

ГОСУДАРСТВО И ГРАЖДАНСКОЕ ОБЩЕСТВО: ПОЛИТИКА, ЭКОНОМИКА, ПРАВО

DOI: 10.17805/zpu.2016.3.14

The Good Capitalist: Conflicting Visions of Russia's Industrial Future in the Pre-Reform Period

S. SMITH-PETER

(CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, USA)

This article examines the debate about the industrial future of Russia that took place in pre-reform Vladimir Province among nobles, merchants, and bureaucrats. These groups put forward two differing visions of a modern Russia. The first was of an urban, industrialized, factory-dominated country where the cotton industry would ensure that Russia remained economically independent. The second called for a Russia that would remain rural but whose linen industry would be transformed by science and improved agriculture and so provide for the continuation of rural life even during industrialization. Both merchants and nobles claimed that they would serve as wise fathers over the people in the future industrial Russia. An analysis of statistical essays in the Vladimir provincial newspaper provides a new source base for our understanding of how Russians made sense of industrialization and social change even before the abolition of serfdom.

Keywords: industrialization; cotton industry; linen industry; Vladimir Province; merchants; nobles; provincial newspapers

During a place and time generally seen as stagnant and backward, there was a lively debate about the definition of industry. The provincial Russia of Nicholas I (r. 1825–1855), known as the “gendarme of Europe” has not seemed a likely setting for cultural and social debates. However, during his reign, Vladimir Province, located not far from Moscow, was the site of a lively debate about the meanings of the cotton and the linen industry. This debate was not between tradition and modernity, but between two contending visions of the modern. Both forms of industry were linked to ideas of science, progress, and national identity and sovereignty; however, they represented two very different ideas of social order. The cotton industry conformed closely to the classic vision of industry: urban, densely populated, large factories owned by industrialists using technologically advanced equipment. The linen industry, in contrast, was based in the countryside, dominated by nobles, and consisted of smaller, often non-mechanized factories. My goal is not to discuss the economic and spatial development of the industries themselves (see: Gestwa, 1999). Instead, this paper aims at tracing the development of cultural meanings of the cotton and the linen industry.

Landscape formed a central terrain of contention in this debate. The description of a particular landscape often gives abstract concepts, such as the nation, progress, or science, a material form (Daniels, 1993; *Picturing power ...*, 1988). In Vladimir Province, descriptions of the local industrial landscape were one of the few legal means of discussing the meaning of industry. Such descriptions were part of the official genre of the statistical essay, which aimed at making known the internal wealth of a particular factory, estate, district, or province. The statistical essay, and not literature, memoirs, or directly political speech, was the means by which the debate was conducted. In large part this was due to censorship restrictions, particularly after 1848. Overall, the censors did not consider “straight” description objectionable. Thus, descriptions of local industrial landscapes carried with them larger ideas about the nation, science, and gender and estate identities that could not easily be expressed in other genres.

Gender was an important part of such descriptions of because the landscapes were never empty; rather, they were densely populated with peasants or workers who, in the thinking of the time, needed to be directed and controlled. The most central figure in the landscape was that of the wise father who scientifically and rationally transformed the landscape into productive and socially stable space. The merchant estate and the noble estate both claimed the role of the wise father for themselves.

Earlier works provide new approaches to the subject of culture, industry, and gender. Susan McCaffray, in her study of industrialization in the late Imperial Donbass, focuses not so much on the process itself but on the active role Russians played in making their own meanings of industrialization (McCaffray, 1996). Where other scholars of the Donbass focused on foreign-owned businesses and their relations with the state, McCaffray uses the institutional sources of the Association of Southern Coal and Steel Producers to explore how Russians thought about industrialization and how this affected their actions. Beth Holmgren examines the commercialization of publishing, the intelligentsia’s response, and the gendered image of the merchant in literature. Holmgren suggests that the intelligentsia’s rejection of the market played an important role in the generally negative portrayal of the merchant in Russian and Polish literature (Holmgren, 1998). Holmgren’s connection of literature and the market combines literary criticism and social history in a suggestive way.

I retain both McCaffray’s interest in examining the responses to industrialization as part of a meaning-making process and Holmgren’s use of detailed textual analysis. Rather than looking at institutional records or literature, my main sources are statistical essays published in the provincial Vladimir newspaper.

The word “statistics” in the nineteenth century referred to three scholarly traditions: *Staatenskunde*, or the collection of information on states’ internal wealth for the purpose of comparing states; the charts and tables of political arithmetic, which developed out of the growth of life insurance and the need of the state to determine the number of potential soldiers; and the theory of probability. The last was more closely allied with higher mathematics than with the immediate needs of the state or the market (Berdinskikh / Бердинских, 1995; Darrow, 2000; Rich, 1998; Westergaard, 1969). While internal histories of statistics focus on the theory of probability, this paper will deal most closely with the development of *Statistik* as a subdiscipline of *Staatenskunde*, which had been brought to Russia by the German academics who were founding members of the Russian Academy of Sciences under Peter the Great (Stigler, 1986).

The theory of *Statistik* originated in seventeenth-century German-speaking Europe as part of a wide variety of new techniques of the state which Foucault has discussed in his work on governmentality. In contrast to older forms of sovereignty, best described by Niccolò Machiavelli, which focused almost entirely on the physical territory of the state, the sciences of governmentality added a powerful new focus on population both as an object of study and as an area of intervention. Foucault set out “to analyze the series: security, population, government” (Foucault, 1991: 87).

While the earlier practices of state had required only rather minimal information on territory, which changed only as a result of war or natural disaster, the new emphasis on governmentality called for an ever-increasing amount of information about the physical, moral, economic, and cultural state of the population. This ever-increasing collection of information has links to Pierre Bourdieu’s concept of informational capital, of which cultural capital is a part. For Bourdieu, informational capital is related to “the unification of the cultural market... the state contributes to the unification of the cultural market by unifying all codes, linguistic and juridical” (Bourdieu, 1999: 61). Thus, statistics, along with many other techniques of government, had as its stated aim the merging of varied localities into one unified field, either the nation or the state (Patriarcha, 1996).

The practice of *Statistik* was grounded in literary and social description, not mathematics. As David Rich put it, “‘statistic’ in the nineteenth century was a branch of political science dealing with the collection, ... classification and discussion of facts dealing with the condition of a state or a community” (Rich, 1998: 43). Statistical essays of the time were firmly qualitative, not quantitative, and more closely resembled a well-informed traveler’s account than what we today would consider a statistical report. Such essays regularly drew upon the present-day disciplines of history, ethnography, geography and anthropology in order to present a fuller picture of the internal wealth of the state. The well-funded institutions of Napoleonic descriptive statistics, which were introduced into conquered states, refined and extended the tradition of state-based *Statistik* in the early nineteenth century. Stuart J. Woolf stresses the dominant role of the state in Napoleonic statistics and argues that they mark the origin of modern statistics as an aid to policymaking and public discussion (Woolf, 1984: 165–169).

Following a period of consolidation after the Napoleonic wars, a widespread statistical movement took shape in the 1830s. During this “era of enthusiasm” statistical societies were founded in Great Britain, the United States, Norway, Denmark, Belgium, Saxony, and Russia (Westergaard, 1969: 136–171). It seems that partly this was due to a rising faith in statistics as a method of perceiving and altering social reality and partly to competition among states to establish large and prestigious statistical organizations. Many of these societies were official state organs that attempted to engage private individuals in the collection of statistical information. No advanced knowledge of mathematics was needed to participate, due to the descriptive nature of the statistics. Thus, when the Russian Ministry of the Interior (MVD) established statistical committees in all European provinces in 1834, they were firmly part of the European mainstream. As in other countries, the committees were responsible for gathering information on industry and agriculture.

The introduction of statistical committees was part of a wide-ranging reform of provincial government between 1834 and 1837 that both clarified and expanded the duties of the provincial governors. In particular, beginning in 1837, the governors were

required to present the MVD with an annual report containing statistical and economic information about the province under their administration (Evtuhov, 2011: 135; Orlovsky, 1981: 30–31). Before these reports, there was no regular flow of information from the provinces to the center, aside from random travelers' accounts and occasional reports from government inspectors. Thus, like other European states of the 1830s, the Russian government created institutions to increase the state's store of knowledge about its own territory and population that could then be used for diverse military, political, and social ends.

This is not a story solely about the state, however. A variety of influences were at work to foreground the question of society. Institutionally, discussions of local society found a forum after the MVD established provincial newspapers (*gubernskie vedomosti*) as part of a series of reforms of the provincial administration in the 1830s. The newspapers consisted of two sections: official and unofficial (Smith-Peter, 2008ab). The official section carried announcements from the central and provincial government, while the unofficial section included “news and articles of all types which deal, more or less, with the locality (*mestnost'*) [such as] geographical, topographical, historical, archaeological, statistical, ethnographic, etc., information” (Продолжение ... / Продолжение ..., 1842: addendum to Statute 648, Chapter 4, Article 153). From the state's point of view, the newspapers served to improve the flow of information between the higher state organs and the provincial board (*pravlenie*), one of the major administrative offices in the provinces. From the point of view of an emerging civil society, the newspaper, and particularly the unofficial section, provided an institutional forum for the study of the local. Vladimir's provincial newspaper began publication on January 1, 1838 and continued until 1918.

Local authors writing for the newspaper were influenced by a rising interest in society in both science and literature. Within the history of statistics, the Belgian statistician Adolphe Quetelet developed in the 1830s what he called “social physics,” which consisted of the mathematical analysis of social phenomenon such as longevity, illegitimate births, and so on (Stigler, 1999: 51–65). Quetelet's scientific discoveries played an important part in the shift from a state-centered statistics to a society-centered one. This new focus on society had already become known to Russian statistical practice in the 1830s (Smith-Peter, 2007).

Parallel to this development in the sciences was the rising popularity of the literary genre of the feuilleton. Originating in France, the feuilleton presented the author as a witty and observant guide to urban society. There were two main kinds of feuilletons: the physiognomic and the boulevard feuilleton. The physiognomic feuilleton classified different groups of people on the basis of their appearance, mentality, and activity. The boulevard feuilleton provided a description of the ever-changing activity in public places (Dianina, 2003).

Although the scientific essay and the feuilleton would seem to be clearly separate by intent and content, what actually occurred was a mixing of genres. It was quite typical for a statistical essay to include feuilletonistic descriptions of provincial scenes and persons. This genre promiscuity was widespread enough to disturb the state, as we see in a 1855 edict from the Committee of Ministers which stated that “news, information, and materials submitted to the unofficial section must not take the form of literary articles which typically include fantasies or embellishments such as tales, stories, and so on, not

related to the subject at hand” (*Vysochaishe utverzhdennoe polozhenie ... / Высочайше утвержденное положение*, 1856: 170).

Describing the physical, moral, and social effects of the rise of industry was one of the main areas of interest for the authors of statistical essays. Due to the local focus of the newspaper and the official dominance of the statistical essay as a genre, debates about industrialization were rarely couched in abstract or national terms. Instead, the terrain of debate consisted of the local landscapes of Vladimir Province, which, by the mid-nineteenth century, had a textile industry second in size and output only to Moscow (Blackwell, 1968: 116). The development of the textile industry in Vladimir Province was the result of various physical, religious and cultural stimuli.

The original site of the industry was in the northwest part of the province, also known as the ‘black earth of Vladimir’ region (not to be confused with the *chernozem*). Although Vladimir Province as a whole was known for its poor soil, in this region, which was centered on the district town of Yuriev-Pol’skii, the soil was highly productive. As a result, Yuriev district became a center for the linen industry, as linen’s raw ingredient — flax — grew in abundance in the region. Between 1720 and 1750, nobles established several linen factories in the ‘black earth’ region of Vladimir. Such “factories,” it should be emphasized, were not mechanized; instead, they were usually a collection of handlooms at which peasants wove. According to William Blackwell, noble owners such as these “were far more a part of the old Russian bureaucratic serf order than a beginning of industrial capitalism. The noble factory owner of the early nineteenth century remained essentially a variant within pre-industrial society. Rarely did he participate in the running of his factories or acquire managerial skills” (Blackwell, 1968: 200—201). Most likely due to the poor quality of its product, by 1830 the linen industry lost its dominant position in the province to the rising cotton industry around Ivanovo (Жорюлов / Копылов, 1999: 25).

The northeast part of Vladimir Province, centered on Ivanovo, formed a marked contrast with the Yuriev region. This region also included the towns of Shuia, Viazniki, and Voznesenskii Posad. Instead of rich soil, the soil was rocky and unproductive, forcing an early focus on crafts and out-working. Old Believers dominated the area economically. The Old Belief arose as a result of Patriarch Nikon’s reforms of the liturgy and other ecclesiastical points in the mid-seventeenth century. The Old Believers refused to accept the reforms, resulting in a church schism. Some scholars have compared Old Believers to Protestants due to their close association with the development of capitalism, while others see them as similar to national minorities (Anan’ich, 2005).

Due to the large communal treasuries of Old Believer communities, these sectarian merchants were able to gain the capital to establish large factories. Their factories sold products directly to the peasants by a system of peddlers without any state mediation. From the 1750s, when sectarian merchants established the first factories in Ivanovo, until 1812, linen was the dominant product, although cotton was increasingly present. When the Moscow cotton factories were destroyed by fire during the War of 1812, Ivanovo’s cotton factories began a period of extremely rapid expansion. The Old Believer cotton magnates were open to technological developments and had the capital to implement them. Despite their innovative practices, many of the Ivanovo merchants were serfs who either bought their freedom in the 1830s or were freed with the emancipation of the serfs in 1861. In Blackwell’s words, “where the landlord entrepreneur to

a large degree failed to modernize, the serf industrialist established himself as a fixed and prominent part of the Russian social scenery, as a modern type of capitalist, and as an important factor in the emerging textile industry” (Blackwell, 1968: 205).

These industrial landscapes were ordered in terms of gender and estate. As Joan Scott has written, “Statistical reports are neither totally neutral collections of fact nor simply ideological impositions. Rather they are ways of establishing the authority of certain visions of social order, of organizing perceptions of ‘experience’” (Scott, 1988: 115). These local spaces were given conflicted meanings by contemporaries who linked them to visions of different social orders. An important part of the debate about industry that went on in the pages of the Vladimir provincial newspaper was a contestation over masculinity. Members of both the noble and merchant estate had a stake in portraying themselves as master of the landscape.

Both estates had reasons to reassert their place in the social order. The nobles were quickly losing their central place in the province’s new industrial order. In addition, during the reign of Nicholas I, the provincial newspapers and statistical committees fostered a civil society of various estates that was taking some of the space formerly occupied by an exclusively noble local public. In response, some nobles attempted to establish scientific agriculture in the province that would, among other things, introduce better cultivation practices for flax and mechanize the production of linen. This was a project of certain nobles throughout the 1840s, and in 1854 they established a formal organization, the Yuriev Agricultural Society, in the district town of Yuriev-Pol’skii (Tikhonov / Тихонов, 1961: 94).

Although the sectarian merchants were at the center of the profitable and growing cotton industry, they experienced severe repression under Nicholas I for their religious beliefs. Nicholas I initiated a two-pronged campaign of repression and conversion. Most conversions were to *edinoverie* (the United Belief), an arm of the Russian Orthodox Church that functioned as a halfway house between the Old Belief and Orthodoxy. The state seized control of the great Old Believer communities in Moscow in 1847, and the peak of repression took place slightly later, between 1850 and 1854. The greatest number of conversions during Nicholas’ reign took place in 1854, largely due to a government decree that no Old Believers would be able to join merchant guilds after January 1, 1855 (Rieber, 1982: 142). Many of the industrialists who participated in the statistical committee and provincial newspaper had seen their fathers convert to *edinoverie* in the 1830s. It is difficult to tell if they continued to practice the Old Belief in secret, but it is clear that certain cultural values of the Old Belief — a strong emphasis on literacy and an interest in authentic, often pre-schism Russian values and traditions — continued to play a central role in the lives of the Ivanovo region industrialists.

Finally, the clerical estate had a stake in this debate, particularly through the clerical bureaucrats who actually ran the statistical committees and provincial newspapers. These clerical bureaucrats were born into the clerical estate, educated at the Vladimir seminary, and then took up posts in the administration in the provincial capital, Vladimir. The seminary emphasized service to the people and valorized Russian language, history, and traditions more than did the noble educational institutions such as the gymnasium (Manchester, 2008). As a result, clerical bureaucrats were the best qualified to organize and participate in the new study of the local that was centered in the provincial capital.

Thus, a spatial and social geography evolved in Vladimir Province, with nobles establishing their own organizations in Yuriev, clerical bureaucrats organizing the study of the local from the provincial capital of Vladimir, and sectarian industrialists participating in this study from the Ivanovo region. By examining the debates that sprang up around the cotton industry of Ivanovo and the linen industry of Yuriev, we can see how different industrial landscapes can represent different visions of the social order. Such landscapes contained conflicting claims about estate and gender identities.

IVANOVO: A LANDSCAPE OF THE COTTON INDUSTRY

Over the course of the 1850s, the way local authors wrote about Ivanovo's industrial landscape changed significantly. During the first half of the decade, the emphasis was on charting the location of products, both natural and man-made. After 1855, which saw the death of Nicholas I and the ascension of the more reform-minded Alexander II, authors focused more on the moral landscape of the factory as an arena for social relations.

The focus on products envisioned the industrial landscape as a map overlaid with samples of the products themselves. For example, Ivanovo would be represented by a piece of chintz and Gorokhovets by fine linen thread. This is visible in Konstantin Tikhonravov's proposal for a museum of the products of Vladimir Province. Tikhonravov was one of the most important clerical bureaucrats who served as the head of the statistical committee and the editor of the provincial newspaper during the 1850s. As part of Tikhonravov's duties as head of the statistical committee, he traveled throughout the province, collecting samples of the province's most important products. Tikhonravov hoped to create a Museum of Natural and Industrial Products of Vladimir Province (*Muzei estestvennykh, manufakturnykh i zavodskikh proizvedenii*) with these products as a base. On April 27, 1853, Tikhonravov (writing for Governor Annenkov) asked Provincial Marshal of the Nobility Sergei Bogdanov for permission to exhibit "maps of towns and districts, soil samples, industrial and agricultural products, as well as drawings of folk costumes" (Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Vladimirskoi Oblasti (GAVO), f. 431, op. 1, d. 1, l. 7). Bogdanov had informed the governor of plans to reopen the public library in the Noble Assembly, and Tikhonravov asked Bogdanov if the museum could be housed in one room of the public library. The letter closed with an argument that the library needed the museum so that "visitors to the library will have a visual understanding of the contemporary condition of the natural and industrial wealth of the province" (*ibid.*, l. 7ob). On April 29, 1853, Bogdanov replied that he was in favor of the project, but that since "at present the public library is closed and its books are stored in boxes in a shed and in the halls of the Noble Assembly, even though I am completely agreeable to locating a Statistical Room in the library, I find it difficult to establish, order and support such a room" (*ibid.*, l. 8ob). He did say that when the library was reopened, there would be no obstacles to devoting a room to the "industrial and crafts production of Vladimir province" (*ibid.*, 8-8ob). In 1854, Tikhonravov donated several objects, including "samples of alabaster and lime mined in the province and Gorokhovets thread of all sorts, from the very best to the worst, classified by fineness, whiteness and strength" (GAVO, f. 431, op. 1, d. 8, l. 28ob). In 1855 the Statistical Committee decided to collect samples of manufactured goods "which are highly developed in this province" (*ibid.*). The committee's 1854 report to the MVD, echoed Tikhonravov's earlier letter,

that “this collection promises to present itself in the future as a, so to say, living visual picture of the inner wealth of Vladimir province” (ibid, l. 20ob).

The committee’s 1856 report described the museum as already founded. Merchants from the Ivanovo region responded enthusiastically to the idea of the museum. Shuia merchant I. F. Popov, who played an important role in personally supporting the statistical committee and gathering donations from Shuia, gave samples of cotton cloth of all kinds for the museum. Lepeshkin’s Chemical Factory donated a wide range of chemicals, such as dextrin, alum, arsenic and wood vinegar (ibid, l. 33). Tikhonravov also successfully asked Ivanovo merchants to donate money for the establishment of the Museum of Natural and Industrial Products, as well as the establishment of a library under the Statistical Committee (GAVO, f. 431, op. 1, d. 9, l. 1).

A focus on products could speak to many different issues, such as empire, civilization, and religion. Andrei Peshe, an impoverished noble and domestic tutor who lived in Aleksandrov, wrote an 1845 statistical essay, “A View of Aleksandrov Town in Relation to Manufacturing,” in which he presented the capitalist as an agent of enlightenment in the East. This enlightenment was made possible by the production of a dyeing agent from the Caucasus. Peshe sketched a portrait of the ideal capitalist in I. F. Baranov. When describing Baranov’s dye works, Peshe wrote that “Every loyal citizen who truly loves his fatherland, should pay attention to Mr. Baranov’s establishment and even more so because in the future it will be so large, so significant in its expanse, that it will stand without rivals, not only in Russia, but in Germany and Switzerland. It will provide our domestic Russian dying needs without spending a kopeck on French or Dutch dye” (Vladimirskie gubernskie vedomosti (VGV), 1845, no. 11).

This equality with the West was juxtaposed with a portrait of the capitalist as bringer of civilization to the East. At the conclusion of his portrait of Baranov, Peshe wrote that, “I cannot be silent about his brave, noble and praiseworthy enterprise: he, like a true patriot, like a person both selfless and full of unconditional love for his fatherland, walks with firm tread along the path, which he has chosen for the glory of his land. He has already rented land in the Caucasus for the sowing of madder¹; wanting to put this work on firm foundation, it has called forth imitation, aroused a spirit of competition, and this has restored activity and trade in a region, still in its infancy. Many hands now have profitable work, the poorest families find means to feed themselves — this establishes contentment, which in turn gives birth to peace, quiet and happiness! And who knows, perhaps in time, instead of Russian paying France and Holland millions for their dyes, others states will pay us substantial sums for Caucasian madder.” Through its production of madder, industry is presented as the agent of civilization, equal to the West and civilizing the East. Interestingly, Peshe stated that Baranov’s works benefited “the simple class of consumers (*prostoi klass potrebitelei*)” and emphasized the number of people and families who found work in the Aleksandrov region thanks to Baranov (VGV, 1845, no. 13).

Industrial products placed the factory owner within an empire-wide system of trade. Merchant M. M. Liadov described the Shuia region (which included Ivanovo and Voznesenskii Posad) as the producer of goods for the Empire and the East. Liadov noted that it was a “purely manufacturing region ... occupied by tens of thousands of skilled laborers and working people (*masterovoi i rabochii narod*) ... [who] produce up to 150 million arshin² [of cloth] for a total sum of 25 million rubles annually!” (VGV, 1856,

no. 13). Liadov stated, “The goods prepared in factories are sold largely in fatherland Russia, and in other countries like Poland, Bessarabia, the Caucasus, Persia, Khiva, Bukhara and Kokand” (VGV, 1856, no. 13). According to Liadov, few merchants extended credit at fairs, such as in Kharkov, where most of the buyers were Polish Jews, Crimean Tatars and traders from Bessarabia and Ukraine. Here, Liadov focused on the production of cloth, and its role in constituting a single sphere of trade within the diversity of the Russian empire.

Another article wove the production of cloth into a valorization of Russian traditions and the Old Belief. Vladimir Borisov was a townsman from Shuia whose family were originally Old Believers. For a time a manager of a factory, Borisov spent most of his life collecting old historical documents on Shuia and publishing many articles in the Vladimir newspaper. Borisov’s religious and industrial interests were combined in the final passage in his otherwise wholly innocuous statistical essay on Shuia. Describing the view from the river Teza looking towards Shuia, Borisov invited the reader to, “Sit on the bank. Behind you are half-knocked over wooden crosses among birches in the Old Believer cemetery. Before you is the river, which in summer days in a blue ribbon weaving past meadows, and in spring is like a big lake covering the plain on the other side. Around it are the Shuia beauties, walking in their fancy clothes. Then we are embarked into such pleasant dreams, which rarely awaken in the soul of residents of the splendid capitals” (VGV, 1844, no. 37). This statement is quite remarkable, given that the censorship rarely allowed any mention of the Old Believers.

There is a complex range of meanings with this description. The Old Believer cemetery is located behind the reader, which may imply either that it refers to the past or is the foundation for the prosperity before him. Both may be true, as Old Believers were the founders of the textile industry in Shuia. The picture of the fancy clothes of the Shuia beauties also is linked to the Old Believer cemetery through the cloth they wear. Borisov’s use of the word ‘fancy’ or ‘dandified’ suggests that the young women are wearing store-bought material, not homespun. This, too, is linked to the textile industry. The cemetery itself is Russian, as birches symbolized Russia. The crosses themselves are wooden and thus lack the luxury of the big city, and are half-bent, half-knocked over. The word cemetery (*kladbischche*) was also part of the name of two major Old Believer communities in Moscow, which were self-sufficient and extremely wealthy until Nicholas I led a frontal attack on them in 1847. The communities were called cemeteries because they were centered on major Old Believer cemeteries in Moscow (Blackwell, 1968: 212–229). Borisov used the word *staroobriadcheskii*, which the Old Believers often used to describe themselves, in contrast to the official word *raskol’niki* (sectarians). Thus, Borisov tied together the elements of the production of cloth, the persistence of the Old Belief, natural beauty, economic wealth and Russianness in this description.

Others focused less on what was produced and more on the methods of production and the need for technological change within a stable social system. The main proponent of this approach was I. E. Nesytov, a graduate of the Petersburg Technical Institute and the Vladimir Provincial Engineer during the 1850s. The government established the post of provincial engineer in 1844 with the aim of spreading technical knowledge. Nesytov was a statist whose aim was not to make visible the interior wealth of the province but rather to show the crucial role of the state in creating a technologically advanced nation.

In response to those who argued that industrialization threatened the social order, Nesytov deployed the rhetoric of tutelage (*popечenie*). According to V. Ia. Laverychev, tutelage was a response to industrialization developed within the Ministry of Internal Affairs that stressed the state's paternalistic care of the workers while preventing the workers from independently organizing (Laverychev / Лаверычев, 1972). Overall, however, the focus of Nesytov's work until 1855 was not on relations between workers and employers, but on the proper methods of production. This presents a clear parallel with Tikhonravov's pre-1855 work, which focused on the products themselves. The main point of Nesytov's pre-1855 work was to argue for the benefits of mechanization, particularly of the linen industry.

Nesytov faced a delicate task in encouraging the linen manufacturers to follow the lead of the more technologically advanced cotton magnates. On the whole, the linen manufacturers were nobles, while the cotton factory owners were merchants and suspected Old Believers at that. The rhetoric of tutelage provided a way to accomplish this goal. Tutelage was strongly gendered male, and the central figure of the rhetoric was the wise father. Within the rhetoric of tutelage, both the noble estate and the merchant estate were called upon to act as dutiful sons toward the solicitous state. For example, Nesytov praised the participation of several Vladimir linen factory owners in a manufacturing exhibition in Moscow in 1855. Nesytov noted that the manufacturers, "if not quickly, then positively and with good sense, are following the beneficial measures of the government. They will progress and show their strength and so will honorably not only maintain, but also increase their annual output" (VGV, 1855, no. 34).

The idea of the paternal state was also visible in Nesytov's extended argument for the founding of mechanized linen spinning in Russia. Nesytov wrote that "through privileges and advantages given by the Government to founders of mechanical linen mills, through encouragement and awards to the producers of linen goods and financial assistance, which as a result of different scientific and specialist searches, have been proposed by the Department of Manufacture and Interior Trade, the Imperial Free Economic Society and different scientific societies, under whose technical direction and promulgation we have learned much in the linen industry, we have mastered much that is useful, and without doubt will assist [the linen industry] to success" (VGV, 1854, no. 50). The trope of the wise father was even more visible in Nesytov's treatment of Peter the Great and the linen industry. Nesytov stated that "the solicitous attention of Peter the Great, given to linen manufacture" resulted in many new regulations regarding the size and quality of linen, which, he argued, "show that the Great Monarch, preoccupied with the limited production of linen, acted for all industrial and trading people and took the most efficacious measures in order to strengthen trust in Russian goods" (VGV, 1855, no. 33).

Nesytov also attempted to question the masculinity of linen manufacturers who refused to mechanize by presenting mechanization as the movement from a feminine to a masculine sphere of work. When discussing the spinning of linen in olden times, he said that with women's work "success was weak" (VGV, 1855, no. 33), but with the introduction of Jacquard looms, all was transformed. "This great discovery of wise Jacquard was energetically taken on by Russian manufacturers and Vladimir factory owners at the very beginning of its development" (VGV, 1855, no. 33). The male inventor was a light-bringer to the weaker female realm of production. Those manufacturers who willfully chose to remain within the female sphere were not fully developed, Nesytov implied.

In sharp contrast with the linen manufacturers, the cotton factory owners eagerly sought after and implemented technological improvements. In retelling the history of the cotton industry in Vladimir province, Nesytov emphasized the Ivanovo factory owners' desire for knowledge and their role in bringing the light of science and technology to Ivanovo. Nesytov wrote, "Driven by the desire to know the secret [of producing chintz], and, even more, by enterprise and a love for art, two Ivanovo peasants, Grachev and Usov, decided to go to the distant capital (a trip of some 900 versts was so considered) and there find happiness. Their desire was fulfilled and they became workers in the chintz printing factory of the foreigner Lemen in Schlüsselberg. There they learned several secrets, and with this indestructible capital returned to their homeland" (VGV, 1856, no. 26), where they set up the first chintz printing factory using the new scientific methods.

It is clear that Nesytov described capitalists with a mixture of paternalism and pride; paternalism because the state and its engineers would keep the capitalists on the right path, and pride because their accomplishments contributed to Russia's glory. Nesytov's fairy tale about Grachev and Usov hid larger conflicts, however. Efim Grachev was not just one of the founders of the cotton industry in Ivanovo; he was also an Old Believer of the radical Theodosian sect, which the state regarded as avowed enemies.

Nesytov consistently downplayed the role of the Old Belief in Ivanovo's past and present. When discussing Shuia and Ivanovo, Nesytov wrote in 1851 that industry "sheds light on the state of education, science, arts and enlightenment in general ... Twenty years ago there was a state of affairs which today's factory owners and merchants look at as the errors and prejudices of their predecessors. Piety (*blagochestie*), obedience, art, love of work, and true enlightenment each year acquire there more and more followers, especially in the younger generation" (VGV, 1851, no. 3). This statement acquires a particular meaning when we recall that there was one wave of conversions from the Old Belief to the halfway house of *edinoverie* in the 1830s and another between 1850 and 1854. The Old Belief had no place in Nesytov's scheme, as it undermined the social relations of paternalism and obedience.

For Nesytov, the capitalist was part of a hierarchy of the tsar, engineers, capitalists, and, at the bottom, the working people. For Nesytov, solicitude was the glue binding this hierarchical system together; each level had to show solicitude to those below them in order for it to function. In this system, the state played the role of paternal guide to Russia's infant industries. "The beneficial Government with fatherly solicitude has put forward for manufacturers the very best assistance in the founding in St. Petersburg of the Technical Institute, where young people are given all possible means for the acquisition of knowledge of Chemistry, Physics, Engineering, Technology and Accounting" (VGV, 1852, no. 5). Local factory owners who failed to send their sons to the institute were acting like ungrateful and petulant children in refusing the care of the government, Nesytov argued. In order to illustrate the correct relation of local factory owners to the state's solicitude, Nesytov described three generations of manufacturers. The son, Vasilii, studied "chemistry, physics and mechanics," and while his father, Avgust Ivanovich, "taught him the practical things about running a factory... Avgust Ivanovich is only a practical man, and Vasilii knows chemistry" (VGV, 1858, no. 40). Vasilii had a son, Fedya, and "Fedya will be sent by his rational father to study technology in St. Petersburg" (VGV, 1858, no. 40). This movement toward acceptance of the state's

paternal concern was also a movement toward attaining individual status as a wise and rational father.

For Nesytov, the growth of industry was a necessary precondition for the growth of the Russian nation. As Nesytov exclaimed, “Now we may say that industry is one of the beneficial influences of humanity’s external and even internal civilization! That which we attribute to England — that is what we ought to await from every state, especially from Russia, which in one century committed an amazing feat, with enough Russian quickness (*smetlivost’*) and business activity to allow the increase of foreign and domestic industry” (VGV, 1851, no. 3). Russian quickness and the crash modernization of Peter the Great distinguished Russia from England, according to Nesytov.

This sense of national competition was very important to Nesytov’s overall belief in the need for rapid industrialization. England’s head start made it all the more imperative that Russia catch up as soon as possible or be left behind forever. At the same time, Nesytov’s belief in already existing Russian superiority suggested that the battle was already half won. Nesytov joined Peter the Great’s top-down transformation of Russian society with an appreciation of Russian quickness and aptitude for business and, in so doing, attempted to unite the desires of the state with the Russian national character.

In writing about Vladimir province’s cotton industry, Nesytov noted in 1856 that “in the last 25 years [the cotton industry] made such a splash, that it called forth foreign rumors and attention and awakened surprise towards Russian inventiveness, quickness and activity, and then awakened envy in several governments” (VGV, 1856, no. 25). In a similar vein, Nesytov wrote that, “We strongly say that the cotton industry has forever acquired solid form in Russia, and foreign egoism will never snatch it away from a strong Russia, which is the land of its origin, where it is supported by business activity, capital and the knowledge of Russian cotton spinners and factory owners” (VGV, 1856, no. 25). Thus, a fear of England and a pride in Russia uneasily, yet quite productively, coexisted in Nesytov.

Overall, in the first half of the 1850s, authors writing in the *Vladimir Provincial Newspaper* focused mainly on industrial products and technological innovations. Theirs was a landscape more shaped by things than by people. In the second half of the decade, however, social relations of production would take the center stage.

RELATIONS OF PRODUCTION

After 1855, authors focused on the need to codify a moral capitalism and to delineate the moral landscape of Vladimir Province’s factories. This focus on morality was often linked to a paternalistic attitude toward the workers, who were often portrayed as children. In contrast to earlier landscapes of the province’s industry that had dealt with products, the focus shifted to the mapping out of a moral hierarchy of factories. Such a hierarchy was determined by the solicitude of the factory owner for his workers. The image of the wise father was central to this vision of a moral industrial landscape.

A forerunner of this interest in the workers and an exceptional article in its own right was Borisov’s 1847 magnum opus on factory workers, “On the Factory, Artisan, and Working Class of the People in Shuia Town and District”. At this time, “class” primarily meant a subset of people within the larger estate category. It also provided a way to lump together members of various estates. In contrast to other treatments, Borisov presented the workers as full adults. Rather than more paternal care, Borisov’s textile

workers needed fairer wages and better working conditions. After 1848, Borisov confined his multitudinous articles to old documents and straight statistical essays without editorializing.

Borisov's article was written in the style of a physiognomic feuilleton crossed with a statistical essay. This type of feuilleton delineated various social types and described their physical, economic, and moral character. Borisov was familiar with the physiognomic feuilleton, for he promised to write another article on workers in Shuia brick factories from Galicia and who "have their own physiognomy" (VGV, 1847, no. 20). Borisov approved of the progress of industry, as we see in his dismissal of the linen industry as merely "remains of former old manufactures" (ibid). This contrasted with the efforts of Nesytov and, later, the Yuriev Agricultural Society, to revive the linen industry.

For Borisov, the cotton industry was dynamic and exciting. "In every street the sound of the shuttles, the wail of unwinding thread, the tapping of the printing process, the bustling of the looms' reeds and other tools, the songs of the workers (*pesni rabotnikov*) are everywhere audible," Borisov wrote. "To these eternal laborers, to their occupations, customs and characteristics, to their condition under the present development of industry, we will give our attention," he continued. (ibid). This description was of an unabashedly vigorous, lively, and mechanized process. Borisov defined the "factory class of people" as the 20,000 to 25,000 workers in the factories, excluding traders and farmers. "The factory class itself was divided into several ranks, each with their own way of life and characteristics, which distinguish one from the other." He based his description on his own experience, writing that "I know about this by my own experience, having managed one important factory for ten years" (ibid).

He then described the various groups within the "factory class," which he divided into an artisan class and a working class. When describing the artisan class, he began with the printers, who formed what could be called a worker aristocracy. He noted that they read the Ministry of State Domains' journal, *Village Reading* (*Sel' skoe Chtenie*), and that "those who demand something more scholarly read, for example, geography, history and particularly religious books" (ibid). The printers, he noted, made less money than they once did. Similarly, the engravers once were paid much more before foreign skilled workers were brought in. Borisov praised the scientific knowledge of such groups as the colorists. "Every colorist knows chemistry or chemical processes, and all are self-taught. There are scholarly colorists, but they are not our Russians (*rusaki*), but foreigners, receiving a huge salary in comparison with the Russians" (ibid).

Borisov then described the working class, such as dyers. "There are many good, experienced, knowledgeable dyers who are no worse than many foreigners and deserve to be paid more than they are now," Borisov argued. The working class also consisted of unwinders, washers and boiler men of two categories, the first and cleaner of which were state peasants, the second of which come from a different district and were cruder. He noted that the second were called *zbuchki*, which he termed a "rather witty name in the language of the working class". In Dal, "*zbuchka*" is listed as a nickname for a black dog and as a name for an unskilled worker (*chernorabochii*) in the Vladimir dialect (Dal / Даль, 1955: 547). The play on words seemed to be on the blackness of the dog and the "blackness" of the unskilled worker, which directly translates as "black worker." Aside from this lower group of boiler men, Borisov excluded the simple unskilled workers as "not really fitting into the delineation of classes" (ibid).

Borisov's descriptions of workers were extraordinary on several counts. Prior articles on factories gave statistics on the number, type of products, owners, and number of workers in the province's factories or praised the factory owners. Borisov's was the first to present the workers as a complex group, in which even the lower rung or "working class" in Borisov's terms, was able to be witty. The "artisan class" was a reservoir of practical scientific knowledge, according to Borisov. In his account, the main problem with the workers was that they were not paid enough, particularly in comparison with foreigners working at similar jobs in Shuia.

In contrast to Borisov's robust workers, both proponents and critics of moral capitalism argued for the need for a paternalistic concern for workers that was often combined with greater control. Ya. A. Solovyov's 1854 article on Vladimir Province's agriculture and industry was the first to create a moral hierarchy of industry on the pages of the provincial newspaper. Solovyov was an enlightened bureaucrat who worked with the liberal Nikolai Miliutin, and was, in fact, even more radical in his advocacy of peasants' rights than Miliutin (Orlovsky, 1981: 131). Prior to the Great Reforms, he worked for the Ministry of State Domains in Vladimir from 1843 to 1857, where he was involved in administering a shift from a head tax on peasants to taxing the income from agriculture and industry. During the Great Reforms, he was in charge of the *Zemskii otdel* (*Land / Local Section*), which was the governmental body responsible for drafting the final administrative reforms, including the introduction of the *zemstvo*, the local governmental body usually seen as the start of local civil society.

In his article, Solovyov ranked the different regions of Vladimir province according to the well-being of the people (*narod*). Solovyov argued that such a differentiated view of peasants was necessary in order to have a fairer distribution of taxes and more effective regulation of state peasants. Solovyov's method of comparison between regions in Vladimir province was not the profits of capitalists, but the wellbeing of the people. "It seems to me," he wrote, "that for the people, their craft is the more profitable, the less it depends from owner-capitalists (*khoziain-kapitalist*)" (VGV, 1854, no. 29). He arranged the regions in a hierarchy so that the Viazniki district, which was the homeland of the traveling peddlers known as *ofeni*, and the Vladimir district, with its tradition of master craftsmen, were presented as the two areas most beneficial to the people and that displayed the least dependence of workers on capitalists. The regions near Moscow, which were known for kitchen gardening, and beyond the Kliaz'ma, known for barge hauling, were more and less beneficial, respectively. The least beneficial to the people was the Shuia region, where the cotton industry and factory labor dominated and workers were most dependent on capitalists.

According to Solovyov', certain relations between capitalists and peasants, such as the *ofeni*, could even be beneficial for the people. "Despite the dependent relationship of the agents to the capitalists, [the *ofeni* trade], by its very nature, is not the unprofitable dependence that exists between factory workers and manufacturers" (VGV, 1854, no. 30). The capitalists' lack of control or surveillance over their agents, who went on foot to the farthest reaches of Ukraine and Siberia, made it profitable for the latter. As a result, if the *ofeni* were not treated well, they could easily trick the owner of the goods. To encourage the *ofeni* to return and pay off their debts, the suppliers of goods promised them new boots or a special carriage upon their return. In addition, "a few *ofeni* become owner-capitalists, while most enter the merchantry" (*ibid*). For Solovyov, the

problem was not the hierarchy of capitalist and worker, but the industrial working conditions characterized by constant surveillance and a low-paying job.

Solovyov was particularly horrified by the situation in the *svetelki*. In Solovyov's description, the *svetelki* were "built as a large hall and have low ceilings and a dirt floor. The looms are close to each other and it is always unhealthy due to the rawness of the atmosphere. Men and women, girls and boys work together and sleep together ... At peasant gatherings, the weavers have pale faces while the brickmakers and carpenters have healthy faces" (ibid). Weaving without impoverishment was possible only in regions with good land, according to Solovyov. Significantly, Solovyov focused almost exclusively on the non-mechanized aspects of factory production, thus denying any claim for the scientific and progressive nature of industry. There were no workers in Solovyov's narrative, only peasants.

Solovyov was one of the first to introduce the rhetoric of moral capitalism into local discourse, and so established a different set of questions by which local authors could evaluate industrial activity. While before the main focus was on the amount of production and the total number of employees, with the advent of the idea of moral capitalism, much attention was given to the relationship between factory owner and employee. Because Solovyov, backed by the Ministry of State Domains, attacked the Shuia-Ivanovo region as the least moral area in the province, defenders of the cotton industry were called to refute the terms using a moral lexicon.

In 1856, Tikhonravov entered a new stage in his writings on industry, which emphasized a moral evaluation of the employer-worker relationship. In an article early in 1856, Tikhonravov discussed the fairs and markets of Kholi town. Rather than giving monetary totals for the goods sold at each fair, Tikhonravov described how the *ofeni* received goods and credit from their bosses at the fairs and traveled across the country selling the goods. The following year, after they returned to the fair, they paid part of their debt to the trader, received more goods and more credit and started the process again. Beginning *ofeni* received the least profitable goods because the sellers at the fair were unable to supervise them.

Tikhonravov refrained from moral statements, but it is clear that he sympathized with the working *ofeni* (i.e., not the sellers or *ofeni* who had bought into the merchantry). He noted, "some workers are long indebted to their boss, and after 20 to 30 years, and they say that they are unable to pay him" (VGV, 1856, no. 7). Tikhonravov called the peddler a capitalist, and noted that he "tries to get his own capital and after some time enters the merchant or townsman estate ... Sometimes he turns over his capital three or four times and year, turns over his quitrent to his owner and keeps a kopeck or two for himself" (ibid). While this seems preferable to being in debt to others, Tikhonravov argued that this upward mobility hurt the larger peasant community. Tikhonravov argued that "after the exit of these capitalists into the merchantry, [many peasants] became poorer than those who had remained farmers, because village workers, let go by such owners, lost their good-paying jobs" (ibid).

In an article later in 1856, Tikhonravov returned to the study of workers and capitalists with a stronger moral accent. Discussing the industry and trade of Viazniki uezd, Tikhonravov decried the baneful influence of weaving and trade on the peasantry. Rather than giving totals of the number of looms, Tikhonravov described the *svetelki* or manufactories. These manufactories were large buildings containing several handlooms

at which peasants wove cloth, mainly linen. The manufactories were usually built by other peasants who acted as intermediaries between capitalists and the peasant workers. Noting that boys and girls began weaving at ten, Tikhonravov wrote, “words do not suffice to describe the influence on the health and morals of this dirty assemblage, which, amid dirt and stuffiness, without separation of sexes and ages, and lacking any supervision for morals, works day and night. Here peasants from a young age become unfamiliar with farming work, which requires more work and does not give immediate gratification” (VGV, 1856, no. 18). Because the workers were no longer self-sufficient, they had to buy the necessities of life from their employer. “Lack of foresight makes the factory worker the slave of the owner-capitalist (*kboziain-kapitalist*),” Tikhonravov wrote, echoing the words and sentiment of Solovyov (*ibid*).

Similar problems occurred with the *ofeni*, whom Tikhonravov divided into two categories: those carrying chintz, books, pictures, and so on, and those selling small things such as ribbons that could be carried in a box on their backs. Tikhonravov emphasized the significance of these traders as a distribution network for factory owners in the provinces, even the most distant, calling it “trade without courtly formalities». Again concerned with the system of credit, Tikhonravov wrote, “the merchantry sells its goods and gives credit at a doubled price, gets half of it up front, and so loses nothing. Thus the moral side is not important” (*ibid*). Even the peddler who did become rich “brings evil to his own house and to the local population, which is hardly to be considered profitable.” This evil consisted of being away from his village for two to three years at the least and above all in losing his peasant ways. “Absences make a peasant distant from his family and home life and used to luxury. He stops drinking only tea and begins to have coffee, too. Instead of a caftan, he has a cashmere robe and stops being a peasant. His income is no longer from being a peasant-farmer” (*ibid*).

Taken as a whole, all of Tikhonravov’s articles suggest an evolution of his image of the capitalist from a producer of useful goods to someone enmeshed in often-exploitative relations with their workers. At the same time, Tikhonravov did not present a negative view of all capitalists; he refrained from moral judgment of the large textile industrialists that made up the majority of the donors and corresponding members for the statistical committee. Instead, he attacked the mainly noble owners of linen manufactories, about whom Solovyov had either remained silent or elided into the category of merchant. Tikhonravov implied that the true evil was the disappearance of the peasantry into the ranks of both capitalists and workers, and not the relationship between employer and worker itself. For Tikhonravov, the peasant was the repository of Russian identity. The drinking of tea and the wearing of caftans were symbols of Russian tradition that were being threatened by the unchecked growth of industry.

For Tikhonravov, the moral capitalist was a merchant who produced useful goods and whose relations with his workers were non-exploitative. Such relationships did not threaten the existing social order, as merchants had long been engaged in production and trade. Tikhonravov was particularly concerned with capitalists’ use of credit to enmesh their employees in a web of debt. The peasant-capitalist was a new figure who did not meet Tikhonravov’s approval. Instead of keeping to the old ways, this new hybrid threatened the social order and morality by losing his peasant ways and entrapping other peasants in a subservient status by means of exploitative credit mechanisms.

Nesytov's post-1855 articles, like Tikhonravov's, were also centrally concerned with the creation of moral capitalism and the construction of a moral hierarchy of capitalists and their factories. Nesytov's favorite saying, "talent is from God but wealth is from the hand of man," suggests the close link in his mind between religion and economic productivity. When discussing the Christian duty of factory owners toward their workers, Nesytov stated that "solicitude about the health of the workers, providing for them in case of old age or on-the-job accidents which otherwise deprive workers of the means for support of themselves and their families, safe work — this comprises the moral duty of the owner of a factory. In the Russian god-fearing heart is a deep-rooted devotion to faith, tsar and fatherland! The Christian catechism gives the Russian people knowledge of the necessity of working, improves their art, profits and their zeal to work. The owners of factories must have duties of Christian love to their workers, "The least of these..." (VGV, 1858, no. 42). This passage expresses Nesytov's belief in the necessity of integrating capitalists into the larger system of paternalism and submission. The factory owner-worker relationship should be a mirror of the tsar-subject relationship.

Nesytov's treatment of the moral and practical side of the capitalist-worker relationship began in the early 1850s. For Nesytov, workers had their own place in the moral hierarchy and were separate from peasants. In 1851, he described the working class as bees, suggesting a lack of individuality and a focus on production. As he wrote, "Industry supports the people's wealth; to it, like to an apiary, flow the working class (*rabochii klass*) and masters [skilled workers] numbered not in the thousands" (VGV, 1851, no. 3). The use of "working class" was quite differentiated from the peasantry. Indeed, Nesytov's 1852 article on wages stated that "wages need to be brought more to the level of the local situation and the needs of the working people (*rabochii narod*), whose well-being depends on the reward for their work" (VGV, 1852, no. 24). Industry, not agriculture, ought to provide for their wellbeing. For Nesytov, the blessings of science, as moderated through the tsar, his engineers, and his loyal capitalists, ensured that factory workers as factory workers had a definite place within a moral system. This contrasts sharply with nobles' and others' concern for the loss of peasant identity among workers, which they associated with a destabilization of the entire society.

The shift in focus from methods of production to the moral relations of production was also visible in contrasting treatments of the capitalist S. V. Morozov. In an 1855 description of Morozov's factory, Nesytov greatly praised his technical advances, and in particular the uniting of spinning and weaving. Morozov, Nesytov stated, was in the ranks of "important and useful capitalists" (VGV, 1855, no. 29). Nesytov's only criticism was that Morozov hired foreign, mainly British, engineers as top management. However, Nesytov's article from 1857 posited a clear moral hierarchy among Vladimir industrialists based on the treatment of workers, and in this respect, Morozov ranked below the top. According to Nesytov, the office formed "the soul of the factory, its moral element" (VGV, 1857, no. 44), and as such had a great responsibility to insure the wellbeing of the workers. This well-being was insured through observation and control, as we see in Nesytov's statement that "each step of the working people should be put into order by inspection" (*ibid.*).

The Mal'tsov cotton spinnery in Gus' received first place in this hierarchy because of Mal'tsov's humane shift schedule. Morozov only appeared in third place, although, according to Nesytov "according to his annual production, he ought to be in first place.

He could be in first place, but the owner needs to give attention to certain things” (ibid). Nesytov’s detailed descriptions of the enlightened relations between other industrialists and their workers (such as the establishment of schools, model housing and so on) made it clear that these “certain things” had to do with Morozov’s treatment of workers. When describing one of the enlightened manufacturers, I. F. Popov (also an active participant in the Statistical Committee), Nesytov wrote that Popov “gives so that Shuia residents are not poor, so that boys don’t have to go to foreigners’ windows and hold out their hand in the name of Christ” (VGV, 1857, no. 45). Morozov’s refusal to act as a wise father was made literal in this description of abandoned boys.

For Nesytov, Russia was to be an industrial nation and workers had a definite and necessary place in it. Nesytov was not interested in the peasant as bearer of Russian national identity. Instead, the tsar functioned as the center of the Russian Empire and was responsible for ensuring Russia’s survival as a proudly independent industrial state. While it would seem that Nesytov had less of a sense of ethnic Russianness based on the Russian peasant, he did strongly call for Russian engineers, not foreign ones. For Nesytov, the Russian engineer combined of the power of science and nationalism and had a duty to use science to help other Russians and the Russian Empire as a whole. Nesytov combined the tripartite motto of Official Nationality (Autocracy, Orthodoxy, Nationality) with an appeal for a moral capitalism. Nesytov’s moral capitalism retained the necessary hierarchy of tsar and subjects, God and supplicants, employees and employers, all bound by ties of mutual respect.

THE CAPITALISTS SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES

Starting in 1853, Ivanovo merchants who were members of the Vladimir Statistical Committee began to publish regularly in the Vladimir paper. Many of them used the newspaper to defend the morality of their relations with the workers. Overall, the years 1853 and 1854 together composed a crucial turning point for Ivanovo factory owners. A severe economic crisis brought on by the Crimean War and the drying up of credit showed the need to study the market. At the same time, cotton manufacturers chose to intensify the mechanization of their factories. It is striking that 1853 marks both the installation of the first mechanized loom in Yakov Garelin’s factory and his first article in the *Vladimir Provincial Newspaper*. At the same time, increased religious persecution of suspected Old Believers meant that manufacturers could no longer count on the religious community between workers and themselves as a source of stability.

At this moment, the Vladimir Statistical Committee asked merchants to participate in its work in collecting information for the government and for publication in the provincial newspaper. For some factory owners, the Statistical Committee offered a way to present their viewpoint in a scientific way. Contact with the Statistical Committee meant that factory owners could present their relations with their workers not simply as paternalistic, but as that of a social scientist and his subjects. With the end of the crisis in the markets in 1856, factory owners continued to participate in the committee, turning to descriptions of the history, founders and production of cotton factories.

One noticeable trend was the shift from a merchant bound to traditional, non-mechanized production, to a factory owner conversant with the newest technology. At the same time, there was a steady increase of interest in the systematic study of the workers in their factories. The factory owner hoped to attain the status of a scientist studying his

workers. An article written by a corresponding member of the Statistical Committee, Lev Nikitin, described the earlier merchant self-image. Nikitin, a merchant and linen producer, focused on the paternalistic relations of merchants toward their workers and on the merchants' good deeds rather than discussing their scientific knowledge. After describing the physical space of the town of Viazniki, Nikitin noted its civic improvements, and particularly those sponsored by merchants. For example, the merchants Sen'kov and Obykhov established a water system in the town, thus providing nearly all factory owners with water. "This water is not just for the residents of the town, but for the visitors and the working people (*rabochii narod*)," Nikitin stated (VGV, 1852, no. 3). Nikitin also noted the contributions of local merchants to the city's churches. According to Nikitin, there were 17 linen factories in Viazniki, some of which were in stone buildings with multiple looms.

Nikitin praised the merchants who had installed steam cauldrons for the heating of thread, saying, "This simple thing not only serves the use of the factory owner, but also shows love of humanity toward the working people (*rabochie liudi*)" (ibid). Nikitin had a paternalistic attitude towards the workers. The merchants (*kuptysy*, not *kapitalisty*) provided for the workers. These terms suggested a vision of workers as a part of the larger folk rather than separate from it. This is quite different from Tikhonravov's plaint of workers ceasing to be peasants. According to Nikitin, the three best of Viazniki's linen factories were non-mechanized. In addition, Nikitin argued, mechanized linen spinning would destroy the contemporary Russian linen industry.

Ivanovo factory owners Ya. P. Garelin and I. A. Baburin retained Nikitin's paternalism but firmly rejected his anti-technological stance. Both of these factory owners were investigated by the MVD during the 1850s on suspicion of being Old Believers. In Garelin's case, his father had converted to Orthodoxy in 1831. The Garelins, along with the Grachevs, were among the founders of the textile industry in Ivanovo in the eighteenth century. Both Garelin and Baburin were supporters of the Vladimir Statistical Committee from the time it was reestablished in 1855 (Baldin / Балдин, 1993).

Garelin and Baburin argued that weaving was good for the peasants and for the Russian nation. In describing the production of unbleached calico, they stated that weaving "is one of the beneficial occupations of free hands". The peasants "during their time free from field work, weave calico at home or in manufactories... [Weaving] for a long time was the source of the well-being of the peasants, who, not having to move far from their families in order to find work and being occupied during the winter, have under their control a business with overly-rewarded work". (VGV, 1853, no. 51). Garelin and Baburin argued that the cotton industry supported the continuation of peasant well-being and peasant identity.

Baburin and Garelin also extolled the national achievements of cotton manufacturers. They described how "before, about ten years ago, when Russian spinning of thread couldn't keep up with the demands of the factory owners, [cotton manufacturers] ordered thread from England through Moscow and St. Petersburg agents (mostly foreigners). At present, thanks to improved distribution and a modernized structure for Russian cotton spinning, Ivanovo factory owners go right to [domestic] cotton spinners and buy thread of the necessary amount for their factory" (VGV, 1853, no. 49).

Unlike Nikitin's article, Garelin and Baburin argued that technological advancements were necessary for the continued existence of the cotton industry and for Rus-

sian industrial independence. The article celebrated technological innovations such as the mechanized spinning of cotton thread on cops (a cone-shaped ball of thread or yarn wound on a spindle in a spinning machine) rather than on spools. This “saves money from the useless paying for unwinding and preserves the thread, which, being unwound on the spools, loses its properties due to the unskilled unwinders,” Garelin and Baburin stated (*ibid*). New technology allowed for the mechanized preparation of warp that was then sold to weavers who completed the pieces on handlooms by weaving in the weft. Rather than having to pay weavers to prepare the entire piece of cloth, manufacturers used them only to weave in the weft. The new technology provided both independence from foreigners and a greater independence from workers’ skills (or lack thereof).

The enlightened factory owners thus argued that they played a crucial role in the creation of a strong national industry that provided the peasants with an honorable way of making a living. An independent Russia needed a flourishing peasantry, and the industrialists argued that they provided the means by which the peasantry could continue to work on the land and retain their peasant identity. The factory owners emphasized their acceptance of technological innovation as a crucial means of insuring national independence from foreigners. While this use of science and technology parallels Nesytov’s, the factory owners did not mention the state at all. This was consistent with their Old Believer background. For them, the moral capitalist made use of new developments in technology and in so doing benefited both the workers and the nation.

The landscape of the Ivanovo cotton industry was an urban, mechanized one dominated by factory owners from the merchant estate. Under attack by the moral hierarchy of Solovyov and others, defenders of the cotton industry responded by creating a moral hierarchy within the cotton industry. This hierarchy created a moral landscape of the factory in which factories led by paternalistic, scientific, and rational owners were held up as models for other, less moral factory owners. Defenders of the cotton industry drew upon the tropes of national sovereignty and national character and connected the technologically advanced industry to science and progress.

YURIEV: THE CREATION OF A RURAL INDUSTRIAL IDYLL

A group of enlightened nobles centered in Yuriev District of Vladimir Province argued for the scientific reorganization of the linen industry rather than the continued growth of the cotton industry. Enlightened nobles believed in the need for the creation of a new, scientifically trained noble estate that would transform agriculture into a dynamic and profitable economic sector. They did not approve of the attempts of other estates or non-noble individuals to take the leading role in this transformation and attempted to create a purely noble sphere of discussion and debate around this issue (Emmons, 1968; Melton, 1990).

The nobles had a very negative image of the urban industrial landscape. In contrast to the bustle of the industrial centers that Borisov captured, the nobles focused on the creation of rural industrial idylls. By processing the native Russian products of flax and hemp rather than foreign cotton, the country estate could be transformed into a scientifically sound and highly productive industrial landscape still dominated by nobles, they argued. The Russian agricultural landscape would retain its unique national characteristics even as it was dotted with small yet technologically advanced linen factories. The

nobility's hostility toward urban industry was deeply rooted and highly influential and stemmed from a crisis in the image of the noble during industrialization. For them, the rise of urban factories meant the breakdown of a peasant society where the nobility had controlled and, occasionally, enlightened the peasant. This was also a crisis of masculinity, as the nobles' role as the father figures to the peasants was being questioned.

Like the Ivanovo factory owners, the Yuriev nobles justified their paternalism by reference to science and rationality. The enlightened nobles argued that their greater scientific knowledge would allow them to continue to rule over the peasants and transform the rural landscape into a rational and productive space dotted with small factories. Thus, even before the emancipation of the serfs in 1861, enlightened nobles realized that their role in society would have to change substantially and some of them took preemptive action to anticipate and direct that change.

The landowners of Yuriev District acted as an informal group since at least 1844, when a provincial agricultural exhibition featured a special marquee for linen. The Yuriev landowners established an institutional presence in 1854 with the founding of the Yuriev Agricultural Society (YAS). The Yuriev Agricultural Society and the Ministry of State Domains shared a concern for the scientific transformation of agriculture and continued noble domination in the countryside. The Ministry of State Domains was founded in 1837 to provide guardianship over state peasants, who Minister of State Domains Count P. D. Kiselev saw as being exploited. He considered that state peasants (i.e. peasants belonging to the state, not to private individuals) needed to be protected from outside influences and to be closely supervised in almost all areas of their life (Druzhinin / Дружинин, 1946–1958).

The attitude of the Ministry of State Domains (MSD) toward industry was strikingly different from that of the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MVD). The MSD saw the rise of industry as a moral problem that would lead to the destruction of the peasantry. This emphasis on morality is clear in a memo written by Andrei Zablotskii-Desiatovskii, the head of the Statistical Section in the Department of Rural Economy under the MSD. In Zablotskii's 1852 "Memorandum on the Shortcomings of Communal Landholding and the Advantages of Private Ownership of Land by Peasants," he wrote that "A subject such as the improvement of the economy ... requires ... that one take into account those economic and moral conditions which serve as the basis of the present economic way of life among the peasants" (Bruce Lincoln, 1982: 123). The MVD, in contrast, was far more inclined to see industry, along with agriculture, as part of the wealth of the nation. While the MVD's Statistical Committees could, as in Tikhonravov's case, morally oppose certain kinds of industry, they did not consider urban industry as a whole to be morally objectionable.

As historian W. Bruce Lincoln noted, the Academic Committee under the Ministry of State Domain's Department of Rural Economy worked to "establish peasant schools and model farms, encourage local agricultural societies, and support agricultural exhibitions" (ibid: 122). These agricultural societies were founded mainly in the two capitals, the Baltics and Southern Russia. In the first decades, only one agricultural society was founded in central Russia: the Yaroslavl' Agricultural Society, established in 1842, which was followed twelve years later by the Yuriev Agricultural Society. According to Lincoln, some provincial nobles resisted forming such societies; one such noble stated, "I am the Emperor on my estate" (ibid: 132).

However, the agricultural societies soon became too active for the tastes of the central bureaucrats when, in 1852 and 1853, the Academic Committee invited noble agricultural societies to send proposals for improving agriculture in Russia. When eleven societies replied at length and with a broad understanding of the problem, Zablotskii and others became worried and stalled requests for further consultation. As Lincoln writes, “An opportunity to extend *glasnost*’ beyond the confines of the bureaucracy thus was lost as a consequence of the enlightened bureaucrats’ own inability to pursue a dialogue among groups with whom they were not closely acquainted and whose public statements they could not readily control” (ibid: 134). Thus, when MSD officials and members of the Yuriev Agricultural Society discussed the meaning of capitalists and agriculture, they were participating in a larger discussion about the necessity of reform.

The main site of enlightened noble activity in Vladimir was the Yuriev Agricultural Society. The enlightened nobles may have accepted the innovations of science, but they were not willing to permanently accept the presence of non-nobles in their midst. This was evident in the case of its first secretary, N. Ya. Dubenskii, who was the son of a junior deacon and teacher of agriculture at the Vladimir Ecclesiastical Seminary. He was known locally as an expert on the peasantry, and in an 1859 article, he ranked landowners by name from most to least moral in their treatment of peasants (Dubenskii / Дубенский, 1859ab). He thus subjected landowners to the same moral hierarchy that Solovyov had used for industry. This article incensed the local nobles so much that they complained to the governor and, as a result, Dubenskii moved to St. Petersburg in 1860, where he was active in debates on emancipation and worked on the journals of the Free Economic Society.

Dubenskii was a scientifically trained non-noble working to improve agriculture in for the benefit of the peasants, not the noble estate. This caused conflict with the other members of the YAS. Dubenskii represented a potential for broader discussion that was stymied by the nobles’ exclusive interest in their own estate. For example, when Dubenskii proposed an insurance program for private estates’ livestock which paralleled an insurance program the Ministry of State Domains had already instituted, he said that the need for such a program “is clear and understandable to every thinking landlord and each citizen, who is able to understand and value what is truly good for himself and his native country” (Dubenskii / Дубенский, 1857: 69). Dubenskii also focused on the good the proposal would do for peasants, saying that it would “improve and raise the well-being of the agricultural population of Vladimir province” (ibid: 74).

It became clear from the responses to Dubenskii’s proposal that other members of the society envisioned the audience and beneficiaries of the proposal to be the noble estate. Prince Aleksandr Golitsyn argued that donations to the insurance fund should be the responsibility of “the entire estate of the nobility” (Golitsyn / Голицын, 1857: 27) and that the next Noble Assembly should decide the question. Three other noble members also suggested that the Noble Assembly should decide on the question. Another noble suggested that the insurance should also cover the master’s home and said that “our enlightened nobles” would not oppose such a plan (Golitsyn, 1857: 83).

For most of the nobles, if not for Dubenskii, the well-being of the peasant was tied to the well-being of the landlord and even subordinate to it. This relied not only on tradition, but also on the nobles’ greater scientific knowledge to justify their roles as the peasants’ teachers. In this way, the nobles hoped to keep their old positions of paternal

guide to the peasant while appealing to the new faith in science. This argument was visible in an article by a member of the society against peasant farming methods (and particularly against strip farming), which noted the “sharp difference between landlords’ agricultural methods and the peasants’. The landlords’ agriculture is already far ahead and is in much better condition” (Pushkevich / Пушкевич, 1857: 117).

An 1857 article by D. Gavrilov, member of YAS, Vladimir bureaucrat, and expert on land taxes, exemplified this new noble self-image as scientific guide to the peasants. Gavrilov was violently opposed to industrialization and yet vigorously supported mechanization and agricultural modernization. Like many government officials, Gavrilov was horrified at the possibility of the rise of the working class and capitalists. He argued that industry should be only secondary to agriculture. He wrote that the rise of a middle estate (*srednee soslovie*) in England, served as a “go-between for the agricultural and industrial classes (*klassov*) on the one hand and between producers and consumers on the other, always enjoying a very profitable exchange and losing nothing, [while] the industrial class (*klass promysblennyi*) is impoverished” (Gavrilov / Гаврилов, 1857: 125).

Such a process had already occurred in Russia, Gavrilov feared, noting that the formation of an industrial class was especially dangerous when factories closed down. As a result, “many workers of such a factory turn into a pauper class (*klass nishchikh*), throngs of which wander about the provincial capitals” (ibid). He later called this class a “proletariat” (*proletariat*) who turn from spinning and weaving to different (and presumably less beneficial) occupations (ibid). The use of “class” here suggests a splintering of estate categories into new and dangerous identities. The depiction of the “middle estate” of factory owners is also striking. By acting as the intermediaries between their workers, the state, and the consumer market, the factory owners challenged the noble estate, which for centuries had acted as the intermediary between the people and the state. By using the example of a closed factory, Gavrilov also implied that factory owners were less responsible than landlords. Again, capitalists were represented as the direct competitors of nobles for control over the people.

For Gavrilov, the nobles’ loss of control over the people would be prevented by the creation of “village factory owners”. These factory owners would be peasants who remained in their native villages and pursued traditional handicrafts, but by modern means and methods. Too much work outside the home “acts injuriously on morality and spreads bad examples,” he stated (ibid: 129). He advocated the judicious development of previously existing handicrafts, which he termed as manifestations of the “very spirit of the residents and their inborn ability” (ibid: 134).

The peasants would weave linen or hemp cloth (which, unlike cotton, were native Russian products) on half-mechanized looms already in use in Germany. Of course the peasants would not supervise themselves. Gavrilov wrote that even peasants recognize their own laziness by having sayings such as “If there’s no clap of thunder, the peasant doesn’t cross himself” (ibid: 140). Noting the “carelessness of our simple people (*prostoliudin*) and their tendency towards laziness” (ibid: 139). Gavrilov argued that the nobility should introduce the newest technical literature to peasant craftsmen and establish the use of simple machinery in the village.

Gavrilov was particularly in favor of the mechanization of linen, which he saw as an important national product, unlike cotton. Gavrilov suggested that the Yuriev Agri-

cultural Society should establish a Committee on the Linen Industry, which would distribute free linen thread among peasants, thus making the peasants beholden to local nobles rather than to merchants and factory owners. Gavrilov called for new laws to support this initiative, stating that otherwise “the improvement will not be general but only local” (ibid: 141).

By 1860, the Society was distributing flax seeds to areas in the province particularly suited to the growing of flax. In addition, the society noted the success of their seed depot, which sold technically advanced machinery and hardy varieties of seeds and asked landlords to donate samples of their best seed varieties. The society continued to encourage the distribution of two- and four-horsepower threshers and separators (Otchet ... / Отчет ... , 1860). The society continued to focus on the scientific development of agriculture and its independence from industry.

For the proponents of a scientifically revitalized linen industry, the Russian countryside needed to be transformed into an arena for rational, scientific production. This transformation would not affect the social order, it was argued, as the noble estate would continue to dominate the rural areas. Visions of the new linen industry drew upon ideas of Russian tradition and upon new technological advances in Germany and elsewhere. In this rural landscape, science and progress were tied to the defense of tradition and status quo, not to their destruction.

In conclusion, the growth of industry was not just about the creation of new products and social groups, but also included the production of new cultural meanings and new visions of the social order. In the case of Vladimir Province, the contrast between the cotton and the linen industry posed the question of whether the noble or the merchant, the rural or the urban, would dominate the new Russia. In general, the defenders of the cotton industry spoke about the need for national industrial independence and the role of industry within the Russian Empire. The linen industry’s proponents focused much more on the world of the traditional Russian country estate that would be transformed by science but not by social change.

Gender and estate identities were deeply implicated in arguments about the two branches of industry. As the merchant and noble estate battled for control over the vision of the industrial landscape, they also attempted to gain control of the cultural construction of the wise father who scientifically transformed the landscape and cared for his dependents. In creating their visions of Vladimir Province’s industrial landscapes, local authors were also outlining a vision of a revitalized social order for all of modern Russia.

NOTES

¹ Madder is the root of an Eurasian herb used in dyeing from antiquity until 1869, when its main coloring principle was artificially reproduced. It produces a color known as Turkey red.

² An arshin was equivalent to 28 inches.

REFERENCES

Anan’ich, B. (2005) Religious and nationalist aspects of entrepreneurialism in Russia. In: *Russia in the European context, 1789–1914: A member of the family* / ed. by S. McCaffray and M. Melancon. New York, Palgrave Macmillan. x, 238 p. Pp. 85–93.

Baldin, K. E. (1993) *Yakov Garelin: predprinimatel’ , istorik, metsenat*. Moscow, Khram Publ. 96 p. (In Russ.).

Berdinskikh, V. A. (1995) *Russkaia provints' ialnaia istoriografiia vtoroi poloviny XIX veka*. Moscow ; Kirov, Arkheograficheskaia komissii Rossiiskoi akademii nauk. 395 p. (In Russ.).

Blackwell, W. (1968) *The beginnings of Russian industrialization, 1800–1860*. Princeton, Princeton University Press. ix, 484 p.

Bourdieu, P. (1999) Rethinking the state: Genesis and structure of the bureaucratic field. In: *State/culture: State-formation after the cultural turn* / ed. G. Steinmetz. Ithaca, NY, Cornell University Press. x, 433 p. Pp. 53–75.

Bruce Lincoln, W. (1982) *In the vanguard of reform: Russia's enlightened bureaucrats, 1825–1861*. DeKalb, IL, Northern Illinois University Press. xix, 297 p.

Dal, V. (1955) *Tolkovyi slovar' zhivogo velikoruskogo iazyka* : in 4 vols. Moscow, Gos. izd-vo inostrannykh i natsional'nykh slovarei. Vol. 1. LXXXVIII, 669 p. (In Russ.).

Daniels, S. (1993) *Fields of vision: Landscape imagery and national identity in England and the United States*. Princeton, Princeton University Press. x, 257 p.

Darrow, D. (2000) The politics of numbers: Zemstvo land assessment and the conceptualization of Russia's rural economy. *Russian Review*, vol. 59, no. 1 (January), pp. 52–75.

Dianina, K. (2003) The feuilleton: An everyday guide to public culture in the age of the Great Reforms. *The Slavic and East European Journal*, vol. 47, no. 2 (Summer), pp. 187–210.

Druzhinin, N. M. (1946–1958) *Gosudarstvennye krest'iane i reforma P. D. Kiseleva* : in 2 vols. Moscow ; Leningrad, Izd-vo Akademii nauk. (In Russ.).

Dubenskii, N. Ya. (1857) Nekotorye soobrazhdeniia Komiteta Yurievskogo Obshchestva sel'skogo khoziaistva. In: *Zapiski Yurievskogo obshchestva sel'skogo khoziaistva za 1857 g.* Moscow. (In Russ.).

Dubenskii, N. Ya. (1859a) O proizvoditel'nosti, dokhodnosti i tsennosti zemel' Vladimirskoi gubernii. *Sel'skoe blagoustroistvo*, no. 1, pp. 91–128. (In Russ.).

Dubenskii, N. Ya. (1859b) O proizvoditel'nosti, dokhodnosti i tsennosti zemel' Vladimirskoi gubernii. *Sel'skoe blagoustroistvo*, no. 2, pp. 199–214. (In Russ.).

Emmons, T. (1968) *The Russian landed gentry and the peasant emancipation of 1861*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. xi, 484 p.

Evtuhov, C. (2011) *Portrait of a Russian province: Economy, society, and civilization in nineteenth-century Nizhnii Novgorod*. Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press. xv, 320 p.

Foucault, M. (1991) Governmentality. In: *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality* / ed. by G. Burchell et al. Chicago, University of Chicago Press. x, 307 p. Pp. 87–104.

Gavrilov, D. (1857) Vzgliad na promysly i otnoshenie ikh k zemledeliu. In: *Zapiski Yurievskogo obshchestva sel'skogo khoziaistva za 1857 g.* Moscow. (In Russ.).

Gestwa, K. (1999) *Proto-Industrialisierung in Rußland: Wirtschaft, Herrschaft, und Kultur in Ivanovo und Pavlovo, 1741–1932*. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 680 p. (In Germ.).

Golitsyn, A. (1857) Mneniia gg. chlenov Yurievskogo obshchestva sel'skogo khoziaistva. In: *Zapiski Yurievskogo Obshchestva sel'skogo khoziaistva za 1857 g.* Moscow. (In Russ.).

Holmgren, B. (1998) *Rewriting capitalism: Literature and the market in late tsarist Russia and the Kingdom of Poland*. Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press. xviii, 240 p.

Kopylov, D. I. (1999) *Istoriia Vladimirskogo kraia v XIX stoletii*. Vladimir, Depart. obrazovaniia admin. Vladimirskoi oblasti. 142 p. (In Russ.).

Laverychev, V. Ia. (1972) *Tsarizm i rabochii vopros v Rossii (1861–1917 gg.)*. Moscow, Mysl' Publ. 340 p. (In Russ.).

Manchester, L. (2008) *Holy fathers, secular sons: Clergy, intelligentsia, and the modern self in revolutionary Russia*. DeKalb, IL, Northern Illinois University Press. xiv, 288 p.

McCaffray, S. (1996) *The politics of industrialization in tsarist Russia: The Association of Southern Coal and Steel Producers, 1874–1914*. DeKalb, IL : Northern Illinois University Press. xxii, 299 p.

Melton, E. (1990) Enlightened seigniorialism and its dilemmas in serf Russia, 1750–1830. *Journal of Modern History*, vol. 62, no. 4 (December), pp. 675–708.

Orlovsky, D. (1981) *The limits of reform: The Ministry of Internal Affairs in imperial Russia, 1802–1881*. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press. 299 p.

Otchet Yurievskogo Obshchestva Sel'skogo Khoziaistva za 1859. (1860) *Zapiski Yurievskogo Obshchestva sel'skogo khoziaistva*, issue 2. Moscow. (In Russ.).

Patriarcha, S. (1996) *Numbers and nationhood: Writing statistics in nineteenth-century Italy*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. xii, 280 p.

Picturing power: Visual depictions and social relations (1988) / ed. by G. Fyfe and J. Law. London ; New York, Routledge. 281 p.

Prodolzhenie svoda zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii. (1842) St. Petersburg, Tip. Vtorogo Otdeleniia sobstvennoi Ego Imperatorskogo velichestva kantseliarii. Vol. 16. 513 p. (In Russ.).

Pushkevich, A. (1857) O krest'ianskom sposobe zemlevladieniia. In: *Zapiski Yurievskogo obshchestva sel'skogo khoziaistva za 1857 g.* Moscow. (In Russ.).

Rich, D. (1998) *The Tsar's colonels: Professionalism, strategy and subversion in late imperial Russia*. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press. xiv, 293 p.

Rieber, A. (1982) *Merchants and entrepreneurs in imperial Russia*. Chapel Hill, NC, University of North Carolina Press. xxvi, 464 p.

Scott, J. (1988) A statistical representation of work. In: *Gender and the politics of history*. New York, Columbia University Press. x, 242 p. Pp. 113–138.

Smith-Peter, S. (2007) Defining the Russian people: Konstantin Arsen'ev and Russian statistics before 1861. *History of Science*, vol. 45, no. 1 (March), pp. 47–64. DOI: 10.1177/007327530704500102

Smith-Peter, S. (2008a) The Russian provincial newspaper and its public, 1788–1864. *The Carl Beck Papers in Russian and East European Studies*, no. 1908. 60 p. DOI: 10.5195/cbp.2008.145

Smith-Peter, S. (2008b) Istoki gubernskikh vedomostei: 1831 — nachalo 1850-kh gg. In: *Provincial'naia zhurnalistika i zbizn' Rossiiskoi imperii v XIX — nachale XX v.* / red. A. A. Kozhanov et al. Petrozavodsk, Petrozavodsk State University Publ. 168 p. Pp. 23–51. (In Russ.).

Stigler, S. (1986) *The history of statistics: The measurement of uncertainty before 1900*. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press. xvi, 410 p.

Stigler, S. (1999) *Statistics on the table: The history of statistical concepts and methods*. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1999. 504 p.

Tikhonov, B. V. (1961) Obzor zapisok mestnykh sel'skokhoziaistvennykh obshchestv 30–50-kh godov XIX v. In: *Problemy istochnikovedeniia* / ed. by A. N. Nasonov and A. A. Novosel'skii. Moscow, OGIz Publ. 342 p. Pp. 92–162. (In Russ.).

Vladimirskie gubernskie vedomosti, 1838–1918. (In Russ.).

Vysochaishe utverzhdennoe polozhenie Komiteta ministrov, raspublikovannoe 22 marta [1855 g.]. Ob izmenenii programmy Gubernskikh Vedomostei. No. 29059. (1856) In: *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii*. Sobranie vtoroe. Vol. XXX. Ser. 1. St. Petersburg, Tip. Vtorogo Otdeleniia sobstvennoi Ego Imperatorskogo Velichestva kantseliarii. 779 p. Pp. 169–170. (In Russ.).

Westergaard, H. (1969) *Contributions to the history of statistics*. The Hague, Mouton de Gruyter. vii, 280 p.

Woolf, S. (1984) Towards the history of the origins of statistics: France, 1789–1815. In: *State and statistics in France, 1789–1815* / ed. by J.-C. Perrot and S. Woolf. Chur [Switzerland] ; New York, Harwood Academic Publishers. xii, 205 p. Pp. 81–169.

Submission date: 11.04.2016.

ДОБРЫЙ КАПИТАЛИСТ: КОНКУРИРУЮЩИЕ ВЗГЛЯДЫ
НА ИНДУСТРИАЛЬНОЕ БУДУЩЕЕ РОССИИ
В ДОРЕФОРМЕННЫЙ ПЕРИОД

С. СМИТ-ПИТЕР

(ГОРОДСКОЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ НЬЮ-ЙОРКА, США)

В статье рассматриваются дискуссии о промышленном будущем России среди дворян, купцов и чиновников Владимирской губернии до реформы 1861 г. В дискуссиях сформировались два различных взгляда на будущее России. Первый представлял Россию урбанистической, индустриализованной, фабричной страной, с хлопкообрабатывающей промышленностью в роли гаранта экономической независимости. Второй вариант предполагал, что Россия останется сельской страной, но развитие науки и совершенствование сельского хозяйства преобразят льнопереработку и помогут деревенским общинам выжить и после индустриализации. И дворяне, и купцы полагали, что могут быть «мудрыми отцами» для народа будущей индустриализованной России. Анализ статистических материалов, опубликованных в губернских ведомостях, показал, что они могут служить новым источником информации о том, как еще до отмены крепостного права в России воспринимали индустриализацию и социальные перемены.

Ключевые слова: индустриализация; хлопкоперерабатывающая промышленность; льноперерабатывающая промышленность; Владимирская губерния; купечество; дворянство; губернские ведомости

СПИСОК ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ

- Балдин, К. Е. (1993) Яков Гарелин: предприниматель, историк, меценат. М. : Храм. 96 с.
- Бердинских, В. А. (1995) Русская провинциальная историография второй половины XIX века. М. ; Киров : Археографическая комиссия Российской академии наук. 395 с.
- Владимирские губернские ведомости, 1838–1918.
- Высочайше утвержденное положение Комитета министров, опубликованное 22 марта [1855 г.]. Об изменении программы Губернских Ведомостей. № 29059 (1856) // Полное собрание законов Российской империи. Собрание второе. Т. XXX. Отд. 1. СПб. : Тип. Второго Отделения собственной Его Императорского Величества канцелярии. 779 с. С. 169–170.
- Гаврилов, Д. (1857) Взгляд на промыслы и отношение их к земледелию // Записки Юрьевского Общества сельского хозяйства за 1857 г. М.
- Голицын, А. (1857) Мнения гг. членов Юрьевского общества сельского хозяйства // Записки Юрьевского общества сельского хозяйства за 1857 г. М.
- Даль, В. (1955) Толковый словарь живого великорусского языка : в 4 т. М. : Гос. изд-во иностранных и национальных словарей. Т. 1. LXXXVIII, 669 с.
- Дружинин, Н. М. (1946?1958) Государственные крестьяне и реформа П. Д. Киселева : в 2 т. М. ; Л. : Изд-во Академии наук.
- Дубенский, Н. Я. (1857) Некоторые соображения Комитета Юрьевского Общества Сельского Хозяйства // Записки Юрьевского общества сельского хозяйства за 1857 г. М.
- Дубенский, Н. Я. (1859а) О производительности, доходности и ценности земель Владимирской губернии // Сельское благоустройство. № 1. С. 91–128.
- Дубенский, Н. Я. (1859б) О производительности, доходности и ценности земель Владимирской губернии // Сельское благоустройство. № 2. С. 199–214.
- Копылов, Д. И. (1999) История Владимирского края в XIX столетии. Владимир : Департ. образования админ. Владимирской области. 142 с.
- Лаверычев, В. Я. (1972) Царизм и рабочий вопрос в России (1861–1917 гг.). М. : Мысль. 340 с.

Отчет Юрьевского общества сельского хозяйства за 1859 (1860) // Записки Юрьевского общества сельского хозяйства. Вып. 2. М.

Продолжение свода законов Российской империи. (1842) СПб. : Тип. Второго Отделения собственной Его Императорского Величества канцелярии. Т. 16. 513 с.

Пушкевич, А. (1857) О крестьянском способе землевладения // Записки Юрьевского общества сельского хозяйства за 1857 г. М.

Смит-Питер, С. (2008b) Истоки губернских ведомостей: 1831 — начало 1850-х гг. // *Провинциальная журналистика и жизнь Российской империи в XIX — начале XX в.* / ред. А. А. Кожанов и др. Петрозаводск : Изд-во ПетрГУ. 168 с. С. 23–51.

Тихонов, Б. В. (1961) Обзор записок местных сельскохозяйственных обществ 30–50-х годов XIX в. // *Проблемы источниковедения* / ред. А. Н. Насонов, А. А. Новосельский. М. : ОГИЗ. Т. 9. 342 с. С. 92–162.

Anan'ich, B. (2005) Religious and nationalist aspects of entrepreneurialism in Russia // *Russia in the European Context, 1789?1914: A member of the family* / ed. by S. McCaffray, M. Melancon. N. Y. : Palgrave Macmillan. x, 238 p. P. 85–93.

Blackwell, W. (1968) *The beginnings of Russian industrialization, 1800–1860*. Princeton : Princeton University Press. ix, 484 p.

Bourdieu, P. (1999) *Rethinking the State: Genesis and structure of the bureaucratic field* // *State/Culture: State-formation after the cultural turn* / ed. by G. Steinmetz. Ithaca, NY : Cornell University Press. x, 433 p. P. 53–75.

Bruce Lincoln, W. (1982) *In the vanguard of reform: Russia's enlightened bureaucrats, 1825–1861*. DeKalb, IL : Northern Illinois University Press. xix, 297 p.

Daniels, S. (1993) *Fields of vision: Landscape imagery and national identity in England and the United States*. Princeton : Princeton University Press. x, 257 p.

Darrow, D. (2000) The politics of numbers: Zemstvo land assessment and the conceptualization of Russia's rural economy // *Russian Review*. Vol. 59. No. 1 (January). P. 52–75.

Dianina, K. (2003) The feuilleton: An everyday guide to public culture in the age of the Great Reforms // *The Slavic and East European Journal*. Vol. 47. No. 2 (Summer). P. 187–210.

Emmons, T. (1968) *The Russian landed gentry and the peasant emancipation of 1861*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. xi, 484 p.

Evtuhov, C. (2011) *Portrait of a Russian province: Economy, society, and civilization in nineteenth-century Nizhnii Novgorod*. Pittsburgh : University of Pittsburgh Press. xv, 320 p.

Foucault, M. (1991) Governmentality // *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality* / ed. by G. Burchell et al. Chicago : University of Chicago Press. x, 307 p. P. 87–104.

Gestwa, K. (1999) Proto-Industrialisierung in Rußland: Wirtschaft, Herrschaft, und Kultur in Ivanovo und Pavlovo, 1741–1932. Göttingen : Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 680 p. (In Germ.).

Holmgren, B. (1998) *Rewriting capitalism: Literature and the market in late tsarist Russia and the Kingdom of Poland*. Pittsburgh : University of Pittsburgh Press. xviii, 240 p.

Manchester, L. (2008) *Holy fathers, secular sons: Clergy, intelligentsia, and the modern self in revolutionary Russia*. DeKalb, IL : Northern Illinois University Press. xiv, 288 p.

McCaffray, S. (1996) *The politics of industrialization in tsarist Russia: The Association of Southern Coal and Steel Producers, 1874–1914*. DeKalb, IL : Northern Illinois University Press. xxii, 299 p.

Melton, E. (1990) Enlightened seigniorialism and its dilemmas in serf Russia, 1750–1830 // *Journal of Modern History*. Vol. 62. No. 4 (December). P. 675–708.

Orlovsky, D. (1981) *The limits of reform: The Ministry of Internal Affairs in imperial Russia, 1802–1881*. Cambridge, MA : Harvard University Press. 299 p.

Patriarcha, S. (1996) *Numbers and nationhood: Writing statistics in nineteenth-century Italy*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. xii, 280 p.

Picturing power: Visual depictions and social relations (1988) / ed. by G. Fyfe, J. Law. L. ; N. Y. : Routledge. 281 p.

Rich, D. (1998) The Tsar's colonels: Professionalism, strategy and subversion in late imperial Russia. Cambridge, MA : Harvard University Press. xiv, 293 p.

Rieber, A. (1982) Merchants and entrepreneurs in imperial Russia. Chapel Hill, NC : University of North Carolina Press. xxvi, 464 p.

Scott, J. (1988) A statistical representation of work // Gender and the politics of history. N. Y. : Columbia University Press. x, 242 p. P. 113–138.

Smith-Peter, S. (2007) Defining the Russian people: Konstantin Arsen'ev and Russian statistics before 1861 // History of Science. Vol. 45. No. 1 (March). P. 47–64. DOI: 10.1177/007327530704500102

Smith-Peter, S. (2008a) The Russian provincial newspaper and its public, 1788–1864 // The Carl Beck Papers in Russian and East European Studies. No. 1908. 60 p. DOI: 10.5195/cbp.2008.145

Stigler, S. (1986) The history of statistics: The measurement of uncertainty before 1900. Cambridge, MA : Harvard University Press. xvi, 410 p.

Stigler, S. (1999) Statistics on the table: The history of statistical concepts and methods. Cambridge, MA : Harvard University Press, 1999. ix, 488 p.

Westergaard, H. (1969) Contributions to the history of statistics. The Hague : Mouton de Gruyter. vii, 280 p.

Woolf, S. (1984) Towards the history of the origins of statistics: France, 1789–1815. // State and Statistics in France, 1789–1815 / ed. by J.-C. Perrot, S. Woolf. Chur [Switzerland] ; N. Y. : Harwood Academic Publishers. xii, 205 p. Pp. 81–169.

Дата поступления: 11.04.2016 г.

Smith-Peter Susan, PhD, Associate Professor, Department of History, College of Staten Island, City University of New York. Postal address: Room 204, Bldg. 2N, 2800 Victory Blvd., Staten Island, NY 10314, USA. Tel.: (+1) 718-982-3290 E-mail: susan.smithpeter@csi.cuny.edu

Смит-Питер Сьюзен — доктор философии (PhD), доцент кафедры истории, колледж Стейтен-Айленд, Городской университет Нью-Йорка, США. Адрес: Room 204, Bldg. 2N, 2800 Victory Blvd., Staten Island, NY 10314, USA. Тел.: (+1) 718-982-3290 Эл. адрес: susan.smithpeter@csi.cuny.edu