

The
**Carl Beck
Papers**

in Russian &
East European Studies

Number 2004

Michael Melancon

From the Head of Zeus:
The Petrograd Soviet's
Rise and First Days,
27 February–2 March 1917



Mieke Meurs is Professor of Economics at American University, Washington, DC. She received her PhD in Economics from the University of Massachusetts. Her current research interests include comparative economic development and institutionalist and behavioralist approaches to microeconomic analysis. She is currently researching the economic behavior of land holding households in Bulgaria and household decisions about maternal healthcare in Central Asia.

Juna Miluka received her PhD in Economics from American University in 2009 with a thesis titled: *Education, Migration, and Labor Markets In Albania: A Gender Perspective*. She is now Assist. Prof. of Economics, University of New York, Tirana Albania.

Tom Hertz is an empirical microeconomist with interests in 1st, 2nd, and 3rd world labor markets. He completed this work while on faculty at the International University College of Turin, whose generosity he gratefully acknowledges.

No. 2003, November 2009

© 2009 by The Center for Russian and East European Studies, a program of the University Center for International Studies, University of Pittsburgh

ISSN 0889-275X

Image from cover: Albanian flag from www.wikipedia.com, within the public domain.
Compiled by Julie Tvaruzek

The Carl Beck Papers

Editors: William Chase, Bob Donnorummo, Ronald H. Linden

Managing Editor: Eileen O'Malley

Editorial Assistant: Julie N. Tvaruzek

Submissions to *The Carl Beck Papers* are welcome. Manuscripts must be in English, double-spaced throughout, and between 40 and 90 pages in length, including notes. Acceptance is based on anonymous review. Mail submissions to: Editor, *The Carl Beck Papers*, Center for Russian and East European Studies, 4400 Wesley W. Posvar Hall, 230 South Bouquet Street, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260.

Abstract

This essay explores the birth and earliest steps of the Petrograd Soviet during late February and early March 1917. It deploys a large array of evidence, new and old, to detail the events in a consecutive narrative, plus analysis that deepens our understanding of what occurred. The analysis focuses special attention on the persons and groups directly responsible for organizing the soviet, as well as on its earliest measures, such as the establishment of military security for the city, the issuing of Order No. 1, and the sharing of power with the State Duma. It clearly shows that an array of socialist leaders, who met and worked together prior to and during the February Revolution, took steps beginning no later than 24 February to summon the soviet and became the leadership group in the soviet itself, thus further challenging the traditional concept of a leaderless, spontaneous revolution. New evidence also describes how socialist soldiers associated with the soldiers' section of the soviet composed Order No. 1, which, as is well known, democratized the Russian Army in one stroke and, less well known, formulated for the first time the "to the extent that" formula that came to underlie the sharing of power between the Petrograd Soviet and the new Provisional Government several days later. Cumulatively, the new analysis and data suggest that the Petrograd Soviet, which immediately began to play a crucial role in determining Russia's fate, reflected the entire history of Russia's socialist movement.

The Petrograd Soviet's birth and first activities, hallmarks of the revolutionary era, have not lacked attention yet remain hazily narrated. In his 1980 study, Allan Wildman noted the "obscurity of the [Soviet's] genesis" and added that in reality its birth was a "quite logical development."¹ The obscurity persists because, among other problems, pertinent studies embed the story in narratives with a different focus, for instance, the history of parties or of the entire 1917 revolution.² Even studies of the February Revolution analyze the specific events chronicled here differently from one another and more perfunctorily than this study.³ The following pages reexamine crucial events, such as the Soviet's rise, its famous Order No. 1, and its power sharing with the Provisional Government, bringing to bear all available documentation, some of it unfamiliar. My analysis does not seek to challenge the entire historiographical scheme of the February Revolution, the basic structure of which is, after all, well known. It does aim to alter how we comprehend the revolution that transformed Russia and spurred further events that shook the world for the balance of the century.

This study continues threads of analysis begun earlier in *Rethinking Russia's February Revolution*, which had the stated goal of critiquing the spontaneous theory of the February Revolution's onset.⁴ The arguments and evidence presented here further the critique of the spontaneity theory, which, although its currency has waned, still in one form or another underlies much of existing scholarship. The present study's prime goal, however, is to explain what direct socialist agency, as the key element at all levels, signified for the early development of the February Revolution. Within the framework of an allegedly spontaneous revolution, the events discussed here were always essentially inexplicable: they simply occurred this way and not some other. We recounted but could not account for. In light of a version of the revolution that emphasizes socialist agency, what can be said about the Petrograd Soviet's birth and early activities? In other words, as we abandon spontaneity, we need a positive version of how agency worked, a matter that, as historians, we cannot leave to the imagination. The whole question has special interest in that little new pertinent research has appeared in recent years.⁵

This study focuses on the people and groups gathered around the Petrograd Soviet who led the nation into and, in a sense, out of the February Revolution and began to determine Russia's fate.⁶ Many outcomes of revolutionary turmoil in the capital were conceivable. The way things worked out reflected complex interactions between leaders and broad social elements, such as workers, soldiers, and students. Exactly what occurred and why is the issue tackled here, with emphasis on the "logical" nature of outcomes so acutely recognized by Wildman. The result will

be, in the end, a deeper understanding of the Petrograd Soviet's birth and first steps and thus a more complete and believable theory of the entire February Revolution as integral phenomenon.

Historiographical Commentary

A brief review of the major interpretations of the February Revolution will aid readers, both Russian specialists and nonspecialists, in threading their way through the intricacies of the succeeding narrative and analysis.⁷ Early Soviet accounts emphasized the spontaneous nature of the February events, a position that also perhaps reflected the difficulty of establishing any special Bolshevik role in the revolution.⁸ Later, Stalinist-era historians simply asserted Bolshevik primacy, an outlook that, whatever its accuracy, imparted to the Communists a perceived legitimacy as agents of the old regime's overthrow. Meanwhile, perhaps in response to these exaggerations, in 1935 William Chamberlin laid out an approach that heavily emphasized spontaneity. The impression among historians that the tsarist regime had successfully quashed the revolutionary movement after the 1905–1907 disorders, plus lack of access to archival records throughout the Soviet era, ensured this interpretation's lengthy and strong hold over the Western historical imagination. Indeed, as noted, in modified form it still has currency today. Freed from the rigors of Stalinist historiography, during the 1960s and 1970s several Soviet historians, with E. N. Burdzhakov leading the way, began to qualify the concept of Bolshevik agency, the evidence for which was always exiguous, in favor of multi-party and worker activism. Even so, these historians carved out a special role for the Bolsheviks as the guiding vanguard of a broader movement. Subsequently, some Western historians, struck by the inherent unlikelihood that a purely spontaneous movement could have produced the relatively structured February Revolution, began cautiously to abandon the pure spontaneity model. For instance, Tsuyoshi Hasegawa favored the agency of middle-level activists in moving forward and guiding the actions of workers, students, and eventually soldiers. Late Soviet historians' withdrawal from the idea of sole Bolshevik agency coupled with Western abandonment of pure spontaneity yielded a degree of convergence.

These modifications, significant as they are, still leave in abeyance a central analytical problem. With various nuances, authors of the late Soviet-Western convergence suggest that middle-level party activists, workers, and other large social groups, with no real guidance from above, responded to severe economic and political

crisis in ways consonant with their long-term experience, ideology, and aspirations and, on this basis, interacted with one another to bring about the downfall of the regime. In this interpretation (and in reality), rather than riot aimlessly, participants demonstrated pointedly against the tsarist regime and by 27 February 1917 caused it to lose control of the capital, in effect making the first part of the revolution. Still, the very progress of the demonstrations—for example, the dissemination of slogans, the coordination among factory districts and students in a sprawling urban/suburban area, the efforts to recruit soldiers for the cause, indeed the entire crescendo effect—implies guiding leadership with a general plan. Regardless, what middle-level activists and mass social groups could not do on their own was finish the revolution by forming a viable, coherent, new government with enough clout to survive. In other words, this version cannot account for how socialist elites, after allegedly failing to provide leadership during the onset and active phases of the revolutionary overthrow, could somehow have gathered together and in the course of one day summoned the Petrograd Soviet and presided over its organization, took loose control over the armed forces, began to assert a modicum of order in the city, and, most vitally, laid the foundations for a new government. Direct guidance from leaders of socialist groups, with somewhat belated and reluctant help from liberals, provided the element of organization necessary for these arduous tasks. It is precisely in the transition from revolutionary demonstrations to revolutionary construction that most existing accounts fall short. How could supposedly uninvolved, feckless socialist leaders have had the information, connections, and influence to act so decisively on 27–28 February? (This thorny problem undoubtedly accounts for many historians' move away from spontaneity toward some form of agency.) In any case, putting aside the inherent improbability of the revolution's onset *sans* socialist elites, much existing evidence contradicts this version. Faced with a lack of untrammelled access to sources, historians resort to various more or less probable theories. With sources at hand, historians perforce must take the evidence into account. Interpretations then replace theories and stand or fall in terms of their ability both to analyze and account for the widest range of evidence.

The most radical critique of the spontaneity theory came in my book on the Socialist Revolutionaries during the world war and in a follow-up essay that appeared in this venue in 2000.⁹ Both assert joint socialist agency (all levels of all socialist groups) in interaction with workers, students, and soldiers, prior to and throughout the events. Regardless, general studies that span the revolutionary year or era often still adhere fairly closely to a leaderless, unexpected revolution, and the few recent studies that touch substantially on the February Revolution simply avoid the issue

by sidestepping the question of the revolution's onset, in effect leaving unaddressed the hodgepodge of existing interpretations.¹⁰ My aim is to move this question, which no less an authority than Hasegawa has called far from settled,¹¹ onto a different plane, from unstated, unclear, and incomplete assumptions to full, openly asserted and assimilated underpinnings, and to do this by showing how socialist agency operated in the birth and first steps of the Petrograd Soviet, the first progeny of the successful revolution and, in a broader sense, of the revolutionary movement. The arguments presented here revolve around the idea that all elements involved in the revolution acted with a notable degree of consciousness and discipline, whereas spontaneity applied primarily to the unpredictable, random happenings that characterize all human events.

Birth of the Petrograd Soviet

The soldiers' uprising of 27 February 1917 had sealed the fate of the old regime, but what would replace it? The great new task of the day became the creation of the rudiments of governmental structures. Fear of counterrevolution precluded any tarrying for those associated with the new Russia. A firm government that could pick up the reins of power of a nation at war, ensure a modicum of order so that life could continue, and, not least of all, prevent any resurgence of tsarism was a stern necessity. For many moderate socialists and liberals, the State Duma would have admirably filled the bill. The right socialist Duma deputies A. Kerensky and N. Chkheidze, with the backing of some Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries (SRs) in the War Industries Committees and cooperatives, had done all in their power to persuade the State Duma to take a role in, indeed to precipitate, the overthrow of the tsarist regime, only to be frustrated by the Constitutional Democratic leader P. Miliukov's refusal to contemplate any wartime illegalities. A police report dated 17 February 1917 noted that:

The State Duma's Trudovik fraction [of which Kerensky was leader] decided not to take part in legislative work, which was now useless . . . and to utilize the [State Duma] tribune solely for agitational purposes in order to persuade the Progressive Bloc [moderates and liberals who dominated the Duma] to their side. . . . The Trudoviks who are in touch with the Popular Socialists and with revolutionary circles [SRs] are determined to dedicate themselves entirely to agitational work among the population and the army, with the goal of preparing the ground for future revolutionary demonstrations . . . [they] predict the onset of powerful revolutionary events."¹²

This was all to no avail since the Progressive Bloc, not to mention more conservative elements, remained adamant. By virtue of its failure to act at a crucial time, not to mention its indubitably low level of authority in the country, especially among the mass social elements and the entire array of left socialists, the Duma could not on its own lay claim, even had it so desired, to be the new government, the matrix of the new government, or even the sanctioning institution of the new government. By default these heavy tasks fell upon the Soviet and those associated with it, including, most notably, Chkheidze, Kerensky, and M. Skobelev, all of whom in reality actually preferred the Duma as locus of power. Thus in cataclysmic times history distributes its unwonted and unwanted burdens.

The following discussion of the Petrograd Soviet's rise reprises well-known factual chains of events and follows some traditional lines of analysis but intersperses these with new analysis and interpretations. For purposes of better comprehending these complex historical events, it adopts the strategy of examining virtually all aspects of the Soviet's onset and formation in a consecutive text, whereas other histories, as informative as they are, have tended to disperse their attention on the Soviet. Only intense and sequential analysis discloses the inner logic of the story. This section's goal then is to explain the rise of the Soviet rather than simply to narrate a series of events that constituted its birth.

The Soviet Idea

The 1917 soviets had their origins in the truly spontaneous formation of workers' soviets in many cities during the 1905 revolution. After their repression by early 1906, the idea of elected soviets entered into revolutionary and socialist lore. Doubtlessly, much of the empire's adult population also remembered or had heard of the soviets during the intervening years before the next revolution. The concept of the soviets, however, did not so much work its way into official socialist theory and programs as win a place in socialist consciousness as a likely and desirable concomitant of successful revolutionary action. Thus all the revolutionary parties held that, at appropriate times, that is, when revolution was imminent, the working population should be summoned to elect delegates to soviets. During 1907, the SRs called for elections to "worker, peasant, and soldier soviets," thus broadening the social scope of the institution, which until then had had primarily proletarian associations.¹³

Perhaps precisely because the soviets remained largely outside the realm of theory and program, the socialists devoted very little discussion and almost no writing to this topic during the interrevolutionary period. In a Menshevik version, the soviets would be nongovernmental organs for representing workers' rights. In left socialist versions (Bolsheviks, various independent Social Democrats, and SRs), they might serve as a framework for a new revolutionary government and, for the SRs, extend to other social groups. Regardless, these matters did not receive lengthy discussion.¹⁴ Perhaps this is not surprising; after all, the soviets had appeared rather unexpectedly during 1905, had suffered complete extinction within a few weeks of their formation, and, for all anyone knew, might never reappear.

Regardless, the concept of soviets played a distinct, if sporadic, role in socialist agitation. For instance, during the rising strike movement of late summer and fall of 1915, Petrograd Bolsheviks and SRs called for elections to soviets (Lenin reprimanded his party juniors for this premature tactic). During the second half of 1916, the Baku SRs urged summoning a soviet, as did other parties in various places on various occasions. Still, such calls were a rarity: the experience of 1905 had shown just how vulnerable the soviets were to disruption as long as military and police power remained with the government. Thus by late fall of 1916 leaflets from the left socialists in the capital and elsewhere habitually called for a "Provisional Revolutionary Government" but usually omitted the specific institutional form it might take. During the last month or so before the actual onset of revolutionary disorders, a further development occurred when proclamations and verbal agitation began to suggest that workers elect their deputies or that they link factory committees with district and citywide "centers."¹⁵ Thus, without using the word, the socialists edged ever closer to the "soviets," which everyone could guess were in the offing. In effect, this line of agitation both heightened mass consciousness about important impending revolutionary events and prepared the groundwork for impending revolutionary institutions such as soviets.

Summoning the Soviet

Already on 24 February, with the continuation and widening of the previous days' strikes and demonstrations, a number of factories in the city began to select soviet deputies, as recent oral and printed propaganda had either implied or specified.¹⁶ As yet, however, these were spontaneous manifestations in that none of the socialist groups as yet openly advocated the gathering of the soviet. On the twenty-

fifth, the situation changed. The growth of street demonstrations, over which they were exerting little control, induced the right socialists to go onto the offensive by coming out behind further demonstrations aimed at the overthrow of the tsarist regime and the immediate election of the soviet. At a daytime meeting of representatives of all the socialist groups at the cooperative headquarters, a majority of those present approved the idea of summoning the soviet. Delegates were supposed to communicate the directive to the factories in their districts so that the first session of the soviet would gather the next day (the twenty-sixth). Half the delegates then went to the scheduled evening session of the War Industries Committees' workers' group and the other half to the session of the city duma. One worker activist recalled how, as the workers' group discussed the question of the soviet, the authorities, accompanied by a unit from the Volynskii Guards Regiment, arrived on the scene and arrested the entire meeting. Some were held until liberated on the twenty-seventh; others were booked and released.¹⁷

Several days after the February Revolution, the Right Mensheviks published an article placing the blame for a day or two delay in the gathering of the soviet on the SRs and Mezhraintsy (a joint Left Menshevik–Bolshevik group) who had warned the joint socialist meeting on the twenty-fifth against immediately summoning the soviet because it could not be defended while the government controlled military forces.¹⁸ Several months later, an unsigned article in *Izvestiia* claimed that the arrest of the delegates at the evening session of the War Industries Committee's workers' group was responsible for the delay. Perhaps both played a role, but the arrests did confirm the accuracy of the warning about the soviet's potential vulnerability. Regardless, as N. Sukhanov noted, the call had gone out for factories to elect soviet deputies, an idea that reached fruition just two days later.¹⁹

At what exact point this or that factory elected delegates to the soviet—many did so on 27 and 28 February and 1 March, followed quickly by military units—is not always clear, but by no later than 24 February the soviet and its imminent election had become a common topic of discussion among workers at factory meetings, as well as among middle- and top-level socialist leaders. M. Skobelev recalled that beginning on 22 February (with the Putilov strike), “advanced workers” from various districts who came to the socialist Duma deputies in the Tauride Palace received the advice “to create factory . . . committees and prepare for elections in the factories to the soviet of workers' deputies.” Furthermore, several reports turned in on 26 February by police provocateurs, who were members of various parties and who participated in revolutionary gatherings, noted that plans existed not only for electing soviet delegates but for the first convening of the soviet on 27 February.²⁰ This last

may have simply represented a commonsensical consensus (the Monday after the Sunday holiday), but the fact that the concept of electing and gathering the soviet on 27 February predated the event itself by perhaps two days renders it likely that the joint socialists designated the twenty-seventh as the appropriate day.

On the evening of 26 February, a highly significant event occurred: the all-socialist group that had first met early in the month to work out a position about the opening of the Duma and which had gathered several times since then, met for the last time before tsarism's demise and thus for the last time as members of illegal or semilegal organizations.²¹ Readers should make special note of their names since these were the same individuals who the very next day launched and led the Petrograd Soviet: Kerensky, V. Zenzinov, and P. Aleksandrovich from the various wings of the SRs; A. Peshekhonov, M. Berezin, and S. Znamenskii from the Popular Socialists and Trudoviks; Ckheidze, Skobelev, P. Grinevich, and O. Ermanskii from the various Menshevik groups; Iurenev from the Mezhraionka; A. Shliapnikov from the Bolsheviks; and N. Sokolov, Sukhanov, and M. Gorkii from the unaligned Social Democrats.²² As at previous sessions, disputes broke out about how to evaluate the movement in the capital and what to do about it the next day, with the various less than complete accounts seeming to indicate that the right socialists, led by Kerensky, wished to take certain unspecified actions of revolutionary significance the next day, whereas the left socialists, led by Shliapnikov and Aleksandrovich, seemed to downplay the movement and thus discouraged the steps proposed by their moderate brethren. The rightists probably proposed summoning the soviet the next day, an idea the leftists discouraged, not out of hostility to a soviet but because they did not want it to gather under right socialist auspices and did not want any soviet until it could be protected. The right socialists also may have suggested that they would again try to induce the State Duma to seize power (which they did the next morning without success), something that also would have met opposition from the leftists and spurred them to downplay the movement in the streets.

Regardless, the assertions that the leftists underestimated the potential for revolution as of 26 February do not bear up under examination. That is to say, as a tactical maneuver the leftists may well have argued for restraint, but upon leaving the joint socialist meeting late on 26 February they acted otherwise. Beginning very early on the twenty-seventh the leftists—the Mezhraionka, the Bolsheviks, the Left Mensheviks, the SRs, and even the Anarchists—in various combinations issued a series of proclamations, the earliest of which would have been composed the previous night or very early in the morning. These leaflets clearly indicated an acute awareness of the revolutionary implications of the movement up to the mo-

ment of each document's publication and each of them urged further appropriate steps, including the soldiers' uprising, the taking of jails and other key buildings, the formation of a revolutionary government, and, ultimately, the election of a soviet with indication of where it should convene.²³ The history of the day's events can be read in the leaflets as though they were a chronicle, albeit composed at odd angles to these events, sometimes registering things that had just occurred, sometimes in advance of them, and sometimes in their very midst. In any case, their composers were clearly not out of touch.

Even so, in some respects these same left socialists lost control of the movement they had so carefully nurtured in recent days, a circumstance that directly influenced the kind of government Russia would have during the succeeding months. To understand this clearly, let us examine the progress of left socialist activities during the day as shown by their proclamations. The first such document was issued by the Mezhraionka in the name of the three major socialist alignments—the SRs, Bolsheviks, and Mensheviks—and thus represented the joint socialist alliance (or, more accurately, the left socialist variant). It urged soldiers to mutiny and told workers to cut the electric power into the city and to organize at the factory and district levels; it also advocated the formation of a new revolutionary government. It did not specify the calling of the Petrograd Soviet, thus reflecting the SR-Mezhraionka desire to avoid creating a sacrificial lamb, as would have occurred if it were summoned before the completion of the soldiers' revolt. The next leaflet had the signature "RSDRP" and seems to have been issued by the Mezhraionka, perhaps acting jointly with the Bolsheviks or the Left Mensheviks. It assured the workers that the "soldiers are with you" and noted the storming of the Kresty and Predvaril'ka jails, indicating its midafternoon origins. It contained the first call by the left socialists for the Petrograd Soviet, which, it stated, should be formed from delegates sent by the factory committees and which would become the "Provisional Revolutionary Government." (With the coming over of the soldiers, left socialist reserve about the soviet melted away: indeed they now described the soviet as the new government.) The leaflet also suggested that an "organizing center" was needed for the soviet to gather, thus showing its authors' abhorrence for the Tauride Palace as the soviet's potential home.²⁴

The next document to appear was the "Finland Station" leaflet, issued by the Mezhraionka, evidently acting jointly with the Bolsheviks and Anarchists, which was distributed late in the afternoon; it continued the lines of advice of previous documents and suggested that the Petrograd Soviet meet at the Finland Station in the Vyborg District, already controlled by workers and soldiers who could protect

the deputies. (Thus it provided the “organizing center” mentioned in the RSDRP leaflet, elsewhere, it should be noted, than the Tauride Palace.) Later in the evening, the Mezhraionka and the leftist SRs (under Aleksandrovich’s leadership)—groups that had issued joint leaflets on previous occasions—put out two further leaflets, one addressed to the workers, the other to the soldiers. Both called for the formation of a provisional revolutionary government based upon the workers and soldiers. The leaflet to the workers specified the creation of the soviet, but neither leaflet so much as mentioned the Tauride Palace, where, in fact, the Petrograd Soviet was already gathering. Likewise, late in the evening the Bolsheviks issued a manifesto which also espoused a revolutionary government formed by the workers and soldiers, but which also omitted any reference to the soviet, including the one already forming at the Tauride Palace.²⁵

By urging and responding to each set of events, these proclamations undeniably show deep left-socialist involvement in the movement in the factories and streets. They also show that the right socialists had stolen the day. After the right versus left socialist quarrel on 26 February, several of the rightist deputies—Kerensky, Chkheidze, Skobelev, and others—gathered the next morning at the Duma. They had a last opportunity to fulfill their program of recent months: induce the Duma to take the lead in overthrowing the tsarist regime and thus ensure the authority of the Duma, or a government issuing from it, in the ensuing revolutionary situation. (This was a reasonable plan for moderate socialists who expected and desired a lengthy bourgeois capitalist phase; the liberals were their natural allies in the construction of a new government.) The last previous concerted push in this direction had come on 14 February, the day the new Duma session opened, when the Right SRs and Mensheviks agitated for massive strikes and demonstrations to culminate at the Tauride Palace. They took the matter so seriously that several of their leaders (Zenzinov, Sokolov, B. Flekkel, and Znamenskii) set up a special communications center to receive and transmit phone reports of demonstrations to Kerensky at the Duma, all to no avail since striking workers failed to go to the Duma and the Duma remained adamant in its refusal to act.²⁶ Subsequently, Chkheidze and especially Kerensky subjected the Duma sessions to daily tongue lashings. Kerensky, who now openly advocated the tyrants’ overthrow, told the Duma members that as they sat in their deputies’ “arm chairs” the movement in the streets was passing them by. (As noted above, by this time the Trudovik Duma fraction, which Kerensky led, had eschewed legislative work entirely in favor of revolutionary propaganda.)²⁷ Still, the Duma did nothing except serve as a forum for bitter antitsarist speeches by its handful

of radical members, which sufficed to bring about its dismissal by the emperor's decree of 26 February.

The Reluctant State Duma

The feverish pace of events on the morning of 27 February left little time for measured contemplation. Already at 8 a.m. a phone call from the vice-chair of the Duma, N. Nekrasov (a left-wing Cadet), awakened Kerensky with the news of the emperor's decree dismissing the Duma and the uprising of one of the guards units. Before dashing from the house, Kerensky instructed his wife to call M. Stankevich, an officer in one of the guards regiments, and other military acquaintances in order to try to get them to lead the soldiers to the Duma (Stankevich received the news but was unable to exercise any influence over his unit). Meanwhile, N. Iordanskii, a moderate Menshevik who lived across the street from the guards regiment complex, had already called Skobelev about the soldiers' uprising, and the latter too headed for the Duma.²⁸ Thus by 9 a.m. a solid group of moderate socialist leaders, including Chkheidze, Skobelev, Kerensky, and Znamenskii, had joined the other Duma deputies at the Tauride Palace. These same moderate socialists had met with the left socialists the previous evening and had pressed for decisive steps the next day. Everything they did on the twenty-seventh must be judged in this light, as well as against the backdrop of the soldiers' uprising, which they may well have expected.

Although many Duma deputies came to the Tauride Palace on the morning of the twenty-seventh, the Duma leaders had not called a session since, in their legalistic interpretation of the previous day's imperial decree, the Fourth Duma no longer existed. Right socialist intentions as regards the Duma played out in this situation. Sometime during the morning, Chkheidze and Kerensky, the latter of whom one eyewitness recalled as "agitated, pale, and decisive," attempted to persuade the Duma to gather in session. "Summon the session," insisted Kerensky. "The State Duma must be at its post. Ring the bell." No one responded. "I'll ring the bell," he declared. The halls resounded with the ringing, but no one moved. "Gentlemen!" shouted Kerensky. "Into the hall!" None of the silent deputies moved. Finally, some of the deputies agreed to a "private session," the sitting of which infuriated M. Rodzianko, chair of the Duma, when he arrived and who was only mollified when informed of the group's private nature. Ultimately, the participating deputies agreed to have the Duma's Council of Elders consider what to do. Finally, at almost 4 p.m. they agreed to create a gingerly titled "Provisional Duma Committee for the

Restoration of Order and Liaison with Institutions and Persons” consisting of Rodzianko, Nekrasov, A. Konovalov, V. Shul’gin, S. Shidlovskii, Miliukov, Chkheidze, Kerensky, and several others.²⁹ This timorous, delayed outcome was the sole result of Kerensky and Chkheidze’s attempts to create the “power of the Duma.”³⁰

Summoning the Soldiers

As mentioned, in all likelihood the right socialists had already decided to take steps toward summoning the soviet on 27 February, which they did not conceive as counterposed to their hopes for the Duma. Quite the contrary, a soviet gathered under their auspices at the Tauride Palace was an integral part of their plans and, one may add, anathema to the left socialists. Still, their first efforts concerned the Duma and only afterward did they turn their attention to the soviet question, although they surely knew that many factories were already selecting delegates. It may well be that they hoped that the Duma would manifest itself first or were simply waiting for signs that the soldiers would come to the Tauride in order to protect the new revolutionary organs. Between 9 a.m. and noon, Kerensky and other deputies had forwarded messages to officer acquaintances to bring their units to the Tauride. Some right socialists had gone to the nearby barracks complex in order to summon the soldiers. Presumably, Kerensky had heard through Skobelev (via Iordanskii) that rebellious units were headed for the Tauride or he may also have had advance knowledge of the soldier uprising. Regardless, Kerensky expected and was waiting anxiously for soldiers. When their arrival was delayed, some Duma deputies began to make jokes about the whereabouts of “Kerensky’s soldiers.”³¹

The timing and circumstances of the arrival of troops at the Tauride remain unexplained. The first units mutinied quite early. Already at 7 a.m., Iordanskii allegedly found out that some of them were headed for the nearby Tauride. Yet the first mention in memoirs of soldiers appearing at the Duma premises was at 11 a.m. Skobelev described the incident as follows: at around eleven someone shouted that “soldiers had arrived at the gates,” setting off a near panic at the “private Duma session” he was attending. Almost the entire group dashed for the windows to see, leaving in place only Kerensky, Chkheidze, and a few other moderate socialists, who evidently felt they had nothing to fear from insurgents. Still, several sources indicate that soldiers did not arrive en masse until 2 p.m.³² After joining the uprising at various times of the morning, most units headed for the jailhouses or went to other barracks in order to bring their units out as well, tasks that were achieved

by 1 p.m. Until then, the number of soldiers at or near the Duma remained small. Then at 1 p.m., according to the news sheet issued by city journalists later that day, a delegation representing twenty-five thousand soldiers arrived to request information about what position “representatives of the people” were taking. Rodzianko replied that efforts were being undertaken to replace the old regime, that the State Duma was involved and that, first and foremost, peace and order were necessary. (In fact, as yet the Duma and even its unofficial Council of Elders had done nothing.) Whether this less than ringing revolutionary call satisfied them is not clear, but at 2 p.m., also according to the journalists’ news sheet, “strong detachments of the revolutionary troops, accompanied by armed civilians, approached the building of the State Duma.” Chkheidze, Kerensky, and Skobelev addressed the crowds, while soldiers shouted “hurrah.” At this point, leaders of the insurgent troops replaced the old regime’s guards at the Tauride Palace and took control of the post, telephone, and telegraph offices on the premises.³³ The revolutionary soldiers and the moderate socialists in the Duma had finally made contact.

Several questions arise. Which soldiers arrived at 11 a.m.? Who were the soldiers’ representatives who arrived at 1 p.m.? Were the soldier crowds that arrived at 2 p.m. the ones who had sent representatives at 1 p.m., and who were the armed civilians with them? Who were the leaders of the insurgents who posted guards and took over protection of the Tauride Palace? Sokolov told Sukhanov that he led the very first units to the Tauride. S. Klivanskii (a former soldier and major participant in the writing of Order No. 1) claimed in a 4 March 1917 speech to the Petrograd Soviet that he was the first to “lead the soldiers to this [Tauride] palace.” Perhaps he and Sokolov led the troops who came before noon. Most evidence suggests that soldiers did not usually follow the lead of civilians and, even more importantly, tended to stay together in sizable groups. That they were not simply milling about is suggested by their purposeful taking of the jails, their successful approaches to other barracks (guards and other regiments in the main downtown barracks complex were still joining the mutiny at noon), and their march to the Tauride.³⁴ Presumably the twenty-five thousand soldiers were from the guards regiments who had taken part in the storming of the jails. Many workers had joined in, and newly liberated socialist prisoners also entered the movement in the streets. Still, by no means all workers and soldiers went to the Tauride or stayed there if they did go. Many thousands went to the Finland Station and remained through the evening, as requested by a left socialist proclamation issued late in the day.

Some Bolshevik memoirists and Soviet historians have described a sort of parting of the ways between left and right on 27 February (usually in an oversim-

plified Bolshevik versus everyone else dichotomy). V. Zalezhskii, a Bolshevik, recounted how he and a group of comrades just freed from one jail happened across K. Gvozd'ev, G. Broido, and other "liquidators" who had just been liberated from another. The moderates said they were going to the "State Duma," whereas the leftists answered, "We're going to the workers' districts."³⁵ Indubitably, right socialists gravitated toward the Duma, whereas leftists stayed away until later in the evening. However, none of this answers questions about the (somewhat delayed) arrival of large groups of soldiers at the Tauride Palace. Insurgent soldiers did not rush to the home of the Duma in the first instance. Furthermore, they later took responsibility for guarding the Tauride Palace only after hearing speeches by the socialists Kerensky and Chkheidze after 2 p.m. One witness recalled Chkheidze's accented speech, "Comrades! Organize yourselves, we need organization," and others recalled Kerensky's transfiguration into "the leader [*vozhd*'] of the revolution": "His words and gestures were sharp, measured, his eyes burned." The soldiers responded to both leaders, who had gained fame during recent months as uncompromising anti-tsarist and antiwar tribunes (not so much as Duma members but as socialists who used the Duma as their platform). "Hurrah! Long live the revolution!" cheered the men in uniform.³⁶

Most memoirists and commentators assert that soldiers and workers came to the Tauride Palace not in support of the Duma but in support of a new revolutionary government associated with the socialists. D. Zaslavskii, a very moderate Bundist, claimed that the soldiers of the guards regiment "did not want to and feared guarding the Duma." S. Mstislavskii, a leftist SR with close ties to the military, insisted that it was the proximity of the Tauride Palace to the central barracks complex "and not the authority of the State Duma that drew the insurgent troops."³⁷ A diametrically opposed interpretation also quickly came into existence, as in this account by one participant of liberal inclination: "At the moment [of the revolution], the people bowed to one authority, in which they had unlimited belief. This was the State Duma. All revolutionary forces gathered there," and so forth.³⁸ This and other similar tracts arguably represented attempts to construct a mythological narrative about the Duma, the liberal forces associated with it, and, ultimately, the Provisional Government. On the whole, the Zaslavskii-Mstislavskii version better coordinates with most data from that day.³⁹

Either way, the chain of events in the garrison—beginning with the soldiers' refusal to shoot on the twenty-sixth, to the uprising and the taking of the jails and, finally, the mass descent on the Tauride Palace—was not essentially chaotic. As eyewitness Iordanskii argued, these events could hardly have happened as described—

neatly, quickly, inexorably—without plan and leadership. Even so, his thesis of a shadowy officers' organization does not hold water.⁴⁰ A profound gap had opened up between officers (even of socialist bent) and soldiers, as Stankevich's experiences showed. Mstislavskii noted that no officers of the Petrograd garrison came over to the side of the revolution on 27 February.⁴¹ Although no definite solution to this historiographical problem is as yet achievable, a reasonable hypothesis is that responsibility lay with the primarily (but not entirely) SR underground revolutionary organizations in the units of the Petrograd garrison noted by Leiberov and several other Soviet historians. One may also surmise that Kerensky and other socialists in the Duma, who had wide ties with underground organizations and who were bent on revolution (as noted by the secret police), knew of the impending soldiers' revolt.⁴² If one rejects this version, then one must settle for a completely spontaneous soldiers' mutiny, which leaves begging a realistic explanation of the surprisingly ordered events of 26 and 27 February.

Organizing and Protecting the Soviet

Regardless, by 2 p.m. soldiers had arrived and the socialists at the Tauride had protection and sanction for their activities. For the rest of the afternoon, delegates went out from the Tauride to garrisons and factories summoning workers, soldiers, and students. Right socialists made phone calls to cooperatives and other locales. Some memoirists recall that in the avenues leading toward the Tauride Palace, people stood at certain points calling for passing crowds to go there. Zenzinov and M. Rafes, who arrived late in the afternoon, recall enormous crowds around the Tauride, where earlier few people had been.⁴³ With this insurance of the Tauride as a major revolutionary center (although as yet not the only one), Kerensky and Chkheidze began taking further steps. By midafternoon, a sizable group of moderate socialists had gathered around the basic core of socialist Duma deputies. Among them were the Menshevik cooperativists Volkov and N. Kapelinskii, Popular Socialists and Trudoviks such as Znamenskii and V. Charnoluskii, the Right SR labor activist Flekkel and Bundists G. Erlich, Zaslavskii, and V. Kantorovich. Between noon and 2 p.m., these had been joined by former leaders of the War Industries Committees' workers' group such as the already mentioned Gvozd'ev and Broido. This core, which was augmented with each passing hour by still others, including Sokolov, Peshekhonov, Rafes, Aleksandrovich, and Zenzinov, represented the entire spectrum of the capital's moderate socialist groups and parties, with a few leftists such as Kapelinskii and

Aleksandrovich thrown in, with ties, it should be added, not only to intelligentsia circles but to the workers through the cooperatives, cultural societies, and factory circles.⁴⁴ We will return to the crucial nature of this group later.

Kerensky arranged for the ever-expanding group to meet in Room 13, the office of the Duma's Budgetary Commission, after which it named itself the Provisional Committee of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies. At 3 p.m., it issued a leaflet, which was widely distributed throughout the city, calling for workers and soldiers to elect deputies according to assigned formulas and send them to the Tauride Palace for the Soviet's first session at 7 p.m. Somewhat later, it organized a food supply commission and issued a second proclamation calling for the population to feed the enormous number of troops in the city center. Additionally, Kerensky and Chkhaidze met with journalists assigned to cover the Duma to arrange for the issuing of the news sheet *Izvestiia* (all other newspapers having shut down), which carried the day's only news reporting about the stunning events, including pronouncements of the State Duma and of the Provisional Committee of the Soviet.⁴⁵

Thus a distinct group of identifiable figures of primarily moderate socialist inclination took specific steps that resulted in the formation of the Petrograd Soviet by the evening of 27 February. Although there were uncertainties and contingencies, these activities, like those of the soldiers' revolt, with which they intertwined, did not have a chaotic character. Forming the soviet was a socialist program, discussion of the elections to the soviet had been occurring already for several days, and the twenty-seventh had even figured in some of these discussions as the appropriate day. Furthermore, at the joint socialist meeting the previous evening Kerensky and Chkhaidze had stated their intention to undertake steps the next day. Against the backdrop of the next morning's soldiers' revolt, which they seemed to have expected, they clearly did so.

Commentators often noted the disorderly and aimless atmosphere at the Tauride and environs by late afternoon and early evening.⁴⁶ Element of formlessness doubtlessly existed. After all, this was a genuine mass revolution and not a military coup d'état. Far more remarkable is how smoothly things went. Sukhanov notes how the newly constituted soviet executive committee "with lightning speed" printed and distributed around the capital its proclamation about soviet elections. Similarly, Zenzinov noted the "amazing ease" with which the foundations for the new soviet were laid. Labor activist Gvozd'ev (using Baron Mandel's automobile) and others began making the rounds of factories in all the districts. Rafes recalled persons stationed in the avenues calling for people to go to the Tauride. The crowds of humanity were part of the revolutionary process but with their arrival the revolution attained assurance.

At about 4 p.m., according to Rafes's version, Kerensky, Skobelev, and Chkheidze came out again to address the amassed workers and soldiers. Kerensky personally led a detachment of soldiers to form guard posts at the entrances of the palace, after which people no longer entered at will. The junior officer F. Linde (later to become famous during the April crisis) undertook to organize the soldiers, most of whom had arrived without officers, into orderly formations. Z. Kel'son, an advocate who came to the Tauride late in the afternoon, noticed automobiles stationed with soldiers lying on the fenders, guns at the ready. Inside, Rafes found revolutionary students in charge of communications (post, telephone, and telegraph) and was himself assigned to a military detachment that soon headed back out into the city streets.⁴⁷

Rafes had happened upon the Tauride just as the so-called military headquarters was coming together. The new soviet executive committee quickly found itself confronted by serious military problems: how to organize the soldier masses milling around the Tauride, how to set up defense for the Tauride and establish order in the city, not to mention how to guard the city against potential counterrevolutionary attacks from outside. In the noted absence of officers among those joining the revolution, the committee decided to contact two individuals with military experience already known to them: the leftist SR Mstislavskii, former lieutenant-colonel and now librarian of the military academy library, and Lt. V. Filippovskii, like Mstislavskii a well-known SR ever since the 1905 revolution. Mstislavskii recounted how, upon returning home from witnessing the turbulent events of the day, he received a call from Kapelinskii, a Menshevik-Internationalist and former officer of the Petrograd Association of Workers' Cooperatives, which Mstislavskii himself had at one time chaired. Kapelinskii, who a few hours earlier had been sitting in the *Kresty* jail, now offered to send a car for him but, regardless, importuned him to come at once to Room 13 in the Tauride. Mstislavskii walked the brief distance, noting the huge crowds and also the heavy guards around the perimeter and entrance to the Tauride. The pass system introduced an hour or so earlier by Kerensky was operating so that Mstislavskii had to talk his way in. Inside, he was quickly directed to Room 13, where he found Sokolov, who told him that delegates from a number of insurgent units were present. They decided that a staff had to be set up. In Room 13 (the organizing center of the new soviet), Mstislavskii saw the entire Trudovik fraction ("they were our hosts"), as well as Social Democratic deputies and delegates from the labor organizations. Of left socialists, he saw only Shliapnikov and the Left SR Aleksandrovich. As regards military tasks, Filippovskii assumed responsibility for the Tauride and Mstislavskii for the city. The "general military staff" of the revolu-

tion had swung into operation or, to put it another way, the revolution was arming itself.⁴⁸

As Zenzinov approached the Tauride during the very early evening, he passed a large truck on the platform of which stood an individual passing out leaflets about the formation of the Provisional Committee of the Duma. The crowds were especially intrigued by the appearance of Kerensky's and Chkheidze's names on the list. Sukhanov, who arrived with Shliapnikov and P. Tikhonov (a moderate Social Democrat), noted rows of military trucks and automobiles being equipped with soldiers and machine guns for some mission. Sukhanov's impression was of too many leaders and not enough people willing to take orders. At the entrance stood dense ranks of military guards and an individual checking passes. Inside activity hummed. His initial impression of military disorderliness was misleading. For example, when Rafes reached the Nevskii with his soldiers' detachment at about 6 p.m., he found pickets already armed and stationed to repel expected reactionary forces.⁴⁹

Shliapnikov confirmed this picture. As he approached with Sukhanov and Tikhonov, he saw stationed at a crucial intersection a truck with a machine gun at the ready and an armed patrol. "Here began," he wrote, "the defense of the approaches to the State Duma." The onslaught of people had begun, not of enemies but of friends of the revolution. The guards at the peripheries restrained the masses of people only with difficulty. Inside, Shliapnikov found himself in the Budgetary Commission's former habitat, now the site of the provisional executive committee of the soviet. Sokolov, Gvozd'ev, Erlich, and even G. Krustalov-Nosar', of fame from 1905, were there. Ermanskii, the head of the Left Menshevik Initiative Group, saw one unit headed for the Tauride under one of its junior officers, a Menshevik known to him. The soldiers not only marched but were accompanied by their military band playing the stirring notes of the *Marseillaise*. Inside the Tauride, he saw delegates from many such military units. Mstislavskii claimed that the military staff and its forces were formed from junior officers and soldiers from the units of the regiments (mostly guards) that had come over to the revolution. These "composite shock detachments," as he called them, were sent back out into the city under new commanders to take or protect important points. A few months after the events, Lieutenant Skobeiko, an SR who joined the military commission, described how his unit (the second Marines, who had rebelled on 26 February, the first unit to have done so), after reporting to the Tauride on 27 February, took part in the seizing of the central telephone station, the Admiralty, and the Winter Palace.⁵⁰

When V. Bulgakov (his friends included Zinaida Gippius, Dmitrii Merezhkovskii, and Kerensky), who was serving as a *Zemgor* (Zemstvo–City Union) am-

bulance driver, arrived with his unit at the Nevskii at 7 p.m., he saw soldiers posted along the avenue holding red flags. On walls and lamp posts, he saw proclamations from the Provisional Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies that called for the population to feed the soldiers. Some people were handing out *Izvestiia*. Peshekhonov, a Popular Socialist with wide connections, spent the day in the streets watching and participating in the demonstrations. He returned home around dusk, where he and several friends exchanged impressions of the day's turbulent events. An hour or so later, they heard noise in the streets of the quiet Petersburg Side. Trucks with armed soldiers were arriving to "take out" garrisons and capture the police stations. Crowds cheered each arriving vehicle. Of course, armed caravans were not dispersing from the center at random. For example, workers at the Moskovskii District Skorokhod plant recalled a tense stand-off between the striking workers and prerevolutionary guards who were still patrolling the plant premises late on the twenty-seventh. Suddenly trucks with soldiers and armed workers arrived; from one moment to the next the old regime guards disappeared, replaced by *Izmailovtsy* (soldiers of the Izmailov Guards stationed near the Tauride).

Peshekhonov and acquaintances went out into the street, read the proclamation from the soviet executive committee pasted to a lamp post, and decided to go to the center of the revolution, the Tauride. The dark streets were already emptying, but around the Tauride large crowds, mostly soldiers, had gathered. The time was 9:30 p.m. He and his friends got past the guard-posts and entered the building. "The quiet and emptiness in the Tauride Palace surprised me . . . in the enormous vestibule only a few people were visible. Could this really be the revolutionary headquarters," he wondered. He soon ran into Charnoluskii and Znamenskii, fellow Popular Socialists. Rafes also "soon met" fellow Bundists Erlich and Zaslavskii; Mensheviks met Mensheviks; Mstislavskii saw the entire Trudovik fraction, as well as the SRs Aleksandrovich and Kerensky; and Shliapnikov was soon joined by fellow Bolsheviks P. Zalutskii and V. Molotov. Everyone found their revolutionary comrades. The entire spectrum of socialism was there. Peshekhonov and his friends worriedly discussed the lack of officers in the Tauride: "Surely, they haven't all stayed on the side of the government," they surmised. Later some began to arrive.⁵¹

The seeming chaos—a salutary, or at least unavoidable, phenomenon associated with the collapse of the *ancien regime*—gave birth to the early manifestations of the revolutionary order. By mid-evening of the first day, the streets were guarded, important points seized, proclamations posted or distributed, and the revolutionary center was operating smoothly and quietly. Obstacles and uncertainties abounded, but the revolution had occurred and a new administration, not to say government,

had already moved into action. This new revolutionary protogovernment did not come forth surprised and helpless but, rather, surprisingly well armed. We have not noticed this because we have dangled all too indecisively between two historiographical imperatives—Bolshevik hegemony and complete spontaneity—both equally misleading and not really improved upon by the half agency of workers and soldiers led by low- or middle-level activists.

Kerensky as Revolutionary Tribune

Without question the principal actor on the scene during the day of 27 February 1917 was Alexander Kerensky. It was he who took the lead in trying to force the Duma to take power, both before and on the twenty-seventh; he, as head of the Trudovik fraction, who arranged the room where the activists gathered to form the provisional committee of the soviet (as Mstislavskii put it, they were all the guests of the Trudovik fraction); he who made the speeches before the crowds that drew the most ardent response; and he who placed the guards at the entrances and set up the check points to keep out unwanted intruders. Skobelev and especially Chkheidze were also involved in all these activities, but they did not shine as did Kerensky. Only about Kerensky did onlookers say that before their eyes “he was transformed into the leader of the revolution.”

Veritably, there was much posturing in Kerensky’s actions and words. When the archreactionary chair of the State Council, I. Shcheglovitov, was brought in under detention and Rodzianko wished to free him, Kerensky intervened, loudly arresting him “in the name of the people” and declaring sonorously, “Your life is secure. . . . The State Duma does not shed blood!” At one point on the twenty-eighth, when shots were heard outside the palace, causing panic in the hall, Kerensky mounted a window ledge and shouted, “To your posts! . . . Defend the State Duma. . . . Kerensky is speaking to you.” Clearly, he had begun to believe in his own mythology. This does not compare especially well with Chkheidze’s response, at a meeting of the newly gathered soviet, to the same episode. Rafes recalled how the “usually indecisive” Chkheidze calmly brought the delegates back to order: “We came here for a life and death struggle. If we must die than we will die, but fear has no place here.” Zenzinov, admittedly a person wholly under Kerensky’s spell, described the difference between the two with some insight. Chkheidze was more restrained and consistent but also somewhat dogmatic (“in a Marxist vein,” quipped the SR Zenzinov). He suffered from a certain reticence and did not attract wide sympathy.

Kerensky, according to his friend, was eloquent, energetic, excitable, and attracted wide popularity. He was, concluded Zenzinov, a romantic whose most shining time was when he “practically speaking led the entire revolutionary opposition in the State Duma.” None of this alters the fact that, because of his joint roles in the Duma and the revolutionary movement before 27 February, “Kerensky immediately became the master of the Tauride Palace” (the words of the Bundists Zaslavskii and Kantorovich) or, as Sukhanov grudgingly admitted, “our conversations always started out with . . . Kerensky” who “had been summoned to be the central figure of the [February] revolution.”⁵²

Some comments are appropriate about Kerensky’s status as a member of the SR Party. Undoubtedly, he conceived his mission during 1917 as above any party, even his own. At one of his few visits to the soviet executive committee, he stated outright that he was “not especially a party person,” which did not deter him from trying very hard, with no success, to be elected into the SR central committee. Of course, Kerensky was not only an SR who played a great role in underground party activities, especially during 1914 and 1915, he also headed the Trudovik fraction in the Duma. As many of his words and actions during the February crisis reveal, he identified with the Duma (and his function as Trudovik fraction leader) rather than with the SRs or the soviet, of which he nonetheless became vice-chair. All of this notwithstanding, Kerensky was and remained an important SR leader with a wide following among the party and nonparty intelligentsia and considerable ties with worker activists and circles. He put together a personal staff of advisers and associates that included three well-known SRs—Zenzinov, A. Somov, and Flekkel, the first of whom had been a central-committee-level leader since 1910 and the last of whom was a long-time labor activist.⁵³ On this basis, Kerensky would play a great role in his party’s development in the capital and in the country.

First Steps: Taking Control

The events chronicled here represent the functional birth of the Petrograd Soviet as an institution. With birth came no opportunity for learning. Immediate action in several realms had to be undertaken. Military questions of all kinds had to be addressed and solved, populations had to be fed, and relations with State Duma leaders had to be decided and acted upon. Ultimately, a relatively small group of persons would shoulder these awesome tasks. Although some Duma figures began to play a role in all these events as well, this study’s prime focus is on the soviet leaders.

They, after all, had helped launch the revolution and now first and foremost were called upon to protect and solidify it. The focus on these socialists of one stamp or another is not merely descriptive or narrative as in most commentaries about the February Revolution. In the deepest sense, it is analytical and explanatory in ways that will become clearer as the story proceeds.

The Soviet and Its Executive Committee

At 9 p.m. on 27 February the first session of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' Delegates opened in Rooms 11 and 12 of the Budgetary Commission's offices.⁵⁴ By this time the entirely moderate complexion of the earlier Provisional Executive Committee (soon to be the official Executive Committee) had received a leavening of leftists, including Shliapnikov, Aleksandrovich, and several others. Roughly two hundred fifty persons attended the session, of whom perhaps only fifty were voting delegates from the factories; the balance were non-voting onlookers from the socialists gathered at the Tauride. Skobelev and Chkheidze switched turns in chairing the lengthy session that went on into the early hours. After choosing a Presidium, the soviet elected Chkheidze as chair and Skobelev and Kerensky as co-chairs, in addition to four secretaries—Gvozd'ev, Sokolov, Grinevich, and G. Pankov, the last two of whom were leftist Mensheviks. The soviet then elected a new executive committee to replace the provisional one. Shortly thereafter, delegates from the various insurgent regiments addressed the gathering and made known the wish of the soldiers for involvement in the soviet (the provisional committee's leaflet had requested units to elect deputies). According to Sukhanov, the soviet then voted to include soldiers' delegates and renamed itself the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.⁵⁵ (Even so, neither this session nor the next day's officially included soldiers' deputies as voting members. These sessions consisted of properly mandated delegates elected at factory meetings—only between forty and fifty at the first session. By definition, until units had reconstituted themselves and officially elected delegates, as suggested by the provisional committee's proclamation, the soldiers on hand were unofficial representatives rather than mandated voting deputies.)

Having exhausted organizational matters, the soviet then turned to other pressing problems, interrupted only by the dramatic announcement of a fresh-faced young soldier that his Semenovskii Regiment had mutinied (Sukhanov thought the soldier's speech showed that he had attended some party's propaganda school). A delegate of the earlier supply commission reported on the problem of feeding the city and

especially the soldiers, leading to the addition of V. Groman, a food supply expert, and the Cadet A. Shingarev to the food supply commission. Filippovski made a report from the military commission about the defense of the city, after which the soviet approved the Menshevik Brounshtein's suggestion that directives be sent out to factories to elect workers' militias that would gather at a central point in each district (usually cooperative premises that had served as focal points for the revolutionaries during the strikes and demonstrations). Shliapnikov recalled that it was at this point that the term *commissar* first arose. The session then proceeded to elect a literary commission (Sukhanov, Peshekhonov, Sokolov, and several others) with the task, among others, of issuing a newspaper to be called *Izvestiia*, the first famous issue of which appeared the very next day (28 February 1917); it also composed a new proclamation calling for the population to support the soviet.

After the closing of the soviet's first session in the early morning hours, the newly elected executive committee held its first meeting. It appointed commissars to each district: Shliapnikov for the Vyborg, the worker-SR S. Surin for the Lesnoi subdistrict, Peshekhonov for the Petrograd Side, and so forth. (Whether this was intended or not is not clear, but in several cases these district commissars initiated the creation of district soviets.) The committee then decided to take general responsibility for the military commission, delegating Sokolov and the Left SR Aleksandrovich to it. Similarly, it sanctioned Chkheidze and Kerensky to act as liaison with the provisional Duma committee, to which they belonged. Participants, including Shliapnikov, recall the businesslike and cooperative atmosphere of the executive committee's first session. Neither party nor personal conflicts arose.⁵⁶

General agreement at its first sessions notwithstanding, the successful gathering of the Petrograd Soviet at the Tauride Palace marked a sharp victory for the right socialists over the leftists. The leftist SRs, leftist Mensheviks, the Mezhraintsy, and the Bolsheviks had tried their best to summon the soviet elsewhere than at the home of the State Duma. Even the leaflets issued by them during the evening failed to mention the Tauride Palace at all, even as the moderates were expending enormous and ultimately successful efforts to attract workers, soldiers, and their elected deputies there. For reasons already mentioned, the Tauride as the site of the soviet took hold, and the leftists made the reluctant migration there during the late afternoon and early evening. Still, as future events would reveal, the left socialist struggle to create a soviet government directly based upon the rebelling workers and soldiers, without the intermediacy of the moderate socialist-liberal block, did not cease. At stake was the sort of government with which Russia would enter its new age.

The Military Commission, the Soviet, and the Duma

While the soviet and its executive committee completed their first round of activities, two other bodies of importance in the Tauride Palace also worked at high pitch. At 2 a.m. in the morning of the twenty-eighth, the provisional Duma committee, faced with the obvious activism of the new Petrograd Soviet and its ancillary bodies, finally decided to “assume power.” In truth, the Duma’s representatives (the “private group”) were the despair of the moderate socialists who had invested such high hopes in the institution. Kerensky later commented that the Duma expired during the twenty-seventh when it refused to act. Even at this point, when Duma representatives finally took belated steps as a provisional committee, they created a poor impression. Peshekhonov, a firm Duma supporter, noted the Duma committee’s indecisiveness and lack of energy, especially in comparison with the soviet’s firm and rather far-reaching decisions and actions.⁵⁷ Still, its belated entry into the revolutionary whirlwind was of import. Its “assumption” of power, although lacking sanction from any source outside itself, did signify that the soviet was now not the only contender for power.

Meanwhile, since early evening the military commission under the direction of Mstislavskii and Filippovskii had been working at feverish pitch.⁵⁸ The initial problems of establishing the basic defense of the Tauride and the city had been solved, by Filippovskii, who established defense perimeters around the building and machine-gun emplacements on the roof. Under Mstislavskii’s direction, detachments had set out in large numbers to secure important buildings and areas—railroad stations, police stations, and crucial intersections. During the evening and night, more and more units, even the usually archloyal Semenovskii and Preobrazhenskii Regiments came over to the revolution, and finally some officers—mostly of socialist persuasion—joined the revolutionary staff. Still, problems remained. Some tsarist government elements and whatever military forces they could muster took shelter in the Admiralty. Reports came in that the still-loyal 171st Infantry Regiment, arriving by train, had seized the Nikolaev Railroad Station and the area around it. Furthermore, some garrisons remained uncommitted, and many tens of thousands of insurgent soldiers from various units were afoot in the city, creating an atmosphere of near anarchy.

Regardless, step by step, the problems resolved themselves. Tsarist forces proved paltry, so that eventually government personnel withdrew even from the Admiralty. The staunchness of the 171st Infantry did not outlast contact with the revolution at the railroad stations, and the same thing happened to other units sum-

moned to tsarism's succor. The troops melted away to join their insurrectionary comrades. Mstislavskii recalled that sometimes detachments sent out on missions also disappeared. Those acting on their own initiative often accomplished much, whereas those with orders at times failed to act. "Could it have been otherwise in a revolution?" he asked. All problems notwithstanding, within a day or so a kind of order prevailed in the districts, mostly achieved by the newly organized militia detachments, as even the skeptical Sukhanov admitted. By midday on 28 February, Mstislavskii could say with relief, "The city is ours."⁵⁹

Also of significance was the military commission's role in blocking the entry of frontline troops into the Petersburg environs and of the emperor himself, whose presence might have become a rallying point for waverers. The provisional Duma committee transferred control of the important transport ministry to the engineer A. Bublikov, who sent out a telegram to all railroad personnel to the effect that the Duma was forming a new government. Subsequently, his department sent out instructions to railroad workers to block troop movements into the capital. Still, the heavily socialist (mostly SR) railroad linemen were not likely to have responded to pronouncements from or about the Duma. Mstislavskii recalled that the military commission itself contacted the railroad workers, who "promised not to let pass any trains" with persons of hostile intent, a more likely spur for railroad workers' purposeful activities. Regardless, railroad workers and other eyewitnesses confirmed that the railroad committees, which began taking shape already on 27 February, acted quickly to hinder the movement of troops toward revolutionary Petrograd.⁶⁰ By the morning of 28 February, the military commission had also contacted the garrison at nearby Tsarskoe Selo, which had agreed to block the highway into the capital. Within the city, the soviet's military command "somehow reinforced the railroad stations" and disposed of three battalions of infantry and, in reserve, an artillery division. The several hundred thousand soldiers in the capital and environs were gradually returning to their barracks but for the moment were under no one's control. Mstislavskii, Sukhanov, and others agreed later that initially the soviet forces could not have withstood a vigorous attack from well-organized units.⁶¹ However, no such attack was forthcoming, not least of all because of the efforts of the military commission.

While the military commission carried out its Herculean tasks, events took place that would greatly influence it and the revolution. Almost at midnight sharp on the evening of 27 February, Rodzianko, accompanied by Col. B. Engelhardt, appeared in Room 41 and announced that the provisional Duma committee, having assumed responsibility for establishing order in the capital, was taking over control of the

military commission, which henceforth would be headed by Engelgardt, a staff officer and Octobrist Duma deputy of impeccably conservative orientation. Sokolov and others objected vociferously: no new subordination was necessary since the soviet had set up the commission and would run it. Rodzianko insisted, voices were raised, fisticuffs seemed imminent. Mstislavskii and others calmed Sokolov with soothing words: What difference did it make? The revolutionaries would watch that nothing was done against the revolution. The crisis dissipated; Rodzianko and Engelgardt left, promising to return later to assume control. The commission's work resumed. At about 11 a.m. on the twenty-eighth, Engelgardt returned, but even then made clear he was not yet ready to take over. By midday, all military news was favorable. Kronshtadt had come over *en masse*, as had the 180th Infantry in full battle regalia. Mstislavskii and others of the commission finally went home to sleep.

When they returned a few hours later, the new staff had arrived. Fancy officers were sitting at well-appointed desks, shuffling papers. Some of the original staff had received summary thanks and dismissals. Mstislavskii recalled that "a clammy horror slowly crept into my heart": they were replicating the Petrograd general staff. Other news was more favorable. The huge antirevolutionary military expedition under the new supreme commander (by the emperor's decree), Gen. N. Ivanov, foundered on the obstacles placed in its path by the railroad workers. The only regiment that had advanced promptly came over to the revolution. The city not only belonged to the revolution but was safe from outside conquest as well. When Mstislavskii, who remained active in the commission along with the fellow SRs Fillipovskii, Skobeiko, and Dobranitskii, left later in the evening, he saw thousands of soldiers arriving in silent marching ranks from outside the city. This display of unadulterated support for the revolution, he recalled, cleared his spirits of dark clouds.⁶²

Although all details had not yet been worked out, by midday on 28 February, with the completion of the first twenty-four hours of revolutionary defense and construction, the outlines of a new, albeit provisional, order had arisen. All real authority lay in the soviet, but the soviet would not itself exercise power directly. Thus, the military commission yielded its control to the Duma committee, although that body had not yet officially "assumed power" in its own name. (Evidently, at around 4 a.m. on the twenty-eighth, after the Duma committee's decision to take power, Rodzianko went to the session of the soviet executive committee for sanction of his committee's control of the military commission, a question that had not been settled by Rodzianko's and Engelgardt's midnight descent on that body.) Despite the awesome nature of the obstacles, psychological and material, confronting it, the soviet had, in the words of the skeptic, Sukhanov, "performed at its very first session a basic

task vital to the revolution—that of concentrating into one center all the ideological and organizational strength of the Petersburg democracy, with undisputed authority and a capacity for rapid decisive action.”⁶³ That it would throw this authority, albeit conditionally, behind a Duma-oriented government was a separate matter, issuing from the central fact of the soviet’s convening at the Tauride Palace, under the deliberately cautious guidance of Duma socialists Kerensky and Chkhaidze.

The Petrograd Soviet’s Leaders: Making a Revolution

The leadership of this center of “undisputed authority and capacity for rapid decisive action” resided in the executive committee elected at the first session of the soviet on 27–28 February. Chkhaidze became chair and Skobelev and Kerensky co-chairs; the secretaries were Sokolov, Gvozd’ev, Grinevich, and G. Pankov. Of these, five were Mensheviks (three rightists and two leftists), one (Sokolov) was an unaffiliated Social Democrat and one was an SR-Trudovik. In addition to these, the soviet elected eight additional members, including nonaligned Social Democrats Iu. Steklov, Kapelinskii, and Sukhanov, the Bolsheviks Shliapnikov and Zalutskii, the Left SR Aleksandrovich, and the leftist Mensheviks Krasikov (later a Bolshevik) and Sokolovskii. In addition, two persons nominated from each party entered the committee, including the moderate Mensheviks B. Bogdanov and B. Baturskii, the Bundists Erlich and Rafes, the Bolsheviks Molotov and Iurenev (a Mezhraionets who was brought in on the Bolshevik list), the SRs N. Rusanov and Zenzinov (both rightists), the Popular Socialists Peshekhonov and Charnoluskii, the Trudoviks Bramson and N. Chaikovskii, and the Latvian SDs P. Stuchka (future Commissar of Justice) and Kozlovskii. Shliapnikov also lists the worker-SR Surin as entering the executive committee and yet another source adds the SR N. Sviatitskii.⁶⁴

The new committee thus consisted of eleven Mensheviks (including the Bundists), five non-affiliated SDs, four Bolsheviks (one of whom was a Mezhraionets), six SRs (counting Surin and Sviatitskii), plus four Trudoviks and Popular Socialists. The Social Democratic–Populist split was roughly twenty to ten (the imbalance may have led to the addition of Surin and Sviatitskii). Looked at from the (then) more important left-right alignment, four of the Mensheviks, all of the nonaligned SDs and Bolsheviks, and two of the SRs (with Surin) were leftists, for a total of perhaps fifteen leftists versus fourteen rightists. Since some of the non-aligned SDs, including Sukhanov and Sokolov, despite their generally leftist alignment, upheld the current revolution as “bourgeois,” at least on that crucial issue,

the outcome of which would not be settled for a day or so, the executive committee had a slight moderate cast (sixteen to thirteen). Still, given the preponderance of moderates in the earlier provisional committee, most of whose members entered the permanent body, the growth of the left wing was striking, doubtlessly representing the solid ties the leftists had with workers and soldiers in the factories and units. As regards party alignments, the two military commission leaders, Mstislavskii and Filippovskii, whose functions at that point were as important as those of executive committee members, were both SRs, one right and one left.

One factor, the most telling of all, has largely escaped commentary. The personnel of the ongoing intersocialist bureau (Kerensky, Gor'kii, Sokolov, Chkheidze, Skobelev, Grinevich, Ermanskii, Erlich, Rafes, Peshekhonov, Shliapnikov, Iurenev, Zenzinov, Aleksandrovich, Sokolovskii, and several others), who had been meeting together since early February and who held their last *prerevolutionary* session on the evening of 26 February, formed the Provisional Committee of the Petrograd Soviet on the twenty-seventh and then entered *en masse* into the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet. Indeed, the rightists among them, joined later in the day by the leftists, had summoned the soviet. In effect, the first full session of the Petrograd Soviet's executive committee was also the first *postrevolutionary* session (with a handful of additions) of the pre-existing intersocialist informational bureau. (Of all secondary and primary sources consulted, only the moderate populist newspaper *Den* drew attention to the continuity between the earlier series of joint socialist meetings and the same socialist leaders' subsequent actions in summoning the soviet.)⁶⁵ These individuals, who represented the entire spectrum of the capital's socialist parties (or "democracy," as Sukhanov put the matter), and who had laid general plans for tsarism's overthrow, now accounted for the "remarkably smooth" seizure and organization of power. Individually and as groups or subgroups, their activism, instrumentality, indeed agency, thread their way through the February Revolution's events from start to finish. They are the thread that forms the pattern.⁶⁶ This circumstance of its very nature requires reconsideration of the "spontaneous-anonymous" theory of the February Revolution in any of its various redactions.

The Struggle for Political and Military Power: Order No. 1

During its first two days of existence, the Petrograd Soviet and its executive committee grappled with vital questions of power and subordination. Even before it could resolve the political problems, related military issues intervened; these issues reflected the unease of soldiers who wanted to guarantee that the revolution, which they had in a sense brought to realization by dint of their armed support, would address their aspirations and agendas. The soldiers' quest for a democratized way of life bore fruit in the form of Order No. 1. The origins and composing of this fateful document have still eluded exact characterization, a problem that this section will address. The significance of the famous order surpassed even the riveting soldiers' question by cutting directly to the heart of the political question as well.

Political Power: Round One

The first full day of the post-tsarist era, 28 February, foreshadowed much that would happen in the following days and months. During the afternoon, both the executive committee and the soviet (with an agenda established by the executive committee) held sessions.⁶⁷ The soviet, which had a larger, if still incomplete, complement than the previous evening, voted to approve the composition of the executive committee and then moved on to pressing issues: ties with city districts (through commissars), worker militias, finances, food supply, and communications (railroad and postal-telegraph). A resolution on finances called for a joint Soviet–Duma committee finance commission, thus touching lightly on the great problem facing revolutionary Russia, the locus and nature of power.

Most speakers at this lengthy session did not so much address as dance around the question of power. Several prominent activists, notably Steklov, Skobelev, Grinevich, and Kerensky, took appropriately militant stances about the revolution and the soviet's authority, while at the same time subtly urging caution and the need to reach out to other social elements besides workers and soldiers. For instance, Steklov noted with approval Peshekhonov's organizational work among the Petrograd Side's propertied groups. "For success," he argued, "we must base ourselves not just on workers." Similarly, Skobelev noted the Petropavlovsk Fortress commander's surrender "in the name of the Duma committee" (the unstated implication being that he might not have done so "in the name of the soviet"). Later these and other speakers would openly argue that only a bourgeois-oriented government would attract officers and other necessary elements to the revolutionary cause.

Several left-wing socialists expressed themselves with a different nuance. For example, Grinevich noted that “the bourgeoisie feels itself master of the situation,” such that the “task of the proletariat was to limit the bourgeoisie.” In connection with the inevitable questions of “government, the overthrow of autocracy, and the democratic republic,” Molotov characterized the current events as a “worker revolution . . . carried out with the revolutionary army,” as a result of which the soviet had the right to “protest and block . . . counter-revolutionary acts.” However, none of the socialist leaders referred directly to the potentially explosive problem of power, a task that fell by default to several obscure speakers, as when S. Bel’skii demanded the immediate clarification of Soviet–Duma committee relations, the latter of which should issue no orders without the former’s sanction. In his single address to the soviet, Sakharevskii urged the deputies simply to issue a “proletarian dictate” on contested matters.

Military Power: Round One

On the twenty-eighth, the soldiers’ question, rather than political power, soon captivated the soviet delegates’ attention. Commentators attribute responsibility for subordinating the soviet’s military commission to the provisional Duma committee to Chkheidze and especially Kerensky, the latter of whom spent a great deal of time in the military commission. Regardless, at around 4 a.m. the executive committee approved the fateful transfer of military control. Shortly thereafter, at Engelgardt’s urging, Rodzianko issued a proclamation that called for soldiers to return at once to their barracks and for officers to take control of their units (a constant theme among Duma committee members was the need to reestablish order). In the Tauride Palace, Rodzianko and others made speeches in a similar vein to soldiers’ meetings. By morning the appeal was pasted to lampposts around the capital. Outraged soldiers’ representatives then appeared at the soviet’s afternoon session, which, after heated discussion, demanded that Kerensky and Chkheidze be summoned to the session to explain the meaning of this provocative act. Some calls were heard for the arrest of Rodzianko and the entire Duma committee. Even Right Mensheviks such as Rafes, Skobelev, and Kantorovich objected vociferously to the resubordination of soldiers to officers, some of whom were openly hostile to the revolution. The matter was smoothed over when Kerensky explained that Rodzianko’s proclamation had been cancelled. He also raised the prospect of relying on the soldiers, who thus required their own organization, as a “restraining force on the officers.”

Still, the crisis regarding the question of the soldiers' subordination continued to gather strength throughout the twenty-eighth, with the soldiers as focus of attention and principal actors in the drama. The first issue of *Izvestiia* carried several proclamations concerning soldiers that had appeared the previous day as leaflets. One, from the literary commission of the soviet executive committee (Sukhanov, Sokolov, and Peshekhonov), addressed to the population of the capital and Russia, emphasized how the soldiers had come over to the people's cause and stated that "the people must create their own governmental organ." It then noted the formation of the soviet, which consisted "of representatives of factories, mills, mutinied troops, and democratic and socialist parties," and urged people to rally around it. This proclamation, with its intimations of soviet power, also assumed soldier integration into the workers' soviet. A second executive committee proclamation urged soldiers to remain dedicated to the revolution, remain orderly, maintain vigilance against counterrevolution, and report to the military commission at the State Duma. It thus sought to provide guidelines for the soldiers' continued vital revolutionary activities. On the night of 27 February, a third proclamation about this issue, written by the Mezhraionka-SR block and addressed to "comrade soldiers, had appeared and also was reprinted in *Izvestiia* on the 28th. It called for the soldiers to organize themselves, retain their arms, seize crucial points in the city, and elect deputies to the "provisional revolutionary government." In failing to mention the existing soviet, this document (the most radical of the three) represented the continued left socialist attempt to bring about a peoples' government away from the Tauride Palace. It placed the insurgent soldiers squarely at the center of revolutionary processes and governmental construction.⁶⁸

These revolutionary appeals to the soldiers sharply conflicted with the Duma committee's early morning directive aimed at bringing soldiers back to the barracks under officers' control. Even after its neutralization, Rodzianko's "provocative" act highlighted the issue of soldiers' organization, to which the executive committee turned as its first order of business that very afternoon (28 February). A group of elected soldier delegates complained not only about Rodzianko's pronouncement but about the conduct of returning officers who were attempting to reinstate "tsarist methods" of address and discipline, already intolerable to revolutionized soldiers. According to Shliapnikov, a group in the executive committee (several Mensheviks, Popular Socialists, and the Bolshevik Zalutskii) concentrated on soldiers' affairs. When someone among them suggested a joint soldier and worker soviet, the Menshevik-Defensists objected. At the soviet's general session later, I. Kroshinskii called for "representatives from the army in the soviet" to avoid the workers' "isolation."

Eventually, the executive committee decided to create a “soldiers’ section” on the basis of one delegate for every company.⁶⁹

Political Power: Round Two

Meanwhile, the executive committee’s evening session held the first discussion of the nature of the provisional government (Shliapnikov recalled that the explosive soldiers’ question had pushed it off the afternoon session’s agenda). Since only twenty members were present, the debate was informal. Steklov and Sukhanov reported on the semiofficial discussions they had held during the day with Miliukov about the nature of the government and its program. Several outlooks emerged, with most comments focusing on whether or not socialists should enter the government, already visualized as bourgeois in nature. According to Rafes’s recollections, most of the Social Democrats opposed socialist entry, although the Bundist Erlich argued that, in order to strengthen the new government in its struggle with the old regime, socialists should not refuse. The SR Zenzinov took a similar line. Existing memoirs (Rafes, Sukhanov, and Shliapnikov) fail to indicate any left socialist objections to a bourgeois-oriented government. Sukhanov recalled that at the soviet’s first general session (27 February) no one proposed a soviet revolutionary government, a lack he laid directly at the left socialists’ door (“it was up to them to make a case for this idea”). Nor, as noted above, did they do so on 28 February. Consequently, those who favored a bourgeois government proceeded to negotiate with Miliukov, resulting in preliminary plans for a government formed by the Duma’s provisional committee.⁷⁰

Some mystery surrounds left socialist reticence at the earliest soviet and executive sessions. Left socialist proclamations from 27 February (several of which *Izvestiia* reprinted on the twenty-eighth) called for elected worker-soldier delegates to create a provisional revolutionary government based directly upon themselves. Some mentioned the soviet, some did not, but all specified a revolutionary government elected by and based upon workers and soldiers. Why then did not the left socialists raise this issue at the sessions of 27 and 28 February? Available sources provide no answer. Sukhanov accused the leftists (he named Shliapnikov and Aleksandrovich) of lacking the ability to formulate their ideas in public (Molotov’s shaky remarks of the twenty-eighth lend credence to this version).⁷¹ Perhaps they were cowed by the right socialist intellectuals’ success in summoning the soviet under their control.

Still, excellent evidence exists of the left socialists' continued concern about the direction of the revolution. V. Ivanov-Razumnik, the famous literary critic (an SR and later Left SR), recalled being escorted to the Tauride on 28 February by Mstislavskii, where he soon met Zenzinov, who suggested that he participate in the newspaper *Izvestiia*, which offer he declined. Later, he ran into Aleksandrovich, who "was organizing a group of leftist worker-SRs." (Sukhanov recalled that Aleksandrovich, rather than SRs of the Zenzinov type, represented the views of the Petrograd worker-SRs). Aleksandrovich promptly tried to recruit him to compose a proclamation that would differentiate the original "workers' revolution" from the "clever tricks" already initiated by compromisers from the soviet and the Duma committee. Ivanov-Razumnik recalled the time as 10 p.m., which would indicate that the evening executive committee session, where the question of power was discussed, had probably just ended, spurring Aleksandrovich to respond in the form of a broadside, which he himself did not have the skills to write. When the hesitant Ivanov-Razumnik warned Aleksandrovich that the autocracy might find forces to counterattack, Aleksandrovich dismissed that possibility and said even if autocracy did counterattack, it would be better to deal with a rotten autocracy than a bourgeois republic that would "further enslave the people." (Ivanov-Razumnik later recalled that, when Aleksandrovich had first arrived in Petrograd before the February Revolution, he had held him in great suspicion as a possible provocateur because of his extreme views. The mutual suspicions had not dissipated, he felt, by their meeting of 28 February.)

In any case, the reluctant Ivanov-Razumnik agreed to write the leaflet and settled in the half-lit hall, where he composed a quite literary essay, full of symbolism, about how the liberal and radical forces were not on the same path but must remain together now to fight tsarism (the same idea espoused by Erlich and Zenzinov in the executive committee). When Aleksandrovich read the flowery prose, he informed the crestfallen Ivanov-Razumnik that he needed a sharply worded agitational leaflet and, furthermore, wanted "the socialists to seize the apparatus of power at once, today, and that the united leftists [the Mezhraiontsy, SRs, Bolsheviks, and Left Mensheviks] were taking steps to make sure that this did not remain only words." The two SRs parted company in full misunderstanding ("he considered me a 'social-compromiser' and I considered him an adventurist," recalled Ivanov-Razumnik), only to meet again a year later as fellow Left SRs.⁷² In any case, this episode shows that as far as leftists such as Aleksandrovich were concerned the location of power still hung in the balance; by the next day, the crisis over power further sharpened, leading the leftists to make their bid, a matter we will return to presently.

The episode also allowed Ivanov-Razumnik a chance to provide a comeuppance to Sukhanov, an often acerbic interlocutor and commentator. Ivanov-Razumnik recalled that when he (Ivanov-Razumnik) had worked as editor of *Zavety*, Sukhanov had often come with articles, some of which had to be heavily edited before publication. Now as Ivanov-Razumnik sat in the hall of the Tauride composing his ill-fated leaflet for Aleksandrovich, Sukhanov, eating a sandwich, happened into the room. Catching sight of Ivanov-Razumnik, Sukhanov remarked, "So you're with us!" to which the latter answered, "Yes, of course!" Ivanov-Razumnik then told Sukhanov, "Don't just stand there. Sit down." To which Sukhanov retorted, "Always these editor's affectations. I'm the chief here, I should offer you a seat." Ivanov-Razumnik shot back, "But that's not possible because I'm sitting and you're standing." Sukhanov had no reply and left (he later placed in his memoirs some comments unflattering to Ivanov-Razumnik about this incident).

Meanwhile another drama, reflecting the tragic aspect of the Russian revolutionary movement in its bitter struggle against tsarism, was under way. Already on 27 February, socialists at the Tauride became aware that crowds of soldiers and workers were attacking courthouses, police stations, and secret police headquarters, many of which were in flames. Suspicions arose that some provocateurs might be attempting to wipe out police records, which now required special protection lest guilty parties escape prosecution. Thus on 28 February a group that included the Left Menshevik Grinevich and the SR Zenzinov took charge of operations to preserve and examine secret police files. They quickly produced a list of provocateurs that included the names of the Bolsheviks M. Chernomazov (long under a cloud of suspicion) and Shurkanov and the SR worker from Aivaz, Surin. The Bolsheviks were arrested a day or so later, but Zenzinov decided to take action at once against Surin, whom the workers had elected into the executive committee and who was participating in SR fractional activities as well. Indeed, this revelation caused enormous dismay among SRs. Surin, a young, well-informed worker widely trusted in party circles, had been involved in all organizational activities and, it now became clear, had single-handedly foiled repeated SR efforts to reestablish their Petersburg Committee during recent months. Zenzinov dispatched a note to Surin asking him to come to a certain hall in the Tauride, where he waited with two other party comrades. When the unsuspecting Surin arrived, Zenzinov pulled his Browning and arrested him for provocation. The other two held him while Zenzinov carried out a search that turned up only a list of participants of a meeting he had attended. The stunned Surin was led away to whatever fate awaited him.⁷³ For months thereafter, socialist newspapers carried long lists of SRs and Social Democrats exposed as provocateurs.

Military Power: Round Two

The day of 1 March 1917 began and ended in a stormy manner. The withdrawal of Rodzianko's offending order notwithstanding, Rodzianko, Miliukov, and A. Guchkov—members of the provisional Duma committee—issued a series of proclamations and made speeches, all of which violated soldiers' expectations. The gist of the Duma committee's new line, with its "law and order" motif, was that soldiers and officers should return to their barracks and make common cause: soldiers should obey their officers, and all units should obey the provisional Duma committee (which now controlled the military commission). None of this fit the soldiers' new concept of themselves as a revolutionary force. The officers' tendency to fall back upon the old modes of discipline (by training and disposition they could resort to nothing else in the absence of new guidelines) heightened tensions. Mstislavskii described a situation in which "at the slightest conflict, the soldiers spun out of the officers' control." Left socialists, especially of the SR-Mezhraionka block, stoked the fire with verbal and printed antiofficer propaganda. Engelgardt recalled that the presence of angry soldier delegates at the military commission's morning session induced him to issue a proclamation to officers threatening them with dire consequences, even execution, if they confiscated soldiers' arms. "The *Dumtsy* [Duma committee members]," recalled Mstislavskii, "suggested to the soldiers that they identify reliable officers willing to subordinate themselves to the Duma."⁷⁴ Not a few officers were still loyal to the tsarist regime, whereas only officers loyal to the soviet (if any such existed), rather than to the Duma, were likely to satisfy soldiers at this point.

The end result was that during the morning of 1 March, the soldier delegates returned to the executive committee—which by this time had taken up the problem of power—with renewed demands to protect their interests. A session of the soviet with soldier delegates was scheduled for noon, but in light of the soldier delegate onslaught the executive committee organized an ad hoc soldiers' meeting chaired by Sokolov. On the basis of their concerns, the executive committee then worked out an agenda with three major points: (1) What was the soldier-officer relationship? (2) Should arms be turned over to officers? and (3) Were soldiers subordinated to the military commission or the soviet? Some time during the day, the executive committee also issued a new proclamation that urged soldiers to obey the military commission in "the struggle with the old regime" but that also advised soldiers to elect deputies, one per regiment, to the soviet. "Comrade soldiers," it concluded, "organize and join your brother workers!"⁷⁵

All this provided the background to the 1 March soviet session, the first with full soldier representation. This session of over a thousand worker and soldier delegates was a historic event not just because it christened the new type of soviet but because it issued the famous Order No. 1. Mstislavskii, Sukhanov, and other eyewitnesses make clear that the executive committee's moderate socialists to some extent sympathized with the Duma committee in its attempts to reestablish order in the military. Obviously hundreds of thousands of soldiers could not remain in the streets, under no one's control. Nonetheless, even the most moderate SRs and Mensheviks shared the common soldiers' distaste for allowing command positions to reactionary officers. Mstislavskii further noted that as the soldiers drifted back to their barracks, they found officers who, whether reactionary or not, utilized traditional methods of address and discipline.⁷⁶

According to Engelgardt, when the military commission refused to issue new directives about soldier-officer relations, the soldier delegates replied, "So much the better! We'll write them ourselves." As noted, various sources mention "anti-officer" propaganda in the streets. Additionally, two memoirists specify seeing an SR-Mezhraionka leaflet on 1 March that posed this question in the sharpest terms. According to Sukhanov's recollections, early on 1 March he read a leaflet issued by the SRs and the Mezhraionka (he remarked that they had found a print-shop willing to issue their proclamations) that called for workers' power. Later in the day, someone showed him a second text from the two groups that was "much worse" since it espoused "violence against officers." A. Tarasov-Rodionov specified that he saw the SR-Mezhraionka leaflet about the officers around noon. Wildman concludes that it probably came out early in the day and, at the very least, earlier than Order No. 1, which it did not mention.⁷⁷

Because of the directness of its language about the concerns and aspirations of broad social elements and its concise picture of the revolution in Petrograd, not to mention the alarm it caused among all moderates, the leaflet merits lengthy quotation:

Comrade soldiers! It is done! You . . . enslaved peasants and soldiers rose up and destroyed the ignominious autocracy. . . . The peasants suffered endlessly, thrown to the mercy of the landowners . . . and the tsarist autocracy's whole gang of lackeys. While . . . the landlords seized all the land, and the gentry fattened on the people's blood, the many-millioned peasantry swelled with hunger: the landless muzhik had no place to keep even a chicken! Brother soldiers! What do you, peasant-tillers, need? What do you, workers, need? All the land and all the freedom, that's what we need! Not in vain did you shed your blood. The workers and soldiers have already held Petrograd in their hands for two

days, while the pitiful State Duma chooses a provisional committee and calls it a provisional government: but even now you haven't heard a single word from either Rodzianko or Miliukov about whether the land will be taken from the landowners and given to the people. Vain hope! . . . Be on guard that the nobles don't deceive the people! Go to the Duma and ask if there will be land for the people, freedom, and peace? Soldiers! Why doesn't the Duma speak of these things? It is necessary to tear out autocracy by the roots. If we don't pursue this to the end, if a Constituent Assembly is not called to which all the peasants and workers send their delegates, and not as in the previous Duma, where the rich ran things, the people's cause will perish! To prevent the nobles and officers—that Romanov gang—from deceiving you, take power in your own hands. Elect your own platoon, company, and regimental commanders, elect company committees. . . . All company commanders should be under the control of these company committees. Accept only those officers who you know as friends of the people. Obey only delegates sent from the soviet of workers' and soldiers' deputies! . . . Enemy-officers are coming to you, who call themselves your friends. . . . [But] the fox's tail is more frightening than the wolf's tooth. Your eternal friend and brother is only the worker and peasant. Unite with them! Send your delegate-representatives to the soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Delegates, behind which already stand 250,000 Petrograd workers. Your representatives and the workers' delegates should become the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the people and from it you will receive land and freedom! . . . Listen to us! Demand of the Duma that it answer you at once: will the land be taken from the gentry . . . ? Will it be given to the peasantry? Will the people be given freedom? Will a Constituent Assembly be called? Don't lose any time! . . . Press for this in the companies and battalions! Call meetings! Elect commanders and deputies to the soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies from your own ranks. All land to the peasants! All freedom to the people! Long live the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies! Long live the Provisional Revolutionary Government!

Petersburg Mezdyraionnyi Committee of the R.S.D.R.P.

Petersburg Committee of Socialist-Revolutionaries.

1 March 1917⁷⁸

Although it did not specifically espouse violence against officers, it may well have left that impression in Sukhanov's memory. What it certainly did was pose a series of basic questions of the broadest import for new revolutionary Russia: the transfer of land to the peasantry, peace, the election of officers, and the election of unit committees. It also delineated the three basic groups upon which the revolution was based—peasants, workers, and soldiers—and repeated the call for the creation of a revolutionary government based upon the workers and soldiers through the auspices of the soviets. The Soviet-era historian Zlokazov noted the similarity of concerns between this leaflet and those of Order No. 1. Since the leaflet originated

much earlier in the day than the soviet's more famous order, it likely played a role in the thinking of the delegates as they deliberated on the same matters.⁷⁹

Military Power Resolved: Order No. 1

As chair of the soviet's general session, Sokolov confirmed the necessity of including soldiers and introduced the three points of the executive committee's agenda (soldier-officer relations, the question of arms, and the subordination of soldiers.)⁸⁰ S. A. Klivanskii (Maksim), a civilian activist and former soldier often described as an SR, who served as an ad hoc spokesperson for the soldiers, laid down the parameters of the problem, after which a series of soldiers debated several points. Klivanskii then submitted a draft resolution summarizing the soldiers' views on the questions posed by the executive committee's agenda; the draft ultimately served as the basis for Order No. 1.

In detail, the session proceeded as follows: Klivanskii's speech combined social and political radicalism with defensism on the war. His attitude toward Duma leaders and officers was unyielding; he wished to counterpose the soviet to the provisional Duma committee, which was trying to return power to the "gentry and capitalists." Klivanskii urged reestablishing military discipline through the auspices of a soldiers' soviet in the Petrograd garrison competent to decide all military questions, thus implying the abolition of the military commission. The soldiers' soviet should unite with the workers' soviet. Like all speakers that day, Klivanskii flatly rejected turning over arms to officers. Officers' functions were valid only at the front; otherwise officers and soldiers were equal citizens. Russia's defense in alliance with France and England was a necessity. Linde (a nonparty radical), the SR Iu. Kudriavtsev, and several other soldier delegates (primarily from guards units) seconded many of Klivanskii's ideas, although none referred directly to the front or Russia's defense. For example, Linde also wanted the soldiers to obey only the soviet. Kudriavtsev found sending soviet representatives into the military commission in order to control it preferable to abolishing it since "we are the power [and] we sanction." All agreed that arms should not fall under officer control, that the soldiers' soviet be empowered on soldier-oriented questions, and that soldiers enter the military commission.

Only the prickly problem of soldiers' relations with officers sparked debate. Linde wished to exclude all officers who had left their units on 27 February, whereas others countered that under those conditions few officers would remain. Klivanskii's reasonable suggestion that officers who had abused or insulted soldiers be excluded

founded on a similar objection. As one guards soldier noted, officers were needed but not their “mother dialect” (a reference to Russian profanity). Kudriavtsev emphasized elected unit committees, and one of the guards soldiers suggested accepting the officers back, but subordinating them to the elected committees. Few took seriously the idea of electing officers.

On the basis of the session’s discussion, Klivanskii then presented a draft resolution and specified that the soviet issue it as an order (*prikaz*) for maximum effect. At this point, Steklov suggested creating an ad hoc soldiers’ commission to edit a final version. Those chosen, presumably on the basis of their participation in the previous discussion, were V. Badenko, Zadorskii (i.e., A. Sadovskii), A. Paderin, A. Borisov, Shapiro, Kudriavtsev, and Linde. Of these, Sadovskii and Borisov were Mensheviks; Paderin a Bolshevik; Kudriavtsev, Shapiro, and Badenko were SRs; and Linde had no party allegiance. Although Klivanskii was not listed (probably because, although a veteran, he was not at that time a soldier), other evidence indicates his continued leading role. Preliminarily, the soviet then voted for several planks that underlay the famous order: (1) soldiers should send delegates to the soviet; (2) the military commission’s decisions would be accepted only when not in conflict with those of the soviet; (3) soldiers’ deputies should enter the military commission; and (4) arms were to be handed over to unit committees. Ultimately, the soldier commission dictated to Sokolov a final edited version.

The historians V. I. Miller, S. A. Artem’ev and John R. Boyd agree about the central role of Klivanskii’s draft in the formulation of Order No. 1. Boyd adds that “two Socialist Revolutionaries, Klivanskii and Kudriavtsev, made . . . perhaps the most substantial contributions.” The Bundist Zaslavskii, an eyewitness, recalled that “the soldiers paid the most attention to ‘Comrade Maksim’—S. A. Klivanskii” and worked out a text “at [his] suggestion.” A student activist, N. Alekseev, who attended the soviet session, described how Klivanskii prepared his text and brought it to the meeting: “It was on a long white page, already typewritten in the form of a draft with handwritten corrections by several people. Sokolov made final stylistic corrections. Klivanskii dictated several amendments to Sokolov and Steklov.” One copy was then forwarded for printing, while others were sent to Moscow and to the telegraph office. Provisional Duma committee members later complained that they were unable to suppress Order No. 1 because it had somehow been transmitted to the front. According to Sokolov, Kudriavtsev took the corrected text to a printing office for duplication. Late that evening, someone read Order No. 1 to the worker and soldier delegates, who, in Shliapnikov’s words, “listened in rapt silence.”⁸¹ Although Social Democratic and SR soldiers of varying tendencies were involved,

the civilian Klivanskii and to a somewhat lesser degree Kudriavtsev, both SRs, did the most to shape the order, which reflected general soldiers' concerns.⁸²

Order No. 1 addressed the Petrograd garrison and "all soldiers of the guard, army, artillery, and navy for immediate and strict execution," a wide casting of its net that excludes the possibility that the soviet intended it for the Petrograd garrison alone. It called for military units to elect committees at once and send representatives to the soviet. In all political matters, "the military branch is subordinated to the soviet of workers' and soldiers' deputies." Orders of the Duma military commission must be obeyed "with the exception of those instances when they contradict the orders and decrees of the soviet." Under no circumstances should arms be turned over to officers. Military discipline must be observed during duty; otherwise, soldiers have full civil rights and "standing at attention and saluting . . . are abolished." The final plank expanded on matters of address between soldiers and officers, forbidding rudeness to soldiers and providing the titles "Mister General," "Mister Colonel," rather than the former "Your Excellency," "Your Honor" and so forth.⁸³

As noted by many historians, the finished document did not espouse the election of officers; nor does the session's stenogram support the contention of some Soviet-era historians that the executive committee deleted a plank calling for officer elections (most soldiers found the idea unrealistic and it was in none of the drafts).⁸⁴ Confusion perhaps arose because of the SR-Mezhraionka leaflet with its call for officer elections. The order also failed to demand the entry of soviet delegates into the military commission, despite the support for this plank during the soviet session and its inclusion in Klivanskii's draft text. Miller plausibly suggests that the text's writers, realizing that the Duma military commission would be loathe to accept rank-and-file soldiers, instead emphasized elected unit committees and soldiers' political subordination to the soviet.⁸⁵

Although historians and other commentators have always recognized the key role of Order No. 1 in democratizing Russia's armed forces, they routinely fail to note an important aspect of its drafting. After hearing Klivanskii, Kudriavtsev, and others speak, the soldiers resolved that they would obey the military commission only when its orders did not conflict with those of the soviet. At this precise moment, the central concept of dual power—the famous "to the extent that" (*postol'ku, poskol'ku*)—attained its very first articulation. For soldiers, it meant that in political matters they would obey only the soviet; in the subsequent dual power agreements, it meant that all democracy (mass elements united by the soviets) would support the provisional government to the extent that it carried out specified (soviet approved) programs.⁸⁶ The initial resolution and final rough draft for Order No. 1 had the language "the

opinion of the military commission will be accepted to the extent that it does not conflict” with that of the soviet. The text of the preliminary resolution was published in *Izvestiia* and Order No. 1 itself, as noted above, reiterated this concept.⁸⁷

After the soldier delegates’ stunning evening labors, the executive committee provisionally co-opted (for three days, in reality permanently) ten of them into its ranks, including the Menshevik-Internationalist Sadovskii, the Menshevik Borisov, the Bolshevik Paderin, the SRs Kudriavtsev and Badenko, and several persons of no or unknown party membership (Linde, I. Barkov, Klimchinskii, the marine Sokolov, and Vakulenko. Several of these individuals had participated in the debates about Order No. 1, although, not being a soldier, the scintillating Klivanskii was not included.) It was at this point that the Petrograd Soviet became the Workers’ and Soldiers’ Soviet.⁸⁸

On the one hand, soldiers’ anger and aspirations launched and carried the entire affair.⁸⁹ On the other, the persons who drafted the document probably did not engage in pure revolutionary creativity. After all, those responsible were educated soldiers aligned with the socialist parties. Recent widespread SR-Mezhraionka and other leftist agitation helped shape their thinking, as did party meetings and conversations among like-minded individuals. Already by 28 February, Bolshevik and SR fractional meetings gathered in the Tauride (presumably the Mensheviks also did not tarry) and interparty blocks continued to operate. The parties would have begun to orient themselves about this issue that so mesmerized Petrograd soldiers.⁹⁰ Every nook, cranny, and hallway of the Tauride buzzed with endless conversation far into the night each night. One can reasonably surmise that the set of ideas that found its way into Order No. 1 reflected the rise of a general socialist orientation toward the military and toward political power. Another possibility is that by a kind of serendipity the soldiers, in striving to solve their problems, actually created a formula that highly placed observers then saw as a way out of the political impasse they all faced. Without new evidence, the existence of which is by this time doubtful, we may never know.

In any case, the political resonance of the order was broad and profound. When soldiers politically subordinated themselves to the soviet, the moderate government found itself in a position that perforce it had to yield to the soviet on major questions. Hegemonic political ambitions of both soviet and government aside, the dual power compromise gave birth de facto to unequal power sharing: the Petrograd Soviet had the backing of soldiers with guns and the Provisional Government did not. Without Order No. 1’s political subordination of soldiers to the soviets rather than to the Duma military commission, most soldiers and workers would probably

never have accepted the dual power arrangement in the first place. The famous order created the formula that underlay dual power in its inception and, simultaneously, enabled the operation of dual power thereafter. This arrangement, by which Russia emerged from the revolutionary crisis intact, contained the seeds of future moderate/radical conflict.

Solving the Power Question: Dual Power

Even as the soviet worked toward the democratization (indeed radicalization) of the Russian military and, in a sense, Russia as a whole, the executive committee was carrying on feverish negotiations with the Duma committee about the joint questions of power and the construction of a government. Most active for the executive committee were Sukhanov and Steklov, whereas Miliukov, Rodzianko, and Guchkov spoke for the Duma side, with Kerensky and Chkheidze balancing somewhere between. The story of the tension-filled meetings that lasted deep into the night and the early morning of 2 March, interrupted by occasional outbursts of Guchkov's fury or Kerensky's hysteria, has been told and retold by memoirists and histories, leaving little to add here.⁹¹ The end result was the agreement to create a Provisional Government that consisted of Duma leaders, an arrangement that would receive support from the soviet under certain conditions. The Duma committee offered positions in the new government to Kerensky and Chkheidze (minister of justice and labor respectively) and at first insisted that socialists enter as a prerequisite for reaching agreement (the Octobrists and Constitutional-Democrats evidently wished to enhance the government's credibility by including socialists). Kerensky asked some of his acquaintances (Sukhanov and Mstislavskii) what he should do but received little help from them.⁹²

Meanwhile, the executive committee itself was holding ongoing sessions to decide what to do. One of the principal lines of debate revolved around whether or not socialists from the soviet should enter the government. Although some evidence suggests that the Right Menshevik Organizational Committee, most of whose members initially opposed entry, now swung behind the concept, thus joining the pro-entry Bundists and moderate populists such as Zenzinov and Peshekhonov, the majority of the executive committee firmly opposed sending socialists into the bourgeois government.⁹³ They wished the government to be bourgeois for ideological and practical reasons and did not wish to associate socialism directly with it. Finally, of

course, Kerensky decided to enter as minister of justice on his own initiative, albeit not without some quiet support from moderate socialists.

All of this is wellknown and uncontroversial. More troublesome is the question of whether or not the left socialists raised the issue of soviet and/or socialist power at the executive committee's sessions on 1 March (as we have seen, they failed to do so on prior days). Shliapnikov claims that of the thirty members of the executive committee, only eight, including himself and several other Bolsheviks such as Paderin, Molotov, Zalutskii, the Left SR Aleksandrovich, the Mezhraionka Iurenev and the Left Menshevik soldier Sadovskii "stood for the power of revolutionary democracy itself." He also insisted that the Bolsheviks agreed upon and advocated a nonbourgeois peoples' government in opposition to the Menshevik-SR plan "to carry out the demands of the workers and peasants through the bourgeoisie."⁹⁴

This may be the case, as it is also the case that the Left SRs and the Mezhraionka wanted a soviet-based government. But did they defend this idea in the executive committee? Neither Shliapnikov nor other sources provide any sense of an executive committee debate along these lines. Sukhanov noted that no minutes of the executive committee's 1 March sessions were kept. According to his recollections, although the "left wing of the soviet, its Bolshevik and SR members, occupied a position [against a bourgeois government], . . . their representatives in the executive committee . . . did not even think of engaging in any real struggle for their principles." Sukhanov specifically recalled the presence of Molotov, Zalutskii, and Shliapnikov but insisted that "as far as I remember not one voice was raised against [a propertied regime] on behalf of a democratic regime."⁹⁵ As noted earlier, Sukhanov believed that leftists like Aleksandrovich and Shliapnikov were simply incapable of articulating their ideas. Whether this or some other reason accounted for their apparent continued reticence remains an open question.

In the final analysis, the agreement reached between the executive committee and the Duma committee allowed the Duma committee to form the government which would then function with the soviet's support. Joint Duma committee-soviet proclamations delineated the program that the executive committee had insisted upon and to which the Duma committee had acquiesced. The three major points of the program were: full political rights, full political amnesty, and a timely convocation of the constituent assembly. In order to mollify the soviet side in its concerns about the new government's sincerity, the Duma committee added an explanation that "it [had] not the slightest intention of taking advantage of the military situation to delay in any way the realization of the reforms and the measures outlined above." The executive committee's parallel announcement also outlined the expected reforms and

then stated that “to the extent that as the emergent government acts in the direction of realizing these obligations and of struggling resolutely against the old regime, the democracy must lend its support.”⁹⁶ Thus the concept of conditional support (“to the extent that”), which first arose among the soldiers in the soviet on 1 March in connection with the formulation of Order No. 1, now, on 2 March, entered the official agreements that created the Provisional Government.

The final hurdle to be overcome in creating the government was in having the plenum of the soviet (2 March) approve the agreement. On this matter, the pro-Provisional Government majority in the executive committee had definite fears. Sukhanov believed that if the Bolshevik and Left SR groups “had taken the struggle to the streets . . . it would have been extremely hard if not impossible to overcome [the] movement.”⁹⁷ Naturally, Order No. 1 unpleasantly shocked the Duma committee. Even so, on the morning of 2 March, just as final governmental agreements were being worked out, a Mezhraionka-SR leaflet (this was either the 1 March leaflet reproduced above or another one of similar cast) also came to the attention of persons in the Tauride Palace.

The furor over this leaflet reached almost comic proportions. Zenzinov recalled how at about 6 a.m. on the second Boris Flekkel, a prominent Petrograd SR, labor activist of long standing, and defensist *intelligent*, ran up with the sheet and, almost in tears, yelled, “Read it! Read it!” After doing so, Zenzinov confronted Aleksandrovich and then dashed off to tell Kerensky, who flew into a rage. “Pounding the table, he accused the authors . . . of provocation . . . and threatened the culprits with all sorts of punishment,” recalled Sukhanov. The executive committee promptly forbade the distribution of the leaflet and confiscated several stacks already in the Tauride, while Molotov, who was guarding them and who at first tried to protest, watched in amazement. Still, it was too late; copies had already gone out into the city. In the soviet later that day, Chkheidze bitterly criticized the proclamation and advised the soldiers “not to obey orders from agents of the old government,” a gratuitous insult for which Aleksandrovich and Iurenev demanded and got an apology.⁹⁸

The alarm caused by this incident reflected, of course, the moderate socialists’ uncertainty about how the soviet would respond to their sponsoring a bourgeois provisional government. The SR-Mezhraionka leaflet threatened to “take the struggle to the streets.” The soviet itself, after all, had just voted on the previous evening for provisions that called for soldiers to obey only the soviet in political matters. How would they respond to the turning over of power to a bourgeois government?

The soviet session started at 2 p.m.⁹⁹ As the executive committee’s spokesperson, Steklov made the case for accepting the bourgeois-oriented provisional government

“under the control and surveillance of the revolutionary *narod*.” Although using militant terms, he nonetheless warned about the danger, on the one hand, of excesses from “our leftist movements” and, on the other, from potential counterrevolutionary forces. The situation, he argued, required a government from Duma elements to ensure support from necessary segments of society (he emphasized the officers). The executive committee had voted, he added, by a two-thirds majority not to enter such a government in order not to burden worker representatives with responsibility for the government’s “prospective internal and external policies.” Steklov emphasized the “colossal victory” the executive committee negotiators had won from Miliukov and the Duma committee by winning the appointment of “progressive” ministers to important posts and placing as a condition of soviet support the government’s establishment of political freedom in Russia. Immediately thereafter, Kerensky made his famous melodramatic speech (“Do you trust me? I am prepared to die right before your eyes!”) in which he explained his decision to enter the government.

These assurances notwithstanding, many speakers of the long list who addressed the soviet that day expressed concern about the provisional government’s makeup or even called for its rejection in favor of a “provisional revolutionary government” based upon the soviet or directly upon revolutionary workers and soldiers. For the first time in the soviet’s existence, Bolsheviks began to express themselves. Early in the debate, Zalutskii (Petrov) questioned the wisdom of turning the government over to “other classes.” This was not a “revolutionary provisional government in the name of the people” and it would achieve nothing on the land question or the eight-hour day. Molotov insisted that a government consisting of Guchkov, Kononov, and Rodzianko was not revolutionary: it would “ridicule the people” and “instead of land give the peasant stone.” I. Uliantsev stated briefly that “he had been authorized by Kronshatdt” to state that a “provisional revolutionary government be formed from the soviet of workers’ deputies.” However, no unanimity prevailed among Bolshevik speakers that day. Shliapnikov wished merely to demand of the existing government that it introduce a democratic republic, the eight-hour day, and elections in the armed forces, whereas Shutko cautioned against objecting to the new government in the current threatening situation.

The Mezhraionka leader Iurenev criticized Kerensky for “careerism,” doubted that workers, soldiers, and peasants would achieve anything from a government including Guchkov, and wanted a “united front against the provisional government.” A certain Gribkov (party unknown) found the soviet’s situation “sad”: with the monarchy barely overthrown, it was faced with the “fact of the provisional government,” as a result of which, he correctly prognosticated, a prolonged struggle stood ahead.

Smirnov (party also unknown) noted that Kerensky's entrance into the government did not reassure many "comrades," as a result of which he recommended that the soviet elect a "people's committee" to maintain "close watch" over the government's activities. The worker-SR Voronkov (a Vyborg delegate to the Petrograd Soviet throughout 1917) echoed this concept when he stated that "a full revolution was imaginable only with real force [behind it to act] as guardian." Several other speakers doubted the intentions of the new government but placed their hopes in a future Constituent Assembly.

Other known socialists, the already mentioned Steklov and Kerensky plus Kantorovich, Krasikov, Ermanskii, and Zaslavskii, spoke with various nuances in favor of the executive committee's actions regarding the provisional government. Most participants seemed resigned to, if not enthusiastic about, the executive committee's approach. In the end, only fourteen of over four hundred delegates present voted against the executive committee's resolution. A counterresolution, allegedly entered by the Bolsheviks but probably reflecting the left socialist coalition, failed overwhelmingly, garnering only the votes of several Bolshevik and a few others. The lack of party identification for many speakers complicates the question of party input into the debate. Prominent Social Democrats of various tendencies were especially well represented in the discussion, whereas only Kerensky and Voronkov spoke from among identifiable SRs. The Bolshevik debut during this session ended their virtual silence up till now in the soviet and in the early activities that swirled around the soviet. The SR-Mezhraionka block led by Iurenev and Aleksandrovich had displayed great activism, especially in the issuing of leaflets, attracting both negative and positive attention. Middle-level SRs had led the way as regards Order No. 1. Specific traceable Bolshevik activities or accomplishments were as yet limited. As regards Bolshevik speeches at the 2 March soviet session, Soviet-era studies exaggerated their articulateness and unanimity and thus overestimated the early Bolshevik role in promoting a soviet-based revolutionary government, an idea quite closely associated at the time with the SR-Mezhraionka block.¹⁰⁰ Nonetheless, the Bolsheviks had now made their appearance and would soon be heard from again.

The voting results belied the worry shown by the moderates on the executive committee. Yet, incontrovertibly, the soviet itself had worked out a program the previous day that had pointed more at soviet power than at bourgeois power. As *Izvestiia's* report on the 1 March session had described the matter, "the soviet . . . showed a tendency to reject all cooperation with the Duma committee and to demand the formation of a provisional government [from its own ranks]."¹⁰¹ Indubitably, if the executive committee had come out for soviet power, then the soviet would have

fallen into line, as suggested by the lack of enthusiasm most speakers showed for the liberal-oriented provisional government. This is what Sukhanov and others meant when they spoke of the “Bolshevik-[Left] SR” potential for stirring up opposition to bourgeois power. This “tendency” did not show up in the voting because the soviet’s socialist leadership, that is, the executive committee, advised against it. In any case, as future events would soon reveal, workers, soldiers, and peasants took seriously the idea of “control” over the provisional government, by which they meant much more than mere oversight, and were quite willing to withdraw their support if the government violated their conception of its authority.

Regardless, an agreement had been reached between Duma-oriented liberal and progressive forces on the one hand and the soviet-oriented socialists on the other. In theory, this alliance covered most of the empire’s broad social groups, to the exclusion only of conservative noble, military, and bureaucratic circles. On this basis, a government arose along lines wellknown to historiography. The government itself would be liberal oriented or bourgeois, whereas the soviets that organized and represented democracy would support and exercise control over the government. This arrangement came to be known as dual power, although the source of power was in the soviets, whereas the government’s share was vicarious.¹⁰² By agreement, the new government would last only until the Constituent Assembly that it pledged to convene with dispatch. Thus the title “Provisional Government” (*Vremennoe Pravitel’stvo*), the better translation of which is “Temporary Government.”

By the next day (3 March), the soviet and its executive committee began more or less routine functioning in a new revolutionary situation. The executive committee reconstituted its various committees, largely affirming the ones already created, with some additions or shifts of personnel. Of twenty-six assignments to eleven committees, very few went to Bolsheviks or SRs. For the SRs—Aleksandrovich went to the committee on publishing and printing and Sviatitskii to the committee for railroads and telegraph; Bramson, a Popular Socialist, was assigned to the finance committee. Of the Bolsheviks, Shliapnikov served on the agitational committee. Several of the moderate Social Democrats—Erich, E. Sokolovskii, Iu. Steklov, Sukhanov, Kapelinskii, and Gvozd’ev—had multiple assignments (Gvozd’ev had three). By this time, the executive committee had roughly ten each of Bolsheviks and SRs (plus Popular Socialists), none of whom played a great role in the soviet leadership, which was dominated by the left-centrist and moderate Social Democrats who roughly equaled the other two groups together. At least some of the SRs in the executive committee, most notably Kerensky and Zenzinov, took little interest in the soviet’s affairs, which explains their absence. Other prominent SRs, such as

Mstislavskii and Filippovskii, were fulfilling vital tasks elsewhere and had not yet been invited onto the executive committee. Filippovskii entered a few days later as representative of the military commission. Still, as new committees arose over the next week or so, assignments occurred on the same disproportionate basis, that is, roughly three or four moderate or centrist Social Democrats for every SR, Popular Socialist, or Bolshevik.¹⁰³ The major factor seems to have been a deliberate selection process exercised by the executive committee's largest group.

A somewhat deceptive normalcy now prevailed. A citywide SR conference on 2 March gave full support to the Provisional Government, over the vociferous objections, of leftists from worker, soldier, and student circles.¹⁰⁴ After some internal clashes, the Petrograd Bolsheviks also lined up behind the dual power arrangement. On 5 March, the Bolshevik Petrograd Committee reaffirmed its decision of 3 March “not to oppose the power of the Provisional Government to the extent that [*postol'ku, poskol'ku*] its actions are consonant with the interests of the proletariat and the broadest democratic masses.”¹⁰⁵ The stunning fact of the fall of the tsarist regime had now become a reality in everyone's minds. All were working together for the common cause of building a new, more just Russia. The period of euphoria had set in to run its brief course.

Conclusion: From the Head of Zeus Fully Armed

In ancient Greek mythology, Pallas Athena sprang from the head of Zeus fully armed. Athena was the goddess of war and of handicrafts, appropriate metaphors for the soldiers and workers who made the February Revolution. This, however, is not the image's principal force. The new central revolutionary organization—the Petrograd Soviet—that arose on 27 February took shape with breathtaking speed and virtually inexorable power. That very evening, through its military commission, it set up defenses for the Tauride and the city and made great strides in taking control of the capital's garrisons and vast number of soldiers, many tens of thousands of whom were in the streets. It had also garnered virtually unlimited support from Petrograd's enormous worker cadres and much of the city's intelligentsia. This did not all go smoothly—what occurred was a genuine revolution, not a coup d'état. Still, by evening of the twenty-seventh no force within the city and environs could stand against the soviet and its socialist leaders. The revolutionary soviet indubitably emerged fully armed.

That the soviet (and the socialists in and around it) had the upper hand over the State Duma, not to mention the conservative elements of imperial society, is hardly a discovery. Differences arise, however, about how this is evaluated. The predominant analytical tendencies, revolving as they do around degrees of anonymity, spontaneity, and formlessness (even when they premise the leadership of lower- or middle-level activists), cannot really hope to explain the quickness and power of the Petrograd Soviet's rise and move to effective action. In such accounts, these become essentially mystical events. Katkov long ago noted that theories of the February Revolution's spontaneity concealed an inability to explain what happened. He also noted, with equal acuteness, that the notion of February's spontaneity arose from early Soviet historiography. Unable to place the Bolsheviks at the vanguard center of the revolutionary phenomena (until Stalinist historiography simply asserted what evidence could not prove), early Soviet historians just interpreted the events as spontaneous. At that point, Katkov's iron calculus descended into paranoid fantasy, a matter that need not detain us. Other historians have also edged close to the reality and then, almost inexplicably, backed off. A case in point is Hasegawa's idea that revolutionary agency resided with middle-level activists in factories and other institutions, whereas, in his view, the leading intelligentsia of Petrograd's socialist movement was cut off, fractious, and impotent. This semi-reestablishment of agency to some degree aligned itself with post-Stalin Soviet accounts that also gave the nod primarily, but not exclusively, to Bolshevik activists. The historical record does not support Bolshevik primacy at the middle or lower levels of activism. Nor does it confirm the clueless impotence of Petrograd socialism's leadership cadres (readers may recall, as one instance of a much broader reality to which readily available evidence testifies, the mid-February police report about the Trudovik Duma fraction's outlooks and plans).

Another case in point occurs when Wildman notes, as do other accounts, that the Petrograd Soviet executive committee of late 27 February closely reflected the Provisional Committee of the Petrograd Soviet that had established itself in Room 13 at around 3 p.m. earlier that day. Crucially, commentators routinely fail to extend this line of factual analysis back any further. After all, if the connection between the Provisional Committee and the eventual Executive Committee is worth noting, why not carry the institutional connection back to its pre-27 February origins? The Provisional Committee hardly represented an accidental collection of socialists who somehow rode the revolutionary wave into the revolution's headquarters. In fact, it precisely replicated the all-socialist group that had been meeting together and laying plans for revolution since before mid-February and which had held its last gathering

the previous evening (26 February). This is historical continuity of the first water. As for historians, having mysteriously subtracted the revolutionary leaders from the process's starting point and then equally mysteriously injected them back into the process's end point, they proclaim the events "leaderless" and "spontaneous." The leaders were there the whole time, lending a degree of organization and guidance not significantly different from that in most revolutions.¹⁰⁶ History writing is about establishing continuities or discontinuities; where evidence of continuities exists, it must be noted and evaluated.

Why are historians so resistant to recognizing the ongoing joint activities and ultimate revolutionary agency of socialist leaders? The whole question is admittedly complicated by the fact that these leaders disagreed about how they wanted the impending revolution to turn out. Consequently, when historians tune in to various intersocialist meetings during February, they in effect hear right and left socialists arguing about impending developments and occupying opposing positions. Understandably, they conclude that these disputatious Petrograd socialists—the elites of both the public and underground socialist organizations—had no real connection to the gathering revolution. Historians miss the reality that both right and left socialists, although marching to somewhat different drummers, entered into direct contact with mass social groups as they all moved toward revolution. By 25 February, the socialists were also aiming at summoning the Petrograd Soviet, although they disagreed about timing. When the soviet arose under their leadership and, furthermore, made the revolution real by beginning to control events, the socialists again argued about the soviet's status and the immediate outcome of the revolution. The right socialists held an advantage and, reluctantly, the left socialists, for the time being, yielded to political *force majeure*. The leaders' fractiousness did not cancel their revolutionary agency or, in a revolutionary sense, statesmanship. Not for the last time, one or the other side conceded the point to the stronger in order to preserve the overall accomplishment and promote further common goals. We need to overcome our inertial assumptions that if anyone was organized, it was the Bolsheviks, and that the arguments of top socialist leaders, mostly in the emigration, can be taken as a synecdoche for the revolutionary movement as a whole.

The "logical developments," noted by Wildman but not followed up on in most histories, reflected long- and short- term socialist involvement in, and leadership of, the workers and revolutionary movements. If Pallas Athena is the Petrograd Soviet (as embodiment of the revolution), who is Zeus? Zeus of course is Russia's fabled revolutionary movement in all its aspects going back, broadly, to the first half of the nineteenth century and, narrowly, in its early twentieth- century guise. The image is

not strained when one considers the hallowed status of the revolutionary movement among Russian workers, peasants, and intelligentsia. The revolutionary movement had a history of ideologies, strivings, accomplishments, disputes, and failures, including the rise and fall, under socialist auspices, of the 1905 soviets. The idea of the soviets had become an agitational icon for the future struggle. The Petrograd Soviet's birth and earliest steps recapture and recapitulate this history in a classic dialectic in which power is no longer strived for but exercised.

Bearing directly on this is the formulation of Order No. 1 by socialist soldiers. Imbued with the Russian revolutionary movement's yearnings and expectations for democratized Russia, and almost certainly responding to approaches being worked out by joint socialist leaders, the soldiers forged an approach that had the power to guarantee democracy's primacy within a temporary political compromise with Russia's middle classes, no mean feat. An outright socialist versus liberal clash did not take place at that point solely because of this arrangement. What the socialists had yielded, that is, control of the military commission and therefore of the military, they partially but very substantially took back in terms of political control over soldiers, a fateful turn of events in a revolutionary situation. In any case, since our historiography has missed the element of continuity within the leadership group that summoned, organized, and led the Petrograd Soviet and has failed to register who originated the dual power formula, it can lay no claim to having settled the primary pertinent issues of the February Revolution. In this case, historians are missing the links and significances that are the very stuff of historical analysis and understanding.

In every respect, the February Revolution represented a profound embodiment of the revolutionary movement. The developments recounted here precisely draw the relationship among the various socialist groups. Socialists and liberals wanted to overthrow the tsarist regime. Socialists, however, did not agree about what should replace that regime. Nor did they agree about whether or not democracy, in that Russian sense signifying the *narod* (the people), required cooperation with Russia's middle classes. The outcome of the February Revolution, a soviet that commanded the total loyalty of workers, soldiers, and most of the intelligentsia, reflected revolutionary socialist outlooks, as did Order No. 1. The transfer of formal control of the military and the sharing of power with the Provisional Government represented exactly the disagreements among the socialist groups. If there had been no moderate socialist leadership, with its Duma fame and activism in workers' and intelligentsia arenas, the February Revolution would have yielded much more radical results. If a powerful leftist socialism, with worker-soldier support, had not been in a position to flex its muscles, Russia would have launched a full-scale liberal experiment in

government. If right and left socialists had not preserved the ability, long hallowed in revolutionary practice, to work together and even to reach out to liberals, real chaos might have ensued.¹⁰⁷ That it did not is an important legacy of the socialist leadership prior to and during the February Revolution.¹⁰⁸ The actual result in this case, a compromise on all sides, reproduced a perceived balance of forces among the various social groups and their representatives. The issue is not whether or not these results were in some way optimal (opinions might vary according to political point of view), the issue is to characterize accurately and explain the results. The fully armed soviet stood ready to defend the people's cause, and a liberal-oriented temporary government got its brief chance to show what it could do.

GLOSSARY

Persons

Aleksandrovich, P.	Worker SR and leader of party underground, future Left SR leader
Berezin, M.	Trudovik дума deputy
Broido, G.	Moderate Menshevik, War-Industries Committee worker's group activist
Charnoluskii, V.	Leader of Popular Socialist Party
Chkheidze, Nikolai	Georgian Menshevik, дума deputy, chair of Petrograd Soviet
Ermanskii, O.	Leader of Left Menshevik Initiative Group
Flekkel, B.	SR intellectual, labor activist, close associate of Kerensky's
Gorkii, M.	Author, Social-Democrat, usually aligned with leftist Mensheviks
Grinevich, K.	Menshevik leader of leftist tendency
Guchkov, A.	Industrial entrepreneur, founder and leader of Octobrist Party, Дума leader, as member of Provisional Дума Committee accepted Nicholas II's abdication
Gvozd'ev, K.	Right-wing Menshevik, War-Industries Committee workers' group leader
Iurenev, I.	leftist Social Democrat, close to Bolsheviks and Left SRs, leader of the Mezhraionka
Ivanov, General N.	Commander of the south-west front, appointed on 27 February as commander of Petrograd Military Region, joined attempt to overthrow revolution, arrested by railroad workers
Kapelinskii, N.	Left Menshevik, worker cooperative activist and leader
Kantorovich, V.	Bundist activist, writer

Kerensky, Alexander	Labor advocate, Duma deputy, head of Trudovik fraction, Provisional Government minister, later head of Provisional Government
Konovalov, A.	Business leader, Duma member and leader, War-Industries Committee leader, aligned with Constitutional Democratic Party and entered party in 1917
Khrustalov-Nosar', G.	Assistant advocate, Social-Democrat, briefly chair of 1905 Petersburg Soviet, left party in 1909, later of tarnished reputation
Miliukov, Pavel	Historian, leader of Constitutional Democratic Party, influential member and minister of foreign affairs in early Provisional Government,
Molotov, V.	Bolshevik leader in Petrograd, later prominent Soviet-era government figure
Mstislavskii, S.	Leftist SR, future Left SR leader, former colonel
Peshekhonov, A.	Writer, statistician, leader of Popular Socialist Party
Rafes, M.	Moderate Bundist leader
Rodzianko, M.	Son of landowner, government official, Octobrist, chair of Fourth State Duma, head of Provisional Duma Committee
Shidlovskii, S.	Landowner, Octobrist, Duma deputy, member of Provisional Duma Committee
Shliapnikov, A.	Worker Bolshevik, prominent figure in early Soviet Communist Party and workers' movement
Shul'gin, V.	Duma deputy, head of Nationalist Party, member of Provisional Duma Committee
Skobolev, M.	Moderate Menshevik, minister of labor in Provisional Government
Sokolov, N.	Centrist Social Democrat, advocate

Somov, A.	Moderate SR and Trudovik, member of Petrograd Soviet's soldiers' commission, close associate of Kerensky
Steklov, Iu.	Revolutionary activist, leftist Social Democrat close to Bolsheviks, Petrograd Soviet leader, organizer and editor of <i>Izvestiia</i>
Sukhanov, N.	Journalist, socialist activist (SR, later left Menshevik), writer of famous first-hand account of the revolution
Sviatitskii, N.	Centrist SR
Tarasov-Rodionov, A.	Writer, Bolshevik
Zalutskii, P.	Bolshevik activist
Zaslavskii, D.	Writer, Bundist, Petrograd Soviet activist
Zenzinov, V.	SR central committee member, moderate, close to Kerensky Znamenskii, S. Trudovik

Institutions, Parties, Places, etc.

Admiralty	Naval headquarters near Nevskii River in central Petrograd
Aivaz	Factory in Vyborg District
Baku	Capital of Azerbaizhan in the Caucasus, now an independent country
Bolshevik Party	Leninist wing of Social Democracy, later Communist Party
Bund	Jewish organization within Social Democracy, usually aligned with Mensheviks
Cadets	Shortened name for Constitutional Democrats
City Duma	Elected city council
Constituent Assembly	An institution espoused by all reformist and radical groups in Russia to be elected and charged with writing a new constitution

Constitutional Democratic Party	Main liberal party, active in Duma, supporter of Provisional Government
Cooperatives	Networks of rural and urban consumer cooperatives thrived after 1906, served as sites of revolutionary activities, united by city-wide associations; district cooperative headquarters served as local revolutionary headquarters during revolutionary disturbances
Council of Elders	Body within the Duma legally allowed to meet even when the Duma was prorogued
Factory committees	Worker leaders elected within individual factories
Finland Station	Railroad station leading to the northeast, located in the working class Vyborg District
Guards Regiments (Finlandskii, Izmailovskii, Preobrazhenskii, Semenovskii, Volynskii) etc.	Elite regiments with barracks in the military complex near the Tauride Palace
Izvestiia	Newspaper of the Petrograd Soviet the first issue of which appeared on 28 February 1917
Izvestiia	News sheet issued by Petrograd journalists on 27 February 1917
Liquidators	Term Lenin applied to moderate Social Democrats who wanted to “liquidate” the underground party organizations
Menshevik Party	Wing of Russian Social Democracy, usually less radical than the Bolsheviks
Mezhraionka	Social Democrats of leftist persuasion who wanted to unite leftist Mensheviks and Bolsheviks into one party
Nevskii Prospekt	Main thoroughfare in central Petrograd
Octobrist Party	Moderate liberals, active in State Dumas

Petrovsk-Fortress	Naval fortress, later prison, on Neva River opposite the city center
Putilov plant	Enormous military-oriented factory on outskirts of Petrograd
Popular Socialist Party	Moderate group that broke off from SR Party, active in Duma
RSDRP	Initials of Russian Social Democratic Workers Party, used by all branches
Skorokhod plant	Shoemaking factory in outlying Moskovskii District
Social Democratic Party	Generic term for Russian Marxist groups
Socialist Revolutionary (SR) Party	Neo-Populist party, descended from earlier Land and Freedom and People's Will parties, with large following during 1917
State Duma	Elected legislative body founded in 1906, based on unequal and indirect suffrage, undertook serious legislation during third and fourth sessions
Tauride Palace	Original home of Prince Potemkin, located near guards regiments' military complex, seat of State Duma, in February 1917 became site of early Petrograd Soviet
Trudovik Party	SR-aligned peasant-oriented party in the Duma, led by Kerensky
Tsarskoe Selo	Tsarist palace near Petrograd
War-Industries Committees	Organization of bankers and industrialists that arose in 1915 to aid lagging Russian war production
Workers' Groups of the War-Industries Committees	Created to give workers a voice and thus to encourage their cooperation in war production; leftist workers and parties opposed worker participation in them

Vyborg District

Industrial and working-class district across the Neva River from the city center, site of Finland Station, which leftist socialists promoted as potential home of the first Petrograd Soviet

Zemstvo-City Union

Volunteer organization founded by zemstvos (rural elected councils) and city dumas to aide Russian war effort; established network of dining halls, clinics, hospitals, and convalescent homes behind the front

NOTES

1. Allan K. Wildman, *The End of the Russian Imperial Army: The Old Army and the Soldiers' Revolt, March–April 1917* (Princeton, 1980), 167.

2. William Chamberlin, *The Russian Revolution, 1917–1921*, 2 vols. (1935; rpt., Princeton, 1987); Oliver Radkey, *The Agrarian Foes of Bolshevism: Promise and Default of the Russian Socialist Revolutionaries, February to October, 1917* (New York, 1958); Alexander Rabinowitch, *Prelude to Revolution: The Petrograd Bolsheviks and the July 1917 Uprising* (Bloomington, Ind., 1968); Rex Wade, *The Russian Search for Peace, February–October 1917* (Stanford, 1969) and *The Russian Revolution, 1917*, 2d. ed. (Cambridge, 2005); Ziva Galili, *The Menshevik Leaders in the Russian Revolution: Social Realities and Political Strategies* (Princeton, 1989); Richard Pipes, *The Russian Revolution* (New York, 1990).

3. This and many following notes contain significant analysis and interpretation that would overburden the text if placed there. See George Katkov, *Russia 1917: The February Revolution* (New York, 1967); E. N. Burdzhalov, *Vtoriaia russkaia revoliutsiia: Vosstanie v Petrograde* (Moscow, 1969), translated by Donald J. Raleigh as *Russia's Second Revolution: The February 1917 Uprising in Petrograd* (Bloomington, Ind., 1987); G. I. Zlokazov, *Petrogradskii sovet rabochikh i soldatskikh deputatov v period mirnogo razvitiia revoliutsii (fevral'–iiun' 1917 g.* (Moscow, 1969); Marc Ferro, *The Russian Revolution of February 1917* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1972), transl. of 1967 original French version; O. Anweiler, *The Soviets: The Russian Workers, Peasant, and Soldiers Councils, 1905–1921* (New York, 1974); Iurii S. Tokarev, *Petrogradskii sovet rabochikh i soldatskikh deputatov v marte–aprele 1917 g.* (Leningrad, 1976); Wildman, *End of the Russian Imperial Army*. Because of these studies' various analytical priorities, one must sometimes consult various chapters to locate full discussions of issues raised here consecutively. Tsuyoshi Hasegawa's magisterial *The February Revolution: Petrograd, 1917* (Seattle, 1981) brings a formidable array of data to bear on the February Revolution and can be consulted with profit on virtually all the issues covered in this study. Still, his dim view of the Petrograd socialist leadership prevents him from highlighting significant aspects of the Petrograd Soviet's inception and earliest activities.

4. M. Melancon, *Rethinking Russia's February Revolution: Anonymous Spontaneity or Socialist Agency?*, The Carl Beck Papers 1408 (Pittsburgh, Pa., June 2000).

5. Among the very few recent studies are A. B. Nikolaev, *Gosudarstvennaia дума v Fevral'skoi revoliutsii: ocherki istorii* (Riazan, 2002); and several articles by Semion Lyandres: "Protokol'naia zapis' 'chastnogo' soveshchaniia chlenov Gosudarstvennoi dumy 27 fevralia 1917 g. kak istochnik po istorii parlamentarizma v Rossii," in *Istoriia parlamentarizma v Rossii (k 90-letiiu i Gosudarstvennoi dumy): sb. nauch. st.* (St. Petersburg, 1996); "Zur Errichtung der revolutionaeren Macht in Petrograd: Neue Dokumente ueber die inoffizielle Beratung von Mitgliedern der Staatsduma am 27.2.1917," *Berliner Jarhbuch fuer osteuropaeische Geschichte* (Berlin), 4 (1997): 305–324; and "On the Problem of 'Indecisiveness' among Duma Leaders during the February Revolution: the Imperial Decree of Prorogation and the Decision to Convene the Private Meeting, February 27, 1917," *The Soviet and Post-Soviet Review* 24, nos. 1–2 (1997): 115–127. These

studies concentrate on the State Duma, a necessary but quite different emphasis than mine. One of Nikolaev's chapter titles, "The State Duma: Center of the Revolution and Headquarters of the Uprising," suggests an estimation of the Duma's direct revolutionary significance at odds with this and most other studies. Nikolaev's vast control of sources and interpretations does not always extend to themes beyond his area of expertise. For example, he attributes to the Bolsheviks the joint left socialist plan to have the Petrograd Soviet gather at the Finland Station rather than the Tauride Palace (39), a slip that suggests an outdated approach to the role of the parties.

6. Readers unfamiliar with the many people and locations appearing in this account may consult the glossary for brief identifications.

7. For a reprise of this discussion, see Melancon, "Rethinking Russia's February Revolution."

8. The February Revolution's relative degree of spontaneity or leadership differs from the spontaneity-consciousness paradigm often utilized for analysis of aspects of party-worker life pre- and post-1917. The latter received renewed attention from Anna Krylova (with responses by Reginald Zelnik and Igor Halfin) in *Slavic Review* no. 1 (Spring 2003): 1–40; and in Lars Lih, *Lenin Rediscovered: "What Is To Be Done"?* In *Context* (Leiden, 2006). Reading these intricate commentaries reminds one that, as a tactical necessity, Lenin and other Russian Marxists utilized the spontaneity versus consciousness paradigm to interpret often unpredictable worker behavior (a hermeneutics of the proletariat), whereas, for historiographical purposes, historians have gradually transformed the discussion into a hermeneutics of Bolshevism and Leninism. Neither has direct bearing on the February Revolution, the appropriate analytical paradigm for which is not worker spontaneity/consciousness but rather, as a practical measure, relative spontaneity of mass action (workers, students, soldiers, and activists) versus direct leadership by socialist elites. Interpretations of the February Revolution now spread along the entire spontaneity-leadership continuum, rendering the terms virtually inutile. As regards a specific set of events (Russia, February 1917), readers are advised (1) to consider degrees of unguided mass action versus degrees of direct leadership, and (2) to recall that no one now asserts either a pure worker/soldier mass uprising or a group of leaders sitting in a room somewhere drafting blueprints for a revolution. On the spontaneity-leadership question, Tsuyoshi Hasegawa has commented that "the debate . . . is far from settled"; see his "The February Revolution," in *Critical Companion to the Russian Revolution*, comp. and ed. Edward Acton, Vladimir Cherniaev, and William Rosenberg (London, 1997), 32–33.

9. Michael Melancon, *The Socialist Revolutionaries and the Russian Anti-War Movement, 1914–1917* (Columbus, Ohio, 1990) and "Rethinking Russia's February Revolution." The current study and its predecessors arise out of a career-long master project about the Socialist-Revolutionaries' role in Russia's revolutionary era. In this regard, it aligns itself with recent studies that have begun to redress imbalances in earlier histories of the revolutions that tended to revolve around Social-Democratic and Bolshevik data, analysis, and problematics.

10. The most recent edition of Rex Wade's widely respected history of 1917 states that the "long-awaited revolution had come swiftly, arising out of strikes and popular demonstrations and without apparent preparation or leaders" and, as regards agency, notes only "the collective

actions of the industrial workers and then of the soldier[s] . . . guided by factory-level activists and non-commissioned officers and supported by the general population” (Wade, *Russian Revolution*, 42). This approach differs from that of Hasegawa and some Western and late Soviet historians in that it weighs in even more heavily on the side of spontaneity than they do and provides no primacy among activists to the Bolsheviks. As regards Bolshevik primacy, J. D. White’s crisp overview, *The Russian Revolution, 1917–1921: A Short History* (London, 1994), 66–77, lays out the February Revolution’s active phase almost entirely against the backdrop of Bolshevik leaders and groups. Above mentioned studies by Nikolaev and Lyandres are examples of recent studies of the February Revolution that do not touch on its origins or onset. For innovative regional studies of the revolutionary process that premise the February Revolution in the capital without taking any position on its nature, see Aaron Retish, *Russia’s Peasants in Revolution and Civil War: Citizenship, Identity, and the Creation of the Soviet State, 1914–1922* (Cambridge, 2008); Susan Badcock, *Politics and People in Revolutionary Russia: A Provincial History* (Cambridge, 2007), and Peter Holquist, *Making War, Forging Revolution: Russia’s Continuum of Crisis, 1914–1921* (Cambridge, 2002).

11. See note 8.

12. See Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Rossiiskoi Federation (henceforth GARF), F111, op. 5, Politseiskoe Okhrannoe Otdelenie (POO), l. 230.

13. Anweiler, *The Soviets*, 93–94.

14. For example, in his post-1905 writings, Lenin returned to the question of the role of the soviets only during early 1917; see Robert Service, *Lenin, A Political Life*, vol. 2: *Worlds in Collision* (Bloomington, Ind., 1991), 141. See also Hasegawa, *February Revolution*, 319. The SR Second Congress of 1907 placed the soviets firmly in the party’s revolutionary plans, but thereafter the SRs, like other socialist parties, did not dwell upon the expected phenomenon.

15. M. Melancon, “Who Wrote What and When?: Proclamations of the February Revolution in Petrograd, 23 February–1 March 1917,” *Soviet Studies*, no. 3 (July 1988): 485–488; Melancon, *SRs and the Russian Anti-War Movement*, 214.

16. Tsuyoshi Hasegawa, “The Bolsheviks and the Formation of the Petrograd Soviet in the February Revolution,” *Soviet Studies* no. 1 (January 1977): 88–89.

17. Rossiiskii Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Sotsial’no-Politicheskoi Istorii (henceforth RGASPI), f. 70, op.3, d. 559, l. 20, recollections of Voronkov; *Den’* 1 (5 March 1917), “Sovet rabochikh deputatov”; *Izvestiia* 155 (27 August 1917), “Kak obrazovalsia Petrogradskii sovet”; Melancon, *SRs and the Russian Anti-War Movement*, 254.

18. Further evidence bearing on this matter comes from I. Iurenev, who recalls that at the joint left socialist meeting (SRs, Mezhraintsy, left Mensheviks, and Bolsheviks) on the evening of 24 February, when the topic of slogans for the next day arose, the Menshevik E. Sokolovskii suggested “the Constituent Assembly,” whereas the Bolshevik V. Pozhello wanted “the Soviet

of Workers' Deputies." Iurenev approved the latter in principle but found it premature, thus foreshadowing the line taken by his group and the leftist SRs the next day; I. Iurenev, "Mezhraionka," *Proletarskaia Revoliutsiia*, no. 1 (1924): 139–140.

19. "Sovet rabochikh deputatov"; "Kak obrazovalsia Petrogradskii sovet"; N. Sukhanov, *The Russian Revolution 1917: A Personal Record* (Princeton, 1984), 15. Soviet historians claimed that on the twenty-fifth the Bolshevik Petersburg and Vyborg committees discussed the soviet question. Hasegawa notes, however, that the Bolshevik Petrograd Committee visualized the soviet as a party organization, whereas the Vyborg committee simply reacted to the initiative already occurring in the factories, responsibility for which neither could lay claim. See Hasegawa, "Bolsheviks and the Formation of the Petrograd Soviet," 92–93; E. K. Barshtein and L. M. Shalaginova, "Departament politicii o plane Petrogradskikh bol'shevikov v fevrale 1917 goda," *Voprosy arkhivovedeniia*, no. 1 (1962): 112.

20. M. Skobelev, "Gibel' tsarizma," *Ogonek*, 11 (207) (13 March 1927): 1; "V Petrograde nakanune fevral'skoi revoiutsii," *Krasnaia letopis'*, no. 7 (1922): 47; "Fevral'skaia revoliutsiia i okhrannoe otdelenie," *Byloe*, no.1 (29) (January 1918): 173–174.

21. For discussions of the significance of the joint socialist meetings, see Melancon, *SRs and the Russian Anti-War Movement*, 202–203, 234–238, and "Rethinking Russia's February Revolution," 22–24.

22. Memoirists do not always agree about who attended; for example, some have Chkheidze present, others do not. In my book, I reported that Shliapnikov was absent from this meeting, whereas it seems he missed the group's 25 February meeting but attended this one. V. Zenzinov, "Fevral'skie dni," *Novyi zhurnal*, no. 34 (1953): 195.

23. For timing and other aspects of these leaflets, with references to various historians' insights and arguments, see Melancon, "Who Wrote What and When," 484–496.

24. *Ibid.*, 485–489.

25. *Ibid.*, 484–485, 489–494.

26. Melancon, *SRs and the Russian Anti-War Movement*, 204; V. Zenzinov, "Fevral'skie dni" (unpublished version), 49–50, Hoover Institution, Nicolaevsky Archive, box 392.

27. Melancon, *SRs and the Russian Anti-War Movement*, 229; Richard Abraham, *Alexander Kerensky: The First Love of the Revolution* (New York, 1987), 121–123, 127; R. Pearson, *The Russian Moderates and the Crisis of Tsarism, 1914–1917* (New York, 1977), 137.

28. Abraham, *Alexander Kerensky*, 130–131; R. B. Browder and A. F. Kerensky, eds., 3 vols., *The Russian Provisional Government: Documents* (Stanford, 1961), 1:40–41; N. I. Iordanskii, "Voennoe vosstanie 27 Fevralia," *Molodaia gardiia* 2 (1927): 162.

29. Abraham, *Alexander Kerensky*, 131–132; Browder and Kerensky, *Russian Provisional Government*, 1:41–47; D. Zaslavskii, “V Gosudarstvennoi Dume,” *Krasnaia panorama* 11 (11 March 1927); V. Kantorovich and D. Zaslavskii, *Khronika fevral’skoi revoliutsii: Fevral’–Mai 1917* (Moscow, 1924), 28–29; Skobelev, “Gibel’ tsarizma,” 1–2; Zenzinov, “Fevral’skie dni” (unpublished version), 49–50. Skobelev and Zaslavskii were eyewitnesses of the events in the Tauride on the twenty-seventh.

30. Scrupulous examination of sources pertaining to the Fourth Duma have led Lyandres and Nikolaev to assert a somewhat different evaluation of the Duma leadership’s activities and intentions than that presented here. In their version, even before he received the prorogation decree from the emperor, M. Rodzianko, chair of the State Duma, sent a message to Duma deputies on 26 February, inviting them to a “private session” the next day. Likewise, the Council of Elders that met the next day allegedly resolved that Duma deputies not disperse and that the current problem facing them was a replacement for the existing government, which was “abolished”. See Lyandres, “Problem of ‘Indecisiveness,’” 19–22; Nikolaev, *Gosudarstvennaia дума*, 24–27; *Izvestiia*, 27 February 1917. Even so, although this analysis seems to indicate that the Duma was finally edging toward some sort of action by late 26 and 27 February, it does not establish a substantially different role for the Duma in the events of those two days. If the tsarist government had somehow ceased to exist, it was not the Duma’s doing; rather, the Duma leadership and most of its members were responding, ex post facto, to what mass action with socialist leadership had done. It is also the case that the Duma leadership, while trying to respond to a situation in which the government de facto no longer existed, still strove to remain within the tsarist legal strictures. These were very reluctant, belated “revolutionaries” who were still maneuvering to avoid the stunning revolutionary reality: the old order and its laws were gone.

31. Abraham, *Alexander Kerensky*, 131–32; Melancon, *SRs and the Russian Anti-War Movement*, 267, 331–332n74.

32. Skobelev, “Gibel’ tsarizma,” 2; Kantorovich and Zaslavskii, *Khronika*, 29; *Izvestiia* (Komitet Petrogradskikh Zhurnalistsov), 27 February 1917, reproduced in P. M. Chechin, ed., *Petrograd v dni revoliutsii* (Petrograd, 1917), 16; Browder and Kerensky, *Russian Provisional Government*, 1:44–45.

33. Browder and Kerensky, *Russian Provisional Government*, 1:44–45; *Izvestiia* (Komitet Petrogradskikh zhurnalistsov); Abraham, *Alexander Kerensky*, 132.

34. Sukhanov, *Zapiski o revoliutsii*, 1:87; Melancon, *SRs and the Russian Anti-War Movement*, 261; “Fevral’skaia revoliutsiia i okhrannoe otdelenie,” *Byloe*, no. 1 (29) (January 1918): 170–176; *Petrogradskii sovet rabochikh i soldatskikh deputatov v 1917 godu. Protokoly, stenogrammy obshchikh sobranii zasedanii Ispol’nitel’nykh komiteta i fraktsii*, 5 vols (St. Petersburg, 1993), 1:122.

35. V. Zalezhskii, *Iz vospominanii podpol’shchika* (Kharkov, 1931), 158–159.

36. Zaslavskii, “V Gosudarstvennoi Dume”; Abraham, *Alexander Kerensky*, 132. Some accounts

conflate the 1 p.m. and 2 p.m. meetings with soldiers' representatives or with soldiers. For example, Burdzhhalov described the approach of the twenty-five thousand troops to the gates of the Tauride, where they stopped and sent in representatives, after which Kerensky, Chkheidze and Skobelev went out to address them. See Burdzhhalov, *Russia's Second Revolution*, 180. Perhaps representatives from the soldiers came into the Tauride around 1 p.m., talked with Rodzianko, and needed further reassurances, which were supplied by the moderate socialist speeches around 2 p.m.

37. Zaslavskii, "V Gosudarstvenoi Dume," and S. Mstislavskii, "Fevral'skaia revoliutsiia," *Krasnaia Panorama*, 11 March 1927; S. Mstislavskii, *Gibel' tsarizma* (Leningrad, 1927), 75. Burdzhhalov quotes one Bolshevik activist who later claimed that, although he and his comrades saw the Finland Station leaflet, they felt that they could not ignore the Duma. They had to go there, bring it in to the revolution, and, thus, control it. Otherwise, it might have counterposed itself to the revolution, (*Russia's Second Revolution*, 179). All the various commentaries notwithstanding, many of these events remain inexplicable at the current level of hard information.

38. M. S-k, *Revoliutsiia v Petrograde* (Petrograd, 1917), 19.

39. Nikolaev adduces considerable evidence in favor of his thesis that the Duma's military commission played a greater role than it has received credit for in summoning military units to the Tauride Palace, (*Gosudarstvennaia дума*, 39–68). He makes reference to the role of officers in leading these units to support the revolutionary center, presumably on the assumption that officers would more likely hearken to calls from the Duma than from the Soviet. Still, most specific individuals Nikolaev names were enlisted officers or warrant officers (*unter-ofitsery* and *praporshchiki*), both groups that were more likely to heed radical leaders. Although interesting and worthy of consideration, Nikolaev's arguments seem to strain the actual evidence and run counter to the testimony of most contemporary witnesses that the soldiers had no affection for the State Duma as an institution and were not inclined to accept its leadership.

40. Iordanskii, "Voennoe vosstanie 27 Fevralia," 162–172.

41. Browder and Kerensky, *Russian Provisional Government*, 40–41; Mstislavskii, *Gibel' tsarizma*, 75–76. Mstislavskii notes that several individual junior officers known to people in the Tauride were summoned there later in the day to form a "military command." Otherwise, his observation about the complete absence of officers with the soldiers is accurate.

42. Melancon, *SRs and the Russian Anti-War Movement*, 258; I. P. Leiberov, *Na shturm samoderzhavii: Petrogradskii proletariat v gody pervoi mirovoi voiny i fevral'skoi revoliutsii (iiul' 1914–mart 1917 g.)* (Moscow, 1979), 233, 239.

43. Zenzinov, "Fevral'skie dni" (unpublished version), 51; M. Rafes, "Moi vospominaniia," *Byloe* 19 (1922): 186; Melancon, *SRs and the Russian Anti-War Movement*, 267–268.

44. Memoirs and histories list members (with numerous variations) of the Soviet's first provisional committee. Many emphasize the Mensheviks, although SRs and Trudoviks were also on hand.

This was not a closed group; anyone with socialist credentials who arrived on the scene was sent to Room 13. See *Izvestiia*, 27 August 1917; Skobelev, “Gibel’ tsarizma,” 2; Burdzhakov, *Second Russian Revolution*, 185–186; S. N. Artem’ev, “Bor’ba za bol’shevizatsiiu Petrogradskogo soveta rabochikh i soldatskikh deputatov v period dvoevlastiia v 1917 g.,” *Trudy Moskovskogo instituta mekhanizatsii i elektrifikatsii sel’skogo khoziaistva* 5, no. 2 (1958): 9; M. G. Skorokhodnikov, *Aleksandr Kastorovich Skorokhodov* (Leningrad, 1965), 170.

45. *Izvestiia*, 27 February 1917; Abraham, *Alexander Kerensky*, 132; Ferro, *Russian Revolution of February 1917*, 46. A report in the news sheet claimed that the Duma Council of Elders had resolved that the Duma “will not disperse.” Refusing to disperse did not, however, mean taking direct steps to call sessions and assume power (for details about the State Duma leaders, see Lyandres, “On the Problem of ‘Indecisiveness,’” cited above). Kerensky later commented that, with its complete intransigence about doing anything against the tsar, the State Duma committed suicide just when its potential had reached a peak; see Browder and Kerensky, *Russian Provisional Government*, 1:43. In a similar vein, Sukhanov quipped, “The social mountain that was the State Duma did not go to the revolution, the revolution came to it.” See Sukhanov, *Zapiski o revoliutsii*, 1:75.

46. See for example, S. Mstislavskii, *Five Days Which Transformed Russia* (Bloomington, Ind., 1988), 28–29; and Sukhanov, *Zapiski o revoliutsii*, 1:80–90. About the interior of the Tauride, the latter uses phrases such as “the crush of people,” “crowds of soldiers milling about,” and “chaos.”

47. Sukhanov, *Russian Revolution*, 39; *Izvestiia*, 27 August 1917; Rafes, “Moi vospominaniia,” 186–187; Zenzinov, “Fevral’skie dni,” 215; Z. Kel’son, “Militsiia fevral’skoi revoliutsii. Vospominaniia,” *Byloe* 29 (1925): 162–163.

48. S. D. Mstislavskii, *Piat’ dnei* (Berlin, 1922), 17–24, and *Gibel’ tsarizma*, 75–77; E. I. Martynov, *Tsarskaia armiia v fevral’skoi revoliutsii* (Moscow, 1927), 110.

49. Zenzinov, “Fevral’skie dni” (unpublished version), 51–52; Sukhanov, *Russian Revolution*, 45–46; Rafes, “Moi vospominaniia,” 187–188.

50. A. G. Shliapnikov, *Fevral’skie dni v Peterburge* (Kharkov, 1925), 43–44; O. Ermanskii, *Iz perezhitogo* (Moscow, 1927), 149–150; Mstislavskii, *Gibel’ tsarizma*, 76; “Revoliutsionnaia deiatel’nost’ poruchika Skobeika 27–28 fevralia i posleduiushikh dnei,” 4 September 1917, GARF, f. 6978, op. 1, d.2 44, l. 62.

51. V. Bulgakov, “Revoliutsiia na avtomobiliakh (Petrograd v Fevrale 1917 g.),” *Na chuzhoi storone* 6 (1924): 7–9; A. Peshkhonov, “Pervye nedeli,” *Na chuzhoi storone*, 1 (1923): 257–261; P. Ivanov, “Moi vospominaniia o fevral’skoi revoliutsii,” RGASPI, f. 70, Ispart RKP(b), op. 3, d. 572, l. 1.

52. Rafes, “Moi vospominaniia,” 190–191; Zenzinov, “Fevral’skie dni” (unpublished version), 52–54; Sukhanov, *Russian Revolution*, 31–33, 52; Kantorovich and Zaslavskii *Khronika*

fevral'skoi revoliutsii, 29; Abraham, *Alexander Kerensky*, 132–133, 135–136. Outlines of Kerensky's considerable activities as a revolutionary during the wartime era can be found in the appropriate chapters of Abraham, *Alexander Kerensky*; Melancon, *SRs and the Russian Anti-War Movement*; and *Alexander Fedorovich Kerenskii (Po materialam Departamenta Politsii)* (Petrograd, 1917). Seen in this light, Zenzinov's statement (54) that "in those days he was the real connection between the insurgent streets and the State Duma that set out on a revolutionary path" becomes understandable and undeniable, regardless of how one evaluates the State Duma's revolutionism.

53. Abraham, *Alexander Kerensky*, 135. Boris Flekkel's wife, Ol'ga Flekkel, was also a labor activist with wide acquaintanceship among SR, Bolshevik, and Menshevik workers in the Narva District.

54. The account of the Soviet's first session is a composite from the following sources: *Izvestiia*, 28 February 1917 (supplement); *Petrogradskii sovet . . . Protokoly, stenogramy* (1993), 1:22–24; N. Avdeev, "Pervye dni fevral'skoi revoliutsii," *Proletarskaia revoliutsiia*, no. 1 (1923): 28–31; *Petrogradskii sovet rabochikh i soldatskikh deputatov. Protokoly zasedanii ispol'nitel'nogo komiteta i biuro i.k.* (Moscow, 1925), 287; Shliapnikov, "Fevral'skie dni v Petrograde," *Proletarskaia revoliutsiia*, no. 1 (1923): 110–114; Zenzinov, "Fevral'skie dni" (unpublished version), 58–60; Mstislavskii, *Gibel' tsarizma*, 82–83; "Kak obrazovalsia Petrogradskii Sovet," *Izvestiia*; Skobelev, "Gibel' tsarizma," 2–3; *Den'*, "Sovet rabochikh deputatov," *Den'*; Peshekhonov, "Pervye nedeli," 262–264; Ermanskii, *Iz perezhitogo*, 158–159; Rafes, "Moi vospominaniia," 190–91; Sukhanov, *Russian Revolution*, 59–73, 79–80; Browder and Kerensky, *Russian Provisional Government*, 70–76. Evidently, someone made a motion that Khrustalov-Nosar' receive the position of chair, which drew protests from the left socialists about his inclusion at all in the affairs of the Soviet because of his questionable activities since 1905. The Soviet voted against him and he played no further role.

55. Sukhanov, *Zapiski*, 1: 71–73; Wildman (*End of the Russian Imperial Army*, 175) doubts the presence of soldiers at this first Soviet meeting and that it at this point renamed itself the Soviet of workers' and soldiers' deputies. He notes that only Sukhanov's account (seconded, we might add, much later by Zenzinov's possibly imitative recollections), includes the episode of soldiers' speeches. Wildman then expresses surprise that the new Soviet's leaders were ignoring the potential soldiers' component. Yet Sukhanov's memoirs, published within four years of the events and with greater detail than other accounts, had no reason to distort this matter. Other much briefer accounts, published mostly after Sukhanov's, simply don't mention, rather than deny, the soldiers' presence. That Soviet leaders ignored the soldiers is inherently unlikely: indeed their leaflet earlier in the day had specified that soldiers elect and send deputies to the Soviet.

56. Shliapnikov, *Fevral'skie dni*, 50–54; Sukhanov, *Russian Revolution*, 71–72; Browder and Kerensky, *Russian Provisional Government*, 1:76; *Petrogradskii sovet. Protokoly i.k.*, 287; Mstislavskii, *Gibel' tsarizma*, 83.

57. Peshekhonov, "Pervye nedeli," 267. The efforts of Nikolaev and Lyandres to refurbish the existing picture of the State Duma's activism are worthy of consideration and conceivably may

eventually alter somewhat historiographical approaches to this question. Readers should be aware, however, that existing histories and memoir accounts already emphasize a turn to activism on the part of Duma leaders, especially late on 27 February and on 28 February.

58. Wildman cautiously notes that the military commission, often connected entirely to the Soviet, had dual Soviet-Duma sponsorship. He adds, however, that its origins (to which one might add its original personnel) were in the Soviet side of things. Wildman, *End of the Russian Imperial Army*, 168.

59. Mstislavskii, *Gibel' tsarizma*, 76–78, 83–85, *Piat' dnei*, 24–50, “Fevral'skaia revoliutsiia”; Sukhanov, *Russian Revolution*, 65–73, 98; Browder and Kerensky, *Russian Provisional Government*, 1:83–89; Martynov, *Tsarskaia armii i fevral'skaia revoliutsiia*, 110–115.

60. Mstislavskii, *Piat' dnei*, 50; Iu. V. Lomonosov, *Vospominaniia o Martovskoi Revoliutsii* (Stockholm, 1921), 30–44; I. M. Pushkareva, *Zheleznodorozhniki Rossii v burzhuazno-demokraticeskikh revoliutsiakh* (Moscow, 1975), 330–335; V. Shul'gin, *Dni* (Belgrad, 1925), 289–292. The railroad worker Naglovskii's memoirs indicated that on the very first day of the revolution Bublikov sent out a telegram (No. 114) that called for all railroad lines to organize their committees. These committees, insisted Naglovskii, acting on their own initiative rather than on instructions from the center, obstructed troop movements into the capital. Naglovskii noted Bolshevik weakness among the railroad workers, who were dominated by “Social Democrats, SRs and internationalists”; (no initial) Naglovskii, “Zheleznodorozhniki v Russkoi revoliutsii (1917–1920 gg.),” unpublished manuscript in Hoover Institution, Nicolaevsky Archive, box 786, file 12, 2–3. April elections to Vikzhel (the All-Russian Railroad Committee) continued the SR domination of the railroad workers' union already noticeable during 1905–1908.

61. Mstislavskii, *Piat' dnei*, 19–20, *Gibel' tsarizma*, 78; Sukhanov, *Russian Revolution*, 66–67.

62. Mstislavskii, *Piat' dnei*, 50–51. The memoirs of Tarasov-Rodionov and F. Sorokin describe the descent of soldiers from Oranienbaum and Tsarskoe Selo to the capital and finally to the Tauride Palace; F. Sorokin, *Gvardeiskii ekipazh v fevral'skie dni i 1917 g.* (Moscow, 1932), 54; A. Tarasov-Rodionov, *February 1917* (New York, 1931), 167–177. Mstislavskii's memory apparently played a trick on him when he reported that the troops arriving on 28 February were from Oranienbaum, whereas those units entered the city quite early in the dawn hours of that day; more likely, he saw the Marine Guards and others who joined them, who were coming in roughly at the time Mstislavskii mentions.

63. Sukhanov, *Russian Revolution*, 60.

64. A. G. Shliapnikov, *Semnadtsatyi god* (Moscow, 1992), 128; Sukhanov, *Russian Revolution*, 40, 79–81; Rafes, “Moi vospominaniia,” 191.

65. For its report on the formation of the Soviet, see *Den'*, 5 March 1917. Hasegawa is well aware of the joint socialist sessions prior to 27 February but feels that their squabbling disqualifies them

as serious leaders of the revolution itself and does not note the identity between the underground group, the Provisional Executive Committee, and the Petrograd Soviet's earliest Executive Committee. His most recent commentary on the Petrograd Soviet's birth (see Hasegawa, "February Revolution," 54–56) focuses no attention on the executive committee's origins.

66. I. Iurenev, *Bor'ba za edinstvo partii* (Petrograd, 1917), 13, contains a listing of most of the individuals who had participated in the pre-27 February all-socialist bureau.

67. This account of the 28 February Soviet session is reconstructed from: *Petrogradskii sovet . . . Protokoly, stenogramy* (1993), 1:26–46; G. I. Zlokazov, "O zasedanii Petrogradskogo Soveta rabochikh i soldatskikh deputatov 28 fevralia 1917," *Oktiabr' i Grazhdanskaia Voina v SSSR* (Moscow, 1966), 47–61; Rafes, "Moi vospominaniia," 192–193; A. Shliapnikov, *Semnadtsatyi god*, 4 vols. (St.Petersburg, 1923–1924), 1:188–194; Sukhanov, *Russian Revolution*, 75–77; Burdzhakov, *Russia's Second Revolution*, 235, 247; G. L. Sobolov, *Petrogradskii garnizon v bor'be za pobedy oktiabria* (Leningrad, 1985), 55–56.

68. *Izvestiia*, 28 February 1917; Browder and Kerensky, *Russian Provisional Government*, 78–79.

69. Shliapnikov, "Fevral'skie dni," 122–125; *Petrogradskii Sovet. Protokoly i.k.*, 287; *Petrogradskii sovet . . . Protokoly, stenogramy* (1993), 1:29.

70. Rafes, "Moi vospominaniia," 192–196; Sukhanov, *Russian Revolution*, 74–99; Shliapnikov, "Fevral'skie dni," 125–127. Galili emphasizes their near unanimity in opposing a bourgeois-socialist coalition at this point, noting that only the arch-conservative O. Bogdanov and the two Bundists Erlich and Rafes joined the moderate populists in favoring entry of socialists into the Duma-oriented government (*Menshevik Leaders*, 57–59). Rafes's memoirs described the matter in somewhat more complicated form. He claimed that after most Mensheviks voted against participation in the executive committee, twelve members of the defensist Menshevik Organizational Committee met on the evening of 1 March at V. Krokhmal's apartment, where they voted by a considerable majority to favor participation in the new government. He added that the result of this vote was the well-known lead article in *Izvestiia*, 2 March 1917, which argued for socialist entry into the government.

71. Sukhanov, *Russian Revolution*, 43–44, 59–60, 82, 128, and *Zapiski o revoliutsii*, 1:124–125. Because of Sukhanov's tendency to deprecate others, his judgments cannot always be taken at face value. Aleksandrovich was a worker not known for eloquence or writing skills, whereas Shliapnikov, also of worker origins, was hardly bereft of such skills.

72. V. Ivanov-Razumnik, *Pered grozoi* (Petrograd, 1923), 132–133. For comments about Aleksandrovich, see Sukhanov, *Zapiski o revoliutsii*, 1:124.

73. Zenzinov, "Fevral'skie dni" (unpublished version), 62–64, and "Fevral'skie dni," *Novyi Zhurnal*, 220; Shliapnikov, "Fevral'skie dni," 133, and *Semnadtsatyi god*, 241. In unpublished recollections, Voronkov, the SR worker at Arsenal, related a curious incident. On 1 March, two

spies at Arsenal were uncovered and arrested, after the Bolshevik worker Romanov produced police photographs of them. When Voronkov asked where Romanov had gotten them, he refused to answer. Presumably, Romanov received information and the photos from the anti-spy operation (RGASPI, f. 70, op. 3, d. 559, ll. 24–25).

74. Browder and Kerensky, *Russian Provisional Government*, 1:62–63; Burdzhhalov, *Russia's Second Revolution*, 234–236, 245–247; Wildman, *End of the Russian Imperial Army*, 178–180; Mstislavskii, *Gibel' tsarizma*, 98–99. Using an archival source, Burdzhhalov shows that reports came in that individuals were agitating soldiers “not to listen to orders from Rodzianko” (249). Both Wildman and Sukhanov indicate that the SR-Mezhrionka group (Aleksandrovich-Iurenev) had printed a proclamation early on the first regarding this matter (Wildman, 181; Sukhanov, *Russian Revolution*, 128).

75. Shliapnikov, *Semnadtsatyi god*, 206–210; Wildman, *End of the Russian Imperial Army*, 182–183; Burdzhhalov, *Russia's Second Revolution*, 249–50; N. D. Sokolov, “Kak rodilsia Prikaz No. 1,” *Ogonek*, 13 March 1927, 8–9; *Petrogradskii sovet. Protokoly i.k.*, 287; “Kak obrazovalsia Petrogradskii sovet,” *Izvestiia*, 27 August 1917; Skobelev, “Gibel' tsarizma”; V. I. Miller, “Nachalo demokratizatsii staroi armii v dni fevral'skoi revoliutsii (Zasedanie Petrogradskoi Soveta 1 marta 1917 g. i prikaz No. 1,” *Istorii SSSR* no. 6 (1966): 28–29. Burdzhhalov introduces the previously unpublished text of the executive committee's proclamation, using TsGAOR (now GARF), f. pechatnykh izdani, inv. no. 4313. Wildman provides a dramatized version of the soldiers' delegates entry into the Soviet: “At this point, all accounts agree, soldiers burst into the room, demanding that the Soviet stay in session and discuss the situation raised by Rodzianko's order.” Information provided by Miller from the archival minutes puts the matter in a somewhat different light. Skobelev chaired the Soviet session that had begun while the soldiers' delegates were meeting in a special session chaired by Sokolov. In connection with certain negotiations the executive committee was conducting, Skobelev proposed adjourning the Soviet session for several hours, to which the delegates loudly objected. A few minutes later, the soldiers' delegates arrived from their separate session and joined the Soviet session. Perhaps Wildman confused events on 1 March with an episode on 28 February (described by Podvoiskii at the sixth Bolshevik congress during August) in which soldiers shouldered their way in to protest “Rodzianko's order” (Burdzhhalov, *Second Russian Revolution*, 246–247). Most sources about 1 March indicate a more or less routine situation, despite the soldiers' continued agitation, since the executive committee had decided a day earlier to create a soldiers' section of the Soviet.

76. Mstislavskii, *Gibel' tsarizma*, 98–102; Sukhanov, *Russian Revolution*, 127–133.

77. Burdzhhalov, *Russia's Second Revolution*, 247–248; Wildman, *End of the Imperial Russian Army*, 180–182; Sukhanov, *Russian Revolution*, 128; testimony of Rodzianko in S. A. Alekseev, ed., *Fevral'skaia revoliutsiia (Revoliutsiia i grazhdanskaia voina v opisaniakh belogvardeitsev)* (Moscow, 1926), 59; recollection of Engelgardt quoted in E. S. Mikhailov, “Prikaz No. 1,” *Voprosy istorii*, no. 2 (1967): 209; Tarasov-Rodionov, *February 1917*, 129–130.

78. This is a translation of the Russian text reproduced in Shliapnikov, *Semnadtsatyi god*, 339–340, with minor emendations. For example, the signature for the Mezhrionka provided

by Shliapnikov reads “Peterburgskii Mezdynarodnyi R.S.D.R.P.” whereas, of course, it should be “Mezhdyraionnyi (komitet),” that is, not “International” but “Interdistrict committee.” It is possible that the printers who printed the original erred about the Mezhraionka’s title or that the solecism appeared for some reason in Shliapnikov’s study. Likewise, Shliapnikov’s version has the date “Marta 1917 g.,” which is grammatically incorrect without a specified date (if “March 1917” had been intended, it would have read “Mart 1917 g.”); thus the date “1 March 1917” is provided. In “Khronika-fakty-nakhodki,” *Voенno-Istoricheskii zhurnal*, no. 11 (1966): 111, an unidentified commentary claimed that although some memoirists insisted that all copies of the leaflet had been confiscated and destroyed, sometime in 1966 an individual had found a copy inserted into a volume he had purchased at “Bukhinist” (a used book outlet) and forwarded it to TsGVIA (Central State Military Historical Archive); see also R. Miller, “Iz istorii prikaza no. 1 Petrogradskogo soveta,” *Voенno-Istoricheskii zhurnal*, no. 5 (1966): 115–118.

79. Zlokazov notes that the proclamation “was very close to Order No. 1”. G. I. Zlokazov, *Petrogradskii soviet rabochikh i soldatskikh deputatov v period mirnogo razvitiia revoliutsii* (Moscow, 1969), 61. According to a Soviet publication of the 1950s, on 1 March the Vyborg Bolsheviks issued an appeal that said “officers using the name of Rodzianko and of the entire executive committee are calling for you to return to the barracks, hand over your weapons and obey your old superiors. Don’t listen to them! This means a return to the old order and to former enslavement” (cited in Burdzhalov, *Russia’s Second Revolution*, 248). Although no independent verification exists, such an appeal is not implausible and would suggest the shared left socialist concern about the soldiers and the transfer of military control to moderates associated with the State Duma.

80. For the text of Order No. 1 discussions, see *Petrogradskii soviet . . . Protokoly, stenogramy* (1993), 1:46–58.

81. V. I. Miller, “Nachalo demokratisatzii,” 31–44; John R. Boyd, “The Origins of Order No. 1,” *Soviet Studies* 3 (1967–1968): 365–68; S. A. Artem’ev, “Sostav Petrogradskogo Soveta rabochikh i soldatskikh deputatov v marte 1917 g.,” *Istoriia SSSR*, no. 5 (1964): 117; Zaslavskii, *Khronika fevral’skoi revoliutsii*, 51–52; N. Alekseev, “Rozhdenie Prikaza No. 1,” *Vozrozhdenie* 2254 (1932): 2; Shliapnikov, *Semnadsatyi god*, 212. Paderin confirmed that the soldiers’ deputies—he, Borisov, Kudriavtsev “and others”—dictated the text to Sokolov, a version Mstislavskii’s unpublished memoirs further supports; see A. Paderin’s letter in *Proletarskaia Revoliutsiia* 8–9 (1924): 401; S. Mstislavskii, “Iz vospominanii o fevral’skoi revoliutsii,” RGASPI, f. 70, op. 3, d. 583, ll. 1–4. Sokolov described the formation of the editorial commission and its signing of the finished text in the name of the Soviet (“Kak rodilsia Prikaz No. 1”) Alekseev, who knew Klivanskii, claimed that he was a reporter for *Den’* (a newspaper of moderate SR, Popular Socialist, and Trudovik opinion). The minutes of the Soviet session of 1 March contain the note that Klivanskii was the organizer of the Riga Soviet of workers’ deputies, (*Petrogradskii soviet . . . Protokoly, stenogramy* (1993), 1:55). This presumably would have referred to the 1905 Riga soviet. It is difficult to know what to make of the mysterious Klivanskii’s range of accomplishments.

82. Commentators identify Klivanskii as an SR, a view supported by the way he expressed himself and indirectly by his contemporary acquaintance, Alekseev, when he identified him

as a journalist for the right populist newspaper *Den'*. Even so, by September 1917 he was a defensist Menshevik, closely associated with A. Potresov and M. Liber; see *Men'sheviki v 1917 godu. Ot kornilovskogo miatezha do Vremennogo Demokraticeskogo Soveta Rossiiskoi Respubliki* (Moscow, 1996), 36, 147, 150, 152, 170–171. Migrations from one party to another were common, and relations among right populists and right social-democrats were especially close. Plekhanov's group, *Edinstvo* (Unity), consisted of both.

83. The text of Order No. 1 is in *Izvestiia*, 2 March 1917; Browder and Kerensky, *Russian Provisional Government*, 2:848–849; and Shliapnikov, *Semnadtsatyi god*, 212–213. About the evident failure of the Soviet and the executive committee to bring the order up for a vote, see Burdzhhalov, *Russia's Second Revolution*, 253.

84. M. E. Solov'ev (pseudonym of E. S. Mikhailov), *Bol'sheviki i fevral'skaia revoliutsiia 1917 goda* (Moscow, 1980), 121; “Khronika-fakty-nakhodki,” 111; Iu. Tokarev, “Prikaz No. 1 Petrogradskogo soveta rabochikh i soldatskikh deputatov,” *Vspomogatel'nye distsipliny 5* (Leningrad, 1973): 49–60.

85. V. I. Miller, “Nachalo demokratizatsii,” 40–42. At one point in the discussion, the soldiers visualized a military commission with a significant soldier composition to engender trust in its decisions.

86. Only Galili notes that Order No. 1 “stated for the first time the principle of a conditional acceptance of authority” (*Menshevik Leaders*, 53–54), but her comment is so cursory as to suggest that she too was unaware of its historiographical import. Other histories quote the language of Order No. 1 about the soldiers' conditional subordination to the Duma military commission but show no awareness that this was the first expression of the famous “to the extent that” formula used in connection with dual power. See, for example, Wildman, *End of the Russian Imperial Army*, 187–188; V. I. Miller, *Soldatskie komitety russkoi armii v 1917 g.* (Moscow, 1974), 25–30; and White, *Russian Revolution*, 75–76.

87. V. I. Miller, “Nachalo demokratizatsii,” 33, 41; *Izvestiia*, 2 March 1917.

88. *Petrogradskii sovet . . . Protokoly, stenogramy* (1993), 1:55; *Izvestiia* 3 (2 March 1917).

89. Zenzinov, “Fevral'skie dni” (unpublished version), 64; Shliapnikov, *Semnadtsatyi god*, 185, 208–209; Boyd, “Origins of Order No. 1,” 366; V.I. Miller, “Nachalo demokratizatsii,” 42; Burdzhhalov, *Russia's Second Revolution*, 363, n.106.

90. One wonders, for example, where Klivanskii's typed draft, which he suddenly produced in the midst of the debate, came from. No information is available about party meetings during this period and records may not have been kept.

91. Shliapnikov, *Semnadtsatyi god*, 215–220; Sukhanov, *Russian Revolution*, 100–134; Mstislavskii, *Piat' dnei*, 56–70 ; Zenzinov, “Fevral'skie dni” (unpublished version), 66–76; Burdzhhalov, *Russia's Second Revolution*, 262–282; Wildman, *End of the Russian Imperial Army*,

190–192; Browder and Kerensky, *Russian Provisional Government*, 1:117–127. For further data and analysis from the Duma and Provisional Government side of the story, see the above-noted studies by Lyandres and Nikolaev and also E. D. Chermenskii, *IV Gosudarstvennaia дума i sverzhenie tsarizma v Rossii* (Moscow, 1976). Semion Lyandres' long-awaited study of the Provisional Government will contribute enormously to our understanding of Russia's liberal/progressive forces, which fully merit consideration in their own right.

92. Mstislavskii, *Piat' dnei*, 60; Sukhanov, *Russian Revolution*, 101.

93. About the Organizational Committee, see Rafes, "Moi vospominaniia," 195.

94. Shliapnikov, *Semnadtsati god*, 217–220.

95. Sukhanov, *Russian Revolution*, 101, 103–104, 108.

96. Browder and Kerensky, *Russian Provisional Government*, 135–136.

97. Sukhanov, *Russian Revolution*, 138; quotation from Burdzhhalov, *Second Russian Revolution*, 271.

98. Zenzinov, "Fevral'skie dni" (unpublished version), 68–69; Shliapnikov, *Semnadtsati god*, 231–232, and "Fevral'skie dni," 133–134; Sukhanov, *Russian Revolution*, 129–130.

99. The minutes of the 2 March Soviet session are in *Petrogradskii sovet . . . Protokoly, stenogramy* (1993), 1:59–81.

100. Information about the 2 March Soviet session can be found in *Izvestiia*, 3 March 1917; Shliapnikov, *Semnadtsati god*, 240–241; M. Rafes, *Dva goda revoliutsii na Ukraine* (Moscow, 1920), 31; Browder and Kerensky, *Russian Provisional Government*, 1:131–133; Sukhanov, *Russian Revolution*, 141–142, 145. Besides the tendency of Soviet-era studies to ignore the SR-Mezhraionka block's activism, they contain a range of inaccurate statements about the Bolsheviks during the 2 March session. Claims that Shliapnikov, Shutko, Zhukov and other Bolsheviks presented clear cases against the provisional government do not find support in the stenograms. See Burdzhhalov, *Russia's Second Revolution*, 271–275; Zlokazov, *Petrogradskii Sovet*, 66–67; Iu. Tokarev, *Petrogradskii Sovet rabochikh i soldatskikh deputatov v marte–aprele 1917 g.* (Leningrad, 1976), 96–100. Tokarev even attributes Uliantsev's brief declaration to Shutko (a more prominent Bolshevik), thus concealing the latter's conciliatory outlook.

101. *Izvestiia*, 3 March 1917.

102. See the discussion of this question in M. Melancon, "The Syntax of Soviet Power: Resolutions of Local Soviets and Other Institutions, February–October 1917," *Russian Review*, no. 4 (Fall 1993): 486–505.

103. "Protokoly Isp. Kom. Petrogradskogo Soveta Rab. i Sold. Dep. za 3–11 marta 1917 g.,

Proletarskaia Revoliutsiia 1 (1923): 311–312, 316; *Organizatsiia i stroitel'stvo sovetov rabochikh deputatov v 1917 godu. Sbornik dokumentov* (Moscow, 1928), 7–8; *Izvestiia*, 29 March 1917.

104. Sukhanov, *Zapiski o revoliutsii*, 1:124–125; N. Sviatitskii, “Voina i predfevral'e,” *Katorga i Ssylka*. 75 (1931): 40–42; *Delo Naroda* 1 (15 March 1917), 6 (21 March 1917); S. Postnikov, “V gody mirovoi voiny,” unpublished manuscript in Hoover Institution, Nicolaevsky Archive, Box 11, File 8, 23; Radkey, *Agrarian Foes*, 140. Conditional Bolshevik support for the new government was relatively short-lived, whereas sizable moderate elements among the SR intelligentsia in Petrograd, Moscow, and elsewhere ensured that the SR Party remained aligned with the Provisional Government virtually until its downfall, a factor that split the party and led to the rise of the Left SRs as a separate entity.

105. *Pravda*, 7 March 1917.

106. In earlier studies (*Socialist Revolutionaries and the Russian Anti-War Movement* and “Rethinking Russia’s February Revolution”), I attempted to record how the long-term revolutionary movement, that is, large social groups in dynamic interaction with socialist activists at all levels, responded to certain historical conjunctures in moving toward revolutionary demonstrations and, if circumstances were propitious, the revolution itself.

107. See M. Melancon, “‘Marching Together!’: Left Block Activities in the Russian Revolutionary Movement, 1900 to February 1917,” *Slavic Review* 49, no. 2 (Summer, 1960): 239–252. That the harsh conditions of 1917 shattered the all-socialist coalition does not lessen its prior role, which still constitutes one of the great under-reported stories of the Russian revolutionary movement.

108. Rex Wade has argued that the mass democratic action that characterized the February events indelibly stamped itself on the revolution for the balance of the year in the form of demonstrations that played a crucial role at every major juncture. As perceptive as this observation is, it registers only part of February’s legacy. After all, mass democratic action during February 1917 did not occur solely as direct elemental reactions of social elements to long- and short-term hardship and frustration, although these latter played a role. Rage and revenge played their way out on the fringes of more pointed and orderly large-scale demonstrations. Interactions among social groups, lower- and middle-level socialist activists, and local socialist leadership elements were a reality of decades-long significance in places all over Russia and certainly in Petrograd. On one or another scale, chaos was a peripheral motif of real revolutionary mass action throughout the year. Otherwise the city and perhaps Russia would have lapsed into total disorder.

Center for Russian & East European Studies
University Center for International Studies
University of Pittsburgh
4400 W. W. Posvar Hall
230 South Boquet Street
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260
(412) 648-8716
www.ucis.pitt.edu/crees/cbpaper.html.

Ronald Linden, Bob Donnorummo, William Chase, Co-Editors
Eileen O'Malley, Managing Editor
Julie Tvaruzek, Editorial Assistant