The
Carl Beck
Papers
in Russian &
East European Studies

Number 1403

Susan M. Vorderer

Migration Patterns, Occupational Strategies, and Work Experiences in a Large Textile Town: The Case of Ivanovo-Vozensensk

Susan M. Vorderer is an Associate Professor of History at Merrimack College in North Andover, Massachusetts. Her current research focuses upon extending her study of peasant-workers in the Imperial period to areas throughout Vladimir Province.

No. 1403, October 1999

ISSN 0889-275X

The Carl Beck Papers
Editors: William Chase, Bob Donnorummo, Ronald H. Linden
Managing Editor: Eileen O'Malley
Cover Design:

Submissions to *The Carl Beck Papers* are welcome. Manuscripts must be in English, double-spaced throughout, and less than 100 pages in length. Acceptance is based on anonymous review. Mail submissions to: Editor, *The Carl Beck Papers*, Center for Russian and East European Studies, 46-17 Forbes Quadrangle, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, industrialization and urbanization were transforming certain areas of Imperial Russia, undermining traditional ways of life and creating severe strains, dislocations, and tensions. In the city of Ivanovo-Voznesensk, located in Shuia *uezd* (district) of Vladimir Province about one hundred fifty miles northeast of Moscow, the powerful, interconnected forces of urbanization and industrialization were carving out an environment based on the factory rather than the farm. Yet within the context of these seemingly inexorable forces changing the social, economic, and eventually, political fabric of the country, there were real people making choices and decisions. They significantly affected their environment and, moreover, created mechanisms and strategies to cope with the impersonal forces that altered the possibilities and opportunities for work and survival. This essay examines peasant-workers' responses to the dislocations and opportunities created by accelerated economic and social transformations.

The Setting

During the late tsarist period, one of the most productive textile areas in the Central Industrial Region of Russia was the city of Ivanovo-Voznesensk, known to contemporaries as the "Russian Manchester." Several factors contributed to the evolution of the city from serf village to urban industrial area. The generally poor state of agriculture in the surrounding regions, a river network, and a large population with a long tradition of nonagricultural or *kustar* (handicraft) employment, combined to create the important foundations upon which Ivanovo-Voznesensk industry was built. By the second half of the nineteenth century, the workshops founded by serf entrepreneurs for weaving and printing cotton cloth had developed into large, mechanized factories, usually owned by the heirs of these "serf millionaires."

From the early period of the town, there existed a definite link between industrial growth and urban development, a situation unique among Russian cities. Unlike provincial cities, with their administrative elements and artisanal economies, or the capitals, with their widely diversified economies, Ivanovo-Voznesensk grew as an urban area clearly and directly catalyzed by the industrial maturation of its textile industry. It was a true factory town where, in the absence of a *zemstvo* (narrowly elected body focusing on education and public health in rural areas), increasingly wealthy industrialists exercised political and social control. Industrial interests were paramount; the transformation of Ivanovo-Voznesensk from a one-industry village into a modern urban area with educational, cultural, sanitary, and other facilities was halting and occurred only gradually in

the first decade of the twentieth century.

The industrial nature of the area determined the urban environment. In the simplest terms, this was an ugly city. Located at the confluence of two rivers, the larger Uvod and the smaller Talka and for a time surrounded by woodland, the impact of industrialization rapidly altered the area after the mid-nineteenth century. The forests gave way to expansion and construction. On the banks of the Uvod, factory complexes erupted, spewing refuse into the river and air. Over the course of the years following its establishment as a city in 1871, eyewitnesses recorded both the evolution of this significant urban and industrial site and the persistence of the elements of a traditional Russian village. The continued preference of inhabitants to build and dwell in *izby* (peasant-type hovels) contrasted with the trappings of a modern, industrial city. A visitor in 1872, F. D. Nefedov, reported his overall impressions of the area:

> We see a mass of dilapidated wooden structures, set up in a six *verst* [about four mile] area, occasionally meeting with a merchant's stone house or long factory building; everywhere straw covers the huts and thus the inhabitants of "Manchester".... Voznesenskii *posad* is organized as a suburb of the Russian Manchester, it strikingly resembles an ordinary village: dirty *izby* covered with straw, taverns and inevitable pubs with monstrously fat samovars on the signs; then waste areas, and finally the center where the commercial rows are found. ... the main street, Alexandrovskii Street, reminds one of a *uezd* city. Ivanovo is even more amazing to the unaccustomed eye of an inhabitant of the capital: dug-up ravines compose the majority of the crooked and irregularly arranged streets, intersected by alleys; construction is largely of wood; all the streets are lined entirely with black *izby* and only in a few places is the line of broken-down peasant huts met by large factories with puffing engines and by the large stone houses with damask drapes in the windows of the rich factory owners. In addition to all this is the bazaar square with its commercial stores, taverns, and innumerable numbers of pubs which one comes across at each step. This is the outward appearance of the Russian Manchester.[1]

Although the city grew over the following two decades, little had changed when S. P. Shesternin entered the city for the first time in 1894. His initial impressions centered on the numerous factory smokestacks dotting the landscape, the lovely homes belonging to the factory owners, and the endless rows of tiny, wooden, workers' hovels with three or four windows poked in their sides.[2] Journeying to research an article about the city for the journal *Russkoe bogatstvo*, V. Dadonov encountered much the same scene in 1900. He was amazed that instead of the enormous buildings and feverish activity that he had expected, he saw row after row of small, wooden, one-story huts bounded by endless, decrepit fences, unpaved side streets lacking sidewalks, and badly paved main streets.

Occasionally, a building of two or more stories met the eye, along with the high, white bell towers of churches. Very few people appeared on the streets during *daylight* (working) hours.[3]

Further contemporary descriptions of Ivanovo-Voznesensk depict an area riddled with air and water pollution as well as numerous other threats to health and well-being. The condition of the Uvod River, which divided the city into two halves, was deplorable. Proclaiming the presence of the many textile factories, the water was by turns red, green, or blue, all covered with an iridescent film and emitting an offensive stench that was overwhelming, even in the more fashionable city center by the Sokovskii Bridge. Factories spewed dyes and oily remains into the river along with other kinds of refuse. As much as one hundred *pudy* (3,611 lbs.) of various acids and ninety *pudy* (3,250 lbs.) of arsenic used in the textile production process made their way into the river each day. Locals considered the Uvod dead and a menace. In hot weather, cattle that ventured to drink from the river often sickened and sometimes died. Anyone foolish enough to wade into the water risked developing a skin rash. Receding spring floods left toxic sediment on the river banks, killing the grass.[4] One of the most frightening aspects of the polluted nature of the river was its use as a major source of water for Ivanovo-Voznesensk's population.[5] In 1912, an article in the Kadet newspaper *Rech'* proclaimed the naked truth that this river "poisoned the existence of Ivanovo inhabitants."[6]

Sanitary conditions were appalling because the city never constructed water mains to bring in relatively safe water to residents nor sewers to carry away the dangerous waste generated by the factories or the population. As early as 1874, the city *duma* (council) debated plans for the construction of water pipes, but the plans were still under discussion on the eve of World War I. The absurdity of this situation was not lost on Dadonov, who marveled that a city of well over fifty-five thousand (by 1900) had no running water or sewerage yet produced a few hundred million rubles in annual sales.[7] In 1912, an article in the newspaper *Russkiia vedomosti* also expressed incredulity that a city of now one hundred fifty thousand people remained without safe water to combat the illnesses and epidemics that plagued the factory workers, who were still living in sad, little, wooden houses with unsanitary conditions.[8]

Clear lines of demarcation between industrial and residential areas did not exist in Ivanovo-Voznesensk at first: the two often coincided for the factory workers. Originally, factory owners had built their mansions alongside their factories in order to be close to production. By the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, however, a certain amount of partitioning had occurred. A number of factory owners resided along the streets immediately adjoining the

city square in the old Ivanovo village section. This area became more heavily upper class, as the owners sought to distance themselves from the workers flooding into the city. Areas also emerged as almost exclusively working-class districts, the most significant of which were the large "suburb" of Iam and the sections of Rylikha, Golodaikha, and Dmitrievskaia sloboda. Here were the tiny, wooden hovels that lined streets "rooted up by swine and strewn with every imaginable form of waste."[9]

The development of Ivanovo-Voznesensk was marked by certain physical contrasts that became more sharply defined with the maturation of the urban environment. The central sections of the city underwent various types of upgrading. Yet basic amenities and decent living conditions never extended to working-class areas before 1914. The net effect was rather efficiently to create a kind of "dual city," with areas of decent structures, some municipal services, and amenities alongside some clearly distinguishable areas of desperate conditions.[10]

Avenues of escape for the vast numbers who lived amidst the squalor and filth of the less fortunate areas were few. Poverty was a way of life for these people. According to a Ministry of Internal Affairs survey of cities in 1913, fully three-quarters of Ivanovo-Voznesensk households existed below the survey's poverty line (owning immovable or movable property worth fifty rubles or more or paying more than a minimum yearly rent).[11] Circumstances forced people into the sections of poor housing, poor sanitation, epidemic illness, and a myriad of other deplorable conditions. To a great degree, spatial and physical barriers encased the workers of Ivanovo-Voznesensk just as the shop floor defined their workplace. This "special" situation of workers in the city exacerbated the psychological effects of actually living in misery. To some extent, one must agree with Reginald Zelnik who describes the "extreme isolation of an early Manchester or an Ivanovo-Voznesensk [wherein the workers were a] distinct, isolated, disdained community."[12] *Zemstvo* census takers in Iam and other suburbs around Ivanovo-Voznesensk in 1899 provide a valuable and detailed picture of these communities:

> [Iam and other working-class suburbs] grew and spread as a stream of factory proletariat, landless peasants, and enterprising small producers and traders. All these people settled in the suburbs; some settled there as proprietors and homeowners, others were cooped up in narrow rooms, without their families who remained in the countryside. Thus arose the district as a noisy quarter, as a narrow, diverse suburb to which the city authority or village communal authority neither extends nor pays much attention. . . . These streets [are] overflowing with dirt, with small, as if play houses. The suburb is like a gypsy camp, like a secondhand market, where all are bartering, moving; some come,

> others leave; like mushrooms, new, bright yellow, little houses without any land attached grow up, appearing lonesome among waste and heaped rubbish; the houses extend in a line and quickly the line becomes crowded as new wings begin to be attached behind the houses. Not one tree nor green bush can be seen throughout these districts, only dirt on the streets, rubbish outside, and the never ending rumble of the factory and smoke and soot in the air.[13]

Population pressure, the decline of agriculture, and industrialization provided the driving forces in propelling great waves of mostly poor peasants to this city. Why did they come? What did they find? And how did they endure?

Population

Like most European countries, Russia in the nineteenth century was undergoing explosive population growth. Population pressure significantly affected the direction and rate of economic change and development. Rapid population growth severely tested the ability of traditional agriculture to provide subsistence for increasing numbers of people. Surplus farm labor urgently needed alternatives to agriculture to earn their livelihoods. Such developments gripped Vladimir Province, Shuia *uezd*, and other surrounding areas, directly affecting industrialization in Ivanovo-Voznesensk in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Table 1 details the significant, sometimes spectacular, population increases in the heart of the non-black-soil province of Vladimir and particularly in the Shuia district and Ivanovo-Voznesensk. As a result of some natural increase and very substantial inmigration, Shuia became ever more important within Vladimir Province, eclipsing the twelve other *uezdy* in terms of population in all surveyed years. In 1883, Shuia was home to 8.4 percent of the province's population. This figure rose to 10.4 percent by 1897 and to 14.4 percent by 1914.[14] In addition, Ivanovo-Voznesensk stood in the forefront of a shift in demographic patterns, as population pressure accelerated urbanization. While there was substantial overall population growth in Vladimir Province, the urban population of the province expanded at a greater rate. Ivanovo-Voznesensk was the driving force behind the development of a large urban population. In 1897, Ivanovo-Voznesensk represented nearly three-quarters (73.5 percent) of Shuia *uezd's* urban population and over one-quarter (28.4 percent) of the entire urban population of Vladimir Province. By 1914, a full 85 percent of Shuia *uezd's* urban population resided in Ivanovo-Voznesensk, while nearly one-half (46.1 percent) of all Vladimir Province urban dwellers lived in this city.[15] These figures indicate the prominence of Ivanovo-Voznesensk as an advanced urban center in the late tsarist period.

Migration, which was undoubtedly the major cause of population growth in Ivanovo-Voznesensk (the rate of natural increase was often negligible), created a city teeming with male migrants. Table 2 demonstrates the sharp contrast between Ivanovo-Voznesensk and rural areas of the *uezd* and province in terms of sex composition. Clearly, there was a link between migration and sex differentials in Ivanovo-Voznesensk, with profound repercussions for rural and urban life. Surrounding district and provincial rural areas were heavily female. Men, culturally freer to respond to economic opportunities outside the village, went to this textile town in large numbers to earn wages, perhaps leaving wives and families in the countryside on the family land allotment. This situation brought definite changes for both men and women: it altered family relations, affected village life, and created emotional hardships.[16] Furthermore, the predominance of single men in the city had far-reaching effects upon the availability of educational opportunities, medical care, housing, and "leisure time" diversions such as tavern going. The sex ratio influenced the type of city, with all its shortcomings, that emerged with increased population growth and urbanization.

Around the turn of the century, this pattern of male predominance began to alter in Ivanovo-Voznesensk as it did in other Russian cities like St. Petersburg and Moscow. More females began to stream into the city in the early 1900s.[17] In attracting not only men but increasing numbers of women, Ivanovo-Voznesensk stood in contrast to other Vladimir provincial cities which, on the eve of World War I, still drew far more men to their administrative and commercial economies.[18] Greater factory employment opportunities for women resulted from the transformation of industrial production through the use of advanced machinery and scientific management. By the turn of the century, the arrival of female migrants, both alone and more often with some kin, increased the pressure for better housing, education, and medical care. Table 2 indicates that more females than males inhabited the Iam suburb in 1897 and 1914. Because the large factories that provided housing for workers did so primarily only for men, families and single women sought housing in this crowded worker enclave.

Furthermore, city residents of both sexes tended to be of prime working age. Both the total provincial and strictly rural figures for Vladimir Province and Shuia *uezd* show that well over one-half of the populations were either under age fifteen or over age fifty. Ivanovo-Voznesensk in contrast had a strong component of young adults: nearly two-thirds (64.9 percent) of its population were adults of working age, with only about one-third under age fifteen (24.1 percent) or over age fifty (11 percent).[19] Imbalances of this sort in the population occasioned by the relative absence of young and old also occurred in Moscow and St. Petersburg in 1897.[20]

The blatant divergence in the age structure between urban areas of Vladimir Province, especially Ivanovo-Voznesensk, and rural areas resulted from people's responses to economic developments. People of working age were the backbone of the cities, while the very young and old predominated in the countryside. Employment opportunities lured working-age adults to the city, where, particularly in a factory town like Ivanovo-Voznesensk, the services of both skilled and unskilled were needed. The 1899 *zemstvo* census takers concluded that it was far easier for young people to adjust to the rigors of factory production and the new environment of the city than for older adults. In the working-class section of Iam in 1899, 77.8 percent of male workers and 80.6 percent of female workers entered the factory for the first time before the age of twenty-five.[21] Given the age structure of the countryside, some family members, usually young or old, remained behind on the land, while young adults migrated to the city for factory work. Although it is hazardous to project cross-sectional information into life history, the evidence here indicates that just as workers were likely to migrate to urban areas in their youth, they were likely to return home when they got older. Urban employment in day labor, construction, and factory work emphasized youth and stamina. Well over one-half of those in the 15–49 age category in Ivanovo-Voznesensk were under age thirty. Older workers usually found themselves in very low-paying jobs. According to *zemstvo* investigators, unless one were both male and among the small contingent of skilled workers in the factory (engraver, smith, turner, joiner, mechanic), wages inevitably fell as workers neared the end of their productive lives. For example, those unskilled and semiskilled jobs with the highest percentages of male workers over age forty paid some of the lowest wages in the factory. Among females, virtually no older workers earned more than twelve rubles per month.[22] Such meager income certainly undercut the attractiveness of urban employment and rendered it more difficult to survive in the city; older people consequently returned to the countryside since alternatives to factory employment in Ivanovo-Voznesensk were quite limited.

Ivanovo-Voznesensk lacked a large population of the very young as well. Census takers in 1899 discovered that many city residents had indeed left their children in the countryside, perhaps in recognition that mortality in Ivanovo-Voznesensk was higher than in rural areas at all ages and particularly for children. A substantial number of married couples had no children present in the city. Four out of ten families in the census had no children living with them. When children were present, small families were the norm. The average number of children per family equaled 1.5.[23] In part, the absence of youngsters reflected the abysmal conditions of life in the city, which created highly hazardous circumstances for infants and children. Lack of sanitation, crowding, tainted

food, and mothers working outside the home were detrimental to the survival of babies and youngsters. In 1881, 45.8 percent of all deaths in the city were of children less than one year old, a significant figure considering the relatively small population of youngsters in the city.[24]

More was occurring in Ivanovo-Voznesensk than simple, straightforward rural to urban migration that transformed peasants into urbanites and proletarians. There were several discernible patterns of movement. Examination and comparison of tables 3 and 4 demonstrate migrants' behavior. According to table 3, the greatest percentage of males living in Iam (21.9 percent) had left their native area two to five years before the local *zemstvo* census of 1899. Yet figures for longer term migration among males were also significant (19.8 percent left six to ten years previously, 15.5 percent over twenty years). A greater percentage of females than of males were recent arrivals from the countryside. Of all Iam females, 14.6 percent had departed from their native villages in the preceding year. Over 40 percent of Iam females had left the countryside no earlier than the mid 1890s. These data indicate a developing trend of women participating more fully in the migration process by the closing years of the nineteenth century.

A gap existed between the number of years since many Iam inhabitants had quit their native areas and the number of years they had been living in Iam. One explanation is that they did not migrate directly from the countryside to Ivanovo-Voznesensk. This urban area was not the first stop but one in a series of movements by peasants. For example, among Iam males, while 15.5 percent had left their village eleven to fifteen years previously, only 11 percent had lived in Iam that long (see table 4). Likewise, 13.3 percent of males had departed sixteen to twenty years before; yet only 9.5 had percent lived in the city this length of time. Second, these figures also raise the possibility that population moved from village to city, then back to the village, and once again to the city. This partially explains the discrepancies between the length of time since originally leaving the native village and residence in Iam. Memoir literature from Ivanovo-Voznesensk reflects this type of widespread back and forth movement.[25]

One must also remember that a portion of migrants to Ivanovo-Voznesensk were not peasants but *meshchane* (petit bourgeois) who abandoned older administrative cities for this burgeoning urban and industrial center. High levels of transiency among *meshchane* have been noted for other Russian cities. They searched for jobs and opportunities and attempted to avoid misery and impoverishment as so many peasants did.[26] Iam census takers commented that "it is interesting that the majority of the workers of the non-peasant *soslovie* [estate, i.e. *meschane*] do not belong to the permanent, native population of the

city of Ivanovo-Voznesensk but have migrated here from other areas."[27] As many as three-fourths of resident Ivanovo-Voznesensk *meshchane* in 1897 came from cities in Vladimir Province.[28] Many were new or relatively new arrivals. Over one-third of male and female workers who were *meshchane* had come to Iam only within the previous five years.[29] Clearly, Ivanovo-Voznesensk was attracting people with diverse backgrounds to its urban area and factories.

A closer examination of *sosloviia* composition, although not wholly satisfying as an accurate picture of social or economic status, does establish the presence of certain elements in the city in various years and forms the basis for some conclusions concerning the impact of industrialization upon these anachronistic estates.

In 1881, a significant majority (approximately 56 percent) of the population of Ivanovo-Voznesensk belonged to the peasant *soslovie*. The rapid growth of the city and the increasing mechanization of the factories in the preceding decade created a demand for large numbers of workers to build, perform day labor, and, above all, operate the factory machines. By providing opportunities that lured rural migrants to the area, industrialization shaped the social composition of the city.

The other large group, about one-third of the total, were the *meshchane*, including petty entrepreneurs, domestic servants, longtime urban dwellers, and some workers. Interestingly, 60 percent of *meshchane* were female. Domestic service, the potential of shopkeeping as a means of support, and differential mortality were among the causes of this rather unexpected imbalance. Also in the city in 1881 were "older" elites (nobility and clergy) along with "newer" elites (honored citizenry and merchantry), who rose in prominence due to the industrial nature of the economy. In comparison to the huge numbers of peasantry and *meshchane*, these four *sosloviia*—nobility, clergy, honored citizenry, and merchantry—together comprised a very small segment (not over 4 percent) of the city's population.[30]

By 1897, the composition of Ivanovo had altered substantially (see table 5). Change was most obvious in the statistics concerning the two largest estates: the peasantry and the *meshchanstvo*. Nearly seven of every ten people in the city in 1897 belonged to the peasant *soslovie*. The number of peasants in the city had increased dramatically, both in absolute terms and relative to the total population. On the other hand, the percentage of *meshchane* in the urban population fell from one-third in 1881 to just over one-fourth (26.8 percent) by 1897.[31] Further industrialization in the city attracted greater numbers of migrants, the vast majority of whom were peasants, either fresh from the countryside or well-traveled in their search for work. Their enormous numbers began to dwarf the rest of the

population. In the space of sixteen years since 1881, the position of the increasingly industrialized and urbanized Ivanovo-Voznesensk as a magnet for population had grown.

A comparison of the *sosloviia* composition in 1897 with all European Russian cities, cities in Vladimir Province, and the capitals indicates the unusual profile of Ivanovo-Voznesensk. Table 5 clearly demonstrates that European Russian cities had more *meshchane* than any other single *soslovie*, and a large component of nobility. In the cities of Vladimir Province excluding Ivanovo-Voznesensk only a slight majority of the population were peasants, joined by a substantial proportion of *meshchane* and a goodly number of nobles. Ivanovo-Voznesensk differed significantly. In 1897, the composition of the cities in Vladimir Province more exactly resembled Ivanovo-Voznesensk in 1881 than in 1897. The 1897 population of Ivanovo-Voznesensk most nearly approximated that of Moscow and to some extent St. Petersburg, although there were far fewer nobility than in either of the two capitals. Both Moscow and St. Petersburg, like Ivanovo-Voznesensk, had large peasant components and far fewer *meshchane*.

The trend of an increasing proportion of peasantry and a shrinking percentage of *meshchane* continued to mark population growth in Ivanovo-Voznesensk up to the eve of World War I. On the other hand, the cities of Vladimir Province registered a significant increase in the percentage of their populations belonging to the *meshchantstvo* and a decrease in the percentage of peasantry between 1897 and 1914. While in Ivanovo-Voznesensk the peasant population by 1914 accounted for 72.2 percent of the population, the peasantry composed one-fourth of the population in other cities of Vladimir Province. In Ivanovo, the proportion of *meshchane* in the population declined to 18.9 percent; in the other provincial cities, however, this proportion rose dramatically to 55.4 percent.[32]

In his study of the two Russian capitals and several large provincial cities, James Bater particularly examined *sosloviia* composition. He deciphered various patterns in urban social structures. Provincial cities were likely to have fewer peasants but greater numbers of *meshchane*, nobility, and females. However, in cities with substantial industry, the population contained large numbers of peasants, fewer *meshchane*, and a high proportion of males to females that was only gradually altering with increased female migration.[33] Ivanovo-Voznesensk fits that sketch of industrialized cities extremely well. The population was predominately male, although a trend to greater female migration was obvious by 1914. In addition, it increasingly became a city of peasants, with fewer *meshchane* and nobility, as the movement of the population over a near twenty-five year period confirms. The link among urbanization, industrialization, and a particular pattern of *sosloviia* composition in the population characteristic of the

capitals and more industrialized provincial centers clearly existed in this city.

Beyond *sosloviia* composition, crucial in understanding the movement of population was the high level of outmigration. Some migrants presumably planned only a temporary stay in the city, while others discovered that the realities of life in the city and in the factory shattered their expectations. They fled Ivanovo-Voznesensk disillusioned, to return to the country or continue their search in a new area. Census takers in Iam in 1899 characterized that environment as a "feverish circulation of population." New immigrants in that year equaled 28 percent of the population. However, they also estimated that between 14 and 20 percent of the population left. One-third to one-half of the inhabitants were on the move. Outmigration as well as inmigration were facts of life in Ivanovo-Voznesensk: "Therefore, all the movement—this is the normal condition of working population of such a large factory center as Ivanovo-Voznesensk."[34]

Relatively short-distance migration was the predominant pattern exhibited by those who trekked to Ivanovo-Voznesensk. Obviously then, distance was one of the foremost considerations in migrants' calculations. Most of the movement that affected the population of Vladimir Province was internal or from nearby Kostroma Province. Few journeyed to the neighboring province and city of Moscow. In 1897, only 3.6 percent of the Moscow city population originally hailed from Vladimir.[35] Vladimir natives generally satisfied their needs for factory employment and urban life by choosing migration to a city like Ivanovo-Voznesensk. The practice of migration became widespread after Emancipation in these two provinces. Between 1861 and 1910, the issuance of passports by village authorities increased 504 percent in Vladimir and 513 percent in Kostroma. In the years 1906 to 1910, the average number of passports issued annually equaled 242 per 1,000 village inhabitants in Vladimir and 200 per 1,000 in Kostroma.[36]

The vast majority of Ivanovo-Voznesensk inhabitants were natives of Vladimir Province. In 1897, almost three-fourths (72.6 percent) of urban residents had been born in this province. Overwhelmingly, when the residents were not native to Vladimir, they originated from Kostroma Province. In 1897, Kostroma natives comprised 20 percent of the city population and 73.3 percent of all non-Vladimir natives. Together, natives of Vladimir and Kostroma Provinces accounted for 92.6 percent of the city population. Contemporary witnesses in Ivanovo-Voznesensk noted this fact: "Chiefly from where do workers flock to Ivanovo-Voznesensk? Such an exceptionally large factory center as Ivanovo-Voznesensk undoubtedly draws workers from very remote corners of Russia, especially workers trained for skilled jobs. But the *mass* of workers are gathered from the regions adjoining the city" (emphasis in the original).[37]

Proximity to Ivanovo-Voznesensk exerted a powerful influence in attracting

migrants. Tables 6 and 7 further refine population origins. Only small percentages of the subject population came from areas other than Vladimir or Kostroma Provinces. Moreover, these tables emphasize the even greater connection of the city's hinterland to migratory patterns of the city's population. Shuia *uezd* natives formed a substantial component of the population even when one excludes those actually born in the city. In addition, the areas immediately bordering Shuia *uezd* contributed heavily as well to Ivanovo-Voznesensk's expansion. For example, over 60 percent of the 1905 strike council deputies whose origins were registered came from either Shuia *uezd* (excluding Ivanovo-Voznesensk) or one of four adjoining *uezdy*: Kovrovskii, Suzdal'skii,Viaznikovskii in Vladimir, and Nerekhtskii in Kostroma.[38]

As has been shown above, male migrants to Ivanovo-Voznesensk outnumbered female migrants, a typical pattern throughout Russia. Factory wages for men were usually greater than for women, and men encountered fewer communal and cultural restrictions. Men had a decided economic incentive. If and when women did obtain passports to migrate, low wages often meant not only exploitation in the factory but also destitution and victimization in the city. These facts sometimes dissuaded them from risking migration even when familial restraints were removed.[39]

When the distance was relatively short, however, the number of female migrants did exceed the number of males. As the distance of the migrants' origins from Ivanovo-Voznesensk increased so did the preponderance of males among this population. Such was the conclusion of Aleksei Smirnov in 1902 when he discovered that women entered the city's factories from nearby areas, while men traveled from many areas.[40] Data from Ivanovo-Voznesensk in 1897 and 1899 confirm this observation. Significantly more men than women came from provinces other than Vladimir or Kostroma. A greater percentage of women than men hailed from surrounding Shuia *uezd* or adjoining *uezdy*. Yet, when women migrated to the city with family members, they were more likely to come from greater distances than were women on their own. Men displayed precisely the opposite pattern.[41]

Amidst the chaos caused to people's lives by migration and the horrendous living and working conditions in the city, men and women developed strategies to cope with circumstances beyond their control. They tended to cluster with families or other kin. According to memoir literature from the Ivanovo-Voznesensk area, entire families often migrated. F. N. Samoilov left his native village as an adolescent with his parents and two younger brothers. S. Balashov, born to a family in Shuia *uezd* which possessed only one *desiatina* (2.7 acres) of land, traveled to Ivanovo-Voznesensk with his parents and at least one of his

brothers. M. A. Bagaev also journeyed to the city with his family.[42] Other families chose not to uproot the whole household but to send only some members to the city. In this way, families attempted to adjust the employment of family members both to labor demand and income potential. In a new and challenging environment, kin provided emotional and sometimes economic support through job-procuring networks and shared living expenses.

About one-third of the Ivanovo-Voznesensk population at the turn of the century lived without relatives in the city. However, very few persons lived alone. In 1897, only 3.4 percent of all households contained a single person. People who migrated to the city without a family member perhaps wanted companionship and, given the extremely high rents in the city, were probably unable to afford a single household even had they so desired. Men without families in the city found lodgings in factory barracks, in *artel'* (association of workers), or with other families as lodgers. Single women almost always lodged with families. Iam investigators observed that females very consciously chose to live in family accommodations which afforded a greater measure of cleanliness and security for lone women.[43]

Indeed, lodging was an integral component of life in Ivanovo-Voznesensk. It markedly contributed to and reflected the tremendous housing shortage as the city's population grew. Contemporaries noted the resulting overcrowded conditions. Touring Golodaikha, one of the poorest sections of the city, Dr. Pomerantsev related, "I am walking in the region adjoining Iamochnyi Square and Novoblagoslovennyi Church . . . . This area is almost entirely built up of wooden peasant huts with few windows. The huts are narrowly spaced one from another. Their yards are extremely narrow. It seems that of four hundred houses in this area a full one hundred, that is one-fourth of the houses, have more than ten inhabitants in each. The owners attempt to get as many lodgers as possible. In warm weather, hay and barns are used for night lodging." [44] Iam census takers in 1899 expressed shock at the housing situation in that district, declaring, "It is hard to believe that these doll-like houses with their apartments are built for permanent habitation by adult working people. And besides this, they are not only just living there but are crammed in at a completely incredible rate."[45]

Statistical data confirm these observations. Three-fourths (74.3 percent) of the Iam population lived in a one-room apartment of six or fewer cubic *sazhenes* (one cubic *sazhene* equals 343 cubic feet). Overall in Iam, an average of 8.6 people lived in each, usually one room, apartment. While this figure is lower than in Moscow, where in 1882, 9.7 people lived in each room, the Iam figure for 1899 approached the Moscow average for 1912, which stood at 8.7 people per apartment. One-half (49.9 percent) of the Iam inhabitants in 1899 lived in an

apartment containing between seven and eleven individuals. Moreover, nearly one-third (31.9 percent) of the population dwelt in accommodations with twelve or more people.[46] Comparison to large cities in the West illustrates the severity of housing situations in these two Russian cities: in 1910, each apartment in Berlin held an average of 3.6 people; Paris, 2.7; and Vienna, 4.2.[47]

When the Ivanovo-Voznesensk population took in lodgers, this usually brought more than one extra person into the household. Workers thus cohabitated with a large number of individuals. For example, in Iam, more than four "outsiders" on average lived with each family. Overall, 84.2 percent of the Iam population had the experience of living with lodgers compared to 33 percent of the working population in Moscow (in 1912).[48]

Lodging reflected the deep-seated needs of an often poor and temporarily displaced population. In Iam, over three-fourths (76 percent) of owner-occupied apartments also had boarders. However, the phenomenon of lodging was hardly restricted to owner-occupied rooms but played an enormous role in rented accommodations as well. Nearly two-thirds (65.5 percent) of Iam rented apartments had lodgers who resided with the primary renters.[49] One of the most important ways in which Iam owners purchased their dwellings was by renting space to lodgers. For the luckiest, crucial extra income from boarders allowed workers to buy their huts and thus obtain a measure of security and permanence. Yet, for the majority of owners and renters, taking in lodgers was an absolute economic necessity. By renting out a corner of their room and perhaps sharing food and laundry services, families added to the pool of earnings at virtually no cost to themselves, except of course, for the added chores undertaken by women. Therefore, widespread lodging in Ivanovo-Voznesensk resulted from the all-pervasive poverty in the city.

Motives for Migration

What prompted so many in the late nineteenth century to migrate to Ivanovo-Voznesensk? Evidence from this city suggests that migrants' behavior was influenced both by personal circumstances and by broader structural changes. One of the most important factors was the explosive population growth occurring throughout Russia. Population pressure in the countryside dictated the necessity of securing nonagricultual employment as peasants, seemingly always short of land in non-black-soil regions like Vladimir Province, experienced ever greater contraction of their holdings. Simultaneously, as discussed below, opportunities for subsistence or supplemental earnings outside the factory narrowed significantly in the Ivanovo-Voznesensk area. Other vital forces affecting

migrants' adaptive strategies were the desire to retain even small pieces of farm land and the desire and need to participate in the burgeoning industrial sector, especially given the powerful influence of Ivanovo-Voznesensk on the surrounding area.

Proximity to Ivanovo-Voznesensk, when combined with the facts of landholding, distinctly affected people's decisions about migration in this area. About one-fourth of the city's factory workers had no overt, direct connection to agriculture: their homesteads did not engage in farming. The majority of workers came from small or medium-sized farms. For example, in 1899, 60.8 percent of males had migrated from farms that cultivated only up to six *desiatiny* of crops. Approximately 10 to 15 percent of male and female workers had family farms of over six *desiatiny* of crops. [50]

Workers whose farms were closest to the city began their industrial employment at the earliest ages. Roughly two-thirds of the men and over one-half of the women who from within ten *versts* (one *verst* equals .66 miles) of the factory center entered into factory production by age fifteen. This was true of only 40.4 percent of the men and 32.5 percent of the women who hailed from over twenty *versts* away. Farm size also influenced the entry age of men and women into the factory. From farms with no cultivation, 65.8 percent of the men entered the factory by age fifteen while from farms with over six *desiatiny* of crops, only 50.9 percent were factory workers by age fifteen.[51] On larger farms, adolescent labor was needed and thus the decision to enter the factory was delayed. Some agricultural families adapted to industrialization by sending one, two, or more members into the city and factory while the rest of the family worked the land. In this way, they preserved the elements of an older way of life while taking advantage of surplus labor and wage opportunities that generated cash and constituted livelihoods.[52]

Ties to the countryside, then, were varied and flexible for migrants to Ivanovo-Voznesensk. However, such ties formed part of people's adaptations to changing conditions in the countryside and in the urban center. This fact was well recognized by those who tried to organize and propagandize among city workers. In early 1905, the newspaper *Vpered* voiced an urgent plea from Ivanovo-Voznesensk Social Democrats for literature and agitators to address the vast numbers of poor peasants in the city: "particularly we need peasant literature here. The connection with the village is great."[53]

In retaining their ties to the village, migrants were acting shrewdly, given the circumstances of late Imperial Russia. The maintenance of a village connection frequently served as an anchor and security for those who migrated. Deleterious urban and factory conditions and the paucity of sickness and old age insurance

until just before World War I meant that a return to the village was often the one refuge of those too ill, old, or disillusioned to continue living in the city. Rural ties acted as a cushion and a resource for many. In the face of challenges endured by those who migrated, the preservation of some ties to the countryside fostered an important link to tradition, family, and a sense of place.[54]

There were, however, several conditions that hindered agriculture and prompted peasants to turn to the industrial sector for wages. In the areas surrounding Ivanovo-Voznesensk, climate, poor soil, and other natural factors combined to make agriculture an unrewarding pursuit by the late nineteenth century. Only in the western districts of Vladimir Province was the soil heavier and more fertile. In the eastern sections, particularly Shuia *uezd,* soil was poor, even for Vladimir, requiring constant and intensive fertilization in order to produce decent yields. Given the relative absence of livestock in the district, such fertilization was not possible. Undeniably, agriculture declined in the second half of the nineteenth century in Shuia. According to a *zemstvo* census in 1899, agriculture had become a mere backdrop to this region's industry. The factories absorbed workers of all types, both those who were considered superfluous to farming and those who were agriculture's lifeblood: adult workers. Because agricultural production and factory work were incompatible, one way of life—industrial production—would inevitably supercede the other.[55]

The traditional way of life reeled before the onslaught of new economic developments, relations, options, and the emergence of a factory workforce. These transformations were so pronounced in Shuia *uezd* that in 1901 A. Smirnov, an observer of agricultural conditions in Vladimir Province, lamented that farming in Shuia was indeed dying a lingering death. The territory around Ivanovo-Voznesensk was particularly blighted, with large, deserted tracts overgrown with grassland, wormwood, and soil-covered rocks.[56] Two years later, Smirnov declared in his survey of books and reading in the countryside that there was extremely little material on agriculture and science anywhere in the Shuia area. People in this district avoided any discussion about agriculture and scientific improvements; they simply were not interested.[57] Traveling in the Ivanovo-Voznesensk area in 1900, V. Dadonov discovered that almost everywhere in the vicinity of the city, there were deserted fields and farms whose former inhabitants had temporarily or permanently forsaken agriculture for factory work.[58] By 1890, Ivanovo-Voznesensk possessed only two small water-driven mills for grinding rye grain.[59] Agriculture was no longer a dynamic sector of Shuia's economy, nor could it meet the needs of the expanding population.

Similar circumstances prevailed in Nerekhtskii *uezd* of Kostroma Province just adjacent to Shuia and Ivanovo-Voznesensk: outmigration to the city was

driven by the poor state of agriculture. In 1909, an observer of Nerekhtskii *uezd* declared: "The population is little interested in peasant agriculture; the chief interest is the factory. Agriculture is falling into inertia, without the least attempt to improve it; it is declining so that not only does it fail to generate an income but it frequently absorbs part of the income of working in the factory . . . . They [the peasants] consider factory work more secure; therefore, they go to the factories with their families."[60]

Industrialization and urbanization were, however, penetrating from Ivanovo-Voznesensk into the hinterland, transforming the area and people's perceptions about their opportunities. Why, given the population pressure, poor natural conditions, and the relative proximity of wage work, would peasants struggle to wrest a livelihood from the land? The "inertia" of agriculture was both a cause and a consequence of migration and industrial development.

The agricultural situation in Vladmir Province had changed dramatically in the decades following Emancipation, rendering full-time, extensive land cultivation a viable method of subsistence for only a small portion of the vast and growing peasant population. In the same period, the traditional and vital supplements to agricultural production experienced sharp contractions. Handicraft and domestic production had a long and flourishing history in Vladimir Province, especially in the Shuia area. These cottage industries, particularly in textiles, had laid the groundwork for and aided in the rapid growth of factory production in Ivanovo-Voznesensk. After the mid-nineteenth century, however, opportunities for domestic production of textiles and other goods deteriorated significantly, as did pay and numbers of those employed in such activities. As the considerable home industry failed and the viability of agriculture increasingly diminished in most areas, migration to Ivanovo-Voznesensk for factory work became the primary and perhaps only feasible choice for large numbers of peasants.

Sharply rising competition from factory and machine production by the late nineteenth century led to the demise of hand weaving in Vladimir Province and in Shuia *uezd* in particular. What hand loom weaving still remained was undertaken by sweated, largely female labor in isolated areas of the *uezd.* Much of the once flourishing, early-nineteenth-century putting-out system for weaving cotton yarn had atrophied. This was especially true in the Ivanovo-Voznesensk area where the countryside was dotted with abandoned one and two story stone huts which had once served as warehouses for the middlemen's yarn. Work previously done by hand in homes or village workshops had disappeared.[61] Only in the Vasil'evskaia and Chechkino-Bogorodskaia *volosti* (subdistricts) of Shuia *uezd* did the putting-out system continue in limited degree. By the second half of the nineteenth century, hand loom weaving was considered a pernicious industry:

workers often toiled as much as fifteen hours per day to earn an average yearly pay of eighteen rubles.[62] Given the proximity of factory production in the Shuia area, temporary or permanent migration became the popular adjustment to the near death of domestic production in cotton goods.

Although other handicraft industries like pottery, embroidery, leather and fur processing, brick making, and icon painting did survive in Vladimir Province and Shuia *uezd* into the twentieth century, these crafts absorbed only a fraction of the growing peasant labor supply. The condition of the peasantry in Vladimir and Shuia was, with some exceptions, quite bleak. Rural misery was no myth in this area of Russia. Population increased, and the available land no longer provided subsistence at a time when the resort to domestic production as subsidiary employment for agricultural families virtually evaporated. Migration was the alternative that the region's peasants accepted in light of emerging, often painful, realities. The factory became the most conspicuous symbol of the intricate web of forces transforming the province. In 1899, *zemstvo* officials declared: "Factory work has become so customary and inevitable that *other business is almost never encountered in the factory region* . . . . The more accessible the factory work the more powerfully it attracts workers of the local agricultural population, *depressing and paralyzing all other branches of work*" (emphasis added).[63]

While the agricultural and handicraft situation in the countryside compelled people to search for alternative livelihoods, growing employment opportunities in Ivanovo-Voznesensk's expanding factories lured scores of men and women. Certainly peasants were being forced off the land; yet, in all this, they were not mindless automatons. Economic motivation, the excitement and challenges of the city, the opportunity to escape family control, and various other factors influenced people's decisions to migrate as well. As industrialization transformed the face of Ivanovo-Voznesensk in creating an enormous factory workforce and capitalist economy, migrants both provided the labor for burgeoning manufacture and were drawn to the factories by the lure (if not always the reality) of expanding opportunities.

Cotton textile work was the lifeblood of the Ivanovo-Voznesensk economy. Large factory complexes with spinning, weaving, and printing sections employed hundreds of workers (in 1901, 89 percent of factory workers were employed in complexes of over five hundred workers).[64] The textile firms accounted for almost the entire industrial output of the city. By about 1890, enterprises which had begun in the early and mid-nineteenth century as hand workshops for printing cotton were in the forefront of modernization, adopting technological advances, vertical integration, capital investment, and the joint-stock company form. Table 8 details some of these developments for the major textile firms in Ivanovo-

Voznesensk. Most obvious in these data are the concerted efforts at expansion, as evidenced in basic capitalization, in the years before World War I. Manufacturers increasingly utilized techniques current in the West to promote efficiency and cut costs such as rationalization, speed-up, and Taylorism. They also seized upon structural changes occurring throughout Russia, like the building of a modern transportation system, to expand their markets into colonial areas and to establish permanent commercial centers for sales. Such concentrated industrialization meant that Ivanovo-Voznesensk created a large workforce in an urban area. Its economic surge in the late nineteenth century coincided closely with the great influx of migrants, thus linking industrialization and urbanization in a manner unique among Russian cities.

Urban and Industrial Experiences

The massive upsurge in industrial activity in the late nineteenth century created factory jobs in Ivanovo-Voznesensk, offering wages that attracted thousands of migrants for whom agricultural or *kustar* labor no longer provided a livelihood. Just what sort of opportunity did Ivanovo-Voznesensk provide?

The new urban residents lived in overcrowded and often badly constructed apartments or hovels. Men and women were plagued by a variety of illnesses including cholera, typhoid, typhus, and tuberculosis. They risked the hazards of toxin-laden drinking water and endured poor nutrition and high prices for food, housing, and, ironically in this textile capital, clothing. While Ivanovo-Voznesensk offered some opportunities for upward mobility, such as night and Sunday training classes, these avenues were strictly limited in terms of numbers and sometimes fell victim to the political climate. For example, training courses, suspended in 1905, were not allowed to resume even after the reassertion of tsarist control.[65] It is clear, both from the high levels of outmigration from Ivanovo-Voznesensk and from workers' own concerns, that frustration from dashed hopes in the city figured heavily in the accumulated grievances expressed in years of large strike activity here such as 1885, 1889, 1895, 1897, and, of course, 1905.

The other side of daily life was work in the factory. Just as the pressures and horrors of rapid urbanization deeply affected migrants, so the harsh work conditions, poor treatment, and often abysmally low wages in the factories also colored people's perceptions of their "opportunities." By the 1880s, Ivanovo-Voznesensk factories were completely mechanized. Subjected to a rigid division of labor, workers processed goods in relatively simple, repetitive tasks with the aid of machinery. Skill levels were low. Although the use of technology created some new skilled positions, such as mechanics, turners, machinists, and smiths,

the vast majority of workers were semiskilled and poorly paid. Coupled with the abundant regional labor supply, the adoption of advanced technology transformed workers into interchangeable parts and often resulted in highly tenuous situations of employment. By the turn of the century, these workers were also subjected to the intensification of work when the owners attempted to increase production and cut costs.

Other factors also made the factory a difficult and sometimes humiliating place to work. In Ivanovo-Voznesensk, the imposition of factory discipline went beyond merely insuring regularity of work habits and safe production. Throughout the pre-World War I period, even under the factory inspectorate, factory discipline and the system of sanctions for transgressions were excessive and harsh. Fines significantly reduced already low earnings and were seemingly inescapable. In 1885, the conservative Minister of Internal Affairs, D. A. Tolstoi, reported to Alexander III on the strike wave gripping Moscow and Vladimir Provinces (including Ivanovo-Voznesensk). He described the situation of factory workers as "clearly extremely oppressed." While pay sank lower in this period, fines levied in the factories consumed as much as 40 percent of earnings so that workers were not always able to pay their bills or support their families.[66] This system of fines still prevailed in Ivanovo-Voznesensk in 1905. The chief prosecutor for this area, P. V. Muraviev, held both the low wages and consistently high fines largely responsible for the city's strike and upheaval during the Revolution of 1905.[67] By 1912, according to *Russkiia vedomosti*, the majority of Ivanovo-Voznesensk workers were losing anywhere from one-tenth to one-fourth of their incomes to fines.[68]

Workers suffered from a number of common problems in the city's factories, including long hours and frequently abusive factory personnel. In addition, conditions within the factory were deleterious to health and safety. For example, "in the bleaching .... department workers use milk or onions as antidotes since the air, saturated with caustic, poisonous gas acts as a sharp poison; the workers frequently faint."[69] One of the workers from the Burylin factory recalled that onions were considered vital to survival in these foul conditions. Yet even the therapeutic use of this potent "medicine" did not prevent him from vomiting upon reaching the fresh air after work.[70] One observer noted that, "In the chemical areas there are as unbearable conditions as in the bleaching departments. The pressers, who arrive at work usually with the help of strong vodka, customarily have teeth fall out. Even the young workers, working as pressers from fourteen, lose all molar teeth. The air in the premises of the pressing department is so permeated with the odor of chemicals and strong vodka that newspaper turns yellow after two to three hours."[71]

There were other hazards, too, as might be imagined. Grisly accidents resulted from a distinct lack of consideration for safety. At the Gandurin weaving factory, looms were in extremely close proximity to one another, making it dangerous to pass around the moving parts that had no safety guards. New additions to Ivanovo-Voznesensk factories were simply built onto old structures. Therefore, at many enterprises, portions of the complex were in poor repair. At N. Garelin, rain or melting snow flooded several areas of the building. At Kokushkin and Marakushev, the poor construction of air vents allowed water to flow in during bad weather, depositing enormous puddles on the floor of the workshop. The Polushin, Kuvaev, and Zubkov establishments had no such difficulties; their buildings, filled with cotton fiber dust, high humidity, and intense heat, lacked ventilation systems altogether. Thus, during their hours in the factory, Ivanovo-Voznesensk workers encountered extreme and taxing conditions, regardless of the type of task they performed or which factory employed them.[72]

Wages were a crucial element in the migrants' decisions to move to city and factory; the amount they could earn vitally affected their strategies and, at the barest minimum, their ability to support themselves and their families. Tables 9 and 10 present data on wages earned by Iam textile workers according to sex and specific occupation. Although it is obvious that some factory workers, particularly men, were earning somewhat higher pay, 68.5 percent of all male workers labored in jobs that paid the vast majority (80 percent plus) no more than fifteen rubles per month. Of these jobs, only in drying, steaming, dye fixing, shearing, sewing, calendring, and smoothing did a greater portion of workers live on their own in the city. Thus, significant numbers of poorly paid workers, including a substantial component of weavers, were attempting to support families on these earnings. Among female workers, all were employed in occupations that paid virtually everyone (90 percent plus) fifteen rubles or less per month. Women in the very lowest paying occupations displayed an unusually high percentage of living on their own in the city.[73]

According to a study undertaken between 1902 and 1905 by a Russian Imperial Commission, a single male worker required a minimum of twenty-one rubles per month for bare necessities, while men with families of four needed a minimum income of fifty-one rubles per month. For single women, the minimum was set at seventeen rubles per month to provide for essentials of housing, clothing, and food.[74] While these figures reflected a general level for the empire, almost all single women (95.6 percent) and single men (94.2 percent) in Iam earned considerably less than the recognized minimums.[75] Few of these single workers of either sex reached the seventeen or twenty-one ruble per month factory wage. Thus, the prospects for single workers in Ivanovo-Voznesensk were far

from bright.

Earnings of adult males within families (85.6 percent earning twenty rubles or less per month) also indicate that few, if any, families in Iam survived simply on the income of one male worker.[76] One of the adaptations made by migrants was for wives and/or children to work, usually in the factory as well, in order for the family to reach subsistence level. The percentage of Iam wives working in Ivanovo-Voznesensk factories was so great that it nearly equaled that of husbands employed in factory work. Marriage did not dissuade women from entering the factory or prompt them to leave the factory during peak childbearing years. Indeed, over two-thirds (67 percent) of working, married women were aged twenty-one to forty and thus saddled with the demands of pregnancy, childcare, and other domestic responsibilities in addition to work in the textile establishments. Furthermore, in these Iam families, most children aged twelve and older worked, some in factories and others in various city shops. Among *meshchantsvo* families, 80 percent of children twelve and over were employed. This figure was even greater among the more numerous peasant families. Children of peasant *soslovie* families were employed at a rate of 94.2 percent.[77]

Dire economic conditions in Ivanovo-Voznesensk forced mothers and most children into employment outside the home. In the West, wives, and to some extent children, sought wage labor only at specific points in the lifecycle, during temporary financial crises. In Ivanovo-Voznesensk, everyday life presented working-class families with the urgent necessity of having numerous family members in the labor force. Painful choices and sacrifices were the hallmark of life in this city.

Conclusion

Within the confines of the developing social and economic realities of the period, men and women, whether married or single, all struggled to make choices and devise strategies that best promoted survival and fulfilled their needs. The decline of regional agriculture, the sharp descent of supplemental domestic production into "sweating," the paucity of rural employment, and the increase in population forced many people to look beyond the village for their livelihoods. Simultaneously, the urban and industrial growth of Ivanovo-Voznesensk offered to the adventurous and the needy the appearance of opportunity, economic incentives, and a different, perhaps more exciting, existence. In response to growing pressures and prospects, men and women calculated their best possibilities for income and endurance.

Migration was an integral component of such plans. It was a complex process

that integrated individual motivations and wider social and economic change. People tried to reconcile the old and the new, the opportunities and the handicaps, all at a time when much was changing in the countryside and the city. Peasants who experienced migration were never the same; urban living and factory work, with their benefits and drawbacks, irrevocably altered the perspectives of these men and women. From their shared needs in the city and on the workshop floor, migrants formed new ties. Communities and networks arose from urban residence and work patterns. Families adjusted to growing employment opportunities and a developing market economy. Many settled permanently in the city, becoming fully immersed in the urban world. Yet traditional ties to the land, village, and family persisted in varying degrees and were also a part of the urban experience. These ties formed the parameters within which migrants coped with upheaval and the new urban environment.

Poverty and misery stalked virtually every aspect of existence in the city; people's choices and aspirations were limited not only by what they could achieve but by what urban and industrial environments would allow. For each opportunity that the city offered to the scores of people who journeyed to Ivanovo-Voznesensk for factory work, much was demanded. Husbands frequently had to leave their wives and families in the countryside because city housing was too crowded and expensive. Furthermore, families often needed the meager income from their agricultural land. Mothers in the city worked outside their homes in the textile factories, sometimes to the detriment of their children. Families took in lodgers to survive. The great influx of population created enormous sanitary problems, housing shortages, and rising prices for necessities. Wages for the vast majority of workers remained low, especially in the face of surplus labor. Adjustments required by factory work and city living plagued wave after wave of new arrivals.

Ultimately, what is most impressive about Ivanovo-Voznesensk is not the rapid urbanization, advanced textile production, or phenomenal growth in the numbers of workers in the city. One must look to the resilience and courage displayed by ordinary men and women in attempting to overcome appalling conditions and financial hardships that were part and parcel of peasant-workers' situations in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Their struggles to secure decent lives for themselves and their families despite the manifest pitfalls and the seemingly overwhelming challenges of migration, urban living, and factory work are impressive indeed.

Tables

Table 1
Population Growth in Vladimir Province, 1859-1914

Year	Total Population	Density per Sq. *Verst*	Percent of Increase
Vladimir Province			
1859	1,222,599		1859–1883: 11.2
1883	1,359,327		1883–1897: 11.5
1897	1,515,691	35.4	1859–1897: 24.0
1904	1,676,800		1897–1909: 23.5
1909	1,872,000		1909–1914: 19.9
1914	2,244,225	47.3	1897–1914: 48.1
Shuia *uezd*			
1883	114,151	44.5	1883–1914: 183.8
1914	323,928	92.8	
Ivanovo-Vozensensk			
1883	31,056		1883–1897: 74.5
1897	54,208		1897–1909: 99.3
1909	108,033		1909–1914: 56.0
1914	168,498		1897–1914: 210.8
			1883–1914: 442.6
Urban Areas			
			1883–1897: 38.8
			1897–1914: 91.6

Sources: Gubernskii Statisticheskii Komitet, *Pamiatnaia knizhka Vladimirskoi gubernii na 1862 g.* (Vladimir: 1862), 3; Tsentral'nyi Statisticheskii Komitet, *Statisticheskii vremennik Rossiiskoi imperii sbornik svedenii po Rossii za 1883 g.* (St. Petersburg: 1886), 30; Tsentral'nyi Statisticheskii Komitet, *Pervaia vseobshchaia perepis' naseleniia Rossiiskoi imperii 1897* (St. Petersburg: 1900) 6, pt. 1, table 1; Tsentral'nyi Statisticheskii Komitet, *Ezhegodnik Rossii 1904 g.* (St. Petersburg: 1905), 51; Tsentral'nyi Statisticheskii Komitet, *Ezhegodnik Rossii 1909 g.* (St. Petersburg: 1910), 35; A. A. Bauer, *Trudy Vladimirskogo gubernskogo nauchnogo obshchestva po izucheniiu mestnogo krai (1921)*, 47; D. Prokof'ev, ed., *Pervoe stoletie* (Iaroslavl': Verhne-volzhskoe Knizhnoe Izdatel'stvo, 1971), 14; Ecole d'Enseignement Professionel à Ivanovo-Wozniéssensk, *Exposition Universelle de 1900 à Paris* (Moscow: Tipograf F. F. Ebe, 1900), 4.

Table 2
Sex Ratios in Vladimir Province, 1859–1914

	Number of Males to 100 Females			
	1859	1883	1897	1914
Vladimir Province	92.1	94.2	83.6	97.8
rural areas	92.0	92.6	80.8	95.8
urban areas	93.2	112.7	106.0	108.6
Shuia *uezd*		102.1	92.5	101.3
rural areas		93.6	80.6	97.9
urban areas		128.3	108.4	103.5
Ivanovo-Voznesensk			110.1	102.9
"Suburb" of Iam			95.6	95.1

Sources: Gubernskii Statisticheskii Komitet, *Pamiatnaia knizhka Vladimirskoi gubernii na 1862 g.* (Vladimir: 1862), 3; Tsentral'nyi Statisticheskii Komitet, *Statisticheskii vremenik Rossiiskoi imperii sbornik svedenii po Rossii za 1883 g.* (St. Petersburg: 1886), 30; Tsentral'nyi Statisticheskii Komitet, *Pervaia vseobshchaia perepis' naseleniia Rossiiskoi imperii 1897* (St. Petersburg: 1900) 6, pt. 1, table 2, 2–3; A. A. Bauer, *Trudy Vladimirskogo gubernskogo nauchnogo obshchestva po izucheniiu mestnogo krai (1921)*, 46–47.

Table 3
Length of Time Since Leaving Native Area
Iam Worker Population, 1899

	Males					
	Total		with Family		Single	
Years	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1–less	386	14.1	209	9.8	177	29.4
2–5	598	21.9	429	20.1	169	28.0
6–10	541	19.8	442	20.7	99	16.4
11–15	423	15.5	373	17.5	50	8.3
16–20	363	13.3	317	14.9	46	7.6
21+	424	15.5	362	17.0	62	10.3

	Females					
	Total		with Family		Single	
Years	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1–less	397	14.6	218	10.2	179	30.4
2–5	711	26.2	518	24.3	193	32.8
6–10	547	20.1	462	21.7	85	14.4
11–15	431	15.8	377	17.7	54	9.2
16–20	337	12.4	293	13.8	44	7.5
21+	295	10.8	261	12.2	34	5.8

Source: Otsenochno-Ekonomicheskoe Otdelenie Vladimirskoi Gubernskoi Zemskoi Upravy, *Materialy dlia otsenki zemel' Vladimirskoi gubernii* (Vladimir na Kliaz'me: Tipolitografiia Gubernskoi Zemskoi Upravy, 1908), 10, pt. 3, 394.

Table 4
Length of Residence in Iam
Worker Population, 1899

	Males					
	Total		with Family		Single	
Year	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1–less	788	28.4	508	23.5	280	45.9
2–5	704	25.4	531	24.5	173	28.4
6–10	472	17.0	402	18.6	70	11.5
11–15	306	11.0	279	12.9	27	4.4
16–20	263	9.5	232	10.7	31	5.1
21+	240	8.6	211	9.8	29	4.8

	Females					
	Total		with Family		Single	
Year	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1–less	786	28.6	529	24.5	257	43.6
2–5	766	27.9	600	27.8	166	28.2
6–10	461	16.8	392	18.2	69	11.7
11–15	328	11.9	289	13.4	39	6.6
16–20	238	8.7	201	9.3	37	6.3
21+	169	6.1	148	6.8	21	3.6

Source: Otsenochno-Ekonomicheskoe Otdelenie Vladimirskoi Gubernskoi Zemskoi Upravy, *Materialy dlia otsenki zemel' Vladimirskoi gubernii* (Vladimir na Kliaz'me: Tipolitografiia Gubernskoi Zemskoi Upravy, 1908), 10, pt. 3, 395.

Table 5
Population by *Soslovia*, 1897 (in percentages)

Soslovia	Cities of European Russia	Vladimir Cities (except Ivanovo-Vozensensk)	St. Petersburg	Moscow	Ivanovo-Vozensensk
Nobility	6.2	5.4	9.1	5.6	1.1
Clergy	1.0	2.9	*	**	0.6
Honored Citizenry	1.1	2.8	1.8	2.1	1.6
Merchantry	1.3	2.1	1.4	1.9	1.0
Meshchanstvo	44.3	34.6	21.3	22.0	26.8
Peasantry	38.8	50.9	59.0	63.7	68.2
Other	5.8	1.1	*	**	0.6
Foreigners	1.5	0.1	*	**	0.1
Total	16,828,900	136,410	1,256,000	1,039,000	54,208

*Clergy, Other and Foreigner categories total 7.4 of the population.

**Clergy, Other and Foreigner categories total 4.7 of the population.

Sources: A. G. Rashin, *Naselenie Rossii za 100 let* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe Statisticheskoe Izdatel'stvo, 1956), 122; Tsentral'nyi Statisticheskii Komitet, *Pervaia vseobshchaia perepis' naseleniia Rossiiskoi imperii 1897* (St. Petersburg: 1900), pt. 2, table 24, 210–11, table 6, 108–109; James H. Bater, "Urban Industrialization in the Provincial Towns of Late Imperial Russia," *Carl Beck Papers*, 503 (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1986), 19.

Table 6
Place of Birth of Workers at the Garelin Factory
Ivanovo-Voznesensk (in percentages)

	Occupation	
	Printing (1890)	Weaving (1887)
Ivanovo-Voznesensk	8.8	8.1
Shuiskii *uezd*	45.2	47.5
Other Vladimir *uezdy*	20.0	16.2
Kostroma Province	25.4	28.0
Other provinces	0.6	0.2

Source: B. N. Vasil'ev, "Formirovanie promyshlennogo proletariata Ivanovskoi oblasti," *Voprosy Istorii 6* (June 1952), 114.

Table 7
Place of Birth of Iam Worker Residents, 1899

	Males		Females			% of
	No.	%	No.	%	Total	Total
Vladimir Province *uezdy*						
Shuiskii	602	21.0	645	22.8	1,247	21.9
Kovkrovskii	274	9.6	288	10.2	562	9.9
Suzdal'skii	439	15.3	487	17.2	926	16.3
Viaznikovskii	20	0.7	10	0.4	30	0.5
Other	284	9.9	267	9.4	551	9.7
Kostroma	995	34.7	997	35.2	1,992	35.0
Other areas	250	8.7	135	4.8	385	6.8

Source: Otsenochno-Ekonomicheskoe Otdelenie Vladimirskoi Gubernskoi Zemskoi Upravy, *Materialy dlia otsenki zemel' Vladimirskoi gubernii* (Vladimir na Kliaz'me: Tipolitografiia Gubernskoi Zemskoi Upravy, 1908), 10, pt. 3, 393.

Table 8
Ivanovo –Voznesensk Factories

Firm	No. of Workers	*Zemstvo* Valuation	Machinery
N.Garelin			
Print	330	189,734	4 steam engines, 5 printing machines, 5 engraving machines
Weave	1,027		18,664 spindles, 468 weaving looms
I. Garelin			
Print	270	139,507	
Weave	1,400		8 steam, 1,141 looms
Ia. Garelin	426		14 steam, 6 print, 3 engrave
Burylin	350		6 steam
Kuvaev	1,000	389,641	31 steam
Zubkov	900		
Polushin	275	171,550	14 steam
Fokin	337	134,362	8 steam, 6 print, 2 engrave
Vitov	276	140,538	9 steam, 5 print, 3 engrave
P. Derbenev	228	110,804	6 steam, 3 print, 2 engrave
A. M. Gandurin			
Print	172		
Weave	450	121,106	340 looms
Ivanovo-Voznesensk			
Weave	2,434	509,817	1,882 looms
Kokushkin and Marakushev			
Print	78	26,451	3 steam, 1 print, 1 engrave
Weave	457	300,147	649 looms
N. Derbenev			
Print	245		
Weave	1,000		806 looms

Table 8 (cont.)

	1900s					
	No. of Workers			Output Value (rubles)		
	1905	1910	1914	1905	1910	1914
N. Garelin		2,300	3,500		6 m.	
I. Garelin	2,950	3,570	4,500		10 m.	15 m.
Griaznov	1,000	1,543			9 m.	
Kuvaev	1,740		2,672		16 m.	
Z.ubkov		2,695			6.5 m.	
Polushin		3,194			12.3 m.	
Fokin		850			4 m.	
Vitov	800					
P. Derbenev		300			.5 m.	
A. M. Gandurin		1,216			1.9 m.	
N. + L. Gandurin	1,000					
I-V Weave	4,675					
Kok. + Marak.		1,240			1.6 m.	
N. Derbenev	1,810	2,186			2.5 m.	

Table 8 (cont.)
Basic Capital

	1900	1905	1910	1914
N. Garelin				5 m.
I. Garelin	2 m.		3 m.	4.5 m.
Griaznov			3 m.	
Kuvaev	1.5 m.		4 m.	
Zubkov			2 m.	2.5 m.
Polushin	.5 m.			2 m.
Fokin				1.5 m.
Vitov		1.2 m.		
P. Derbenev				
A. M. Gandurin				2 m.
N. + L. Gandurin	1.2 m.			2 m.
I-V Weave				
Kok. + Marak.				
N. Derbenev	.6 m.	2 m.		5 m.

Sources: V. F. Svirskii, *Fabriki, zavody i prochiia promyshlennaia zavedeniia Vladimirskoi gubernii*, (Vladimir na Kliaz'me: Tipolitografiia Gubernskoi Zemskoi Upravy, 1890), pt. 1, 19–24, pt. 2, 20–44; P. M. Ekzempliarskii, *Istoriia goroda Ivanova* (Ivanovo: Ivanovskoe Knizhnoe Izdatel'stvo, 1958), 1, 155, 312, 358–60; *Vestnik Finansov* 45 (1909): 327, and 52 (1909): 622–57; *Promyshlennost' i Torgovlia* 1–6 (Jan.-Mar. 1912): 157–58; Ralph M. Odell, "Cotton Goods in Russia," *The United States Department of Commerce and Labor Bureau of Manufacturers Special Agents Series* 51 (1912): 44; Muriel Joffre, "The Cotton Manufacturers of the CIR, 1880s–1914," Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1981, 34–35, 450, 455; P. A. Peskov, *Fabrichnyi byt' Vladimirskoi gubernii otchet za 1882–1883*, (St. Petersburg: Ministerstvo Finansov, 1884), 36–37; D. I. Shishmarev, *Kratkii ocherk promyshlennosti v raione Nizhegorodskoi i Shuisko-Ivanovskoi zhel. dor.* (St. Petersburg: Tipografiia V. V. Komarev, 1892); *Vseobshchaia stachka Ivanovo-Voznesenskih rabochih v 1905 gody sbornik dokumentov i materialov* (Ivanovo: Ivanovskoe Knizhnoe Izdatel'stvo, 1955), 40; P. M. Ekzempliarskii, "Ivanovo-Voznesenskii proletariat i burguaziia v nachale XX stoletia," *1905-i god v Ivanovo-Voznesenskom raione*, ed. O. A. Varentsova et al. (Ivanovo-Voznesensk: Osnova, 1925), 5, 7, 20; Ministerstvo Finansov i Ministerstvo Torgovli i Promyshlennost', *Spisok fabriki zavodov Rossii 1910 g. po offitsial'nym dannyh fabrichnago, podatnogo, i gornago nadzora* (St. Petersburg: Mettsl and Co.), 11–15, 32–34, 80, 155, 271–72, 328, 429, 898, 907; Ministerstvo Finansov, *Sbornik svedenii o deistvuiushchih v Rossii aktsionnernyh obshchestvah na paiah* (St. Petersburg: Kirshbaum, 1914), 2–17; A. M. Pankratova, ed., *Rabochee dvizhenie v Rossii v XIX veke* (Gospolitizidat, 1952), 3, pt. 1, 809–35; Ministerstvo Finansov Departament Torgovli i Manufaktur, *Prodolzhitel'nost'rabochago dnia i zarabotnaia plata rabochih v 20 naibolee promyshlennyh guberniiah Evropeiskoi Rossii* (St. Petersburg: Kirshbaum, 1896), 32–39; Ch. M. Ioksimovich, *Manufacturnaia promyshlennost' v proshlom i nastoiashchem* (Moscow: Izdanie Knizhnago Magazina, 1915), 1, 214–63.

Table 9
Percentages and Wages of Males Engaged in Specific Factory Occupations, Iam, 1899

Occupation	% employed	% Wages 1-15r.	16-20r.	21r.+
Peeler, comber, mixer	0.9	96.1	3.9	0.0
Spinner, twister	1.9	90.4	7.7	1.9
Winder	0.8	86.9	8.7	4.3
Creeler, doffer	0.4	100.0	0.0	0.0
Warper	0.7	36.4	54.5	9.1
Jenny frame tender	0.4	90.0	10.0	0.0
Sorter, aid	3.3	80.6	19.3	0.0
Slay-maker, binder	0.4	66.7	25.0	8.3
Uncoiler	0.1	75.0	25.0	0.0
Weaver	26.7	81.4	17.2	1.4
Shearer, sewer, smoother, calendrer	3.0	87.4	10.0	2.5
Sizer	0.9	42.2	46.2	11.5
Greaser, cleaner, assembler	1.6	62.8	2.6	11.6
Standardizer, packer, sorter	6.0	80.6	18.2	1.2
Dyer, roller, bleacher	11.8	90.2	7.0	2.8
Dryer, steamer, dye fixer	3.0	96.5	2.4	1.2
Unskilled, servant	14.8	93.0	4.7	1.8
Engraver	3.1	35.6	19.5	44.5
Smith, founder, grinder	8.5	37.3	20.7	41.9
Carpenter, modeler, joiner, turner, cooper	3.5	12.9	37.6	49.5
Gas lighter, stoker, stocker	1.5	65.1	30.2	4.6
Stovemaker, painter, plasterer	0.8	36.3	22.7	40.9
Master, foreman, steam mechanic, electrician	4.8	27.3	39.4	33.4
Lifting machine	0.2	100.0	0.0	0.0

Source: Otsenochno-Ekonomicheskoe Otdelenie Vladimirskoi Gubernskoi Zemskoi Upravy, *Materialy dlia otsenki zemel' Vladimirskoi gubernii* (Vladimir na Kliaz'me: Tipolitografiia Gubernskoi Zemskoi Upravy, 1908), 10, pt. 3, 348-51.

Table 10
Percentages and Wages of Females Engaged in Specific Factory Occupations, Iam, 1899

Occupation	% employed	% Wages 1-15r.	16-20r.	21r.+
Mixer, peeler, picker	2.1	100.0	0.0	0.0
Twister, spinner, coiler	4.7	84.9	11.1	4.0
Bobbin-winder	5.2	93.6	5.7	0.7
Ribbon, pattern maker	1.3	97.3	0.0	2.6
Jenny-frame tender	5.8	81.4	17.3	1.2
Fly-frame tender	2.3	75.8	22.6	1.6
Weaver	71.5	60.5	32.0	8.1
Standardizer, folder, sorter, storer, packer	1.6	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bleacher, dyer, vat tender	2.4	100.0	0.0	0.0
Dryer	0.9	100.0	0.0	0.0
Unskilled, servant	2.1	86.7	13.3	0.0

Source: Otsenochno-Ekonomicheskoe Otdelenie Vladimirskoi Gubernskoi Zemskoi Upravy, *Materialy dlia otsenki zemel' Vladimirskoi gubernii* (Vladimir na Kliaz'me: Tipolitografiia Gubernskoi Zemskoi Upravy, 1908) 10, pt. 3, 350.

Notes

1. P. M. Ekzempliarskii, *Istoriia goroda Ivanova* (Ivanovo: Ivanovskoe Knizhnoe Izdatel'stvo, 1958), 1:133–34.

2. S. P. Shesternin, *Perezhitoe* (Ivanovo: Ivanovskoe Oblastnoe Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'svo, 1940), 91.

3. V. Dadonov, "Russkii Manchester'," *Russkoe bogatstvo* (12 Dec. 1900): 46.

4. *Ibid.*, 46–47; M. A. Bagaev, *Moia zhizn'* (Ivanovo: Ivanovskoe Oblastnoe Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'stvo, 1949), 3; *Russkiia vedomosti* (23 July 1901), 1.

5. *Russkiia vedomosti* (23 July 1901), 1.

6. *Rech'* (18 May 1912), 5.

7. Dadonov, "Russkii Manchester'," 47.

8. *Russkiia vedomosti* (23 May 1912), 4–5.

9. Cecilia Bobrovskaya, *Twenty Years in Underground Russia* (New York: International Publishers, 1934), 165.

10. Daniel R. Brower, "Urban Revolution in the Late Russian Empire," in *The City in Late Imperial Russia*, ed. Michael F. Hamm (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986), 340–41.

11. Daniel R. Brower, "Urban Russia on the Eve of World War I: A Social Profile," *Journal of Social History* 13, no. 3 (Spring 1980): 428.

12. Reginald E. Zelnik, "Passivity and Protest in Germany and Russia: Barrington Moore's Conception of Working Class Responses to Injustice," *Journal of Social History* 15, no. 3 (Spring 1982): 503.

13. Otsenochno-Ekonomicheskoe Otdelenie Vladimirskoi Gubernskoi Zemskoi Upravy, *Materialy dlia otsenki zemel' Vladirmirskoi gubernii* (Vladimir na Kliaz'me: Tipolitografiia Gubernskoi Zemskoi Upravy, 1908), 10, pt. 3, 89 (hereafter cited as *Materialy*).

14. A. G. Rashin, *Naselenie Rossii za 100 let* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe Statisticheskoe Idatel'stvo, 1956), 78; Tsentral'nyi Statisticheskii Komitet, *Statisticheskii vremennik Rossiiskoi imperii sbornik svedenii po Rossii za 1883 g.* (St. Petersburg: 1896), 30 (hereafter cited as *Statisticheskii vremennik 1883*); A. A. Bauer, *Trudy Vladimirskogo gubernskogo nauchnogo obshchestva po izucheniiu mestnogo kraia* (1921), 47; Tsentral'nyi Statisticheskii Komitet, *Pervaia vseobshchaia perepis' naseleniia Rossiiskoi imperii 1897* (St. Petersburg: 1900), 6, pt. 1, table 1 (hereafter cited as *Pervaia vseobshchaia perepis'*).

15. *Statisticheskii vremennik 1883*, 30; *Pervaia vseobshchaia perepis'*, 6, pt. 1, table 1.

16. Barbara Alpern Engel, *Between the Fields and the City* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

17. *Ibid.*, Robert W. Thurston, *Liberal City, Conservative State* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 21; James Bater, "Urban Industrialization in the Provincial Towns of Late Imperial Russia," *Carl Beck Papers* 503 (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1986), 20, 22.

18. Bauer, *Trudy*, 46–47.

19. *Pervaia vseobshchaia perepis'*, 6, pt. 2, table 4, 66–67, 94–95.

20. Joseph Bradley, *Muzhik and Muscovite* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1985), 34–36.

21. *Materialy*, 10, pt. 3, 109, 388.

22. *Materialy*, 10, pt. 3, 348–51.

23. *Pervaia vseobshchaia perepis'*, 6, pt. 2, table 4, 66–67; *Materialy*, 10, pt. 3, 96–101, 340–47, 391–93.

24. Gubernskii Statisticheskii Komitet, *Ezhegodnik Vladimirskago gubernskago statisticheskago komiteta 1881* (Vladimir, 1883), table 5 (hereafter cited as *Ezhegodnik 1881*).

25. F. N. Samoilov, *Vospominaniia ob Ivanovo-Voznesenskom rabochem dvizhenii 1903–1905 g. g.* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'stvo, 1922), 3, 9–11.

26. James Bater, "Transience, Residential Patterns, and Mobility in Moscow and St. Petersburg, 1900–1914," *Slavic Review* 39, no. 2 (June 1980): 24–43; Daniel Brower, "L'urbanisation russe à la fin du XIXe siécle," *Annales: Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 32, no. 1 (Jan.-Feb. 1977): 77, 81.

27. *Materialy*, 10, pt. 3, 108.

28. *Pervaia vseobshchaia perepis'*, 6, pt. 2, table 6, 23.

29. *Materialy*, 10, pt. 3, 347.

30. *Ezhegodnik 1881*, table 1.

31. *Pervaia vseobshchaia perepis'*, 6, pt. 2, table 6, 108, 109.

32. Bauer, *Trudy*, 46–47.

33. Bater, "Urban Industrialization," 20, 22, 39.

34. *Materialy*, 10, pt. 3, 104, 106, 108, 110–11.

35. *Pervaia vseobshchaia perepis'*, 6, pt. 2, 24, 42.

36. N. N. Vladimirskii, *Otkhod krest'ianstva Kostromskoi gubernii na zarabotki* (Kostroma: Izdanie Kostromskogo Gubstatodela, 1927), 6–7.

37. Dadonov, "Russkii Manchester'," 66; *Materialy*, 10, pt. 3, 105; Aleksei Smirnov, "Fabrika i fabrichnyi rabochii," *Russkaia mysl'* 5 (1902): 159.

38. "Spisok deputatov, izbrannyh rabochimi ot fabrik goroda Ivanovo-Voznesenska," in *1905-i god v Ivanovo-Voznesenskom raione*, ed. O. A. Varentsova et al. (Ivanovo-Voznesensk: Osnova, 1925), 341–50.

39. Engel, *Between the Fields and the City*, chaps. 2–5; Rose L. Glickman, *Russian Factory Women* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1984), 35; Marcelline J. Hutton, "Russian and Soviet Women, 1897–1939: Dreams, Struggles, and Nightmares," Ph.D. diss., University of Iowa, 1986, 30, 369.

40. Smirnov, "Fabrika," 161.

41. *Pervaia vseobshchaia perepis'*, 6, pt. 2, table 6, 20, table 8, 26–31.

42. Samoilov, *Vospominaniia*, 9; Bagaev, *Moia zhizn'*, 5; S. Balashov, "Rabochee dvizhenie v Ivanovo-Voznesenske, 1898–1905 g.g.," *Proletarskaia Revoliutsiia* 9 (September 1925): 144.

43. *Pervaia vseobshchaia perepis'*, 6, pt. 2, table 2, 4–7, table 21, 133; *Materialy* 10, pt. 3, 96–101, 340–47, 391–93.

44. Quoted in Ekzempliarskii, *Istoriia*, 163.

45. *Materialy*, 10, pt. 3, 92.

46. *Ibid.*, 338–39.

47. James A. Bater, "Some Dimensions of Urbanization and the Responses of Municipal Government: Moscow and St. Petersburg," *Russian History/Histoire russe* 5, pt. 1 (1978): 49.

48. *Materialy*, 10, pt. 3, 338; Manya Gordon, *Workers Before and After Lenin* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1941), 184.

49. *Materialy*, 10, pt. 3, 338.

50. *Ibid.*, 258, 266.

51. *Ibid.*, 261, 269.

52. *Ibid.*, 101.

53. *Vpered* (9 May 1905), 4.

54. As noted for French peasant migrants by James R. Lehning, *The Peasants of Marlles* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980), 98–99.

55. *Materialy*, 10, pt. 3, 65.

56. Aleksei Smirnov, "Zemledelie i zemledelets tsentral'noi, promyshlenni gubernii," *Russkaia mysl'* 7 (1901): 174–76.

57. Aleksei Smirnov, "Chto chitaiut v devrevne," *Russkaia mysl'* 7 (1903): 110, 114.

58. Dadonov, "Russkii Manchester'," 58.

59. V. F. Svirskii, *Fabriki, zavody i prochiia promyshlennaia zavedenia Vladimirskoi gubernii* (Vladimir na Kliaz'me: Tipolitografiia Gubernskoi Zemskoi Upravy, 1890), pt. 2, 43–44.

60. Vladimirskii, *Otkhod*, 152.

61. Dadonov, "Russkii Manchester'," 57.

62. *Materialy*, 10, pt. 3, 69–71.

63. *Ibid.*, 52–53.

64. E. Chernova, *Ivanovo-Voznesenskii proletariat—sozdatel'odnogo iz aeruyh sovetov rabochih deputatov* (Izdatel'stvo VTsSPS Profizdat, 1955), 10.

65. *Russkiia vedomosti* (31 Oct. 1895), 1–2; *Russkiia vedomosti* (14 Jan. 1899), 2; *Russkiia vedomosti* (28 June 1914), 3–4.

66. A. M. Pankratova, ed., *Rabochee dvizhenie v Rossii v XIX veke* (Gospolitizdat, 1952), 3, pt. 1, document 1, 703.

67. D. Prokof'ev, ed., *Pervoe stoletie* (Iaroslavl': Verhne-volzhskoe Knizhnoe Idatel'stvo, 1971), 43.

68. *Russkiia vedomosti* (15 July 1912), 5; Ministerstvo Torgovli i Promyshlennosti, Otdel' Promyshlennosti, *Svod otchetov fabrichnyh inspektorov za 1903 g.* (St. Petersburg: Kirshbaum, 1906), 162, 169, and annual volumes for 1904 (166, 173), 1905 (93, 96), 1906 (86, 93), 1907 (90, 97), 1908 (143, 146), 1909 (143, 146), 1910 (283–84), 1911 (226, 233), 1912 (228, 235), and 1913 (234, 241).

69. N. I. Vorob'ev, "Iz zhizni Ivanovo-Voznesenskih rabochih," *Obrazovanie* 3, pt. 2 (1906): 26.

70. Bagaev, *Moia zhizn'*, 28.

71. Vorob'ev, "Iz zhizni," 26.

72. *Ibid.*, 28–29.

73. *Materialy*, 10, pt. 3, 348–49.

74. M. I. Pokzovskaia, "A Woman Doctor's Report on Working Conditions for Women in Russian Factories," in *European Women: A Documentary History, 1789–1945*, ed. Eleanor S. Riemer and John C. Fouts (New York: Shocken Books, 1980), 14.

75. *Materialy*, 10, pt. 3, 390.

76. *Ibid.*

77. *Ibid.*, 96–101, 340–47, 386–87, 391–93.