasants, first as a rural teacher and then, with Makaveyev and L.A.Dicheskulo, as a cooper.
- (156) (N.Morozov) 'A.A.Franzholi i Ye.F.Zavadskoy' in Vestnik Narodnoy Voli no.1, 1883, pp.203-204; N.Morozov 'Andrey Franzholi' in Byloye 1907, no.3, p.284. He began visiting the villages as a village teacher at the end of 1873, but then returned for some five months dressed as workmen to spread propaganda.
- (157) A.Shekhter 'Revolyutsionnaya Odessa 1877-78gg.(k kharakteristike Liona i Fomicheva)' in KiS 1923, k.6, p.45.
- (158) P.Shchegolev 'Aleksey Medvedev' in KiS 1930, k.10, pp.85-86,88,92.
- (159) A.Pribylev 'In.Fed.Voloshenko' in KiS 1930, k.3, p.138; M.Frolenko 'Obshchestvo Narodnogo Osvobozhdeniya' in KiS 1932, k.3, p.89.
- (160) S.Ye.Lion 'Ot propagandy k terroru. (iz odesskikh vospominaniy semidesyatnika)' in KiS 1924, k.12, p.15, for one month - either June or July 1877 - from which he returned disillusioned and decided to concentrate amongst city workers.
- (161) P.Shchegolev 'Aleksey Medvedev' in KiS 1930, k.10, pp.85-86.
- (162) A.Pribylev 'In.Fed.Voloshenko' in KiS 1930, k.3, p.138; P.Shchegolev op.cit. p.101.
- (163) P.Shchegolev op.cit. p.92.

- (164) Ibid., p.134.
- (165) Ibid., p.88, relates that he did not remain long in the Bashentsev. M.D.Terent'yev and I.I.Teftul had spread propaganda in Kherson at the end of 1875, as village teachers, see S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, p.470.
- (166) D.Footman 'Red Prelude' p.238.
- (167) A.Pribylev 'In.Fed.Voloshenko' in KiS 1930, k.3, p.129.
- (168) 'Sovetskaya Istoricheskaya Entsiklopediya' tom 11.
- (169) B.A.Engel and C.N.Rosenthal(ed.) 'Five Sisters: Women Against the Tsar' p.103, however when she went amongst the peasants she did so only to observe, she did not spread propaganda (ibid., p.109). M.F.Frolenko 'Obshchestvo Narodnogo Osvobozhdeniya' in FiS 1932, k.3, p.89, appears to be implying that she did spread propaganda when he writes that she went 'v narod' with Medvedev and Rossikova.
- (170) G.Kennan 'Siberia and the Exile System' vol.11, p.377, note: claims that Rossikova had been 'v narod' for 7 - 8 months in order to see how the peasants could be reached and helped. She was successful amongst the Shtundists.
- (171) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, doc.64, p.336.
- (172) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, p.427, note 207.
- (173) B.Bazilevsky(ed.) 'Gos Prestup' tom III, p.90.
- (174) B.S.Itenberg 'Dvizheniye Revolyutsionnogo Narodnichestva' p.331.
- (175) 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.1, col.318; v.2, col.746; v.3, col.850.
- (176) B.S.Itenberg 'Dvizheniye Revolyutsionnogo Narodnichestva' p.331,334.
- (177) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, p.469; see also B.S.Itenberg 'Dvizheniye Revolyutsionnogo Narodnichestva' p.335.
- (178) F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.569; O.V.Aptekman 'Obshchestvo Zemlya i Volya' 70-kh' p.187,188 & 199.
- (179) (L.Gartman) 'Iz Vospominaniy L'va Gartmana' in Byloye Feb.1903, no.3, p.130,181,182.
- (180) M.Popov 'Iz moyego revolyutsionnago proshlago' (ocherk pervyy) in Byloye 1907, no.5, p.274,276.
- (181) Ibid., p.285. Popov tells how Barannikov left Pavlovsky military College and came South; he suggests that Barannikov was unprepared for activity amongst the peasants. Barannikov dressed

as a manual worker and studied the peasants, but did not try to spread propaganda - see, B.S.Itenberg 'Dvizheniye Revolyutsionnogo Narodnichestva' p.343.

(182) 'Sovetskaya Istoricheskaya Entsiklopediya' tom 11.

CHAPTER IV. SOUTHERN REVOLUTIONARIES AND POLITICAL TERRORISM,
1877 - 1883.

1. Introduction.

The period from 1877 to 1883 is usually characterised as being the time when the South turned to political terrorism, because of factors which were extrinsic to the revolutionary movement itself; the lack of response amongst the peasantry and police persecution, in particular. That this change of course took place first of all in the South is accounted for by reference to factors such as the Southern temperament or the climate. Interestingly this was precisely the period when the Southern revolutionaries manifest much greater involvement in revolutionary activity than they had shown during the period which was characterised by agitation amongst the peasants, (see Appendix I). The present Chapter considers this traditional view by trying to establish if the revolutionaries who were first to turn to political terrorism were also those who had been most affected by police persecution and by failure to arouse sympathy amongst the peasants. It also examines the social and educational backgrounds of these people to discern if such a significant alteration in revolutionary activity was underpinned by any change in the composition of the kruzhoks. Finally, the reasons which these revolutionaries of 1877-78, as well as those of 1878-83, gave for resorting to political terrorism are reviewed.

2. Early examples of political terrorism.

'Political terrorism' was the most noticeable activity of the revolutionaries from around 1877; it developed at the start of 1878 with Koval'sky's armed resistance and the attempt by Zasluch to assassinate Trepov, but reached its fullest development with the appearance of the 'Narodnaya Volya' Party. 'Political terrorism' in this context means the direct and personal actions by the revolutionaries against the state. This might seem to be more graphically denoted as 'anti-state activity', but that was what the defendants in the 'Trial of the 193' were charged with, and it was what in a sense they were guilty of. Terrorism, on the other hand, describes the particular violent methods used by the revolutionaries, and it must be described as 'political' since being directed against the government, it differed from factory or agricultural terrorism - both of which were advocated by some groups during the decade under consideration. 'Political terrorism' embraced robberies, resistance to arrest, the freeing of prisoners, the assassination of government servants - provincial governors, police chiefs and agents, as well as attempts on the life of the tsar. Apart from its violent aspect, it also differs from other forms of activity in that it did not involve the revolutionaries in trying to stir up social groups against the government. The Buntars, for example, who attempted to rouse a bunt in Chigrin were hoping to participate with the peasants in a physical struggle against the state but this activity if successful would have resulted not primarily in a change of government but in a social revolution. Political terrorism was not the only form of activity undertaken by the revolutionaries from 1877 to 1883; there was a continuation of, and a rapid increase in, involvement with the urban workers, as well as individual action in propagandising the peasantry. Typically the Southern revolutionary was involved in both political terrorism and propagandising the urban workers, although stressing one side or the other. It is interesting that the first actual, rather than merely planned, case of political terrorism in the South was directed against an informer who had been active amongst urban workers' organisations.(1) Later, attempts were made to involve workers in the organisation of political terrorism, by persuading them to accept and support the programme of 'Narodnaya Volya'.

It is not uncommon to encounter statements that political terrorism originated in the South or at least that it manifested itself in the South before it appeared in the rest of the Empire. Thus, in 1862, Lev Tikhomirov wrote that subversion of the Government was envisaged by southerners much earlier than northerners; "'Terror' was far more the creation of the south than the north." (2) A one time colleague of Tikhomirov also commented: "So the revolutionaries took up arms. The first in this instance appeared in the south, where there was more ardent material and where the wish for a struggle with the government, weapons in hand, appeared strongly ..." (3) However it should be pointed out that political terrorism had always existed as an alternative method of revolutionary activity and, in the South, had had its proponents from the start of the seventies. As A. Tun wrote in the early eighties, three tendencies had existed since the beginning of the '70's, "at first the decentralised peaceful propaganda of socialism predominates, then decentralised revolutionary socialist objectives, finally dominance passes to centralised political terrorism. The germs of the last tendency existed from the very start, but now in the heat of the struggle they attained maturity prematurely." (4)

In the first half of January 1871, for example, an illegal congress of students from all over Russia was held in St. Petersburg. The second largest delegation came from Kiev whose delegates were Armashevsky, Andreyashev, S.A. Podolinsky and Ivan Ya. Chernyshev. During the congress, "The Kievans recommended political agitation..." (5) Frolenko recollected that the idea of waging a campaign against the government itself was to be heard in both Odessa and Kiev at the end of 1871. (6) Subsequently, in 1873 a number of plots were associated with the name of I.I. Khablits and other members of the 'vspyshkopuskateli'. Tradition accords Khablits the credit of having been the first to plan the destruction of the royal family with dynamite, and he claimed to have gone to great lengths in order to discover how to produce and to use the substance. (7) His kruzhok of course transferred to Kiev and there, "In autumn 1874 when persecution of members of the kruzhok began and some of them were arrested, in the Commune a very great agitation developed, and it was decided to counter the measures of the government by measures to frighten, to terrorise ... the government, with arson, prussic acid, nitroglycerine and revolvers. With this aim Stronsky

obtained ... considerable amounts of morphia and chloroform, Larionov found out how to make nitroglycerine, Rogacheva obtained a revolver... and made up her mind to go to Petersburg ... to shoot the chief of gendarmes." These 'plans' of course came to nothing.(8) Simultaneously in Odessa, "In July 1874, members of the kruzhoks of F.Volkhovsky and the brothers Zhebunev repeatedly met in the flat of A.Franzholi and P. Makarevich for discussion of future steps in the field of revolutionary propaganda." At these meetings "in connection with the commencement of arrests of participants, in different places in Russia, the meeting discussed the idea of organising armed opposition to the gendarmes..."(9)

Such adventures were not likely to command universal support. P.Kropotkin in his memoirs recalled: "When a young man came to St. Petersburg from one of the southern provinces with the firm intention of killing Alexander II, and some members of the Chaykovsky circle learned of his plan, they not only applied all the weight of their arguments to dissuade the young man, but when he would not be dissuaded, they informed him that they would keep a watch over him and prevent him by force from making any such attempt."(10)

Thus, when revolutionaries in the South turned to political terrorism after 1877, they were following precedents, and it is noteworthy that when the whole of Koval'sky's kruzhok composed their 'Golos chestnykh lyudey' on the eve of their armed resistance on 30 January 1878, they mention previous would-be assassins, Varakozov and Berezersky and refer to "our unforget^table heroes - Karakozov, Fozlova and others."(11)

3. Examination of members of Southern kruzhoks, with special reference to 1877-1879.

The purpose of examining the membership of the Southern revolutionary kruzhoks, in this section, is to try to discern reasons why they turned to political terrorism. The reasons offered by the revolutionaries themselves - which are discussed in section 5 of this Chapter - were that they were bitter about the persecution of those who had spread propaganda amongst the peasants, or that they were frustrated by the lack of response from the peasants to their message, or that they wished to gain political freedom for the country in order to be able to carry out propaganda at will. If this was the case, one could expect that those revolutionaries who were the very first to turn to political terrorism would have been themselves intimately involved with the 'v narod' movement, and so would have been the first to feel the need to seek revenge on the government, or to sense their rejection by the peasants, or to perceive the necessity of freedom from police persecution. Also, if they were of the intelligentsia and had been active amongst the peasants, there is no reason why they should not be similar in all respects to those other revolutionaries, considered in the last Chapter, who were involved in agitation amongst the peasants in 1873-1876/7.

To examine these hypotheses, it is necessary to study primarily those kruzhoks which were involved in political terrorism in 1877, 1878 and the start of 1879, because their members would have had the opportunity to go amongst the peasants in the preceding years. There would be little point in extending a systematic enquiry into kruzhoks' membership to include the period after 1879 since revolutionaries had a rather short life expectancy as practising revolutionaries, and it was unlikely that a revolutionary who could have been active in the summer of 1874 would still be in a position to be active in 1881. Arrests, ageing or disillusionment (12) would ensure that. Thus it was that, even by 1879, the great majority of most Southern kruzhoks were composed of people who could not possibly have been able to take part in the earlier stages of the movement, even if they had so wished. For example, the combined membership of the two rival local Central 'Narodnaya Volya' Groups in Kiev, which endured from the end of 1879

until the start of 1882, was some thirteen people. Anyone who had participated in the 'v narod' movement in the summer of 1874 was unlikely to have been born after 1856, but only two of the members of the above kruzhoks were born before 1856; one in 1851 and the other in 1833. (See Table 17.i-ii) Further, people who embarked upon a revolutionary career after 1876 would be introduced into a world where, as time passed, the norm of behaviour was increasingly that of adherence to political terrorism and where activity amongst the peasantry would be too unfashionable to be considered as an option. It was in fact the years from 1877 to 1879 which witnessed the greatest amount of political terrorism in the South, for subsequently energies were harnessed to the single task of assassinating the Tsar. However as Soviet historians often observe, there were indeed a handful of revolutionaries who survived and who passed through many stages of the movement and, perhaps because of their greater experience and reputation, emerged as leaders of the movement in the early eighties.(13) Being leaders they were rather atypical in their experience. Nonetheless at the end of this section, after considering the kruzhoks which functioned from 1877 to 1879, the backgrounds of Southerners who were leaders of the movement in the early eighties will be examined in order to ascertain if their revolutionary careers prior to their turning to political terrorism were similar to those of the people who were active in 1877-79.

Since a more limited chronological period is being considered, it is possible to extend the geographical range of the study beyond the three main urban centres. The following kruzhoks will be considered here:

<u>Odessa</u>	Koval'sky's kruzhok (end of 1876 - 30/1/78)
<u>Nikolayev</u>	Vittenberg's kruzhok(1876/7 - August 1878)
<u>Kiev-Odessa</u>	Osinsky's kruzhok (1876/7 - 1879)
<u>Kiev - Zhitomir</u>	Basov's kruzhok (1876 - 1879)
<u>Kharkov</u>	1. D.T.Butsynsky's kruzhok (1877 - 1878) 2. Ye.Koval'skaya's kruzhok (Feb./March - August 1879) 3. Tellalov-Glushkov's kruzhok (second half of 1879)

In this period there was considerable movement between towns by kruzhoks and between kruzhoks by individual revolutionaries. Therefore to avoid excessive double counting, it has been necessary in a few cases to allocate individuals arbitrarily to one kruzhok. The biographical information on the members is taken from the 'Deyateli Revolyutsionnogo Dvizheniya v Rossii. Bio-Bibliograficheskiy Slovar'' tom II. vypusk 1-4 and tom III. vypusk 1 - 2, unless stated otherwise.

The membership of each kruzhok will be tested on the following five issues:

1. What was the member's revolutionary 'past'?
2. Was the member a native of the South?
3. Had the member had a higher education?
4. Had the member been educated outwith the South?
5. What was the rank of the father of the member?

The first kruzhok to demonstrate armed resistance to the government was, of course, that led by I.M.Koval'sky and it was one in which very few of the members had participated in propaganda amongst the peasants. Only two had contributed significantly to such activity, and in both cases their work had been largely amongst the religious sects: I.M. Koval'sky and Ye.I.Rossikova. At least one, G.Chernyavskaya, had spent time observing the peasants (14), while four, and probably also Spandoni, had been, either before or during their membership of the kruzhok, involved with propaganda amongst urban workers. A number of them had previously been members of the Bashentsev, while Spandoni was only starting on a revolutionary career which would take him into the upper ranks of 'Narodnaya Volya'.

V.S.Illich-Svitych's claim that by December 1877, "Propaganda v narod had almost completely lost credit in the eyes of the revolutionaries..."(15) must be treated with caution in the light of these members' backgrounds. A number of them had been hostile to rural propaganda for some time: Ye.N.Yuzhakova, N.A.Vitashevsky and G.Chernyavskaya were followers of F.Tkachev and in spasmodic contact with his paper Nabat, and had advocated political terrorism for a number of years, although whether or not they formed an inner group within the kruzhok is dubious.(16)

The kruzhok was rather 'provincial' in two ways. Only two of

the members were not from the South and secondly only two had received any part of their higher education in the North. Indeed, the lack of higher education amongst its members is striking, and only four from fourteen had such an education. Socially, on the other hand, they were quite typical of earlier kruzhoks: of sixteen whose father's rank is known, nine were dvoryane, four clerical, two meshchane.

According to T.G.Snytko, "the kruzhoks of I.Koval'sky and S.Chubarov in Odessa, and S.Vittenberg in Nikolayev were the most active in the south between 1877 and 1878." (17) The Vittenberg kruzhok existed from the end of 1876 until most of the members were arrested in August 1878. (See Table 11.i-iii) The kruzhok met in the flat of the Zlatopol'skys' until the latter left at the beginning of 1877, when it moved to a flat belonging to F.Levandovskaya. This 'commune', as it was called, was "mainly involved in sending propagandists to neighbouring villages and in direct agitation amongst zavod workers and sailors." (18) However its most memorable endeavour was its attempt to kill the tsar with a mine under the landing stage at Nikolayev, an exploit which was only prevented by the arrest of the kruzhok on the eve of the event. (19)

S.Vittenberg's own revolutionary past was quite clear: he believed in terror and activity amongst the workers and had been active himself amongst the workers on the Zhmerinka railway. (20) He had decided early in his career to assassinate the tsar. S.Zlatopol'sky was also already a 'political' revolutionary. As S.Valk wrote in his introduction to S.S.Zlatopol'sky's autobiography, "the thesis must definitely be put forward, that the raising by 'Narodnaya Volya' of the aim of political revolution and still more - its firm decision for a terrorist struggle with the autocratic government, attracted to it representatives of those social groups, which earlier anarchism, and later the same anarcho-socialist tendencies in 'Zemlya i Volya', alienated from the revolution." (21) Such was Zlatopol'sky. It is true that, as a friend of I.M.Koval'sky, he had gone amongst the religious sects but there is no reason to suppose that he distributed any propaganda amongst them. Similarly at the start of 1877 when he went to Kaluga province it was to study, but not to propagandise, the vozdvigantsev sect which had developed amongst the Great Russians. (22)

The revolutionary record of the kruzhek does not manifest much interest in activity amongst the peasants. Four from ten appear to have propagandised the peasants, and three of these were from the same family - A. and L.Zlatopol'sky and their sister Sara. At the start of 1877, while Saveliy Zlatopol'sky went to Yaluga to study the sects, his two brothers and his sister went north also, but to Yaroslav province to spread propaganda amongst the peasants. The other propagandist in the kruzhek, I.L.Shepansky, had spread propaganda amongst the Molokane in the South in the company of L.Deych during 1875.

As regards the other aspects of the kruzhek, all but one of those whose province of origin is known came from the South. From fourteen whose educational background is established, only six had higher education and three of these were the three Zlatopol'sky brothers. Others in the kruzhek had no formal education, while still others had attended gymnasias or real schools. There was little contact between this kruzhek and the North; four had been in St. Petersburg in some capacity, but once again three of these were the Zlatopol'sky brothers. Socially, the kruzhek embraced four whose fathers were dvoryane (from seventeen whose rank is known) and nine meshchane. This group of people would be similar in many ways, but not as regards its social composition, to the last kruzhek examined - the Koval'sky kruzhek - if the Zlatopol'sky family could be excluded from the study. There are grounds for so doing since the Zlatopol'skys belonged to the kruzhek for only a few months at the start of its existence and it continued for approximately one and a half years after their departure, during which time it acquired other members and embarked upon most of its activities.

The Osinsky kruzhek had its genesis in Odessa where Osinsky went, after his failure to win acceptance for the introduction of the 'political element' into the programme of 'Zemlya i Volya', in the winter of 1877/8. He moved to Kiev at the start of 1878 and gradually a large group of revolutionaries were attracted to his side; attracted no doubt by the successes of his kruzhek. (See Table 12.i - v.) It took for itself the name of 'The Executive Committee of the Social Revolutionary Party'. Most of its members had previously been

involved in revolutionary activity, but this had been of such diversity that Frolenko questions if it should actually be called a kruzhok since it embraced people of so many different tendencies.(23) The background of Valer'yan Osinsky, whom Venturi describes as "the first man to organise terrorism on a wide scale in southern Russia."(24) is important. He had been involved in the city administration in Rostov and had used that position to assist the revolutionaries, but "while the propagandist movement lasted he held aloof."(25) Deych has suggested that this was a consequence of Osinsky's personality, since "Valer'yan was not the slightest inclined to activity v narod, demanding large self-control, patience and calmness."(26) There is not the least reason to suppose that he was ever involved with the peasantry and he apparently considered such activity to be a waste of time.(27) N.N.Kolodkevich was another not involved with the peasantry. It is true, according to his testimony that he had devoted long periods "to the study of the life of my own narod, and also the history of the culture of other narod ..." (28), but it was for propaganda amongst the workers of Kiev that he was arrested in the winter of 1875.(29) It may have been his experiences in prison which turned him to terrorism (30), but his aim in using terrorism was to gain a constitution (31). Many of the members of the kruzhok do appear to have been involved previously with propaganda work amongst urban workers: Brandtner, the two Ivichevich brothers, Ivanchenko, Sentyanin, Sviridenko, Feokhari. This substantiates Venturi's observation that "It is of interest that the core of the first Kiev terrorists of Osinsky's 'Executive Committee' came from these circles..."(i.e., groups involved with the work of Zaslavsky and his Union amongst urban workers) (32) Members who had definitely been involved with activity amongst the peasants were G.A.Popko, N.A. Armfield, Fedvedev, V.Debagory-Mokriyevich, N.Frolenko, and S.Leshern von Gertzfel'd, while Steblin-Kamensky probably had been also. This total of seven from the twenty-six whose background is known in some detail gives credence to the remark of L.Deych that: "Turning over in my mind almost all the supporters of 'the disorganisation of the government' who I knew personally, I must say that the great majority of them had never gone to the narod, consequently, they personally could not be disappointed in it.... In the inclination of the South to violent acts a very large part was played by the then ripening

and already definitely forming aspiration of the advanced part of our society to struggle for political freedom."(33)

This kruzhek was overwhelmingly Southern in that twenty-one of the twenty-five whose province of origin is known were from this area. The educational background of twenty-five members is also known. Almost half of these had not received higher education, including three women who had limited access to higher education, and eight of the male members who had not had education beyond the gymnasium or real school. Fourteen had had some form of higher education. Of the latter group seven had been educated in the South and seven outwith. This figure of seven indicates that the kruzhek did have some contact with the North, and to it should be added two women members who were educated in the North, as well as the considerable contacts which Osinsky, Popko and Lizogub would have had with the north and specifically, because of their association with 'Zemlya i Volya', with St.Petersburg. Socially, nineteen of the twenty-eight members whose fathers' ranks are known were dvoryane of some grade.

The kruzhek led by I.I.Basov, which gravitated between Kiev and Zhitomir during 1876 to 1879, does not appear to have been large. (See Table 13 i - ii) Most were Southerners; indeed of those whose province of origin has been identified, only one came from outwith the South and he came from the neighbouring province of Mogilev. Socially, it differed from the Osinsky kruzhek since the dvoryanstvo element was only 33.3% compared with the former's 67.9%. In this group was represented a number of 'workers' from a variety of ranks. Difficiency in knowledge about the educational background of the members is noticeable, but three from five appear to have experienced higher education, and only one outwith the South. Basov is the sole member recorded as having been involved in propaganda work amongst the peasants; for the others, their previous revolutionary experience had been predominantly amongst metal and railway workers. During the time of its existence, the group manifest two types of activity: propaganda amongst urban workers and secondly, violence against the state, which took the form of killing a provocateur, T.Kurilov and attempting to rob the post in order to obtain money for the revolutionary cause.

The D.T.Butsynsky kruzhek existed in Khar'kov from 1877 till the

end of 1878, and was, according to one of its members, "the most prominent group in Kharkov." (34) (See Table 14. i) This may have been less impressive than it sounds, since another source considered that the revolutionary movement was very weak in Kharkov in 1878, having only about 20 adherents of whom most were "peaceful propagandists, almost nobody was anti-government." (35) However, according to Butsynsky all but an insignificant number of youths were carried away with the political struggle even as early as the end of 1877 and start of 1878, and in support of this he cites the student disorders at the beginning of 1878 in Kharkov. (36)

Four of the members had, in 1874-1875, belonged to the 'Poltavtsy' kruzhok in Poltava which had been formed amongst the local youths with the purpose of propoganda amongst the peasants. Yet, with the exception of Steblin-Kamensky, it is very doubtful if any of them did propogandise the peasants although they did study them, as shall be shown in Chapter VII. D.T. Butsynsky himself was a dedicated 'political' and had no inclination to propogandise the peasants. All but one of the five whose province of birth is known came from outside the South but three of these moved to Poltava when young, were educated there and clearly identified with the South. Four of the six had higher education and this had also been experienced in the South. Only one member had had any part of his education in the North and as a whole the kruzhok had very little contact outside the South, even in the form of visits to the revolutionary kruzhoks of the capital. Since only one of the five members was the son of a dvoryanin, socially the kruzhok manifests the general overall trend in the composition of kruzhoks in the South in the second part of the period under consideration: a decline in the numerical dominance of dvoryane.

None of the members of the Koval'skaya kruzhok did any rural agitation. (See Table 15. i - iii) All were from the South or from contiguous provinces. This regionalism of the kruzhok is also manifest in their education, in the sense that none was educated in St. Petersburg or in Moscow. The children of dvoryane were in the minority: three from amongst the eleven whose social status has been established, but this proved no obstacle to entry into higher education since of twelve members, eight attended Southern institutes of higher education.

The final kruzhok to be examined is that led by P.A. Tellalov and I.I. Glushkov, and with this kruzhok the study arrives at the border of the 'Narodnaya Volya' era. (See Table 16. i - iii) The date of the start of the kruzhok is dubious. Recent Soviet research dates it as summer 1879(37), while earlier sources give the end of 1878 and the start of 1879(39). Certainly both the leaders were in Kharkov at the earliest date.(39) However once the kruzhok had taken shape, it was visited in September 1879 by G. Gol'denberg and A.I. Zhelyabov and persuaded to accept the programme of 'Narodnaya Volya' as its own.(40) The kruzhok set up workers' and students' sub-groups(41), and assisted the Executive Committee in the three attempts it made to try to kill the Tsar during 1879. The kruzhok was crushed at the end of 1879, but was replaced by another during 1880.

Both of the leaders of the kruzhok had been active in the revolutionary movement since 1873 or 1874, but neither had been active in rural propagandist activity. Tellalov related in his speech at his trial in 1883, that he had been involved in student disturbances at the Mining Institute in St. Petersburg in 1874 for which he had been expelled and exiled to Kostroma province. Due to ill health, he was allowed to live in Simferopol' from 1876 till 1879, during which time he took no part in revolutionary affairs. He said that if he had been free to do as he wished, he would have liked to settle in the villages, close to the narod, and to spread propaganda.(42) Nonetheless he did not. Glushkov may have been in F. Volkovsky's kruzhok in Odessa at the start of the seventies when he was arrested. He was found innocent of any propaganda activity by the court, after which he worked on the Kharkov railway and was involved with G. Gol'denberg's assassination of Prince Kropotkin before joining the present kruzhok.(43) Of the remainder, only V.A. Danilov appears to have carried out propaganda amongst the peasants, which he had done in 1874 amongst the sects.(44)

The origin of eight of the members is known, of whom two but possibly three came from outside the South. Three had had higher education in St. Petersburg from thirteen about whom information is available. Significantly these three were the older members of the kruzhok, in terms of revolutionary experience: Tellalov, Glushkov and Danilov. Two of the thirteen members had not had higher education. Links between this kruzhok and the north were correspondingly weak.

With regard to social status, from thirteen members, five were children of dvoryane.

As has been pointed out already, there would be little point in examining subsequent groups since their members would have been too young to participate in the revolutionary movement when it was dominated by the 'v narod' movement. In studying the kruzhoks in 1877 to 1879, certain trends appear to have emerged. Most members of these kruzhoks had not been active amongst the peasants; they may have studied the peasants or propogandised urban workers. Members had almost always been born in the South, and had usually also been educated in the South. Few of the members would have had any contact with the St.Petersburg or Moscow kruzhoks on a personal basis. Slightly less than a half would not have had higher education. Socially, slightly more than one third would be children of dvoryane. In order to establish if these trends in composition of revolutionary kruzhoks in the South continued after 1879 the combined membership of the two rival Central Groups of 'Narodnaya Volya' in Kiev between 1880 and 1882 are examined below.(See Table 17. i - ii) One of the groups was led by P.V.Gortynsky and his group was officially recognised as the 'Narodnaya Volya' local Central Group while the other was led by I.Ya.Levinsky. These kruzhoks largely conform to the characterisation of the 1877-1879 kruzhoks presented above. Only one of the members was involved with propoganda amongst the peasantry: L.S.Balkind had spread propoganda during each summer holiday while he had been at Mogilev gymnasium and continued to do so after he left.(45) Five of eight identified members had been born in the South and three outside, although two of these three had been born in provinces which are contiguous with the South. From seven whose educational background is known, a surprisingly large number of five had had higher education but only one of these had been educated in St.Petersburg. This group of revolutionaries demonstrate the lack of contact on a personal basis between Southern kruzhoks and revolutionary kruzhoks in the capital which has been remarked upon. An above average figure of one half of the revolutionaries were children of dvoryane, while the other half were children of Jewish meshchane.

It is possible also to look finally at the question from another standpoint: what was the background of some of the leaders of political

terrorism in the early 1860's who had a Southern background; specifically, if their revolutionary career stretched back to the early seventies, had they participated in the propaganda amongst the peasants?

N.I.Kibal'chich testified that while a student at the Medical-Surgical Academy in St.Petersburg he was undecided whether to go 'v narod' for socialist propaganda or to complete his studies and help the narod by serving as a doctor. However during a visit to his home province of Kiev in the summer of 1875, he was arrested for having given a book to a peasant. When his flat in St.Petersburg was searched, a trunk of illegal literature was found and Kibal'chich was jailed until 1878.(46) Kibal'chich denied at the time that he had been propagandising and perhaps that was natural, but his colleague and biographer, L. Tikhomirov, later wrote that "He did not have the special purpose of spreading propaganda."(47) In his speech at his trial in 1881, Kibal'chich observed that he probably would have become a propagandist if he had not been arrested, and his propaganda would have had a cultural character as well as a socialist one, because he wanted "to raise the mental and moral level of the mass, to develop communal instincts and inclinations..."(48) On release from prison, in the spring of 1878 till August 1879, Kibal'chich was occupied with the production of dynamite not with propaganda.(49)

Adrian F.Mikhaylov had been born in the Kuban', but attended Stavropol' gymnasium till 1873 when he went to Moscow University. In 1877 he came to the conclusion that he should study some trade and through that draw close to either the rural population or to the lower strata in the city. He chose the former and went to live for six months in a village. He sometimes hunted and sometimes dropped in at the smithy to help. He had conversations with the peasants as far as was necessitated by his work at the smithy but not apart from that because the peasants regarded him as not belonging to their milieu. "I did not engage in propaganda..." he declared.(50)

G.Gol'denberg was born in 1855 in Berdichayev in Kiev province. In August 1875 he joined a metal workshop, as a worker, in order to study the life of the Russian worker and to prepare for propaganda amongst the peasants. After a number of such exploits he eventually went to the villages to spread propaganda in 1877, but did not find this satisfactory, and returned to the towns where he took an active part in all that was going on, particularly in distributing the

Hebrew paper Emes amongst the Jewish population of Kiev, Berdichayev and Zhitomir.(51) He subsequently gained notoriety by killing Prince Kropotkin and later was present at the negotiations leading to the establishment of 'Kerodnaya Volya'.

Another important Southerner, M.N.Trigoni - a boyhood friend of A.I.Zhelyabov - does not appear to have considered going into the villages, but instead began his revolutionary career in 1875 by distributing revolutionary literature amongst youths and artillery officers.(52) Other Southerners specifically rejected it.(53) A.A.Kulakov in Taganrog knew young intelligentsia who did go amongst the peasants in 1873-75, but, knowing the peasants through daily contact he declared that "personally I was not attracted to the idea of going v narod."(54) F.Yurkovsky did not go amongst the peasants either, perhaps, as L.Deych remarked, due to his personality; it was something for which he was "completely unfitted".(55)

It would appear therefore that amongst the later leaders of political terrorism there were a number of Southerners who had not been involved in agitation amongst the peasants or had done so in only an uncommitted and unenthusiastic manner. This indicates a continuation of the pattern revealed by the analysis of the kruzhoks in 1877-79.

4. Tables 10-17 of the membership of kruzhs 1877-1879.

KRUZHOK: KOVAL'SKY

TABLE: 10.i.

MEMBER'S NAME.	PREVIOUS REVOLUTIONARY EXPERIENCE.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
1. I.M.Koval'sky (56)	Prop. Peasant Sects. (60)	Podolia.	Podolia Gymn.; Podolia Seminary; Odessa Univ.	Priest.
2. V.S.Illich-Svitych (F.N.Voskresensky) (56)	Prop. Workers and sailors. (61)	Mogilev.	Mogilev Gymn.	Dvor.
3. Ye.N. Yuzhakova (56)	Prop. Odessa workers when Member of Bashentsev.	Kherson.	At home; Zurich.	Dvor.
4. N.A. Vitashevsky (56)		Kherson.	Nikolayev 'real' school	Dvor.
5. G.F. Chernyavskaya (Bokhanovskaya) (56)	Nurse in Serbia.			
6. V.I.Vitten (56)		Kherson.	Yelisavetgrad boarding school.	Dvor.
7. Ye.I. Vitten (Rossikova) (56)	Prop. Peasants in Tauride and Kherson.	Tauride.	Qualified as domestic teacher.	Dvor.
8. L.M. Merzhanova (56)	Worked as shop assistant in Odessa.	Kherson	Home education.	Dvor.

KRUZHOK: KOVAL'SKY.

TABLE: 10. ii.

MEMBER'S NAME.	PREVIOUS REVOLUTIONARY EXPERIENCE.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
9. V.D.Klenov (56)	Prop. soldiers.	Kherson.	Village school.	Meshch.
10. A.A.Alekeyev. (56)				Friest?
11. A.Borynevich (Barinevich?) (56)		Kherson.	Odessa Railway school.	Meshch.
12. A.N.Akimov. (57)		Kherson?	Nikolayev Gymn.; Nikolayev Military School.	Dvor.
13. N.A.Beverley (57)	Member of Bashentsev.		St.Pb.Tech. Inst.	Dvor.
14. N.I. Mirolyubov. (57)	Belonged to Buntars - involved in Chigrin affair; in 1878 Prop. workers and pupils in Odessa	Podolia.	Kamenets- -Pod. Gymn.; Odessa Univ.	Priest.
15. S.Levandovsky (57)	Friendly with Zlatopol'sky; kept a store of books.	Kiev	Kiev Seminary; Odessa Univ.	Deacon.
16. A.V. Afanas'yeva (née Poltor- anova). (57)	Held rev. books; member of Bashentsev.	Irkutsk	Smolny Inst.	Dvor.

KRUZHOK: KOVAL'SKY

TABLE: 10. iii.

MEMBER'S NAME.	PREVIOUS REVOLUTIONARY EXPERIENCE.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
.....
17. A.A.Spandoni (58)	Joining Koval'sky was Spandoni's first revolutionary step. (59)			Kupets.

	2 from 12 had prop. peasants = 16.7%	11 from 13 were Southern = 84.6%	4 from 14 had h.e. = 28.6%; 4 from 14 had some educ. o/s. S. = 28.6%	9 from 16 were children of dvor. = 56.2%

KRUZHOK: VITTENBERG.

TABLE: 11.i.

MEMBER'S NAME.	PREVIOUS REVOLUTIONARY EXPERIENCE.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
1. S.Vittenberg. (62)	Prop. Workers and sailors	Kherson	Nikolayev 'real' school; Vienna Tech. Inst.	Meshch.
2. S.S. Zlatopol'sky (62)	Observed peasant sects in North; travelled to St.Pb.	Kherson	Nikolayev Gymn.; St.Pb.Tech. Inst.	Meshch.
3. A.S. Zlatopol'sky (64)	Prop. Peasants in summer and autumn 1876.	Kherson	Nikolayev Gymn.; St.Pb.Tech. Inst.	Meshch.
4. L.S. Zlatopol'sky (64)	Repeatedly prop. peasants.	Kherson	Nikolayev Gymn.; St.Pb.Tech. Inst.	Meshch.
5. S.S. Zlatopol'skaya (64)	Prop. peasants in summer and autumn 1876.	Kherson.	Nikolayev Gymn.	Meshch.
6. Akimov. (62)				
7. N.A.Fovalev (62)		Kherson.	Nikolayev 'real' school.	Kupets.
8. F. Levandov- skaya (62)	Prop. Black Sea fleet; helped to prepare attempt on Tsar.	Podolia.	Kherson Gymn.	Dvor.

KRUZHOK: VITENBERG.

TABLE: 11. ii.

MEMBER'S NAME.	PREVIOUS REVOLUTIONARY EXPERIENCE.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
9. M.A. Moreynis (62)		Kherson		Kupets.
10. A.L. Rashkov (63)		Bessarabia	Nikolayev 'real' school; St.Pb. Mining Inst.	Meshch.
11. A.A. Kalyuznyy (63)		A southern province.		Dvor.
12. I.I. Logovenko. (63)		Kherson	Little or no formal education.	Not Dvor.
13. A.G. Lur'ye (64)	Prop. sailors	Kherson.	Nikolayev Gymn.	Meshch.
14. A.N. Zaydner (64)	Prop. sailors	Tauride		Kupets.
15. V.A. Sviridenko (64)	Prop. sailors.	Tauride	Simferopol' Gymn. Nikolayev 'real' school	Dvor.
16. N.T. Fomenko (64)		Tauride	Literate	Meshch.

KRUZHOK: VITTENBURG.

TABLE: 11. iii.

MEMBER'S NAME.	PREVIOUS REVOLUTIONARY EXPERIENCE.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
.....
17. I.L. Shchepansky (64)	In Fesenko's kruzhek; prop. amongst Molokane.	Kiev.	Kiev Gymn.; Kiev Univ.	Dvor.
18. V.V.Krasovsky (64)		Warsaw	Gymn.	Meshch.

	4 from 10 had prop. peasants. = 40%	16 from 17 were southern = 94.1%	6 from 14 had h.e. = 42.9% 5 from 14 had some educ.o/s. S. = 35.7%	4 from 17 were children of dvor. = 23.5%

KRUZHOK: OSINSKY

TABLE:12. i.

MEMBER'S NAME.	PREVIOUS REVOLUTIONARY EXPERIENCE.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
.....
1. V.Osinsky (65)	Prop. students.	Don	Taganrog Gymn.; St.Pb.Inst. of Transport.	Dvor.
2. L.K.Brandtner (65)	In Kovalik's Kharkov kruzhok(70); prop. workers in Kharkov and Rostov.		Kharkov Gymn.; Kharkov Vet.Inst.	Prussian subject.
3. Ignat Ivichevich (65)	Odessa Rev. kruzhoks; active amongst workers' groups.	Kherson.		Dvor.
4. Ivan Ivichevich (65)	Prop. Rostov railwaymen	Kherson.		Dvor.
5. R.A.Steblin-Kamensky (65)	Formed Poltava group to prop. peasants; often in prison; joined 'Poltavtsy'.	Orel	Poltava Gymn.; Kharkov Vet. Inst.	Dvor.
6. G.A.Popko (65)	In Moscow Rev. groups; Bashentsev; Zaslavsky; prop: peasants in Yuban.	Kuban	Stavropol' Seminary; Moscow Petrov. Agric. Acad.; Odessa Univ.	Priest.
7. G. Ivanchenko (65)	Zaslavsky's Union	Kherson		Meshch.
8. S.Leshern von Gertzfeld (65)	School for peasants; Dolgushin affair; prop. peasants; Lermontov's Group	Novgorod	St.Pb.	Dvor.

KRUZHOK: OSINSKY

TABLE: 12. ii.

MEMBER'S NAME.	PREVIOUS REVOLUTIONARY EXPERIENCE.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH	PLACE OF EDUCATION	FATHER'S RANK.
9. N.A.Armfeld (Komova) (65)	Moscow Chaykovtsy; prop. peasants.	Moscow	Moscow's Nikolay Inst.	Dvor.
10. Rafael (65)				
11. I.F. Voloshenko (65)	Insufficient evidence of prop. Kuban peasants. (72)	Tauride	Kharkov Gymn.; Odessa Univ.	Dvor.
12. A.Ye. Sentyanin (65)	Prop. Rostov workers.	Yekaterinos- lav.	Kharkov Gymn.; Mining Inst. in St.Pb.	Dvor.
13. A.F.Medvedev (Fomin) (65)	Zaslavsky's Union; frequently prop. peasants. (73)	Smolensk	Local <u>Uyezd</u> school	Meshch.
14. D.Lizogub (66)	Involved with Fesenko's and other rev. kruzhoks in St.Pb.; accused of distributing prop. (74)	Chernigov	Yekaterinos- lav Gymn.; St.Pb.Univ.; abroad.	Dvor.
15. V.Debagory- Mokriyevich (66)	In Kiev Commune and Buntars; prop. peasants.	Chernigov	Nemirov. Gymn. and Kamenets- Pod. Gymn.; Kiev Univ.; Zurich and U.S.A.	Dvor.
16. V.A. Sviridenko (66)	Prop. sailors in Nikolayev; attempt on Tsar; prop. Kiev workers. (75)	Tauride	Simferopol' Gymn.; Nikolayev 'real' school.	Dvor.

KRUZHOK: OSINSKY

TABLE: 12. iii.

MEMBER'S NAME.	PREVIOUS REVOLUTIONARY EXPERIENCE.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
17. V.P.Pozen (66)		Kharkov	Kiev Univ.	Kupets.
18. M.P. Kovalevskaya (née Vorontsova) (66)	Kiev Buntars	Yekaterin- oslav	At home; Inst. in Odessa	Dvor.
19. S.D.Dikovsky (66)	Nikolayev sailors' group; prop workers.	Tauride	Tauride Seminary	Priest.
20. M.N. Kolodkevich (66)		Chernigov	Kiev Univ.	Dvor.
21. M.Frolenko (66)	Prop. Moscow workers and Ural peasants; in Buntars.	Kuban	St.Pb.Tech. Inst.; Moscow Petrov Agric. Acad.	Son of retired military doctor with rank of sergeant major.
22. V.P. Lepeshinsky (67)	In St.Pb. prepared to go amongst peasants; joined Buntars in Odessa.		St.Pb.Med.- Surg. Acad.	
23. Levchenko (67)	Involved in escape of Deych, Bokhanovsky	Tauride		Meshch.
24. V.Kostetsky (68)			Kiev Gymn.	

KRUZHOK: OSINSKY.

TABLE: 12. iv.

MEMBER'S NAME.	PREVIOUS REVOLUTIONARY EXPERIENCE.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
.....
25. B.Kostetsky (68)				
26. G.I.Izbitske (68)		Kiev.	Kiev 'real' school	Dvor.
27. V.O.Izbitske (68)	Expelled from Univ.	Podolia	Zhitomir Gymn.; Kiev Univ.	Dvor.
28. V.Rozhovsky (68)				
29. Yu. Zelinsky (68)	Volunteer in Balkan war.	Kiev	Kiev Gymn.	Dvor.
30. E.Studzin'sky (68)	In I.Debagory -Mokryevich's group in 1873; prop. students.	Volynia		Dvor.
31. P.O.Rokhal'sky (68)	Kiev Buntars; involved with Chigrin and attempt on Gorinovich		Poltava Gymn.	Dvor.
32. K.O. Rokhal'skaya (68)	Close to Debagory- Mokriyevich's group; prop. students.		Kiev Univ.? 'Women's course'	Dvor.

KRUZHOK: OSINSKY

TABLE: 12.v.

MEMBER'S NAME.	PREVIOUS REVOLUTIONARY EXPERIENCE.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
.....
33. S.I. Feokhari (69)	Prop. workers and soldiers; in Bashentsev.	Pherson	At home; Commercial Art School; semi-literate	Greek citizen; son of a poor landowner.
.....
	7 from 26 had prop. peasants = 26.9%	21 from 25 were Southern = 84%	14 from 25 had h.e. = 56%; 9 from 25 had some educ. o/s. S. = 36%	19 from 28 were children of dvor. = 67.9%

KRUZHCK: KIEV-ZHITOMIR
(BASOV)

TABLE: 13. i.

MEMBER'S NAME.	PREVIOUS REVOLUTIONARY EXPERIENCE.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
.....
1. I.I. Basov. (76)	1871 St. Pb. Chaykovtsy; prop. workers in Kiev and peasant sects.	Don.	St. Pb. Tech. Inst.	Don cossack.
2. Yu (C.I.?) Bil'chansky (Gorbachev) (76)				Dvor.
3. P.G. Gorsky (76)		Kiev		Meshch.
4. Ya. Zubrzhitsky (I. Sotov) (76)	Prop. workers on Kiev railway			Peasant.
5. K.F. Bagrynovsky (76)	Volunteer in Balkan wars.	Volynia	At home	Dvor.
6. A. Trushkovsky (76)	worked as a metal worker on Kiev railway	Kiev		Meshch.
7. A. Kshizhanovsky (76)				
8. V. Yanushkevich (76)	Organised student youth in Chernigov.	Mogilev	Chernigov Gymn.; Kiev Univ.	Dvor.

KRUZHOK: KIEV-ZHITOMIR
(BASCV)

TABLE: 13.ii.

MEMBER'S NAME.	PREVIOUS REVOLUTIONARY EXPERIENCE.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
.....
9. P.F. Gudz' - Lobanevsky-Lobanchuk	Transported books; prop. workers	Kiev	Little education	Meshch
(77)				
10. F.Ya. Davidenko	Prop. workers in Zhitomir	Kiev	Kiev Military Medical school.	Son of army clerk.
(77)				
.....
	1 from 7 had prop. peasants = 14.3%	6 from 7 were Southern = 85.7%	3 from 5 had h.e. = 60%; 1 from 5 had some educ. o/s. S. = 20%	3 from 9 were children of dvor. = 33.3%

KRUZHOK: D.T.BUTSYNSKY
(POLTAVTSY)

TABLE: 14.i.

MEMBER'S NAME.	PREVIOUS REVOLUTIONARY EXPERIENCE.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
.....
1. D.T.Butynsky (78)	None	Kursk	Kursk Seminary School; Belgorod Seminary; Kharkov Univ.	Priest.
2. R.A.Steblin-Kamensky (78)	In 1874 organised a Poltava kruzhok to prop. peasants.	Orel	Poltava Gymn.; Kharkov Vet. Inst.	Dvor.
3. N.A.Sazhin (78)	1874 Poltava kruzhok		Poltava gymn.	
4. N.V.Yatsevich (78)	1874 Poltava kruzhok; prop. workers.	Poltava	Poltava gymn.; Kharkov Vet. Inst.	Priest.
5. A.I. Preobrazhensky (78)		Kursk (79)	Poltava gymn.	Priest. (79)
6. V.S.Yefremov (78)	Spread anti-state ideas in Kursk.	Kursk	A religious school; Seminary; Kharkov Vet. Inst.	Deacon.

	1 from 5 had prop. peasants = 20%	1 from 5 was Southern = 20%	4 from 6 had h.e.= 66.7% 1 from 6 had some educ. o/s.S.= 16.7%	1 from 5 was child of dvor. = 20%

KRUZHOK: YE.KOVAL'SKAYA

TABLE: 15.i.

MEMBER'S NAME.	PREVIOUS REVOLUTIONARY EXPERIENCE.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
.....
1. Ye.N. Koval'skaya (80)	Organised school for working women in Kharkov; worked in Zemstvo school.	Kharkov	At home	Meshch.
2. D.T. Butsynsky (80)	1878 student disorders; 1877-8 Poltavtsy; involved in attempt to free Fomin in Oct. 1878.	Kursk	Kursk Seminary school; Belgorod Seminary; Kharkov Univ.	Priest.
3. A.I. Preobrazhensky. (80)	Butsynsky's kruzhok (81)	Kursk (81)	Poltava Gymn.; Kharkov Univ. (81)	Priest. (81)
4. V.I.Usakovsky (80)				
5. I.N.Kashintsev (80)	1878 student disorders (81)		Kharkov Univ. (81)	Dvor. (81)
6. K.N.Filippov (80)			Kharkov Univ. (81)	Dvor. (81)
7. Ye.V.Nikitin (80)	1878 student disorders (81)		Kharkov Univ. (81)	Meshch. (81)
8. Tret'yakov (80)				

KRUZHOK: YE.KOVAL'SKAYA

TABLE: 15.ii.

MEMBER'S NAME.	PREVIOUS REVOLUTIONARY EXPERIENCE.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
.....
9. M.A.Blinov (80)		Kharkov	Kharkov Gymn.; Kharkov Univ.	Meshch.
10. Ya.I. Kuznetsov (80)	1878 student disorders. (81)	Kharkov (81)	Kharkov Univ. (81)	Priest. (81)
11. V.Kapust- yansky. (80)				
12. Protopopov (80)				
13. A.O.Sytsyanko (80)			Pupil at 'real' school (81)	? A lecturer at Kharkov Univ. (81)
14. I.I.Geyer (80)		Yekater- inoslav	Kharkov 'real' school; Kharkov Vet. Inst.	Dvor.
15. A.N.Granat (80)			Melitopol' 'real' school.	Kupets.
16. M.Lazurin (80)				

KRUZHOK: YE. KOVAL'SKAYA

TABLE: 15.iii.

MEMBER'S NAME.	PREVIOUS REVOLUTIONARY EXPERIENCE.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
.....
17. D.R. Manych (80)		Tauride (81)	Kherson Seminary (81)	A sailor (81)
18. A.S. Balashova (80)				
19. A.A. Shandor (80)				

	0 from 6 had prop. peasants = 0%	5 from 7 were Southern = 71.4%	8 from 12 had h.e. = 66.7% 1 from 12 had some educ. o/s. S. = 8.3%	3 from 11 were children of dvor. = 27.3%

KRUZHOK: TELLALOV-GLUSHKOV.

TABLE: 16.i.

MEMBER'S NAME.	PREVIOUS REVOLUTIONARY EXPERIENCE.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
.....
1. P.A.Tellalov (82)	Student disorder in 1874.		St.Fb. Mining Inst.	Meshch.
2. I.I.Glushkov (82)	Zhebunev's, and Volkhovsky's kruzhoks? ; prop. workers in Kharkov	Moscow or Kharkov	Kharkov Gymn.; Moscow Petrov. Agric.Inst. Kharkov Univ.	Meshch.
3. K.N.Filippov (82)	Koval'skaya's kruzhok. (83)		Kharkov Univ. (83)	Dvor. (83)
4. I.N.Kashintsev. (82)	1878 student disorders; in Koval' - skaya's kruzhok (83)		Kharkov Univ.	Dvor.
5. A.O.Sytsyanko (82)	Koval'skaya's kruzhok. (83)		'Real' school at Kharkov. (83)	? A lecturer at Kharkov Univ. (83)
6. A.N.Granet (82)				
7. V.I.Usakovsky (82)				
8. Ye.V.Nikitin (82)	Dec.1878 student disorders; in Koval' - skaya's kruzhok. (83)		Kharkov Univ. (83)	Meshch. (83)

KRUZHOK: TELLALOV-GIUSHKOV.

TABLE: 16.ii.

MEMBER'S NAME.	PREVIOUS REVOLUTIONARY EXPERIENCE.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH	PLACE OF EDUCATION	FATHER'S RANK.
.....
9. N.A.Blinov (82)	Koval'skaya's kruzhok.	Kharkov	Kharkov Gymn.; Kharkov Univ.	Meshch
10. Ya.I. Kuznetsov (82)	1878 student disorders; in Koval'skaya's kruzhok. (83)	Kharkov (83)	Kharkov Seminary; Kharkov Univ. (83)	Priest. (83)
11. D.R.Nanyoh (82)	Koval'skaya' kruzhok.	Tauride (83)		A sailor (83)
12. V.A.Danilov (82)	In Kovalik's kruzhok; prop. peasant sects.	Kharkov	Moscow Petrov. Agric. Acad.; Inst. in St.Pb.; Zurich.	Dvor.
13. V.A.Tikhotsky (82)		Kharkov (83)		Dvor. (83)
14. Ye.G.Legky (82)			Yekaterin-oslav Gymn. (83)	Kupets. (83)
15. N.S.Ivanov (82)				
16. T.I.Ivanov (82)				

KRUZHOK: TELLAIOV-GLUSHKOV

TABLE: 16.iii.

MEMBER'S NAME.	PREVIOUS REVOLUTIONARY EXPERIENCE.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK
.....
17. P.Torchinsky (82)			Kharkov Univ. (83)	
18. N.I.Dolgoplov (82)		Voronezh	Voronezh Seminary school; Seminary; Kharkov Univ.	Dvor.
19. N.A.Boguslavsky (82)				
20. I.M.Golubov (82)	Had illegal books; in prison	Minsk	Kiev Univ.	Meshch.
21. I.F.Okladsky (82)				
22. N.Khrushchev (82)				

	1 from 11 had prop. peasants = 9%	5 from 7 were Southern = 71.4%	11 from 13 had h.e. = 84.6%; 4 from 13 had some educ. o/s. S. = 30.8%	5 from 13 were children of dvor. = 38.5%

KRUZHOK: LEVINSKY/GORTYNSKY
CENTRAL GROUPS.
(1879-1882)

TABLE: 17.i.

MEMBER'S NAME	PREVIOUS REVOLUTIONARY EXPERIENCE	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
.....
1. I.Ya.Ievinsky 1859 (84)				Meshch. (89)
2. A.I.Bychkov 1862 (84)	Prop.Kiev students.	Kiev	Kiev Gymn.	Dvor.
3. V.Ye. Gorinovich 1858 (84)	Prop. railway workers in Kremenchug	Volynia	Kiev Gymn.; Chernigov Teachers' Inst.	Dvor.
4. A.I. Bogdanovich 1860 (84)		Vitebsk	Nizhgorod Gymn.; Kiev Univ.	Dvor.
5. P.V.Gortynsky 1857 (84)	Student disorder in Moscow; joined Moscow 'Narodnaya Volya'.	Chernigov	Chernigov Gymn.; Moscow Tech. School.	Dvor.
6. N.O.Baranova (Kogan- Bernshteyn) 1861 (85)		Yekaterin- oslav		Meshch or Kupets.
7. L.S.Zalkind 1861 (86)	1875 organised group amongst pupils; prop. peasants in Mogilev and later, workers in Kiev. (90)	Mogilev	Mogilev Gymn.; Kiev Univ.	Meshch
8. A.N.Bakh 1857 (86)	1878 student disorder in Kiev.	Koltava	Kiev Gymn.; Kiev Univ.	Meshch.

KRUZHOK: LEVINSKY/FORTYNSKY
CENTRAL GROUPS
(1879-1882)

TABLE: 17.ii.

MEMBER'S NAME.	PREVIOUS REVOLUTIONARY EXPERIENCE.	PROVINCE OF BIRTH.	PLACE OF EDUCATION.	FATHER'S RANK.
.....
9. V.Meshchersky 1851 (87)				Dvor. (89)
10. V.Pirozhenko 1833 (87)				Meshch (89)
11. N.I.Krzhminsky ? (84)				
12. Yanovsky ? (84)				
13. V.I.Bychkov 1861 (84)	Associated with Osinsky's kruzhok	Nogilev	Gomel and Kiev Gynms.; Kiev Univ.	Dvor.

	1 from 6 had prop. peasants = 16.7%	5 from 8 were Southern = 62.5%	5 from 7 had h.e. = 71.4%; 4 from 7 had some educ. o/s. S. = 57.1%	5 from 10 were children of dvor. = 50%

5. Reasons given by Southern revolutionaries for using political terrorism.

This issue can be considered from two angles. Firstly, what the revolutionaries hoped to gain by using political terrorism. Secondly, if these aims are sufficiently wide and general to have made it possible to have achieved them by some other means, why did the Southern revolutionaries elect to use political terrorism in preference to the alternatives.

The leaders of 'Narodnaya Volya' - as well as other practitioners of political terrorism - amongst whom were many Southerners, liked to justify their tactics by reference to the persecution which they, or their comrades, or the 'narod' had suffered at the hands of the tsarist state. Zhelyabov and M.I.Kibal'chich, amongst many others, mentioned this at their trials as a justification for their methods.(90) The prominence given to this reason for political terrorism no doubt reflects in part the realisation that their trials were being reported internationally and that their use of murder would be found shocking by many of those whose sympathy and support they sought. Similarly, P.B.Aksel'rod assured the socialist international community at its Zurich Congress that 'Narodnaya Volya' chose political terrorism not for reasons of principle, but because of tsarist persecution and the absence of freedom of political activity.(91)

Valer'yan Osinsky - whose group was probably responsible for most murders in this period - justified the murder of Prince Kropotkin, in February 1879 by G.Gol'denberg, with a reference to the supposedly inhuman suffering imposed on Kharkov students and prisoners by the Prince.(92) When on trial himself in May 1879, Osinsky advanced additional reasons: while accepting that the use of murder was anti-social, he asserted that the revolutionaries resort to it only for self-defence or for removing wicked people who could not be removed in any other way; in all cases, however, it was used grudgingly.(93) Ivan Koval'sky, eighteen months before this had expanded the range of reasons for political terrorism when he wrote that even when the revolutionaries discuss armed opposition to arrest or other forms of violence, "we remain pure propagandists", because they hoped that such action would inspire imitation on the part of the narod.(94)

However, these reasons for political terrorism - revenge, self-defence, propaganda - were supplementary to that one which the great majority of revolutionaries advanced: the use of terrorism to gain a constitution and political rights. I.Voloshenko, G.Popko, D.Lizogub and V.Osinsky(95), as well as many others saw the necessity of gaining political rights, although their exact reason for wishing to have them varied. Osinsky was generally accredited by the revolutionaries themselves as being the first to see terror not merely as revenge, but as a means of struggle to achieve political reform, and they date this realisation from 1878.(96)

The unfortunate Grigoriy Gol'denberg who, although not considered quite adequate as a revolutionary was none the less privy to most of the discussions in revolutionary circles in the later 1870's, said in his confession to the police that he turned to terrorism to achieve political rights which once gained, the socialist party would use to spread propaganda amongst the villages: once a constitution and political freedom had been granted, liberals and socialists would 'fight' each other with arguments.(97) It was on the basis of an assurance that the government was about to introduce such political freedom that Gol'denberg proceeded to provide the authorities with the information which formed the basis for most of the subsequent political trials.(98)

Amongst his testimony to the police, Gol'denberg included a description of S.S.Zlatopol'sky as the 'main centre' of revolutionary activity in Odessa in 1879 - a man therefore whose ideas may be taken to have been influential at that time.(99) Zlatopol'sky was convinced of the importance of achieving political change. He had refused to join 'Zemlya i Volya' in the first half of 1878 since its programme lacked a clear political character and was dominated by the 'socialist' element. For Zlatopol'sky, "the immediate aim (should be) to modify the existing structure of political life so that the narod get the opportunity to participate in the deciding of the general questions of Russian life..." The revolutionary party must "direct all forces to the introduction into Russia of representative narod institutions." (100) He recognised "the need to bring representation of the narod into the life of the Russian state and to make the narod's will its highest principle." Consequently "the immediate aim of the party would be realised, when the Zemsky Sobor is created with the highest decision making powers,..."(101)

In July 1879, he met N.Kolodkevich, who shared his political views. He heard from Kolodkevich, who had recently returned from St.Petersburg, about the new (i.e., narodovol'tsy) ideas predominating in the capital. Zlatopol'sky was delighted to find that ideas which he had espoused for some time were now gaining wider currency. His satisfaction was marginally abated when he saw 'Narodnaya Volya's' programme, since it lacked a declaration that "the political revolution as an aim is not directly connected with the violent realisation of the socialist ideals..."(102)

N.N.Kolodkevich was less explicit when describing his beliefs. In his testimony, he admitted that he had been involved in revolutionary activity from 1875. His experiences since then, and particularly the government's campaign against the socialists, convinced him of the need to introduce political aims alongside the movement's economic ones, and he saw the government as the main hindrance to their achievement.(103)

Zlatopol'sky was not the only one to come to an early recognition of the need for political freedom. In Kiev, in particular since around 1876, voices had been heard supporting demands for political freedom. The most vociferous were I.F.Voloshenko - who later joined Osinsky's group - and Ivan Debagory-Mokriyevich, the brother of Vladimir. They argued that only once political freedom had been gained would the revolutionaries be able to create a broad organisation amongst the 'narod'. Ivan Debagory-Mokriyevich in particular argued for a constitution, and wrote a manuscript brochure in which, according to his brother, he argued that "the task of the Russian revolutionaries amounts only to the conquest of political freedoms and, in a harsh expression, suggested they should even stop calling themselves 'socialist' as it was completely inappropriate for them..." He believed that "the liberation of the narod from exploitation must be done only by the narod itself." and asserted that the failures of 1874, 1875 and 1876 had come about because socialists from the intelligentsia had tried to do what only the muzhiks could do.(104)

D.T.Butsky was another long-standing advocate of fighting to achieve political freedom.(105) He had a long association with the revolutionary movement which started during his days as a student in Kharkov. Already by the second half of 1878 he led a group - often referred to as the 'Poltavtsy' - which has been described as "the most eminent group in Kharkov..."(106) He went on to join the 'Narodnaya Volya' - 'Chernyy Peredel' group in Kiev, where he represented the

former persuasion. Subsequently he helped to organise the 'Narodnaya Volya' group in Kharkov, where he had previously been a student, with the assistance of the veteran Southern revolutionary, V.A.Danilov. Most of this group was arrested in January 1880 and at his trial in Kiev, he said "I am a socialist-revolutionary and belong to that fraction which has as its aim to achieve political freedoms." Sergey Dikovsky also declared that he was "a socialist-revolutionary having the aim to achieve political freedoms." M.Dikovsky and Lozyanov, from this same group, made similar responses.(107)

Andrey Zhelyabov, the most famous of the Southern revolutionaries, had been an active participant in the revolutionary movement since the early seventies and his conviction of the need for political freedom had been developing for many years when he announced at the Lipetsk Congress in 1879 that without free political institutions "any activity is impossible. Therefore the Russian social-revolutionary party is forced to take on itself the obligation to crush despotism and to give Russia those political structures through which it is possible to have 'an ideological struggle'."(108) Zhelyabov went on to develop the advantages which would come from a constitution: a constitution "would be very useful, in that it would increase the possibility to act, if not for the 'official socialists', then for the people in general, and that would help the narod to put forward their men, who as well as us would be able to define the narod's needs and to realise them."(109) To some extent this belief in the beneficial effects of freedom may have flowed from his experience of the Emancipation of the serfs: "He always recognised that freedom was a great boon for the peasantry and undoubtedly raised its moral level, although it didn't improve its economic position. Nevertheless he hated the principle of tsarism .."(110) Given Zhelyabov's statement at his trial that "we are statist, not anarchists... We recognise that governments always exist, that the state system must inevitably exist as far as common interests exist."(111), then it was natural that he should strive for a state which allowed its citizenry political freedoms rather than endure one that did not.

N.I.Kibal'chich appears to have shared many of Zhelyabov's basic political propositions. For example, he believed that 'Narodnaya Volya' must carry out the 'historic role of the bourgeoisie in Russia' - to gain political freedom - because they were too weak.(112) At his trial, Kibal'chich assured the court that 'Narodnaya Volya' would abandon terrorism as soon as the government set up a Constituent Assembly, elected

by universal suffrage, and allowed personal liberties and freedom for 'Narodnaya Volya' to campaign peacefully for its policies. He believed that in the free elections which would be held, after a constitution and personal liberties had been won by the Party, the peasantry would return a socialist majority.(113) This does not do full justice to Kibal'chich's views. In his article in Narodnaya Volya for 5th February 1881, he explained that in his opinion this political transformation would merge with an economic one: "The process of disintegration of the existing political system is fatally linked with the process of economic impoverishment of the narod, progressively intensifying with each year, and the destruction of the existing political regime, by means of the victory of the narod movement, would inevitably entail the ruin of this economic order, which is inextricably linked with the existing state."(114) However, political freedom cannot be had without great historical preparation in the economic sphere and the economic transformation cannot be realised without political changes.(115)

This view would seem to have something in common with that of G.A.Popko who from the end of 1877 began to favour a constitution, partly because it would allow the revolutionaries to agitate without risking the fate which befell Bogolyubov, but also because he came to believe "that political freedom was a necessary condition for the economic improvement of the Russian narod."(116)

The political reason for terrorism was stated quite clearly by yet another of Zhelyabov's Southern colleagues and friends - P.A. Tellalov. He proclaimed at his trial in 1883, that "We don't want the destruction of the state and still less of the economic structure, but only the realisation of the combination of all political conditions through which the will of our people can be expressed freely. If by the path of the Zemsky Sobor or Constituent Assembly - let the people gather, let them freely express their wishes..." If the government was to allow this, then the revolutionaries would cease their violence and "turn to the lawful means available to any Russian citizen."(117)

G.G.Romanenko,(118), writing in 1880, was rather sanguine about how much the terrorist tactics had already forced the government to concede and about how much could yet be gained. In his pamphlet 'Terrorizm i Rutina' he claimed that these tactics had already limited the government, but it must "achieve for Russia political freedoms, without which the normal pace of narod life is unthinkable."(119)

He was at great pains to make a distinction between political freedoms and a constitution: by the latter he understood the right of the narod to take part through deputies in the formulation of legislation for the country. A constitution was not synonymous with, nor a guarantee of, political freedom.(120) He instanced Germany and England which, he said, both had constitutions, but the latter had political freedom while the former did not. Political freedom has two aspects: the first, the rights of a free press, of meetings and association, and of inviolability from arrest and sentence; the second aspect is the right of people to express their will, directly or indirectly through a legislature. The crux however is that "The political freedom, in both its aspects, stands above the law..." and cannot be changed or yielded up by the narod.(121)

I.Ya.Shternberg in his pamphlet 'Politicheskiy Terror v Rossii 1884' (122) likewise appreciated that the revolutionary task has its complexities. In his opinion, the intelligentsia should commit all its forces to the overthrow of the imperial government, but the struggle, "besides its final aims - the seizure of power and the entrusting of it to representatives of the people - leads the government into total confusion and loss of any confidence in the future and also loss of credit and respect amongst subjects and neighbours; it teaches the narod to watch the activity of this struggle, by the champions of their interests, of the slogan and ideas which serve their programme of action..."(123)

At the start of 1884, April, Makar N.Vasilyev drew up a 'Declaration' which was to be the programme of the paper 'Socialist', the mouthpiece of the 'South-West Group of the party Narodnoy Voli', based in Kiev.(124)

As with Shternberg, there is the suggestion of a minimum and a maximum programme. In the 'Declaration' it is explained that the final aim was to achieve socialism. Socialism could only be achieved by "the city and village working classes in a common force and the overthrow of the existing order by this force." i.e., by an economic revolt and by the transfer of all sources of wealth to the working people.(125) But first the political regime must be changed "for the possibility of further development of any progressive party, including the socialist party." Hence, the Party's "immediate aim: to prepare and precipitate a change of the political regime in Russia." by terrorism

which has been forced on the revolutionaries by the government's barbarity.(126)

From this sample of leading Southern revolutionaries, it is clear that the wish to gain political freedom was the main reason for their activity in the second part of the period under consideration and not the wish for vengeance, propaganda or self-defence. However the question still remains of why the revolutionaries chose the method of terrorism to effect a political change. Why, for example, did they not try to draw some social group or groups onto their side in this struggle with the government? Why did they not try to persuade the peasantry or more probably the 'middle classes' to concentrate upon demanding political change? Superficially the answer seems obvious: only once political freedom had been won from the autocracy would the revolutionaries be at liberty to make these contacts with, and to organise amongst, peasants or middle classes. This however does involve the acceptance of the assumption that government persecution had previously blocked off contact between revolutionaries and peasants and 'middle classes'. Such an assumption may have been more a reflection of what the revolutionaries pretended than of reality. Important members of the movement, such as V.Figner, testify that it was the absence of any response from the peasants which caused the revolutionaries to turn away from them.(127) Likewise as Chapters V and VI show, the revolutionaries maintained extensive contacts with the urban working and middle classes. No doubt part of that difficulty in influencing the peasantry and other social groups could quite legitimately be attributed to the results of police repression which prevented the revolutionaries from deploying themselves and their arguments to their greatest advantage. The following survey of important Southern leaders does however indicate that the decision to adopt political terrorism was based upon more than any supposed inability of the revolutionaries to contact other social groups. It actually involved a decision not to try to involve such groups.

When V.Osinsky told Fomin (A.Medvedev) in 1877/78 that going 'y narod' - which Fomin was extremely assiduous in doing - was a waste of time(128), he was expressing a view which was generally held by members of Osinsky's kruzhek. Voloshenko, who had previously been the theoretician of the Bashentsev (129) and who was estimated by Deych as

"After Plekhanov ... the strongest polemicist of the time."(130), believed that nothing could be achieved peacefully because of the unusual sluggishness of Russian society, ignorance and poverty of the narod. He knew where "the root cause of all this evil lay and ... directed their (i.e., the revolutionaries) blows against the all-powerful autocratic government."(131) He "did not believe in the immediate possibility of all forces wanting to overthrow the autocracy, or in a craving by all the forces of our society for revolution and freedom..."(132) Yet there was too strong a constitutional current in the South at this time (133) for this analysis to be completely convincing for all social groups. Even the Suntars around Vladimir Debagory-Mokriyevich were encouraged by this trend, and their leader later admitted that the kruzhok recognised the usefulness of a constitution and were prepared to collaborate with the constitutionalists for short-term objectives.(134)

S.V.Zhebunev was one of the few Southern revolutionaries to have participated in all stages of the movement during the 1870's. He gave up any hope of the peasants initiating a revolution as a result of his personal experience amongst the peasants and his subsequent visit to Germany. He came to see the responsibility of the revolutionaries as being the securing of political freedom through terrorism. If he had no faith in support from the peasants the same was not true of his view of the urban workers, for as Vera Figner said of him, he "was more of a social democrat than a narodnik." "Zhebunev definitely saw in the urban industrial proletariat the only support in the political struggle. Believing that only the working class was the bearer of the socialist idea, he thought that all forces of the party must be directed to propaganda and agitation in this class."(135)

In reviewing which groups would be of assistance in fighting for political freedom, A.Zhelyabov and N.I.Kibal'chich manifest considerable agreement both with each other and with Zhebunev. They shared Zhebunev's hopes about the urban workers, if less sanguinely. As mentioned above, both men were of the opinion that the liberals were too weak in Russia to fulfil their historic task, which must therefore be carried out by the revolutionaries. Both feared or doubted the revolutionary potentiality of the peasants. As Zhelyabov said to Aksel'rod, "I come from the peasants and know the narod: a peasant revolt would only

bring chaos to the country..." and he had opposed any attempt to initiate local disturbances or economic terror.(136) On the 2nd April 1881, while in prison, Pibal'chich wrote to the Emperor and explained that peasant bunts "were looked upon by the socialists not only as useless, but even as harmful, since they could not achieve the aims, but meanwhile their consequences were still more intimidation and suppression amongst the peasant population."(137) Two months earlier in an article in Narodnaya Volya, he had expressed himself sceptical about the possibility of a peasant revolt and besides, in considering the history of peasant revolts in Russia, he observed that they had always involved either a false tsar, a mythical 'Zolotaya gramota', or been produced by a combination of city bunt plus starvation plus an organised nucleus of, for example, raskolniks or cossacks.(138) However, to ensure the successful politico-social revolution which he hoped would come about, it would be necessary for a simultaneous peasant and workers' revolt as well as for political terrorism to take place. The social-revolutionary party would serve as the nucleus, with a solid base amongst the city and fabrika population and with numerous positions amongst the peasants. But, "Judging by the great intelligence and liveliness of the city population, judging, finally, by the fact that the activity of the party gives greater results in numbers of contacts in the cities than in the villages, it is necessary to think that in the city and not in the village will appear the first slogan of revolt. But the first move in the city must give the signal to a bunt by millions of starving peasants."(139) That Zhelyabov also had high expectations of the urban workers is well known, and is manifest in his decision to set up a workers' group in 'Narodnaya Volya'.

N.K.Kolodkevich showed a similar distrust of the revolutionary ability of the peasants as well, possibly, as a distrust of the peasants. He believed that an even greater hindrance to the achievement of political freedom than the activity of the government was actually the "ignorance of the mass", for it was this which allowed an autocratic government to exist and which the government therefore sought to maintain and to increase.(140)

S.S.Zlatopol'sky was against any violent social revolution such as would result from a peasant revolt. He had regretted that the 'Narodnaya Volya' programme had not contained "a frank declaration about the political revolution as an aim, not directly connected with the violent

realisation of the socialist ideals..."(141) and had called only for the establishment of a Zemsky Sobor.(142) He claimed that the revolutionary party had no intention of abolishing the state, religion, property or the family and should direct all its forces to achieving the introduction into Russia of popular representative institutions.(143) At his trial Zlatopcl'sky re-emphasised these points: he denied that "the party dreams of destroying the existing social structure by its activity: this is an objective for the distant future, about which we do not think."(144)

Romanenko wrote 'Terrorizm i Rutina' early in 1880 with the intention of winning assistance from the liberals, and he believed it was impossible to imagine that "the whole people are in a condition of potential revolution, ready to blaze up at the first necessity..."(145) He thought that it was not possible or reasonable to expect to be able to raise the 'commoners' in a struggle for political freedoms because of the commoners "historic isolation from the intelligentsia, through their life of want and the difficult struggle for a crust of bread .." (146) Fortunately however, "from any narod, not completely depraved, one always finds a group of people, sufficiently selfless and energetic, to defend their country from the crimes of despotism."(147)

Shining through the writing of Romanenko is a distrust of the consequences of a revolution by the masses, similar to that expressed by Zhelyabov. Romanenko compares the suffering which would be caused by a terrorist revolution by the intelligentsia with that which would be involved in a mass revolution (148); he tries to frighten the liberals with the idea of the "elemental, uncontrollable force" of a popular revolution (149) and he is contemptuous of the way in which the German narod had been persuaded into giving up - as he saw it - their political freedom at the bidding of Bismarck(150).

L.Ya.Shternberg in 'Politicheskiy Terror v Rossii 1884', before coming to the conclusion that a revolutionary élite would have to take upon itself the task of political revolution, considered the revolutionary potentiality of the major social groups. The least useful from the revolutionary's point of view were the peasantry: the peasant would struggle for existence on his few strips of land or if needs be, would emigrate, but would "seldom sacrifice any tolerable existence for the sake of a risky future."(151) Nor indeed was it desirable that the peasants should revolt, for it would involve great bloodshed, it would unite the possessing classes with the government, and it would

be difficult to control since the "Russian intelligentsia does not have the positive sympathy of the masses."(152), leading possibly to unfortunate consequences for the intelligentsia itself. The liberals were weak, and although sympathy and assistance could be expected from them, so too could a cowardly indifference.(153) The city proletariat held out a better prospect, for it was easier to spread propaganda amongst them than amongst the peasants, but they could not be relied upon because its composition was fluid: "now rushing in, now pouring out, changing with each year, from here is absent the close tradition of solidarity amongst the majority, and only a small constant part - on which it would be possible to rely entirely."(154) Consequently the intelligentsia - recognising that amongst the discontented there was an absence of clear aims - would have to provide direction by word and action, but mainly by action.(155)

The picture which emerges is one of distrust of the narod, with regard both to their revolutionary potentiality, and as regards the desirability of a peasant, or mass, revolt. According to most of these revolutionaries who have been considered, apart from Kibal'chich, once the political revolution had been effected, the intelligentsia would have to guide the narod. Gol'denberg imagined that after the constitution had been obtained, there would be two or three years of calm, under a constitution and with an amnesty, those sent into exile would return - "then we would peacefully and quietly, energetically and wisely develop ourselves, teach ourselves, and teach others, and everyone would be happy."(156)

The leadership role assigned to the intelligentsia was manifest also in the trial of Naum Gekker on 22 November 1882, when he declared that he belonged to a narodnik group "whose main aim was to unite the separate units and groups of city workers into one organised revolutionary force, which would be able to take upon itself the initiation of a narod revolt at a favourable opportunity and to give this movement a socialist direction."(157) Although not in 'Narodnaya Volya', he said, he accepted its programme.(158)

This élitist role of the intelligentsia contrasts with the sentiment put across by the central kruzhok of the 'Union of the Young Party Narodnaya Volya' in 1884, which stressed the use of agrarian and factory terror since this would bring workers and revolutionaries together on the basis of the farmers' demands.(159) A similar view was held by Ye.Koval'skaya about the advantages of economic terror when she was

involved with the 'Union of Workers of South Russia'.(160)

It would appear that the revolutionaries wanted to gain a constitution by means of political terrorism, and that they favoured this method because they doubted the mass's revolutionary potentiality and feared the consequence of its involvement in any revolutionary activity, but not because police persecution had prevented contact between revolutionaries and narod. The revolutionaries would therefore be the ones to win political freedom, albeit with periodic assistance from various social groups, notably from the urban workers. These views about the narod had not come into being as a consequence of disillusionment with work amongst the peasantry, in fact those revolutionaries who espoused political terrorism had on the whole consistently avoided the peasants. This point casts a shadow over their inclination to do so when political freedom had been gained.

6. Summary.

Political terrorism had existed as an alternative method of activity for the revolutionaries since the start of the seventies, and those who turned to it in 1877/78 were aware of this fact. The revolutionary kruzhhoks which were the first to become terrorist, in 1877-79, were typically neither those who had been most involved with the peasantry, and thus the first to sense their unresponsiveness, nor were they those who as a consequence had been the main focus of police attention. In reality they were the revolutionary kruzhhoks whose members had on the whole avoided contact with the peasants before 1877. A number of the most active members of these kruzhhoks - for example, Osinsky, S. Zlatopol'sky, Voloshenko, Butsynsky, Vittenberg - had deliberately stood apart from propaganda amongst the peasants, and had little sympathy with such a course of action. Of the kruzhhoks active in 1877-79, only an average of 18.1% of their members had agitated amongst the peasants, at any time. This compares strikingly with the average of 47.7% of the members of kruzhhoks extant during 1873-76/7 who had been involved in such activity.

It could be that precisely the fact of their lack of involvement in rural agitation and their dislike of it allowed these kruzhhoks a clearer perception of the failure of this method of activity - and less compunction about abandoning it once it appeared futile. However, the members who composed these kruzhhoks were significantly different types of people from those who had been active previously when the movement was rural and propagandist. In 1877-79, an average of 38% of a kruzhhok's membership were children of dyoryane, which compares with an average of 50% of membership during 1873-76. The average percentage which had had some education in the North or abroad fell dramatically from 49.5% in 1873-76, to 25.2% in 1877-79. Consistent with the drop in the social rank, there was a drop in the average percentage of kruzhhoks' memberships to have higher education: it fell from 68.4% to 57.8% from 1873-76 to 1877-79. However this drop in the percentage of the kruzhhok's membership with higher education was much more significant in the very first - and perhaps most important - kruzhhoks to turn to political terrorism: only 28.6% of Koval'sky's kruzhhok had had higher education; 42.9% of Vittenberg's kruzhhok (a figure seriously distorted upwards by the short membership of the Zlatopol'sky family) and 56% of Osinsky's

kruzhok. Northern revolutionaries had almost exactly the same numerical importance in 1877-79 as they had had in 1873-76: they constituted an average 27% of a kruzhok's membership in the later period, compared to 27.6% in the earlier. In both cases, the majority of northerners came from provinces contiguous to the South, not from St. Petersburg or Moscow. Thus, the members of typical kruzhoks in 1877-79 were of significantly lower social rank; they were somewhat less well educated than those of 1873-76; and they were more provincial, because they were much less likely to have been educated abroad or in the North, and, given the absence of an all-Russian revolutionary organisation at this time, few had personal links with the North. Their background of activity lay not in rural agitation but in work amongst various sections of the urban population.

It is not possible confidently to extrapolate these trends of 1877-79 into 1879-83, since the context had changed considerable by the later date. In one respect there does appear to be continuity: a number of the Southern leaders of the movement during the early 1880's had been active in the early 1870's and they appear to have avoided rural propaganda in the same way as had those who led during the transitional period of 1877-79. This aspect of the average profile of a kruzhok in 1877-79, as well as others, is also manifest in that of at least one of the important kruzhoks active in 1879-83.

The revolutionaries of 1877-83 did publicly justify their terrorist activity by reference to police harassment although it seems possible that there was an element of propaganda in this claim. Their main concern in terrorism was to gain political freedom and, in many cases, to avoid a peasant revolt - something which they themselves had, in most cases, never attempted to ferment.

7. References.

- (1) On the 11th June 1876, L.Deych, V.A.Malinka and others had tried to kill the informer N.Ye.Gorinovich, who had helped to bring about collapse of Zaslavsky's Union; on 2nd February 1878 I.Ivichevich and R.Steblyn-Kamensky killed A.G.Nikonov who had been responsible for the collapse of the working-class movement in Rostov headed by Yu.M.Tishchenko, etc..
- (2) (L.Tikhomirov) 'Andrey Ivanovich Zhelyabov' p.15,16.
- (3) Ye.Serebryakov 'Obshchestvo 'Zemlya i Volya'' in 'Materialy' May 1894, tom 11, p.42; M.Frolenko refers to 'the new method of struggle' moving 'from south to north' in 'Kommentariy k stat'ye N.A.Morozova 'Vozniknoveniye Narodnoy Voli'' in Byloye 1906, no.12, p.23; also F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.597.
- (4) A.Tun 'Istoriya Revolyutsionnykh Dvizheniy v Rossii' p.192.
- (5) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, doc.24, pp.215-216.
- (6) M.Frolenko 'Kommentariy k stat'ye N.A.Morozova 'Vozniknoveniye Narodnoy Voli'' in Byloye 1906, no.12, p.22.
- (7) Eg., V.F. 'Iz arkhiva L.Tikhomirova' in Krasnyy Arkhiv 1924, tom 6, p.129. E.Breshko-Breshkovskaya 'Hidden Springs of the Russian Revolution' p.24, describes the authoress' involvement with Yablits' plan to blow up the Palace. Also (L.Tikhomirov) 'Nikolay Ivanovich Kibal'chich' p.11.
- (8) B.Bazilevsky (ed.) 'Gos Prestup' tom III, p.107. See also B.B. Glinsky 'Revolutsionnyy period russkoy istorii 1861-1881' p.51.
- (9) R.V.Filippov 'Iz istorii narodnicheskogo dvizheniya na pervom etape 'khozheniya v narod' (1863-1874)' p.284.
- (10) P.Kropotkin 'Memoirs of a Revolutionist' p.316.
- (11) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.9, p.51.
- (12) Disillusionment or dissatisfaction with the way in which the revolution was developing explains the withdrawal of Yu.M. Tishchenko and N.P.Moshchenko from the revolutionary movement once it ceased to be mainly aimed at work amongst the peasants; see C.V.Aptekman 'Obshchestvo 'Zemlya i Volya' 70-kh' p.248. Neither they nor Khotinsky and S.Andreyev subsequently joined 'Chernyy Peredel', see op.cit., pp.382-383.
- (13) N.A.Troitsky 'Bol'shoye Obshchestvo Propagandy 1871-1874gg' in Istoriya S.S.S.R. 1962, no.5, p.90, points to the leading role

- played by Chaykovtsy members later, in 'Zemlya i Volya', 'Narodnaya Volya' etc., while V.A.Tvardovskaya 'Organizatsionnyye osnovy 'Narodnoy Voli'' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1960, tom 67, pp.142-143 shows how the majority of members of the first Executive Committee of 'Narodnaya Volya' had commenced their revolutionary activity at the start of the seventies.
- (14) B.A.Engel and C.N.Rosenthal' (ed.) 'Five Sisters: Women Against the Tsar' p.106,109.
- (15) V.Ilich-Svitych 'Moye znakomstvo s I.M.Koval'skim' in Byloye 1906, no.8, p.143.
- (16) Ye.Kusheva 'Iz istorii 'Obshchestva Narodnogo Osvobozhdeniya'' in KiS 1931, k.4, pp.31-62 argues that there was, and in this is followed by F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' pp.598-599. M.F.Frolenko dismisses the whole idea in 'Obshchestvo Narodnogo Osvobozhdeniya' in KiS 1932, k.3, pp.81-100, although he does not deny that there were 'jacobins' in the kruzhok.
- (17) T.G.Snytko 'Russkoye narodnichestvo i pol'skoye obshchestvennoye dvizheniye 1865-1881gg' p.178.
- (18) A.Semenov 'Solomon Vittenberg (Materialy k biografii)' in Byloye 1925, no.34(6), pp.63-64.
- (19) Ye.Serebryakov 'Obshchestvo 'Zemlya i Volya'' in 'Materialy' May 1894, tom 11, p.51.
- (20) A.Semenov 'Solomon Vittenberg' in Byloye 1925, no.34(6), p.64,66.
- (21) S.N.Valk 'Iz narodovol'cheskikh avtobiograficheskikh dokumentov' in Krasnyy Arkhiv 1927, tom 20, p.205.
- (22) Ibid., p.229.
- (23) A.Pribylev 'In. Fed.Voloshenko' in KiS 1930, k.3, p.141, note 3, by M.F.Frolenko.
- (24) F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.600.
- (25) Stepniak 'Underground Russia' p.87.
- (26) L.Deych 'Valer'yan Osinsky. (k 50-letiyu ego kazni)' in KiS 1929, k.5, p.9.
- (27) P.Shchegolev 'Aleksy Medvedev' in KiS 1930, k.10, p.97.
- (28) S.N.Valk 'Iz narodovol'cheskikh avtobiograficheskikh dokumentov' in Krasnyy Arkhiv 1927, tom 20, p.210.
- (29) M.F.Frolenko 'Dopolnitel'nyya svedeniya o protsess 20-ti' in Byloye 1906, no.6, p.297.

- (30) Ad.Byalovesky 'Iz proshlago' in Byloye 1906, no.8, p.200.
- (31) M.F.Frolenko 'Lipetskiy i Voronezhskiy s"ezdy' in Byloye Jan.1907, no.1/13, p.80.
- (32) F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.601.
- (33) L.Deych 'Valer'yan Osinsky' in KiS 1929, k.5, p.27.
- (34) V.S.Yefremov 'Malen'koye Delo' in Byloye 1907, no.5, pp.82-83.
- (35) L.Deych 'Valer'yan Osinsky' in KiS 1929, k.5, p.16.
- (36) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.30, p.131.
- (37) V.V.Shirokova 'Vozniknoveniye narodovol'cheskoy organizatsii v Khar'kove' in 'Iz istorii obshchestvennogo dvizheniya i obshchestvennoy mysli v Rossii' p.80.
- (38) 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.1, col.270.
- (39) Loc. cit.; 'Rechi podsudimyykh v protsess 17' in Byloye 1906, no.12, pp.242.
- (40) S.S.Volk 'Narodnaya Volya, 1879-1882' p.74; 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom III, v.2, col.1071.
- (41) V.A.Tvardovskaya 'Organizatsionnyye osnovy 'Narodnoy Voli'' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1960, tom 67, p.125,128.
- (42) 'Rechi podsudimyykh v protsess 17' in Byloye 1906, no.12, p.242; see also 'Sovremennoye Obozreniye' p.172 in Vestnik Narodnoy Voli 1883, no.1, for confirmation of Tellalov's failure to go 'v narod'.
- (43) 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.1, col.270.
- (44) Ibid., tom III, v.2, col.1071.
- (45) I.I.Popov 'Pamyati L.S.Zalkinda' in KiS 1929, k.11, p.172.
- (46) 'Pokazaniya Pervomartovtsev' in Byloye 1918, no.4/5, p.296.
- (47) (L.Tikhomirov) 'Nikolay Ivanovich Kibal'chich' p.9.
- (48) 'Iz rechey na sude A.I.Zhelyabova, N.I.Kibal'chichai S.L.Perovskoy' in Byloye March 1906, no.3, p.67.
- (49) (L.Tikhomirov) 'Nikolay Ivanovich Kibal'chich' pp.14-15; also, 'Pokazaniya Pervomartovtsev' in Byloye 1918, no.4/5, p.297.
- (50) 'Pokusheniye A.K.Solov'yeva na tsare-ubiystvo 2 aprelya 1879 goda' in Byloye 1918, no.2, p.101,102.
- (51) R.M.Kantor 'Ispoveg' Grigoriya Gol'denberga' in Krasnyy Arkhiv 1928, tom 30, p.120; R.M.Kantor 'Dva pis'ma Gr.Gol'denberga iz Trubetskogo bastiona' in KiS 1924, k.13, p.139.
- (52) V.Figner 'Mikhail Nikolayevich Trigoni' in Golos Minuvshago 1917, no.7/8, p.200.
- (53) M.Yu.Ashenbrenner 'Voyenno-revolyutsionnaya organizatsiya partii Narodnoy Voli' in KiS 1923, k.7, p.62.
- (54) A.A.Kulakov 'Avtobiografiya' in KiS 1930, k.3, p.165.

- (55) L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom II, p.137.
- (56) T.G.Snytko 'Russkoye narodnichestvo i pol'skoye obshchestvennoye dvizheniye 1865-1881gg' pp.178-179.
- (57) N.Vitashevsky 'Pervoye vooruzhennoye soprotivleniye - pervyy voyenny sud'' in Byloye 1906, no.2, pp.224-226.
- (58) N.Gekker 'Afanasiy Afanas'yevich Spandoni' in Byloye 1906, no.11, p.294.
- (59) Loc. cit.
- (60) As has been indicated in Chapter III, I.M.Koval'sky was deeply involved in propaganda work amongst the Shtundists, but after 1876, once he had settled in Odessa, he also carried on propaganda amongst the student youth, see M.F.Frolenko 'Zametka po povodu stat'i S.Ye.Liona' in KiS 1924, k.12, p.25.
- (61) V.S.Illich-Svitych admitted that he had not been amongst the peasants although at the end of 1877 he had made plans for visiting the Volga area as a volost' clerk, see V.S.Illich-Svitych 'Moye znakomstvo s I.M.Koval'skim' in Byloye 1906, no.8, p.151,143.
- (62) M.A.Moreynis 'Solomon Yakovlevich Vittenberg i protsess 28 - mi' in KiS 1929, k.7, p.51.
- (63) A.Semenov 'Solomon Vittenberg' in Byloye 1925, no.33 (5), p.66.
- (64) 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.1-4; tom III, v.2.
- (65) F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.601, 627-628.
- (66) S.S.Volk 'Narodnaya Volya, 1879-1882' p.69. On N.N.Kolodkevich, see 'Sovetskaya Istoricheskaya Entsiklopediya' tom 7; on M.Frolenko, see ibid., tom 15.
- (67) A.Pribylev 'In.Fed.Voloshenko' in KiS 1930, k.3, p.141, note 3 by M.Frolenko.
- (68) T.G.Snytko 'Russkoye narodnichestvo i pol'skoye obshchestvennoye dvizheniye 1865-1881 gg' p.168.
- (69) 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.4, col.1818-1819.
- (70) V.F. 'Iz arkhiva L.Tikhomirova' in Krasnyy Arkhiv 1924, tom 6, p.147: according to Tikhomirov, Brandtner was by "views and taste a narodnik" but seeing the impossibility of such activity became a terrorist. Nonetheless, Brandtner did devote a considerable amount of energy to propagandising the urban workers.
- (71) Ye.Breshko-Breshkovskaya 'Iz vospominaniy' in Golos Minuvshago Oct.1918, no.10/12, p.176, writes that S.A.Leshern von Gertzfeld did not go amongst the peasants in 1874, but instead manned the

'bureau' in St.Petersburg from where the provincial groups were organised.

- (72) A.Fribylev 'In.Fed.Voloshenko' in KiS 1930, k.3, p.134, indicates that Voloshenko did not go amongst the peasants, although he did spend some time in farm work in the Caucasus (p.135), and later conducted discussions with the Shtundists.(p.138) L.Deych 'La Polveka' tom II, p.277, describes Voloshenko as being incapable of any practical revolutionary work.
- (73) P.Shchegolev 'Aleksey Medvedev' in KiS 1930, k.10, pp.67-110, describes the many trips which Medvedev made into the villages.
- (74) Narodnaya Volya 5 Feb.1881, no.5, in 'Literatura' pp.370-372, contains Lizogub's obituary and biography and it nowhere mentions that he at any time was an active propagandist amongst the peasantry. Perhaps he was too aware that he was the subject of police observation for much of the time and his arrest would prevent his liquidation of his property.
- (75) Ya.D.B.'Sud i kazn' L.F.Brandtnera, V.A.Sviridenko, i V.A.Osinskogo' in KiS 1929, k.6, p.74; Sviridenko had not agitated amongst peasants.
- (76) T.G.Snytko 'Russkoye narodnichestvo i pol'skoye obshchestvennoye dvizheniye 1865-1881gg' p.174.
- (77) 'Bio-Biblio Slovar'' tom II, v.1, col.330-331; v.2, col.796.
- (78) V.S.Yefremov 'Malen'koye Delo' in Byloye 1907, no.5, p.82.
- (79) V.V.Shirokova 'Vozniknoveniye narodovol'cheskoy organizatsii v Khar'kove in 'Iz istorii obshchestvennogo dvizheniya i obshchestvennoy mysli v Rossii' p.96.
- (80) V.V.Shirokova 'Vozniknoveniye narodovol'cheskoy organizatsii v Khar'kove' in 'Iz istorii obshchestvennogo dvizheniya i obshchestvennoy mysli v Rossii' p.73.
- (81) Ibid., pp.95-97.
- (82) Ibid., pp.80-81.
- (83) Ibid., pp.95-97.
- (84) S.S.Volk 'Narodnaya Volya, 1879-1882' p.268,357.
- (85) I.I.Popov 'Pamyati L.S.Salkinda' in KiS 1929, k.11, p.173.
- (86) S.S.Volk 'Deyatel'nost 'Narodnoy Voli' sredi rabochikh v gody vtoroy revolyutsionnoy situatsii 1879-1882' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1963, tom 74, p.208.

- (87) V.A.Tvardovskaya 'Organizatsionnyye osnovy 'Narodnoy Voli'' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1960, tom 67, p.122.
- (88) A.N.Bakh 'Vospominaniya Narodovol'tsa (1882-1885gg)' in Byloye 1907, no.1, p.119.
- (89) N.A.Troitsky ''Narodnaya Volya' pered tsarskim sudom' p.184.
- (90) See for example, 'N.I.Kibal'chich i imp. Aleksandr III.(2/4/1881)' in Byloye 1917, no.3, pp.37-38; 'Rechi podsudimyykh v protsess 17' in Byloye 1906, no.12, p.247; 'Pokazaniya Pervomartovtsev' in Byloye 1918, no.4/5, p.297.
- (91) F.B.Aksel'rod 'Mezhdunarodnyy kongress v Ynure' in Byloye Jan. 1904, no.5, p.40 - first printed in Vol'no Slovo Nov.1881, no.13. Similarly, the article, 'K obshchestvu' in Zemlya i Volya no.4, written by one of those involved in the assassination of Prince Kropotkin, prior to the event, justified the attempt by pointing to the suffering of the '183', and other political prisoners in Khar'kov Central prison, see B.Bazilevsky(ed.) 'Revolutsionnaya Zhurnalistika semidesyatykh godov' pp.226-228.
- (92) 'Proklamatsiya Isp. Komiteta po povodu kazni Khar'kovskago gubernatora Kropotkina' in 'Da Zdravstvuyet Narodnaya Volya!' pp.12-14. P.A.Tellalov argued that most political murders had been committed either before 'Narodnaya Volya' had been set up or by people who did not belong to that Party, see 'Rechi Podsudimyykh v protsess 17' in Byloye 1906, no.12, p.244.
- (93) 'Protsess Sotsialistov Valer'yana Osinskago, Sofii Leshern-von-Gertsfel'd i Varfolomiya Voloshenko' p.18.
- (94) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev.Narod' tom II, doc.23, p.82; see also Listok 'Zemlya i Volya' 22 March 1879, no.2-3, in B.Bazilevsky(ed.) 'Revolutsionnaya Zhurnalistika semidesyatykh godov' p.282: "Political murder - this is the sole means of self-defence in the present conditions and one of the best agitational examples." S.Ye.Iion in 'Ot propagandy k terroru' in VIS 1924, k.12, p.15, recollected that Koval'sky read to him a manuscript devoted to his theory of resistance to arrest. Koval'sky also saw political terrorism as a potentially consistent policy suitable for the punishment of those guilty of oppressing the people; see, S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev. Narod' tom II, doc.9, pp.50-51, and F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' pp.598-599.

- (95) V.Levitsky (V.O. Tsederbaum) 'Partiya 'Narodnoy Volyi'. Voznikoveniye, bor'ba, gibel'' p.52.
- (96) See for example, (I.Tikhomirov) 'Andrey Ivanovich Zhelyabov' p.16; Stepniak 'Underground Russia' p.87; I.Deych 'Valer'yan Osinsky' in FiS 1929, k.5, p.36. On Osinsky's attempt to persuade 'Zemlya i Volya' to include political reform in its programme, during the winter of 1877/78, see Ye.Serebryakov 'Obshchestvo 'Zemlya i Volya'' in 'Materialy' May 1894, tom 11, pp.53-54. Osinsky had already been urging Southern students during the winter of 1877/8 to put forward political demands for a constitution etc. See, F.Shchegolev 'Aleksy Medvedev' in FiS 1930, k.10, p.95.
- (97) R.M.Kantor(ed.) 'Ispoved' Grigoriya Gol'denberg'a' in Krasnyy Arkhiv 1928, tom 30, p.140, 155.
- (98) Ibid., p.168.
- (99) 'Obvinitel'nyy Akt' in 'Sovremennoye Obozreniye' in Vestnik Narodnoy Volyi 1883, no.1, p.171.
- (100) S.Valk(ed.) 'Iz narodovol'cheskikh avtobiograficheskikh dokumentov' in Krasnyy Arkhiv 1927, tom 20, pp.229-230.
- (101) Ibid., pp.227-228.
- (102) Ibid., p.230.
- (103) Ibid., pp.210-211.
- (104) V.Debagory-Mokriyevich 'Iz vospominaniy Russkago Sotsialista' in Vestnik Narodnoy Volyi 1884, no.3, p.91.
- (105) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.30, pp.125-136, where Butsynsky describes the development of the revolutionary movement in the South in the second half of the seventies, highlighting the progress of awareness of the need for political freedoms.
- (106) V.S.Yefremov 'Malen'koye Delo' in Byloye 1907, no.5, pp.82-83.
- (107) L.Berman 'Kievskiy protsess 21-go v 1880 g' in FiS 1931, k.8/9, p.96.
- (108) (Lev Tikhomirov) 'Andrey Ivanovich Zhelyabov' p.23.
- (109) Ibid., p.26.
- (110) Ibid., p.10.
- (111) 'Iz rechey na sude A.I.Zhelyabova, N.I.Fibal'chicha i S.L. Perovskoy' in Byloye March 1906, no.3, p.62.
- (112) A.Doroshenko (N.I.Fibal'chich) 'Politicheskaya revolyutsiya i ekonomicheskyy vopros' in Narodnaya Volya 5th February 1881, no.5, in N.K.Karatayev(ed.) 'Narodnicheskaya Ekonomicheskaya

- Literatura' p.389. I.Tikhomirov also subscribed to the view that Russia's bourgeoisie was too weak - see, for example, I.Tikhomirov 'Chego nam' zhat' ot revolyutsii' in Vestnik Narodnaya Volya 1854, no.2, p.257. Tikhomirov was a Southerner and very important in the movement, but since he spent the whole of his revolutionary career outside the South, he has been omitted from the present study.
- (113) 'Pokazaniya Pervomartovtsev' in Byloye 1918, no.4/5, p.295 and Narodnaya Volya no.5, in 'Literatura' pp.336-343.
- (114) Ibid., p.389.
- (115) Ibid., p.390.
- (116) (R.Steblin-Lamensky) 'Grigoriy Anfomovich Popko' in 'Materialy' Oct.1893, tom 16, p.188.
- (117) 'Rechi podsudimyykh v protsess 17', in Byloye 1906, no.12, p.245.
- (118) See also G.G.Romanenko's view of the Russian state in Narodnaya Volya no.6, in 'Literatura' pp.410ff. On the man himself, see S.N.Valk 'G.G.Romanenko (Is istorii 'Narodnoy Voli')' in 'KiS 1928, k.11(48), pp.36-59.
- (119) V.Tarnovsky (G.G.Romanenko) 'Terrorizm i Rutina' London (in fact, Geneva) n.d.(1881) p.7.
- (120) Loc.cit..
- (121) Ibid., p.8.
- (122) On Shternberg, see M.A.Frol' 'Vospominaniya o L.Ya.Shternberge' in KiS 1929, k.8-9, pp.214-237.
- (123) B.Sapir(ed.) 'Iavrov' tom II. Prilozheniya. doc.1, p.579.
- (124) S.N.Valk 'Socialist', organ yugo-zapach. gruppy partii 'Narodnoy Voli' in Yrasnyy Arkhiv 1929, tom 33, pp.204-206, for background information about the Group.
- (125) Ibid., p.207.
- (126) Ibid., p.208.
- (127) V.Figner 'Zapechatlennyy Trud' tom I, p.204. Figner is here criticising Flekhanov and Popov's argument that the armed struggle attracted the youth away from the more mundane agitational work.
- (128) P.Shchegolev 'Aleksey Medvedev' in KiS 1930, k.10, p.97.
- (129) S.Ye.Lion 'Ot propagandy k terroru (Iz odesskikh vospominaniy semidesyatnika)' in KiS 1924, k.13, p.11.
- (130) L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom II, p.277.
- (131) A.Fribylev 'In.Fed.Voloshenko' in KiS 1930, k.3, p.135.

- (132) Ibid., p.137.
- (133) (R.Steblin-Lamensky) 'Grigoriy Anfomovich Popko' in 'Materialy' Oct.1893, tom 16, p.170.
- (134) V.Debagory-Pokriyevich 'Iz vospominaniy russkago sotsialista' in Vestnik Narodnoy Voly 1884, no.3, p.91. On Osinsky, Popko and Voloshenko and the Constitutionalists, see F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.603.
- (135) V.Figner 'Zapechatlennyy Trud' tom I, p.291.
- (136) F.B.Aksel'rod 'Perezhitoye i perezumannoye' tom I, p.361; V.Levitsky (V.O.Tsederbaum) 'Partiya 'Narodnoy Voly'. Voznikoveniye, bor'ba, gibel'' p.69.
- (137) 'N.I.Kibal'chich i imp. Aleksandr III. (2/4/1881)' in Byloye 1917, no.3, p.33.
- (138) (N.I.Kibal'chich) A.Doroshenko 'Politicheskaya revolyutsiya i ekonomicheskyy vopros' in Narodnaya Volya 5/2/1881, no.5, in N.K.Karatayev(ed.) 'Narodnicheskaya Ekonomicheskaya Literatura' p.394.
- (139) Ibid., pp.394-395.
- (140) S.N.Valk 'Iz narodovol'cheskikh avtobiograficheskikh Dokumentov' in Krasnyy Arkhiv 1927, tom 20, p.211.
- (141) Ibid., pp.229-230.
- (142) Ibid., pp.227,229-230.
- (143) Ibid., p.230.
- (144) 'Rechi podsudimyykh v protsess 17' in Byloye 1906, no.12, p.247.
- (145) V.Tarnovsky (G.G.Romanenko) 'Terrorizm i Rutina' (1880), p.10.
- (146) Ibid., p.20.
- (147) Ibid., p.10.
- (148) Ibid., p.17. This point is also made in N.Morozov's pamphlet 'Terroristicheskaya Bor'ba', on which Romanenko had collaborated (see 'Da Zdravstvuyet Narodnaya Volya! Istoricheskiy Sbornik No.1.' p.21), where the authors claim that terrorism only kills the guilty.
- (149) Ibid., p.24.
- (150) Ibid., p.7. See also Romanenko's article in Narodnaya Volya 23/10/1881, no.6, in 'Literatura' pp.410ff., in which he describes the increasing range of state activity and argues for a constitution. Less than a month later he was arrested.
- (151) B.Sapir(ed.) 'Lavrov' tom II, Prilozheniya. doc.1, I.Ya.Shternberg 'Politicheskyy Terror v Rossii 1884' p.574.

- (152) Ibid., pp.574-575.
- (153) Ibid., p.577.
- (154) Loc.cit..
- (155) Ibid., p.578. Shternberg's views were shared by another Southerner, Bogoraz; they both wrote leading articles for Narodnaya Volya in 1856.
- (156) R.L.Kentor 'Izoved' Grigoriya Gol'denberg'a' in Frasnyy Arkhiv 1928, tom 30, p.174.
- (157) 'Obvinitel'nyy Akt' (22/11/1882) in 'Sovremennoye Obozreniye' p.170 in Vestnik Narodnoy Voli 1884, no.2.
- (158) Ibid., p.171.
- (159) This document is reprinted in 'Sovremennoye Obozreniye' pp.239-240 of Vestnik Narodnoy Voli 1885, no.4.
- (160) C.Fauré(ed.) 'Quatre Femmes Terroristes contre le tsar' p.263, being a translation of Koval'skaya's autobiography in Granat tom XL, pp.189-199. Here she talks about placing economic terror at the forefront of the movement.

CHAPTER V. SOUTHERN REVOLUTIONARIES AND THE URBAN WORKERS.

1. Introduction.

In the course of Chapters III and IV, it became evident that Southern activists were involved with urban workers on a considerable scale, often in preference to involvement with peasants. This fact is not specifically acknowledged in the 'traditional view' of the development of the movement in the South, since such urban activity is usually considered merely to have been a variety of activity among the peasants, with the urban workers being used as a channel through which the revolutionaries could contact the villages. The present Chapter tries to discover the extent and purpose of this involvement with the urban workers, and to establish if the Southern revolutionaries regarded the workers as a vehicle for contacting with the peasants. It also considers the impact which this involvement might have had on the revolutionaries and any contribution which it could make towards explaining the development of the Southern revolutionary movement as a whole.

2. The extent and nature of involvement with urban workers.

"As regards the success of propoganda amongst the workers in 1870 - 1882, immediately after Moscow, stood Kiev and Odessa. Here propoganda amongst the workers, unlike both the capitals, did not break off at the time of the arising of 'Narodnaya Volya'."(1) This importance of the commitment of Southern revolutionaries to activity amongst the urban workers will already be apparent from Chapter III and even more so from Chapter IV, but it can be substantiated by memoir material. N.A.Charushin, for example, relates how he arrived in Kiev at the start of 1873 with the purpose of informing the Chaykovtsy there that their St.Petersburg colleagues had decided to concentrate more effort on agitation amongst city workers. He discovered that "Kiev was a large city of 75,000 but with little industry, so there was not the basis for the new policy but there were carpenters' artels, made up of village people, and all the members of the Kiev Chaykovtsy were actively spreading propoganda amongst the artel workers, in the absence of any better material."(2) Charushin then moved on to Odessa where he visited Volkhovsky's kruzhok and there found that "Not only ideologically but also in practice they already stood on the same point of view ... and already actively worked both in the intelligentsia groups and also amongst the workers." "This last circumstance was helped in a significant degree by the presence in Odessa of quite developed fabrika-zavod industry, and also of numerous workers' artels of different crafts."(3) Proceeding to Ekheron, he found Franzholi working amongst the urban workers, in so far as this was possible given the absence of large-scale industry in the town, but the local group was linked to the workers of Nikolayev where there was a naval ship-yard and large workshop.(4)

Subsequently, at various times during the decade three unions were organised amongst the urban workers in the South: one in Odessa (Zaslavsky's) and two in Kiev. Even in the disappointing years after the ending of the 'v narod' movement, what activity there was tended to be agitation amongst the urban workers. Such was the comment of V.Debagory-Mokriyevich about Kiev in 1877, adding rather bitterly that "people were hardly able to fantasise about this (i.e., activity amongst urban workers) as they had fantasised two years before about the peasants."(5) A similar willingness to be involved with urban

workers, after the movement to propagandise the peasants had ended, was noted by D.T. Butsynsky regarding Kharkov revolutionaries in 1877.(6)

This activity amongst the workers could take years to bear results, and the results might be somewhat unexpected. In Kharkov, for example, C.V. Aptekman recalled that at the start of the seventies, the students of the University, led by Nemirovsky, organised a kruzhok of shop assistants with the purpose of self improvement. To these people were read lectures of a general educational character, including popular lectures on physics and cosmology by Ya.I. Koval'sky. Contact between the shop-assistants and the student body continued, until "In 1873, during the student disorder, ... shop-assistants were in the ranks of the students, (and) together with them were in the streets and protested against the raid by the Cossacks and military on the University and against assaults on the students by the Cossacks."(7) The workers in Kharkov do appear to have been particularly susceptible to propaganda or perhaps unusually rowdy, for in April 1872 there had been "an attack by a crowd on the police department, some people murdered soldiers; the governor and all the authorities fled from Kharkov, and the city was in the hands of the people for three days."(8) Writing his report for 1877, the Kharkov governor stated that: "Socialist teaching ... one can say, has still not at all penetrated amongst the village population; the faithful basis of religion, morals and order remains. It is impossible to say this about the lower class of the city population, which is undermined by socialist teachings; in many is lost the formerly inviolable religious faith and patriarchal family relations. The class of factory workers, very numerous in Kharkov, needs close surveillance and does not represent a guarantee of stability against the distribution of new teaching. Amongst this population, revolutionary propaganda meets with constant sympathy..." and should there be an attempt to put these revolutionary ideas into practice, the great majority of Kharkov workers could not be counted upon to oppose it. Police agents had recently reported overhearing workers complaining about poor pay, cheating of the people, the autocratic nature of the government.(9)

With the appearance of the 'Narodnaya Volya' Party, deliberate involvement by the revolutionaries amongst the urban workers reached its highest point, and the Party was able to profit from the labours of other revolutionaries in this sphere, in the preceding years.

Thus, regarding Odessa, Vera Figner pointed out that the workers who joined the group, organised in the early eighties by M.Trigoni and M.I.Drey, had previously been influenced by Zaslavsky, and then had been in contact with N.N.Kolodkevich in 1879, before coming under Trigoni's influence. Agitation amongst these workers was the main revolutionary activity of the Odessan Central Group.(10) Similarly, along the Black Sea coast at Rostov, when N.Popov arrived in 1877 he found that 'the cause' was going well amongst the workers, thanks in some measure to the work of V.Osinsky in the preceding years.(11) So, when A.Bakh went to Rostov to organise in January 1884, he was able to ponder the fact that 'Narodnaya Volya' had built up an organisation here, particularly amongst the workers, thanks to his predecessor S.Peshekerov who had in turn benefited from the work of 'Zemlya i Volya' and groups before that. As a result, "from the workers had emerged such revolutionaries as Antonov, Pankratov and Borisevich."(12)

In Kharkov in the autumn of 1879, the 'first place' amongst the activities of the 'Narodnaya Volya' was occupied by propaganda amongst the student youths and workers.(13) From 1882 until 1884, according to Figner, "the principal, and it must be said, the sole activity of the group was propaganda amongst the workers and activity with them."(14) The Kharkov worker groups had established links with workers in Poltava, Nikolayev, Yelisavetgrad, Taganrog, Novocherkassk and other cities, and within the town of Kharkov itself, all zavods and railway workshops had been affected to some extent.(15) In Kiev also, from the early '80's, the main narodovol'tsy activity was propaganda amongst the workers.(16) There seems to be little reason for doubting the claim made by the Executive Committee of 'Narodnaya Volya', in 1881, that "In provincial cities, where there were only narodovol'tsy, activity amongst workers went on everywhere, sometimes, as in Odessa, making up the main bulk of all revolutionary work."(17) The Southerner and 'Narodnaya Volya' Party member, S.Rossi, declared that "propaganda of the workers in the South included not less than one thousand persons."(18) It is perhaps therefore no cause for surprise that it was a Southern member of the Executive Committee - A.F.Zhelyabov - who formed the Workers' Group of 'Narodnaya Volya'. Zhelyabov had been involved in propoganda activity amongst urban workers since he had been a member of F.Volkhovsky's kruzhok in Odessa.(19)

Simultaneously with 'Narodnaya Volya', the members of 'Chernyy Peredel' Party, despite intentions to the contrary according to one source, eventually "concentrated all our attention on work in the city ... amongst intelligentsia and workers."(20) P.B.Aksel'rod of 'Chernyy Peredel' explicitly urged an active and systematic development of relations with the city workers as well as with these peasants who had already been recruited, in order to discover the demands and grievances of "the lower classes in different localities."(21)

An interesting aspect of the Southern kruzhsoks was that whenever one was sufficiently numerous and wealthy, its members would specialise in particular types of revolutionary activity. The choice of activity no doubt reflected individual preferences as well as the fact that certain revolutionary work required a degree of expertise in dealing with practical problems. According to I.Tikhomirov, the Volkhovskiy kruzhsok in Odessa in 1873-1874 had "a strict division of labour .."(22) Some specialised in agitation amongst city workers - Golikov and Dicheskulo - some on the artels - A.Franzholi and V.Kostyurin.(23) The Kiev Chaikovtsy were too few to trouble about specialisation but while some, (Aksel'rod and the brothers Levental'), were mainly occupied in propaganda amongst the workers, others spent most of their time with the intelligentsia.(24) Similarly with the Bashentsev, two of its members - Lion and Fomichev - were involved with "mainly city work."(25) S.Kuritsyn related to the police how during his conversations with D.Lizogub at the start of 1879, the latter had told him that his - Lizogub's - group was "strictly organised with large finances and other resources for revolutionary purposes, divided by specialising on the basis of relations with groups.."(26) In this case, this evidence may rather indicate that specialisation was considered a desirable ideal rather than a reality in 'Lizogub's group'.

With the advent of 'Narodnaya Volya', specialisation was further encouraged because the Party's constitution required that local Central Groups should form specialist sub-groups which would be responsible for activity amongst different social groups: workers, students, liberals etc.(27) This injunction appears to have been carried out where possible. In Odessa, for example, in the summer of 1880, a 'Narodnaya Volya' group was formed in which Svedentsev conducted relations with the army, Drey with the workers while Martino dealt with conspiratorial organisation.(28) Since most of 'Narodnaya Volya's' routine work was propaganda amongst

urban workers, some sub-groups specialised in particular types of worker - in Kiev in the summer of 1882, one sub-group concentrated on railway workers while a second directed its attentions towards metal workshop workers.(29)

There were at least three different types of activity amongst the urban workers by the revolutionaries: cultural-educational work; work undertaken by those wishing to prepare themselves for propaganda amongst the peasants in the villages and, finally, propaganda agitation. There was an overlap and sometimes this overlap was quite deliberate, as is illustrated by the rules which the Zhebunev kruzhok drew up to guide their actions: point 'K' states that members would work "in the cities conducting propaganda in the artels under the guise of instruction in reading and writing."(30) Alternatively, members of the same group, V.A.Zhebunev and L.A.Dicheskulo, in the spring and summer of 1874, spread propaganda amongst the metal workshop of Rykhlitsky in Odessa where they had gone to study the metal trade as a preparation for joining the 'v narod' movement.(31) A second point is that people pursuing different types of activity amongst the urban workers could co-exist, although not without friction, in the same kruzhok. Thus, P.B.Aksel'rod began to teach the workers in Kiev at the end of 1872; shortly after, he was joined in this venture by Rashevsky, Emme and Grishi Gurevich. Then the Levental' brothers added their support. "The character of its (i.e., this group's) teaching was not the same everywhere; it depended both on the composition of the audience, and on who conducted the propaganda. Thus Rashevsky and Emme were far more careful than me (Aksel'rod): with them, the cultural-educational side of the work decidedly predominated over the revolutionary-political propaganda; as for me, reading and writing were only means, revolutionary propaganda was the direct objective".(32)

Although there was inevitably an element of educational work in any propaganda activity, it would appear that pure educational-cultural activity was more common at the start of the seventies. Breshko-Breshkovskaya and other liberals set up narod schools in the late sixties and early seventies, although these were more likely to be on the liberals' own estates for their own peasants rather than in the towns.(33) Students were as active in this field as were the zemstvo liberals. At the

students' conference in St.Petersburg in January 1871, the theme of narod education was discussed. S.N.Yuzhakov, the delegate from Odessa advanced a plan for establishing a series of students' schools for the narod. Ya.Koval'sky from Kharkov "also said something similar, adding here the publication and distribution of general-educational books." (34) The matter was considered sufficiently important that it figured in the meeting held in Kiev in 1873 occasioned by the arrival of S.Podolinsky (Dalinsky) who wanted to discover the attitudes of the Kiev Chaykovtsy and other revolutionaries. Breshko-Breshkovskaya was invited to the meeting by Aksel'rod, and she later gave this account of the ensuing discussion. They debated whether they should "undertake, in addition to revolutionary propaganda, educational work as well, and if they thought that the opening of schools in villages and towns should be a compulsory part of this programme.

"Emme and Dalinsky felt that revolutionaries ought not to do purely educational work, because teaching in children's schools would use up much strength and yield little return on account of the general ignorance of the population. But I, who have always been in close contact with the masses, knew how eagerly they aspired to even the most elementary knowledge.... I alleged that it would be very difficult to inculcate, among illiterate people, our socialistic views and our resolve to do away with the monarchy. Aksel'rod, who often shared my views, supported me and the question was answered in the affirmative. It was declared desirable that we should teach the older children." (35) In Kharkov, educational work was carried out by Ye.N.Solntseva and Ya. Koval'sky (36), by a group around S.S.Semirovsky, in which G.V.Aptekman participated (37), and by a group of students from Kharkov Veterinary Institute, for poor children (38). In Odessa, in 1872, there was a free school operated by the University students for young people, which counted amongst its teachers Kaslavsky and Zhelyabov. (39) M.Frolenko and I.N.Koval'sky were involved in educational work amongst Odessan workers in 1873. (40)

The second reason for activity amongst the urban workers was as a consequence of the wish to acquire a skill or trade which would allow its possessor to travel around the villages. The Kharkov seminarists who had agreed to go to propagandise the peasants were urged at meetings in April/May 1874 each to have a training "in a trade or in farming" so

that the agitator could engage in these and "not arouse the suspicions of the lower class of the population..."(41) Those who did acquire a skill were usually those who intended to participate in 'flying propaganda'; those who intended to be 'settled propagandists' were more likely to qualify as nerod teachers or as medical assistants.(42) Flying propaganda was mainly a feature of the early seventies and so consequently was this motive for participating in activity amongst the urban workers - as was the case with the educational - cultural motive.

The third possible reason for activity amongst the urban workers is that of agitational propaganda, which may appear to be the most obvious and most extensive cause of this form of revolutionary activity, and one which manifest itself throughout the years under consideration.

The Soviet historians tend not to distinguish between different types of activity amongst the workers, and their interpretation of the significance of this type of revolutionary activity has been generally constant over a number of generations of Soviet historians. Basically, they contend that the revolutionaries did not see urban workers as fundamentally distinct from the peasants: the urban worker was usually seen as an inferior type of peasant, although a small number of revolutionaries considered them to be the cream of the peasantry. This was the view put forward as late as 1879 by Plekhanov.(43) Activity amongst the urban workers was therefore motivated by the wish to acquire skills which would allow the revolutionary to go amongst the peasants and by the ambition to form, from the urban workers, some posredniki (mediators) who would also go into the villages. As the seventies progressed, emphasis passed from the acquisition of skills to the creation of mediators. Given this motivation, the revolutionaries, say the Soviet historians, concentrated their attentions on building-artel and fabrika workers, rather than zavod workers, because the former were believed to have closer ties with the villages and to return there more frequently than the zavod workers.(44) It is therefore necessary to digress at this point in order to consider the reality of this interpretation, by examining the composition of the urban workforce, and its potentiality for functioning as a mediator between the revolutionaries and peasants in the South.

3. Urban workers in the South.

^
"the less numerous (nature of the) provincial groups of 'propagandists', with less developed fabrika-zavod industrialisation and more backward workers made the development of the workers' cause in the periphery difficult. As a result its scale there was significantly less than in Petersburg."(45) Here N.A.Troitsky, referring to 1871-4, presents the frequently encountered point of view that because of objective factors, such as a smaller and more backward work force in Southern towns, the involvement of revolutionaries with urban workers was on a small scale in the provinces. No doubt the Southern work force was less developed, but as has been seen, the Southern revolutionaries were very deeply involved with them, perhaps proportionately more so than elsewhere.

The economic situation in the South was indeed somewhat different. No sharp distinction existed between the industrial workers and the peasantry. The crucial distinction was between where the people lived - town or country - rather than primarily in the industrial or agricultural nature of their work. A number of peasants were involved in seasonal work in primary industries based on agricultural produce: sugar beet, tobacco etc., on the estates of the landowners. The 'industrial proletariat' was small: "Even such cities as Kiev, Odessa, Kharkov, Rostov, had in 1879 only 2 - 4,000 industrial workers. Much more numerous than them were the small-scale craftsmen." By comparison, St. Petersburg and Moscow had in excess of 70,000 and 60,000 industrial workers respectively.(46) Within the South different centres were progressing at different rates of industrialisation. There was, for example, little fabrika or zavod industry in Kharkov; the work force was largely occupied in artels and workshops of milliners, furniture makers etc. Perhaps because Kharkov was only embarking on the earliest stages of industrialisation, the working conditions were considered worse than those in the industrially more advanced Odessa.(47) Nevertheless the urban work force was increasing rapidly in the South. In Kiev, it increased by 66% between 1864 and 1874 and by a further three hundred per cent during the following ten years.(48)

Many of the town workers came from outwith the South. Indeed, B.S.Itenberg has written that "The distinctive peculiarity of the working class of the Southern regions of Russia was the presence in its

composition of newly arrived (mainly Russian) workers, enriching the cadres of the Ukrainian proletariat."(49) In the case of the zavod population of Yuzhov, 41.2% had arrived from the central provinces.(50) In the main urban centres, the situation was similar. In 1873-1874, according to one source, there were 50,000 workers in Odessa, gathered in artels, who had come from central Russian provinces such as Orlov, Palyuzh, Ryazin. These men were carpenters, brick-layers, plasterers.(51) In Yekaterinoslav also, many of the workers were Great Russian.(52) The zavod workers in Rostov were, according to the memoirs of V.Pankratov, largely composed of newly-arrived factory hands from all corners of Russia.(53) In Kiev, recruitment to the industrial undertakings was mainly from amongst non-Ukrainian workers, and these composed 72% of the labour force, while local workers composed only 16%. Things were otherwise in Kiev's tobacco industry where 64% were Ukrainian, 18% Great Russian, 13% Belorussian.(54)

It was not only many of the urban workers who were from outwith the South. Numbers of the peasantry were migratory workers from the North. In Rostov, for example, in the spring of each year 20 - 30,000 agricultural workers gathered from all corners of Russia, from where they spread out through the north Caucasus and the Don. This migratory population was prone to disorder.(55) Non-Southern peasants were also to be found in the rural industries. While going 'v narod' in the summer of 1874, Breshko-Breshkovskaya spent some time in a township which contained a number of sugar zavods. The workers here were Great Russian and had been brought to the zavods from Samara prior to liberation. Breshko-Breshkovskaya found the propagandisation of these peasants easier since she spoke only Great Russian herself.(56) This was not always the case. F.L.Antonov, for example, in December 1881 left Odessa to work in a zavod in Poltava province, as a blacksmith. He considered that "The ground for propaganda of the revolutionary idea seemed exceptionally favourable here. In this zavod worked almost exclusively peasants from round about ..." (57)

Many of the urban workers therefore had no contact with the surrounding countryside being Great Russian, whereas they themselves presented no linguistic problems for the revolutionaries. Other groups of urban workers, while being Southern, still promised no hope of contact with the peasantry. This was the Jewish element of the urban population. The absence of links between the Jews and the peasantry

was partly a consequence of the hostility expressed by the latter, and partly because prior to the Reforms of the 1860's the Jews were not allowed to hold land, and even after this situation changed, few Jews chose to take advantage of the new opportunity.

On the surface, urban workers did not offer very fertile soil for mediation with the peasants and would appear to have been in many cases quite distinct nationally and linguistically, if not economically, from the peasants. However the important factor is not necessarily the objective reality of the situation, but how the revolutionaries actually perceived it. The attitude of the revolutionaries towards the workers is examined in the following section.

4. The attitude of the Southern revolutionaries towards the urban workers.

The attitude of the Southern revolutionaries towards the urban workers quite naturally changed during the ten years under consideration but so too did the nature and size of the urban work force, as was indicated in the last section. Consequently in tracing alterations in these attitudes it is necessary to bear in mind that part of the explanation for any change may be that the revolutionaries recognised something of this change in the urban workers.

At the start of the seventies many Southern revolutionaries do appear to have regarded the urban workers as potential mediators with the peasants but they realised that the workers themselves were not peasants, and that they would have to be treated differently. N.Langans, for example, recorded that the Volkhovsky kruzhok in Odessa, in 1873-1874, spread propaganda amongst the workers. They concentrated on the artel workers because "the zavod population, spoilt by city life, was not conscious of its links with the peasants, not so receptive to the propaganda of socialism." and also, because the artel workers would return to their villages in Russia and spread the socialist message.(58) However, Charushin recalled that when he visited the kruzhok in August 1873, he found that it worked amongst both fabrika-zavod and artel workers with some success (59), and at least one member of the Volkhovsky kruzhok, A.Zhelyabov, knowing the peasants, believed that the workers would be the main force of revolutionary change.(60) Probably, the Kiev Buntars in 1875, about which Deych wrote, were more typical at this stage of the revolutionary movement; he wrote that many revolutionaries then thought that the city workers were 'depraved' by city living and were only useful as a link between the intelligentsia and the peasants.(61)

The report which G.Popko gave to the Lavrovist Conference in Paris in 1876 shows the motivation behind the activity in the towns of a man who had worked alongside Ye.Naslavsky and was now in the Bashentsev group. He reported that the kruzhok had been disappointed with the results of activity amongst urban workers in 1874-1875 because it had not been completed and had only produced about 25 men suited to be propagandists, 15 of whom landed in prison due to their own carelessness and inexperience. However the kruzhok decided to learn from its mistakes, and gathering together the most active of the workers left after the arrests of 1876;

we "united them into a kruzhek and met with them during the course of almost the whole of 1876. At the end of the last third of this year, we were sufficiently acquainted with the members of the kruzhek, and we chose from it ten men with ready and energetic personalities... to make them into entirely conscious propagandists of the narod. For this purpose a school was constructed, and some of our kruzhek worked in it, teaching necessary general knowledge in a range of short courses, as for example, history, politics, economics, geography, arithmetic and some of the natural sciences, not forgetting private discussions on the different social questions. On completion of this general education course, the workers, in our opinion, must soon begin their practical activity, and settle in a village, hamlet, town, wherever is convenient." "This is the only path, we think, by which it is possible to produce from town workers, conscious propagandists for the narod." This was obviously extremely costly in terms of the time which the revolutionaries had to devote to it, and Popko admitted that it constituted the main part of their work so they paid less attention to propaganda amongst the intelligentsia.(62) The Kiev delegates to the conference, in their reports also revealed the importance which was attached to activity amongst the workers: one reported that the Kievans had carried out activity amongst workers from May 1875 till August 1876, mainly on an experimental basis from which they had drawn the conclusion that it is desirable "firstly, to get to know the moral side of the workers, which is possible when the propagandist is involved closely with them, ..." (63) The second delegate from Kiev stressed the necessity of "popular textbooks for the more developed workers..." distinct from "the narod publications proper." (64) The workers were not, then, considered simply as peasants who lived in towns, but were the material from which a workers' intelligentsia could be formed and which would communicate the teachings of the revolutionaries to the villages.

Such a formidable programme had to be rewarded quickly with commensurately large results. They were not, and sooner or later the revolutionaries had to recognise this. F.B.Aksel'rod and his colleagues, even as early as the summer of 1873, had found that work amongst the artel workers was no longer satisfying them; the workers only appeared to be interested in acquiring education and not in becoming propagandists themselves.(65)

The revolutionaries in the second half of the seventies, faced with the

failure of the 'v narod' movement, were quick to realise that although there had been little success in persuading the urban workers to become propagandists in the villages, they had shown themselves to be interested in revolutionary ideas and willing to participate in revolutionary organisations. Since they offered the revolutionaries some success the latter rapidly changed their evaluation of urban workers for one which was more positive. Ye.O.Zaslavsky, for example, had been an observer of the peasants in the early '70's and had found them unsatisfactory, so when, in September 1875, he came to write an estimation of the urban worker he contrasted them not with the peasants but with the intelligentsia: "Contact with the young intelligentsia never aroused in me as much hope as did contact with the workers, for the rapid development of the social revolution in Russia." He had found that the initial ardour of the young intelligentsia would disappear in the face of the demands, which 'the cause' imposed on its adherents. With the workers, there was an initial lack of enthusiasm but gradually commitment to the cause became a stubborn energy.(66) Thus by March 1871, for example, when N.F.Bukh went to the capital and was duly upbraided by the St.Petersburgers for the Southerners' failure to settle amongst the peasants, he was quite content to assure them "that propaganda in the city amongst the intelligentsia and the workers, was significantly more productive than propaganda amongst the villages."(67) Not only were the revolutionaries drawn to the urban workers by the prospect of success, but also because, until well through the seventies, it was easy for them to get jobs as factory workers - in the interest of spreading propaganda - without having a residence permit or identity papers.(68)

Success in propagandising the urban workers and the comparative ease of access to them brought about a re-evaluation of their revolutionary significance, in the second half of the seventies. The new attitudes varied, but all accorded the urban workers a greater theoretical importance than had been the case before. In the early seventies the urban workers had been regarded as distinctive from the peasantry and this theme was intensified in the later period and they were viewed as an independent social group. The part now accorded to urban workers in revolutionary tactical theory varied from that of autonomous activists amongst the peasants, through being vital for the success of a revolution, to being the only possible ally of the revolutionaries. At one extreme the new attitude was similar to the old one in that it stressed the usefulness

of the urban workers in communicating ideas to the villages but the ideas which were to be communicated were now to be those of elements of the urban work force itself. Thus, in Odessa in 1880-1881, was formed a kruzhok of workers who had previously been in the kruzhoks of either Zaslavsky, Ikon, Fomich or some other; these were 'old' workers such as F.Popov, F.Klimenko, G.Batagov, P.Baluyev, G.Kostyurin and K.Ivanaynen. (69) This group conducted propaganda in the suburbs of Odessa, and generally in the Odessa area where artels of workers newly arrived from the villages usually settled. Many of these were construction workers, and this Odessian kruzhok of 'Narodnaya Volya' workers concentrated on them. One of the 'Narodnaya Volya' group recalled that "We valued these workers very highly, since they were still closely linked with the villages, and they were able to be good conductors of our ideas to there."(70) "They were all quite susceptible to propaganda and the group took pains to mix with these newly arrived workers, to familiarise them with our ideas and to organise kruzhoks amongst them."(71) Vera Figner, talking of this group of 'Narodnaya Volya' workers, described them as "a group of genuine zavod workers, already for a long time attached to the party..." But they "did not stand on a class point of view and in revolutionary activities were led by the same motives as the intelligentsia itself; these were altruism, the idea of justice etc., clear moral motives."(72) There was therefore now a clearly separate group of urban workers, albeit one which had special abilities when it came to contact with the villages. The journal Rabochiy published by a group of worker members of 'Narodnaya Volya' in Odessa shows that a joint revolt of workers and peasants was still being hoped for.(73) The workers were not merely instruments in bringing about the great peasant uprising but a group which could initiate such a movement and lead the peasants towards it. Even the 'Chernyy Feredel' activists, while still stoutly maintaining that there was an ultimate identity of interests between peasant and urban worker - i.e., the re-distribution of land - were willing to include short term demands in their programme, which were of interest to the urban workers: shorter working day, freedom of speech and assembly, universal, equal, direct and secret elections. This meant that it "had a programme in outward appearance in agreement with the programme of the German S.D.'s."(74) One possible new appraisal of the urban workers was therefore as a distinct social group which could act on its own, had special short term objectives but was ultimately

to participate in the general narod revolution.

The official 'narodnaya Volya' policy represented a different view of the urban workers, for it recognised that they had a special tactical significance. The party urged its local Central Groups that "The city worker population, having especially great significance for the revolution; both due to its position, and with regard to its large development, the party must turn serious attention to it." The position of these workers is important because they could close the factories etc., and come onto the streets as well as serving as a link with the narod.(75) "Therefore amongst the workers must be brought intense propoganda for (i) the socialist idea ... (ii) the political revolution and the creation of a democratic government, as the first step to the realisation of the narod's demands." To this end, any type of worker should be organised - artel worker, artisan etc..(76)

Another possible position on the urban workers was expressed by N.I.Kibal'chik in Narodnaya Volya when he claimed that the peasantry would not revolt because of their material deficiencies. The signal for the revolution would therefore come first from the urban workers, who had "greater development and mobility..." than the peasants.(77) Millions of starving peasants would then follow the urban workers' leadership, and would have to follow it if the success of the revolution was to be assured. A second important Southerner, V.Zhebunov, had similar opinions. By the early eighties, he "was more a social democrat than a narodnik ... not having expectations of the village. Zhebunov definitely considered the city industrial proletariat as the single support in the political struggle." He thought that only the proletariat could appreciate the socialist idea.(78) By 1884, Narodnaya Volya was even proclaiming that the organisation of a mass following amongst the peasantry was impossible and so the 'decisive' revolutionary force (i.e., the intelligentsia) would have to have the aid of small but experienced cadres of city workers which would have links with the other city workers and, as far as possible, with the peasants.(79) This point of view represented a complete reversal of the relative importance attached to urban workers and peasants which had been espoused ten years before. Indeed one activist in Rostov in the early eighties later wrote that "It is very probable that in the period under consideration (1882-1884), this aspiration to work amongst city workers took the place for us of the going v narod in the preceding

period - in the '70's."(80) He and his group did not concern themselves with the peasants, but concentrated on the skilled workers of the railway and engineering zavod. Their message to these workers was an explanation that the economic interests of worker and capitalist were contradictory, that the government always takes the side of capitalist and landowner against worker and narod, and that the worker must fight for political rights and for the programme of 'Narodnaya Volya'.(81) The same order of priorities between peasant and worker is witnessed in the editorial programme for the planned paper of the Kiev based South-West group of the party 'Narodnaya Volya', which was to have been called Sotsialist. The editor specified that his paper was to contain a 'Chronique' of revolutionary activities which would mention "notable arrests amongst the workers, army, intelligentsia ...(trials)... information about signs of popular opposition and of the revolutionary movement: strikes, bunts, agrarian terror etc..."(82) He did however believe that the desired for revolution required the "organisation of city and village working class into a social force..."(83)

There was a still more extreme viewpoint which excluded the peasantry totally and condemned the working class for what had previously commended it in the eyes of the revolutionaries - contact with the villages. L.Ya.Shternberg, writing in 1884 pointed out that "The composition of the working class in the capital is mainly newly arrived, now rushing in, now pouring out, changing with each year; from here is absent a close tradition of solidarity amongst most of them, and only a small constant part - on which it would be possible to rely entirely."(84)

Thus after the failure of the 'v narod' movement, the Southern revolutionaries came to rely increasingly on urban workers whether as allies against the government or as assistants in the dissemination of the revolutionary appeal. They came increasingly to recognise the distinctive demands of the working class and the unique contribution which it could make. Given this increasing closeness of revolutionaries and working people in the towns, did the latter exercise any wider influence on the revolutionaries apart from causing them to alter their opinion of the urban population? Evidence, such as there is, suggests that the urban workers conceived of their own needs as being for improved conditions and for political freedoms. As F.Venturi has pointed out, "the demand for political freedom appears in the working class programme before it appears in the programme of the revolutionary intelligentsia."(85)

Such an indication is supported by the experience of Zaslavsky's Union. Zaslavsky had proposed to exclude the word 'political', as a main aim, from the Union's rules, where it referred to the struggle with the economic and political regime. Persistent demands by the workers forced him to withdraw his proposal.(86) A similar support for a political struggle, by the workers, was manifest in the Union of Shchedrin and Koval'skaya - the 'South-Russian Workers Union' - in Kiev, in 1880. These two leaders believed that political reforms would be meaningless unless preceded by social and economic revolutions. The programme of their Union consequently proclaimed that its first priority was the transfer of the ownership of the land, fabrika and zavod to those who would work them in associations; only as a consequence of these economic changes would political change, such as equal rights to participate in government, enjoyment of full personal liberties, come about.(87) The Union initially devoted itself to economic terrorism which did actually win wage increases for the workers but failed to cause the economic system to collapse. Once the two founders had been arrested, however, the demands of the worker members of the Union became increasingly concerned with the need for political freedoms and for legislation to regulate pay and conditions, rather than for economic terrorism and the destruction of the economic system.(88)

5. Summary.

The involvement of Southern revolutionaries in activity amongst urban workers was extensive and continuous, especially so during the period of the 'Narodnaya Volya' party when a previously existing tendency towards specialisation in this type of work, by individual members of a kruzhek, increased. The motivation behind this involvement was complex: it involved educational/cultural work and 'preparatory' work by the revolutionaries as well as an agitational purpose. The Soviet view that it was done in order to use the workers as mediators with the peasants is too simple, for any period of the decade under consideration. Objectively the whole notion of using the workers as mediators seems at odds with the economic reality since so few of the urban workers did have contacts with the villages of the South and this probably contributed to the loss of popularity of this idea by the mid seventies. At the start of the period, despite the objective situation, many Southern revolutionaries do appear to have believed that they could use the urban workers as mediators, but they soon began to appreciate that they were distinct from the peasants. They were, for example, easier to propagandise and success encourages further involvement with urban workers at the same time as failure was making the peasants less attractive. Increasingly many began to perceive the urban worker as a good ally in the revolutionary struggle - more alive than the peasants and more trustworthy than the liberals. This relationship was dialectic; the revolutionaries agitation amongst the workers also necessitated some sensitivity by them to the workers' own demands and interests, which do appear to have been inclined towards the need for greater political freedom and improved conditions.

6. References.

- (1) S.S.Volk 'Deyatel'nost' 'Narodnoy Voli' sredi rabochikh v gody vtoroy revolyutsionnoy situatsii 1879-1882' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1963, tom 74, p.208. P.Milyoukov 'Russia and Its Crisis' p.403, wrote "The southern circles of Odessa and Kiev ... were the first (1871) to try direct agitation among the workmen, in the factories." Also S.S.Volk 'Narodnaya Volya 1879-1882' p.299.
- (2) N.A.Charushkin 'O Dalekom Proshlom' p.156.
- (3) Ibid., p.159, and p.185 where he refers to 'systematic work' by Volkhovsky's group amongst workers during the summer of 1873.
- (4) Ibid., p.163. On Franzholi's kruzhok, see also A.O.Lukashevich 'V narod! (Iz vospominaniy semidesyatnika)' in Byloye 1907, no.3, p.4.
- (5) Vl. Debagory-Mokriyevich 'Iz Vospominaniy' in Vestnik Narodnoy Voli no.3, 1884, p.93.
- (6) S.N.Volk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.30, p.130. Some of the workers' meetings were held weekly and a number of the kruzhoks involved more than 20 workers. According to O.D.Sokolov 'Revol'yutsionnaya propaganda sredi fabrichnykh i zavodskikh rabochikh v 70-kh godakh XIX veka' in M.I.Kim(ed.) 'Iz istorii rabocheho klassa i krest'yanstva SSSR.' p.19, comments that workers were being propagandised in the majority of districts of Kiev. The evidence of continuous involvement with urban workers confounds the thesis of Sh.M.Jevin 'Obshchestvennoye Dvizheniye v Rossii v 60-70-ye gody XIX veka' p.484, that since revolutionaries saw urban workers and peasants as being the same, when they became disillusioned with the peasants, they also became sceptical about raising city workers and did not increase their activity amongst the latter.
- (7) O.V.Aptekman 'Iz istorii revolyutsionnago narodnichestva 'Zemlya i Volya' 70-kh godov' p.32.
- (8) Vl. Burtsev(ed.) 'Da sto let' p.79. G.Hare 'Thirty-Five Years in Russia' p.125,139 comments on the frequency and seriousness of riots in Pberkov.
- (9) Printed in Zemlya i Volya no.2, 15 December 1871, see B.Bazilevsky (ed.) 'Revol'yutsionnaya Zhurnalistika semidesyatnykh godov' pp.129-130

- (10) V.Figner 'Mikhail Nikolayevich Trigoni' in Golos Minuvshago 1917, no.7/8, p.202. L.Tikhomirov 'Iz Davnyyego Razgovora' in 'Vestnik Narodnoy Volyi' no.4, 1885, p.97, related that in around 1879, a whole list of his personal friends were involved in propaganda amongst urban workers independent of 'Narodnaya Volya'.
- (11) M.Popov 'Iz moyego revolyutsionnogo proshlago' (oчерk pervyy) in Byloye 1907, no.5, pp.228-239. On the extent of the links established between workers in Rostov and those in other towns, see:V.Levitsky 'Narodnaya Volya i rabochiy klass' in KiS 1930, k.1, p.63.
- (12) A.Bakh 'Vospominaniya Narodovol'tsa' (Prodolzheniye) in Byloye 1907, no.2, p.193.
- (13) V.V.Shirokova 'Vozniknoveniye narodovol'cheskoy organizatsii v Khar'kove' in 'Iz istorii obshchestvennogo dvizheniya i obshchestvennoy mysli v Rossii' p.82.
- (14) V.Figner 'Zapechatlyenny Trud' tom I, p.328.
- (15) V.Levitsky(V.Tsederbaum) 'Partiya 'Narodnaya Volya'. Vozniknoveniye, Bor'ba, Gibel'' p.121.
- (16) V.Levitsky 'Narodnaya Volya i rabochiy klass' in KiS 1930,k.1,p.60.
- (17) 'Pis'mo Iсполnitel'nogo komiteta 'Narodnoy Volyi' zagranichnyam tovarishcham' in S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.80, pp.318-319 and B.Sapir(ed.) 'Lavrov' tom II, doc.71, p.113.
- (18) S.S.Volk 'Deyatel'nost' 'Narodnoy Volyi' sredi rabochikh v gody vtoroy revolyutsionnoy situatsii 1879-1882' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1963, tom 74, p.208.
- (19) D.Footman 'Red Prelude' pp.52-53.
- (20) G.V.Aptekman 'Obshchestvo 'Zemlya i Volya' 70-ki godov' p.387. A.Tun 'Istoriya revolyutsionnykh dvizheniy v Rossii' p.270, quotes Ya.Stefanovich that 'Chernyy Peredel' was only active in urban centres and did nothing in the villages.
- (21) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.43, p.170.
- (22) (L.Tikhomirov) 'Andrey Ivanovich Shelyabov' p.9.
- (23) P.L.Lavrov 'Narodniki-Propagandisty 1873-78 godov' p.216.
- (24) N.A.Mroitsky 'Bol'shoye obshchestvo propagandy 1871-1874gg(tak nazyvayemyye chaykovtsy)' p.39.
- (25) A.Shekhter 'Revolutsionnaya Odessa 1871-78gg. (k kharakteristike Lioba i Fomicheva)' in KiS 1923, k.6, p.45.
- (26) S.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.29, p.110,111.

- (27) 'Podgotovitel'naya Rabota Partii' in 'Literatura' pp.872-875.
- (28) M.I.Drey 'Strel'nikovskiy Protssess v Odesse v 1873 gody' in KIS 1904, k.9, p.47.
- (29) A.K.Bekh 'Vospominaniya Karobovol'tsa (1882-1886gg)' in dyloye 1907, no.1, pp.182-183.
- (30) B.S.Itenberg 'Dvizheniye Revolyutsionnogo Narodnichestva' p.306.
- (31) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, p.470.
- (32) F.B.Aksel'rod 'Perezhitoye i Perodumannoye' pp.96-97. For further information on the educational work carried out by students in Kiev, see N.Charushin 'O Dalekom Proshlom' p.385 and 188.
- (33) E.K.Breshko-Breshkovskaya 'Hidden Springs of the Russian Revolution' p.21. Recently, Pamela S.Pickinsey in 'From City Workers to Peasantry: The Beginning of the Russian Movement 'To the People'' in Slavic Review 1979, vol.38, pp. 629-649, has advanced the thesis that 'v narod' movement originated in a movement by ex-zemstvo activists in St.Petersburg, who with others - all under the influence of Lassalle's writings - decided to concentrate on revolutionary activity amongst urban workers. However because of government persecution and the discovery that the urban workers were semi-rural, the revolutionaries decided to go 'v narod' in 1874. The early activity amongst urban workers was an end in itself not, as the Soviets maintain, to produce 'mediators'. The present study confirms that a number of those active in 'v narod' in the South were ex-zemstvo activists and also that Lassalle appears to have been widely read by southerners.
- (34) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, doc.24, p.216.
- (35) E.K.Breshko-Breshkovskaya 'Hidden Springs of the Russian Revolution' pp.12-13.
- (36) B.S.Itenberg 'Dvizheniye Revolyutsionnogo Narodnichestva' pp.157-158; G.N.Ferris 'Russia in Revolution' p.213; O.V.Aptekman 'Obshchestvo 'Zemlya i Volya' 70-kh godov' pp.51-52.
- (37) O.V.Aptekman op. cit., pp.47-49; B.S. Itenberg op. cit., pp.157-158.
- (38) B.S.Itenberg op. cit., p.334.
- (39) A.Shekhter 'Is dolekogo proshlogo' in 'Tis' 1923, no.5, p.42; for more information on Zaslavsky's educational work in Odessa in 1872/3, see A.M.Pankratova(ed.) 'Rabocheye Dvizheniye' tom II, ch.2, doc.57, pp.119-120.

- (40) A.M.Fankratova(ed.) 'Rabocheye Dvizheniye' tom II, ch.2, doc.58, p.121; L.Beych 'Ve tolveka' tom I, p.277; tom II, p.183.
- (41) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, doc.64, pp.336-337.
- (42) The Zhebunev kruzhok for example, began as narod teachers but, disappointed with the slowness and unproductiveness of this method, they decided to acquire trades in the spring of 1874 so that they could move freely amongst a greater number of peasants. See, R.V.Filippov 'Iz istorii narodnicheskogo dvizheniya na pervom etape 'Khozhdeniya v narod' (1863-1874)' pp.232-235.
- (43) (G.Plekhanov) 'Zemlya i Volya' no.4, 20 Feb.1879, in B.Bazilevsky (ed.) 'Revolyutsionnaya Zhurnalistsika semidesyatykh godov' p.194,196.
- (44) The basis of this composite view can be discerned in Sh.M.Levin 'Obschestvennoye Dvizheniye v Rossii v 60-70-ye gody XIX veka' p.357; S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, p.441, note 21; S.S.Volk 'Deyatel'nost' 'Narodnoy Voli' sredi rabochikh v gody vtoroy revolyutsionnoy situatsii 1879-1882' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1963, tom 74, p.190.
- (45) N.A.Troitsky 'Bol'shoye obshchestvo propagandy 1871-1874' p.58.
- (46) S.S.Volk 'Deyatel'nost' 'Narodnoy Voli' sredi rabochikh v gody vtoroy revolyutsionnoy situatsii 1879-1882' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1963, tom 74, p.189.
- (47) On the scarcity of fabrika and zavod workers in Pherkov in early '70's, see Ye.Foval'skaya 'Po povodu pis'ma V.Malyutina' in Is 1931, k.4, p.139. On the bad working conditions in Pherkov, see, for example, the testimony of Teterka in 'Otchet o protsess 20-ti Narodovol'tsev v 1882 gody' in Byloye 1906, no.6, p.261.
- (48) O.A.Parasun'ko 'Stachechnoye dvizheniye 70-kh - nachala 90-kh godov' in V.A.Golobutsky et al. (ed.) 'Istoriya Nivea' tom I, p.391.
- (49) B.S.Itenberg 'Vuzhno-Rossiyskiy Soюз Rabochikh. Vozniknoveniye i Deyatel'nost'' p.37.
- (50) P.I.Kabanov(ed.) 'Ocherki istorii rossiyskogo proletariata (1861 - 1917)' p.22
- (51) P.I.Lavrov. 'Narodniki-Propagandisty 1873-78 godov' p.216.
- (52) See, Istok Narodnoy Voli no.1, 1883, in 'Literatura' p.624.
- (53) V.Fankratov 'Iz deyatel'nosti sredi rabochikh v 1880-84 gg' in Byloye 1906, no.3, p.249.
- (54) O.A.Parasun'ko 'Stachechnoye dvizheniye 70-kh - nachala 90-kh godov' in V.A.Golobutsky et al. (ed.) 'Istoriya Nivea' tom I, p.391.

- (55) A.Bekh 'Vospominaniya kerotovol'tsa. (Prodolzheniye)' in Byloye 1907, no.2, p.204. On the riots started by these peasants in 1879, see V.Pankretov 'Iz deyatel'nosti sredi rabochikh v 1870-84 gg' in Byloye 1906, no.3, p.249; 'Svod'" in Byloye 1907, no.8, p.105.
- (56) Ye.Breshkovskaya 'Vospominaniya Propagandistki' in Byloye May 1903, no.4, pp.34-35 which is a reprint of her articles in Obshchina nos.7, 8/9, 1878.
- (57) 'Iz avtobiografii F.L.Antenova' in Holos Vinuvshago 1923, no.2, in A.V.Yakimova-Dikovskaya (ed.) 'Narodnaya Volya' v dokumentakh i vospominaniyakh' p.172.
- (58) F.L.Lavrov 'Narodniki-Propagandisty, 1875-78 godov' p.217,218.
- (59) N.A.Charushin 'O Dalekom Proshlom' p.185.
- (60) D.Footman 'Red Prelude' p.51.
- (61) L.Deych 'La Polveka' tom I, p.116.
- (62) B.Sapir(ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, doc. 67, pp.235-236.
- (63) Ibid., p.234.
- (64) Ibid., p.233.
- (65) P.M.Aksel'rod 'Perezhitoye i Peredumannoye' p.104; A.Ascher 'Favel Aksel'rod and the Development of Menshevism' pp.19-20. On the general failure to persuade urban workers to go to the villages as propagandists, see E.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.539.
- (66) B.Sapir(ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, Prilozheniye, doc. 1, p.489. Correspondence of Ye.G.Zaslavsky. In his article 'Iz Odessy' in Vpered!, Zaslavsky put forward the view that the workers "were still not mature enough for revolutionary upheaval..." and would still require to be properly educated by the intelligentsia. On the enthusiastic response by urban workers to revolutionary teaching by the Bashentsev in Odessa, see S.Ye.Lion 'Ot propagandy k terroru' in KiS 1924, k.12, p.17.
- (67) N.K.Bukh 'Vospominaniya' p.143. On success amongst urban workers in the late seventies, see also, Ye.Serebryakov 'Obshchestvo 'Zemlya i Volya'' in 'Materialy' tom II, May 1894, p.49.
- (68) B.A.Engel and C.N.Rosenthal(eds.) 'Five Sisters: Women Against the Tsar' p.103.
- (69) F.Drey 'Zametka o rabochem dvizhenii v Odesse v 1880-18 1 gg' in KiS 1924, k.12, p.74.
- (70) Ibid., p.75. See also F.Drey 'Strel'nikovskiy protsess' in A.Yakimova-Dikovskaya (ed.) 'Narodnaya Volya' pered tsarskim sudom' p.12.

- (71) M.Drey 'Jurel'nikovskiy protsess' in A.Yakimova-Dikovskaya (ed.) 'Narodnaya Volya' pered tsarskim sudom' p.13.
- (72) V.Figner 'Mikhail Nikolayevich Trigoni' in Golos Minuvshago 1917, no. 7/8, p.202.
- (73) 'Rabochiy' - Rostovskiy Zhurnal 1885 goda' in 'Literaturnoye Nasledstvo' 1932, no.2, pp.75-100.
- (74) P.B.Aysel'rod 'Ferezhitoye i feredumannoye' p.330, referring to the programme of his 'Workers' Union of South Russia', Kiev 1879, probably written by Ya.Stefanovich.
- (75) 'Podgotovitel'naya Rabota Partii' in 'Literatura' p.874.
- (76) Ibid., p.875.
- (77) A.Doroshenko (N.I.Kibal'chich) 'Politicheskaya Revolyutsiya i ekonomicheskiy vopros' in Narodnaya Volya no.5, 5 Feb.1881, reprinted in N.F.Faratayev (ed.) 'Narodnicheskaya ekonomicheskaya Literatura' p.395.
- (78) V.Figner 'Zapechatlenyye Trud' tom I, p.291.
- (79) 'O zadach. deystel'n. partii v narod' in Narodnaya Volya no.10, Sept. 1874, reprinted in 'Literatura' p.669.
- (80) 'Propaganda sredi rabochikh v Rostov-na-Donu v 1882-1884gg' in Byloye Jan.1904, no.5, p.14.
- (81) Ibid., pp.14-15, 17,19.
- (82) S.N.Valk(ed.) ''Sotsialist', organ yugo-zapadnoy gruppy partii 'Narodnoy Voli' in Krasnyy Arkhiv 1929, no.33, p.209.
- (83) Ibid., p.207.
- (84) L.Ya.Shternberg 'Politicheskiy Terror v Rossii 1884' in S.S. Sapir(ed.) 'Iavrov' tom II, Prilozheniye, doc.1, p.577.
- (85) F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.347.
- (86) B.S.Itenberg 'Vozniknoveniye pervoy proletarskoy organizatsii v Rossii -Yuzhnorossiyskogo soyuza rabochikh' in Estoricheskiye Zapiski 1953, tom 44, p.172.
- (87) A.D.Fankratova(ed.) 'Rabocheye dvizheniye' tom II, ch.2, doc.233, p.435.
- (88) Ibid., doc.235 and 236. On the Union's activities, see Ye.Fovel'skaya 'Yuzhnyy Rabochiy soyuz v 1880-81 gg' in Byloye Feb.1904, no. 6, pp.35ff. For another example of apparently spontaneous demands by Southern workers for political rights, see S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.86, p.349.

CHAPTER VI. THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT AND LIBERAL SOCIETY IN THE SOUTH, 1873 - 1883.

1. Introduction.

Chapter II, section 4, considered finances and pointed out that 'society' had assisted parts of the Southern revolutionary movement in this respect. Chapter IV, section 5, indicated that some Southern revolutionaries regarded liberals - to a greater or lesser extent - as possible allies. Further, the wish for political freedom shown by post-1876 revolutionaries (see Chapter IV) would appear, superficially at least, to be something which they had in common with the liberals in Russia.

This Chapter is intended to investigate whether the development of the movement was affected in any way by these contacts with liberal society - an influence not recognised by the traditional view of the development of the movement. To elucidate this point, the present Chapter will examine the extent and nature of these contacts and consider the attitudes towards the liberals to which these gave rise. To this end, the separate sections will examine the personal links between the two movements, the links existing at an 'organisational' level, and thirdly, the attitudes and policies which Southern revolutionaries had towards the liberals at various times between 1873 and 1883. This Chapter is not concerned with the history of liberal society in the South during this period, or with its shifting political fortunes, it is merely concerned with the revolutionary movement and how it related to liberal society.

2. Revolutionaries who had been liberals.

'Liberal society' in this Chapter is used to indicate that part of Southern educated society which wished for, preferably peaceful, social and/or political change, but was not itself revolutionary or involved in any such organised movement. It was a position which is perhaps most commonly associated with those who worked in the zemstvos, town dumas or as Justices of the Peace. Yet ultimately, the distinction was one of attitude and behaviour not of occupation. However, it was periodically difficult to assign an individual to one camp or the other on the basis of his chosen sphere of activity. Thus considerable numbers of revolutionaries during the earlier part of the movement went amongst the peasantry to arouse revolution as zemstvo teachers or as medical assistants - for example, the Zhebunev kruzhok. Conversely, one of the activists in the Kharkov kruzhok of D.T. Butsynsky, in 1878, named Rodin, proclaimed at his trial that he was "only a liberal..."(1) Similarly, when A.N. Bukh went to Rostov at the start of 1884, he considered that one of the main leaders of the Central Group of Rostov's 'Narodnaya Volya' Party was too much of a liberal; he "knew the liberal catechism thoroughly and had on occasions even made full use of it, but he completely failed to understand the revolutionary movement and did not even interest himself in its meaning."(2) In ambiguous cases it has been necessary to make arbitrary decisions.

Lev Deych once wrote that in part due to the revelations of the Nechayev trial, he reacted against violence, and at the beginning of the seventies came to consider himself a liberal but, "It was a rare revolutionary of this period who did not begin his social activity with some legal attempt to be of use to the needy."(3) Clearly, if one was willing to use a definition of sufficient width, few of the revolutionaries could escape being called ex-liberals. P. Kropotkin wrote, in the same vein as Deych, in an article for the Fortnightly Review in 1882, that "nearly all those who have taken an active part in the revolutionary agitation, before joining the Revolutionary Party, have tried to work in peaceful and law-abiding ways." "Osinsky and Kvyatkovsky... before they joined the Revolutionary Party, served in the zemstvo; Voynaralsky was a Justice of the Peace; Kravchinsky, Doubrovin, Shishko, Sukharov, Vemelyanov were officers; Weimar was a distinguished surgeon; and the present writer was for several years a public official naively believing

in the good intentions of his Government."(4) Numbers of those who were to become revolutionaries did begin in fact as liberal reformers.

Yekaterina Breshko-Breshkovskaya offers an interesting case of someone who reached the position of being a leader of the Kiev Commune and an active participant in propaganda amongst the peasants, through disillusionment with the possibilities of legal zemstvo educational and social work. She was born in 1844 in Vitebsk but brought up on an estate in Chernigov. Her father was the scion of an aristocratic Polish family and her mother a member of the Russian aristocracy. Her family was liberally inclined, and she explained her own liberalism as being founded upon her father's teachings and influence. However, Breshkovskaya went further to the left than her father's mild liberalism. In her late teens, she went to St.Petersburg and became involved in liberal and revolutionary circles around the University. Married to a liberal in 1869, she left her husband the following year.(5) "As an already adult young woman, with her father, she took part in the preparations on their estate for the liberation of the peasants from serfdom, and with her husband she opened the first zemstvo schools and libraries in their district."(6) "At that time (i.e., the 1860's), Breshko-Breshkovskaya herself dreamt of nothing further than legal cultural work in the village. Together with her father, her husband and their neighbour, Sinegub, she gave herself wholeheartedly to the organisation of schools, libraries, and hospitals in their uyezd.

"But neither in the zemstvo nor in the neighbouring territory did Sinegub and Breshkovskaya succeed. Alarmed by a too rapid growth of cultural institutions, in the village, the authorities closed the schools founded by the Breshkovsky and Sinegub families and forbade their working among the peasants. It was then that a rupture took place. Breshkovskaya's father and her husband submitted to the government and remained loyal liberals, while Katerina and Sinegub, on the other hand, placed their duty to the people before obedience to the government."(7) Another future revolutionary, I.I.Kablits, also worked with Breshkovskaya in these endeavours. However, this group of liberal activists had wider contacts, for it was the brother of the K.F.Baydakovsky mentioned below - Pavel F.Baydakovsky - who, in company with A.A.Kril', went abroad to Switzerland and contacted Lavrov in March 1872 in order to suggest that he, Lavrov, should start a paper.(8) As a result of his meeting and conversation with these two, Lavrov went ahead and wrote the first draft of the Vpered! programme, which is generally considered as zemstvo -

constitutional in tone.(9) The first programme for Vpered! did indeed state that "we do not call for revolutionary measures... What it is possible to do by way of small reform, that should also be done. However small the legal path is in Russia, it does exist." The zemstvo worker and the lawyer could do much legally to improve the material, educational and legal position of the peasant.(10) P.F.Baydakovsky returned to Russia and, during the period from September to November 1872, was visited by S.L.Podolinsky. Baydakovsky presumably must have been content with this programme for Podolinsky subsequently wrote to Lavrov that "Baydakovsky categorically said he would give 3,000 rubles..." and appears to have given Podolinsky no reason to question his own belief that "For the time being in the south it is possible to count on Kiev, Odessa, Kharkov, Yelizavetgrad, Holtava and Chernigov..." to provide an organisation through which the projected journal would be distributed.(11)

However, according to Breshkovskaya it was not the closure of her schools and libraries, nor even her argument with her father, which turned her to that revolutionary path embraced by her in 1872/3. The government had proceeded to remove the progressive influences from the uyezd administration: K.F.Baydakovsky was sent to Kostrum, from which he subsequently fled (12), S.F.Kovalik was denied confirmation of his office as a J.P., and Breshkovskaya's father was forced to resign from his zemstvo office.(13) These events confirmed to her "the obvious impossibility" of proceeding by the path of open legal work to improve the lot of the narod, which remained her aim. She decided "to protest against the existing order, to unite her voice with those of a number of protesting friends, it was not calculated, of course, to bring immediate and direct profit to the narod, the bad position of whom impelled us to act like this. But I suggested and suggest that the louder and the more that protest is expressed against this position ... the quicker the government will turn its attention to it ..." At the same time, "as I entirely parted from the peaceful path of activities I endeavoured to establish a farm on which young people from the intelligentsia were able to teach ourselves simple, physical work, to study the peasant way of life, in order then to go amongst the narod and to live as one with them, to lift their moral and material way of life, to develop in them good inclinations and to help in difficult situations. In line with this, it was not proposed to introduce anti-government propaganda. This attempt, however, again turned out badly

and it was to be the last."(14) Thus Breshkovskaya regarded herself as having embarked on "a criminal and non-peaceful", but not particularly revolutionary method of struggle; the latter she had obviously tried to avoid.

S.F.Kovalik, mentioned above, had been appointed J.P. for Mglinsk uyezd, Chernigov province, in 1870, by the Chernigov provincial zemstvo, but this was rescinded by the Senate in the following year. Kovalik moved to the capital and applied unsuccessfully for a professorship, after which he became increasingly active in the revolutionary circles of St.Petersburg.(15) I.M.Koval'sky also applied for a position as a J.P. without success, after which in 1876, he became a correspondent for the Nikolayev Vestnik.(16) Thus, four of the important leaders of the revolutionary movement in the earlier years had begun by trying to accommodate themselves within the official structure of Imperial society: Breshkovskaya, Kablits, Kovalik and Koval'sky.

F.Volkhovsky had been deeply involved with student politics in St.Petersburg and Moscow in the late sixties and had been a founder of the Ruble Society. He had also been one of those who attended the meetings with the liberals in the home of Professor Tagantsev at the end of 1871 in St.Petersburg.(17) He was arrested in connection with the Nechayev Affair and imprisoned, but after being found not guilty, and released from prison in 1872, he moved to the Caucasus and from there to Odessa "where he obtained a post as a chief clerk to the city council."(18) During the following year, 1873, he, F.V.Volkhovsky, continued to serve in the Odessa city duma and was close to the Odessan liberal city mayor, Novosel'sky, whom he valued highly and had extensive links with liberal groups.(19)

A.I.Zhelyabov, later to be one of the leading members of 'Narodnaya Volya', also had been associated with the liberals when younger: P. Semenyuta wrote that in the early '70's, even before his arrest, "he hung about with a group of liberals, whose influence on him showed."(20) He was also linked with Odessan liberal society through marriage: "he had married the daughter of Yakhnenko, the mayor of Odessa. This man had the reputation of being a liberal and was related to the Simirenko family who had turned their sugar factories into a centre of Ukrainophilia and constitutionalism."(21) According to Venturi the political climate of Odessa was particularly propitious for Zhelyabov's liberal and revolutionary activity: in 1872 he spread propaganda

amongst workers and intelligentsia, and "In this he was supported by the expanding wave of discontent which at this time was sweeping through Odessa, gathering up Ukrainophile and liberal sympathies in its train. His political life began in those constitutional circles, whose most advanced and pugnacious wing consisted of the young men who were more or less allied to the Chaykovskists." "But the distinction between liberals and Populists which was already so clear in St.Petersburg was as yet hardly apparent in Odessa or other towns in the South. 'Society' as a whole seemed to be united in a general political revival."(22)

Valer'yan Osinsky came from a rich dvoryanstvo family in Rostov-on-Don and in 1873 went to St.Petersburg to study at the Institute for Communication. At this time, Osinsky still saw in the zemstvo "the main healer of social ills ..." and he thought that it could increase the prosperity of the narod, provide it with education and so on.(23) Later he returned to Rostov uyezd in Yekaterinoslav province to take an active part in zemstvo work as secretary to the zemstvo board and subsequently also of Rostov city duma.(24) Through his experience here, according to Narodnaya Volya, "He convinced himself of the stagnation of zemstvo institutions." and although he first joined with the Lavrovists, "He quickly (1875) transferred to the narodnichestvo party, and gave himself the aim of direct incitement of a bunt."(25) This suggested date - 1875 - of Osinsky's conversion clashes with other evidence. L.Gartman met Osinsky at the start of 1877 when the former was a member of the Kharkov-Rostov kruzhok associated with 'Zemlya i Volya' and living in Rostov. At that time Osinsky was with his brothers and sisters on their family estate; a family now headed by Osinsky's elder brother, Paul, who was president of the local administration. Gartman relates that Osinsky was then a zemstvo liberal due to his brother's considerable influence over him. Osinsky borrowed books but took no further part in the kruzhok's revolutionary activities.(26)

Others came from families which were prominent in local liberal circles. M.P.Kovalevskaya, for example, whose maiden name was Vorontsov, was the sister of the writer later famous as 'V.V.'. George Kennan wrote that "Her brother's interest in political economy led her at a comparatively early age to study the problems presented by Russian life, and even before her marriage she made an attempt, by opening a peasant school, to do something to improve the condition of the great mass of the Russian common people. At the age of twenty-two or twenty-three she married a teacher in one of the gymnasia ... of Kiev named Kovalevsky -

a man of culture and refinement, who at one time had been a member of the city council of Odessa, and who was generally respected and esteemed ..." (27) She "passed from the position of a moderate liberal to the position of a revolutionist. After trying again and again, by peaceful and legal methods, to remedy some of the evils that she saw about her, and after being opposed and thwarted at every step... she became satisfied that nothing could be done without a change in the existing form of government..." and so she joined the revolutionary circles in Kiev. The situation was similar with Yelizaveta Yuzhakova, who was the sister of S.N.Yuzhakov, the writer, and the editor of the Odessa Vestnik. (28)

3. Involvement of revolutionaries with liberal society.

Soviet historians rarely mention the involvement of liberals with the revolutionaries and the extent to which the survival of the revolutionary movement depended upon the good will of the liberals. As the decade progressed and their methods of fighting the autocracy became more expensive and they increasingly cut themselves off from legal ways of providing themselves with an income, so then the dependence of the revolutionaries on liberal society increased in proportion. Some mention has already been made in Chapter II section 4 of the financial assistance given by society to revolutionaries and in this section other forms of help will also be dealt with. One of these forms was indicated by Stegniak-Kravchinsky when he named the sympathisers in society as the Ukrivateli (the Concealers): "They are a very large class, composed of people in every position, beginning with the aristocracy and the upper middle-class and reaching even to the minor officials in every branch of the Government service, including the police, who, sharing the revolutionary ideas, take no active part in the struggle, for various reasons, but making use of their social position, lend powerful support to the combatants, by concealing, whenever necessary, both objects and men."(29)

In the case of Odessa, the autocracy was confronted with a city whose liberals gave considerable help to the revolutionaries and who consequently had to be subjected to widespread purges. From the beginning of the seventies, F.Volkhovsky "started (mainly for financial motives) to have relations with the bureaucratic sphere."(30) His kruzhok as a whole attached considerable importance to establishing "broad links" with "the liberal intelligentsia in particular the Zemstvo element ..." (31) One member of the kruzhok, A.Zhelyabov, as is well known, was extremely active in this field and even when the v narod movement was at its height, he "never turned away from 'society' as did the majority..."(32) The cousin of Zhelyabov's father-in-law was L'yev Simirenko who not only supported the revolutionary cause financially but also allowed revolutionaries such as Ivan Belokonsky to spread propaganda in his Kiev zavod and was acquainted with Valer'yan Osinsky.(33) Belokonsky was indebted to other wealthy sympathisers: he went abroad on behalf of a landowner in Tauride province, Nestroyeva, the wife of the district dvoryanstvo chairman, who supplied the money, helped to bring in revolutionary publications and even settled

revolutionaries such as Drobyazgin, Dobrovol'sky, V.Vitten, Ivanovskaya, Yelena Vitten on her estate.(34) The liberals' belief that they were to some extent on the same side as the revolutionaries was shown when P.I.Torgashev was exiled to Kherson in December 1879. There Torgashev was offered a job by the local timber-merchant who "thought himself a liberal, and so considered himself obliged to help a like-minded person."(35)

Writing of Odessa in 1877-1878, Anastaysia Shekhter records that 'the democratic population' had links with the Bashentsev kruzhok and provided it with money, hid illegal literature, gave refuge to illegal activists and set up a Red Cross for political prisoners.(36) I.M.Koval'sky was active in Odessa in the same period and he went round the local liberals for a monthly financial donation with, according to M.Frolenko, satisfactory results.(37) V.M.Pashchenko who was closely associated with Koval'sky's kruzhok and worked in the Russian Trade and Commerce Company, was well acquainted with the former secretary of the Odessa Duma, Gernet.(38) However no other kruzhok at this time in Odessa was so intimately involved with 'society' as that of the Bashentsev. One of the members of the kruzhok recalled that "The support of the liberals was very important for us also in narrowly practical, technical matters: where, if not at a 'liberal's', was it possible for an illegal revolutionary to find shelter in a moment when the danger of arrest was threatening; where, if not at a 'liberal's', could one hide illegal literature etc.? But still, perhaps, the importance of their role was in connection with financial support ...", especially important for professional revolutionaries.(39) Amongst such liberals in Odessa, a leading role was played by the eminent woman Sof'ya Grigor'yevna Rubinshteyn, sister of the famous pianists Nikolay and Anton Rubinshteyn. S.Lion recalled the "weekly 'at home' here, in which liberals and revolutionaries met; the legal and the illegal..."(40) Zhelyabov, Trigoni, Osinsky, all visited, as indeed did almost all the Odessan revolutionaries. "Around Sof'ya Grigorevna grouped all the leading local liberals, (the editor of Odessa Vestnik, S.N.Yuzhakov; the newspaper satirist, Gertso-Vinogradsky; the secretary of the town council, N.I.Drago; Gernet and many others); but about these 'at homes' only the initiated knew, and they endeavoured to keep the secret."(41)

D.Lizogub had a friend, V.Kh.Kravtsov, who served on the Odessan town council in the second half of the seventies, and contrived to

combine this function with propaganda activity amongst the workers (42), but the extent of the overlap of liberal and revolutionary activity can be better examined by considering the case of N.I. Drago who was the secretary to that same town council. In 1871 Drago became a student at the Odessa Technical Institute and during the next two years he was associated with the Odessan Chaykovtsy although he only joined them in 1873. He was charged in connection with 'Propaganda in the Empire', not because he had carried out any propaganda himself, but because of his close relation with those who had. In August 1876 he was put under open surveillance as a consequence of his political unreliability, but still in the same year he managed to participate in the organisation of the escape of P. Kropotkin. Then, together with Ivanchin-Fisarev and Bogdanovich he helped to draw up the programme for 'Zemlya i Volya' which he then joined. In 1877 he arrived back in Odessa and retired from revolutionary activity, although once again put under police surveillance. He became secretary to the Odessa town council in 1879.(43) Between 1879 and the summer of 1882, when he was arrested, he secretly assisted the 'Narodnaya Volya' Party. As Vera Figner relates, the Party used his address for sending mail to its Odessa group but did not allow Drago to become privy to their business, for he was now in contact with the liberal-constitutionalists around Panyutin. When this group of liberals was liquidated, Figner and the narodovoltsy "regarded with irony their playing with words about the form of the constitution." (44)

Whatever ironic or indeed contemptuous attitude towards the liberals may have been harboured by the revolutionaries, the official organ of the 'Narodnaya Volya' Party (Narodnaya Volya No.1 of 1st October 1879) inveighed against Tottleben, the new governor-general of Odessa, and the purge which he carried out amongst the city's liberals in the summer of that year. The paper claimed that almost sixty people had been exiled from Odessa including Gernet, the secretary to the Odessan mayor, Bemer, an inspector of schools, Vuzhakov, 'the assistant editor' of the Odessa Vestnik; Chandatsky, Dubravny, Markovich and Kovalevsky all of whom were teachers; A. Popich, Borisov and Malevanny all of whom worked in the city council; Gertso-Vinogradsky, who wrote under the pseudonym of Baron Iks, and a variety of other teachers, doctors, students and workers.(45) However the effectiveness of this type of purge was not complete from the government's point of view, and indeed

may have been counter-productive. M.I.Drey, who joined the newly formed Central Group of 'Narodnaya Volya' in Odessa in the summer of 1850 recorded that already the Group was trying "to form links in 'society'.." (46)

Earlier, at the end of 1879, Figner had also been active in Odessa and quickly made a wide circle of acquaintances in which figured representatives of all social classes - professors, generals, landowners, students, doctors, chinovniks, workers. She defended the 'Narodnaya Volya' Party before them. She was anxious to win them over as the party needed money, flats in which to keep illegal literature and members. Apparently she had some success. (47) Trigoni, who acted as the agent between the Executive Committee and the Odessan Central Group, settled in Odessa from the autumn 1880 and obtained a job as the assistant to a barrister at the Odessa district court which gave him "a lot of contacts" (48) amongst 'society'.

The assassination of the Tsar and the subsequent reaction by the government were to have a considerable impact upon those who inhabited this world between being reformers and being revolutionaries and compelled them to clarify their position. A group of young people for example, had met at the home of Count Strogonov, in Odessa, for 'self-development', from the start of 1881. There they were able to use the Count's library of illegal literature brought in from abroad. "The terrible event of 1 March 1881, divided it (i.e., the group), the less decisive part of the comrades went over to legal work, the other part continued its meetings..." (49) This second group later came into contact with the 'Narodnaya Volya'.

Nikolayev, perhaps because of its proximity to Odessa, also illustrates the assistance given by society to revolutionaries. In 1875, in Odessa, had been formed the kruzhok of N.F.Bukh, Orel Gabel, Dorfman, Lepeshinsky, Malinka and Gorodetsky. (50) N.F.Bukh recounts how "Lepeshinsky and I were sent on business to Nikolayev, and stayed mainly at Shmitt's, who had been exiled for the student disorders at the St.Petersburg Technical Institute; whose father served on the town council and besides the son, had a whole 'flower garden' of daughters." Here Bukh became acquainted with Chadnovsky, with the elder brother of the future revolutionary Zlatopol'sky and his other brother Aleksandr. Lepeshinsky, through these contacts, obtained lessons which provided the basis of their financial resources. (51)

In the following year, 1876, I.M.Koval'sky was to find employment with the favourably disposed local Nikolayev newspaper; a task which he combined with activity amongst the Shtundists in the environs of the town.(52) Subsequently, in 1878 in Nikolayev a sympathetic landowner, Pulevich, gave his house for the revolutionaries Vittenberg, A.G.Luri, and A.N.Zaydner to hide in, after Vittenberg had fired at a soldier during Koval'sky's trial.(53)

Even in out-of-the-way Simferopol', there is evidence of assistance being provided by liberals: "In Simferopol' comrades fixed up M.A. (Dikovsky) as a clerk in the provincial zemstvo office, the chairman of which was the well-known zemstvo activist, Vitberg, later subjected to government repression for acquaintance and friendly relations with Zhelyabov, Perovskaya, Tellalov and other revolutionaries."(54)

In Rostov, while still working in the town's administration, Osinsky and other liberals had assisted the revolutionaries. Osinsky's brother was president of the local administration, and he himself had been for some time secretary of the Rostov city duma. It was partly as a result of Osinsky's work that the atmosphere in Rostov at the beginning of the seventies was far more receptive than elsewhere to Populist propaganda. In some factories the management helped those who wanted to get in touch with the workers, and the revolutionaries had many accomplices in the town administration. Some at least of the bourgeois in this industrial and commercial town did not view with disfavour some movement of protest and reform. And the workers too were widely influenced by the Populists. Such was the atmosphere when Osinsky first began to work...(55) One of Osinsky's colleagues, M.R.Popov later recollected that Osinsky, in the summer of 1876, left his job as secretary of the Rostov town council. Through him it had been possible to get a revolutionary a job with the town council. "On the Rostov Council many of the members serving at this time regarded the revolutionary movement sympathetically," and looked favourably upon the idea of a constitution; the mayor Krivosheyin, for example.(56) P.S.Tkachenko also remarks on how the local 'Zemlya i Volya' group in Rostov-on-Don benefited from the favourable circumstances for revolutionary work. It was well connected to the chairman and members of the zemstvo board, which gave it the opportunity to establish in work doctors, medical assistants and teachers of the 'Zemlya i Volya'. "In the uyezd zemstvo board, the secretary was the 'Zemlya i Volya' member V.Osinsky. In the

winter of 1875/76 nearly all councillors making up the board were narodniks. The manager, clerk and accountant of Graham's zavod were linked with the 'Zemlya i Volya'. It had people in the railway workshop, in the tobacco fabriki, in the city library; in the Azov Commercial Bank worked the 'Zemlya i Volya' member L.Gartman."(57)

Rostov continued to be well disposed towards the revolutionaries. In 1882 to 1884, the Central 'Narodnaya Volya' Group in Rostov was involved in the search for financial and other links amongst the local society and the intelligentsia.(58) This was done to such effect that by the early 1880's "In Rostov the majority of ('Narodnaya Volya') links were amongst people having a definite position. There were bank officials, railway employees, officials of the town government, there was even the director of Zinger and Co. in Nakhichevani."(59)

In Kharkov, there was also an element of co-operation between the liberals and the revolutionaries. In the early seventies, joint meetings of the Ya.Koval'sky and Ye.Koval'skaya's kruzhoks were held in the flat of "the liberal family of the Shabel'skys ...", whose children were members of these kruzhoks (60). Such casual but intimate contacts typify the character of the meeting of liberals and revolutionaries. Similarly, from 1876, the liberal J.P., Varzer, and his wife were put under secret surveillance mainly due to their relationship by marriage to Ivan G.Rashevsky who was both a J.P. and involved with the revolutionary movement.(61)

D.T.Butsynsky believed that the liberals were one of the influences which pushed the Kharkov youth along the road towards a political struggle with the autocracy - the other being the Kazan Demonstration of 6 December 1876. Butsynsky was at this time, 1877, a student at Kharkov University and leader of a kruzhok which included Steblin-Kamensky and Sazhin. He described how "In Kharkov arrived a fairly elderly retired military barin. He arrived here from Kiev, having stayed there for two months. This was in April 1877. For the youths he had letters of recommendation from Peter and Kiev socialists and Ukrainophiles. Here he stayed for about a month..." He asked if they were willing to join in a petition, to be organised by St.Petersburg liberals, requesting the government to grant wide liberties. "The youth regarded it sympathetically and was prepared to take part in this petition... but not many of the local liberals decided to take the risk. In Kiev he met with more

sympathy." "The result of these attempts was that dealings were established between the socialists and the liberals lasting up till now..."(i.e., till 1880) Further co-operation did indeed follow. In mid-1878, the liberals and revolutionaries in the south arrived at an agreement; "the liberals had obtained the means to construct a press: the youth undertook to construct the press; to publish brochures both of a political and of a socialist character; for their part the liberals had to influence the different institutions so that they gave addresses, petitions for the granting of freedom; the youth had to take part in these petitions; only the liberals had to make the first step. But afterwards the liberals again did not come to an understanding amongst themselves; therefore this agreement remained without any result."(62) Whatever the truth of Butsynsky's thesis, contact with liberals may have had some influence on the student body, for in Zemlya i Volya No.3 for 15 January 1879, it was reported that some of the students at Kharkov University, e.g., Danevsky, "urged the students to support legal paths to achieve their rights, and this declaration not only did not evoke protest, but actually found a response amongst the students."(63)

In Kiev, contact between liberal and revolutionary trends had been remarkably close throughout the seventies; sufficiently close as to divide families. Even at the very beginning Ivan Debagory-Mokriyevich, brother of the revolutionary Vladimir, had set up a constitutional group. Ivan produced a brochure in which he demonstrated that only with political freedom would the revolutionaries be able to create a broad narod organisation.(64) At the same time, Dr.Kaminer, the father of the three revolutionary Kaminer sisters and future father-in-law of P.B.Aksel'rod, was developing a reputation for himself as a liberal radical.(65)

However the extent of involvement seems to have changed with the arrival of V.Osinsky in Kiev in 1877. As indicated previously, he had been a supporter of the liberal movement himself till recently, and had extensive ties with Odessan liberals. He set about duplicating that situation in Kiev. Presumably he was successful, for Deych subsequently described Osinsky as being the centre of affairs in Kiev, "uniting both representatives of the liberal and also of the revolutionary movements."

At the start of the Russo-Turkish War, to Osinsky flowed "from everywhere all sorts of news, underground publications, and primarily material means in relatively large amounts." (66) He had friends both in the government and in the prisons of Kiev. (67) Amongst the former he could count Ivan Prisetsky who was the Kievan provincial secretary (68), and Doctor Aleksandr Volkenshteyn, who worked for Poltava provincial zemstvo, and who obligingly busied himself with transporting copies of Zemlya i Volya from St. Petersburg to Osinsky in Kiev. (69) Further assistance was forthcoming from Baron Geyking who "time and again... warned in advance about searches, time and again hid from the procurator's eyes the discovery of illegal books." Geyking knew "very many of the present activists..." in Kiev in 1877. However he showed himself to be "a liberal only in relation to such harmless malcontents as Ukrainophiles, Lavrovists and others." (70)

A.B. Ulam has recently argued that his close relationship with liberals influenced Osinsky's views: it convinced him "that terror had to have a rationale in concrete political postulates." Liberals would not accept violence for its own sake and such behaviour would alienate society, and sources of moral, legal and occasionally financial support would dry up. The liberals would however accept violence if it was a step towards a constitution. (71)

The traditional description of Osinsky's political evolution holds that he was a supporter of a bloody mass revolution, but as a consequence of a visit to Kiev in 1877 when he became involved with the Kiev constitutional kruzhok his initial hostility was overcome and he came to be a supporter of the idea of winning political rights as a necessary prelude to social change. (72) While this account completely ignores Osinsky's own liberal background it is necessary to examine this constitutional kruzhok which existed in Kiev from 1877 to early 1878 and had contacts with the revolutionaries.

From 1877 to early 1878 a kruzhok (including Kolodkevich), calling itself 'the constitutional kruzhok' or 'the constitutional club', existed in Kiev which had the aim of agitation in favour of a constitution and propaganda of 'the political idea'. The kruzhok did little practical work apart from organising a political demonstration at the funeral of a worker in 1877, and taking an active part in the student agitation of 1878. (73) M.F. Frolenko writes of the composition and purpose of the kruzhok: "Here in Kiev ... was formed a club embracing a very significant

number of students, a few radicals and private people." In this constitutional club questions about a constitution were discussed in a very serious manner and from this club they hoped to be able to give a very solid push to the constitutional tendency. (74)

Osinsky became involved with these constitutionalists to the extent that it precipitated his break with 'Zemlya i Volya'. In January 1878 an agent for the Kiev constitutional group, its leader Yuvenaliyev, arrived in St. Petersburg to suggest firstly the joint publication of a revolutionary paper between it and 'Zemlya i Volya', and secondly the publishing of liberal material on the Zemlya i Volya press - specifically a proclamation from the Kiev group to Russian society calling for a constitution. The Society had a meeting to discuss these suggestions. The first proposal was not approved; even Osinsky "occupied a vacillating position on this question"(75) Osinsky clearly argued for the second proposal, saying that "Our press is a free press, and it must be so not only for its owners; free for everyone, the word of protest must find a place in it. By a refusal to print this proclamation, we undermine the proper basis, the holy of holies of our revolutionary credo - the right of the free word. Our press is the only free press in Russia, from which issues the free word." Others vehemently opposed this measure, but eventually a compromise was accepted by which the liberal material would be printed but only along with a disclaimer of the Society's support for the views expressed in it and a statement of its support for 'the free word'.(76) Shortly after this event Osinsky tried unsuccessfully to persuade the Society to include a demand for political freedom in its programme.(77) He had already told Aptekman that if the meeting did not support his view then he would leave the Society: he wanted political freedom.(78)

According to Frolenko the Kievan constitutional 'club' died out because so many of its members were arrested and exiled as a result of the Lavrovskaya affair in Kiev. He maintained however that the idea of a constitution remained, and never 'scared' the southerners as it scared the northerners.(79) Likewise, F. Venturi recognises that the constitutional 'club' had some vitality and "a certain following throughout the younger generation."(80)

Even if the 'club' was short lived, it reflected a more general propensity in Kievan radical circles towards constitutionalism. Vladimir Debagory-Mokriyevich, writing in 1884, pointed out that even before the students' agitation of 1877 liberals were trying to persuade the socialists

to adopt a form of political struggle in order to win a constitution, and he added that the 'Constitutional Party' held a considerable sway amongst the students of Kiev.(81) Bogucharsky referred to "the penetration in the revolutionary milieu of the idea of the Kiev constitutionalists .." from 1877.(82) Steblin-Famensky recorded that "all Kiev was full of talk about a constitution..."(83) Bogucharsky claims that a fundamental change came over the Southern revolutionary movement because of its contact with liberals in 1877: "the political tendency amongst the revolutionaries grew precisely from 1877-78 specifically in Kiev, in the city "saturated with the constitutional tendency,..."(84) S.S.Volk likewise picks out 1877/78 as the time when a change occurred in the Southern revolutionary movement, with a move from a belief in social revolution to a belief in a political one.(85)

There was also contact between liberal and revolutionary at a more formal level for, "The Ukrainian Zemstvos, particularly those of Chernigov and Kharkov, were tinderboxes for the Russian constitutional movement. In 1879 a secret conference took place in Kiev; the leaders of the Hromada offered their mediation between zemstvo liberals and the terrorist 'Executive Committee'. The purpose was to create a common front of all forces of opposition against the autocracy. The conference failed, but this event shows that in the 1870's there was already a tendency of all democratic groups of 'South Russia' to unite..."(86) These particular approaches were made with a view to drawing up a common policy between the liberals and the revolutionaries and did indeed come to nothing. On 3rd December 1878, according to I.I.Petrunkevich, he and A.F.Lindfors, the leaders of this movement of the Zemstvo, went to meet Valer'yan Osinsky and several other 'terrorists', to ask if "they were prepared to put a temporary stop to terrorism, so as to give them the time and opportunity to raise a public protest against the policy of the government in wider social circles and above all in the assemblies of the Zemstvos." "After a long animated discussion, we did not reach any specific conclusion", wrote Petrunkevich."(87) The revolutionaries who attended this meeting were V.A.Osinsky, M.F.Kovalevskaya, S.A.Leshern, I.F.Voloshenko and V.K.Debagry-Mokriyevich (88).

4. The attitude of Southern revolutionaries towards the liberals.

This section is concerned with the view which the revolutionaries had of the liberals as a group possessing its own political aims. The revolutionaries did not always speak favourably of the liberals but they always recognised them as a force which had to be taken into consideration in their analyses of the alignment of social forces and of their revolutionary potential. The revolutionaries increasingly came to believe that they could make use of the liberals to achieve short term aims.

It was suggested above that the liberals in the South liked Lavrov's initial draft of the Vpered! programme since it accorded them a considerable importance in working for the improvement of the narod, and also because to a certain extent it reflected their views. S.A.Podolinsky, who was at that particular moment Lavrov's chief contact with the Empire - mainly the south of the Empire - informed him that "my opinion is that your programme (the first) has a much greater chance of success ..." than any other.(89) S.Lur'ye of the Kiev Chaykovtsy recalled that in Kiev the programme of Vpered! which they had heard about from Charushin in February 1873 (and so must have either been the first or the similar second version) was considered "sufficiently radical".(90) However, for the purpose of gaining the support of the adherents of Bakunin in Switzerland, Lavrov produced the final version of the programme of Vpered!, in which he reversed his initial judgement on the liberals and proclaimed that the man from the educated class should be "refusing any part in the state structure of contemporary Russia", instead he should be acquiring knowledge of the narod prior to going amongst the narod.(91) Dragomanov in his autobiography reported that at the beginning of 1873 he had been told by a Kievan, who was very close to the editor of Vpered!, that "the first question in Russia would be the question of a constitution..." but that Lavrov could not write this in the journal since the young Bakuninist generation would then turn away from it.(92) Perhaps the reasoning behind the hostility of this 'young generation' at the start of the seventies to which Lavrov referred, can be understood from the first number of the manuscript journal produced by the Chernigov group of gymnasts which came into being under the influence of Bozhko-Bozhinsky, the Kievan student with contacts in the Kiev Commune, and of Aksel'rod, Ye. Levental' and S.I.Faminer of the Kiev Chaykovtsy. The article considers the liberals from the point of view of people who are thinking exclusively in terms of bringing about an economic revolution which would result first

and foremost in the transfer of ownership of land and tools to the rural and urban working class.(93) Their estimation of the liberals, as people, is not too unsympathetic: "The very best, the most generous of the liberal party in essence are only self-deceivers: they undoubtedly wish to help the people but their help is mainly of palliatives, with a philanthropic quality."(94), and they are really only interested in political reform and not in a fundamental economic transformation; "the most moral, if not the most educated, leave the ranks of the (liberal) party, hostile to the liberals." Further, 'history' was against the liberals: "This liberal party, however, notwithstanding that in its members stand professors, advocates, the most advanced landowners and finally the majority of the students ... has no future ..." because of three factors. These were (i) the liberals consist of the dvoryane who are hated by the narod, (ii) the real friends of the narod reject the liberals because they can see the example of Europe where, despite all the liberal reforms, economic exploitation continues, (iii) the narod listen to their friends and not to the liberals.(95) The article concludes that "in consequence of our hostility to relations with the liberals we not only must not wait, but with all effort must hinder their influence on the narod."(96)

A striking contrast can be observed between this position in 1873 and the attitude of an Odessan activist four years later. One of the Bashentsev recalled that in 1877 "Many of us understood that for the struggles with the autocracy, we represented then too small an avant garde; that the narod mass, in the name of which we entered on the path of the revolutionary struggle for the triumph of the social revolution, was still too inert and little conscious, to be able to show us any support, not only physical, or active but even moral. Therefore we reckoned it very important to have sympathisers, to find supporters amongst the influential circles of so-called society, i.e., amongst the liberal bourgeoisie and landowning intelligentsia, and amongst the liberal and liberally-inclined bureaucrats, whom we at this time called 'coast liberals'; tsarism even at this time did not enjoy popularity and to be 'liberal' was considered a sign of 'decency'. The support of the liberals was very important for us..."(97)

Osinsky was clearly in favour of greater co-operation with the liberals, as was mentioned in tracing his relations with 'Zemlya i Volya'. The first programme (1876) of that Society ignores the liberals but the

two drafts of the second programme - drawn up after an intense campaign by Osinsky in the winter of 1877/78 to persuade the Society to include 'the political element' (98) - does deal with the liberals and may reflect the Southern pressure towards a more co-operative attitude to liberals. The second programme states briefly that members should "Establish links with the liberals with the aim of exploiting them to our advantage." (99) The first issue of the Society's paper, Zemlya i Volya, followed the new line and denied that the Society was an opponent of political freedoms and a hater of Russian liberals and constitutionalists. The paper said that the Society would define its relation to them when "the constitutionalists appear as an active party. But they can believe one thing, that any attempt to struggle for human rights, for broadening free thought, we hold no less dear than the Russian liberals." (100) Although holding out the prospect of joint action with the liberals, the attitude of many of the Northern revolutionaries had probably been more accurately expressed in Nachalo five months earlier in May 1878, when it said that it anticipated that the autocracy would be replaced by a constitutional democracy. The editors criticised such a bourgeois democracy but claimed that it will be especially weak in Russia because in that country the liberals have no roots. True, under a constitution the socialists would have more freedom to carry out their work, but "socialists ... must banish any thoughts to help the liberals in the struggle for a constitution." (101)

Because the 'Narodnaya Volya' party had strong support in the South, it is reasonable to assume that the Party's attitude must to some extent reflect Southern attitudes to liberals and it might even be argued that the Party's attitude was decided by Southern thinking on this subject. The 'Narodnaya Volya' Party, in setting itself the short term target of winning political freedom for Russia and by expressions in its paper of solicitude about the persecution of liberals, obviously envisaged a degree of co-operation between itself and the liberals. This point was seized upon and exaggerated by Plekhanov in his 'Socialism and the Political Struggle' of 1883. "Thus we see that the 'Narodnaya Volya' party relies not only, nor even mainly, on the working and peasant classes. It also has in mind society and the officer corps ... It wants to convince the liberal part of that society that "with the present setting of our Party's tasks the interests of Russian liberalism coincide with those of the Russian social-revolutionary party"... In its famous 'Letter to Aleksandr III' the Executive Committee also demanded "the convocation of representatives

of the whole Russian people to reconsider the existing forms of statehood and public life and to refashion them according to the desires of the people." That programme does indeed coincide with the interests of the Russian liberals, and in order to carry it out they would probably be reconciled even to universal suffrage, which the Executive Committee cannot fail to demand."(102) Flekhanov's criticism was not shared by the majority of the revolutionaries in the South for the Party commanded a considerable following there. Indeed Southerners such as Zhelyabov and N.N.Kolodkevich were specially invited to the Lipetsk and Voronezh conferences since they were known to espouse views similar to those which were subsequently to be propounded in the Party's programme (103), and which recognise the importance of aligning the Party with liberal society as well as with other groups.

'The Programme of the Executive Committee', which was drawn up between September and December 1879, stated that amongst the Party's other tactical objectives was "The acquisition of influential positions and links in ... society ..." "For the successful fulfilment of all functions of the party, a solid position in the different strata of the population is very important. With regard to the revolution the administration and the army are especially important."(104) Further, that "All opposition elements, not joining with us in union, find in us help and defence."(105) In spring of the following year, 1880, the document 'Preparatory Work of the party' set out the tasks for the local groups of the Party. Local Central Groups of the Party were told that ... the first task was for local groups to gain "a position in the administration and army ...", and that their ...third task was that they "must at every possibility meet with the local liberals and constitutionalists..."(106) "The acquisition of positions in the administration and army is especially important for the first moments of the movement." (107) The local Groups should point out to the liberals that "our interests and theirs compel us to act jointly against the state."(108) Later Party documents also underlined the necessity of forming local groups amongst sympathetic members of 'society'.(109)

'Narodnaya Volya's' rival for revolutionary support, 'Chernyy Peredel', had a harshly contrasting view of the liberals but since this Party did not have any following of significance in the South it will be dealt with summarily. Chernyy Peredel in the article 'Fis'mo k byvshim tovarishcham' written by G.Flekhanov in 1883, had already discarded the evaluation of

the liberals as basically favourably disposed towards the revolutionaries. "The dvoryane, the youth of our bourgeoisie, the 'l^titerateurs', pupils and others - we have not any independent forces, they only make up inseparable parts of our state, with which they are linked more or less openly by common interests. They are too passive, inexperienced in the struggle, without principle - apart from the principle of gain - to risk their privileged position, their purses, in order to struggle with the government, which they have humbly obeyed from time immemorial." There remains only the young intelligentsia who must therefore make up the main contingent of the revolutionary party.(110) However, 'Chernyy Peredel' warned that if a constitutional regime was achieved by the revolutionaries, the bourgeoisie would rapidly develop, and 'Narodnaya Volya' should not lay too much store in elections being able to safeguard the narod from the bourgeoisie, for in view of how the elections for city mayors and for zemstvo chairmen were manipulated, so too the constitution and the Zemsky Sobor could be invalidated.(111)

Turning to survey opinions about liberals held by individual Southern revolutionaries - rather than the parties which they supported - A.Zhelyabov had definite and strongly held views. According to Zhelyabov, at the Lipetsk Conference, the liberals in Russia were too weak to fulfil their historic mission and consequently although "The social revolutionary party did not have as its aim political reform. This business must lie entirely with the people who call themselves liberals. But (in Russia) these people ... are absolutely powerless and for whatever reason, show themselves unable to give Russia free institutions and guarantees of personal rights." So the revolutionaries would have to assume the liberals' historic function of overthrowing autocracy and winning political rights.(112) However, Zhelyabov made it clear that even if the liberals could not carry out their 'historic mission' because of their weakness, he believed that they could assist the revolutionaries to carry out theirs. He pointed out how this would affect the tactics of the revolutionary party: "On which should the revolutionary party lean? On the narod or on the liberal bourgeoisie, which sympathises with the overthrow of absolutism and the establishment of political freedoms? If the former, then find room for both factory and agrarian terror. If we want to find support amongst industrialists, zemstvos and the activists of the city governments then such policies

push these natural allies from us." He added that in Chernigov and Tauride provinces, in Kiev and in Odessa there were liberal activists who were at that time in contact with the revolutionary party because of their common political aims.(113)

Even after the conferences at Lipetsk and Voronezh were over, Zhelyabov continued to fight for his belief in a conciliatory attitude towards the liberals in order to gain their support for common short-term objectives. At the end of 1879, during the considerations by 'Zemlya i Volya' to decide on their attitude towards the liberals, Zhelyabov urged the Society "to cease completely writing in the paper Zemlya i Volya about the agrarian question, in order not to frighten the liberals, who (he said) regarded the party 'Zemlya i Volya' with distrust and considered the representatives of 'Zemlya i Volya' as wolves in sheeps' clothing."(114) Shortly after, at the beginning of 1880, Zhelyabov spelt out his intention to Aksel'rod, who was bound to find it objectionable: "Our sole aim at the present moment is to achieve a democratic constitution. For this we need the sympathy of society. We must therefore avoid such steps as could drive our liberal circles from us." By 'such steps' he had in mind tactics like factory terror.(115)

The practical considerations which led Zhelyabov to urge the modification of the party's tactics were sound and were shared by other Southerners. Conversely, the consequences of a failure to appreciate the results of a particular method of fighting the authorities can be seen in the case of the 'Southern Workers' Union', which existed from 1880 to 1881. In 1880, Ye.Koval'skaya and N.Shchedrin came to Kiev from Moscow. They organised a workers' group and won support among the urban workers by their policy of threatening to kill employers who did not concede to demands of an 'economist' nature: increased wages, lower working hours etc.. During 1880, the Kiev Central Group of 'Narodnaya Volya', attracted by the success of the Union in building up a following amongst the urban workers, approached Shchedrin and Koval'skaya with a view to their joining 'Narodnaya Volya'. "But" wrote Koval'skaya "as they (i.e., the narodovoltsy) placed the condition of refraining from economic terror (which in their words, frightened off the liberals), then we refused to join."(116) Koval'skaya ruefully observed that the bourgeoisie willingly gave money to parties which, unlike her own, did not include economic terrorism as a plank in their programme.(117) The Union somewhat later modified its own policies.

If Zhelyabov, Osinsky's group and the Kiev 'Narodnaya Volya' all manifest a wish to win over the liberals by showing a sensitive appreciation of their susceptibilities, then others, such as G.G. Romanenko, tried to scare the liberals into joining the revolutionary camp. Romanenko's 'Terrorizm i Rutina' written in 1890 was in part addressed to the liberals around 'Golos'. Romanenko warned that "the Russian liberal exists only in embryo."; he does nothing, criticises those who are fighting for freedom and is afraid of 'the powers that be'.(118) Nor would economic progress in Russia result in the strengthening of the bourgeoisie, as the liberals hoped; quite the opposite, it would result in their fading away without having had the chance to blossom.(119) The liberals in short had no future. Turning to the political sphere the author argued that the suppression of normal progress in this area had led to the appearance of political terrorism as practised by 'Narodnaya Volya'. If that Party should fail, political terrorism would take other forms: economic terror, peasant and workers' terror. "History not allowed in through the door, comes in the window and its form will horrify. This would no longer be political terror directed by the intelligentsia, but an elemental uncontrollable force, which the ruling classes do not yet foresee." This force would take terrible revenge not only on the brutal monarchy but also on the sycophantic liberals who "stood by and even encouraged this brutality."(120)

This contrasts with the somewhat more sober but probably potentially more successful approach to winning over the liberals witnessed in the case of another Southerner, N.I.Kibal'chich. According to his defence lawyer, Kibal'chich had written a leaflet, 'Perekhodnoye polozheniye dlya zemstva' shortly before his arrest and probably after 1 March 1881. In it he argued for the zemstvos being given more independence from the administration.(121) Kibal'chich did not have any illusions about the strength of the liberals; in his opinion the Russian privileged classes, unlike their Western counterparts were the creatures of the Russian state and so were too weak to carry out the political revolution in Russia - an historical function which now devolved upon 'Narodnaya Volya'.(122)

L.Ya.Shternberg, in his pamphlet 'Politicheskiy Terror v Rossii 1884' had by then come to entertain less sanguine hopes about just how important liberal assistance would be, for the narodovol'tsy had still not achieved their objectives, and in fact, the party was manifestly in

decline. Conceding that the 'cultured classes' were "convinced of the necessity of fundamental reorganisation of the state structure of the country."(123), such classes however lacked "solidarity and inter-connection...", so "what can be expected from these classes: sympathy, assistance après tout fait, at times, perhaps, criminal, cowardly indifference, but to rely on its initiative is impossible."(124)

The revolutionaries wish for co-operation between themselves and the liberals continued, and in the 'Declaration' of the paper Sotsialist, which the Kiev group of 'Narodnaya Volya' tried to establish in January 1884, the editor promised that it would serve as "the organ of the free word", provided it does not contradict the aims of 'Narodnaya Volya'. Indeed, it promised to publish anything which cannot find a place in the legal press.(125) The point for which V.Osinsky had fought during the meeting of 'Zemlya i Volya', during the winter of 1877/78, appears here to be conceded.

Contact between liberals and revolutionaries was of course extensive throughout the Empire. For example, as J.H.Billington has written: "many insurrectionists established ties with Mikhaylovsky and St.Petersburg narodnichestvo, often through Ukrainians on the Annals, like Krivenko and Vovchok." Mikhaylovsky's interest probably began as early as 1875, when two of his closest friends, Uspensky and Ivanchin-Pisarev, visited Kiev and lent their moral support to an extremist circle dedicated to liberating imprisoned radicals.(126) A liberal such as Mikhaylovsky in fact had a great deal of contact with the revolutionaries.(127) He was in contact with and occasionally carried out missions for the Executive Committee; for example, he did so for Figner (128), and also for Tikhomirov.(129) However if the attitude of Northern revolutionaries to the liberals was as positive as that shown in the South remains to be demonstrated.

While O.V.Aptekman may be exaggerating when he said that there had been "almost universal sympathy by the liberal sphere for the narodovol'tsy."(130), there was undoubtedly a lot of co-operation as has been shown in the case of the South. Tikhomirov, a Southerner even went as far as to suggest that "it is impossible not to come to the conclusion that the effective cause of the difference between the Socialists and liberals is less in their programmes and aims than in the fact that the former are, and the latter are not, revolutionists.

The differences are rather due to personal qualities ..."(131)

The argument put forward by the Chernigov manuscript that the narod hated the dvoryane - liberal or otherwise - may have been a theoretical argument, valid or invalid in 1874, for not involving the revolutionaries with the dvoryane. A few years later the revolutionaries were too anxious to ally themselves with liberals, not because the 1874 argument had been proved false theoretically or practically, but because the revolutionaries were no longer so concerned if the narod hated liberal dvoryane. The revolutionaries no longer looked upon the narod as their mainstay, whereas they did want the assistance of the liberals. The effect of this close contact on the revolutionaries is relevant here. As has been shown, in the case of Zhelyabov for example, the wish to develop relations with the liberals contributed to his decision to follow the particular method of political activity which he adopted. Or, as L.Deych wrote of Osinsky: "Valer'yan caught this aspiration (i.e., for political freedom) a little earlier than others, owing to his relations with representatives of the Ukrainian liberals."(132)

The liberals disappointed the more exaggerated hopes of the revolutionaries. In Listok Narodnoy Voli No.2, for October 1883, the author reviews the zemstvo's anti-government sentiments in the late '70's and early '80's in Kharkov, Chernigov, Tauride and Bessarabia. In retrospect he argues that the blood spilt by the terrorists is the responsibility not only of the State, but also of those such as the zemstvo liberals who, knowing about the pressing needs of the country did not, and are not, using the peaceful means of bringing peace which the author thought were available to them.(133)

5. Summary.

This Chapter demonstrates yet again the need to view the revolutionaries within their social context; there were no firm boundaries between the revolutionaries and the rest of Southern society. Some of the leading Southern revolutionaries had considered themselves, at one time, to be liberals before they came to adopt a more extreme political posture. Family and friends however often continued to espouse liberal views. Therefore it may well be the case that there was an element of family loyalty in some of the help given by liberals to revolutionaries.

Most of the evidence of liberal contact and assistance to the revolutionaries relates to the period after 1876/77, when help appears to have increased considerably throughout the South. The Osinsky kruzhok seems to have marked a new stage in this relationship, but later 'Narodnaya Volya' kruzhoks were equally heavily involved with the liberals. Whether this increased assistance was because of the escalating expenses of the revolutionaries or because the liberals were more sympathetic to the new policies of the revolutionaries, needs to be established. Aid came in various forms: money, jobs, hiding-places, literature, information and encouragement.

The statements made by the Southern revolutionaries - or by the organisations which Southerners are known to have supported - about the liberals, became increasingly positive and constructive after about 1877. Contact with the liberals seemed to have led to a recognition amongst the Southern revolutionaries of their common aspiration to achieve political liberties, as well as of the benefits to be derived from such an association. These contacts may have contributed yet another influence directing revolutionaries to political terrorism if they were still undecided; they existed at a time when there was great disillusionment with the peasantry. Certainly the relationships with the liberals impeded those revolutionaries who wished other forms of political activity. The personal contacts and the appreciation of the importance of liberal help did lead the revolutionaries to regard co-operation with them as necessary. To this end, the revolutionaries were prepared to modify to some extent the public statements of their aims and also their actions, but this willingness to compromise with the liberals did not extend as far as a willingness to abandon terrorism.

6. References.

- (1) V.S.Yefremov 'Malen'koye Delo' in Byloye 1907, no.5, p.88.
- (2) A.N.Bakh 'Vospominaniya Narodovol'tsa. (Prodolzheniye)' in Byloye 1907, no.2, p.193.
- (3) N.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom 1, p.45,47.
- (4) P.Kropotkin 'The Russian Revolutionary Party' in The Fortnightly Review Jan.1 - June 1882, vol.31 (new series), p.659.
- (5) Based on information in W.B.Walsh 'Some Breshkovskaya Letters' in The American Slavic and East European Review 1945, vol.4, nos.1-4, pp.128-140.
- (6) F.Kerensky in Foreword to E.K.Breshko-Breshkovskaya 'Hidden Springs of the Russian Revolution' p.v. On Breshkovskaya's early involvement in zemstvo work, see also A.Tun 'Istoriya revolyutsionnykh dvizheniy v Rossii' p.142; S.F.Kovalik 'Revolyutsionnoye Dvizheniye Semidesyatykh godov i protsess 193-kh' p.79; V.Debagory-Mokriyevich 'Vospominaniya' p.53.
- (7) F.Kerensky in Foreword to E.K.Breshko-Breshkovskaya op.cit., p.viii. These events took place in 1871.
- (8) B.Sapir (ed.) 'Vpered!' tom I, p.238.
- (9) P.I.Lavrov 'Narodniki-Propagandisty 1873-78 godov' pp.53-54. In Lavrov's note in A.Tun 'Istoriya revolyutsionnykh dvizheniy v Rossii' p.391,392, states that he drew up the first draft when he had no contacts inside Russia: 'I only knew the oppositional aspiration of my personal friends, writers , radicals and liberals.' "The (first) draft was fitted to the people who I thought would be future collaborators." B.Sapir(ed.) 'Vpered!' tom I, p.257, evaluates the first draft as 'zemstvo-constitutionalist'.
- (10) B.Sapir(ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, doc.52, p.123.
- (11) B.Sapir(ed.) 'Lavrov' tom II, doc.28, p.40.
- (12) Vl.Burtsev 'Za sto let' part 2, p.83,93.
- (13) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, note 138, pp.422-423; E.K.Breshko-Breshkovskaya 'Hidden Springs of the Russian Revolution' p.21.
- (14) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, doc.40, p.271.
- (15) S.F.Kovalik 'Revolyutsionnoye Dvizheniye Semidesyatykh godov i protsess 193-kh' pp.15-16; J.K.Meijer 'Knowledge and Revolution' p.137; B.Bazilevsky(ed.) 'Gos Prestup' tom III, p.47 describes I.I.Kablits' work in local administration.

- (16) S.N.Valk 'Iz narodovol'cheskikh avtobiograficheskikh dokumentov' in Fresnyy Arkhiv 1987, tom 20, p.228.
- (17) F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.436.
- (18) G.H.Ferris 'Russia in Revolution' p.228.
- (19) K.A.Charushin '3 Dalekom Proshlom' p.158.
- (20) P.Semenyuta 'Iz vospominaniy ob A.I.Zhelyabov' in Byloye 1906, no.4, p.91E.
- (21) F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.645; see also I.P.Belckousky 'Andrey Ivanovich Zhelyabov' in Byloye 1906, no.3, p.78.
S.S.Yakhnenko, Zhelyabov's father-in-law, was an ex-mayor of Odessa, and joint owner-with I.Sivirenko - of sugar factories.
- (22) F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.645.
- (23) Narodnaya Volya no.2, 1st October 1879 in 'Literatura' p.107.
- (24) Ibid., p.108.
- (25) Ibid., p.109,110.
- (26) 'Iz vospominaniy D'va Gartmana' in Byloye Feb.1903, no.3, p.131.
- (27) George Fenelon 'Siberia and the Exile System' vol.II, pp.212-213.
- (28) Ibid., pp.213-214. On Ye.Yuzhekova, see 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.4, col.2112-2114.
- (29) Stepniak (S.Fravchinsky) 'Underground Russia' pp.180-181.
- (30) N.A.Troitsky 'Bol'shoye Obshchestvo Propagandy 1871-1874' p.39.
- (31) N.A.Troitsky 'Bol'shoye Obshchestvo Propagandy 1871-1874gg' in Istoriya S.S.S.R. 1962, no.5, p.83.
- (32) (L.Tikhomirov) 'Andrey Ivanovich Zhelyabov' p.10. See also A.Tun 'Istoriya revolyutsionnykh dvizheniy v Rossii' p.284, and F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' pp.645-646.
- (33) 'Iz knigi, izdannoy sekretno zhandarmami' in Byloye Jan.1904, no.5, pp.64-65.
- (34) 'Svod"' in Byloye 1907, no.8, p.100.
- (35) P.I.Torgashev 'Zapiski Narodovol'tsa 1873-83' in Golos Minuvshago 1914, tom 11, p.156.
- (36) A.Shekhter 'Revolutsionnaya Odessa 1877-78 gg. (K kharakteristikam Liona i Fomicheva)' in FIS 1923, k.6, p.45.
- (37) M.Frolenko 'I.N.Koval'sky. Zametka po povodu stat'i S.Ye.Liona' in FIS 1924, k.12, p.25.
- (38) 'Svod"' in Byloye 1907, no.7, p.166.
- (39) S.Ye.Lion 'Ot propagandy k terroru. (Iz odesskikh vospominaniy semidesyatnika)' in FIS 1924, k.13, pp.14-15.

- (40) Ibid., p.15.
- (41) Ibid., p.16.
- (42) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.29, p.110 and p.454. Another associate of Lizogub was Kerpinsky, the director of the Chernigov city bank, described by the police as "one of the influential members of the anti-government party." - see 'Iz knigi, izdannoy sekretno zhandarmami' in Byloye Jan.1904, no.5, p.63. Yet another associate was N.N.Kharin, the son of "the largest capitalist in Pher'kov" who was friendly not only with Lizogub, but also with Osinsky, Tishchenko and others - see, S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.29, p.123.
- (43) On N.I.Drago, see 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.1, col.371-372.
- (44) V.Figner 'N.I.Drago' in KiS 1923, k.6, p.8.
- (45) Narodnaya Volya no.1, 1st October 1879, in 'Literatura' pp.54-55. See also Narodnaya Volya no.3, 1st January 1880 in 'Literatura' pp.197-198, where there are continued complaints about the widespread arrests amongst the Odessan liberals. On these arrests, see S.Ye.Lion 'Ot propagandy k terroru' in KiS 1924, k.13, p.16.
- (46) M.I.Drey 'Strel'nikovskiy protsess' in A.V.Vakimova-Dikovskaya (ed.) 'Narodnaya Volya pered tsarskim sudom' tom II, pp.11-12.
- (47) Quoted in V.Levitsky (V.O.Tsederbaum) 'Partiya 'Narodnoy Voli' Vozniknoveniye, bor'ba, gibel'' pp.140-141.
- (48) V.Figner 'Mikhail Nikolayevich Trigoni' in Golos Minuvshago 1917, no.7/8, p.202.
- (49) Gr.Borzyakov 'Revolyutsionnaya Molodezh' v Odesse v 1882-1884 gg' in KiS 1929, k.8-9, pp.130-131.
- (50) N.I.Bukh 'Moskovinaniya' p.105,107.
- (51) Ibid., p.108.
- (52) M.Frolenko 'I.M.Poval'sky. Zametka po povodu stat'i S.Ye.Liona' in KiS 1924, k.12, p.28.
- (53) M.A.Moreynis 'Solomon Yakovlevich Vittenberg i protsess 28-mi' in KiS 1929, k.7, p.52.
- (54) V.I.Sukhomlin 'M.A.Ditrovskiy' in KiS 1930, k.5, p.191.
- (55) F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.600. M.Popov 'Iz moyego revolyutsionnogo proshlago' in Byloye 1907, no.5, p.295,289, referring to 1876/7, writes that the revolutionaries felt so secure that they held open air meetings with the workers. The management of Graham's zavod encouraged propaganda amongst workers and they allowed Dentyanin to work there so that he could spread propaganda: "In

general, revolutionaries found very favourable conditions in Rostov compared with other provincial cities."

- (56) M.Popov op.cit., p.283.
- (57) P.S.Tkachenko 'Revolyutsionnaya narodnicheskaya organizatsiya 'Zemlya i Volya'' p.179.
- (58) (Peshekerov) 'Propaganda sredi rabochikh v Rostov-na-Donu v 1882-84 g.' in Byloye Jan.1904, no.5, p.13.
- (59) A.Bakh 'Vospominaniya Narodovol'tsa (Prodolzheniye)' in Byloye 1907, no.2, p.195.
- (60) Ye.Koval'skaya 'Po povodu pis'ma V.Malyutina' in KiS 1931, k.4, p.138.
- (61) 'Svod"' in Byloye 1907, no.8, p.97; 'Iz knigi, izdannoy sekretno zhandarmami' in Byloye Jan.1904, no.5, p.62.
- (62) S.N.Valk(ed.) Rev Narod tom II, doc.30, p.128,132.
- (63) Zemlya i Volya no.3, 15 January 1879, in B.Bazilevsky(ed.) 'Revolyutsionnaya Zhurnalistika semidesyatykh godov' p.183.
- (64) S.S.Volk 'Narodnaya Volya, 1879-1882' p.67.
- (65) V.Iokhel'son 'Dalekoye Proshloye' in Byloye 1918, no.7, p.65; A.Ascher 'Pavel Aksel'rod and the Development of Menshevism' p.19.
- (66) I.Deych 'Valer'yan Osinsky (k 50-letiyu ego kazni)' in KiS 1929, k.5, p.26.
- (67) E.K.Breshko-Breshkovskaya 'Hidden Springs of the Russian Revolution' p.172.
- (68) 'Svod"' in Byloye 1907, no.7, p.160.
- (69) 'Iz knigi, izdannoy sekretno zhandarmami' in Byloye Jan.1904, no.5, p.63.
- (70) (R.Steblyn-Kamensky) 'Grigoriy Anfomovich Popko' in 'Materialy' Oct.1893, tom 16, p.171.
- (71) A.B.Ulam 'In the Name of the People' p.279. V.Figner 'Zapechatlenny Trud' tom I, p.188, also implies that Osinsky's wide contact with liberal groups was connected with his divergence from socialism to political aims.
- (72) See for example, V.Bogucharsky 'Aktivnoye narodnichestvo semidesyatykh godov' pp.323-326; S.S.Volk 'Narodnaya Volya, 1879-1882' p.68.
- (73) V.Levitsky (V.Tsederbaum) 'Partiya 'Narodnoy Voli' Vozniknoveniye, bor'ba, gibel'' p.52. See also, S.S.Volk 'Narodnaya Volya, 1879-1882' pp.67-68, who says that the kruzhok was made up of students and 'revolutionary narodniks'. Yuvenalyev was its leader. It organised a procession at the funeral of the gymnasist Bellyustin

with the purpose of propaganda amongst the workers.

- (74) N.F.Frolenko 'Lipetskiy i Voronezhskiy s"ezdy' in Byloye Jan.1907, no.1/13, p.83.
- (75) O.V.Aptekman 'Obshchestvo 'Zemlya i Volya' 70-ka' p.286.
- (76) O.V.Aptekman 'Iz istorii revolyutsionnogo narodnichestva' p.131.
- (77) O.V.Aptekman 'Obshchestvo 'Zemlya i Volya' 70-ka' p.291.
- (78) Ibid., p.295.
- (79) N.F.Frolenko 'Lipetskiy i Voronezhskiy s"ezdy' in Byloye Jan. 1907, no.1/13, p.84.
- (80) F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.603.
- (81) Vl.Debagory-Mokriyevich 'Iz vospominaniy russkogo sotsialista (ot kontsa 1877g do vesny 1879g) in Vestnik Narodnoy Voly 1884, no.3, p.86,90.
- (82) V.Bogucharsky 'Aktivnoye narodnichestvo semidesyatykh godov' p.326,330.
- (83) (R.Steblin-Kamensky) 'Grigoriy Anfimovich Fogko' in 'Materialy' Oct.1893, tom 16, p.170.
- (84) B.Bogucharsky 'Aktivnoye narodnichestvo semidesyatykh godov' p.326.
- (85) S.S.Volk 'Narodnaya Volya, 1879-1882' pp.67-70.
- (86) I.L.Rudnytsky 'The Intellectual Origin of Modern Ukraine' in Annals 1958, vol.6, pp.1393-1394.
- (87) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Arkhiv 'Zemlya i Volya' i 'Narodnoy Voly'' p.100.
- (88) Ibid., p.103; V.Debagory-Mokriyevich 'Vospominaniya' tom I, p.300; A.A.Kinevetter(ed.) I.I.Petrunkevich 'Iz zapisok obshchestvennogo deyatelya. Vospominaniya' in Arkhiv russkoy revolyutsii 1934, tom 21 pp.100-102.
- (89) B.Sapir(ed.) 'Lavrov' tom II, doc.22, p.32.
- (90) N.Levental' 'Semen Iur'ye' in KIS 1928, k.1(38), pp.126-127.
- (91) B.Sapir(ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, doc.54, p.168.
- (92) M.Draronomanov 'Avtobiografiya' in Byloye 1906, no.6, p.196.
- (93) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, doc.12, p.140.
- (94) Ibid., p.139.
- (95) Ibid., p.137.
- (96) Ibid., p.141.
- (97) S.Ye.Iion 'Ot propagandy k terroru' in KIS 1924, k.13, p.14.
- (98) Ye.Serebryakov 'Obshchestvo 'Zemlya i Volya'' in Materialy tom 11, May 1884, pp.33-34, writes that the meeting to introduce the political element was in the winter 1877/78; O.V.Aptekman 'Obshchestvo 'Zemlya i Volya' 70-ka' p.236.

- (99) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Arkhiv 'Zemlya i Volya' i 'Narodnaya Volya'' p.57 (first programme), p.62 (second programme).
- (100) Zemlya i Volya no.1, 25th October 1878, in B.Bazilevsky(ed.) 'Revolutsionnaya Zhurnalistika semidesyatykh godov' pp.70-71.
- (101) Nachalo no.4, May 1878, in Ibid., pp.53-54.
- (102) G.Plekhanov 'Socialism and the Political Struggle' in M.T.Tovchuk(ed.) 'G.Plekhanov. Selected Philosophical Works' vol.I, p.107.
- (103) 'Kalendar' 'Narodnoy Voli' 18 3' in A.V.Yakimova-Bikovskaya(ed.) 'Narodnaya Volya v dokumentakh i vospominaniyakh' p.260; V.A. Tvardovskaya 'Krizis 'Zemli i Voli' v kontse 70-kh godov' in Istoriya S.S.S.R. 1959, no.4, p.70.
- (104) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.44, p.173.
- (105) Ibid., p.174.
- (106) 'Literatura' p.372.
- (107) Loc.cit..
- (108) Ibid., p.373.
- (109) See, for example, 'Ustav Vestnoy Tsentral'noy Gruppy partii 'Narodnoy Voli'' in Bylove 1906, no.12, p.34.
- (110) 'Pis'mo k byvshim tovarishcham' in Chernyy Peredel no.1 in 'Iz programmykh statey 'Chernago Peredela'' p.29.
- (111) Ibid., pp.30-31.
- (112) (L.Tikhomirov) 'Andrey Ivanovich Zhelyabov' p.23.
- (113) V.Figner 'Sapechatlenny Trud' tom I, p.188.
- (114) M.R.Popov ''Zemlya i Volya' nakanun Voronezhskago s"ezda' in Bylove 1906, no.8, p.17.
- (115) P.B.Aksel'rod 'Ferezhitoye i Feredumannoye' pp.335-337.
- (116) Ye.Koval'skaya 'Yuzhnyy Rabochiy Soyuz v 1880-81gg' in Bylove Feb.1904, no.6, p.37. A.Bakh in 'Vospominaniye Narodovol'tsa (Prodolzheniye)' in Bylove 1907, no.2, pp.199,207-208, relates how, in Rostov's 'Narodnaya Volya' circles, he also opposed the idea of factory or agrarian terror.
- (117) Ye.Koval'skaya 'Yuzhnyy Rabochiy Soyuz v 1880-81gg' in Bylove Feb.1904, no.6, pp.33-34. Koval'skaya and Shchedrin believed that political freedom could not be realised without a preceding social revolution and they consequently had a hostile attitude towards liberals and towards any suggestion of co-operation with them - see, 'Programma Yuzhnorusskogo rabocheho soyuza' in A.M.Fankratova(ed.) 'Rabocheye Dvizheniye' tom II, ch.2, doc.233, p.433,435.

- (118) (G.G.Romanenko) V.Tarnovsky 'Terrorizm i Rutina' p.22.
- (119) Ibid., p.23.
- (120) Ibid., p.24.
- (121) 'Rech' Zashchitnika pris. pov. Gerarda' in 'Nikolay Ivanovich Kibal'chich' p.44.
- (122) (N.I.Fibal'chich) A.Doroshenko 'Politicheskaya revolyutsiya i ekonomicheskiiy vopros' in Narodnaya Volya no.5, 5/2/81 reprinted in N.K.Keratayev (ed.) 'Narodnicheskaya Ekonomicheskaya Literatura' p.393.
- (123) B.Sapir(ed.) 'Lavrov' tom II, Prilozheniye, doc.1, I.Ya.Shternberg 'Politicheskiiy Terror v Rossii 1884' p.576
- (124) Ibid., p.577.
- (125) S.N.Valik 'Sotsialist', organ yugo-zapadnoy gruppy partii 'Narodnoy Voli'' in Krasnyy Arkhiv 1929, tom 33, p.209.
- (126) J.H.Billington 'Mikhailovsky and Russian Populism' p.102.
- (127) Ibid., p.107,109. See also V.A.Tvardovskaya 'N.F.Mikhaylovsky i 'Narodnaya Volya'' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1968, tom 82, pp.165-203.
- (128) Ibid., pp.140-141; see also V.Figner 'Zapachatlennyy Trud' tom I, pp.349-350.
- (129) Ibid., pp.140-141.
- (130) C.V.Aptekman 'Obshchestvo 'Zemlya i Volya' 70-kh' p.379. V.Ya. Bogucharsky 'Iz istorii politicheskoy bor'ba v 70-kh i 80-kh gg XIX veka' argues that although the Southern revolutionaries were won over to the fight for political rights in 1877-78, as a result of their contact with Southern liberals and Ukrainophiles, he maintained (pp.178-218) that liberal society had no sympathy for 'Narodnaya Volya'.
- (131) L.Tikhomirov 'Russia. Political and Social' vol.II, p.146.
- (132) L.Deych 'Valer'yan Osinsky (k 50-letiyu ego kazni)' in KIS 1929, k.5, p.27.
- (133) Listok Narodnoy Voli no.2, in 'Literatura' pp.631-636, especially, p.636.

CHAPTER VII. THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT IN THE SOUTH AND
UKRAINOPHILISM, 1873 - 1883.

1. Introduction.

The traditional view of the development of the movement in the South makes no mention of the influence exerted by Ukrainophilism. Yet, this was a force in the South at the time under consideration, and so might on that basis alone be entitled to serious consideration for its impact on the development of the revolutionary movement. Further, local studies of other outlying parts of the Empire have indicated that nationalist feelings existed and that these had an affect on the local revolutionaries. There do appear to be grounds therefore for examining this relationship as a possible influence moulding the revolutionary movement.

This Chapter is not concerned with the Ukrainophile movement itself, but seeks to explore its impact on the revolutionaries. However to assist an appreciation of its influence, section 2 of the present Chapter highlights those aspects of the Ukrainophile movement which seem relevant. Section 3 identifies some of the activists who belonged to both movements, while section 4 considers the assistance rendered to the revolutionaries in the South by Ukrainophile organisations. Section 5 tries to ascertain if Southern revolutionaries in general regarded Ukrainophilism with approval.

2. Aspects of the Ukrainophile Movement.

At this time there were stirrings of national consciousness amongst the educated classes of the national minorities which composed the Russian Empire, and these were reflected in the revolutionary movement. As Z.L.Shvelidze has written of the Georgian revolutionaries of the 1870's: "Before Georgia were the problems not only of social but also of national liberation... in the views of the Georgian narodniks the national question occupied a much larger place than in the Russian." (1) Similarly in Belorussia: "The national question and the struggle against national oppression was quite acute here, and occupied a larger place in the decisions of the local revolutionary kruzhoks than with the Russian narodniks. This brought out some taint of nationalism in the views of individual narodniks of Belorussia. In order to rise to the position of consistent revolutionary-internationalists, Belorussians had to renounce definitely the old shlakhta nationalism and at the same time to struggle with any manifestation arising from Belorussian and Jewish nationalism in its ranks."(2) Inevitably this tendency was most clearly marked in the case of Poland where Dluski and Piekarski resigned from the board of the paper of the revolutionary party Proletariat because "They do not agree with our relations with the Russians ('Narodnaya Volya'). They want an organisation with ethnographic frontiers."(3) The Ukrainians also experienced nationalism: "It is well-known that in the '70's was the time of the golden age of Ukrainophilism. The question of the rights of Ukrainian nationality and about the revival of Ukrainian culture were the order of the day..."(4)

Many revolutionaries therefore belonged to a second world apart from the one of the all-Russian revolutionary movement; they also belonged to the world of Ukrainophilism, Polish nationalism or whatever. They had ties with their fellow nationalists outside the Empire; the Ukrainians, for example, with the Ukrainians in the Austro-Hungarian Empire. These ties proved to be of practical benefit in facilitating the transportation of revolutionary materials across borders. Other south Slav countries also provided a refuge for a number of Southern revolutionaries such as Z.K.Ralli, V.Debagory-Mokriyevich or K.A.Kats.(5) Numbers of the Southern revolutionaries thus led dual existences which inevitably had an impact on their activities as members of the all-Russian

revolutionary movement. However apart from its practical benefits, this fact also posed difficult theoretical problems when defining their attitude as members of a national minority, to the Russian revolutionary movement, which can be exemplified with reference to the Polish revolutionaries in the Empire. As the Polish historian A. Prochnik wrote: "Among the Polish youth (in the Russian Universities) in this epoch... Two roads, two possibilities are open to them. Some consider it to be their aim and duty directly to participate in the Russian socialist movement... Others take the position that their task is to return home and there to lay the foundations of socialism among the Polish toiling masses. Naturally this division is not strict. There will be those who will simultaneously find themselves in the Russian and Polish movements..."(6) There was indeed much inter-relation between the Polish and Russian revolutionary movements. "Many of the St. Petersburg Poles were also members of 'Narodnaya Volya', as also were the members of the Polish socialist groups in the University towns of Moscow, Kiev and Wilno (where Poles, Jews and Russians, intelligentsia and workers worked together)."(7) While recognising their different objectives, most of these Polish revolutionaries did not seek to cut themselves off from the Russian revolutionaries. Indeed, some Poles suggested an all-Russian party of socialists: "One universal socialist party, which would consist of the socialist organisations of different nationalities in the Russian state..."(8) Nonetheless they had difficulty in participating fully in the 'v narod' movement, not only for linguistic reasons but also because of a lack of sympathy for the narodnik view of the peasant.(9) Their thoughts were more directed to the Russian state which had conquered their nation. Even in 1874 F.O. Yurkevich, a Pole at Kharkov Technical School told a friend that he was "unsympathetic to the Russian government as a Pole by birth and with relations who had suffered from the government in the Polish revolt."(10) Clearly the tactics of the 'Narodnaya Volya' Party were of a type which commanded greater sympathy amongst the Poles in the Empire than the earlier manifestations of the revolutionary movement had done and the Party was one in which they could participate to their mutual advantage.

The population of the South was polygenous: apart from the Ukrainian majority, there were large groups of Poles, Jews and Russians, as well as colonies of Rumanians, Greeks, Germans, French, Bulgarians and Turks. Indeed it is sometimes difficult to establish an individual's

nationality. The Southern revolutionary movement reflected this national mixture of the region. The nature of the Ukrainophile movement, its relationship with the revolutionary movement and its influence upon the latter, will be considered below, but then other nationalist movements existed in the South and they were also in contact with the Southern revolutionary movement. Georgi Kirkov and Yanko Sakazov, who were to become "leaders of the Bulgarian Communist and Socialist Parties respectively, received their political education in the Populist and Socialist student circles at the gymnasias of Nikolayev and Odessa in the early 1880's." (11) Bulgarian students sent to the seminaries and universities of Kiev and Odessa "were usually initiated into revolutionary student circles, particularly in Odessa which was swarming with these groups in the 1860's and 1870's." (12) The police came to hear of an Odessan kruzhek of Bulgarian and local revolutionary youths in 1873-74 which had as its aim, "the overthrow of the existing state regime." Its members tried to acquire weapons, and individual members, such as Kh. Donev, went to the Bulgarian villages around Odessa and spread the revolutionary message. One of the 'local' revolutionaries in the kruzhek was I. Drobyazgin, subsequently in the Koval'sky kruzhek. (13) A more important minority in the South was the Poles. At Kiev University the Poles made up almost half the student body and although they had their own kassa and library, "in all-student affairs they did not separate themselves from the rest of the students and participated in all the student activities at the university." At Odessa's Novorossia University and at the various educational institutions in Kharkov, the situation was similar. (14) Participation was not restricted to the Polish students. In 1879, in a Taganrog infantry regiment stationed in Yekaterinoslav province, the colonel, a Pole called Salatsky, organised a kruzhek of officers and others who had been sent from the Kingdom of Poland for participating in the 1863 revolt. These people, with their patriotic mood, approved of the Russian revolutionary movement and hoped to establish Polish freedom. (15) The connection between Polish nationalist and revolutionary could be closer than that: K. Lisovskaya, the wife of N. N. Kolodkevich, was an active Polish nationalist. (16) So the revolutionary movement in the South could experience nationalist influences not only, although mainly, from the Ukrainophile movement but also from those of its members who were involved in the nationalist movement of some other minority.

A Western historian has summarised the history of the Ukrainophile movement at this time thus: "During the relatively liberal regime of Aleksandr II the Ukrainian movement made further progress, and during the 1870's it took on a definitely political hue. A network of conspiratorial communities (hromady), under the leadership of the Kievan (or Old) Hromada, covered all the principal cities." The movement gained influence in the South-Western Section of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society and in the Kievskiy Telegraf. Contact with the Russian opposition, both revolutionary and liberal, developed. Between 1875 and 1876 there was a counter-attack on the Ukrainian movement: "the legal forms of social and cultural activity were destroyed, the Ukrainian language banned in publication (the Ukaz of Ems), and the leaders banished."(17) In 1879, the police informants put the number of members of the Old Gromada at twenty-one, with a group of at least twelve youths associated with it.(18) Ya.Stefanovich, himself connected with the Ukrainophile movement, wrote to Pleve in 1882 that by 1879 the Gromada had managed to create a 'social-Ukrainophile' party in Little Russia which was supported with money and correspondence from Kiev, Kharkov and Odessa. It welcomes 'Narodnaya Volya's political struggle although disapproving of terrorism but criticised 'Chernyy Peredel'. In 1879, the action by Totleben and Chertkov "cleared the force of Ukrainophilism from everywhere in the South..."(19) However P.B.Aksel'rod, even by 1880 noted that the gromadas were "the most organised group..."(20)

The Ukrainophiles were interested in the peasantry: as S.A. Podolinsky wrote, "The Ukrainian narod are predominantly muzhiks..." and so any Ukrainian movement must be "purely concerned with the muzhik." Podolinsky asked V.N.Smirnov rhetorically, "who in Russia first indicated the path of v narod, if not the khlopomans. In 1863 the khlopomans went v narod with the same aims and acted in just the same way as the radicals do now." Although the Ukrainophiles were now, in the mid-1870's, again going amongst the peasants, their movement differed from that of the 'radicals' (i.e., the revolutionaries) because "our ideal is to settle throughout the Ukraine.", not to carry out flying propaganda. They would settle as farmers - which would not be difficult since "most of us (Ukrainophiles)" were "children of small, often very small landowners..."(21) M.Dragomanov, the leading Ukrainophile of the seventies, also recommended settled propaganda: the intellectuals

"must settle down in communities of our people and use their forces to service the needs of the social organism. This will enable them to spread sound ideas by word and deed..."(22) In fact some of the Ukrainophiles who settled amongst the narod, had "married into the peasants and now once more, some intend to do the same." Podolinsky emphasised that settled propaganda offered the opportunity for important cultural work simultaneously with revolutionary activity: geographical and ethnographical research had to be done, dictionaries created etc..(23)

S.A.Podolinsky spent six months, from May 1874, in a village near Kiev working as a doctor. He criticised the idea of short sojourns amongst the narod and he himself planned to buy a homestead in the sugar zavod region of Kiev where he would grow his own food and work legally amongst the peasants as a medical assistant. His was fairly typical of the methods used by Ukrainophiles amongst the peasants. C.V.Aptekman for example, had been impressed in the early seventies by the construction of a farm by student Ukrainophiles near Kharkov where the youths dressed in narod costumes, and produced dairy products for sale at the market. They also engaged in studying the narod way of life, collected narod proverbs, stories, legends songs and other 'products of narod creativity'(25) The Poltava kruzhok of Ukrainophiles led by N.I.Troitsky, a barrister at the Poltava district court, was active amongst the peasants of the village of Rybtsy in Poltava district where they distributed books.(26) Berenshtam of the Old Gromada also spread propaganda amongst the narod as did S.S.Topchayev (27) and zemstvo doctor, V.Pokramovich, (28) both of whom belonged to the Young Ukrainophile group around the Old Gromada. The group called Chernomortsy, which functioned in Kiev between 1876 and 1877, concentrated its attention on the peasants in the areas from which the group's members had come.(29)

Given this particular interest of the Ukrainophiles, it is not surprising that they were the activists who most acutely felt the inadequacy of the materials which were used in activity amongst the narod of the South. S.A.Podolinsky claimed that the narod books of the Great Russians were inappropriate for the south because they used the Great Russian language, illustrations, manners and so on, which were not relevant to the region.(30) He repeatedly upbraided the editor of Vpered! for not printing books for the narod in the Ukrainian language.(31) However nothing was forthcoming from that source and the Ukrainophiles had to produce their own narod literature.

V.F.Zakharina, in her study of revolutionary propaganda in the seventies, states that twenty-nine narod brochures were written and published from 1872 to 1877 inclusive, of which only five were specially published in Ukrainian (by the Vienna kruzhek of Ukrainian students.). She divides these twenty-nine narod brochures into two groups: those seventeen which were published between 1872 and 1874, and the remaining twelve published between 1875 and 1877. The majority therefore were produced before or during the initial movement to the peasants in the summer of 1874. Curiously all the Ukrainian brochures were published after this date. Thus while the output of Great Russian language brochures began to decline, the output of Ukrainian literature developed as a proportion of the total: in 1875, seven narod brochures were published of which two were Ukrainian, in 1876, three narod brochures of which one was in Ukrainian; in 1877, only two narod brochures were published and these were both in Ukrainian. Four of these brochures were written by the same man, S.A.Podolinsky. The fifth was the work of F.Volkhovsky. Zakharina detected an ideological difference between the material produced in the two periods; "In the popular literature 1872 - 1874, mainly questions concerning the socio-economic position of the narod, and also the programmatic-tactical question of the impending revolution were considered. In the literature of the second period, side by side with these questions appeared a range of new ones; the central problem becomes a critique of the capitalist regime. A large place in the narod publications of this period is occupied by considerations of general theoretical problems of a politico-economic nature, but also by the idea of peasant socialism."(32)

The significance of the lateness of the Ukrainophile response to the need for narod literature appropriate to the Southern peasants is not at issue here. It was a practical point which caused difficulty for all revolutionaries: the conspirators in Chigrin had to have their appeals and charters for the peasants printed in Ukrainian, at considerable effort, in Geneva. The Ukrainian student group which Zakharina identified as the publishers of the narod brochures discussed above, was headed by Dragomanov, had agents in L'vov and directed its activity exclusively towards the South.(33) Its activity was quite considerable by the standards of the day, and, for example, on 14 February 1876, one of its members, O.S.Terletsy, wrote to V.N.Smirnov that three thousand copies of narod books had been sent to the Ukraine.(34)

However two years later, S.A.Podolinsky was complaining to Lavrov that a large part of the group's Ukrainian brochures were lying abroad since they could not be got into Russia.(35) At least one attempt was made by the Ukrainophiles to construct a press inside Russia, in Odessa in fact, with the assistance of revolutionaries.(36)

The Ukrainophiles were not interested only in the peasants, they were particularly interested in peasant sectarians. Dragomanov, for example, was very concerned with the Shtundists and "As early as 1875 he endeavoured to provide Ukrainian translations of the Bible for them."(37) Antipovich, a member of the Old Gromada and a Kievan landowner, along with the Poltava landowner Yanovsky, who also supplied money for Dragomanov and the Genevan press, both gave encouragement, money and literature to enable P.D.Galushkin to carry out propaganda amongst the Shtundists of Yelisavetgrad district in 1877.(38) I.I. Basov was similarly helped to carry out propaganda amongst Shtundists in 1878 and then assisted in his escape abroad in 1879 by Yanovsky.(39)

Ukrainophiles did not reserve their admiration for the peasantry but attached considerable importance to the existence of urban workers. M.Dragomanov, in his editorial for Gromada no.4, in 1879, admitted that he had considerable doubts about the supposed progressive nature of the mir and added that "one sees that in our lands too we already have the embryo of a better society. We dare to say that the beginning of an urban educated working class, which combines manual labour and reading, is the foundation of all foundations."(40) Considerably earlier, Dragomanov had been involved in educational work amongst urban workers. From 1859 to 1862 he had been active in the circle of students at the University of Kiev which "founded the first adult folk schools in the Russian Empire." (41) S.A.Podolinsky likewise considered that Ukrainophiles, although regarding the muzhiks as the main target of their attention, should also be active amongst the emerging workers in the cities.(42) Sometimes this activity amongst the factory workers was carried on with the connivance of the factory owners. Thus the Ukrainophile P.P.Chubinsky was given a job by the management of the Yakhnenko and Simirenko fabrika in Kiev so that he could agitate amongst the employees.(43) In Kiev in the second half of the seventies, F.Vinichenko spread anti-government propaganda amongst the workers (44) and in 1877, a large group of Ukrainophiles which included I.I.Basov, members of the Young Ukrainophiles around the Old Gromada and others planned to carry out extensive organisational and educational work amongst the town workers.(45)

The Ukrainophile movement had close links with the liberal movement and this association was illustrated in 1878 when members of the Old Gromada - Antonovich, Zhitetsky and Berenshtam - arranged and were present at the meeting of revolutionaries and liberals in Kiev.(46) Dragomanov was 'liberal' in his political views and shared their belief in the necessity of political reform, while rejecting the use of terrorism.(47) Dragomanov tried to convince the revolutionaries that the struggle for political freedom must have priority over specifically socialist aims if only because these freedoms were necessary before there could be a flourishing labour movement.(48)

Where Dragomanov and the more determined Ukrainophiles differed from the others was in their insistence on a separate Ukrainian organisation. Dragomanov wanted the complete organisational independence of the Ukrainian political parties and groups - "No Ukrainian group can unite with any Russian group or party - not until the Russian groups are ready to renounce the theory of 'Russian unity', to acknowledge the Ukrainians as a nation on precisely the same footing as the Great Russians, Poles etc., and to accept the practical consequences of this recognition."(49)

There is often insufficient evidence to determine directly the motivation for a particular revolutionary activity: K.A.Kats' curiosity about peasants' songs and legends in the summer of 1874, or the land-owner's son, N.A.Zhebunev's marriage to the daughter of a Ukrainian peasant, may or may not have been manifestations of Ukrainophilism.(50) Clearly the Ukrainophile activity amongst the narod or the religious sects meant that such activity had overtones for Southern revolutionaries which it did not have for Northerners. Similarly Ukrainophile support for the creation of decentralised political structures could be indistinguishable on the surface from revolutionary Bakuninists' support for the idea of federations of autonomous communes. The Ukrainophile movement in the '70's and '80's had many aspects which were strikingly similar to the revolutionary movement. It is the purpose of the following sections to consider how the former might have influenced the development of the latter.

3. Southern revolutionaries who were associated with the Ukrainophile movement.

In considering the influence which Ukrainophilism had on the revolutionary movement the most obvious area to consider is that of revolutionaries who were simultaneously involved with both. However in the absence of definite parties this may be too narrow a view. It does not appear that A.I.Zhelyabov, for example, was a member of a Ukrainophile group but he was constantly surrounded by Ukrainophile influences to which he always showed himself cautiously friendly. By marriage, Zhelyabov had links with the Simirenko family "who had turned their sugar factories into a centre of Ukrainophilism..."(51) Later he repeatedly rubbed shoulders with Ukrainophiles on the committees formed to raise money for the Slavs of Herzegovina and Bosnia in their struggle with the Turks,(52) in 1875. Then again it was Zhelyabov who chose to write to M.Dragomanov on 12 May 1880 asking him to act as the European representative of 'Narodnaya Volya'. In this letter he explained that he and the others were "convinced autonomists" but for largely tactical reasons - i.e., the lack of support for the idea amongst the peasants - they were unable to put this at the forefront of their programme.(53) He repeated in his trial that he supported the "principle of the federal structure of the state..."(54) which may be slightly less than fulfilling the aspirations of the Ukrainophiles, but none the less shows no hostility towards them. An alternative example is that of N.Kolodkevich, the survivor of the Kiev Chaykovtsy, of Osinsky's group and of 'Narodnaya Volya', whose sister was a participant in the Ukrainophile group of youths around the Old Gromada (55), and who counted the Ukrainophile M.Dragnevich amongst his contacts.(56) Yet another revolutionary who may well have been affected by Ukrainophilism through family and friends was the Buntar M.P.Kovalevskaya whose husband, N.V.Kovalevsky, had led a group of Ukrainophiles in Kharkov in the late '60's and early '70's and subsequently became an important Ukrainophile.(57) Possibly even D.Lizogub may have been influenced by the movement, for his family had been connected with the two founders of Ukrainophilism: Shevchenko and Kostomarov.(58) Conversely there are those such as K.A.Kats and N.Zhebunev whose activities were those characteristic of Ukrainophiles but who cannot be identified as being in contact with the Ukrainophiles.

There were however revolutionary activists who had certainly participated in Ukrainophile kruzhoks even from the start of the period under consideration. At the illegal students' congress in St.Petersburg in January 1871, Kiev had a delegation of four, which was the second largest delegation. These four students were Armashevsky, Andreyashev, S.A.Podolinsky and Ivan Ya.Chernyshev.(59) The first three of these were Ukrainophile activists and the first two spoke in favour of this type of agitation at the congress.

F.Volkhovsky, an eminent Southern revolutionary at the start of the seventies who numbered amongst his credits leadership of the Odessan Chaykovtsy, had a life long association with the Ukrainophile movement. During his student days in the 1860's, at Moscow University, he was arrested and charged with being the secretary of a Little Russian obshchina - a students' zemlyachestvo. His second arrest came in connection with his activities as a member of the 'Ruble Society'.(60) Volkhovsky contributed to the composition of the Society's programme, which showed a strong awareness of south Russian distinctiveness.(61) In a letter of 1875, S.A.Podolinsky chose Volkhovsky to exemplify a 'radical' of the revolutionary movement who was also a Ukrainophile.(62) In the following year, 1876, Volkhovsky's 'narod' book, written in 1874, in Ukrainian was published by the Vienna kruzhok of Ukrainian students.(63) Almost twenty years later, Volkhovsky wrote that "a necessary condition of political freedom is the recognition of the right to political self-determination, for all the nationalities entering into its (Russia's) composition."(64)

Ya.Stefanovich, a member of the Kiev Commune and subsequently the most famous of the Buntars, while in the last year of gymnasium participated "in one of the Ukrainophile kruzhoks widespread in Little Russia, having the inoffensive aim of facilitating the development of their native language, literature etc.."(65) Other members of the Commune were also involved in Ukrainophilism: L.Il'nitsky was a Ukrainophile (66), as was the active propagandist of the peasantry, S.S. Topchayevsky (67).

Amongst the Buntars, Ukrainophiles included S.Yastremsky (68), Vera Okhremenko who in 1878/9 aligned herself with those Ukrainophiles of "extreme revolutionary convictions."(69), and of course V.Debagory-Mokriyevich who subsequently became a close associate of M.Dragomanov.

In the Bashentsev group of Odessa, F.A.Shcherbin had been in the Odessan Gromada since 1874 as had P.T.Klimovich and G.V.Khandozhevsky who also joined Malevannyi's Ukrainophile group.(70) All three were more preoccupied with the Ukrainophile movement than with the revolutionary kruzhek of the Bashentsev. Shcherbin had also been involved in Zaslavsky's Union, working amongst the Odessan urban workers and had contributed 50-100 rubles to the Union to assist it in setting up a press, during the winter of 1875.(71)

In the middle years of the decade in Kiev, the 'Zhitomir-Kiev' group was lead by a Ukrainophile, I.I.Basov (72), and included amongst others, A.Trushkovsky who was involved with the Young Ukrainophiles led by V.Pokramovich. Ukrainophile P.D.Galushkin frequently worked alongside this kruzhek.(73) Basov, later in the decade, in 1878/9, was in contact with members of Osinsky's group which similarly contained a considerable number of Ukrainophiles: Ivan Ivichevich, V.Sviridenko and the invaluable servant of that group, Volkenshteyn.(74) Osinsky, himself, was sufficiently alive to the issue of Southern distinctiveness to have informed his comrades in 'Zemlya i Volya' in October 1878 that he and his group meant to start soon the publication of a journal in Ukrainian "with a terrorist tendency." (75)

Another Ukrainophile - later a member of Osinsky's group, as well as participating in many others - was Rostislav A.Steblyn-Kamensky, the son of the Poltava police chief. (76) In 1874, N.I.Trotsky, a barrister at Poltava district court, and a member of the Old Gromada formed a local revolutionary kruzhek of Ukrainophile socialists in Poltava. This group was joined by Steblyn-Kamensky, N.Sazhin, N.V.Yatsevich, Khokhul, Marchenko, Ostapenko, Sin'kevich and S.Ogolevts and others.(77) One of the members, D.Leyvin, recalled that most of the early members were gymnasists, but later they were acquainted with older activists who had experienced imprisonment, K.I.Grinevich, A.M.Kalyuzhnyy and M.A.Olekhovsky, and they became convinced of the necessity of going to propagandise the peasants. "both Rostislav and all his friends decided to go v narod but, unable to become simple workers, they decided to go v narod mainly as medical assistants. Some (Ogolevets, Reyder) soon obtained for themselves medical assistants' diplomas and took a place in the zemstvos, although quickly passing on to other service. Rostislav wanted to go to the university to graduate, simultaneously distributing propaganda amongst the narod."(78) According to one source, the group, by the beginning of 1875, was known as 'Uniya',

and possessed illegal literature.(79) "In the spring of 1875 and 1876, Rostislav and some friends often took long walks, sometimes lasting a whole school day, in the area around Poltava with the aim of closely studying the life of the peasant."(80) Evidence given to the police suggests that some members of the group also distributed illegal books amongst the peasants of Rybtsy in Poltava district as well as carrying out propaganda amongst the workers in Poltava itself.(81)

On the 8th December 1876, Steblin-Kamensky was arrested with Sin'kevich and Ostapenko for propaganda. In 1878 he was freed and went to join the Veterinary Institute in Kharkov. There he, Sazhin and Yatsevich soon joined up with the local revolutionaries.(82) A member of this group recollected that it was known, and well known, as the 'kruzhok poltavtsev' since "Its nucleus was made up of the three comrades of the Poltava gymnasium: R.A.Steblyn-Kamensky, N.Sazhin and N.V.Yatsevich..." as well as D.T.Butzynsky, the leader, A.I.Preobrazhensky and V.S.Yefremov.(83) By the "summer vacation (1878), Rostislav began advocating the necessity of terror." He had been involved in the attempt to free V.Malinka, took part in the attempt to kill the spy Nikonov in Rostov and was associated with Osinsky's group in Kiev. In August 1878 he became 'illegal', and travelled to Yelizavetgrad district to obtain a medical assistant's diploma. At the beginning of February 1879 he arrived at the congress of revolutionaries in Kiev where, on the 11th February, along with the rest, he was arrested after an armed resistance.(84)

Amongst the 'Narodnaya Volya' party there were also those Southerners who were committed to Ukrainophilism. N.Kibal'chich, for example, "to the last kept certain marks of a Ukrainophile tendency."(85) In August 1879, although by then a supporter of 'Narodnaya Volya's' terrorist struggle, "he made up his mind, independent of 'Narodnaya Volya', together with certain people not joining this party - to start independently a paper in the south. The programme of this organ... although containing a political element, reserved a large place for a distinctive 'federalism'. He thought it necessary to give the opportunity to express local, provincial elements, since a revolutionary organ existing in the capital of necessity deals only with the centre, concentrates the main attention only on it. But it seems ... that his tendency would probably be called 'provincialism'".(86)

At a less exalted level of 'Narodnaya Volya's' hierarchy, was P.F.Lobanchuk-Gudz' who was also known as Gudz' and P.F.Lobanevsky.(87)

A metal worker by trade, he was a member of the Young Group which was associated with the Old Gromada. He was involved with I.I.Basov's 'Kiev-Zhitomir' kruzhok in 1877, participated in the armed demonstration at the time of Koval'sky's trial and busied himself with transporting books from abroad.(88) Later he moved to Kharkov where he joined 'Narodnaya Volya' and headed a students' group at the University where he helped to operate the kruzhok's hectograph.(89)

Many other examples of important and active revolutionaries who were also members of Ukrainophile groups could be given; the Bio-Bibliograficheskiy Slovar' lists many who were members of Gromada, the Ukrainian Party, the Black Sea Group, etc.. It may be true, as asserted by D.Mirsky, that "Most of the numerous socialists and revolutionaries produced in the '70's by the Ukrainian intelligentsia had no particular national tendencies."(90) It was, however, clearly an exaggeration when Ye.K.Breshko-Breshkovskaya wrote that "Ours was a struggle for the whole nation and for all other nations under the yoke of despotism. In our prosecution and in these that followed, a great many people of various nationalities were tried. The general oppression eclipsed separate national interests, and no one ever thought of separate nationalist social-revolutionary organisations."(91) Also very few of the Southern revolutionaries ever expressed opposition to Ukrainophilism; one of the few being Lev Tikhomirov (92), who condemned it consistently because he opposed nationalism in general.

Even those who were not associated with Ukrainophile groups often co-operated with them in their revolutionary activities, as will be apparent from the following section of this Chapter. The revolutionary movement must have considered itself to have somethings in common with the Ukrainophiles before such activities would have become possible, which in turn suggests that they had established some familiarity with each others views.

4. Co-operation between the revolutionary and Ukrainophile movements.

The last Section considered individuals who were involved with both movements, the present Section is concerned with the contact between individuals resulting from co-operation between the two organised movements. According to one source, in 1875/76, the "...Hromada was in close touch with Russian revolutionary organisations, many of whose members were of Ukrainian origin..."(93) Also in 1875, S.A.Podolinsky informed V.N.Smirnov that "mutual help (between Ukrainophiles and revolutionaries) is very common", regarding 'harbouring', finance and the distribution of books.(94) Podolinsky went on to illustrate this by writing that "The distribution of your publications (Vpered! etc..), recently unfortunately in very small quantities, were also in our (i.e., Ukrainophiles') hands...", adding that "Regarding Vpered!, the Ukrainophiles, I am assured, regarded it more highly than the majority of radical-Great Russians."(95) For such services some reciprocity was naturally expected, so, for example, in 1878 Ukrainophiles visited the Bashentsev kruzhok in Odessa and rather disconcertingly asked the kruzhok to assist them in the distribution of the Gospels, translated into Ukrainian.(96)

With the advent of 'Narodnaya Volya' contact became much more extensive. The Soviet historian, S.S.Volk, has written of the Ukrainophile revolutionaries that "They either entered the 'Narodnaya Volya' circles in Kiev, Odessa, Kharkov and other cities or functioned in close contact with them."(97) Certainly, in Kiev where the Old Gromada was located there were discussions between the Ukrainophiles and the narodovol'tsy, N.N.Kolodkevich and S.S.Zlatopol'sky.(98) Co-operation was manifest at a more mundane level. In 1879, the Ukrainophile R.Zhitetsky obtained a printing press so that the Kievan Ukrainophiles would have their own press. Unhappily, he was arrested but the press was passed over to the 'Narodnaya Volya' - 'Chernyy Peredel' kruzhok of M.R.Popov. When the latter group was itself destroyed by arrests the press was once again rescued and in February 1880, another Ukrainophile Ya.G.Piotrovsky gave the press to Shchedrin and Koval'skaya's 'Workers' Union of South Russia'.(99) A later incident illustrates another type of assistance. At the end of 1882, the Kiev Central Group of the 'Narodnaya Volya' Party printed a proclamation entitled 'K Ukrainskomu narodu' in Ukrainian. This work so "pleased the Ukrainophiles, whose centre was in Kiev, that they even undertook to distribute it amongst

the narod, notwithstanding its socialist content."(100)

In Odessa in 1873 there had been an abortive attempt by P.Levchenko, who was associated with the Buntars and with Osinsky's kruzhok, to establish, along with the Ukrainophiles Shul'gin, Malevanny and Andriyevsky, a press for the production of books "with a Ukrainian tendency." The money for this may perhaps have been going to be supplied by Chubarov.(101) This project was eventually carried out about four years later when a Ukrainophile, K.Maslov "organised at this time (c 1882), in association with the narodovolt'sy, a secret press. The narodovolets A.A.Fomin, with Maslov's money bought a press-bed abroad and delivered it to the Ukrainophile, S.Russov, in Kiev. Another narodovolets, I. Gorovich transported this bed from Kiev to Odessa."(102)

Even in out-of-the-way Yelizavetgrad, there was, according to S.S.Volk, "Close links between the 'Narodnaya Volya' party and the Ukrainian circles..." which involved the future writer Ivan Tobilevich. They communicated to each other secret information which they had obtained concerning the gendarmes' instructions and planned searches by the authorities. They also assisted one another in the distribution of their respective papers.(103)

Contacts developed at the highest levels of the two organisations. In 1880 Zhelyabov sent a letter to Geneva in which he asked Dragomanov to be the political representative of 'Narodnaya Volya' in Western Europe, and the guardian of the Party's archives (104); an offer which Dragomanov could not accept as he objected to 'Narodnaya Volya's' use of terrorism. Inside Russia, one of the leading Ukrainian activists, V.G.Malevanny, more than once, in 1881, appeared in Moscow for talks with the members of the Executive Committee. Malevanny directed the activities of the Ukrainian circles on the path of friendly co-operation with the 'Narodnaya Volya' Party. However, in 1882-83, under the influence of a speech by M.P.Dragomanov hostile to the 'Narodnaya Volya', certain Ukrainian activists began to treat the narodovolt'sy with distrust, which had consequences for most 'Narodnaya Volya' circles.(105)

Later, Dragomanov received from Russia, in the summer of 1883, a politico-socialist programme, compiled by different Ukrainian kruzhoks which were in contact with active Russian revolutionaries. It featured an organisation based on Jacobin centralism. At the end of June delegates of two of these kruzhoks followed later by others, arrived in Geneva to work out a fuller programme with Dragomanov. They wanted to conduct agitation mainly in the Ukraine but not exclusively. Dragomanov

also discussed this with those people belonging to the 'Narodnaya Volya' Party in Southern Russia having Ukrainian sympathy and prepared to join with the Free Union. But Dragomanov disagreed with these people, in part because he felt that they did not want to concentrate - as much as he did - on activity in the Ukraine and they wanted a relationship with 'Narodnaya Volya', which in the opinion of Dragomanov was too close. However in August 1883 the programme had been printed and taken into Russia.(106) The Union did not materialise as, in September 1883, in Kiev, V.G.Malevannyy and I.N.Prisetsky, who were living illegally, were arrested.(107)

One episode in the 1870's which swept up both revolutionaries and Ukrainophiles and brought greater contact between them, was the Volunteer Movement to assist the revolt against the Ottoman Empire in Bosnia and Herzegovinia. It was inevitable that the South would feel the impact of the revolt, and the subsequent Balkan War, more than other parts of the Russian Empire (108), given the proximity of the South to the Balkans and the existence of groups of people in the South who had nationalist links with the Balkans. Bulgarian and Rumanian groups, for example, functioned in the South (109). Then there was the general atmosphere in the South, particularly in Kiev where "national and social problems were closely entangled. There were, too, the traditional links with Poland and the other Slav countries which were then seething with the desire for liberty...(110) As Ya.Stefanovich described it to A.N.Bukh, "the radical public in Kiev was carried away by the Herzegovinian revolt and it set off to fight the Turks, ... From our kruzhok - since we could not dissuade them - Khod'ko and Lepeshinsky set off to Herzegovinia..."(111)

Amongst those who played a notable part in the revolutionary movement in the South and participated in the Volunteer Movement or planned to, there was I.F.Kostyurin of the Odessan Chaykovtsy (112), I.F.Voloshenko (113) N.K.Sudzilovsky of the Kiev Commune (114), Dzvonkevich and Bal'zam (115), Orest Gabel and Vl.Debagory-Mokriyevich (116), and many others (117). Even S.A.Podolinsky was anxious to participate, being restrained only by parental obligations.(118)

Apart from Ukrainophiles and revolutionaries finding themselves fighting side by side or at least sharing a common cause, the two movements were brought into contact in the organisation of the Movement. Zaslavsky's Union was involved in the collection of funds for the Movement (119), while on the Ukrainophile side, Dragomanov was among the first, in 1875, to begin the collection of funds and supplies to aid the

Serbian rebels of Herzegovina in their fight against the Ottomans.(120) Dragomanov recounts how, through working for the Volunteer Movement, he met Zhelyabov in 1875, "in a semi-public committee engaged in gathering money and dispatching it to Herzegovina... on it were two Serbs, three Ukrainians (one from Austria), one Pole." In his autobiography, Dragomanov refers to two such committees - one in Odessa with Zhelyabov, and another, entirely Ukrainian in Kiev. "The Kiev and Odessa Ukrainians even in the autumn 1875 composed committees for directing volunteers to Hercegovina. In Odessa however in the committee participated 'the radical' (Zhelyabov), who there drew much closer to the Ukrainians."(121)

As the revolt turned into the Balkan War, the two movements became aware of greater commonality of views: D.T.Butsynsky recounted the immense popularity amongst the young people of Dragomanov's brochures - 'Vnutrenneye rabstvo i vojna za osvobozhdeniye', 'Turki vnutrenniye i vneshniye', 'Kto nashi vragi' - which were in keeping with the students' own annoyance that the Russian Empire was fighting to give the Slavs freedom to establish constitutional rule while persecuting their own youths for seeking the same goal in Russia.(122)

5. Attitudes to Ukrainian self-determination.

So far, this Chapter has considered only the objective factual evidence of a connection between the Southern revolutionary and Ukrainophile movements. It is also necessary to try to probe the more nebulous area of what revolutionaries thought about self-determination in general and about Ukrainian self-determination in particular. Apart from those who were simultaneously in both movements, unfortunately few of the Southern revolutionaries went so far as to commit their personal attitude towards Ukrainian self-determination to paper. It is however possible to examine relevant pronouncements in programmatic statements originating in the South or in organisations and papers which, although not Southern, are known to have enjoyed some support in the South.

Given the nature of this evidence - theoretical, and frequently pertaining to the whole of the Empire rather than just the South - it is attitudes towards self-determination within the Empire which should be sought, since the Ukraine is unlikely to be mentioned specifically. Yet this is not quite satisfactory because, other than by the numerous small groups of various types of nationalists in the Empire, the use of the term 'self-determination' may not have been thought appropriate. To the Great Russian, or to anyone not personally identifying with nationalism, a statement in favour of 'federalism' obviated the need for any separate mention of self-determination since the former would seem to cover the latter. The nationalist might object that such a view is indicative of a misunderstanding of the nature of national identity, but he might find that 'a federation of free areas' would satisfactorily allow for national self-determination. Demands for the establishment of a separate regional identity could be subsumed within the demand for 'federalism', 'regional unions' 'independent obshchina' and other such expressions which appeared in many of the revolutionary publications. Such a case was when in Kiev in November 1873, the Zhebunev kruzhok decided that it should strive for a political and social reconstruction which would create a federal union of village obshchinas totally independent from each other, without any general laws or representative assemblies (123). Perhaps it is in this light that one should view J.H. Billington's comment that "The vision of a loose multi-cultural federation,... was particularly dominant among non-Great Russian revolutionaries..." And later, his reference to the southern tradition

of support for "a decentralised federal system and the creating of local revolutionary councils..."(124) The commonality of view which could arise between Ukrainian nationalist and anarchist federalist is illustrated by P.B.Aksel'rod in his memoirs of the early seventies: "We Bakuninists were not interested in the Ukrainophile tendency of Dragomanov... But the idea of autonomy which played so large a role in Dragomanov's views, drew him to a certain extent close to us: from it, it seemed to us easy to cross over to the anarchist ideal."(125) and "only Kropotkin did not maintain personal relations with Dragomanov."(126) Similarly, Stepniak-Kravchinsky, a Great Russian, wrote that part of political freedom in Russia would be "autonomy, local and regional; we desire a federalism which will render independent all those races and lands which make up the state."(127) Conversely, "Amongst the Ukrainophiles, of course, there *are* no, or almost no centralists..." Interestingly, P.L.Lavrov, in 1883, when discussing the 'Ukrainophiles' opposition to 'centralism' refers to their favouring "the old federalist idea".(128)

Reverting to the South and once again to the early seventies, in the manuscript journal, written by a kruzhek of Chernigov gymnasts with the help of Bozhko-Bozhinsky and others from the Kiev Commune, is found the following: "In the replacement of the state, - that is, the substantial territory with a diverse population, the heterogeneous (natural) localities, artificially joined by a higher authority - we put forward the ideal of ... anarchy, i.e., the idea of the freedom of each obshchina, of each group of people to join in a union with groups and obshchinas voluntarily, consistent with their own interests." "Under anarchy, consequently is implied a free union of persons in obshchinas and a free union of all obshchina consistent with their economic and other interests and needs."(129) This would appear to allow for the existence of national areas. It is important to note however that revolutionaries who were not anarchists; indeed who recognised the value of the state, still envisaged that the post-revolutionary state would be federalist: A.Zhelyabov proclaimed at his trial that "We are not anarchists, we stand for the principle of the federal structure of the state..."(130) and M.N.Trigoni similarly admitted that he was "A follower of the federative principle..."; the Empire he said had no purpose for the narod.(131) These last two were of course members of 'Narodnaya Volya' which in theory was a highly centralised organisation, a fact accepted by Zhelyabov and Trigoni and others as a temporary necessity in the circumstance of armed struggle with the state. Others

insisted that their belief in the federative principle should also be manifest in their party organisation. Thus, in the summer of 1873, the Zhebunev group had returned to Russia and worked out a programme, the second point of which was "to create a federal organisation." (132) Seven years later, P.B.Aksel'rod was worrying that the union of 'narodniks' in north and south Russia should be on a federative basis and that there should be "autonomy of each federation concerning the tactics of struggle..." (133) The Ukrainophile, then, could accept a declaration in favour of a federation of autonomous regions as holding out a prospect for collaboration but he was much less happy about participation in an organisation which was centralist, i.e., was not federalist and so did not admit of the possibility of different ways of struggling against the authorities in different areas of the Empire.

There were however many declarations in unambiguous terms in favour of independence for the Ukraine, even from before 1873. Zaichnevsky's 'Young Russia' manifesto (1862) had included a call for freedom for the regions (134), while S.Nechayev, at the start of the seventies, appealed "to the national sentiments of the Ukraine..." (135) The first version of the programme of Vpered! might be considered as the first programmatic expression which contains statements about the question of self-determination. It was written on the basis of what a number of Southerners had told Lavrov was the prevailing mood amongst the 'radicals' and liberals. Lavrov later reported that when he drew up the first draft for Vpered!, "I only knew the oppositional aspiration of my personal friends, writers, radicals and liberals." "The (first) draft was fitted to the people who I thought would be future collaborators." (136) These people were pre-eminently two Southerners, A.A.Kril' and P.F.Baydakovsky (brother of the liberal associate of E.K.Breshko-Breshkovskaya), who approached Lavrov at the beginning of 1872 with a view to producing a journal. (137) In the first draft of the programme it declares that it is not important if in the future the Russian Empire is "a single all-Russian republic or some federation more or less independent..." (138), and later that "each obshchina would decide independently which they wanted to be - Russian, Polish, Latvian, Little Russian. In the future boundaries between states would have very little meaning in the United States of Europe." (139) The second draft was drawn up after Lavrov had had an opportunity to discuss matters with the Bakuninists in Switzerland with the aim of winning their support for the publication, and it is more hostile to nationalist aspirations. According to the third and final

version of the programme: "The national question, in our opinion, must absolutely vanish before the important problem of social struggle." (140) Lavrov called for a decisive struggle against these national differences and hostilities which, he believed were manifest too often even in the habits of thinking people; "Any encouragement to rivalry of race or nation is a direct contradiction of the international social question of the single struggle of the oppressed classes of society against their oppressors." (141) For Lavrov - and this became increasingly clear as the decade progressed - regarded nationalism as something of an anachronism and believed that social struggle was the single worthwhile activity. After the consummation of this struggle, a federal system would operate which might well prove satisfactory to the Ukrainophile. However Lavrov's indifference to nationalism and in particular his unsympathetic attitude to the Balkan rising of 1875 hastened the decline of his influence during the '70's. (142)

In 1877 a group of "former Lavrovists or persons who had contact with Lavrovist activity in Russia..." (143) drew up a programme for a paper which they intended to call Narodnik. The paper did not materialise, but the editorial statement indicates a marked dissatisfaction with Lavrov's and Vpered!'s attitudes to nationalism. The editor wrote that "the paper Narodnik will consider the question of methods of setting up strong and sound relations between the parties of the Russian, Little Russian, Polish and the other socialists. Although the editors support a cosmopolitan view, it is not possible to reject or ignore the fact of the existence of divergencies in the nations' moral, social and economic interests. And in this sense, the study of the national question, in the opinion of the editor, represents an absolute necessity for Russian socialists, the activity of whom automatically come in contact with the activity of Little Russian and Polish socialists. Recognising that social revolution in Russia depends on successful action by all the mentioned parties, it is important that their parties should help each other: and such a solidarity amongst them can arise only when there is a clear understanding of the interests of each separate nationality." (144) Consequently, one of the points in the Narodnik's programme was that there would be "Articles on the working out of national questions of the different separate peoples joining in the composition of the Russian state." (145)

The programmes of 'Zemlya i Volya' give prominence to the need for self-determination for the constituent parts of the Empire. The first programme was written in January 1877 at the time of the union between the North Russian Revolutionary Group and the southerners: Tishchenko, Moshchenko, Aptekman etc.. It was drafted by Oboleshev, and Point 2 states that one objective of the party was "The breaking-up of the Russian empire according to local desires.", and the establishment of fully autonomous obshchina.(146) The second programme was drawn up between the winter of 1877/78 and the spring of 1878. Two drafts of the second programme of 'Zemlya i Volya' exist: the original and the final. Clause three of the original draft reads: "In the composition of present-day Russia are joined such localities and even nationalities which, burdened by this unification, at the first opportunity are prepared to separate themselves, such as, for example, Little Russia, Poland, Caucasus, and others. Therefore we must not hinder the division of the present-day Russian Empire into parts corresponding to local wishes." The final draft was slightly amended: "In the composition of 'The Russian Empire' are joined such localities and even nationalities which at the first opportunity are prepared to separate themselves, such as : Little Russia, Poland, Caucasus and others. It follows that our obligation is to assist the division of the present Russian Empire according to local wishes." (147) Thus the final draft of the second programme of 'Zemlya i Volya' represented a hardening of the party's attitude towards self-determination; it identifies the areas most concerned and states that the party will 'assist' the break up of the Empire.

The illegal paper Nachalo which was appearing in St.Petersburg during 1878 had a very similar attitude to self-determination. In issue No.1 of March 1878, the editorial article argued that the basis of the state should be "a federation, formed by means of a free union of free obshchinas, without any compulsory central authorities..."(148) In issue No.4, the paper anticipated that this would result in the break-up of the Empire into "several independent members of a federation, e.g., Little Russia."(149)

The émigré paper Obshchina, which functioned in 1878, "took into account also the national interests, for example, of the Little Russians..."(150) A not surprising consequence of the fact that most of the editors were from the South. However Lavrov in 1879, accused it

of causing splits amongst the revolutionaries who previously had been united without a thought to national differences; the editors, he claimed, had in their journal, given open access to 'south-Russian nationalism'. (151) This was something which was scarcely in keeping with the paper's declared policy of 'federal - internationalism'. M. Dragomanov, writing in Vol'noye Slovo, confirms this appraisal of Obshchina by his praise for the paper. He wrote that Obshchina "in its programme devoted some lines which showed an intention to raise the 'Russian social-revolutionary party' from the Russianised unitarism of Nabat and Vpered!. (The programme of Obshchina recognised the necessity of regional-national organisations of socialists in Russia.) "And he cited approvingly the article by N. Zhukovsky 'Reform and Revolution' which argued that there were regional differences in the narod in the Empire which should consequently be reflected in the socialist propaganda used.(152)

In the case of the 'Narodnaya Volya' Party, its programme stated in 1879 that it would support, after the revolution, " 2) wide regional self-government,... independence of the mir and economic independence of the narod. 3) independence of the mir, as an economic and administrative unit..."(153) There was a stronger statement of the position in the Programme of 'Worker Members of the Party Narodnaya Volya' which appeared in November 1880: "Peoples, forcibly united to the Russian tsardom, are free to separate or remain in the All-Russian Union." and "The structure of the State must be based on a federal pact of all the obshchinas."(154) The appearance of this more explicit statement may be due to the fact that it is generally held to have been composed by A.I. Zhelyabov, but it has been suggested by A.B. Ulam that whereas the Party's statements on this issue were more muted in other publications it was stated frankly for the workers because they were considered to be a more advanced audience.(155) However the reality of the heterogeneity of the Empire was recognised by the Party when local groups of the Party were instructed to limit themselves "to geographic or ethnographic areas of activity."(156) The Party did find itself imposing a very important qualification on its endorsement of the freedom of the nationalities to leave the Empire, which was well expressed by A. Tun: the 'Narodnaya Volya' did not visualise that nations would be restored immediately parliamentary government had been established - rather the Empire as a whole would have to undergo revolution and only then could various regions re-establish themselves, if they wished. In this way no region would be able to harbour a reactionary force which might fight the revolution.(157) Equally the

Party could not accept that there could be any separation of national groups before the revolution had taken place; even in the case of the Polish party Proletariat, which the Party had no alternative but to recognise as being a separate organisation, it nonetheless declared that in the struggle to overthrow the Russian state, the "Polish revolutionary forces, for this particular task, join, as an auxiliary co-worker corp."(158)

In 1882, the Executive Committee had tried to clarify its position by stating in the columns of Narodnaya Volya that the Party regarded the oppressed of all nations as its brothers and denied that it aspired to subjugate other nationalities to the Great Russians. It accepted the right of nationalities to separate themselves, but against the common enemy, must be directed a united effort. Only once the government has been overthrown can the separate nationalities consider separation.(159)

Supporters of 'Chernyy Peredel' manifest a similar awareness of and sympathy for anti-centralist tendencies within the Empire. In the 'Programme of the socialist union of workers of the town N.', probably written in the winter of 1879/80 by Aksel'rod in connection with the founding of the 'Workers' Union of South Russia', decentralisation is advocated as one of the themes of its propaganda: it would call for "the establishment of the complete independence of each village, volost' and town and the abolition, to this end, of the Russian state with the replacement of its organisation by a union of self-governing obshchina." More to the point, the programme envisaged one of the reforms which should be carried out was that of giving "equal rights for all nationalities in the empire."(160) Local 'Chernyy Peredel' groups witnessed a similar sympathy for the nationalities. In Novocherkassk, for example, a kruzhok headed by the 'Chernyy Peredel' member, M. Petrovsky, produced a programme for itself entitled the 'Don 'Zemlya i Volya' Society', in 1882. This evinced an extreme dislike for the Russian control of the Cossack areas and for their imposed administrative structures: "Autonomous regions, wide narod independence, absolute equality of members, freedom of the individual, liberty of conscience, absence of private immovable property..." were the traditional ways of the Cossacks, which had been destroyed by the "Russian despots"; "the Russian state, by means of violence and of artificial administrative centralisation of provinces which are very different in their relations, Little Russia, Poland, Belorussia, the

Caucasus, Siberia, the Cossack regions." "the contemporary system of centralised monarchist government... never abdicates voluntarily from its claims to the region of the Don Cossacks, and any attempt by them to realise their wishes encounters hostility and it (the government) resorts to force of arms."(161) The 'Don 'Zemlya i Volya' Society' was consequently going to organise secret Cossack revolutionary groups, peasant detachments and workers' unions, to carry out agitation, propaganda and terrorism."(162) The Society listed in its aims: "The destruction of any administrative centralisation, and freedom to organise obshchina by a general plan worked out by means of a universal vote." and "Federation with other nationalities of the Russian Empire."(163) The Minsk branch of the 'Chernyy Peredel' in its programme of 7 April 1881, entitled 'Programme of the Narod Party', called for the independence of nationalities "mechanically" linked to the all-Russian Empire.(164)

The programmatic material of revolutionary organisations extant at this time, and not merely of those originating in, or supported by the South, does almost unanimously endorse greater freedom for the regions whether this is clothed in support for autonomous obshchina or is more explicitly presented as endorsement of national independence. This evidence is buttressed by the information provided in the second Section of Chapter II concerning the self-conscious separatism shown in Southern organisation.

6. Summary.

An organised Ukrainophile movement existed in the South. A significant number of Southern revolutionaries were participants in it albeit to varying degrees: Ukrainophiles were to be found in Volkhovsky's, the Buntars, the Bashentsev, Osinsky's the Kiev-Zhitomir group, and in various Southern 'Narodnaya Volya' kruzhoks. There was a considerable degree of mutual help and collaboration between the two movements. This varied during the time under consideration but on several occasions the organisations seem to have been very close which must have been the case before discussions in 1881 about closer co-operation in the future could have taken place. The revolutionaries in the South and in the North either implicitly, when they called for federalism, or increasingly as the years passed, explicitly, when they demanded self-determination for the Ukraine, were acknowledging the existence of the Ukrainophile movement and declaring their approval of it.

The Ukrainophile movement mirrored the revolutionary movement in many ways--in the form if not in the content of its activities. It had members who particularly in 1875-7, participated in activity amongst the peasants, albeit with the intent of studying and helping them rather than inciting them to revolt; it manifest an interest in the religious sects, albeit as a phenomenon of the Ukrainian spirit rather than as the most inflammable peasant revolutionary material; it admired the emergent urban workers, albeit as the basis of the future society rather than as the most easily organised and reliable forces of discontent. However the Ukrainophile movement had turned to demands for political freedoms before the revolutionaries and it urged the latter to do likewise. Given the shared personnel, the intimacy of organisational links, and a common sympathy for federalism or self-determination (for the Ukrainophiles did not demand complete separation from the Great Russians), it seems probable that the Ukrainophile movement should be counted as one of the factors which was urging the Southern revolutionary movement along a number of roads amongst which was the road towards political terrorism, and away from 'social' agitation, at an early stage in its development.

7. References.

- (1) Z.L.Shvelidze 'Sodruzhestvo russkikh i gruzinskikh revolyutsionnykh narodnikov v 70-80-kh godakh XIX veka' in Voprosy Istorii 1957, no.12, p.125.
- (2) S.M.Baykov 'Svyazi narodnikov Belorussii s pol'skim revolyutsionerami' in V.A.D'yakov, I.S.Miller, L.A.Obushenkov (eds.) 'Svyazi revolyutsionerov Rossii i Pol'shi XIX - nachala XX v.' p.115.
- (3) L.Blit 'The Origins of Polish Socialism' p.88.
- (4) B.P.Koz'min 'Ot 'devyatnadsatogo fevralya' k 'pervomy martu'' in 'Iz istorii revolyutsionnoy mysli v Rossii' p.427. See also, D.Mirsky 'Russia. A Social History' p.276. The flourishing of Ukrainophilism, especially in the Left Bank provinces of Poltava and Chernigov, at this time is also discussed in I.L.Rudnytsky 'The Role of the Ukraine in Modern History' in D.W.Treadgold(ed.) 'The Development of the U.S.S.R..' p.213,221.
- (5) 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.1, col.338 (V.Debagory-Mokriyevich); tom II, v.3, col.1310 (Z.K.Ralli); tom II, v.2, col.554-555 (K.A.Kats).
- (6) Quoted in L.Blit 'The Origins of Polish Socialism' p.17.
- (7) Ibid., p.53.
- (8) Ibid., p.49.
- (9) T.G.Snytko 'Russkoye narodnichestvo i pol'skoye obshchestvennoye dvizheniye 1865-1881gg' p.145. Some Poles did participate in the 'v narod' movement; see pp.146-147.
- (10) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, doc.63, p.326.
- (11) J.Rothschild 'The Communist Party of Bulgaria. Origins and Developments 1883-1936' p.1.
- (12) Ibid., p.10. Another Bulgarian, Stambalov, was a member of an Odessan kruzhok. See V.Bogucharsky 'Aktivnoye narodnichestvo semidesyatykh godov' p.293, and I.G.Budak 'Obshchestvenno-politicheskoye dvizheniye v Bessarabii v poreformenny period'.
- (13) K.A.Poglubko 'Ocherki istorii bolgaro-rossiyskikh revolyutsionnykh svyazey (60-70-ye gody XIX veka)' pp.104-105.
- (14) T.G.Snytko 'Russkoye narodnichestvo i pol'skoye obshchestvennoye dvizheniye 1865-1881 gg' p.205.
- (15) Ibid., pp.227-228.
- (16) Loc.cit.

- (17) I.L.Rudnytsky 'The Intellectual Origins of Modern Ukraine' in 'Annals' 1958, vol.6, 3-4(21-22), pp.1393-1394. See also S.A.Podolinsky's history of the 'Ukrainian Social-Democratic Party' in B.Sapir(ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, doc.206, pp.438-449.
- (18) 'Svod"' in Byloye 1907, no.6, p.120,130.
- (19) F.Pokrovsky(ed.) 'Russkaya Revolyutsionnaya Emigratsiya. Zapiski Ya.V.Stefanovicha' in Byloye 1921, no.16, p.77.
- (20) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.42, p.164.
- (21) B.Sapir(ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, doc.206, p.439. On the 'narodniks' of the 1860's, see I.L.Rudnytsky 'The Role of the Ukraine in Modern History' in D.W.Treadgold(ed.) 'The Development of the U.S.S.R..' p.226.
- (22) M.Dragomanov's Introduction to Hromada in I.L.Rudnytsky 'Drahomanov as a Political Theorist' in I.L.Rudnytsky(ed.) 'Symposium' p.114.
- (23) B.Sapir(ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, doc.206, pp.439-440, 447-448.
- (24) B.Sapir(ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, doc.203, p.431.
- (25) O.V.Aptekman 'Iz istorii revolyutsionnago narodnichestva' p.32.
- (26) 'Svod"' in Byloye 1907, no.6, pp.125-126.
- (27) Ibid., pp.133-134.
- (28) Ibid., p.139.
- (29) Ibid., p.137.
- (30) B.Sapir(ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, doc.206, p.448. The argument about the South's 'exceptionalism' spilt over into discussions amongst the revolutionaries. D.N.Ovsyaniko-Kulikovsky, in 'Zapiski yuzhno-russkogo sotsialista' (1877) had argued that the activists had to take cognizance of national peculiarities if they were to be able to communicate with the narod and so he called for a separate Ukrainian organisation. N.Zhukovsky in an article on 'Reformy i Revolyutsiya' in Obschchina no. 5, pp.1-6, pointed out that regional differences necessitated different approaches to propaganda. In Obschchina no.8/9, pp.33-38, in 'Nashi zadachi v sele', Ya. Stefanovich argued that if the revolutionaries were to have any success with the narod, they would have to root themselves in the immediate wishes of the narod, and this necessitated an appreciation of regional and national peculiarities amongst peasants and alterations in the methods used by the revolutionaries. P.B.Aksel'rod 'Perekhodnyy moment nashey partii' in Obschchina no.8/9, pp.21-31, asserted that the revolutionaries had to propagandise socialism to the mass and not slavishly follow them and believe in their implicit socialism.

- (31) B.Sapir(ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, doc.203, p.433, 434; doc.204, pp.435-436. However, S.A.Podolinsky admitted that few of his Ukrainophile friends could write Ukrainian and that even he found writing narod books in Ukrainian to be difficult and slow, see Ibid., tom II, doc. 213, p.462.
- (32) V.F.Zakharina 'Golos revolyutsionnoy Rossii. Literatura revolyutsionnogo pod pol'ya 70-kh godov XIX v. izdaniya dlya naroda' pp.133-137. O.Razumovskaya - a member of Volkhovsky's Odessan kruzhok - translated 'Istoriya frantsuskogo krest'yanina' into Ukrainian: such translations are not included by Zakharina in her calculations. On O.Razumovskaya, see Z.V.Pereshina 'Ocherki istorii revolyutsionnogo dvizheniya na yuge Ukrainy' p.85.
- (33) B.Sapir(ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, doc.208, p.450.
- (34) B.Sapir(ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, doc.224, p.480.
- (35) B.Sapir(ed.) 'Lavrov' tom I, doc.307, p.502.
- (36) For this incident, which happened in 1879 and involved the Ukrainophiles Shul'gin, V.G.Malevanny and Andriyevsky as well as Zhitetsky, see 'Svod"' in Byloye 1907, no.7, p.148. The press was organised, but was not put into use because of arrests and emigrations.
- (37) I.L.Rudnytsky 'Drahomanov as a Political Theorist' in I.L.Rudnytsky (ed.) 'Symposium' p.84.
- (38) 'Svod"' in Byloye 1907, no.6, p.123,127; 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.1, col.239-240.
- (39) 'Svod"' in Byloye 1907, no.6, p.142,128.
- (40) Hromada no.4, p.313, in I.L.Rudnytsky(ed.) 'Symposium' p.97.
- (41) V.Doroshenko 'The Life of M.Drahomanov' in I.L.Rudnytsky(ed.) 'Symposium' p.8.
- (42) B.Sapir(ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, doc.206, p.441. See also, S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.42, p.164.
- (43) 'Svod"' in Byloye 1907, no.6, p.122 and A.A.Rusov and F.K.Volkov 'Primechaniya k chasti 'Svoda', kasayushcheysya soobshchestva ukrainofilov' in Byloye 1907, no.6, p.156, note 16.
- (44) 'Svod"' in Byloye 1907, no.6, p.124.
- (45) Ibid., p.142.
- (46) Ibid., p.123.
- (47) V.Tarnovsky (G.G.Romanenko) 'Terrorizm i Rutina. (Po povodu polemiki g. Dragomanova s 'Golosom')' p.3.
- (48) I.L.Rudnytsky 'Drahomanov as a Political Theorist' in I.L.Rudnytsky (ed.) 'Symposium' p.88.

- (49) From M.Dragomanov 'Contribution to the biography of A.I.Zhelyabov' in I.L.Rudnytsky(ed.) 'Symposium' p.111; M.P.Dragomanov 'K biografii A.I.Zhelyabova' p.11 and elsewhere. See also, on the Ukrainophile wish for a separate revolutionary organisation, P.L.Lavrov 'Sotsialisticheskiye dvizheniye v Rossii' in KiS 1925, tom 14, p.54.
- (50) J.M.Meijer 'Knowledge and Revolution: The Russian Colony in Zurich 1870-1873.' pp.53-54; S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, p.471.
- (51) F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.645.
- (52) P.Semenyuta 'Iz vospominaniy ob A.I.Zhelyabov' in Byloye 1906, no.4, pp.218-219; D.Footman 'Red Prelude' p.55. On the closeness of A. Zhelyabov's relationship with the Ukrainophiles, in 1875, see 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom III, ch.2, col.1406.
- (53) 'Pis'mo A.I.Zhelyabovak M.P.Dragomanovu' in Byloye 1906, no.3, pp.72-73.
- (54) Vl.Burtsev(ed.) 'Za sto let' (1800-1896)' ch.1, p.186.
- (55) 'Svod'' in Byloye 1907, no.6, p.130.
- (56) Ibid., p.135.
- (57) Ye.Koval'skaya 'Po povodu pis'ma V.Malyutina' in KiS 1931, k.4, p.139.
- (58) F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.636.
- (59) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, doc.24, pp.215-216, 237.
- (60) 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.1, col.220-221; Z.V.Pereshina 'Ocherki istorii revolyutsionnogo dvizheniya na yuge Ukrainy' pp.68-69.
- (61) Z.A.Pereshina op.cit., p.79; see also, B.S.Itenberg 'Nachalo massovogo 'khozheniya v narod'' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1961, tom 69, p.146, note 16.
- (62) B.Sapir(ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, doc.206, p.439.
- (63) V.F.Zakharina 'Golos revolyutsionnoy Rossii' pp.84-85.
- (64) F.Volkhovskiy 'The Claims of the Russian Liberals' in 'Nihilism As It Is' p.120.
- (65) L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom I, p.272.
- (66) 'Svod'' in Byloye 1907, no.6, p.128; 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.2, col.512.
- (67) 'Svod'' in Byloye 1907, no.6, pp.134,157-158 note 29.
- (68) 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.4, co.2148.
- (69) 'Svod'' in Byloye 1907, no.6, pp.140-141.
- (70) 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.4, col.1865, 2079; v.2, col.581.

- (71) B.S.Itenberg 'Yuzhno-Rossiyskiy Soyuz Rabochikh. Vozniknoveniye i Deyatel'nost' p.133, and on Shcherbin's activity amongst the workers: A.Fribylev 'In.Fed.Voloshenko' in KiS 1930, k.3, p.139, note by M.Frolenko.
- (72) 'Svod"' in Byloye 1907, no.6, p.142.
- (73) 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.4, vol.1755; v.1, col.239-240
- (74) 'Svod"' in Byloye 1907, no.6, p.135,142,144,130. Ivan Ivichevich was in the Young Group of the Old Gromada, as was Volkenshteyn. Volkenshteyn's wife, L.A.Aleksandrova, attended women's educational courses run by Ukrainophiles in Kiev in 1874-76, see A.A.Rusov and F.K.Volkov 'Primechaniya k chasty 'Svod', kasayushcheyshya soobshchestva ukrainofilov' in Byloye 1907, no.6, p.156, note 11-12.
- (75) Sh.M.Levin 'Obshchestvennoye dvizheniye v Rossii' p.485.
- (76) Zemlya i Volya no.5, 8 February 1879, in B.Bazilevsky(ed.) 'Revolyutsionnaya zhurnalistika semidesyatykh godov' p.269.
- (77) 'Svod"' in Byloye 1907, no.6, p.125,126,127. It may have been to this kruzhok that S.A.Podolinsky was referring when he noted that the Poltavan Ukrainophiles were more extreme in their separatism than their 'Right-bank' or Chernigov colleagues who were better disposed to the Russian revolutionaries. See B.Sapir(ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, doc.206, p.439.
- (78) Dm.Leyvin 'Pamyati Rostislava Andreyevicha Steblin-Kamenskogo' in KiS 1924, k.12, p.283.
- (79) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, p.454.
- (80) Dm.Leyvin 'Pamyati Rostislava Andreyevicha Steblin-Kamenskogo' in KiS 1924, k.12, p.283.
- (81) 'Svod"' in Byloye 1907, no.6, p.126,127.
- (82) Dm.Leyvin 'Pamyati Rostislava Andreyevicha Steblin-Kamenskogo' in KiS 1924, k.12, p.284.
- (83) V.S.Yefremov 'Malen'koye Delo' in Byloye 1907, no.5, p.82 note.
- (84) Dm.Leyvin 'Pamyati Rostislava Andreyevicha Steblin-Kamenskogo' in KiS 1924, k.12, p.285. On his membership of Osinsky's group, see F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.601,627-628.
- (85) (L.Tikhomirov) 'Nikolay Ivanovich Kibal'chich' p.3; see also A.Tun 'Istoriya revolyutsionnykh dvizheniy v Rossii' p.291.
- (86) (L.Tikhomirov) op.cit., p.15.
- (87) 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.2, col.796-797.

- (88) 'Svod'' in Byloye 1907, no.6, p.130,131,142.
- (89) V.A.Tvardovskaya 'Organizatsionnyye osnovy 'Narodnoy Voli'' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1960, tom 67, pp.128-129.
- (90) D.Mirsky 'Russia. A Social History' p.276.
- (91) E.K.Breshko-Breshkovskaya 'Hidden Springs of the Russian Revolution' p.170.
- (92) See for example, L.Tikhomirov in Vestnik Narodnoy Voli no.4, 1885, p.237.
- (93) V.Doroshenko 'The Life of Mikhaylo Drahomanov' in I.L.Rudnytsky(ed.) 'Symposium' p.15.
- (94) B.Sapir(ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, doc.206, p.441.
- (95) Ibid., p.441,442.
- (96) P.Shchegolev 'Aleksey Medvedev' in KiS 1930, k.10, p.88.
- (97) S.S.Volk 'Narodnaya Volya, 1879-1882' p.271.
- (98) Ibid., pp.271-272.
- (99) S.Livshits 'Podpol'nyye tipografii 60-kh, 70-kh i 80-kh godov' in KiS 1929, k.6, p.51, note 3.
- (100) A.N.Bakh 'Vospominaniya Narodovol'tsa (1882-1885gg)' in Byloye 1907, no.1, p.123.
- (101) 'Iz knigi, izdannoy sekretno zhandarmami' in Byloye Jan.1904, no.5, p.68, 66.
- (102) S.Livshits 'Podpol'nyye tipografii' in KiS 1929, k.1, p.76.
- (103) S.S.Volk 'Narodnaya Volya, 1879-1882' pp.271-272.
- (104) See 'Pis'mo A.I.Zhelyabovak M.P.Dragomanovu' in Byloye 1906, no.3, pp.71-73, and also I.L.Rudnytsky 'Drahomanov as a Political Theorist' in I.L.Rudnytsky(ed.) 'Symposium' p.113.
- (105) S.S.Volk 'Narodnaya Volya, 1879-1882' pp.271-272.
- (106) V.Ya.Bogucharsky 'Iz istorii politicheskoy borby v 70-kh i 80-kh gg XIX veka' pp.421-422.
- (107) Ibid., p.423.
- (108) F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.562: "the movement in aid of their 'Slav brothers' spread mainly among the Populist groups of Southern Russia, in the Ukraine, at Odessa and Kiev. See also J.Billington 'Mikhailovsky and Russian Populism' p.99. Similarly, V.Bogucharsky 'Aktivnoye narodnichestvo semidesyatykh godov' claims that the first to respond to the revolt in Herzegovina were Ukrainians (p.262), and the first volunteer came from Kiev (p.290)

- (109) See K.A.Poglubko 'Ocherki istorii bolgaro-rossiyskikh revolyutsionnykh svyazey (60-70-ye gody XIX veka)' pp.106-108 and elsewhere. See also I.G.Budak 'Obshchestvenno-politicheskoye dvizheniye v Bessarabii v poreformenny period', especially pp.70-82 on the help given by Bessarabians, and on the Bulgarian volunteers from Bessarabia.
- (110) F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.603. Estimations of the significance of the Volunteer Movement differ: F.Venturi op.cit., p.526 believes that "Disillusionment, and above all Russia's official intervention, stifled this little movement of volunteering at birth. It had always been insignificant..." V.Bogucharsky 'Aktivnoye narodnichestvo semidesyatykh godov' p.262 gives a different version: "Events in the Balkan peninsula in the second half of the '70's and the Russo-Turkish war had, without doubt, a very large influence upon the fate of the Russian liberation movement in Russia..."
- (111) N.K.Bukh 'Vospominaniya' p.116.
- (112) F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.561. Kostyurin was arrested before he was able to leave for the Balkans.
- (113) V.Bogucharsky 'Aktivnoye narodnichestvo semidesyatykh godov' p.291.
- (114) B.Sapir(ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, doc.222, p.476.
- (115) M.Frolenko 'I.M.Koval'sky. Zametka po povodu stat'i S.Ye.Liona' in KiS 1924, k.12, p.27.
- (116) 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.1, col.235-236; 336-338.
- (117) N.A.Troitsky 'Tsarskiye sudy protiv revolyutsionnoy Rossii' p.52, lists many of those mentioned in the 'Slovar' who were involved in the Movement. See 'Bio-Biblio Slovar' tom II, v.1-4.
- (118) B.Sapir(ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, doc.213, p.463.
- (119) B.S.Itenberg 'Yuzhno-rossiyskiy soyuz rabochikh. Vozniknoveniye i deyatel'nost'' p.156.
- (120) P.E.Mosely 'Drahomanov and the European Conscience' in I.L. Rudnytsky(ed.) 'Symposium' p.3.
- (121) M.P.Dragomanov 'Avtobiografiya' in Byloye June 1906, no.6, p.201.
- (122) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.30, p.131.
- (123) B.Bazilevsky(ed.) 'Gos Prestup' tom III, p.126.
- (124) J.Billington 'Mikhailovsky and Russian Populism' p.191, note M.
- (125) P.B.Aksel'rod 'Perezhitoye i Peredummanoye' p.185.
- (126) Ibid., p.186.

- (127) Stepniak 'What is Wanted?' (1891) in 'Nihilism As It Is' p.37.
In 1882, Kravchinsky had asserted that anarchism meant federalism and, "only in the development to the utmost possible extent of individual, local and regional autonomy do I see the guarantee both of the future happiness of men and of mankind and the triumph of the revolution." see, B.Sapir 'Vpered!' tom I, p.236.
- (128) B.Sapir(ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, doc.203, p.434; B.Sapir(ed.) 'Lavrov' tom II, doc.222, p.536.
- (129) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom I, doc.12, p.140.
- (130) 'Rech' A.I.Zhelyabova po sude' in A.V.Yakimova-Dikovskaya(ed.) ''Narodnaya Volya' v dokumentakh i vospominaniyakh' p.51.
- (131) 'Dopros M.N.Trigoni' in A.V.Yakimova-Dikovskaya(ed.) '1 Marta 1881 goda. Po neizdannym materialam' p.66.
- (132) B.S.Itenberg 'Dvizheniye revolyutsionnogo narodnichestva' p.326.
- (133) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.43, p.169.
- (134) J.M.Meijer 'Knowledge and Revolution: The Russian Colony in Zurich 1870-1873' p.19. Three former members of Zaichnevsky's group were in Koval'sky's kruzhok.
- (135) F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' p.382.
- (136) P.L.Lavrov in a postscript to A.Tun 'Istoriya Revolyutsionnykh Dvizheniy v Rossii' p.391,392.
- (137) B.Sapir(ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, doc.15, pp.52-53.
- (138) Ibid., tom II, doc.52, p.129.
- (139) Ibid., tom II, doc.52, p.131.
- (140) Ibid., tom II, doc.54, p.160.
- (141) Ibid., tom II, doc.54, pp.160-161.
- (142) J.Billington 'Mikhailovsky and Russian Populism' p.192.
- (143) B.Sapir(ed.) 'Vpered!' tom I, p.275.
- (144) B.Sapir(ed.) 'Vpered!' tom II, Prilozheniye, doc.7, pp.523-524.
- (145) Ibid., tom II, Prilozheniye, doc.7, p.525.
- (146) S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Arkhiv 'Zemli i Voli' i 'Narodnoy Voli'' pp.53-54; see also F.Venturi 'Roots of Revolution' pp.573-574. A.D.Mikhaylov summarised 'Zemlya i Volya's' programme on this particular point, as "there must be wide autonomy for obshchinas and for regions". Quoted by F.Venturi 'op.cit.,' p.572.
- (147) S.N.Valk(ed.) op.cit., p.55,59. The final draft of the second programme is discussed in F.Venturi 'op.cit.,' pp.611-615.

- (148) Nachalo no.1, March 1878 in B.Bazilevsky(ed.) 'Revolyutsionnaya zhurnalistika semidesyatykh godov' p.4.
- (149) Nachalo no.4, May 1878 in Ibid., pp.63-64.
- (150) A.Tun 'Istoriya revolyutsionnykh dvizheniy v Rossii' p.201.
- (151) P.L.Lavrov 'Sotsialisticheskoye dvizheniye v Rossii' in KiS 1925, k.14, p.52.
- (152) M.Dragomanov 'Istoricheskaya pol'sha i velikoruskaya demokratiya' in Vol'noye Slovo no.15, 15/11/81, 3/11/81, p.5, col.3. Dragomanov dismissed Rabotnik as 'Great Russian'.
- (153) 'Programma ispolnitel'nago komiteta' in Narodnaya Volya no.3, 1 January 1880, in 'Literatura' p.164; Vl.Burtsev(ed.) 'Za sto let' (1800-1896)' p.150.
- (154) 'Programma rabochikh chlenov partii 'Narodnoy Voli'' (Nov.1880) in S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.46, p.188; also 'Literatura' p.883.
- (155) A.B.Ulam 'In the Name of the People' p.331; a similar suggestion appears in S.S.Volk'Deyatel'nost' 'Narodnoy Voli' sredi rabochikh v gody vtoroy revolyutsionnoy situatsii 1879-1882' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1963, tom 74, p.194.
- (156) 'Podgotovitel'naya rabota partii' in 'Literatura' p.872.
- (157) See for example, 'Pis'mo A.I.Zhelyabovak M.P.Dragomanovu' in Byloye 1906, no.3, pp.71-73; A.Tun 'Istoriya revolyutsionnykh dvizheniy v Rossii' p.242, presents a résumé of this.
- (158) 'Otvét ispolnitel'nago komiteta partii Narodnoy Voli' (1/3/84) in Narodnaya Volya no.10, September 1884, in 'Literatura' p.681.
- (159) Narodnaya Volya no.8-9, 5/2/1882, in 'Literatura' p.509.
- (160) 'Programma sotsialisticheskogo soyuza rabochikh goroda N' in S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.85, p.348. B.S.Itenberg. 'Yuzhno-Rossiyskiy soyuz rabochikh. Vozniknoveniye i Deyatel'nost'' p.199, identifies this as P.B.Aksel'rod's original draft of the programme for the Union.
- (161) 'Programma Donskogo obshchestva 'Zemlya i Volya'' (1882?) in S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.38, p.156.
- (162) Ibid., p.157.
- (163) Ibid., p.158.
- (164) 'Programma Narodnoy partii' in S.N.Valk(ed.) 'Rev Narod' tom II, doc.35, p.151. Shchedrin and Koval'skaya- two other supporters of 'Chernyy Peredel' in the South - also favoured the replacement of the

state by autonomous obshchina: see 'Molnari o Yuzhnom Rabochem Soyuzo' in Byloye Feb.1904, no.6, pp.42-43.

CHAPTER VIII. CONCLUSIONS.

This thesis initially set itself the task of examining the constituent parts of the 'traditional' view of the development of the revolutionary movement in the South, (see page 25). It has found them to be, to varying extents, inadequate explanations. The Southern revolutionary movement may be considered different and discrete but it should not be thought of as being politically 'backward'. The South generated a series of revolutionary kruzhoks which manifest a distinctive organisational pattern; it enjoyed continuous and wide contacts, not merely with the centres of the emigration in London, Vienna and Switzerland, but also with south Slav centres; it provided money, personnel and information to the centres of emigration; produced its own literature inside the South as well as contriving to get supplies of literature independently from St.Petersburg.

Nor can it be accepted, in the face of the evidence presented in Chapter II, that the Southern kruzhoks were ever subject to the organisational leadership of the capital. Practical problems militated against this possibility: distance, an antagonism towards the capital's revolutionaries, the informality of the kruzhok structure of the movement in these years. Further the North was only one of a number of competing sources of that money, literature and leadership, which were the channels for exercising control. The existence of a complex of competing and diverse sources prevented any one becoming dominant. Even the Buntars, turned away by some St.Petersburg revolutionaries when seeking money, rejected by the leading Southerners and probably also by the Ukrainophiles, could still find assistance from somewhere. Certainly at times the capital did try to encourage particular tendencies amongst the Southerners and hinder others through these channels, but arguably it was the weaker kruzhoks which were more likely to fall under Northern control. The Andreyeva and Kovalik kruzhoks were both Northern inspired and supplied but since they lacked indigenous support, they foundered. Also, it should be recognised that at times the Northern organisations were simply uninterested in striving for such leadership. During the existence of 'Zemlya i Volya', for example, the Northern revolutionaries were not concerned to extend their

organisation beyond Great Russia. The only occasion when organisational leadership came anywhere near to being exercised by St.Petersburg was during the period of 'Narodnaya Volya', but it should be borne in mind that those Southern kruzhoks which entered into this all-Russian organisation predated its foundation, had to be treated with considerable circumspection by the Executive Committee and, given their querulousness, they were not expected to endure a harsh servitude. It is also worth mentioning that 'Narodnaya Volya' did not actually have its centre in St.Petersburg, but moved around the Empire. Nor does the idea of 'leadership' by 'Narodnaya Volya' over Southern kruzhoks seem sound, in the sense of an all-Russian organisation directing the development of its component parts, since 'Narodnaya Volya' was basically only propounding a policy which had become commonplace in the South two years previously and which already commanded wide support there. Finally, on the point of St.Petersburg organisational leadership, the information provided in Appendix I tends to indicate that 'Narodnaya Volya' may arguably be considered a Southern party in as much as (if the rate of arrests does, in any way, reflect the degree of support) around half of that Party's support may have come from the South.

The third strand in the 'traditional' view stresses the importance of police persecution of the activists and the unresponsiveness of the peasantry as the causes of the Southern revolutionaries firstly becoming advocates of buntarism, and subsequently of political terrorism. That these extrinsic forces were elements in the explanation of the movement's development is undoubted, but not that they were of special importance.(1) They were probably more important in speeding the demise of agitation amongst the peasants than they were in initiating political terrorism. Some of the propagandists because of these forces made a transition to political terrorism, others withdrew from activity.(2) But they are not adequate explanations because the Southern police may in fact have been less efficient than their colleagues in other parts of the Empire, where agitation amongst the peasants experienced a more prolonged existence (3), whereas it is difficult to know if the Southern peasantry was any more or less responsive than peasants elsewhere. However, more to the point, the examination of the Buntar kruzhok showed that in reality only around one in three of the members had been involved in rural agitation before joining that kruzhok, and only an average of 18% of the membership of

those kruzhozs, which were the first to turn to political terrorism, had been so involved. Both the Buntars and the activists of 1877-79 had had the opportunity to be active at the time when rural agitation was at its height in 1873-74, but had chosen not so to do. Therefore they were not the ones who were most affected by police persecution or by peasant unresponsiveness or concerned about them. Indeed numbers of the activists in political terrorism in 1877-79 had disapproved of rural agitation and tried to discourage others from involvement in it. Some of the most eminent of them feared the consequences of a successful propaganda campaign amongst the peasants. As for the reality of the causal significance of temperament and climate in hastening the onset of political terrorism, these lie outwith the scope of the present study. They may have been elements, but there were certainly other reasons which rest upon surer and more easily demonstrable grounds than they do, and these reasons will be discussed at a later point below.

In Chapter I, general grounds were indicated for doubting the four premises which sustain this 'traditional' view of the movement. More concrete reasons for doubting the adequacy, at least in so far as they pertain to the South, have been revealed in the course of this thesis. The first premise was that the revolutionaries were from the intelligentsia, a body uniting people from various social classes on the basis of their shared beliefs. The thesis indicates that in fact there was a significant change in the composition of the Southern revolutionary movement during these years, 1873 to 1883, with a consequential change in the beliefs espoused by the revolutionary movement.(4) In a typical kruzhoz of 1873 - 1876/7, 50% of the members would have been the children of dvoryane, 49.5% would have received some of their education outwith the South and 68.4% would have had higher education at some establishment. During 1877 to 1879, (and the limited investigation carried out on one 'Narodnaya Volya' kruzhoz in Chapter IV, may indicate that this, in the main, holds true for kruzhozs in 1880 to 1883) of the average kruzhoz's membership only 38% were the children of dvoryane, 25% were educated outside the South, and 57.8% had had higher education. In the very first kruzhozs to turn to political terrorism some of these indices were even more divergent from the situation in 1873-1876/7. One would hesitate to claim that this represented a change in the social composition of the

revolutionary movement, since fathers' official ranks cannot readily be translated into terms of social class. However there may well be a connection between the decline in the number of children of dvoryane in the movement, and the decline in those being able to afford to receive higher education, and in those being able to attend the prestigious universities in the North or abroad. This second group of activists was in a sense more 'provincial' since it was less well educated and less well travelled. The change in the composition of the revolutionary movement heralded an alteration in the policies advanced by the movement.

The second premise was that the different groupings amongst the revolutionaries can only be explained in terms of their commitment to the ideas of Bakuninism, Lavrovism and Tkachevism. It might be sufficient to indicate that it has been possible to discuss the revolutionary kruzhoks in the South at some length without using these terms (except when mentioned in quotations from other sources). Although these kruzhoks had access to the émigrés, there is no evidence to substantiate the view that they discriminated amongst themselves on the basis of commitment to ideologues. Indeed it is one of the main conclusions of this thesis that in reality the revolutionary activists were subjected to a multiplicity of influences deriving from their social environment and their practical experience. Thus they were influenced by liberal society, by Ukrainophiles, by urban workers, by peasants as well as by money, or the lack of it, the influence of dominant personalities within particular kruzhoks, the police and by government attitudes. These pressures were more immediate and stronger than the influences of the émigré ideologues. Instead of attaching undue portentousness to the view of Lavrov, Bakunin and Tkachev, the activists were more likely to upbraid these émigrés for their failure to produce the narod books which the activists required, or for having the wrong level of theoreticality in their works. The activists could always ultimately exercise control over the émigré ideologues since they supplied the latter with funds, worked to bring the literature into the Empire, and supplied the émigrés with information. Regarding the ideology of the movement, Z.V.Pereshina has recently tried to demonstrate that "The sources of the ideas shaping the views of the revolutionary narodniks in the South were common to the revolutionaries all over the land."(5) This is at variance with the argument presented here, but

even in so far as it is true that the works of the ideologues did inform the views of all the active revolutionaries, their perception of these ideas and how they were realised in practice was profoundly moulded by local social and political circumstances.

The term 'passive nature' has been employed to describe the third premise, by which is meant that the changes which took place in the revolutionary movement were simple and direct responses to external forces, and that the movement did not generate any changes itself. In this thesis an alternative has been advanced. The evidence suggests that within the movement a number of competing and divergent groups co-existed, with different ones predominating at different times. It is true that the precipitation of a change in the movement may have owed something to external events but the response was the consequence of the internal composition of the movement itself. Thus, police repression, or the influence of St. Petersburg or peasant unresponsiveness could create the climate and the opportunity for a policy, but the tactic to be used by the movement and the support for it was developed within the movement. These internal factors altered over time, and the particular juxtaposition of factors which stimulated one tendency and stifled another at a particular time was delicate and largely fortuitous. A second element in the view of the nature of the movement presented here is that the movement should not be regarded as a body to which things were done; rather it was itself an integral part of society, and those who influenced it - whether liberals, Ukrainophiles, urban workers, or even government officials - were to a degree also part of the revolutionary movement. Indeed in certain cases, revolutionary, Ukrainophile and urban workers (or, less comfortably, official, revolutionary and liberal) could be embodied in the one person. These different movements shaped imperceptibly into one another, co-existing not only in an individual but also in a family and in the community. The revolutionary movement was then firmly embedded in the specific social context of Southern Russia.

The fourth premise - that the sequence of stages through which the movement passed in St. Petersburg was substantially repeated everywhere, and done so under the leadership of the capital's revolutionaries - was the one which emerged most explicitly in the 'traditional' view of the development of the Southern revolutionary movement, and so it has been discussed above to a certain extent. However, at the risk of slight

repetition, the present study indicates that St. Petersburg's leadership was inconsequential and its sequence of stages irrelevant. 'Narodnaya Volya' alone was an all-Russian organisation. The sequence of stages which appears to have obtained in the South was of this character: a variety of trends co-existed; initially agitation amongst the peasantry enjoyed a weak ascendancy, but from 1877 onwards, political terrorism rapidly won wide support, and from 1879, the 'Narodnaya Volya' party harnessed it to the achievement of the assassination of the Tsar.

In the process of examining the 'traditional' view of the development of the revolutionary movement, an alternative explanation has been cast up. It depends upon an understanding of the revolutionary movement as existing in a matrix of social and political forces, often specific to the South. This can be seen in the course of considering the two central problems of the development of the Southern revolutionary movement: why the movement for propaganda amongst the peasantry was weakly supported, and secondly why political terrorism began here so early and enjoyed such dominance.

Regarding the first problem, there were firstly some specifically Southern practical problems which inhibited activity amongst the peasants. It was widely held that the obshchina was not the prevalent form of land holding, but that instead individual farmsteading predominated (a view shared incidentally by the Ukrainophiles). Thus it was considered that these Southern peasants were less likely to respond to the revolutionary message. Secondly, there was a serious language difficulty, and also a lack of narod books in the Little Russian language until the second half of the seventies. Thirdly, a section of the urban population of the South was Jewish and this was naturally reflected in the composition of the revolutionary movement. These people were reluctant to propagandise in the villages - as was demonstrably the case with, for example, P. Aksel'rod of the Kiev Chaykovtsy - because of the anti-Jewish sentiment which was believed to exist amongst the rural population. Jewish revolutionaries may also have felt the language problem particularly acutely.(6) They also may have had difficulty in gaining access to the peasantry since they were very much less likely to have relatives with estates which was, for many activists, probably the single most common venue for reaching the rural population.

There were intellectual problems too. The Ukrainophiles, at the same time as the revolutionaries were active amongst the narod, albeit with cultural and educational motives, and particularly so amongst the peasant sects. This fact must inevitably have been inhibiting, especially as numbers of the revolutionaries were Ukrainophiles and so did not hope for a peasant revolt. How, after all, could the peasants be roused to a revolt - in the near or distant future - when one was simultaneously subjecting them to serious cultural study; in search perhaps for the 'Little Russian creativity' which I.Koval'sky and S.Zlatopol'sky saw in the peasant Shtundists? The Volkhovsky kruzhek was deeply linked with the Ukrainophile movement and its members provided translation into Little Russian of narod books and actually wrote some. On the other hand, although the kruzhek conformed in most ways to the profile of a kruzhek which would be deeply involved in revolutionary propaganda amongst the peasants, actually its contribution was very disappointing. A further problem of an intellectual nature was that the Ukrainophiles amongst the revolutionaries, and also the Jewish participants, were disposed to regard the urban workers as almost as valuable a social group as the peasants; they were also more accessible and less of a problem linguistically as well as being generally more congenial. Thus for these activists the same primacy was not attached to the peasantry as was done by other revolutionaries: it was not a case of propaganda amongst the peasantry or revolutionary quiescence.

However, the most important limiting force on Southern support for agitation amongst the peasants was the fact that it was mainly those kruzheks which had a predominance of members with educational, organisational or other ties with the North or abroad, who favoured this form of activity, and these were by their nature limited in number. Their members also tended to have fathers from the dvoryane which may have facilitated access to the peasantry. But, even amongst kruzheks so characterised, and so disposed, their intentions could be stifled by lack of money. Liberal society did not support a policy of revolutionary rural agitation in the case of the kruzheks examined here, although it occasionally feted its practitioners. Assistance from the liberals was not forthcoming if, as Zhelyabov was later to caution his fellows, the revolutionaries continued to discuss the land question and to support agrarian violence. The Bashentsev, initially a poor kruzhek, received assistance from Odessan liberals at a later stage in its

existence. What propaganda activity was carried out by this kruzhok was mainly performed in the earlier stage and far from increasing such activity with its new found affluence, it actually contracted it. It may also be significant that Volkhovsky's kruzhok - despite expert leadership, good contacts with the North and the emigration, plentiful literature, a strong organisation - did surprisingly little in the villages but was intimately bound up with Odessan liberals and in receipt of money, sympathy and help from them.

On the other hand, support for agitation amongst the peasants was also limited by the fact that a substantial body of activists stood back from participation in it. This included some of the most vigorous and capable later leaders, such as Osinsky, Voloshenko, Vittenberg, Butsynsky, Tellalov, S.Zlatopol'sky, Zhelyabov. Some were active in urban agitation at the time, while others were busy in zemstva. If their statements of a few years later represent their views in 1874, then at the time of the 'v narod' movement in the summer of that year, they disapproved of such activity, and indeed feared a peasant revolt. Others, active in the field of urban propaganda, may have approved of rural agitation and may have considered their work as assisting it, in that they were forming mediators - a widespread view till the mid seventies. But even the decision to concentrate upon the formation of mediators from the midst of the urban workers, at a time when other revolutionaries were going into the villages, must of itself be a token of a qualification in support for that practice in the minds of the activist.

The upshot of these specific Southern factors was that Southern support for rural propaganda was weak, and in so far as faith can be put in the statistical material discussed in Appendix I, then the South contributed far less to this propagandist movement than was even reasonably predictable on the basis of the size of her student population.

It may be thought that the South's contribution to political terrorism was only impressive in comparison to the meagre part which it played in propaganda amongst the peasants. However Appendix I, bearing in mind the strictures mentioned above, appears to show that the South made a greater contribution than any other single area, and one far in excess of that which its population would have warranted. This policy swept up support from all corners of Southern society and it was aided not just within the South, but, through financial

remittances, also on the all-Russian stage. This raises what was identified above as the second central problem of the development of the Southern movement: why political terrorism began here, why it began so early, and why it enjoyed such dominance? It has already been argued that the wish for revenge for, and defence from, police persecution, and disillusionment with the lack of response from the peasants, should not be discounted as reasons. Certainly some propagandists did turn to terrorism for these reasons; certainly some people who had previously been politically disinterested and inactive were motivated to attack the authorities because of their sense of outrage at the treatment of some of the activists.(7) However these factors, of police persecution and lack of success with the peasants, were more important in ending support for propaganda amongst the peasants (the Southern revolutionaries more easily and more readily cast off this policy since commitment to it had been weak and its failings and difficulties were more quickly perceived) than they were in initiating political terrorism. This statement can be made because Chapter IV has shown that the great majority of the members of those kruzhoks which were the first to turn to political terrorism in 1877-79 had no experience of these factors themselves; their revolutionary backgrounds lay elsewhere.

The central explanation for the precipitous and sizeable Southern switch to political terrorism rests upon an appreciation that a different stratum of the revolutionary movement had moved to the forefront; one which previously, during the period characterised by rural agitation, had remained in the background. Then, it had been either inactive, involved in urban propaganda or in zemstvo work, but in general, not in rural agitation from which it stood apart. Only 18% of the membership of the average kruzhek functioning in 1877 to 1879 had been involved with peasant propaganda before 1877 or was so, during those two years. These were typically people who were less well educated and with parents of a somewhat lower rank than those who had been active previously. The most marked difference between them and their predecessors was their greatly reduced contact with the North: there were significantly fewer who had received education outside of the South, or who had the personal ties with the St. Petersburg and Moscow student kruzhoks, which had been distinctive features of their

predecessors. They showed a continued distrust of the capital and of central control.

Perhaps these people had not participated in rural agitation simply because they had not had the opportunity to go to the North, or abroad, to absorb the ideas there; perhaps some of them lacked access to the peasantry which the children of dvoryane were more likely to have; perhaps they avoided the peasants since they were too familiar with them to have any illusions about them, or conversely because through a lack of familiarity they feared them. Such specific factors could have arisen from the socio-economic background of these activists of 1877-79. They were also subject to the factors which help to explain the limited nature of Southern involvement with rural propaganda discussed above. In so far as their views of 1873 to 1876/7 reflected their view of 1877-79, then there was a significant group of the activists in the former period who did not want a major social change to be initiated by the peasants, believing that the peasants were too backward to conceive of it and too ignorant to control it, if it began. They did want political reform which would include the establishment of a democratic and constitutional government and which would further the development of the mass of the population, but they did not seek a bloody and chaotic social revolution.

More important than the motive for its behaviour in 1873 to 1876/7 are the explanations for the choice of political terrorism by this stratum of the revolutionary movement in 1877-79. It has been argued in the course of Chapters V, VI and VII that the pursuance of political reform by the revolutionaries was encouraged by liberal society, by Ukrainophiles and by urban workers and that from these sources the revolutionaries received the aid which allowed them to carry out their activities on such a grand scale during 1877-79. Also it has been argued that it is wrong to envisage these influences as being outside pressures on the movement since they were all, to a degree, part of the movement itself. Given the greater 'provincialism' of the revolutionaries in 1877 to 1879, they were more susceptible to such influences than had been their more outward looking and more widely travelled predecessors, who had experienced countervailing influences from the North. Not only were the activists of 1877 to 1879 more open to the climate of Southern opinion within which they functioned, but also the liberals and Ukrainophiles were more vigorous in endeavouring to

spread their own influence in these years than they had been previously. This juxtaposition of influences would apply particularly to 1877 to 1879 since after the latter date, political terrorism was advocated in most parts of the Empire and so Northern influences only served to reinforce the indigenous Southern development.

'Liberal society' assisted the revolutionaries in many ways and there seems little doubt that this was a source from which Osinsky's *kruzhok* got some of the means with which it was able to operate on a comparatively spectacular scale in 1878 and 1879. Such assistance was, at this stage of the movement's history, more vital than before due to the increasing professionalism of the participants and the greater cost of the activities with which they were now involved. The 'confiscation' of money from the government clearly did not meet the new needs and so the revolutionaries were more receptive to influences exerted through financial control. The revolutionaries realised that this aid was contingent upon their behaving in certain ways, and the liberals sought political reform, not social anarchy. It is not being suggested that the liberals were bending the revolutionaries to their will by financial bribes. Rather they were encouraging an existing propensity. The evidence suggests that many of the activists of 1877 onwards already shared the aspiration of the liberals for political reform, either because of their earlier involvement with the *zemstva* or as a result of convictions arising from their intercourse with the liberals. Southern programmes, and revolutionary organisations which enjoyed Southern support, from 1877 do not manifest hostility to the liberals, indeed they advocate co-operation and stress the importance of liberal aid. Clearly then the revolutionaries considered that there was much common ground between them and the liberals; a feeling manifest by the meeting of the revolutionaries, in 1879, with Petrunkevich and other liberals.

The Ukrainophile movement, which held many views and supporters in common with the liberal movement, was more organically bound up with the revolutionary movement than even the liberals were.(8) Few of the important *kruzhoks* functioning after 1876 lacked a Ukrainophile element in their membership. There had, of course, been Ukrainophiles in earlier *kruzhoks* but not, as far as can be discovered, to the same extent. The whole revolutionary movement, both in the North and in the South, showed no hostility to Ukrainophilism, but in the second half of the period under consideration, the revolutionaries increasingly adopted a position more in keeping with that of the Ukrainophiles. They moved from a position of demanding a federal union of *obshchinas* to one where

they were specifying political self-determination for the Little Russians. Thus, given shared membership, co-operation and a general sympathy for Ukrainophilism - although slightly less so for their views on decentralised party structures - it does not seem improbable that Ukrainophilism influenced the development of the revolutionary movement. Since the Ukrainophile movement was seeking, initially at least, primarily for political reform of the Empire, and the establishment of a constitution, it is very likely that the revolutionaries after 1877, who were also Ukrainophiles, carried this viewpoint over into the revolutionary camp.

The urban workers were yet another group which overlapped with the revolutionary movement. Their own aims, such as they are known, would appear to have been for political reform and 'economist' objectives. Until the mid seventies, the revolutionaries were inclined to view them as mediators with the peasantry, but the revolutionaries altered their perception of them from around 1876, after which the urban workers were accorded a more independent role and, to a greater or lesser extent, a more important role. In this new situation the aspirations of the urban workers, rather than those attributed to them, had to be taken more seriously. Once again, there was a shared membership, for the urban workers, from the mid seventies, had a growing presence amongst the revolutionaries, and were soon to be found in the local Central Groups of 'Narodnaya Volya'. Contact with the urban workers might, then, be considered as a further reason for the South turning to political terrorism. The workers' personal involvement in the revolutionary movement, the wish to retain their support, the influence of contact with urban workers in the course of urban agitation, all indicated that the revolutionaries should be demanding political reform and, given their dislike of and disbelief in, peasant revolt, then political terrorism was the only way that this could be accomplished. It is of considerable significance that the first act of political terrorism in the South was an attack upon someone who had betrayed a workers' group to the police, and that it was carried out by revolutionaries who had a background of agitation amongst urban workers.

The perspective on the revolutionary movement outlined by S.N.Valk some fifty years ago is still most valuable, and the preceding Chapters have endeavoured to deal with some of the points which he identified and to suggest their interconnections. He wrote that: "Its historical

past, its economic and social structure, its national composition and culture, finally differences of governmental policies in the Ukraine and in Great Russia ... all this could not but create here a revolutionary movement, the class character of which had its specific features."(9)

2. References.

- (1) Discussions on the relevant importance of these two 'extrinsic' factors is to be found in V.Bogucharsky 'Aktivnoye Narodnichestvo Semidesyatykh Godov' p.198, or in V.A.Tvardovskaya 'Krizis 'Zemli i Voli' v kontse 70-kh godov' in Istoriya S.S.S.R. 1959, no.4, p.61.
- (2) M.Langens, S.Lur'ye and I.P.Belokonsky, amongst others, did become disillusioned with the peasantry and turned to political terrorism. See Byloye 1906, no.5, pp.274-5, 291; L.Deych 'Za Polveka' tom I, p.295; I.P.Belokonsky 'Andrey Ivanovich Zhelyabov' in Byloye 1906, no.3, p.79.
- (3) R.Seth 'The Russian Terrorists' pp.166-7, has asserted that the police in the South, even by the early eighties, were 'grossly incompetent'; S.Chudnovsky 'Iz dal'nikh let' in Byloye 1907, no.10, p.230, makes a similar judgement on the Odessan police in the early seventies.
- (4) S.M.Baykov describes a similar change which occurred amongst the Belorussian revolutionaries at this time: "In this period the national and class composition of the intelligentsia of Belorussia changed. If until recently the cadres of the local intelligentsia were recruited entirely from, in the main, Polish or polishified Belorussian dvoryane, now its ranks were joined by the new intelligentsia from the raznochintsy, of Belorussian, Jewish and Polish stock.", see S.M. Baykov 'Svyazi narodnikov Belorussii s pol'skim revolyutsionerami' in V.A.D'yakov 'Svyazi revolyutsionerov Rossii i Pol'ski XIX - nachala XX v.' p.115.
- (5) Z.V.Pereshina 'Ocherki istorii revolyutsionnogo dvizheniya na yuge Ukrainy' p.76.
- (6) Apparently numbers of the Jewish population did not learn Russian, let alone Little Russian, till their late teens, see M.A.Krol' 'Vospominaniya o L.Ya.Shternberge' in KiS 1929, k.8-9, p.214.
- (7) On the entry of new people into the movement, motivated by a sense of outrage to become politically active, see M.R.Popov 'Iz moyego revolyutsionnogo proshlago (1878-1879gg)' in Byloye 1907, no.7, p.245; M.F.Frolenko 'Lipetskiy i Voronezhskiy s"ezdy' in Byloye Jan. 1907, no.1/13, p.83.
- (8) On the close relations between liberals and Ukrainophiles, see for example, V.Bogucharsky 'Aktivnoye Narodnichestvo Semidesyatykh

Godov' p.327; V.Levitsky (V.Tsederbaum) 'Partiya 'Narodnaya Volya'. Vozniknoveniye, Bor'ba, Gibel''' p.162; A.A.Rusov and F.K.Volkov 'Primechaniya' in Byloye 1907, no.5, p.153.

- (9) Foreword by S.N.Valk to Vl.Debagory-Mokriyevich 'Ot Buntarstva k Terrorizmu' p.3.

APPENDIX I: A Review of Statistical Studies of the Revolutionary
Movement, 1873-1883.

The purpose of this Appendix is to review the relevant statistical information in order to ascertain if Southern revolutionaries contributed more in the second half of the period than they had in the first half. That is, were more Southerners willing to become involved in revolutionary activity from the late seventies? If there were, then possibly this might indicate that they were more approving of the type of activity prevailing at that time and of the objectives which it aspired to achieve, than they had been of previous activities and objectives. However since there was a general upsurge in revolutionary activity from 1878 throughout the Empire (1), it is not sufficient to distinguish an increasing number of Southern revolutionaries; it would only be meaningful if the statistics showed that Southern revolutionaries constituted a larger proportion of the total number of revolutionaries in existence at any given time. However, the primary and secondary material available for this purpose is far from ideal.

The primary statistical material for the revolutionary movement is derived exclusively from figures concerned with arrests. This is unavoidable since there was an absence of formally constituted and continuous party organisations during the period, which would have been the obvious source of information. Using the figures for people arrested as a *gauge* of enthusiasm for the revolutionary movement has two main defects. The first defect is inherent since it is not safe to suppose that arrests and revolutionary enthusiasm are correlated. The number of arrests at any particular time could reflect a greater or lesser efficiency amongst the police in all or in part of the Empire, rather than an increasing or diminishing enthusiasm for the revolutionary cause, amongst all or part of the Empire's population. Indeed this almost certainly was an influence, for by the Ukaz of 5 April 1879, Odessa, Kharkov and St. Petersburg were put under military rule in the persons of Generals Totleben, Count Loris-Melikov and Gurko respectively, thereby extending the regime which already existed in Moscow, Kiev and Warsaw. The actions of these men must inevitably have manifest themselves in the rising figures of revolutionaries arrested in these different parts of the Empire. Similarly, it should not be assumed that police arrests necessarily followed rapidly upon involvement in the movement, or even that police invariably apprehended the guilty party.

A second defect in the primary material is that the statistics were originally produced for police, judicial or administrative purposes, and consequently the time span which they encompass does not necessarily correspond to any natural episode in the life of the revolutionary movement. Nor should it be assumed that statistics relating to contiguous or overlapping periods can safely be treated as comparable, since the two sets of statistics may have been compiled on different bases.(2) For example, it would not be sensible to endeavour to compare directly the data in 'Zapiski ministra yustitsii grafa Palena' (3) which deals with the 'v narod' movement, and M.M.Merkulov's report of 1877 which covered the years since 1873(4), with the information contained in two statistical articles in Narodnaya Volya entitled 'K statistik gosudarstvennykh prestupleniy v Rossii' which cover August 1873 to the end of 1879 and the first six months of 1879(5), with Schebëko's study(6) published in 1890 concerning the years 1878 to 1887, in the hope of establishing a trend over the whole period from 1873 to 1887.

Secondary works also do not offer a ready and reliable answer to questions concerning the changes in the composition of the revolutionary movement, and this is for at least two reasons. Firstly, it is because the secondary works which involve statistical studies also have the period of their investigation dictated by the dates covered by the primary material. Thus, I.Avakumović's study covers 1878-1887 because his work is largely based on Schebëko's earlier work (7). Similarly B.S.Itenberg's statistical analysis is based on a Third Section Report for 1873 to March 1879.(8) The second reason is equally deep rooted. Partly as a result of the constraints of the material, but partly also because of the belief that the revolutionary movement did not significantly alter its composition between 1873 and 1883, secondary statistical analyses have invariably focused upon the total figures for whichever period is under consideration, in order to produce generalisations based on this summative picture. There have been no longitudinal analysis of the movement on a year by year basis. This type of summative analysis can be seen in B.S.Itenberg (9), V.S.Antonov (10) and even in the otherwise most imaginative article by Ye.D.Nikitina (11), as well as in the other works mentioned above.

A further feature of statistical writing on the revolutionary movement is the limited nature of the questions put to the material: the social

rank, educational experience, age, length of service in the revolutionary movement are regularly considered. The nationality or the place of higher education are also often mentioned, but neither of these features are useful for the present purposes, since a Polish national could have been born in the Tauride and a student at St.Petersburg could be a Kievan, and so - for the purposes of the present study - be Southerners.

A number of works actually do consider the place of origin of the total number of revolutionaries with which they are dealing and these shall be discussed here although this material suffers from the limitations mentioned above. M.M.Merkulov in 1877 was able to identify the province of origin of a sample of 760 people arrested between 1873 and 1877 for revolutionary activity. Of these, 184, that is 24.2% of the sample, were from the South. The most 'fertile' Southern provinces were Podolia and the Don Military Region, which were ranked respectively 6th and 7th in the Empire for this particular characteristic.(12) This figure is similar to that produced by L.Tikhomirov in 1881 Feb., for a slightly different period. Tikhomirov studied 2,238 people accused between 1875 and 1880 and found that the Malorussian provinces had produced 440 of these i.e., 19.7% (13). The South was of course somewhat larger than Malorussia. The Soviet historian, B.S.Antonov suggests that around 22% of revolutionary students in the 1870's were from Ukrainian institutions; 70% were from higher institutions in St.Petersburg and Moscow.(14) More recently N.A.Troitsky has examined 1,238 revolutionaries who were sentenced in 211 trials held between 1871 and 1890. He is able to identify the place of birth of 940 of these, and 162 (i.e., 17.2%) were found to be 'Ukrainian'.(15) All this evidence despite its possible unreliability does appear reasonably consistent: it suggests that one should expect about one revolutionary in five active in the 70's and 80's to have been from the South.

However studies which concentrate particularly on the late seventies and eighties show a somewhat different pattern. I.Avakumović in 1959 analysed the provinces of origin of his sample of 453 revolutionaries and this shows that the Southerners were very prominent during 1878-1887. The 12 Southern provinces - from the total of 60 provinces dealt with - contributed 45.25% of the sample. The three most 'fertile' provinces in the Empire were all Southern: Kherson, Poltava and Kiev; St.Petersburg was fourth. Indeed, of the 18 most fertile provinces, 10 were Southern.(16) Many years earlier, Ye.D.Nikitina had examined the years from around

1880 to 1890, and had identified 175 leading revolutionaries linked with the 'Narodnaya Volya' Party, who had been tried during that period. This study shows that the six most fertile provinces were all Southern: Tauride, Odessa, Poltava, Kherson, Chernigov and Kiev. These accounted on their own for 33.8% of the sample. St. Petersburg, the most fertile of the Northern provinces contributed 4% of the sample and was placed seventh. The total contribution by all 12 Southern provinces was 40.1% of the total sample.(17) A different form of testimony to the importance of the South as a centre for revolutionary activity at this time could be deduced from the material provided by N.A. Troitsky: he shows that between 1879 and 1882, 20 political trials were held in Kiev; 14 in Odessa; 13 in St. Petersburg but only 9 in Moscow.(18) The information provided by Troitsky about his sample of revolutionaries tried between 1880 and 1883 makes it possible to calculate the percentage of the accused which was from the South in each of these years. In 1880, Southerners comprised 57.3% of the sample; in 1881, 60%; in 1882, 33%; in 1883, 77%. This indicates that a yearly average of 55.3% of this sample of accused revolutionaries in 1880 to 1883 were Southern.(19)

This admittedly inadequate material does seem to indicate that the South played a much more important role in the second half of the ten years under consideration than it had done during the first. A relevant statistic is the proportion which the students in the Southern universities formed of total student population; it stood at this time at approximately one third.(20) Thus the above statistical material would suggest that from 1873 to around 1878 the South may have contributed considerably less to the revolutionary movement than might have been expected, whereas in the subsequent five years it probably contributed much more to the all-Russian movement than its size would have suggested.

References.

- (1) N.A.Troitsky 'Tsarskiye sudy protiv revolyutsionnoy Rossii' pp.75-76, 205; N.A.Troitsky ''Narodnaya Volya' pered tsarskim sudom' p.84.
- (2) See Ye.D.Nikitina 'Narodovol'cheskiye protsessy v tsifrakh' in A.V.Yakimova-Dikovskaya (ed.) 'Narodnaya Volya pered tsarskim sudom' tom II, p.126, for a discussion of the difficulties arising from differing terminology and inadequate and incomplete information. Also V.S.Antonov 'K voprosu o sotsial'nom sostave i chislennosti revolyutsionerov 70-kh godov' in V.F.Zakharina (ed.) 'Obshchestvennoye dvizheniye v poreformennoy Rossii' p.336.
- (3) 'Zapiski ministra yustitsii grafa Palena. Uspekhi revolyutsionnoy propagandy v Rossii' (1875) in Byloye 1907, no.9, pp.268-276.
- (4) N.I.Sidorov (ed.) 'Statisticheskiye svedeniya o propagandistakh 70-kh godov v obrabotke III otdeleniya' in KiS 1928, k.1, pp.27-56.
- (5) 'K statistike gosudarstvennykh prestupleniy v Rossii' in Narodnaya Volya no.4, in 'Literatura' pp.315-322 (covering the first six months of 1879); Narodnaya Volya no.5, in 'Literatura' pp.344-356 (covering August 1873 to the end of 1879).
- (6) Lt.-Gen. Schebêko 'La Chronique du Mouvement Socialiste en Russie 1878-1887' St.Pb. (1890); Russian language version, 1906.
- (7) I.Avakumovič 'A Statistical Approach to the Revolutionary Movement in Russia, 1878-1887' in The American Slavic and East European Review April 1959, vol.18, no.2, pp.182-186.
- (8) B.S.Itenberg 'Dvizheniye revolyutsionnogo narodnichestva' p.374.
- (9) Ibid., pp.373-377.
- (10) V.S.Antonov 'K voprosu o sotsial'nom sostave i chislennosti revolyutsionerov 70-kh godov' in V.F.Zakharina (ed.) 'Obshchestvennoye dvizheniye v poreformennoy Rossii' pp.336-343.
- (11) Ye.D.Nikitina 'Narodovol'cheskiye protsessy v tsifrakh' in A.V. Yakimova-Dikovskaya (ed.) 'Narodnaya Volya pered tsarskim sudom' tom II, p.144, for an example of a summative table on social composition.
- (12) N.I.Sidorov(ed.) 'Statisticheskiye svedeniya' in KiS 1928, k.1, pp.53-54.
- (13) (L.Tikhomirov) 'K statistike gosudarstvennykh prestupleniy v Rossii' in Narodnaya Volya no.5, 5/2/1881, in 'Literatura' pp.354-355.

- (14) V.S.Antonov 'K voprosu o sotsial'nom sostave i chislennosti revolyutsionerov 70-kh godov' in V.F.Zakharina (ed.) 'Obshchestvennoye dvizheniye v poreformennoy Rossii' pp.339-340.
- (15) N.A.Troitsky 'Tsarskiye sudy protiv revolyutsionnoy Rossii' p.336.
- (16) I.Avakumović 'A Statistical Approach to the Revolutionary Movement in Russia, 1878-1887' in The American Slavic and East European Review April 1959, vol.18, no.2, p.183.
- (17) Ye.D.Nikitina 'Narodovol'cheskiye protsessy v tsifrakh' in A.V. Yakimova-Dikovskaya (ed.) 'Narodnaya Volya pered tsarskim sudom' tom II, p.147.
- (18) N.A.Troitsky ''Narodnaya Volya' pered tsarskim sudom' p.29.
- (19) Ibid., pp.164-185.
- (20) G.I.Shchetinina 'Universitety i obshchestvennoye dvizheniye v Rossii v poreformenny period' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1969, tom 84, p.166, gives the composition of the 6 Universities in 1875; one third of the total was in the universities of Kharkov, Kiev and Novorossia (Odessa). I Avakumović 'A Statistical Approach to the Revolutionary Movement in Russia, 1878-1887' in The American Slavic and East European Review April 1959, vol.18, no.2, p.184 quotes figures to show that in 1880 25.1% of students were in the 3 Southern universities; in 1885, 27%.

APPENDIX II. A Select Index to References to the Main Southern
Kruzhoks, mentioned in the Text.

- Andreyeva, A.V. 48, 65, 148-9, 172, 176.
(Kharkov)
- Bashentsev 46, 70, 131, 146-7, 164-7, 177, 259, 288, 298, 325, 328.
(Odessa)
- Basov, I.I. 44, 203, 220-1, 325, 326-7.
(Kiev-Zhitomir)
- Buntars 44, 46, 60, 71-3, 79, 134, 142-4, 157-9, 177, 324.
(Kiev)
- Butsynsky, D.T. 48, 73, 203-4, 222, 292-3, 326.
(Kharkov)
- Chaykovtsy 44, 53, 64, 70, 82, 85, 86, 141-2, 155-6, 176-7, 256,
(Kiev) 259, 260, 261.
- Chaykovtsy (F.V.Volkhovsky) 46, 52-3, 59, 70, 82, 83-4, 137-8, 145-6,
(Odessa) 162-3, 177, 196, 256, 259, 287, 324.
- Commune 44, 53, 69, 85, 133-4, 137, 139-41, 151-4, 175-6, 195-6,
(Kiev) 324.
- Kovalik, S.F. 48, 65, 69-70, 134, 147-8, 168-71, 176.
(Kharkov)
- Koval'skaya, Ye. 48, 204, 223-5.
(Kharkov)
- Koval'sky, I.M. 46, 55, 58, 59, 70-1, 134-5, 196, 199-200, 209-11,
(Odessa) 243, 288.
- Levinsky, I.Ya. and Gortynsky, P.V. 44-45, 61, 88-89, 197-8, 206, 229-30.
(Kiev)
- Osinsky, V. 44, 46, 60, 73-4, 86, 201-3, 215-9, 243, 293-4, 325.
(Kiev-Odessa)
- Tellalov, P.A. and Glushkov, I.I. 48, 75, 77, 89, 131-2, 205-6, 226-8.
(Kharkov)
- Vittenberg, S. 200-1, 212-4, 243, 290-1.
(Nikolayev)
- 'Zemlya i Volya' (M.Popov) 48, 71, 86-8, 149-50, 173-4, 177, 291.
(Kharkov-Rostov)
- Zhebunevs 46, 70, 84, 144-5, 160-1, 175-6, 260, 334.
(Odessa)

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

1. Contemporary newspapers and journals.

Chernyy Peredel. Organ sotsialistov-federalistov Zemlya i Volya.
Nos. 1-5, 15 January 1880-1881.
London (Nos.1,2,4); Minsk (Nos. 3 & 5).

Letuchiy Listok.
No.1, April 1878.

Listok Narodnoy Voli. Revolyutsionnaya khronika.
Series I, Nos. 1 - 3, 1 June - 20 September 1880.
Series II, No. 1, 22 July 1881.
Nos. 1 - 2, 1883.

Listok Zemlyi i Voli.
Nos. 1 - 5, 22 March - 8 June 1879.

Nabat. Organ russkikh revolyutsionerov.
Nos. 1 - 4, November 1875 - 15 September 1881.
Geneva, London, Brussels.

Nachalo.
Nos. 1 - 4, March - May 1878.

Narodnaya Volya. Sotsial'no-revolyutsionnoye obozreniye.
Nos. 1 - 3, 1 October 1879 - 1 January 1880.
Nos. 4 - 11/12, 5 December 1880 - October 1885.
St.Petersburg, Kharkov/Rostov.

Obshcheye Delo.
Nos. 1 - 112, 9 May 1877 - November 1890.
Geneva.

Obshchina.
Nos. 1 - 8/9, January - December 1878.
Geneva.

Rabochaya Gazeta.
Series I, Nos. 1 - 2, 15 December 1880 - 27 January 1881.

Rabotnik. Gazeta dlya russkikh rabochikh.
Nos. 1 - 14/15, January 1875 - February/March 1876.
Geneva.

Vestnik Narodnoy Voli. Revolyutsionnoye sotsial'no-politicheskoye
obozreniye.
Nos. 1 - 5, 1883-1886.
Geneva.

Vol'noye Slovo.
Nos. 1 - 61/62, 27 July 1881 - 22 May 1883.
Geneva.

Vpered! Neperiodicheskoye Obozreniye.

Nos. 1 - 5, 1 August 1873 - 1877.

Zurich, London.

Vpered!

Nos. 1 - 48, 3/15 January 1875 - 19/31 December 1876.

London.

Zemlya i Volya

Nos. 1 - 5, 25 October 1878 - 8 February 1879.

2. Published documents.

Aksel'rod, P.B. 'Mezhdunarodnyy klass v Khure' (Vol'noye Slovo, No.13, Nov.1881) in Byloye Jan.1904, no.5.

Aptekman, O.V. 'Dmitriy Rogachev. V ego 'Ispovedi k druž'yam' i pis'makh k rodnym' in Byloye 1924, no.26.

B., Ya.D. 'Sud i kazn' L.K.Brandtnera, V.A.Sviridenko i V.A.Osinskogo' in KiS 1929, k.7.

Bakh, A.N. 'Tsar'-golod' n.p. 1902. (first published 1883.)

Baum, Ya.D. 'K istorii khar'kovskikh revolyutsionnykh kruzhkov nachala 70-kh gg' in KiS 1931, k.4.

Bazanov, V.G.(ed.) 'Agitatsionnaya literatura Russkikh revolyutsionnykh narodnikov. (1873-5)' Leningrad, 1970.

Bazilevsky, B.(Bogucharsky, V.) 'Gosudarstvennyya prestupleniya v Rossii v XIX veke' tom II (1877), tom III (protsess 193-kh) Rostov-na-Don, 1906

Bazilevsky, B.(Bogucharsky, V.) 'Revolyutsionnaya zhurnalistika semi-desyatykh godov' Rostov-on-Don, n.d..

Berman, L. 'Kievskiy protsess 21-go v 1880g' in KiS 1931, k.8/9.

Breshkovskaya, Ye. 'Vospominaniya propagandistki' in Byloye May 1903, no.4, (Obshchina nos. 7, 8-9. 1878)

Burtsev, Vl. (ed.) 'Za sto let' (1800-1896)' London, 1897.

Bychkov, A. 'Pobeg'" (1882) in Byloye 1907, no.8.

'Da zdravstvuyet Narodnaya Volya! Istoricheskiy Sbornik No.1' Paris, 1907.

- 'Dokumenty k Chigirinskomu delu' in Byloye 1906, no.12.
- Dragomanov, M.P. 'K biografii A.I.Zhelyabova' Geneva, 1882.
- Dragomanov, M.P. 'Fis'ma M.A.Bakunina k A.I.Gertsenu i N.P.Ogarevu' (1896) St.Pb., 1906.
- Iovchuk, M.T.(ed.) 'G.Plekhanov. Selected Philosophical Works' vol.I, London, 1961.
- 'Gr.Loris-Melikov i imp. Aleksandr II o polozhenii Rossii v sentyabr 1880g' in Byloye 1917, no.4.
- 'Iz arkhivnykh raskopok. Missiya Strel'nikova' in KiS 1924, k.9.
- 'Iz knigi, izdannoy sekretno zhandarmami' in Byloye Jan.1904, no.5.
- 'Iz programnykh statey 'Chernago Peredela'' Geneva, 1903.
- 'Iz rechey na sude A.I.Zhelyabova, N.I.Kibal'chicha i S.L.Perovskoy' in Byloye March 1906, no.3.
- 'Kalendar' Narodnoy Voli na 1883 god' Geneva, 1883.
- Kantor, R.M. 'Dva pis'ma Gr.Gol'denberga iz Trubetskogo bastiona' in KiS 1924, k.13.
- Kantor, R.M. 'Proklamatsiya 'Yuzhno-Russkogo Rabocheho Soyuza' ob ubiystve Aleksandra II' in KiS 1923, k.5.
- Kantor, R.M. 'Ispoved' Grigoriya Gol'denberga' in Krasnyy Arkhiv 1928, tom 30.
- Kantor, R.M. 'O protsesse N.I.Kibal'chicha 1875-1878 gg' in KiS 1929, k.8/9.
- Karatayev, N.K.(ed.) 'Narodnicheskaya ekonomicheskaya literatura' Moscow, 1958.
- Kibal'chich, N.I. 'Pokazaniya N.I.Kibal'chicha' in Byloye 1918, no. 4-5 (32-33).
- Kropotkin, P. 'The Russian Revolutionary Party' in The Fortnightly Review Jan. 1 - June 1, 1882, vol.31 (new series), London, 1882.
- (Lavrov, P.L.) 'La Justice en Russie' in Vanity Fair 14th April 1877.
- Lavrov, P.L. 'Narodniki- Propagandisty 1873-78 godov' St.Pb., 1907.
- Lavrov, P.L. 'Sotsialisticheskoye dvizheniye v Rossii' (Jan.1879) in KiS 1925, k.14.
- 'Literatura sotsial'no-revolyutsionnoy partii 'Narodnoy Voli'' (Paris), 1905.

Maximoff, G.P.(ed.) 'The Political Philosophy of Bakunin: Scientific Anarchism' Glencoe, Illinois, 1953.

'Molinari o Yuzhnom Rabochem Soyuze' in Byloye Feb.1904, no.6.

Morozov, N.A. 'Terroristicheskaya bor'ba' London (Geneva) 1880.

'N.I.Kibal'chich i imp. Aleksandr III' (2 April' 1881) in Byloye 1917, no. 3.

'Otchet o protsesse 20-ti narodovol'tsev v 1882 gody' in Byloye 1906, no.6

(Ovsyaniko-Kulikovsky, D.N.) 'Zapiski yuzhno-russkogo sotsialista' Geneva, 1877.

Pankratov, V. 'K protsessu 12-ti 1884g v Kiev' in Byloye 1907, no.2.

Pankratova A.M.(ed.) 'Rabocheye dvizheniye v Rossii v XIX veke. Sbornik dokumentov i materialov' tom II (1861-1884): ch.1 (1861-1874), ch.2 (1875-1884). Moscow, 1950.

'Pis'mo A.I.Zhelyabovak M.P.Dragomanovu' in Byloye 1906, no.3.

'Pokazaniya pervomartovtsev' in Byloye 1918, no.4/5.

Pokrovsky, F.(ed.) 'Russkaya revolyutsionnaya emigratsiya zapiska Ya.V.Stefanovicha' (1882) in Byloye 1921, no.16.

'Pokusheniye A.K.Solov'yeva na tsare-ubiystvo 2 aprelya 1879 goda' in Byloye 1918, no.2.

'Protsess 17-ti narodovol'tsev v 1883 godu' in Byloye Oct.1906, no.10.

'Protsess 20-ti narodovol'tsev v 1882g' in Byloye Jan.1906, no.1.

'Protsess sotsialistov Valer'yanava Osinskago, Sofii Leshern-von-Gertsfel'd i Varfolomiya Voloshenko' (5/5/79) Geneva 1903.

'Rabochiy' - Rostovskiy zhurnal 1883 goda' in Literaturnoye Nasledstvo 1932, tom 2.

(Ralli, Z.K.) 'Nikolay Petrovich Zubko-Kodreanu' Geneva, 1879.

'Rechi podsudimyykh v protsess 17' in Byloye 1906, no.12.

Rudnytsky, I.L.(ed.) 'Mykhaylo Drahomanov. A symposium and selected writings' in Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S. Spring 1952, vol.II, no.1(3).

Sapir, B.(ed.) 'Lavrov-Gody Emigratsii. Arkhivnyye materialy v dvukh tomakh' tom I: 'Lavrov i Lopatin (Perepiska 1870-1883); tom II: 'Ot 'Vpered!' k gruppe Starykh Narodovol'tsev' Dordrecht, 1974.

Sapir, B.(ed.) ''Vpered!' 1873-1877'. Materialy iz arkhiva Valeriana Nikolayevicha Smirnova' tom I: 'Ocherk istorii 'Vpered'; tom II: 'Dokumenty' Dordrecht, 1970.

Scanlan, J.P.(ed.) 'Peter Lavrov. Historical Letters. London 1967.

Shchegolev, P. 'Aleksey Medvedev' in KiS 1930, k.10.

Stepniak (S.M.Kravchinsky) 'Underground Russia' (1882) 3rd edition, London, 1890.

'Svod" ukazaniy dannykh nekotorymi iz arestovannykh po delam o gosudarstvennykh prestupleniyakh. (May 1880 goda)' in Byloye 1907, no. 6.

'Svod" pokazaniy dannykh nekotorymi iz arestovannykh po delam o gosudarstvennykh prestupleniyakh' in Byloye 1907, nos. 7 and 8.

Tarnovsky, V. (G.G.Romanenko) 'Terrorizm i Rutina. Po povodu polemiki g. Dragomanov s 'Golosom' 1875' London (in fact Geneva) no date (but 1881).

(Tikhomirov, L.) 'Andrey Ivanovich Zhelyabov' London, 1882.

(Tikhomirov, L.) 'K biografiyam A.I.Zhelyabova i S.L.Perovskoy' in Byloye 1906, no.8.

(Tikhomirov, L.) 'Nikolay Ivanovich Kibal'chich n.p., 1903.(originally 1881).

'Ustav mestnoy tsentral'noy gruppy partii 'Narodnoy Voli'' in Byloye 1906, no.12.

Valk, S.N.(ed.) 'Arkhiv 'Zemli i Voli' i 'Narodnoy Voli'' Moscow, 1932.

Valk, S.N.(ed.) 'Iz narodovol'cheskikh avtobiograficheskikh dokumentov' in Krasnyy Arkhiv 1927, tom 20.

Valk, S.N.(ed.) 'Revolyutsionnoye Narodnichestvo 70-kh godov XIX veka. Sbornik dokumentov i materialov v dvukh tomakh' tom I: 1870-1875gg; tom II: 1876-1882gg. Moscow-Leningrad, 1964, 1965.

Valk, S.N. ''Sotsialist', organ yugo-zapadnoy gruppy partii 'Narodnoy Voli'' in Krasnyy Arkhiv 1929, no.33 (2).

Valk, S.N. 'Zhurnal rostovskikh rabochikh. Poslesloviye k publikatsiy 'Rabochiy' - Rostovskiy zhurnal 1883 goda' in Literaturnoye Nasledstvo 1932, no.2.

Yakimova-Dikovskaya, A.V. et al. (eds.) 'Narodnaya Volya' v dokumentakh i vospominaniyakh' Moscow, 1930.

Yakimova-Dikovskaya, A.V. et al. (eds.) 'Narodnaya Volya' pered tsarskim sudom' tom I and II, Moscow, 1930.

Yakimova-Dikovskaya, A.V. et al. (eds.) '1 Marta 1881 goda. Po neizdannym materialam' Petrograd, 1918.

'Zapiski ministra yustitsii grafa Palena. Uspekhi revolyutsionnoy propagandy v Rossii' 2nd edition, Geneva, (1875) also in Byloye 1907, no.9.

3. Later writings by revolutionaries.

Lavrov, P.L. 'Pis'mo tovarishcham v Rossii' Geneva, 1888.

'Nihilism As It Is' London, n.d. (1895) including Stepniak's 'What is Wanted?' (1891) and F.Volkhovsky's 'Claims of the Russian Liberals' with an introduction by Dr.R.Spence Watson.

Plekhanov, G.V. 'Russkiy rabochiy v revolyutsionnom dvizhenii' n.p., (Geneva) 1892.

Polonskaya, M.N. (Olovennikova), M.N. 'K istorii partii Narodnoy Voli. 'Pokazaniya M.N.Polonskoy '' (1893) in Byloye 1907, no.5.

Stepniak, S. (S.Kravchinsky) 'King Stork and King Log. At the Dawn of a New Reign. A Study of Modern Russia' (Nov.1895) London, 1905.

Stepniak, S. (S.Kravchinsky) 'Russia Under the Tzars' (c1885) London,n.d..

Stepniak (S.Kravchinsky) 'The Russian Peasantry. Their Agrarian Condition, Social Life, and Religion' 2 vols., London, 1888.

Tikhomirov, L. 'Russia. Political and Social' 2 vols.,(1886), London, 1888.

Volkhovsky,F. Introduction (1 Dec. 1892) to H.von Samson-Himmelstierna 'Russia Under Aleksander III. And in the preceding period' London, 1893.

Walsh, Warren B. 'Some Breshkovskaya Letters' in The American Slavic and East European Review 1945, vol.4, parts 1-4.

4. Memoir material.

Aksel'rod, P.B. 'Perezhitoye i peredumannoye' Berlin, 1923.

'Aleksandr Dmitriyevich Mikhaylov. (Materialy dlya biografii)' in Byloye 1906, no.2.

Alekseyev, V.P. 'Revolyutsionnoye i studencheskoye dvizheniye 1869 v otsenke tret'yego ot deleniya' in KiS 1924, k.10(3).

Aptekman, O.V. 'Iz istorii revolyutsionnago narodnichestva 'Zemlya i Volya' 70-kh godov (Po lichnym vospominaniyam)' Rostov-na-Don, n.d.. (1907).

Aptekman, O.V. 'Obshchestvo 'Zemlya i Volya' 70-kh godov' 2nd edition, Petrograd, 1924.

Ashenbrenner, M. 'Vospominaniya' in Byloye 1907, no.5.

Ashenbrenner, M.Yu. 'Voyenno-revolyutsionnaya organizatsiya partii 'Narodnoy Voli'' in KiS 1923, k.7.

B., V. 'Angel' Ivanovich Bogdanovich' in Byloye 1907, no.4.

Bakh, A.N. 'Vospominaniya Narodovol'tsa (1882-1885gg)' in Byloye 1907, nos. 1,2 and 3.

Belokonsky, I.P. 'Andrey Ivanovich Zhelyabov' in Byloye 1906, no.3.

Blackwell, A.S.(ed.) 'The Little Grandmother of the Russian Revolution. Reminiscences and Letters of Catherine Breshkovsky' Westport, Connecticut, 1973.

Borzyakov, Gr. 'Revolyutsionnaya molodezh' v Odesse v 1882-1884gg' in KiS 1929, k. 8 - 9.

Breshko-Breshkovskaya, Ye. 'Iz vospominaniy' in Golos Minuvshago Oct.1918, no. 10/12.

Breshko-Breshkovskaya, E. 'Hidden Springs of the Russian Revolution. Personal Memoirs of Katerina Breshkovskaya' edited by L.Hutchinson with a Foreword by A.Kerensky. Stanford U.P. California, 1931.

Bukh, N.F. 'Vospominaniya' Moscow, 1928.

Byalovesky, Ad. 'Iz proshlago' in Byloye 1906, no.8.

Charushin, N.A. 'O dalekom proshlom. Iz vospominaniy o revolyutsionnom dvizhenii 70-kh godov XIX veka' 2nd edition, Moscow, 1973.

Chaykovsky, N.V. 'F.V.Volkhovsky' in Golos Minuvshago Oct.1914, no.10.

Chudnovsky, S. 'Iz dal'nikh let' (Otryvki iz vospominaniy)' in Byloye 1907, nos. 9 and 10.

Chudnovsky, S. 'Stranichka iz vospominaniy' in Byloye 1907, no.5.

Danilov, V.A. 'Iz vospominaniy (Protsess Sytsyanko, 1879-1880) in Byloye 1907, no.8.

Debagory-Mokriyevich, Vl. 'Ot buntarstva k terrorizmu' tom I and II Moscow-Leningrad, 1930. Foreword by S.N.Valk.

Debagory-Mokriyevich, Vl. 'Vospominaniya' St.Pb., n.d.(1906).

Deniker, I.E. 'Vospominaniya' in KiS 1924, k.11.

Deych, L.G. 'Narodnaya Volya' in Byloye 1924, no.25.

Deych, L. 'V.I.Zasulich' in Golos Minuvshago 1919, no.5/12.

Deych, L. 'Valer'yan Osinsky. (k 50-letiya ego kazni)' in KiS 1929, k.5.

Deych, L. 'Za Polveka' tom I and II, Berlin, 1923.

Drago, N.I. 'Zapiski starogo narodnika' in KiS 1923, k.6.

Dragomanov, M. 'Avtobiografiya' in Byloye June 1906, no.6.

Drey, M. 'Strel'nikovskiy protsess v Odesse v 1883godu' in KiS 1924, k.9.

Drey, M. 'Zametka o rabochem dvizhenii v Odesse v 1880-1881gg' in KiS 1924, k.12.

Engel, B.A. and Rosenthal, C.N. (ed.) 'Five Sisters: Women Against the Tsar' London, 1975.

F., V. 'Iz arkhiva L.Tikhomirov' in Krasnyy Arkhiv 1924, tom 6.

Fauré, C. (ed.) 'Quatre Femmes Terroristes contre le tsar' Paris 1978.

Feokhari, S.I. 'Delo o vooruzhennom soprotivlenii v Kieve 11 fevralya 1879g' in KiS 1929, k.4.

Feokhari, S.I. 'Vooruzhyennaya demonstratsiya 1878g v Odesse (sud nad I.M.Koval'skim)' in KiS 1924, k.8.

(Figner, V.) 'Iz avtobiografii Very Figner' in Byloye 1917, no.2.

Figner, V. 'Memoirs of a Revolutionist' New York, 1927.

Figner, V. 'Mikhail Nikolayevich Trigoni' in Golos Minuvshago 1917, no.7/8.

Figner, V. 'N.I.Drago' in KiS 1923, k.6.

Figner, V. 'Zapechatlennyy Trud. Vospominaniya v dvukh tomakh' (1921) Moscow, 1964.

Frolenko, M.F. 'Dopolnitel'nyya svedeniya o protsesse 20-ti' Byloye 1906, no.6.

Frolenko, M.F. 'I.M.Koval'skiy. Zametka po povodu stat'i S.Ye.Liona' in KiS 1924, k.12.

Frolenko, M.F. 'Kommentariy k stat'ye N.A.Morozova 'Vozniknoveniye Narodnoy Voli'' in Byloye 1906, no.12.

Frolenko, M.F. 'Lipetskiy i Voronezhskiy s"ezdy' in Byloye Jan.1907, no.1/13.

Frolenko, M. 'O Gol'denberge' in KiS 1929, k.8/9.

Frolenko, M. 'Obshchestvo Narodnogo Osvobozhdeniya' in KiS 1932, k.3.

Frolenko, M. 'Pobeg" Aleshi Popovicha' in Byloye 1906, no.5.

Frolenko, M.F. 'Popytka osvobozhdeniya Voynaral'skogo 1- go iyulya 1878g' in KiS 1928, k.4.

Frolenko, M.F. 'Sobraniye Sochineniy v dvukh tom' 2nd edition, Moscow, 1932.

Frolenko, M.F. 'Tatyana Ivanovna Lebedeva-Frolenko' in KiS 1924, k.2.

Freydenberg, A. 'Revolyutsionnaya Odessa v kontse 70-kh godov' in Byloye 1925, no.3(31).

- (Gartman, L.) 'Iz vospominaniy L'va Gartmana' i Byloye Feb.1903, no.3.
- Gekker, N. 'Afanasiy Afanas'yevich Spandoni' in Byloye Nov.1906, no.11.
- Gekker, N.L. 'Revolyutsionnyye kruzhki v Berdyanske (1878-79)' in KiS 1924, k.11(4).
- Golovina-Yurgenson, N.A. 'Moye vospominaniya' in KiS 1923, k.6.
- Illych-Svytch, V. 'Moye znakomstvo s I.M.Koval'skim' in Byloye 1906, no.8.
- Iokhel'son, V. 'Dalekoye proshloye' in Byloye 1918, no.7.
- Ivanovskaya, P.S. 'L.D.Trent'yeva' in KiS 1931, k.3.
- Koff, G. 'K delu o pervom vooruzhyennom soprotivlenii v Odesse v 1878g' in KiS 1928, k.8-9.
- Kovalik, S.F. 'Revolyutsionnoye dvizheniye semidesyatykh godov i Protsess 193kh' Moscow, 1928.
- Kovalik, S. 'S.A.Zhebunev' in KiS 1924, k.12.
- Koval'skaya, Ye. 'Iz moikh vospominaniy' in KiS 1926, k.9.
- Koval'skaya, Ye.N. 'Moi vstrechi s S.L.Perovskoy' in Byloye 1921, k.16.
- Koval'skaya, Ye. 'Po povodu pis'ma V.Malyutina' in KiS 1931, k.4.
- Koval'skaya (Solntseva), Ye. 'Vospominaniya L.B.Gol'denberga. Moy vstrechi s Lazarem Gol'denbergom' in KiS 1924, k.10(3)
- Koval'skaya, Ye. 'Yuzhnyy Rabochiy soyuz v 1880-81gg' in Byloye Feb.1904, no.6.
- Koval'skaya, Ye. 'O proiskhozhdenii 'Vuzhno-russkikh rabochikh soyuzov' in KiS 1926, k.4.
- Koval'skaya, Ye. 'Pervaya tipografii 'Chernogo Peredela'' in KiS 1929, k.1.
- Krol', M.A., 'Vospominaniya o L.Ya.Shternberge' in KiS 1929, k.8-9.
- Kropotkin, P. 'Memoirs of a Revolutionist' London, 1971.
- Kulakov, A.A. 'Avtobiografiya' in KiS 1930, k.3.

Kulakov, A. 'Iz vospominaniy o N.K. Sigide' in KiS 1929, k.11.

Kunkl', A. 'V.A. Tikhotsky' in KiS 1929, k.10.

Kusheva, Ye. 'Iz istorii 'Obshchestva Narodnogo Osvobozhdeniya'' in KiS 1931, k.4.

Kusheva, Ye. N. 'Gobst ili Gobet' in KiS 1930, k.3.

Lazarev, Ye. 'Gavayskiy Senator' in Byloye 1907, no.5.

Levental', N. 'Semen Lur'ye' in KiS 1928, k.1(38).

Leyvin, Dn. 'Pamyati Rostislava Andreyevicha Steblin-Kamenskogo' in KiS 1924, k.12.

Lion, S. Ye. 'Ot prog^aandy k terroru. (Iz odesskikh vospominaniy semi-desyatnika)' in KiS 1924, k.12 and 13.

Lopatin, G. 'Po povodu 'Vospominaniy Narodovol'tsa' A.N. Bakha' in Byloye 1907, no.4.

Lukashevich, A. O. ''V narod!' (Iz vospominaniy semidesyatnika)' in Byloye 1907, no.3.

Lyubatovich-Dzhabadari, O. 'Dalekoye i nedavneye' in Byloye 1906, no.6.

M., I. 'Naum Leont'yevich Gekker' in Byloye 1920, no.15.

Martynovskaya, Ts. 'I. M. Koval'sky i pervoye vooruzhyennoye soprotivleniye v Odesse' in KiS 1928, k.8-9.

'Mitrofan Eduardovich Novitsky' in KiS 1924, k.8.

Moreynis, M. A. 'Solomon Yakovlevich Vittenberg i protsess 28-mi' in KiS 1929, k.7.

Morozov, N. 'Andrey Franzholi (Ocherk iz dvizheniya v 'narod' v 70-kh godakh i iz poslednikh dney 'Narodnoy Voli')' in Byloye 1907, no.3.

Morozov, N. 'Otgososok davnikh dney' (po povodu stat'i M. R. Popova: 'Iz moyego revolyutsionnago proshlago') in Byloye 1907, no.10.

Morozov, N. A. 'Vozniknoveniye 'Narodnoy Voli'. (Iz vospominaniy o Lipetskom i Voronezhskom s'yezdakh)' in Byloye 1906, no.12.

N--in, G. 'Iz zhizni rabochikh narodovol'cheskikh kruzhkov' in KiS 1929, k.8-9.

Nadin, P. 'Strel'nikovskiy protsess 1883 goda v Odesse' in Byloye 1906, no.4.

Nevsky, V.I. (ed.) 'Istoriko-Revolyutsionnyy Sbornik' tom I Moscow-Petrograd 1924, tom III, Moscow-Petrograd, 1926.

Novitsky, V.S. 'Vospominaniya tyazhelykh dney moyey sluzhby v korpus zhandarmov' in Byloye 1917, no.5/6.

Pankratov, V. 'Iz deyatel'nosti sredi rabochikh v 1880-84gg' in Byloye 1906, no.3.

(Peshekerov, P.) 'Propaganda sredi rabochikh v Rostove-na-Donu v 1882-84gg' in Byloye Jan.1904, no.5.

Peshekerov, P. 'Rabochiy-narodovolets G.G.Rudometov' in KiS 1929, k.11.

Petrunkovich, I.I. 'Iz zapisok obshchestvennogo deyatelya. Vospominaniya' edited by A.A.Kizevetter in Arkhiv russkoy revolyutsii (Berlin) 1934, tom 21.

Pisnaya, V.N. 'K biografii Zhelyabova. (Materialy doznaniya po delu 193-kh)' in KiS 1924, k.4.

Pisnaya, V.N. 'Studencheskiye gody A.Zhelyabova' in Byloye 1925, no.32(4)

Polyakov, M. 'V.A.Danilov' in KiS 1924, k.12.

Popel'nitsky, A. 'Po povodu st. P.Nadina 'Strel'nikovskiy protsess 1883 goda v Odesse' in Byloye 1906, no.12.

Popov, A. 'Adrian Fedorovich Mikhaylov' in KiS 1929, k.10.

Popov, I.I. 'Nikolay Konstantinovich Russel'-Sudzilovskiy' in KiS 1930, k.6.

Popov, I.I. 'Pamyati L.S.Zalkinda' in KiS 1929, k.11.

Popov, M.R. 'Iz avtobiografii M.R.Popova' in Byloye 1925, no.29(1).

Popov, M. 'Iz moyego revolyutsionnago proshlago (Ocherk pervyy)' in Byloye 1907, no.5.

Popov, M.R. 'Iz moyego revolyutsionnago proshlago (1878-1879gg)' in Byloye 1907, no.7.

Popov, M.R. 'K biografii Butsinskogo' in KiS 1923, k.5.

Popov, M.R. 'K istorii rabocheho dvizheniya v kontse 70-kh godov' (Dec.1902) in Golos Minuvshago 1900/1 no.5.

Popov, M. 'Nikolay Pavlovich Shchedrin' in Byloye 1906, no.12.

Popov, M.R. 'Voyenny sud v Kieve v 1880 godu. (Iz moikh vospominaniy)' in 'Zapiski zemlevoit'sa' Moscow, 1933.

Popov, M.R. ''Zemlya i Volya' nakanune Voronezhskogo s"ezda' in Byloye 1906, no.8.

Popov, Mak. 'Zametka o G.A.Lopatine' in KiS 1924, k.12.

Pribylev, A. 'In.Fed. Voloshenko' in KiS 1930, k.3.

Pribyleva (Korba), A. 'Po povodu protsessa 17-ti' in Byloye 1906, no.12.

Pribyleva-Korba, A.P. and Figner, V.N. 'A.D.Mikhaylov' Moscow-Leningrad, 1925.

Rebrova-Kharizomenova, Ye.A. 'S.A.Kharizomenov' in KiS 1924, k.4(11).

Rusanov, N.S., 'P.L.Lavrov' in Byloye Feb.1907, no.14.

Rusov, A.A. and Volkov, F.K. 'Primechaniya k chasti 'Svoda', kasayushcheysya 'soobshchestva ukrainofilov'' in Byloye 1907, no.6.

Rusov, S. 'Martyn Langans' in Byloye 1906, no.5.

Semenov, A. 'Solomon Vittenberg (Materialy k biografii)' in Byloye 1925, no.34(6)

Semenyuta, P. 'Iz vospominaniy ob A.I.Zhelyabov'e' in Byloye 1906, no.4.

(Serebryakov, Ye.) 'Obshchestvo 'Zemlya i Volya'' in 'Materialy dlya istorii Russkogo Sotsial'no-Revolyutsionnago dvizheniya' tom 11, Geneva, May 1894.

Shchegolev, P. 'K biografii N.I.Kibal'chicha' in KiS 1930, k.11.

Shekhter, A. 'Iz dalekogo proshlogo' in KiS 1923, k.5.

Shekhter, A. 'Revolyutsionnaya Odessa 1877-78gg (k kharakteristike Liona i Fomicheva)' in KiS 1923, k.6.

Skveri, M. 'Pervaya rabochaya sotsialisticheskaya organizatsiya v Odessa' Odessa 1921.

- Skveri, M. 'Yuzhno-rossiyskii soyuz rabochikh' in KiS 1923, k.5.
- Spandoni, A. 'Stranitsa iz vospominaniy' in Byloye 1906, no.5.
- (Steblyn-Kamensky, R.) 'Grigoriy Anfomovich Popko' in 'Materialy dlya istorii Russkogo Sotsial'no-Revolyutsionnogo dvizheniya' tom 16, Geneva, Oct. 1893.
- Stepniak (S.Kravchinsky) 'A Female Nihilist' Boston, 1885.
- Sukhomlin V.I. 'Iz epokhi upadka 'Narodnoy Voli'' in KiS 1926, k.3.
- Sukhomlin, V.I. 'M.A.Dikovsky' in KiS 1930, k.5.
- Tikhomirov, L. 'Vospominaniya' M.-L., 1927.
- Timofeyev, M.A. 'Perezhitoye' in KiS 1929, k.8-9.
- Titov, A.A. (ed.) 'Nikolay Vasil'yevich Chaykovsky. Religioznyya i obshchestvennyya iskaniya' Paris, 1929.
- Torgashev, P.I. 'Zapiski narodovol'tsa 1878-83gg' in Golos Minuvshago 1914, no.2.
- Trigoni, M.N. 'Moy arest v 1880 godu' in Byloye 1906, no.3.
- Viktorov-Val'ter, S.A. 'Iz zhizni revolyutsionnoy molodezhi vtoroy poloviny 1870-kh godov' in KiS 1924, k.4(11).
- Vitashevskaya, A. 'N.A.Vitashevsky (Beglyye vospominaniya)' in KiS 1924, k.4.
- Vitashevsky, N. 'Pervoye vooruzhennoye soprotivleniye - pervyy voyenny sud' (protsess I.M.Koval'skago)' in Byloye 1906, no.2.
- Vladychenko, P. 'M.P.Skveri' in KiS 1925, k.1.
- Vladychenko, P. 'Pamyati uchitelya i pogibshikh druzey' in KiS 1923, k.5.
- Yakimova, A.V. 'Iz dalekogo proshlogo. Iz vospominaniy o pokusheniyakh na Aleksandra II' in KiS 1924, k.1.
- Yakimova, A. 'Pamyati M.A.Kolenkinoy-Bogorodskoy' in KiS 1927, k.2.
- Yakimova, A. 'Pamyati Natal'i Nikolayevny Olovennikovoy' KiS 1925, k.1.
- Yakimova-Dikovskaya, A.V. et al. (eds.) 'Narodovol'tsy Sbornik III' Moscow, 1931.

Yastremsky, S. 'D.A. Lizogub (Tri vstrechi)' in KiS 1924, k.4.

Yurkovsky, F. 'Podkop pod khersonskoye kaznacheystvo' in Byloye 1908, no.7.

Yefremov, V.S. 'Malen'koye Delo' in Byloye 1907, no.5.

Zhebunev, S.A. 'Otryvki iz vospominaniy' in Byloye 1907, no.5.

5. Secondary works.

Alekseyeva, G.D. 'Oktyabr'skaya revolyutsiya i istoricheskaya nauka v Rossii, (1917-1923gg)' Moscow, 1968.

Ardasenov, N.M. 'Alikhan Ardasenov. Dokumental'nyy ocherk o revolyutsionnoy nauchnoy i obshchestvennoy deyatel'nosti' Ordzhonikidze, 1970.

Ascher, A. 'Pavel Aksel'rod and the Development of Menshevism' Cambridge Massachusetts, 1972.

Avakumović, Ivan 'A Statistical Approach to the Revolutionary Movement in Russia, 1878-1887' in The American Slavic and East European Review April 1959, vol.18, no.2.

Avrich, P. 'The Russian Anarchists' Princeton, 1967.

Bachman, J.E. 'Recent Soviet Historiography of Russian Revolutionary Populism' in Slavic Review December 1970, vol.29, no.4.

Baron, S.H. 'Plekhanov. The Father of Russian Marxism' London, 1963.

Baron, S.H. 'Plekhanov on Russian Capitalism and the Peasant Commune, 1883-1885' in The American Slavic and East European Review Dec.1953, vol.12, no.4.

Baum, Ya.D. 'K istorii kharkovskikh revolyutsionnykh kruzhkov nachala 70-kh gg' in KiS 1931, k.4 (77)

Becker, C. 'Raznochintsy: the Development of the Word and of the Concept' in The American Slavic and East European Review Feb.1959, vol.18, no.1.

- Billington, J.H. 'Mikhailovsky and Russian Populism' London, 1958.
- Blit, L. 'The Origins of Polish Socialism' Cambridge, 1971.
- Bogucharsky, V. 'Aktivnoye narodnichestvo semidesyatykh godov' Moscow, 1912.
- Bogucharsky, V. Ya. 'Iz istorii politicheskoy bor'by v 70-kh i 80-kh XIX veka. Partiya 'Narodnoy Voli' yeya proiskhozhdeniye, sud'by i gibel'' Moscow, 1912.
- Brower, D.R. 'The Problem of the Russian Intelligentsia' in Slavic Review, Dec. 1967, vol.26, no.4.
- Branfoot, A.I.S. 'A Critical Survey of the Narodnik Movement, 1861-1881' University of London Ph.D., 1926.
- Budak, I.G. 'Obshchestvenno-politicheskoye dvizheniye v Bessarabii v poreformenny period' Kishinev, 1959.
- Carr, E.H. 'Michael Bakunin' London, 1937.
- Dimitriyev, S.S. (ed.) 'Ocherki istorii S.S.S.R.. 1861-1904' Moscow, 1960.
- D'yakov, V.A. et al. (eds.) 'Svyazi revolyutsionerov Rossii i Pol'shi XIX - nachala XX v.' Moscow, 1968.
- Field, D. 'Rebels in the Name of the Tsar' Boston, 1976.
- Filippov, R.V. 'Pervyy etap 'khozhdeniya v narod' (1873-4)' Petrozavodsk, 1960.
- Filippov, R.V. 'Iz istorii narodnicheskogo dvizheniya na pervom etape 'khozhdeniya v narod' (1863-1874)' Petrozavodsk, 1967.
- Filippov, R.V. 'Ideologiya bol'shogo obshchestva propagandy (1869-1874)' Petrozavodsk, 1963.
- Footman, D. 'Red Prelude. A life of A.I. Zhelyabov' London, 1944.
- Frankel, J. 'Party Genealogy and the Soviet Historians (1920-1938)' in Slavic Review Dec. 1966, vol.25, no.4.
- Ginev, V.N. 'Narodnicheskoye dvizheniye v srednem povolzh'ye 70-ye gody XIX veka' Moscow-Leningrad, 1966.
- Gleason, A. 'The Emigration and Apostasy of Lev Tikhomirov' in Slavic Review Sept. 1967, vol.26, no.3.

Glinsky, B.B. 'Revolyutsionnyy period russkoy istorii (1861-1881gg)
tom I and II, St.Pb.1913.

Gurevich, Kh.S. 'K voprosu ob ideynykh istokakh i napravlenii programm
'Yuzhno-Rossiyskogo Soyuza Rabochikh' i 'Severnogo Soyuza Russkikh
Rabochikh' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1961, tom 70.

Hardy, D. 'Petr Tkachev, the Critic as Jacobin' London, 1977.

Hardy, D. 'Tkachev and the Marxists' in Slavic Review March 1970,
vol.29, no.1.

Hare, R. 'A Repentant Social Revolutionary' in The Slavonic and East
European Review Dec.1958, vol.37, no.88.

Hare, R. 'Portraits of Russian Personalities between Reform and
Revolution' London, 1959.

Hingley, R. 'Nihilists. Russian Radicals and Revolutionaries in the
Reign of Aleksander II (1855-81)' London, 1967.

Hingley, R. 'The Russian Secret Police' London, 1970.

Ionescu, G. and Gellner, E. (eds.) 'Populism. Its Meanings and National
Characteristics' London, 1970.

Itenberg, B.S. 'Deyatel'nost 'Yuzhnorossiyskogo soyuza rabochikh'' in
Voprosy Istorii 1951, no.1.

Itenberg, B.S. 'Dvizheniye revolyutsionnogo narodnichestva. Narodnicheskiye
kruzhki i 'khozhdeniye v narod' v 70-kh godakh XIX v.' Moscow, 1965.

Itenberg, B.S. 'K voprosu o vliyaniy revolyutsionerov epokha padeniye
kreposnogo prava na narodnikov pervoy poloviny 70-kh godov XIXv' in
Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1960, tom 67.

Itenberg, B.S. 'Nachalo massovogo 'khozhdeniya v narod'' in Istoricheskiye
Zapiski 1961, tom 69.

Itenberg, B.S. 'Rasprostraneniye izdaniy Russkoy septsii 1 Internatsionala
v revolyutsionnom podpol'ye Rossii' in Voprosy Istorii Oct.1962, no.10.

Itenberg, B.S. 'Svyazi peredovykh rabochikh Rossii s revolyutsionnym
dvizheniyem zapada (70-ye gody XIX v)' in Voprosy Istorii 1956, no.9.

Itenberg, B.S. 'Vozniknoveniye pervoy proletarskoy organizatsii v Rossii -
'Yuzhnorossiyskogo soyuza rabochikh'' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1953,
tom 44.

Itenberg, B.S. 'Yuzhnorossiyskiy soyuz rabochikh - pervaya proletarskaya organizatsiya v Rossii' Moscow, 1954.

Itenberg, B.S. 'Yuzhno-Rossiyskiy Soyuz Rabochikh. Vozniknoveniye i Deyatel'nost'' Moscow, 1974.

Kabanov, P.I. (ed.) 'Ocherki istorii rossiyskogo proletariata (1861-1917)' Moscow, 1963.

Kantor, R.M. 'Razgrom 'Yuzhno-russkogo rabocheho soyuza' v 1880-1881gg' in Krasnyy Arkhiv 1928, tom 30.

Kennan, G. 'Siberia and the Exile System' 2 vols., London 1891.

Kim, M.I. (ed.) 'Iz istorii rabocheho klassa i krest'yanstva SSSR' Moscow, 1959.

Kiperman, A.Ya. 'Glavnyye tsentry russkoy revolyutsionnoy emigratsii 70-80kh godov' XIXv.' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1971, tom 88.

Knowles, A.V. 'The 'Book Affair' of the Chaykovsky Circle' in The Slavonic and East European Review Oct. 1973, vol. 51, no. 125.

Kon, F. et al. (eds.) 'Deyateli revolyutsionnogo dvizheniya v Rossii. Bio-Bibliograficheskiy Slovar' ot predshestvennikh dekabristov do padeniya tsarizma' tom II (1870's), ch. 1-4; tom III (1880's), ch. 1-2. Moscow, 1929-1934.

Kornilov, A. 'Obshchestvennoye dvizheniye pri Aleksandre II. 1855-1881' Moscow, 1909.

Korol'chuk, Ye.A. 'Severnyy soyuz russkikh rabochikh i rabocheye dvizheniye 70-kh godov XIXv. v Peterburge' Moscow, 1971.

Koz'min, B.P. 'Ot 'devyatnadsyatogo fevralya' k 'pervomu marta'' in 'Iz istorii revolyutsionnoy mysli v Rossii' Moscow 1961.

Kulczycki, L. 'Geschichte der russischen Revolution' band II, Gotha, 1911.

Kuznetsov, I.V. 'Istoriya S.S.S.R.. Epokha kapitalizma. (1861-1917gg)' Moscow, 1971.

Lampert, E. 'Sons against Fathers. Studies in Russian Radicalism and Revolution' London, 1965.

Lampert, E. 'Studies in Rebellion' London, 1957.

Levandovsky, A. 'Yelizaveta Nikolayevna Koval'skaya' Moscow, 1928.

Levin, Sh.M. 'Dve demonstratsii' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1955, tom 54.

Levin, Sh.M. 'Obshchestvennoye dvizheniye v Rossii v 60-70-ye gody XIX veka' Moscow, 1958.

Levin, Sh.M. 'Ocherki po istorii russkoy obshchestvennoy mysli' Leningrad, 1974.

Levin, Sh.M. 'Revolyutsionnoye narodnichestvo 70-kh godov v osveshcheniy V.I.Lenina' in Istoriya S.S.S.R. 1962, no.2.

Levitsky, V. (V.Tsederbaum) 'Narodnaya Volya i rabochiy klass' in KiS 1930, k.1.

Levitsky, V. (V.Tsederbaum) 'Partiya "Narodnaya Volya". Voznikoveniye, bor'ba, gibel' Moscow-Leningrad, 1928.

Lifshits, G.M. 'K istorii Moskovskogo S"ezda narodnikov 1875g' in Istoriya S.S.S.R. 1965, no.4.

Lifshits, G.M. and Lyashchenko, K.G. 'Kak sozdavalas' programma vtoroy 'Zemli i Voli'' in Voprosy Istorii Sept.1965, no.9.

Livshits, S. 'Podpol'nyye Tipografii 60-kh, 70-kh i 80-kh godov' in KiS 1928, k.4 and 6; 1929, k.1, 2 and 6.

Los', F. 'K voprosu o formirovaniy rabocheho klassa na Ukraine' in Voprosy Istorii 1951, no.3.

Mckinsey, P.S. 'From city workers to peasantry: The beginning of the Russian movement 'to the people'' in Slavic Review 1979, vol.38.

Meijer, J.M. 'Knowledge and Revolution: The Russian Colony in Zurich, 1870-1873' Assen, 1955.

Miller, M.A. 'Ideological Conflicts in Russian Populism: The Revolutionary manifestoes of the Chaikovsky Circle 1869-74' in Slavic Review March 1970, vol.29, no.1.

Miller, M.A. 'Kropotkin' London, 1976.

Nechkina, M.V. (ed.) 'Istoriya i Istoriki. Istoriografiya Istorii S.S.S.R., Sbornik Statey' Moscow, 1965.

Nikitin, I. 'Pervyye rabochiye soyuzy i sotsial-demokraticheskiye organizatsii v Rossii (70-80-ye gody XIX veka)' Moscow, 1952.

Oruyeva, N.F. and Sergeyeva, N.A. 'O rabote narodnikov sredi rabochikh (gruppa 'Moskvitsey')' 'Uchenyye Zapiski' 1965, v.22. Omskiy Gos. Pedagog. Institut

Patkin, A.L. 'The Origins of the Russian-Jewish Labour Movement' London, 1947.

Pereshina, Z.V. 'Ocherki istorii revolyutsionnogo dvizheniya na yuge Ukrainy. (k 100-letiyu 'Yuzhnorossiyskogo soyuza Rabochikh')' Kiev-Odessa, 1975.

Perris, G.H. 'Russia in Revolution' London, 1905.

'Peterburgskiya studencheskiya zemlyachestva v polovine 80-kh godov i ikh znacheniye' in Materialy dlya istorii Russkago Sotsial'no-Revolyutsionnago dvizheniya 1895, Geneva, tom 10.

Pipes, R. 'Narodnichestvo: A Semantic Inquiry' in Slavic Review Sept. 1964, vol.23, no.3.

Pipes, R. 'Russian Marxism and its Populist Background' in The Russian Review Oct. 1960, vol.19, no.4.

Pipes, R. (ed.) 'The Russian Intelligentsia' New York, 1961.

Poglubko, K.A. 'Ocherki istorii bolgaro-rossiyskikh revolyutsionnykh svyazey (60-70-ye gody XIX veka)' Kishinev, 1972.

Pokrovsky, M.N. 'A Short History of Russia' London, 1933.

Pomper, P. 'Peter Lavrov and the Russian Revolutionary Movement' Chicago and New York, 1972.

Pradwin, M. 'The Unmentionable Nechayev' London, 1961.

Prokof'yev, V. 'Zhelyabov' Moscow, 1965.

Reuel', A.L. ''Kapital' Karla Marksa v Rossii 1870 kh godov' Moscow, 1939.

Reuel', A.L. 'Russkaya ekonomicheskaya mysl' 60-70kh godov XIX veka i marksizm' Moscow, 1956.

Rodichev, F.I. 'Ivan Petrunkevich' in The Slavonic and East European Review 1929, vol.7.

Rudnytsky, I.I. 'The Intellectual Origins of Modern Ukraine' in Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S. 1958, vol.6, nos.3-4 (21-22)

Samorukov, N. 'Obshchestvenno-politicheskaya deyatel'nost G.A.Lopatina (1845-1918)' in Voprosy Istorii 1951, no.3.

Saykin, O.A. 'Iz istorii 'Molodoy' Partii Narodnoy Voli' in Istoriya S.S.S.R. 1971, no.6.

Schapiro, L. 'The Role of the Jews in the Russian Revolutionary Movement' in The Slavonic and East European Review Dec.1961, vol.40, no.94.

(Shchebeko) 'Khronika Sotsialisticheskago Dvizheniya v Rossii, 1878-1887 gg. Ofitsial'nyy Otchet' Moscow, 1906/1907.

Schebēko, Lt.-Gen. 'La Chronique du mouvement socialiste en Russie 1878-1887' St.Pb.1890.

Schlesinger, R. 'The Preparatory period of the Revolutionary Party: Some observations on Franco Venturi's 'Roots of Revolution'' in Soviet Studies April 1963, vol.14, no.4.

Sedov, M.G. 'Geroicheskiy period revolyutsionnogo narodnichestva (Iz istorii politicheskoy bor'by)' Moscow, 1966.

Seleznev, K.L. '1 Internatsional i revolyutsionnoye dvizheniye v Rossii v XIXveke' in Istoriya S.S.S.R. 1964, no.4.

Sergiyevsky, N. 'Chernyy Peredel i narodniki 80-kh godov' in KiS 1931, k.1(74).

Seth, R. 'The Russian Terrorists. The Story of the Narodniki' London, 1966.

Shchepov, S.V. 'Kratkaya istoriya rabochego dvizheniya v Rossii (1861-1917 gody)' 1962.

Shchetinina, G.I. 'Universitety i obshchestvennoye dvizheniye v Rossii v poreformenny period' in 'Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1969, tom 84.

Shirokova, V.V. 'Vozniknoveniye narodovol'cheskoy organizatsii v khar-'kove' in 'Iz istorii obshchestvennogo dvizheniya i obshchestvennoy mysli v Rossii' Saratov 1964.

Shirokova, A.A. 'Yeshche raz o revolyutsionnykh demokratakiy i narodniki' in Istoriya S.S.S.R. 1962, no.3.

Shvelidze, Z.L. 'Sodruzhestvo russkikh i gruzinskikh revolyutsionnykh narodnikov v 70-80-kh godakh XIX veka' in Voprosy Istorii 1957, no.12.

Sidorov, N.I.(ed.) 'Statisticheskiye svedeniya o propagandistakh 70-kh godov v obrabotke III otdeleniya' in KiS 1928, k.1.

Simmons, E.J. 'Continuity and Change in Russian and Soviet Thought' Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1955.

Smirnov, A.P. and Ionova, G.I. 'Revolyutsionnoye demokraty i narodniki' in Istoriya S.S.S.R. 1961, no.5.

Snytko, T.G. 'Russkoye narodnichestvo i pol'skoye obshchestvennoye dvizheniye 1865-1881gg' Moscow, 1969.

Sokolov, O.D. 'Revolyutsionnaya propaganda na zheleznnykh dorogakh Rossii v 70-kh godakh XIX v' in Istoriya S.S.S.R. 1958, no.6.

'Sovetskaya Istoricheskaya Entsiklopediya' edited by Ye.M.Zhukov. tom 1-16, Moscow, 1961.

Tatishchev, S.S. 'Imperator Aleksandr II. Ego zhizn' i tsarstvovaniye' St.Pb., 1903.

Theen, R. 'The Russian Blanquists and the Hague Congress' in Canadian Slavic Studies Summer 1969, vol.3, no.2.

Theen, R. 'Seizure of Political Power as the Prologue to Social Revolution: The Political Ideas of P.N.Tkachev in the early 1870's in Canadian Slavic Studies winter 1970, vol.4, no.4.

Titlinov, B.V. (ed.) 'Molodezh' i revolyutsiya. Iz istorii revolyutsionnogo dvizheniya sredi uchashcheysya molodezhi dukhovnykhi srednikh uchebnykh zavedeniy 1860-1905' Leningrad, 1924.

Tkachenko, P.S. 'O nekotorykh vosprosakh istorii narodnichestva' in Voprosy Istorii 1956, no.5.

Tkachenko, P.S. 'O spornykh problemakh istorii narodnichestvo' in Istoriya S.S.S.R. 1963, no.6.

Tkachenko, P.S. 'Revolyutsionnaya narodnicheskaya organizatsiya 'Zemlya i Volya' (1876-1879gg)' Moscow, 1961.

Treadgold, D.W. 'The Development of the U.S.S.R. London, 1964.

Troitsky, N.A. 'Bol'shoye obshchestvo propagandy 1871-1874gg (tak nazyvayemye 'chaykovtsy')' Saratov, 1963.

Troitsky, N.A. 'Bol'shoye obshchestvo propagandy 1871-1874gg (tak nazyvayemye 'chaykovtsy')' in Istoriya S.S.S.R. 1962, no.5.

Troitsky, N.A. ''Narodnaya Volya' pered tsarskim sudom 1880-1891gg' Saratov, 1971.

Troitsky, N.A. 'Osnovaniye zhurnala P.L.Lavrova 'Vpered!' in 'Iz istorii obshchestvennogo dvizheniya i obshchestvennoy mysli v Rossii' Saratov, 1964.

Troitsky, N.A. 'Russkaya advokatura na politicheskikh protsessakh narodnikov (1871-1890gg)' in 'Iz istorii obshchestvennogo dvizheniya i obshchestvennoy mysli v Rossii' Saratov, 1968.

Troitsky, N.A. 'Tsarskiye sudy protiv revolyutsionnoy Rossii. Politicheskiye protsessy 1871-1880gg' Saratov, 1976.

Tun, A. 'Istoriya revolyutsionnykh dvizheniy v Rossii' (1883) n.p. (but Geneva), 1903.

Tvardovskaya, V.A. 'Krizis 'Zemli i Voli' v kontse 70-kh godov' in Istoriya S.S.S.R. 1959, no.4.

Tvardovskaya, V.A. 'Organizatsionnyye osnovy 'Narodnoy Voli'' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1960, tom 67.

Tvardovskaya, V.A. 'Sotsialisticheskaya mysl' Rossii na rubezhe 1870-1880 kh godov' Moscow, 1969.

Tyutchev, N.S. 'Revolutsionnoye dvizheniye 1870-80gg. Stat'i po arkhivnym materialam' Moscow, 1925.

Ulam, A.B. 'In the Name of the People' New York, 1977.

Ulam, A.B. 'Russia's Failed Revolutions: From the Decembrists to the Dissidents' London, 1981.

Valk, S. 'G.G.Romanenko. (Iz istorii 'Narodnoy Voli')' in KiS 1928, k.11.

Valk, S. 'P.L.Antonov v Petropavlovskoy kreposti' in Krasnyy Arkhiv 1928, tom 31.

Venturi, F. 'Roots of Revolution. A History of the Populist and Socialist Movements in Nineteenth Century Russia' London, 1960.

Verkhovtsev, I.P. 'Kratkaya istorii rabochego dvizheniya v Rossii (1861-1917 gody)' Moscow, 1962.

Volk, S.S. 'Deyatel'nost' 'Narodnoy Voli' sredi rabochikh v gody vtoroy revolyutsionnoy situatsii 1879-1882' in Istoricheskiye Zapiski 1963, tom 74.

Volk, S.S. et al. (ed.) 'Issledovaniya po otechestvennomu istochnikovedeniyu sbornik statey posvyashchennykh 75-letiyu professora S.N.Valka' Moscow-Leningrad, 1964.

Volk, S.S. 'Narodnaya Volya, 1879-1882' Moscow-Leningrad, 1966.

Von Laue, T.H. 'The Fate of Capitalism in Russia' in The American Slavic and East European Review Feb.1954, vol.13. no.1.

Walicki, A. 'The Controversy over Capitalism. Studies in the Social Philosophy of the Russian Populists' London, 1969.

- Walker, F.A. 'The morality of Revolution in Pyotr Lavrovich Lavrov' in The Slavonic and East European Review Dec. 1962, vol.51, no.96.
- Weeks, A.L. 'The First Bolshevik. A Political Biography of Peter Tkachev' London, 1968.
- Woodcock, G. 'Anarchism. A History of Libertarian Ideas and Movements' London, 1971.
- Woodcock, G. and Avakumović, I. 'The Anarchist Prince' London-New York, 1950.
- Wortman, R. 'The Crisis of Russian Populism' Cambridge, 1967.
- Yaroslavsky, E. 'History of Anarchism in Russia' London, (1937).
- Zakharina, V.F. 'Golos revolyutsionnoy Rossii. Literatura Revolyutsionnogo podpol'ya 70-kh godov XIX v. 'izdaniya dlya naroda'' Moscow, 1971.
- Zakharina, V.F. (ed.) 'Obshchestvennoye dvizheniye v poreformennoy Rossii. Sbornik statey k 80-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya B.P.Koz'mina' Moscow, 1965.
- Zaslavsky, D.O. 'M.P.Dragomanov, K istorii ukrainskogo natsionalizma' Moscow, 1934.
- Zelnik, R.E. 'Populists and Workers' in Soviet Studies Oct.1972, vol.24, no.2.
- Zilliacus, F. 'The Russian Revolutionary Movement' London, 1905.
-
6. Relevant general material.
- Abramsky, C. (ed.) 'Essays in Honour of E.H.Carr' London, 1974.
- Acton, E. 'Alexander Herzen and the role of the intellectual revolutionary' London, 1979.
- Allen, W.E.D. 'The Ukraine. A History' Cambridge, 1941.
- Bendix, R. 'Social Stratification and Political Power' in American Political Science Review 1952, no.46.
- Bill, V.T. 'The Forgotten Class. The Russian bourgeoisie from the earliest beginnings to 1900' New York, 1959.

Black,C.(ed.) 'The Transformation of Russian Society. Aspects of Social Change since 1861' Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1960.

Blackwell,W.L. 'The beginnings of Russian Industrialisation, 1800-1860' Princeton, New Jersey, 1968.

Brandes,G. (Dr.) 'Impressions of Russia' London, 1888.

Demeshina,E.I. et al.(eds.) 'Istoriya Dona, s drevneyshikh vremen do velikoy Oktyabr'skoy sotsialisticheskoy revolyutsii' Rostov, 1965.

Dixon,H. 'Free Russia' 2 vols., London, 1870.

Eckstein,H.(ed.) 'Internal War. Problems and Approaches' London 1964.

Emmons,T. 'The Russian Landed Gentry' Cambridge, 1968.

Fischer,G. 'Russian Liberalism. From Gentry to Intelligentsia' Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1958.

Gallenga,A. 'A summer tour in Russia' London, 1882.

Gernet,M.N. 'Istoriya tsarskoy tyurmy' 3rd edition, Moscow, 1963.

Golobutsky,V.A. et al.(eds.) 'Istoriya Kieva' tom I Kiev, 1963.

Greenberg,L. 'The Jews in Russia. vol.I: The Struggle for Emancipation' Yale, 1945.

Gross,F. 'The seizure of political power in a century of revolution' New York, 1958.

Haimson,L.H. 'The Russian Marxists and the origins of Bolshevism' Harvard, 1955.

Hume,G. 'Thirty-Five Years in Russia' London, 1914.

Johnson,C. 'Revolution and the Social System' Stanford, 1964.

Kautsky,J.H. 'The Political Consequences of Modernization' New York, 1972.

Keep,J.L.H. 'The Rise of Social Democracy in Russia' London 1963.

Kleyn,N.L. 'Zemsko-liberal'noye dvizheniye v samarskoy gubernii v 60-80-ye gody XIXv' in Istoriya S.S.S.R. 1970, no.6.

Korolenko,V.G. 'The History of my Contemporary' Oxford, 1972.

Lane, D. 'The Roots of Russian Communism. A Social and Historical Study of Russian Social-Democracy, 1898-1907' Assen, 1969.

V.I. Lenin 'Collected Works' Moscow-London, 1960, vols. 1,3 and 5.

Leroy-Beaulieu, A. 'The Empire of the Tsars and the Russians' London, 1903. (French edition, 1893).

Lichtheim, G. 'A Short History of Socialism' London, 1971.

Lipset, S.M. 'Social Stratification and Right-Wing Extremism' in British Journal of Sociology Dec. 1959, vol.10, no.4.

Iyashchenko, P.I. 'History of the National Economy of Russia' New York, 1949.

Mavor, J. 'An Economic History of Russia' London, 1914.

Maynard, J. 'Russia in Flux' London, 1941.

Mazour, A. 'Russia, Past and Present' London, 1951.

Mendel, A.P. 'Dilemmas of Progress in Tsarist Russia' Harvard, 1961.

Milyoukov, P. 'Russia and Its Crisis' Chicago, 1906.

Mirsky, D. 'Russia. A Social History', London, 1931.

Nechkina, M.V. (ed.) 'Istoriya S.S.S.R. tom II: Rossiya v XIX veke' Moscow, 1954.

Pares, B. 'Russia and Reform' London, 1907.

Perrie, M. 'The Social Composition and Structure of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party before 1917' in Soviet Studies Oct.1972, vol.24, no.2.

Pokrovsky, M.N. 'A short history of Russia' London, 1933.

Radkey, O.H. 'The Agrarian Foes of Bolshevism' Columbia, 1958.

Radkey, O.H. 'The Election to the Russian Constituent Assembly' Mass., 1950

Rappoport, A.S. (Dr.) 'Pioneers of the Russian Revolution' London, 1918.

Reuel, A.L. 'Russkaya Ekonomicheskaya mysl' 60-70-kh godov XIX veka i marksizm' Moscow, 1956.

Rothschild, J. 'The Communist Party of Bulgaria. Origins and Developments 1883-1936' New York, 1959.

Sack, A. J. 'The Birth of the Russian Democracy' New York, 1918.

Seaton-Watson, H. 'The Decline of Imperial Russia' 1855-1914' London, 1952.

Schapiro, L. 'The Communist Party of the Soviet Union' 2nd edition, London, 1970.

Stead, W. T. 'Truth about Russia' London, 1888.

Utechin, S. V. 'Russian Political Thought. A Concise and Comprehensive History' London, 1964.

Wallace, D. M. 'Russia' 1st and 6th editions, London, 1877; enlarged edition in 2 vols., London 1905.

Walkin, J. 'The Rise of Democracy in Pre-revolutionary Russia. Political and Social Institutions under the Last Three Czars' London, 1963.

Worsley, P. 'The Third World' London, 1967.

Zayonchkovsky, P. A. 'Krizis samoderzhaviya na rubezhe 1870-1880-kh godov' Moscow, 1964.

Zayonchkovsky, P. A. (ed.) 'Krest'yanskoye dvizheniye v Rossii v 1870-1880gg. Sbornik dokumentov' Moscow, 1968.

