

Proletarians of All Countries, Unite!

ISKRA

(THE SPARK)

Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party

No. 3

APRIL 1901

No. 3

Translated from the Russian. This edition reproduces, in translation, the full text and article structure of the original four-page broadsheet (a digitised, OCR-scanned copy of which was supplied for translation). The masthead epigraph reads “From a spark a flame shall be kindled!—the

*Decembrists’ reply to Pushkin,” and the paper is described on this issue as organ of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party. A small number of passages were illegible or badly garbled in the source scan (faded type, torn columns, pre-reform Cyrillic orthography, and, in this issue, a work of short fiction printed in very small type across several columns); these were reconstructed from context rather than transcribed with confidence, and are bracketed in the text with the tags **[RECONSTRUCTED TEXT]** ... **[END RECONSTRUCTED TEXT]**. The endnotes at the close of this issue are later scholarly annotations appended to a subsequent reprint edition (they refer to events of mid-1901 and cite a published volume of correspondence) rather than part of the original April 1901 issue; they are translated here but kept clearly separated under their own heading.*

A STORMY MONTH

Russian society must by now have become convinced that the reactionary insolence of the autocratic government knows no limits save the active revolutionary resistance of its citizens, that the political flabbiness of the governed only feeds the mad urge of those who govern to wipe from the face of the earth everything that so much as remotely recalls right, legality, freedom. For no visible reason, driven by nothing but an insatiable desire to abolish every germ of independent activity among the population, the government has led an assault along the whole line against everything that remained: a campaign against Finland, a campaign against popular schooling, a campaign against the zemstvo, a campaign against the press, a campaign against the universities. Utterly corrupted by the feeble resistance of Russian society, the government finally dared to throw in its face, one after another, two insolent challenges: the forcible drafting into the barracks of two hundred young men guilty of disturbing order at the university, and the solemn excommunication of the most popular writer, the pride of Russia the world over. The madness of oppressors often does a service to the cause of freedom. Nicholas II's government wished finally to stifle Russian society, and it called forth the first outburst of the revolutionary storm. The wish we expressed in our last issue, that the workers should come to the aid of the students in the struggle they had begun against the government, was realised even before those who see in such aspirations nothing but unworthy 'Narodnaya Volya'-style schemes had time to abuse us for expressing it. In a series of major demonstrations in St Petersburg, Moscow, Kharkov, Kiev and Bialystok, Russian workers showed, in the most unambiguous fashion, their readiness to struggle shoulder to shoulder with the revolutionary elements of 'society' against the yoke of the autocracy. To the government's two mad strokes — the drafting of students into the army and the solemn excommunication of Tolstoy — the proletariat loudly answered by expressing its solidarity both with the 'rebellious' students and with the excommunicated writer.

The active participation of the workers in the political demonstrations of this stormy month gave them an entirely special significance and opened a new epoch in Russian history. The press of every country in Western Europe notes this historic fact. Now it will depend on the political maturity of Russian society whether it manages to grasp this fact and draw from it all its practical consequences, whether it manages, leaning on the help of the proletariat, to strengthen the revolutionary sweep of its struggle against the Asiatic autocracy and to display sufficient energy not only in defence but in direct attack upon the hateful order. Fighters for freedom can no longer be afraid of remaining alone in their struggle, of finding no support in the masses of the people. And the organised proletariat has now won the right to hope that 'society' will at last understand the political meaning of the struggle it is waging, and will recognise the pre-eminent political importance of the labour movement in present-day Russia.

For us, Social-Democrats, the events that took place in February and March have a special significance. Through them, we may hope, a dispute that has tormented our party in recent years has at last been settled in practice: the dispute whether our proletariat is, at the present time, capable of waging political struggle, or whether such a struggle could arise otherwise than directly out of the strike movement. We — the supporters of the revolutionary political struggle of the proletariat — may triumph: the Russian proletariat has proved to its short-sighted friends the rightness of the very point of view we have defended. Regardless of its leaders*, the proletariat threw itself into the fray when it saw that the radical part of society was ready to try its strength, in earnest, against the government. This fact can no longer be passed over in silence; willy-nilly, it will have to be reckoned with, and Russian Social-Democracy must make this evident readiness of the working

masses to take an active part in the liberation struggle of the whole of Russian democracy the very foundation of its practical activity; it will have to do this if it does not wish to be left out, if it does not wish to hand over its right to lead the movement of the proletariat to other political forces.

But the participation of the Russian proletariat in Russia's liberation struggle will be all the more fruitful for its class interests, for its ultimate goals, and, along with this, for the interests of democratic freedom too, the more consciously the working masses fight in the political sense, the more independently they conduct their own policy within the general political movement. If, for all the discontented elements of Russian society, the matter now beginning consists chiefly in curbing an unbearable police autocracy, then for the proletariat, in its class interests, in the interests of its ultimate goals and in the interests of the immediate improvement of its position, what is necessary is the overthrow of the autocracy and the founding of a free democracy that would secure for the proletariat the legal defence of its class interests. And the first duty of Russian Social-Democracy, in its everyday work, is to give the proletariat such a political education that, in critical moments such as the days we are living through, it might succeed in clearly and sharply sounding its own note in the general chorus of the discontented. We must

* Only in Kharkov, and especially in Kiev, did Social-Democratic organisations actively assist in drawing the workers into the demonstrations of this recent period.

recognise that, from this point of view, the events of the February and March days have clearly shown that our party still has a great deal of work to do along the path indicated. And it only remains to wish that it should immediately, everywhere, and with redoubled energy, set about this rewarding work.

These same events revealed corresponding shortcomings in our own organisation as well. Adapted to propaganda and to everyday agitation, our organisations are not yet fitted to lead mass demonstrations, and this costs the latter much in strength and coherence. Events like those we have just lived through do not, of course, happen often; but, in the first place, we must expect them to become ever more frequent; and in the second, however rare they may be, the party must be ready for them, so as always to be able to achieve the greatest results at the smallest cost in sacrifice. With a better organisation, no police stratagems would have prevented the workers from appearing at the appointed hour at the appointed place; with better preparation of organised forces the crowd would not have proved so helpless when the troops began to beat it. With proper organisation it would have been possible to concentrate all the protesting masses at a single point, and to gather a crowd scattered in one place into another. With such an organisation it would have been possible, in the course of the demonstration, to direct the crowd's attention to ever new occasions for expressing its protest, and to answer every act of arbitrary rule and violence by the authorities with an act of revolutionary violence against, say, government buildings or organs of obscurantism. In a word, to fight the government in the squares and streets, our party must reform its own organisation. But this same reform of the organisation is also necessary for carrying out a broader agitational-political work.

To the mass popular protests, the tsarist government replied with measures of bloody violence, the beating and killing of unarmed people, the publication of a plan for a military campaign against the unsubmitive population of major centres (see Sipyagin's circular of March 12). By these thousands of victims the government is, of course, trying to avenge itself for what it lived through during these days, for the Tsar's disgraceful flight from his own capital on March 4, for the hissing given to his exalted viceroy in Moscow. By all these measures the government will not be able to heal that deep, bleeding wound it received in these days. However much reaction may rage, it will not take

from the revolution what has already been achieved — it will not destroy the rapprochement, achieved on the ground of revolutionary struggle, between the radical intelligentsia and the popular masses; it will not take from the people the revolutionary schooling it has acquired this month; it will not be able to extinguish the general consciousness that flared up so brightly in these days, of how irreconcilably hostile, how endlessly alien to one another, are the two worlds that have now collided: old Russia, the world of the Cossack whip and police violence, the world of the hypocrites of the Most Holy Synod, dreaming of stakes for heretics and their writings, the world of venal scholars and the venal press, defended from the people by armed force — and the world of free thought and proletarian enthusiasm, the young Russia straining toward light and toward freedom. And therefore, whatever new blows may await, in the near future, the fighters for freedom, however oppressive the lull that may follow this storm that has just broken may seem, we shall not have to lose heart, we shall not have to doubt the future of our cause. The hateful chains binding young Russia have already been strained to breaking; one more series of heroic efforts, and they will fly to dust. However the mass may be affected by the government's new reactionary measures, we can boldly look the future in the face and turn to our comrades with the poet's words:

*Let darkness and foul weather thicken ever more,
Let the wild blizzard sing its song of death,
Believe in youth, believe in its strength and happiness,
And call it forward with a fearless word.*

[L. Martov]

THE WORKERS' PARTY AND THE PEASANTRY¹

Forty years have passed since the emancipation of the peasants. It is entirely natural that our society should celebrate, with particular enthusiasm, February 19 — the day that marked the fall of old serf-owning Russia, the beginning of an era that promised the people freedom and well-being. But we must not forget that, alongside the sincere hostility to serfdom and all its manifestations, there is a great deal of hypocrisy in the eulogistic speeches of those celebrating it. Thoroughly hypocritical and false is that assessment of the 'great' reform which has become current among us: 'the emancipation of the peasants with land, by means of a state-financed redemption payment.' But in actual fact this was the emancipation of the peasants from land, because from those allotments which the peasants had held for centuries enormous strips were cut away, and hundreds of thousands of peasants were left entirely landless — settled on a quarter-allotment or a beggar's allotment. In actual fact the peasants were robbed twice over: not only was their land cut away from them, they were also made to go on paying a 'redemption' for the land that had been left to them and had always been in their possession — and, what is more, the redemption price of the land was fixed far above its real value. The landlords themselves, ten years after the emancipation, admitted to government officials investigating the state of rural economy that the peasants had been made to pay not only for their land, but for their freedom as well. And, having taken redemption payments for their personal emancipation, the peasants were still not made free people: they were kept for twenty years as 'temporarily obligated,' they were left — and to this day remain — a lower estate, subject to the birch, paying special dues, not permitted freely to leave the semi-serf commune, freely to dispose of their land, freely to settle in any locality of the state. Our peasant reform does not testify to the government's magnanimity; on the contrary, it stands as the greatest historical example of just how thoroughly botched every undertaking becomes once it passes through the hands of an autocratic government.

Under the pressure of military defeat, terrible financial difficulties and the menacing unrest of the peasantry, the government was, quite literally, forced to free them. The Tsar himself admitted that serfs must be freed from above, before they began to free themselves from below. But having taken up the task of emancipation, the government did everything possible and impossible to satisfy the greed of the 'aggrieved' serf-owners; the government did not stop even at such an outrage as rigging the selection of the men called upon to carry out the reform — though these men were themselves drawn from the ranks of the nobility! The mediators of the first draft were dismissed and replaced by men incapable of denying the serf-owners their share in cheating the peasants, even in the very surveying of the land. And the great reform could not be put into effect without the aid of military execution squads and the flogging of peasants who refused to accept the charters setting out the terms of emancipation. It is no wonder that the best men of that time, gagged by the censor's muzzle, greeted this great reform with the curse of silence...

The peasant, 'emancipated' from serf labour, emerged from the reformer's hands so beaten down, so plundered, so downtrodden, so tied to his allotment, that nothing remained for him but to go 'voluntarily' to work for his lord as before. And the peasant took to working his former master's land, 'renting' from him his own cut-off strips, hiring himself out in winter — in exchange for a loan of bread to his starving family — for summer labour. Forced labour and bondage — this is what that 'free labour' turned out to be in practice, the labour that the manifesto, drawn up by a priest turned Jesuit, had summoned to be called on with 'God's blessing.'

And to this landlord oppression, preserved thanks to the magnanimity of the officials who drafted and carried out the reform, there was added yet another burden: the yoke of capital. The power of money, which crushed even, for instance, the French peasant — freed from the power of the landlords not by some pitiful, half-hearted reform, but by a mighty popular revolution — this same power of money bore down with its full weight upon our semi-serf peasant. Money had to be found at any cost: to pay taxes, increased by the beneficent reform, and to pay for the hire of land, and to buy those beggarly products of factory industry which were beginning to displace the peasant's own home-produced goods, and to buy bread besides. The power of money not only crushed the peasantry — it split it: an enormous mass steadily went to ruin and turned into proletarians, while a minority produced small knots of tenacious, tight-fisted kulaks and prosperous peasants, who got their hands on both peasant farming and peasant land, forming the cadres of a nascent rural bourgeoisie. The whole forty years since the reform have been one unbroken process of this de-peasantisation, a process of slow, agonising dying-off. The peasant was reduced to a beggarly level of existence: he lodged together with his cattle, dressed in rags, fed on goosefoot; the peasant fled from his allotment whenever there was anywhere to flee to, even buying his way out of it, paying whoever agreed to take on the allotment sums that exceeded its income. The peasants went hungry chronically, and tens of thousands died of hunger and epidemics during years of crop failure, which recurred ever more often.

Such is the state of our village even today. The question arises: where are we to seek a way out, and by what means may the peasant's lot be improved? The small peasantry can rid itself of the yoke of capital only by joining the labour movement, helping it in its struggle for the socialist order, for the transformation of land and other means of production (factories, works, machinery, and so on) into social property. To try to save the peasantry by defending small-scale husbandry and small property against the onslaught of capitalism would mean uselessly holding back social development, deceiving the peasant with the illusion of a possible well-being even under capitalism, and dividing the toiling classes by creating a privileged position for a minority at the expense of the majority. This is why Social-Democrats will always struggle against such senseless and harmful institutions as the inalienability of peasant allotments, mutual responsibility (circular guarantee), the prohibition of free withdrawal from the peasant commune and of free admission into it of persons of any estate whatever!

But our peasant suffers, as we have seen, not only, and not even so much, from the yoke of capital, as from the yoke of the landlords and from the survivals of serfdom. A merciless struggle against these fetters, which immeasurably worsen the peasantry's position and bind it hand and foot, is not only possible but necessary in the interests of the whole social development of the country, for the hopeless poverty, ignorance, rightlessness and degradation of the muzhik stamps every order of our fatherland with the mark of Asiatic backwardness. And Social-Democracy would fail in its duty were it not to give this struggle its every kind of support. Such support must find its expression, to put it briefly, in the bringing of class struggle into the countryside.

We have seen that, in the contemporary Russian countryside, two kinds of class antagonism coexist: first, between agricultural labourers and agricultural employers; second, between the peasantry as a whole and the landlord class as a whole. The first antagonism is developing and growing; the second is gradually weakening. The first still belongs largely to the future; the second, to a considerable extent, already belongs to the past. And in spite of this, for contemporary Russian Social-Democrats it is precisely the second antagonism that has the more essential, the more practically important significance. That we must make use of every occasion presenting itself to us for developing class-consciousness among hired agricultural labourers, that we must

therefore direct attention to the migration into the countryside of urban workers (for instance, mechanics employed at steam threshing-machines, and so on), to the labour markets for hired agricultural workers — this is self-evident, an axiom for every Social-Democrat.

But our rural labourers are still too closely bound up with the peasantry, the general peasant calamities still weigh too heavily upon them, and so a movement of rural labourers, of national significance, cannot for now, nor in the near future, arise. On the contrary, the question of sweeping away the survivals of serfdom, of rooting out from every institution of the Russian state the spirit of estate inequality and the degradation of tens of millions of 'common folk' — this question already now has national significance, and a party laying claim to the role of the foremost fighter for freedom cannot stand aside from this question.

The recognition of the peasant's calamities has now become (in a more or less general form) almost universal; the phrase about the 'shortcomings' of the 1861 reform, and about the necessity of state assistance, has become a common truism. It is our duty to point out that these calamities arise precisely from the class oppression of the peasantry, that the government is the faithful defender of the classes that do the oppressing, that it is not help from it, but liberation from its yoke, that must be sought by those who sincerely and seriously wish for the peasants' fundamental betterment. There is talk of the excessive height of the redemption payments, of the beneficial nature of the reduction and rescheduling of these payments by the government. To this we shall say that all these redemption payments are nothing other than the plundering of the peasants by the landlords and the government, concealed under lawful forms and bureaucratic phrases — nothing other than a tribute paid to the serf-owners for the emancipation of their slaves. We put forward the demand for the immediate and complete abolition of redemption payments and quit-rent dues, the demand to give back to the people those hundreds of millions which the tsarist government has, over the years, extracted to satisfy the appetites of the slave-owners. There is talk of the peasants' land-hunger, of the necessity of state assistance for the expansion of peasant land-holding. To this we shall say that it is precisely thanks to state assistance — assistance, that is, to the landlords, of course — that in so many instances the peasants have been deprived of the land most necessary to them. We put forward the demand to return to the peasants those cut-off strips by means of which unfree, bonded, corvée-labour — that is, in practice, the very same serf labour — continues to be maintained. We put forward the demand to establish peasant committees to correct those crying injustices which the noblemen's committees, set up by tsarist power, inflicted upon the emancipated serfs. We shall demand the establishment of courts empowered to lower the immoderately high rent for land exacted by the landlords owing to the desperate position of the peasants — courts before which the peasant would have the right to prosecute, for usury, those who conclude bonded deals, taking advantage of another's extreme need. We shall try, always and on every occasion, to explain to the peasants that people who speak to them of guardianship or help from the present-day state are either fools, or charlatans and worse enemies of theirs; that what the peasantry needs, before anything else, is deliverance from the arbitrary rule and oppression of official power, that it needs, before anything else, the recognition of its full and unconditional equality of rights, in every respect, with all other estates, full freedom of movement and resettlement, freedom to dispose of its land, freedom to dispose of all its communal affairs and communal revenues. The most ordinary facts of daily life in any Russian village can always furnish a thousand occasions for agitation in the name of the demands named above. This agitation must proceed from local, concrete, most pressing peasant needs, but must not stop short at these needs; it must unceasingly broaden the peasants' horizon, unceasingly develop their political consciousness, point to the special place occupied in the state

by landlords and peasants, point to the sole means of delivering the countryside from the oppression, arbitrary rule and violence now weighing upon it — the summoning of the people's representatives, the overthrow of the officials' self-will. It is a foolish and empty claim that this demand for political freedom is inaccessible to the consciousness of the peasantry: not only workers, who have lived through years of direct struggle with manufacturers and police, who have constantly seen arbitrary arrests and the persecution of the best among their ranks — not only these workers, already infected with socialism, but any sensible peasant at all, however little he stops to think about what he sees around him, will be capable of understanding and of assimilating for himself just what it is the workers are struggling for, will assimilate the idea of a zemsky sobor that would free the whole country from the omnipotence of hated officials. And agitation, on the ground of the immediate, most pressing needs of the peasantry, will only be capable of fulfilling its task — of bringing class struggle into the countryside — when, with the exposure of each fresh piece of 'economic' evil, it succeeds in linking to it definite political demands.

But the question arises: can a Social-Democratic workers' party introduce into its programme demands of the kind indicated above? Can it take upon itself agitation among the peasantry? Will this not lead precisely to our dispersing our forces and diverting, from the main and only reliable channel, our revolutionary strength, already so scanty as it is?

Such objections rest on a misunderstanding. Yes, we must certainly introduce into our programme demands for the liberation of our countryside from every survival of servitude — demands capable of calling forth, among the better part of the peasantry, if not an independent political struggle, then at least a conscious support for the liberation struggle of the working class. We would make a mistake were we to defend measures capable of holding back social development, or of artificially fencing the small peasantry off from the growth of capitalism, from the development of large-scale production; but it would be a still more fatal mistake if we failed to make use of the labour movement to spread among the peasantry those democratic demands which the reform of February 19, 1861, failed to satisfy, owing to its distortion at the hands of landlords and officials. It is necessary for our party to include such demands, if it wishes to place itself at the head of the whole people in the struggle against the autocracy.*

* A draft of a Social-Democratic programme including the above-mentioned demands has already been drawn up by us. We hope, after discussion and revision of this draft, with the assistance of the Emancipation of Labour group, to publish, in one of our forthcoming issues, a draft programme for our party.

But this inclusion by no means implies that we should call active revolutionary forces out of the city into the countryside. There can be no question of this. There is not the slightest doubt that all the fighting elements of the party must strive toward the cities and the factory-and-works centres, that only the industrial proletariat is capable of an irreversible, mass struggle against the autocracy, that only this proletariat is capable of bearing on its shoulders such means of struggle as the organising of an open demonstration, or the putting out of a regularly appearing and widely circulated popular political newspaper. It is not in order to call convinced Social-Democrats away from the city into the countryside, not in order to chain them to the countryside, that we must introduce peasant demands into our programme — no, but in order to give guidance for their activity to those forces which cannot find application anywhere except in the countryside, in order to make use, for the cause of democracy and of political struggle for freedom, of those ties with the countryside which, owing to circumstances, are possessed by no small number of devoted Social-Democratic intelligentsia and workers, and which necessarily expand and grow along with the growth of the movement. We long ago outgrew the stage when we were a small detachment of volunteers, when the whole store of

Social-Democratic forces was exhausted by circles of young people who had gone, entirely, to 'the workers.' Our movement now disposes of an entire army: an army of workers, touched by the struggle for socialism and for freedom — an army of intelligentsia, who have taken and continue to take part in the movement and who are now scattered to every corner of Russia — an army of sympathisers, looking with faith and hope upon the labour movement and ready to render it a thousand services. And before us there stands a great task: to organise all these armies, to organise them in such a way that we should be capable, not only of arranging fleeting outbursts, not only of dealing the enemy chance, scattered (and therefore harmless) blows, but of pursuing the enemy with a steady, persistent and sustained struggle along the whole line, hounding the autocratic government wherever it sows oppression and reaps hatred. But is it possible to attain this goal without carrying the seeds of class struggle and political consciousness into the many-millioned mass of the peasantry? And do not say that such a carrying-in is impossible: it is not only possible, it is already taking place, it travels by a thousand paths, slipping past our attention and our influence. It will move immeasurably wider and faster once we succeed in giving a slogan for such influence, and raise the banner of the liberation of the Russian peasantry from all the remnants of the shameful right of serfdom. The village folk who come into the towns already look, even now, with curiosity and interest, at the incomprehensible struggle of the workers, and carry news of it into every backwater. We can and must succeed in making this curiosity of outside onlookers give way — if not to full understanding, then at least to a dim consciousness — of the fact that the workers are struggling in the interests of the whole people; this must give way to an ever-growing sympathy for their struggle. And then — the day of the victory of the revolutionary workers' party over the police government will draw nearer with a swiftness unexpected even by ourselves.

[N. Lenin]

FROM OUR PUBLIC LIFE²

The student movement and the popular demonstrations in many towns have, over the past few months, come to occupy an overwhelming place in our attention. We give below accounts of these events, compiled on the basis of some hundred reports sent to the Iskra editorial board. We extend our warm thanks to all our correspondents, and to those who have sent us every kind of leaflet and material, and earnestly ask them to continue and broaden their collaboration with us.

ST. PETERSBURG

The chronicle of events for February and the beginning of March must begin with that government announcement (January 11) about the sending of the Kiev students into the army, which we noted in No. 2 of Iskra. Our observation, that this was not a purely student question, that it must call forth a mass student strike and demonstration with the participation of every class of society, with the workers at the head, was borne out in full measure.

Protest against the sending of students into the army as soldiers quickly flared up among the St Petersburg students. In the majority of institutions of higher education — a series of meetings. Resolutions are passed calling for the organisation of obstruction, demanding the repeal of the 'Provisional Rules.' Such a demand was presented, for instance, on January 25 by representatives of the organised St Petersburg student body (the University, the Higher Women's Courses, and the Institutes of Mining, Forestry, Electrical Engineering, Transport Communications, the Women's Medical Institute, the Courses in Church History, the Military-Medical Academy, and the Academy of Arts). Referring to the Provisional Rules, and to the whips already brought into play (in Kazan), they threatened the government that it would 'awaken our fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, just as it has already awakened a part of the popular masses — the workers.' A mass of leaflets and bulletins appears. We shall not tire the reader by listing all these leaflets that have been sent to the editors. Let us note two characteristic features: on the one hand, a certain despondency and depressed mood among the students, many of whose representatives are intimidated by the threat of being punished with 'Asiatic' severity. "Truly, I do not recall a gloomier time, it has become stifling," one correspondent reports at the end of January, after the fate of the 183 Kiev students was shared by 27 St Petersburg ones. "The mood is one of such depression, everyone is so intimidated, that now, whatever you do, everything passes without objection." The struggle between the radical students ('obstructionists,' that is, those who stood for a strike and obstruction) and the 'sensible ones,' who stood for submission and were unwilling to risk their bourgeois careers, sometimes grew so heated that they threatened to douse one another with acid, and the like. The authorities tried to fan this split, appealing in their announcements to 'serious minds,' inviting the students to be 'more modest' (an announcement by the trustee of the St Petersburg educational district, Sonin, of February 6). Students unwilling to give way to servility answered with an ardent protest against 'Bogolepov and Co.,' proclaiming: "Forward, comrades, enough of keeping silent! Remember that history's verdict will be more terrible and more frightful than the verdict of the temporary commission" (Bulletin No. 6, of February 6). Another trait — a growing sympathy for the students among those who were not themselves threatened with being sent to the army, and among society at large. The students of the Military-Medical Academy, at a meeting on January 30, unanimously resolve to submit a petition for the release of the students who have been sent into the army as soldiers, and for the granting of the right to hold meetings. Women students of the Higher Courses, at a meeting on February 3, propose a strike, and warmly protest against the 'Provisional Rules.' A hectographed letter, signed 'Mother,' passes from hand to

hand, branding, on the one hand, the arbitrary rule of the Pobedonostsevs, the Sipyagins, the Bogolepovs, who have reached the point of senseless, insolent cruelty; and, on the other, the degrading silence of 'Russian society,' knowing only how to endure, keep silent and tremble. A poem by a student, 'Then and Now' (February 1, 1899–1901), is spread about, summoning to struggle, indignant at the pusillanimity of the mass that allows the temple of learning to be turned into 'a prison, a barracks for soldiers.' Wavering students were afraid to believe in their own strength, not knowing that awakening and the spirit of struggle were penetrating other classes of society as well.

The government could not, of course, fail to see that ferment was growing. Arrests followed one another, the prisons filled up. Over the affair of the ill-fated 'loyal-subject' petition to the Tsar for the repeal of the Provisional Rules, they took the well-known historian, the writer Miliukov. Searches were carried out at the homes of many writers. There were up to fifty 'ordinary' arrests in the single night of February 9-10. It must be added that the policy of the government was already beginning to show signs of vacillation: whether to suppress, or to make concessions, or, more precisely, to deceive with concessions. This last found expression — feebly, it is true — in the send-off given to the students conscripted as recruits, arranged by the Minister of War, who shook the hands of these lowliest of servicemen, spoke encouraging words to them and asked them to apply to him personally in case of any difficulty. Readers may kindly compare this with the correspondence from Pskov printed below.

Agitation grew. The reactionary press (Grazhdanin, Moskovskiy Vedomosti) only poured oil on the flames, proving with disgusting hypocrisy, à la Judushka, that there was nothing cruel about sending students into the army as soldiers, that this measure testified to the government's paternal solicitude about giving these thoughtless young men a fatherly correction... One can imagine what mockery, on the part of a fallen and pinned-down opponent, such speeches sounded like! But those who had been knocked down began to rise, and the street helped untie their hands.

On February 14 a shot rang out fired by P. V. Karpovich, striking down the hated Minister of Popular Education, Bogolepov. Everyone sympathised with Karpovich, and when, for instance, the director of the Women's Courses, Rayev, hastened, together with a group of professors, to express sympathy for the dying Bogolepov, a group of women students of the 1893 graduating class issued a leaflet (of February 21) branding their 'careerist calculations' and 'base act' of servility toward this 'vile figure.'

The broader public began energetically discussing the possible resumption of revolutionary terror. But — as the Zlobodnevny Listok (SPB, printed by the 'Free Russian Press,' No. 2, of March 2) justly remarked — "this view seems entirely mistaken. Living history knows no learned-by-rote, word-for-word repetitions... What is our present autocrat — what, what idea does he embody?! Is he anything more than a mere figurehead chairman presiding over a bureaucratic business enterprise?... The task now is not to destroy this 'God-anointed stamp' (the leaflet says the autocrat resembles a rubber stamp bearing the words 'let it be so'), but to take it out of the hands of the bureaucracy and into our own hands." It is naturally understood that, to achieve such a task, the political action of the masses is urgently necessary. And all the revolutionary work of recent years, proceeding under the banner of Social-Democracy, has naturally pushed the thought of the advanced student youth toward a plan of street demonstration, a plan of drawing every class of society in general, and the workers in particular, into protest (by way of broadening it). One expression of this thought was a February leaflet, issued by the mutual-aid fund of the St Petersburg University students and printed at the press of the 'Union of Struggle.'* "The solution of the university question," the authors justly wrote, "must be sought in the solution of a broader and more pressing question — the

question of broadening the political framework for Russian public life... To violence must be opposed force... And this force is already growing, life itself is bringing it forth, in it lies the pledge of a better future. It is quickly spreading across the country, embracing it ever more tightly and firmly, menacing, though as yet still unconscious. But let it wake to consciousness — and it will be the end of absolutism, the end of masked slavery.” And what better means of broadening the university question and of awakening consciousness in this menacing popular force than to carry the protest out into the street, before a crowd of the people? And the plan for organising an open demonstration was adopted by the leaders of the movement.

[RECONSTRUCTED TEXT] Note 3 in the endnotes below discusses the role of the St Petersburg ‘Union of Struggle’ in this movement.**[END RECONSTRUCTED TEXT]**

It was decided to gather at Kazan Cathedral on February 19. By the organisers’ calculations, more than 2,000 students and women students were to take part in the demonstration. However, between the 17th and the 18th, twenty-six people were arrested, six of them ‘delegates’ bearing printed appeals relating to the manifestation, so that confidence in its feasibility was badly shaken, and the demonstration was called off. Nevertheless, on February 19, some 200 to 300 (some accounts say up to 400) of the student youth came to Kazan Cathedral. Part of them went into the cathedral; part stood about on the benches near it. When nothing of interest turned out to be happening inside the church, everyone came out into the street and, joining the crowd that had held a waiting posture near the cathedral, turned onto the Nevsky. At this moment mounted and dismounted police surrounded the crowd of demonstrators and followed them the length of the Nevsky. The crowd walked, singing the Marseillaise (‘Arise, ye people, rise!’). Near the Duma building, mounted police cut into the crowd of demonstrators with the evident intention of turning the procession aside into a side street (between the Duma and the Myutinsky Row). The young people, pressed against the Duma building, began to push back against the pressing policemen, and the latter, without so much as a by-your-leave, used their fists and began dealing blows right and left. The gathered public shouted at the police: “You have no right to hit!” — to which they replied: “We were ordered to.” The crowd of demonstrators consisted mainly of women — students of the Rozhdestvensky courses and medical students. A desperate cry went up. Several people watched this savage scene from the window of the Duma building (among them the city mayor Lelyanov himself), and expressed their strongest indignation against the police; one of the young ladies observing what was happening from there suffered a serious nervous shock.

“They beat the girls so badly,” one correspondent reports, “that the shopkeepers of the Gostiny Dvor arcade started standing up for them. Many in the public began to feel faint.” Cries went up: “They’re beating them, they’re beating them!” A crowd of some five to six thousand outsiders gathered around the demonstration. The crowd grew turbulent. A very serious brawl seemed about to break out. At this point the governor-general Kleigels himself appeared and requested (at first, he had ‘demanded,’ but owing to the crowd’s protest he was forced to change his demand into a polite request) that they go into the courtyard. There, in the courtyard, the demonstrators were registered. Part of the students, who had stood outside the police cordon, tried to join the demonstrators, but Kleigels, having let through five of them, then refused to continue this dangerous practice. To the young people’s assertion that they had been beaten, Kleigels expressed disbelief in the very fact (‘my police do not fight,’ he said) and refused to accept their complaint, leaving those who had suffered to seek their own lawful means of pursuing their protest. All who had been registered, and many of those who had merely been standing around, went to the nearest police station and there demanded that a formal report be drawn up. In the end a complaint against the actions of the police was drawn up and sent, with a certain medical student, to the public prosecutor. It is said

that Kleigels summoned this medical student to himself and made it clear to him that complaints against the police never lead anywhere (citing, for example, a precedent from 1899). And indeed, the prosecutor, who at first listened politely to the students’ complaint, then changed his tone: “You are rioters,” he said, “and I am sending your complaint on to the governor-general.” It is said (in another version) that Kleigels accepted the statement about the actions of the police, and, in reply, read aloud a passage from some Russian book describing how policemen in England beat demonstrators. Mr Kleigels missed one small difference between free England and rightless Russia: that in England it is the public that gets beaten for disturbing order, while in Russia it is the police, disturbing order, who do the beating.

Here is another extract from the account of a person who was an eyewitness of the event: “Leaving Kazan Cathedral on February 19 to go home, I saw that the square in front of the cathedral was surrounded, on the left side, by a detachment of policemen and mounted gendarmes... Near Myutinsky Row I noticed that constables had appeared behind us, who began to block off the pavement: some passer-by expressed displeasure that his way was being blocked. Turning around, I saw a constable, bowing politely and pointing to the crowd of students visible ahead, ask ironically: ‘Which party would you like to join, this one or that one?’ This insolent question, of course, forced any decent person simply to make his choice at once. But, knowing precisely which ‘party’ is meant in any case, and by no means wishing to ‘join’ the party of the police, I, without looking back any more, hastened to join those walking ahead. I had barely reached them when a detachment of policemen, walking in even rows, closed in tightly from behind and to the side. The front rank crossed their arms over their chests and thrust out their elbows, and the whole mass of the detachment pressed steadily against the crowd. When further movement became almost impossible, a violent reprisal began. Without changing the general position of their arms, the policemen would raise their clenched right fist, bending the arm at the elbow, and then straighten it out again, thrusting the fist straight in front of them, not troubling to see where or on whom it might land: the blows of the fists were regular, simultaneous, uniform; one could see a worked-out method in it, one felt an organised system of fist-blows in action. Neither the indignant cries of the students, ‘Don’t dare touch the women!’, nor the blue-turned faces with bulging eyes, nor the possibility of a disaster before the huge mirror-glass windows of the shops — nothing halted the ceaseless, hideously brutal pressure of the policemen...”

“This first experiment in demonstration showed that public sympathy is assured to the students, standing up against the arbitrary rule of tsarist autocracy — and at the same time it showed” what factors determine the relative failure of February 19. The absence of a revolutionary organisation meant that the demonstration was, half the time, called off, and not everyone even knew of it. The absence of workers meant that the demonstration could not take on the character of a genuine popular clash with the police: no one had troubled to see to it that, along with the students’ demands, broader demands should be put forward as well. All this explains why the mood of revolutionary St Petersburg after February 19 was two-fold: on the one hand, an awareness that demonstration is the one true path; on the other, uncertainty about success. On February 28 — the anniversary of the paper ‘What You Wish’ (Novoye Vremya) — a demonstration was planned for Ertelev Lane. A group of organisers, in a special leaflet, invited people to mark, in a fitting manner, the twenty-fifth anniversary of the esteemed Alexei Sergeyevich Suvorin — a man who had raised to a principle the lack of principle that had made him such a brilliant career out of servility and toadying before the government. The demonstration did not succeed, and again for the very same reasons. More police gathered than young people. They stood in lines all along Liteiny, along Malaya Italiyanskaya. The crowd was divided into segments and dispersed. Some were registered. It is said that the whole lane was strewn with fragments of

Novoye Vremya. In this way, this failed demonstration, too, was only a relative failure: some result was certainly achieved. To convince oneself of this, it is enough to read the following little scene, sketched by one of those who took part in the celebration: "And so, Suvorin had an enormous material success. Both his sons too became involved in editing the paper, and the Suvorin dynasty's rule is now secured. I heard the deacon singing, heard congratulatory speeches, to which old Suvorin answered by shaking hands or kissing the speakers on the cheek. They drank champagne. I stood by the window and looked out into the street. And what did I see? Detachments of mounted and dismounted police roaming about a short street. Some sixty men were stationed by the house. I grow curious. On the opposite side of the street I see a small knot of students laughing loudly and gesturing. Only now do I understand this ovation on the part of the police. Petersburg students have not been on good terms with Suvorin since the time when, in one of his witty 'little letters,' he made light of, two years ago, the student disturbances and condemned them. It seems the young people wished, in their own fashion, to mark the jubilee: with a cat-concert, with the smashing of windows, and other little pranks of this kind. Some time later I left the hospitable house, where champagne was flowing like a river that day. Ertelev Lane was guarded by police, and there was no sign of students to be seen. On both ends, from the Bassejnaya and Italiyanskaya sides, the street was cordoned off. On Bassejnaya, a gendarme officer rode on horseback in front of the cordon. No one was let through. In honour of Suvorin, at least two hundred policemen had been called out, who looked, evidently, very pleased with themselves. I asked the first fat superintendent I met whether his lads were equipped with whips, and he winked at me significantly in reply. 'A lovely ovation, in honour of Suvorin,' I said to myself, mentally, as I continued on my way. At this moment the all-powerful General Kleigels himself appeared, to personally oversee the maintenance of order. All around, not a single student could be seen, but the police stood firm and brave at their posts. In actual fact, several dozen students and women students had tried to approach Ertelev Lane from various directions, but had turned back on finding it cordoned off, and that the police, with their whips, were guarding Suvorin's realm like a fierce archangel guarding the gates of paradise.'"

One cannot help but express regret at the inaction of the Social-Democratic 'Union of Struggle' in St Petersburg — the local committee of the RSDLP. Was it right for Social-Democrats not to respond to the student movement, not to turn to the workers with an explanation of it, not to call on the workers to demonstrate against the government of the Kleigelses and the Bogolepovs? Evidently, the sad fruits made themselves felt of that propaganda so assiduously carried on in St Petersburg over the last two or three years: on the one hand, the 'Economists' zealously counselled 'not running ahead' of the undeveloped masses, and did nothing for the development of revolutionary organisation and of political education of the workers; on the other hand, the capital's 'critics' and 'Bernsteinians' played into the hands of the 'Economists' with their 'demolition job' on orthodox Marxism.*

* Both these tendencies had for some time already been earning the local Social-Democracy a certain notoriety, as our earlier issues have discussed.

The inaction of Social-Democracy could not fail to affect a movement that was left without support from organised advanced workers. A whole series of reports speaks of a mood of despondency and hopelessness. "The mood is heavy," they write, for instance, on March 2, "somehow no one hopes for a good outcome." Fortunately, the events at Kharkov and Moscow, which we describe below, raised spirits in St Petersburg too. "As soon as the Kharkov events became known in the capital," one correspondent writes, "a stir began among the students." "The Moscow and Kharkov events," another reports, "strongly rekindled the excitement among the youth that had died down." We see clearly here how the mass participation of workers in the

demonstrations, characterising the events in Kharkov and Moscow, breathed new life into the movement of the intelligently youth and prompted it toward more decisive and revolutionary actions, marking an epoch in the popular movement against the autocracy.

A new demonstration had originally been fixed for March 3, the day of Karpovich's trial. But since the trial was postponed (evidently not only because of Bogolepov's death, but out of fear of a popular demonstration), the demonstration was moved to March 4. A printed proclamation, 'To Everyone,' issued in the name of the 'Council of the Union of United Landsmanshaften and Student Organisations,' dated the day of the twentieth anniversary of the assassination of Alexander II, March 1, 1901, declared that "the police regime has reached its culminating point... The protest of the living part of society against the obscurantism of the government, against its own rightlessness and slavery... is beginning to find real ground... Student protests have finally found support and sympathy among various strata of society. We... standing up for man's trampled rights, and struggling for them on the social-political arena, appeal to every stratum of society."

The fourth of March will probably long be remembered, not only by St Petersburgers, but by the whole of Russian society.

Everyone knew of the demonstration and, after the event of February 19, harboured no illusions, knew what they were going into. "The students' mood was one of depression; in the evening on Saturday, taking leave of acquaintances and comrades, the young people spoke their 'until tomorrow, then?' in a tone that made it clear they were going to what they were, in fact, going to! One little girl, a woman student, prayed: 'Lord, let me fall ill tomorrow morning' — and went all the same. From every side there was this languishing before 'tomorrow,' and Saturday dragged so painfully long, so much was heard out and reheard, so much thought through, in this eve of the day."

At exactly twelve o'clock on Sunday, all the demonstrators emerged onto the porch from the cathedral, which had been full of people. The whole square before the cathedral was a sea of heads. It was hard to determine the number of demonstrators: witnesses' accounts vary and range from three thousand to fifteen. This does not, of course, include the mass of outside public surrounding the demonstrators on every side. "There was a huge number of onlookers," one correspondent writes, "far more than demonstrators." A balloon was released, and two banners were raised over the square, one white, one red (the latter, as one eyewitness correspondent tells us, was raised by workers). The inscriptions on the banners read: "Down with the Provisional Rules!" There was also, it is said, an inscription demanding freedom of speech. A technologist (according to another report, a forestry student) began to address the crowd. He laid out the present state of affairs, pointed to the abnormality of the existing regime, to the necessity of changing Russia's political structure, and finished with the words: "Long live legality, down with the Provisional Rules!" The public expressed its solidarity with cries of 'hurrah,' 'agreed,' and the like. This did not last long, but the sight was impressive. Clouds of proclamations were scattered through the crowd, leaflets were read aloud in various parts of it. The onlookers — chiefly people sympathetic to the cause — pressed right up against the demonstrators. Order was complete, and, 'at first,' the eyewitness reports, 'things went almost in the European style.'

But 'the European style quickly gave way to the Russian one, and very quickly.' Very soon after the flag was raised, Kleigels drove past in a carriage. He looked over the public with a smile, transferred to a horse and — gave a signal. The gates of the neighbouring houses were thrown open, and masses of police and troops surrounded the cathedral. A cavalcade of Cossacks on large, spirited horses rode out onto the square and headed straight for its centre. "The crowd surged in different directions," one correspondent writes, "partly toward the Nevsky." The Cossacks turned to face the cathedral. The crowd pressed back toward the cathedral. And while the crowd was still packing itself in, the Cossacks moved forward in a solid line. There was no hint whatsoever of negotiation with the crowd, no warning; no one heard even a simple order to disperse before the attack, or an offer to do so. And besides, there was nowhere to go — the cathedral was behind them — and no time either: it all happened so fast that there was no time to think. The Cossacks rode with their whips in hand; when the crowd could no longer retreat or draw together, they rode right up close and at once began lashing everyone in front of them. Large chestnut horses bore straight down on people, breast-first, growing excited, rearing up; and the burly Cossacks, with dull, brutish faces, leaning forward, swung their whips, and only a sort of clicking sound could be heard. 'The captain gave the order: "Whips out!"', another writes, 'and himself charged first, showing his subordinates the example; with the full force of a swing he struck the first student he came upon, who staggered and fell. Right behind the captain, a sergeant-major charged forward, dealing blows with both his right and left hands, seizing students by the collar and throwing them under their feet. The whole hundred followed after them. At first, everything went quiet, as though no one could believe that they were flogging completely defenceless people with whips. A terrible voice broke the silence: some woman fell into hysterics. Cut off and fenced in by a body of Cossacks, the public sobbed, cried out, but could not help. The whips whistled, the clubs of the constables struck the heads of unresisting, stunned students. "This can't be!" cried a colonel who happened to be in the crowd, "that they should be beating people with whips! There must be some mistake" — hoofbeats on the pavement.' The public parted wordlessly, and the colonel found himself face to face with the beating. In horror the colonel grabbed his head and, as though mad, ran off down the street. Meanwhile the students, surrounded on every side, opposite the entrance to the columns, began to retreat toward Kazan Cathedral, where at that very moment a service happened to be taking place, and the priest was carrying out the holy gifts. And here, at the church door, between the columns, where it is written, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord!", the last act of this most vile violence was played out. The whips whistled, students fell under their blows, row after row. There could be heard the whistling and cracking of the descending clubs. The Cossacks were ordered to fall back, and the dismounted police set about their work. I do not know which was worse: the Cossacks, at least, only drew blood, while the constables beat men to death; they struck people directly in the face and on the head. One student, who had fallen with a cracked skull, evidently had his neck trodden on: he wheezed terribly, evidently in his death agony. Panic seized the crowd, and it rushed into the church. The students, too, grew savage, and tore out the railings. 'If you must beat, then beat to death.' Self-defence multiplied their strength tenfold, and the constables were forced to retreat. It became terrible for a man when he was driven, by madness, to the point of having nothing to oppose the blows of the club with but his bare hands. One of the most ferocious of the policemen, his eyes bloodshot, with a huge club, stumbled over a fallen student. A medical student flew at the policeman; a piece of a broken shaft flashed in the air, and the policeman went down. But meanwhile, inside the cathedral, other policemen were beating unfortunate women students half to death, women who had thought to find refuge with the priests, who, instead of stopping this slaughter with the cross in hand, locked themselves in the sanctuary. Policemen seized women students by the hair and beat their heads against the walls.

Students burst in and freed the wretched, beaten victims. One student of the Technological Institute, cut off from this group by the Cossacks, tried to break through the cordon; at last, seeing his brother fall beneath a descending club, and blood — or was it brains? — spatter, he went out of his mind on the spot.'

It goes without saying that each eyewitness could only speak of one small part of the scene he had personally witnessed. We therefore consider it necessary to give a few more accounts.

"...The policemen cut into the crowd, fighting with sabres not drawn from their sheaths. With these sabres, however, they struck so hard that by the end half of them were fighting only with bare stumps. Many students snatched away the whips, broke off pieces of the sabres and defended themselves with them. This was a prepared, organised massacre; it will long be remembered. At the height of the slaughter I was pushed off the porch and fell on someone who had, apparently, also fallen from above. At that moment they were carrying a dead student down from the porch. When I ran up to him, he was still wheezing. A fellow student and I tore open his shirt, began rubbing his chest with snow, rubbing his head too, but he trembled all over on our arms and stretched out; within a few minutes his face went completely dark; his whole body somehow stiffened. After that, we, who had been knocked down, could stand up again. At this moment cavalry attacked from the back of the cathedral too. The mass of people, knocked from the porch, beaten by whips and sabres, had nowhere to go; the cavalry began to trample it. I myself saw how the cavalry rode down a medic who had already been knocked down by a policeman, who beat him, already lying there, with a sabre; before my very eyes they rode down a very properly dressed young lady, and some coachman or peasant. At this moment I myself received a blow and fell unconscious. I came to my senses in a small garden, on the snow, among the public that was fussing around me. This is how I avoided being arrested. The workers behaved themselves on the square like heroes. They broke apart the wooden staircase of the cathedral, and fought with these pieces of wood to their last strength. There were relatively few workers on the square, however, since from the early morning the workers' districts had been cordoned off with troops, and the workers could not get to the square in any great numbers; only a small part, those living in the city itself, managed to reach the square."

"There was such shouting," another eyewitness writes, "that it could be heard for several blocks around. Some woman student cried out something at a Cossack bearing down on her; he grabbed her by the hair and dragged her along; then she was trampled by the horses. Who was she? Perhaps that very woman who had wanted to fall ill with typhus. Part of the crowd first rushed into the cathedral, thinking to give shelter to many and to prevent the Cossacks from cutting off the rest; but the cathedral could only hold a few, and the public itself began coming out of it again once the wounded, brought in by their comrades, began to appear. This only poured more oil onto the fire. Meanwhile, through other doors, policemen began entering and squeezing the public out of the cathedral with such force that it became impossible to come down from the porch: some fell headlong, while others managed to jump down from the porch (you know, it stands higher than a man); and either they fell and others fell on top of them, or their own people happily caught them, or they fell straight into the hands of the police, who beat them. There were, at the least, four dead; three of them were trampled by horses, and finished off while already lying on the ground. They beat people wherever they could reach, whatever came to hand; they seized people by the hair, dragged them along; women were there without their hats, in tatters. The police themselves seized students and threw them off the porch straight at the policemen standing below, who beat them."

"The Cossacks flogged with their whips everyone they could reach," one woman student reports, — "the first to fall was some old woman coming out of the church; there were children in the crowd... A few

students carried down from the porch a forester who had taken a sabre-blow to the neck. In my view, he was dead. A terrible cry rose all around. A hail of stones and snowballs flew at the police; students, workmen and boys threw them. On one side, a sabre; on the other, an almost unarmed crowd... They led out one medical student with a cracked skull; put her on a cab and drove our student off, her whole face covered in blood, terrible to see. One miner's head was bandaged here on the spot: it was all bloody. An acquaintance, a university man, came up: his whole face was covered with purple welts from the whip. Another miner had a scar from cheek to cheek across his nose. I list everyone I saw with my own eyes."

"Two gentlemen led over a woman student, who was almost fainting, to the priest of the cathedral (I know him), with a request to take the girl to a place of safety, where she might be given something to drink. God's servant answered, with a savage look: 'I do not help rebels!' I heard this myself. A few minutes later this scoundrel, laughing, was talking with several drunken gendarme officers in the middle of the square, cleared of the public by the cavalry."

Another correspondent, who had come to the square by Kazan Cathedral at around noon, writes, among other things: "From my right I heard the particular sound of whipping and slapping and saw Cossacks in red caps, riding in a row (the reader will recall that Cossacks who had arrived by train had by then dismounted) and beating with their whips, to the right and left. The blow fell on the dress of a woman student who stood two people away from me, and the next blow should have fallen on me, as the Cossacks were bearing down on me. It was disgusting and degrading to await such a blow, being pinned in the crowd; there was no way to fight it. But at this moment the crowd pushed forward and lifted me up onto the porch. There were as yet no red caps here, they were lower down. But the crowd pushed me to the right, that is, toward the left side, toward the left colonnade, and there I saw a hideous scene on the porch. A Cossack lashed some hatless student, lashed him once, twice, on the head; the student fell; then three Cossacks bent over him and beat him with their whips too. Then suddenly everything went quiet, and a whisper spread: 'He's dead.' I could see how something was being carried; I saw the top of a carriage below, near the left colonnade. They say he was put into the carriage and driven away, but I did not see him myself. The crowd's pressure pushed me back against the right colonnade, toward the cathedral door. All this time there was a shrieking, cries of 'They're beating them!', the crack of the whips. Then I heard a cry: 'Into the church!' — but whether people actually went into the church, I did not see. I saw only that two or three red caps entered the cathedral door, and heard shouting. I thought that they were beating people in the cathedral. But, they say, no one was beaten in there, and I now think that the Cossacks carried a wounded man in there. I was pushed out onto the right colonnade, from which I ran toward the Nevsky, to see if the way out was free. Seeing that it was, I ran back and began calling everyone after me, so we could join our comrades on the Nevsky... A crowd of some twenty-five followed me, but we met two passionately agitated medical students who shouted: 'To the comrades who are being beaten!', and we all rushed back again. There, behind the colonnade, they were still beating people with whips. On the colonnade itself I saw four policemen chasing a medic, and, having caught him, throwing him down off the colonnade onto the stones below, but he jumped up and ran off. Then these same policemen, with brutal faces, began crushing a technologist, whom they also threw down. What happened to him, I did not see... In other places there was fighting with the policemen too, who beat people with their sabres in their sheaths. Many saw completely beaten people lying motionless. The policemen attacked several at a time, threw people down and beat them."

There can be no doubt whatsoever, then, that this was an organised, prepared massacre. The authorities had foresightedly prepared, in advance, fifty Red Cross carriages for the wounded. "There were such

scenes," Zlobodnevny Listok No. 3, of March 5, reports, "as several policemen holding down a student, while a Cossack lashed him with his whip."* Though not much, the police too got a taste of it: a Cossack officer received a blow to the head and immediately fell off his horse; a gendarme officer was seriously wounded and fell from his horse. Several policemen and Cossacks were wounded.

* We cannot pass over in silence the fact that this lively and interesting sheet contains the following liberal phrase: 'The police cannot allow street demonstrations — this is understandable. Is it not possible to have surrounded and registered all who gathered, or arrested them?'... The claim that it is 'not permitted' for citizens to leave the house 'in a body,' to hold processions and give speeches to the public — this is 'understandable' only from the point of view of people accustomed to political rightlessness and slavery. And if the police, not for the first time and not for the last, have gone so far as to beat and kill citizens protesting against this slavery, then one must not call on the police to peaceably cordon off, register and arrest, but must call upon the people to rise up entirely in struggle against the police, so that it might answer the outrageous violence against defenceless youth and women with a violent reckoning with the tsarist government.

There is no doubt that the demonstration would have presented, not a simple beating of unarmed people, but a battle with the people, had the socialist and Social-Democratic groups approached with a special proclamation to the workers, organised a distribution of delegates to them and word about the field of battle, organised local demonstrations in the outskirts, partly to divert police attention, partly so as not to leave inactive those who could not manage to reach Kazan Square. To our misfortune, the St Petersburg Social-Democrats turned out, as has already been noted, not to be equal to the task (partly owing to the spread of Economism and Bernsteinism among them, partly, perhaps, owing to the mass raids shortly before the event). But the workers were nonetheless at the demonstration and, moreover — a matter of particular importance — they were on their way to the demonstration but were held back by troops. Neither from the Narva Gate nor from the Shlisselburg Tract were the police willing to let the workers through: troops were even sent to stop the mass of workers making their way to the demonstration, in the course of which a clash occurred, in which many were wounded. Another correspondent likewise reports that there was a series of skirmishes with the Cossacks. "The workers," one correspondent writes, "arrived late for the demonstration owing to the suspension of horse-tram service (deliberate, of course). They came on foot to the Petersburg Side only by six o'clock in the evening." "At the Narva Gate," another writes, "four companies of soldiers stood, and did not let the workers through."

Public sympathy for the students expressed itself again and again, in the most varied ways. The barbarous beating enraged everyone. "Some young officer (a guardsman, apparently)," an eyewitness reports, "quite pale, sprang forward and cried: 'Halt!' to the Cossacks. A Cossack officer rode up to him, displeased, and the two argued — I don't know about what. The guardsman officer literally ground his teeth and shouted: 'Well, we shall see about that!'; the Cossack, all the same, rode off (it wasn't clear whether the Cossack rode away, or whether he rode off in order to continue beating people). From the public there came cries: 'Down with the whips, what are you doing, monsters?'"

That the actions of the police outraged even highly placed persons, and called forth their intervention, is proved by the fact, reported in our newspapers, that "the sovereign emperor has issued a stern reprimand to the member of the State Council, Lieutenant-General Prince Vyazemsky, for his interference in the actions of the police during the suppression of the street disorders." We cannot but thank the government for having published this reprimand, which shows all and everyone the solidarity of the Tsar with the governor-general, with the Cossacks and with the police.

The demonstration ended with the police, having beaten up a mass of the population, beginning to surround and arrest separate groups: they

cordoned people off, registered them, drove them into the courtyard of the Discount Bank, into the Kazan police precinct, into the courtyard of the Gostiny Dvor arcade. It is said they cordoned off a knot of military men — about six of them — and led them off too. A single procession of a cordoned-off group (sometimes numbering as many as two thousand) already constituted a considerable demonstration in itself.

It is hard to say exactly how long the massacre continued. But the unrest along the Nevsky continued into the evening. "Mounted detachments stood around the cathedral, a line of police and Cossacks along the pavements. Now and again a knot of students would gather, get into a scuffle, or shout: 'Down with the whips!' The Cossacks and police would charge, cordon off the knot, and lead it away. From time to time detachments would gallop along the pavement, sweeping the public before them and then, by some manoeuvre, forcing it off into one of the side streets; but the moment the detachment turned back, the crowd would flood back onto the pavement. The streets leading to the cathedral, and the nearest cross-streets on the other side of the Nevsky, were occupied by detachments. Patrols rode constantly up and down the streets." "The Cossacks," another eyewitness reports, "rode up and down the Nevsky until eleven at night, and there was still public about at that hour."

The government could congratulate itself on a triumph. That it did not feel confident of this triumph is clear from the fact that the Tsar took flight and rode off with his entire family to Tsarskoye Selo. On departing, he is said to have declared that the riot must be suppressed at any cost, by whatever means might prove necessary, and that he wished to hear no more about it. As is clear from the facts cited above, Kleigels acted precisely on this prescription; and the reprimand to Vyazemsky shows that this was indeed the Tsar's own attitude. Kleigels coolly presided over the massacre and, in conclusion — as Zlobodnevny Listok (No. 3) testifies — loudly pronounced: "We have met them steadfastly!" One old writer, restraining the police from savagery, was knocked off his feet and struck in the face. When he, seeing Kleigels, asked him why such things were permitted, the latter replied: "Why did you come here, then?" In the evening Kleigels telegraphed to Tsarskoye Selo: "The rebellion in St Petersburg has been suppressed."

It is a well-known saying that rebellion is a revolution that failed, and revolution a rebellion that succeeded. The demonstration of March 4 was, of course, neither a rebellion nor a revolutionary uprising, but the government — one must give it its due — did everything within its power to widen and deepen its significance, tenfold its 'suppression of the riot' spurred general discontent and thereby brought immeasurably nearer the moment when demonstrations of this kind become genuinely dangerous and not at all doomed, in advance, to failure as a mere 'riot.'

Can we sum up the total number of victims of March 4? At this moment we can report only very indefinite data. The number of dead is put at six to eight. Medical students Annensky and Timofeyevsky are named; it is said that the student Mogilyansky cannot be found; forester Dontsov, student Peters, woman student Zabyakina (it seems), and a Lesgaft-course student, Belyayeva*, are dead. As for the wounded, there can be no question of counting them all: it is known that, among the writers, Struve and Peshekhonov (thrown down a staircase) were wounded, as was Annensky. To the dead and wounded must be added the arrested, whose number, by some reports, comes to about 1,050: 252 in the Litovsky Castle, 339 women students in the Spasskaya precinct, then in the Vasilyeostrovskaya, Kolomenskaya and Kazanskaya precincts, in the transit prison, and in the Kresty on the Vyborg side. Among those taken, incidentally, are the writers Struve and Tugan-Baranovsky.

* According to the latest reports, the news that there had been fatalities is refuted.

Such are the approximate figures for the fallen in this battle. St Petersburg's mood is tense, 'electric.' New demonstrations are expected.

"We don't drink or eat properly," one witness of the massacre said on March 7. The government's announcement (published in the papers on March 6) astonished even people of high society with its falsehood, and a statement (?) is being prepared there concerning the atrocious actions of the police on March 4 and the falsity of the government's announcement. That society at the very top is deeply outraged is proved by a letter from 45 writers (to which a further 34 writers, signing their names just as the previous ones had, later attached themselves), addressed to the editors of the Russian papers and published in foreign newspapers. Russian papers naturally did not dare print this letter, and it circulated by hand. It gave voice to indignation over this savage, premeditated beating, over the enforced silence of the press, over the desperate condition of a country handed over entirely to the fists and whips [of the police]. As for St Petersburg society generally, it was informed, to a man, of the event of March 4, and sympathised with the demonstrators. "To whitewash itself," one correspondent reports, "the police, through the precincts, most likely spread the rumour that the beating had occurred because the students had permitted themselves to smoke inside the cathedral, to stand there in their hats, and generally to profane the shrine. This manoeuvre won it the sympathy of cooks — and no one else. The rest of the public was partly unconvinced by the police, and partly, on making enquiries on the spot, became convinced of the opposite; and, to its credit, if it did not express direct sympathy for the students, it at least condemned the police. In private flats, meetings were held at which petitions to the Minister of the Interior were drawn up, then signed and submitted." Let us note that the reactionary press, too, picked up this police lie about the students' unruliness in the cathedral. Who, in fact, behaved unruly in the cathedral is clear from the accounts above.

Upon the students the impression made by this demonstration was enormous. Before it, many students at the Institute of Communications, of Civil Engineers, at the Forestry and the Women's Medical Institute treated student disturbances with scepticism, but now it was unanimously resolved, in every one of these higher educational institutions, to cease attending lectures. And not only students, but even every last professor, now refuses to give lectures. By two reports, street demonstrations are taking place around the prisons, and the police is powerless to deal with the demonstrators.

The tsarist government, visibly, is experiencing a certain hesitation. Bogolepov's successor has not been appointed, and it is stubbornly said in society that the emergency conference of ministers, which met in Tsarskoye Selo on March 4, has resolved not to apply the 'Provisional Rules' any further. On the other hand, the government has issued a mendacious and improbably insolent statement about the 'disturbances' in St Petersburg, Moscow and Kharkov, drawing in exultation from the reactionary press for its directness and firmness of tone — the Tsar has issued the reprimand to Vyazemsky, the Minister of the Interior has published a circular (of March 12) criticising the actions of the police in the street disturbances, with instructions on how to conduct oneself in future. The Minister demands greater 'speed and decisiveness'; the Minister is displeased with the 'slow-footedness of the authorities'; the Minister is forced to acknowledge (poor thing!) that the 'disorders' represented 'demonstrations that had been prepared in advance,' against which 'weak persuasion' is insufficient. Against 'gatherings unwilling to disperse,' attempting resistance, against persons who begin 'making speeches' — 'the immediate application of the most decisive measures' is necessary, 'distinguished by their especially energetic character.' The Minister is especially pleased with the Cossacks: "The timely summoning of cavalry," he proclaims, "as an example to every police rank, and as a lesson to every loyal subject of the Russian Empire, is presented as something not exclusively for the purpose of the 'use of arms'" (read: for the purpose of the use of whips; the Minister's style is as heavy-handed as the blows of the Cossack whips) "but sometimes as most fitting and desirable."

We earnestly counsel everyone to read and re-read this most interesting circular. It is a genuine plan of campaign, a plan of the government's military operations against the people, who have begun to carry their protest and their indignation out onto the street.

Let us, too, then, we socialists, work out and put into practice our own plan of campaign, our own plan of the people's military operations against the government. Let this plan be reckoned not on an isolated, chance blow, but on a systematic, persistent struggle.

Petersburg workers, remember the May Day demonstration! Remember those killed, wounded and arrested on March 4: these people rose against your own worst enemy, against the police self-will that keeps Russian workers and the whole Russian people in an oppressed, degraded, rightless condition. Petersburg workers, remember the May Day demonstration, and strive to give the government a fitting answer for its savagery and violence!

P.S. These lines were already written when we received information about events after March 4. This information fully confirms the assessment given above of the activity of local Social-Democrats, who did not put out a single leaflet to the workers. After March 4, only the united groups 'Sotsialist' and 'Rabocheye Znamya'⁴ issued appeals to the St Petersburg workers, calling for a demonstration on March 11. A meeting of student delegates came out against the demonstration: this was affected, on the one hand, by the fact that the best forces of the radical youth had been broken up on March 4, and, on the other, by the influence of rumours that the 'Provisional Rules' would not be applied further. The 'Union of Struggle' was also against the demonstration, and it was called off. In this way, the moderately liberal part of the intelligently youth and the 'Economist'-minded part of the Social-Democrats found themselves — as was to be expected, and as opponents of 'Economism' and 'criticism' had long foretold — on the same side, and won out over the badly damaged Social-Democratic revolutionaries. But the workers — this it is especially gratifying to note — did not, all the same, heed these calls for calm. Roused revolutionary in spirit, they streamed into the city in masses on Sunday, March 11, filled the streets and, from minute to minute, awaited the call to struggle. And the struggle loomed, and it was no laughing matter, for all the forces of the St Petersburg police and the local troop units had been mobilised, and, by all reports, preparations were being made to open fire on the people. The workers waited long, and at last dispersed, showering the students and moderate Social-Democrats with just reproaches for their timidity and inaction. The workers declared their readiness for struggle, and let March 11 serve as a fresh lesson and warning to the St Petersburg Social-Democrats.

MOSCOW

In Moscow, throughout the whole of January, ferment had been developing at the University under the influence of news of the Petersburg and Kiev events. The majority were, undoubtedly, intimidated by the threat of being sent into the army, and it was hard to rouse them. On January 19 there appeared a hectographed proclamation, 'What Is to Be Done,' signed 'Moscow comrades,' calling on students not to follow the example of a timid society. The proclamation called for a strike, with the demand of 'the return of all comrades' and the abolition of the 'Provisional Rules.' On January 29 a meeting of 317 students took place in the assembly hall. The rector, invited to attend, declined 'on grounds of illness.' The meeting decided to send a delegation to the rector demanding the release of the Kiev students sent into the army, and the repeal of the 'Provisional Rules,' adding to this the usual student demands: the restoration of the 1863 statute and the right of assembly. The names of the meeting's participants were recorded, and the rector refused to speak with the delegation. A second meeting was set for February 3. Arriving at the University, the students found all the doors locked. The crowd of students walked down Nikitskaya Street singing student songs. Curious onlookers joined the crowd, while the police maintained a completely indifferent attitude toward the demonstrators, not interfering in their procession. Given the unorganised, spontaneous nature of the demonstration, this attitude of the police put the students at a loss; not knowing what to do, they little by little dispersed. All those recorded at the meeting of January 29 were handed over to be tried by the University authorities.

The strike decreed by the January 29 meeting was not carried out. The mass of the students did not join in. On February 2 there appeared a proclamation of the 'Executive Committee of the United Landsmanschaften and Organisations, in a changed composition,' which testified to 'the failure of the strike, owing to the presence at the University of a narrowly conservative element.' Taking steps toward the calling of a new meeting, the 'Executive Committee' announced, on February 19, that, according to a count taken, the number of those wishing a meeting to be called had reached 917, and set a gathering for Friday, February 23, at noon, in the courtyard in front of the assembly hall of the University.

The meeting of February 23 marked a turning point in the course of Moscow events. On the one hand, news received from Petersburg and Kharkov about the demonstrations of February 19, and about the cruelty shown by police and Cossacks, called forth a stronger excitement in ever wider student circles; on the other, the tsarist government's faithful ally — the government administration itself — took pains to carry the student movement out into the street and thereby to lend it the significance of a political event of the first importance.

Of the events of February 23 we are written:

"On February 23, from noon, a crowd of people began to gather on Mokhovaya Street, and by two o'clock so many people had gathered that the street was blocked. Masses of policemen and gendarmes. Even more of the general public. Students of the Petrovsky Academy, of the Land-Surveying Institute, and a mass of women students. Almost no technologists. Some of the students remain in the courtyard, but the majority are visible in the street. No shouting or scandals of any kind. The police are remarkably polite. Leaflets fly through the air from every side. The bailiffs, going round corners, write down whoever seems suspicious to them. There is no sign of assistant inspectors. Having stood for a while in the street and in the courtyard, the students and women students decided to go into the hall. The number of those who came was, they say, up to 600, of them up to 103 women students. When the meeting had taken place, gendarmes surrounded the University and pushed back the crowd. Part of the students refused to disperse and were sent to the Manège. Besides this, knots of students were repeatedly taken

away to the Manège, but were let through, and the majority succeeded in slipping away. On the whole, relations between students and police were rather friendly. The students joke and declare to the constables that they (i.e. the constables) are behaving in a mob, and the police ask the students for a 'tip,' since they are having to carry out this extra duty. The boys of the Okhotny Ryad, seeing the excitement, guess that the Tsar must have arrived. The police ask outsiders to disperse. Some red-haired long-haired subject enjoys a special privilege with the constables; some guess this is a spy, and ask for him to be removed, which, willy-nilly, is done. The mood grows ever more elevated. At last, the meeting ends, and out comes a towel with an enormous inscription — I cannot say for certain what it read — either 'obstruction' or 'repeal of the Provisional Rules.' However, this inscription was soon removed by the students themselves. It was decided to send delegates to the rector and the trustee, but, since they will surely not receive them, to organise a whole series of street demonstrations instead. Demands: return the Kiev soldiers, repeal the 'Provisional Rules,' demand the restoration of the 1863 statute. After this the police surrounded all those attending the meeting and took them into the Manège. Now for the most striking part: on the way to the Manège, the crowd of students breaks through the police line and rescues about fifty of those being taken. When the 'rioters' were locked into the Manège, an entire regiment of soldiers and mounted gendarmes were driven in there too. The public did not think of dispersing, and stood there until late in the night."

In the Manège, the arrested refused to give their names to the police. School inspectors were invited to identify those detained. Soon after this, the police proposed that the detained divide into groups of fifty and set off under escort: men to the transit prison, women to their homes. Whistling, laughter and shouts were the answer to this proposal. The chief of police Trepov threatened not to give the prisoners food until they agreed to go to prison. This threat had no effect on those detained; they forced their captors to give them 200 loaves of bread and set up a samovar. This food turned out to be insufficient. On the whole, those detained were kept in disgraceful conditions in the Manège. Here is what one of the detained writes:

"They did not even give us straw to sleep on, and we had to sleep on the frozen bare ground. The air in the Manège, from the presence of several thousand people and 300 horses (we were guarded by 1,500 soldiers and 300 Cossacks), became so stifling that convulsive fits began to happen with many. We told all this to the enormous crowd of people surrounding the Manège, and thereby turned the curious into 'demonstrators.'"

And indeed, the crowd of people took the liveliest part on the side of the students. "When the students were led out of the University to be taken to the Manège, a loud 'hurrah' rang out over the whole square. It was shouted, not only by students, but by outsiders too (workers, girls, and so on). The crowd of a thousand did not disperse until evening."

While the police in the Manège argued with the detained, the crowd around the Manège 'kept gathering, growing bigger and bigger. The police and the mounted gendarmes could do nothing with it. Only when a regiment of soldiers arrived did it help to disperse the crowd and take many off to police stations.'

Under the influence of the accounts by those sitting in the Manège about what was happening there, the crowd began to grow excited, individual skirmishes with the police began, and soon ambulances began to appear. Cries were heard in the crowd calling for the release of the detained, and 'the soldiers had to take their rifles at the ready to hold back the raging mass.'

On the night of February 24, the police carried out a great many searches.

On February 24, the students again gathered for a meeting at the University, but were not let in. By noon a crowd of two thousand had gathered on the square. By one in the afternoon, the crowd, which had by now grown to include far more than students, moved toward the Manège, where those detained the day before had been held. The crowd began to demand that it be let into the Manège. A detachment of soldiers dashed out of the Manège and began beating people with their rifle-butts. On the other side, a detachment of Cossacks under the leadership of a colonel began charging the crowd with their horses. In reply, cries of indignation rang out. Workmen whistled loudly, freed the arrested students, loudly cursed the police. Part of the crowd moved toward the Tverskoy Boulevard, to the house of the governor-general, breaking up the line of constables standing there. Cossacks appeared and dispersed the crowd. In the evening the crowd demonstrated in front of the house of the chief of police. In the evening the square before the Manège again filled with people. There were masses of factory workers and workmen among the crowd. By eleven at night, a group of workmen rushed with a shout at the doors of the Manège, broke down the outer doors, but was then repelled. Under the pressure of the Cossacks the crowd fled past the Manège, breaking windows. Those who had broken windows were arrested (three men), but the crowd freed them. In this scuffle the Cossacks made zealous use of their whips. The crowd was dispersed, and part of it gathered again near the old University, but, driven off toward Tverskaya, walked, singing, to the house of the governor-general, and there was dispersed. Its remnants gathered near the theatre and, singing, walked along Petrovka Street. Mounted gendarmes stood guard at the offices of Moskovskiy Vedomosti. The crowd walking along Tverskaya consisted mainly of workers; by report, up to 280 of them were arrested. On the night of February 26, the students who had been held in the Manège were taken to prison under heavy escort.

On Sunday, February 25, agitation reached its highest pitch, and tens of thousands of ordinary people took part in anti-government demonstrations. For the first time, Moscow saw such a mass expression of popular protest. From the morning, crowds began gathering near the University. After noon, a large crowd, which included workers from the Prokhorov manufacturing works, moved along Nikitskaya and Tverskoy Boulevard, singing. On the middle of Tverskoy Boulevard they met the Cossacks. The crowd built a barricade out of the boulevard benches and held off the assault of the Cossacks, who charged full-speed. With loud whistling and abuse, the crowd expressed its contempt for the Cossacks. Suddenly cries went up that the crowd had been surrounded from behind by constables. The crowd rushed backward and broke through the police line, in the course of which a whole battle took place. The crowd rescued those the police tried to detain, and no more than a dozen people were left in police hands. At last, the police succeeded in dispersing the crowd. Throughout the whole day huge crowds, made up mainly of workers, demonstrated in the streets, particularly along Lubyanka, along Tverskoy Boulevard, Myasnitskaya and Nikitskaya. We reproduce a letter from a correspondent who witnessed one such demonstration at about four o'clock in the afternoon: '...We reached Kuznetsky Most, where a wondrous sight presented itself to us: the whole of Kuznetsky Most, all the way to Lubyanka, was flooded with a solid mass of people, made up almost entirely of factory and workshop hands and an insignificant number of students, along with a mass of street children; this whole crowd whistled, shouted "hurrah," waved handkerchiefs and threw their caps; but, like a hurricane, the gendarmes swooped down, breaking up the crowd into several groups, and we went to Lubyanka Square. There several students were arrested; the crowd rushed to free them, beat the precinct captain and, when he hid in a restaurant, smashed the windows there. Here the public caught sight of L. N. Tolstoy (this was on the very day of his excommunication from the Church, announced in the newspapers), and the crowd gave Tolstoy an ovation, with cries of "hurrah, Lev Nikolayevich," seeing him off along

Rozhdestvenka Street, where at his request he was seated in a cab. I went out to Tsvetnoy Boulevard, which was thick with people; the police tried to break up the crowd into small knots and to keep it away from Tverskaya, directing it instead into the side streets, but the crowd, shrinking in one place, would grow again, hydra-like, into a still bigger crowd in another.'

Another eyewitness writes: 'At four o'clock I approached Tverskaya. Theatre Square was entirely flooded with the crowd, literally flooded. The crowd was moving along Tverskaya toward the house of the governor-general. Cossacks charging up blocked the way. Then the crowd made its way along a side street toward Neglinny Passage, and from there onto Kuznetsky. I must tell you, the crowd showed astonishing discipline. It did not scatter at the sight of policemen and Cossacks, but met them with unanimous hooting, whistling and abuse. Either it followed the unanimous instructions of leaders ("Close ranks! To the right! Forward!"), who were always drawn from among the intelligently workers (students took almost no part in this), or it made its disagreement with the leaders clearly known and forced them to change direction. On Neglinny the Cossacks split the crowd into three parts. I have information about only the first part; the others carried out demonstrations along other streets... The first part moved toward the Polytechnic Museum, where a meeting of students was expected, but then turned toward Myasnitskaya. The crowd greeted every student it met with the throwing of caps, cries of sympathy, and invitations to join. If he agreed (which, incidentally, happened very rarely), the crowd would lift him up with "hurrah," applaud, and so on; but if not, it would see him off with laughter and whistling... The police, even those walking singly, were hissed at by the crowd, pelted with hard objects, and forced to flee their posts in a hurry. The whole time, the crowd did not wreck a single shop, but, if any boys allowed themselves to smash a street lamp, the crowd would not let them, saying: "They'll write afterwards that we were just hooligans," "They'll make us pay for it in taxes anyway," and the like.'

'Passing through Myasnitskaya, the crowd moved onto the boulevard. There it grew and grew, and, by the time it was near Tverskaya (one boulevard away), the crowd numbered no less than 8,000 people. There were, perhaps, a few students — no more. The crowd halted in front of the offices of Moskovskiy Vedomosti. The workers decided to wreck the editorial offices. But at this moment Cossacks and constables came galloping up. The Cossacks, with whips and lances, split the crowd into four parts, while the constables began beating (literally) individual people picked out from the crowd, spotted as ringleaders. The crowd pelted the Cossacks with snowballs and lumps of ice, forcing an officer to ride off to the very rear, but the constables, under the Cossacks' protection, literally beat the crowd, meeting, mind you, a good rebuff too. On Tverskaya Street and Strastnaya Square the whistling of whips hung in the air: it was not only the Cossacks who whipped, but the gendarmes too. That same day a cat-concert was arranged in front of the house of the governor-general. In the courtyard of the governor-general's house, day and night, to this day, a mass of Cossacks and policemen still sit. On Sunday, crowds also walked through the other streets. Near the University, a thousand-strong crowd stood the whole day.'

A third eyewitness relates: 'The workers (craftsmen) sympathised quite energetically with the students. The crowd of 6 to 8 thousand men was managed by 100 to 150 students, who held this crowd back — which was extremely difficult to do. The police were positively trembling on Sunday.'

We read, in yet another report: "Along Trubetskaya Square there walked a crowd of about 7,000 men, singing songs, and at their head they carried a red flag, of course a rather primitive one, made, they say, from a shirt." Another report describes the Sunday demonstration near the governor-general's house thus: "Apples and oranges flew at his

windows, boys whistled on whistles handed out beforehand; the concert was such that the grand duke thought a revolution had begun." The crowd shouted: "Long live Prince Khodynsky!" "All the troops present in Moscow, the police, the gendarmes, the Cossacks, could do nothing with the demonstrators. When they attacked with cavalry, the public responded with barricades; here and there revolutionary flags even appeared. The troops were issued live ammunition, but did not dare use it." Until three in the morning, crowds of workers walked the streets (by our correspondent's reports, these demonstrations took place in five different places), smashing lamps, windows and beating the police here and there. On Myasnitskaya, after a fight with the police, up to 300 people were arrested and driven into the courtyard of Stakheyev's house. During the evening, crowds of students and workers went to Tolstoy's house to greet this champion of freedom of conscience, excommunicated by the Synod. Tolstoy addressed the people. By reports we have, he spoke sympathetically of the students' strike, recommended perseverance in the struggle they had begun, and told them that, as far as he knew, the highest spheres were inclined to repeal the 'Provisional Rules.'

In the following days, unrest continued. The extraordinary measures taken by the police (including a mass of arrests at people's homes, carried out by gendarmes) prevented new demonstrations. On Monday, February 26, another clash between the crowd and the police occurred in the Okhotny Ryad; in the struggle with the police, the students were assisted by the Okhotnoryadtsy — those ancient, celebrated defenders of throne and country. The transfer of this part of the Moscow population to the side of political protest represents a highly significant fact. If even the Okhotnoryadtsy are ready to assist in political struggle, then one may hope that the day is not far off when even our own 'Economists' will take part in it as well. Thanks to intensified police measures, the demonstration planned for March 4 did not succeed in Moscow. Military force did not permit a repeat of the events of February 23-26. There were isolated clashes with the police; not a few demonstrators were arrested.

On February 25 there appeared a curious appeal by the students' 'Executive Committee,' urgently entreating students not to take part in street demonstrations, since, it was claimed, it was necessary to preserve strength for the campaign of 'obstruction' at the University. The students, it claimed, had already achieved the sympathy of the public, and their further participation in demonstrations was undesirable. As one correspondent rightly observes, the 'Executive Committee' displayed, in this case, a 'wilful failure to understand,' striving artificially to narrow down a movement that had far outgrown the bounds of a purely student struggle. Messrs the proponents of a 'purely student' movement naively imagined that the popular crowd had demonstrated, sacrificing itself and, subjecting itself to a beating by the soldiers, solely for the purpose of demonstrating sympathy for the students, to have an influence on the government, and then to withdraw quietly from the stage, leaving the students to sort out their university affairs in a decent, orderly fashion. But representatives of the 'Executive Committee' were frightened by the development of the student protest into a political movement and wished to place it back on a purely professional footing, which in fact only weakened its force. The usual liberal short-sightedness!

But even this liberal half-heartedness must appear as the height of unattainable political wisdom, if one compares it with the conduct of the Moscow professors, who published, on February 27, their vile proclamation, which we shall discuss in more detail below. In answer to this missive, two proclamations of students appeared: one in Moscow, one in Kiev. The Moscow one is written quite moderately and pallidly; the Kiev one is far stronger.

Be that as it may, the seemingly dying movement of Moscow students came back to life on making contact with 'the street.' The street gave it that strength which it had lacked; it strengthened its influence on

the indifferent part of the students. Moscow's institutions of higher education finally came to a standstill, and the authorities no longer even attempt to apply the 'Provisional Rules' to the strike-bound students.

And, together with this, the students' movement, having taken to the street and called forth into the open the protest of broad strata of the urban population (chiefly the proletariat), unexpectedly served as the occasion for revolutionary events. In 'the heart of Russia,' in the first-throned capital city, the crowd of ordinary people openly expressed its hatred toward the administration, hissed at the highest representative of authority. In this citadel of Russian autocracy, the representative of the reigning family was forced to defend his palace with a forest of bayonets and pikes against attack by working folk. In the pious, orthodox mother-city of Moscow, thousands of workers gave an ovation to the great champion against Orthodox obscurantism, only just anathematised by the primates of the Orthodox Church. Upon the ruling order a deep wound has been dealt, straight to the heart; it has suffered a serious moral defeat. The flames of revolution have licked, with their tongues, the moss-grown walls of its most impregnable strongholds, and the day draws near when these strongholds shall helplessly collapse.

KHARKOV

With the resumption of classes after the Christmas holidays, the advanced part of the Kharkov student body displayed feverish activity, striving to rally the mass of students on the ground of protest against the reprisals against the students in Kiev and Petersburg. The organisation of university and technological-institute students distributed leaflets almost daily, reprinting proclamations that had appeared in other cities, trying to communicate to the mass of students the excitement already reigning in Petersburg and in Kiev. Over the course of a whole month these attempts were fruitless. Only at the Veterinary Institute did the students express readiness to strike, if other institutions took action first. At the Technological Institute, and especially at the University, the mood was depressed. Fear had gripped the mass of the students. There was no shortage of cases of shameful desertion from the field of battle: many students lingered before returning from the holidays to Kharkov, others hastily took leave (which, incidentally, the inspectorate granted very readily) and slipped away from Kharkov without looking back, citing to their comrades false news of the dangerous illness of parents and similar pretexts. Meetings called kept failing to happen, or were too poorly attended to pass any resolution. The University inspectorate was utterly worn out with the tension of waiting to see how this whole business would end, so much so that it even asked the students to decide, once and for all, whether there would be a strike or not.

Of the mass of leaflets distributed during this period, we should note the extremely fervent and eloquently written appeal of the 'Union Council' and the 'Organising Committee of Technological-Institute Students,' with an epigraph from Gorky: "O bold falcon! In battle with the foe thou hast bled thy blood..." The appeal called for a meeting and put forward the demands: the repeal of the 'Provisional Rules' and the return of the 183 condemned Kiev students.

On February 4 the 'Union Council' issued an 'open letter' to the professors, informing them that a strike had been fixed for February 5, and inviting the professors not to read their lectures.

During this period two revolutionary proclamations were circulated. The first from the 'Central Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Party'; the other from the recently formed 'Party of Socialist-Revolutionaries.'

The student strike, fixed for February 5, did not take place, in view of the utter indifference of the mass of the students. In an appeal dated February 8, 1901, 'a group of students of Kharkov University' addresses the students with a bitter reproach, for not having supported the movement, and the professors, who 'did not walk out of the temple of learning after the sabre of the soldier had been bared within it.' Ending on a word of encouragement to their suffering comrades, who were left isolated in the struggle, the appeal expressed the hope that 'in a few years' time an honest student body will come together again and rise once more, perhaps not isolated this time.' In this way, the vanguard of the student movement lost all hope of organising the struggle on a purely professional, narrowly student basis.

But, though isolated in the educational institutions, the radical part of the student youth did not lay down its weapons, and made use of the first occasion that presented itself to carry its lonely protest out into the street. And in the street, this protest at once took on a national, and consequently a political, character, and the street, responding to it, lent it tenfold force.

The students decided to arrange a demonstration by the cathedral on February 19, on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the peasants' emancipation. On this occasion two proclamations were circulated by the organisations of technologists and veterinary students. A few days before this day, some workers' groups approached the local committee of the RSDLP with a request to distribute a leaflet at the factories on the

occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the reform. A hectographed leaflet was drawn up and distributed (a portion of it was seized by the police). At the same time, another Social-Democratic organisation — the Kharkov 'Union of Struggle' — distributed a similar printed appeal. In this way, the workers were prepared. Unfortunately, the students did not heed the advice to hold the demonstration in the evening, when the workers and working intelligentsia are freer. By noon a small group of students had gathered at the cathedral. Coming out of the cathedral, the students headed for the University and struck up the 'Song of the Cudgel.' Immediately, all the gates and entrances to the University were locked. The students, accompanied by an already numerous public, then made their way down University Street singing. Given the small number gathered, the demonstrators had begun to think of dispersing, when the Cossacks fell upon them and, showering blows with their whips right and left, surrounded some forty or fifty students. By this time a large number of onlookers had gathered, including workmen. Some of them tried to break through the Cossacks' cordon, but without success. Blows of the whip rained down mercilessly. They beat, indiscriminately, very savagely. The massacre made a shattering impression on the public: ladies fainted, one of the students had an epileptic fit. The arrested were led off to a police station along Sumskaya Street. A mass of the public followed them and surrounded the station into which the detained students had been taken. Some time later, the Cossacks unnoticed came round behind the crowd and surrounded another sixty or so students, along with four ladies.

Word of the students' arrest spread through the town and, from about six o'clock, the public began to gather along Sumskaya Street, near the theatre, at a distance of one block from the station where the students had been taken. Soon the singing of the 'Song of the Cudgel' rang out. At six o'clock, Cossacks rode out of the courtyard of the station and galloped toward the theatre. The public greeted them with hissing and whistling. The crowd filled the pavements and the roadway. Traffic along this part of Sumskaya Street came to a halt. Near the theatre, the Cossacks surrounded some seventy students and made off with them toward the station, accompanied by the public. At seven in the evening, a company of infantry, with a drumbeat, arrived at the theatre. By this time it had already become known to the public that the workers of the locomotive works were making their way to the scene. Some of them (along with the railway workers) were cordoned off and detained; others got around the site of the demonstration, and later in the evening unexpectedly flooded, in considerable numbers, onto the square in front of the theatre. Workers from the smaller Kharkov works and artisans also arrived here. By nightfall, the students, and the intelligentsia generally, had become lost among the workers. The crowd sang the Marseillaise, the 'Song of the Cudgel,' 'Volya' (Liberty) and other songs. During the singing, a detachment of Cossacks suddenly rode out of the yard of the Yuzhny Kray editorial offices and, without any warning, set their whips to work. Even women, standing on the pavement and watching the crowd, were beaten. Many were wounded on this occasion. The people gave ground, but the workers rushed to the fence of the little public garden and, tearing it apart, armed themselves with stakes. Boys played a very active role in all this. One of them raised, on a long pole, a red flag, which was knocked down by the police charging toward it. The Cossacks were given the order to bare their sabres, which they did. Later they beat with the flat of the sabre as well. The crowd kept growing; the singing did not stop; in various places speeches were made, which it was hard to make out over the incessant noise of the crowd. Throughout the whole evening (until midnight), Cossack raids and clashes with the tsarist forces kept occurring here and there in the crowd. On the square, the Cossacks still showed some restraint, but if the attacked crowd scattered into the adjoining streets, the Cossacks, pursuing the fugitives, subjected them to a barbarous beating. The crowd shouted at the Cossacks: "Get away from us, Asiatics!" A voice cried out: "Beat up Yuzefovich!" (the editor of the

notorious Yuzhny Kray), and the crowd, as one man, rushed at the editorial offices, but was repelled by the Cossacks. One felt the absence of an organised detachment that might have given form to the demonstration and lent it a more coherent character. By nightfall the troops finally managed to clear Sumskaya Street. Of the impression made by the demonstration on the population, and of its external character, we are written, among other things: "It must be noted that the crowd conducted itself decently throughout, although the 'respectable' public expected the workers to start smashing shop windows, roughing up passers-by, and so on. Nothing of the kind happened at all... The whole of Kharkov speaks of nothing but 'what happened on Sumskaya.' Along the remotest back streets one hears the ordinary folk talking about the causes of the clash. Everyone with one voice names the anniversary of the peasants' emancipation: 'Our grandfathers were beaten forty years ago, when they were serfs, and now the students have remembered this, and so now they too get beaten...' Shopkeepers cursed the Cossacks: 'You'd do better to go fight the Germans than your own kind, damn you'..." etc.

Eyewitnesses recount the following little scene during the clash. A fat grain-merchant said: 'The students are scoundrels.' Hearing this, a burly worker pushed through the crowd and, with a cry — 'There he is, the scoundrel!' — thrashed the respectable bourgeois in full view of a sympathetic public.

Those arrested (up to 200 people) were released on February 23, apart from 18 students and a former officer, Ilyinsky, who, according to the governor, were involved in political matters. A strike began at the University and at other educational institutions.

After the demonstration, the Kharkov Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Party issued a detailed proclamation to society, explaining the significance of the events that had occurred. Having noted the historic significance of the first appearance of the masses of Russian workers on the path of an open expression of political protest, the Kharkov Committee draws the attention of 'the politically mature strata of Russian society' to the labour movement, as the chief political force capable of crushing the autocracy. The proclamation ends with an invitation to assist, by every means, the political organisation of the working class. One can only welcome this attempt by our Kharkov comrades to make use of the event that occurred in the interest of the political influence of Social-Democracy on all the elements struggling against the government.

We are much saddened that we must end this survey of events with an indication of a fresh instance of political short-sightedness on the part of our liberal allies. In a proclamation issued fresh with the immediate impression of the day of February 19, and signed 'comrades students,' we find a touching tale of how, oppressed by the government's violence, the Kharkov students wished to travel back to a bright past, of which they told the day of February 19, and went to pray for the 'Tsar-Liberator' — a well-meaning wish for which the Cossacks rewarded them with their whips. We venture to assure the Kharkov students that the power of the tsarist whip will last over them all the longer, the more they persist in the pale faith of various 'liberator-tsars,' every one of whose reigns has been drenched in the blood of the 'freed' peasants and of fighters for the peasants' well-being. The whole meaning of the celebration of February 19 by discontented elements vanishes if it is turned into a commemoration of the memory of that tsar who, in the peasant reform as in the whole of his policy, showed himself a tool of the exploiting classes in their striving to re-enslave the newly liberated people. To celebrate February 19 as the beginning of Russia's liberation from its general bondage is unquestionably fitting, but we would advise remembering more firmly, on this day, not the never-existent liberator-tsars, but the oppressor-tsars weighing upon us still to this day. Had the liberal students of Kharkov thought more about the latter, they would not have used, in their leaflet, the absurd phrase

that they were beaten with whips 'contrary to the ban of the young Tsar.' Setting aside the fact that no such ban ever existed, we would ask you, gentlemen students, how would you feel if you were beaten precisely on the wish of the 'young Tsar'? Would the pain of the whip's blow seem more pleasant to you in that case?

KIEV

The most characteristic feature of the course of the student movement in Kiev is the sharp struggle between the radical part of the student body and the bourgeois-conservative elements, which held back the movement and came out against it quite resolutely and in a fairly organised fashion. These elements twice succeeded (in January and again in mid-March) in defeating, at the Polytechnic, a proposal to join the strike; they likewise succeeded, at the University, in preventing 'disorders' throughout the whole of February and half of March. In its turn, however, the advanced part of the student body here acted more radically than in other cities, as is testified, for instance, by the appeal of the group of 'independent obstructionists,' issued at the start of the movement, and the proclamation of the 'Union Council' on the occasion of Bogolepov's assassination, expressing full sympathy with Karpovich.

As early as January 31, the Kiev Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Party distributed a printed appeal to all workers 'on the subject of the student disorders,' explaining the political significance of the student protest. When news of the Petersburg, Moscow and Kharkov demonstrations reached Kiev, the Kiev Committee took the initiative for a similar demonstration in Kiev, and, by a special appeal, invited the workers to appear on Sunday, March 11, at noon, on the Kreshchatik. The demonstration, in which students too took part, passed off brilliantly. A colossal crowd of workers (up to 15,000, they say) marched in orderly fashion along the Kreshchatik with a red banner and singing the Marseillaise. No major clash with the authorities occurred. We shall report the details of this remarkable demonstration once we have sufficiently verified information about it. Here we shall confine ourselves to congratulating our Kiev comrades on the great service they have rendered our party by their bold action. We wish that organised comrades in other places might, in the near future, display just such revolutionary energy and understanding of tactics corresponding to the actual interests of the Russian proletariat.

The student movement has also spread to the remaining university centres: Kazan, Tomsk, Riga, Yuryev, Warsaw (Veterinary Institute), Odessa. In Odessa up to 100 people have been arrested; in Kazan, several dozen (some over a labour-related matter); in Riga likewise. All educational institutions are closed by order of the Minister until Easter. We hope to be able, in the next issue, to give more detailed information.

In a proclamation of March 17, the Kiev Committee describes the demonstration thus: "The day of March 11. The streets are filled with people. To the sounds of revolutionary songs, mixed with cries of 'hurrah,' strictly orderly thousand-strong crowds of demonstrators move; here have come together people of every profession, sex, age, nationality — craftsmen, factory and unskilled workers, men and women, old men and boys, Russians, Poles and Jews. On every face — enthusiasm, in every eye — the joyous glint of a passionate desire to live, to live as befits a human being, not a downtrodden slave. This is no wild outburst, no shapeless riot, moved by blind hatred. This is a considered, prudent and organised movement toward new orders, toward a new life founded upon the principles of freedom, equality and justice. In its organised spirit lies its might. In its organisation lies the pledge of further successes. Comrades! We still have long years of stubborn struggle ahead, but we now possess a mighty weapon — mass protest, demonstration. With every fresh act of lawlessness by the tsarist government we shall loudly protest against this violation, in the name of humanity and justice."

KAZAN

Of the demonstration in Kazan we are written: "On March 11 a demonstration took place here — modest, it is true. But even the other cities may say: 'Even Kazan!' Had it not been for the foresight of the police, it would have taken on a different character. Even the day before, two main factories and the dam linking the town with the outlying

settlement had been surrounded by cordons, since they feared the workers might come. And indeed they would have, had it not been for this foresight. There were attempts to break through the cordon, but without success; some workers (as we are told, though this is not yet confirmed, up to sixty) were beaten. Bakers and craftsmen were to have taken part too. But on the night of the 11th, up to forty bakers were arrested at a meeting where they had decided to strike on the 11th and join the demonstration. There were many students and members of the public on the main street. Before they had time to gather themselves and organise, mounted and dismounted police charged and cordoned off, with almost no warning and quite indiscriminately, some 150 people. We stood there for about two hours. We sang through the whole repertory of songs. There were several attempts to break through the cordon, but there was too little strength. It did not come to a beating, though there were, as always, instances of violence. Then the troops (!) arrived and, with much pomp, led the arrested off to a precinct. Now some have been released, some have been transferred to the transit prison, some to private lodgings hired by the police for the purpose."

PSKOV

Of the Petersburg students sent into the army as soldiers, almost all (only three were sent to Yamburg) were escorted to Pskov for preliminary training in discipline, for a month, after which it is planned to distribute them to various places. Many of those sent suffer from physical defects (many, for instance, have very weak eyesight, one is a paralytic, and so on); among them there are many minors (under twenty years of age, some even nineteen or eighteen). At first the position of the students was relatively tolerable. The officers, on first meeting them, treated them well and declared that, being subordinate men, they were obliged to be treated as ordinary privates, without being granted any exemptions or privileges. But the position of the students soon changed, and for the worse, brought about by orders from some Cossack general who arrived for an inspection. The students were forbidden to take meals apart from the officers' mess, and ordered to make do with the common pot. Leaves into town were curtailed, and even meetings between one another became a very difficult matter. An order was issued instructing the nearest superiors of the students, and even soldiers, to address the students with the familiar 'thou,' with the warning that any violation of this rule would incur severe punishment. The students were forbidden to answer questions not only from junior ranks, but from officers as well, on anything having a direct or indirect bearing on their recent past. They are let into town only with great difficulty: under the watch of so-called 'nannies' (*dyadki*), and even then only until nine in the evening. Especially unpleasant is the attitude of the lower military authorities toward them: the non-commissioned officers, sergeant-majors, and their own 'nannies,' and so on. The fact is that these *dyadki* are held responsible for every fault of the student-soldiers: if a student does not do up his belt in accordance with every rule of the art, the *dyadka* is put under arrest; if he does not step out correctly, as some commander might wish, the *dyadka* again bears the answer for it. And these *dyadki*, thoroughly terrorised, look with more than a jaundiced eye at the primary source of their sufferings — that is, at the newcomers. One must add to this that the absence of any clear rules governing the relations between soldiers in disgrace and the rest of the military world gives enormous scope for the element of personal arbitrary judgement, and generally for the arbitrary rule not only of officers, but of sergeant-majors, non-commissioned officers and other minor fry, so that a constant, and one might say penal, regime is determined at the discretion of these latter. On the whole, however, the general tone is set by the regimental commander, so that in different regiments the position of the students varies. They are stationed here in three regiments: the Irkutsk, the Yeniseysk and the Omsk, no more than two men to a company. Particularly bad is the position of students in the Omsk regiment, whose commander, Danilov, has already 'succeeded' in making a name for himself by his purely Asiatic attitude toward the

students. Out of fear of him, even those officers of the regimental hierarchy who in their heart of hearts have nothing against the students treat them roughly.

Trouble for the students here began from the very first day of their arrival. At the first inspection, the Omsk regiment's commander made a speech before the whole regiment, in the course of which he pointedly reminded them that the students were ordinary privates, and that there was accordingly no reason to pay them any particular attention. "Your education is worth little," he told them, — "you must forget your past and become genuine soldiers... They have stripped you of your civilian clothing, — now we shall knock the civilian spirit out of you... People come to see you, they feel sorry for you: the other day, one of your mothers came to me and said she wished to send for your father. Tell your relatives and other visitors that there is no reason for them to come here... There is nothing terrible in a soldier's life, so there is no reason for sympathy."

A few days later a flogging took place in the regiment: a soldier who had committed some infraction was to be punished with birch rods; a student of that same company, which was required to be present at the flogging, wished to find some pretext or other to avoid this terrible sight; he was made a point of keeping as close as possible to this disgusting scene.

At a second inspection, one of the students of the Omsk regiment, Terian, on account of the weak muscles of his right arm, was unable to hold his rifle in a horizontal position for long. The regimental commander, suspecting the student of feigning, snatched the rifle away from him, shoved him, and, calling him a 'scoundrel,' ordered him (and, of course, his *dyadka* too) put under arrest. A few minutes later, apparently realising he had gone too far, this Pskov boor ordered an investigation of this case and lifted the student's arrest. A medical examination showed that the student was, in fact, unable to hold his rifle for long.

In general, the position of student-soldiers, even the best-treated ones, is very grievous. Their human dignity has to suffer at every turn. All of them, to a man, assert that ordinary penal servitude would have seemed like paradise by comparison with soldiery.

It must be said, however, that they are all cheerful and do not lose heart. They are reluctant to talk about themselves and, with feverish impatience, await news from various corners of Russia: are their comrades following in their footsteps, is the dark horizon of Russian public life beginning to clear?

Will the majority of Russian officers not be outraged by this disgraceful brand that Danilov's conduct has fixed upon them?

[P. Lepeshinsky]

IN THE CHRONICLE OF PUBLIC PROTESTS

A series of outrageous illegalities by the tsarist government has finally forced our bourgeois society to protest. We note with satisfaction facts testifying to the political awakening of Russian society.

From February on, signatures began to be collected across the whole of Russia for a liberal petition to the Tsar concerning the student unrest. The petition speaks out against the notorious 'Provisional Rules,' brands Bogolepov's policy, and concludes with a request to 'show trust in public opinion' and to summon society to 'free and beneficial participation in the affairs of its native country.' By correspondents' reports, signatures for the petition are being gathered briskly. After the great massacre of March 4, this petition was published in the English paper *The Times*, with the indication that it originated from certain professors and senators.

The massacre of March 4 served as the occasion for a whole series of protests. As is known from the papers, the member of the State Council, Lieutenant-General Prince Vyazemsky, personally protested, right at the scene of the massacre, against the outrages of the police, for which he was rewarded with the highest reprimand. Let Prince Vyazemsky console himself: before the judgment of history and of public opinion, this tsarist reproach does him more honour than all the marks of tsarist favour that he ever earned in the service of the autocracy. We are told that, beyond this, Vyazemsky has been sent abroad.

Immediately after the massacre, 45 writers drew up their well-known statement, mercilessly branding the tsarist government, which had deliberately carried out this vile slaughter. Later, a further 34 writers joined this statement. This statement, sent to the editors of the newspapers, has been published in the foreign and underground press.

On March 9, the 'Union of Mutual Aid of Russian Writers' authorised its committee to submit to the Minister of the Interior a statement about the violence committed on March 4 against members of the Union. The same statement was also submitted to the Minister of Justice, with a request to expedite the revision of press laws that make it impossible for the press to discuss public questions calmly, and thereby to prevent events like those of March. Beyond this, the Union requested that, pending this revision, the ban on the press discussing the causes of the student disorders be lifted.

In answer to these statements, the committee of the 'Union of Writers' received the following paper, dated March 12: "By order of the Minister of the Interior... the Union of Mutual Aid of Russian Writers is closed, of which the committee is hereby informed, for the taking of appropriate measures."

On March 7, an honoured professor of the Institute of Communications, the actual state councillor Beleyubsky, submitted to the governor-general Kleigels a detailed statement about the massacre that had occurred on March 4. Beleyubsky points out that, contrary to the claim of the *Pravitelstvenny Vestnik*, 'brute force, in the person of Cossacks and police, was applied without warning.' Turning then to the 'Provisional Rules,' which served as the cause of the disorders, Beleyubsky invites Kleigels to correct the mistake that occurred 'through a misunderstanding,' to ask the Tsar to repeal the 'Provisional Rules' and to free all those arrested. For this appeal to the St Petersburg pasha, Beleyubsky has been exiled from the capital. The conduct of this old professor stands out especially favourably by comparison with the conduct of those university professors who themselves took part in the consultations about sending students into the army.

On March 12, the well-known academician A. S. Faminstyn submitted a 'proposal' of the following kind to the Academy of Sciences. Pointing out that Article 61 of the Academy's statute permits an academician to occupy his free time with other matters, 'corresponding to his rank,' the honoured academician raises the

question of which occupations are to be considered as corresponding to the high rank of academician. "Incompatible with the rank of academician," he says, "seems to me the activity, in the capacity of trustee, of N. Ya. Sonin. As is known, N. Ya. Sonin stands at the head of the 'special conference' — a tribunal against the young. Under every administrative order N. Ya. Sonin signs, not only in his capacity as trustee, but as an ordinary academician too, which may give people not closely acquainted with the matter grounds for the mistaken conclusion that the Academy has some connection with the administrative activity of academician Sonin." A. S. Faminstyn concludes with the assertion that 'the activity of academician Sonin in the capacity of trustee corresponds neither to the dignity of the Academy, nor to the rank of ordinary academician,' and invites the Academy to express its view on this question. The Academy's decision on the matter is not yet known to us.

We congratulate the St Petersburg trustee, academician Sonin, on this publicly received slap in the face. One can only wish success to attempts to act, through the expression of public contempt, upon the run-amok minions of autocracy.

Finally, let us note the published statement, dated March 14, of eyewitnesses to the 'bestial actions of the police on March 4.' The statement asserts that 'the government's report' about the conduct of the public and the student youth is 'knowingly false.' Noting the utter falsity of the tale about the alleged unruliness of the students in the cathedral, the eyewitnesses assert that 'Kleigels set a trap for the student youth.' From the words of the Cossacks themselves, the eyewitnesses declare that officers had impressed upon the rank and file, the day before, that the students wanted to kill the Tsar, and that they must therefore be beaten without mercy, and that, on the morning of March 4, the police and the Cossacks were plied with vodka. After describing the beatings, the statement ends with the following call: "Society must resolutely and unanimously protest, with every means at its disposal, against police terror and the beating of its children. It is morally obliged to demand the repeal of the 'Provisional Rules,' to demand a strict investigation of the events of March 4..., to demand a trial of Kleigels, as a man who has committed a crime with premeditated intent."

Let us see whether society will fail to calm down until all these demands are met, and will refuse to sell its sacred rights for the first Jesuitically-meek words 'from the heights of the throne.'

THE CIVIC FEAT OF MEN OF SCIENCE

The Russian public has grown accustomed to being astonished by nothing; nonetheless, it was struck by the appeal of the Moscow professors to the students, which appeared on February 26 in *Russkiye Vedomosti* and *Moskovskiy Vedomosti*, supposedly on behalf of 72 professors present at a session of the university council at which this appeal was discussed. In fact, as follows from a letter by several professors, published later in *Moskovskiy Vedomosti*, this composition was accepted by only 57 professors — a respectable enough figure, in whatever way it is counted. The priests of science kept a disgraceful silence when the government sent the Kiev and Petersburg students into the army, though they could not fail to know that this act must call forth student disorders; they did not answer this vileness of the government with the one worthy measure — a collective resignation. But when the protest engulfed the mass of the students, when it won the sympathy of society, when the popular masses in Kharkov and Moscow took up the students' cause, the Moscow professors climbed out of their cosy studies and stepped forth openly into the role of defenders of order, treacherously scheming to sow division within the student milieu. Under the cover of concern for the poor students, they warn against those 'instigators' who 'confuse and deliberately worsen an already difficult position' for the students, who 'foist upon you a new word and act, unbecoming a student — "strike" — and so on, in the same vein.

Calling on the students to return to their classes, the professors then undertake to 'help' put university affairs 'in order.' All this, and much else besides, is set out in the tone of a Suvorin, presenting genuine Judas-like verbosity. It goes without saying that this appeal earned the professors nothing but universal contempt, which found expression in the biting leaflets of Moscow, Kiev and Kharkov students.

For the politically thinking part of the student body, this vile document must have opened their eyes to just what moral corruption the autocratic regime brings into the temple of science, how it kills every trace of civic decency among the professoriat. Putting forward the demand for the restoration of the 1863 statute, which has, among other purposes, the goal of the moral recovery of the professorial milieu, the students must understand that every political regime creates its own university order, and that the regime of the Pobedonostsevs and Bogolepovs is inseparably bound up with the present order of university life. This is precisely why a purely professional struggle by students for better university order must become a political struggle for the general reform of our social structure.

The professorial milieu answered the students' protest with a vile attack from the rear, an attempt to slander the better part of the student body and to sow division within it. But the mass of the people supported the students and lent their movement its political significance. Let the students become convinced that only by uniting with this mass, only by adding their own particular protest to the general protest of the working class against the source of all our social evil and moral corruption, will they become a truly effective force. Let them come out on May 1 in support of the workers' demands!

We are especially glad to publish an article, sent to us by V. I. Zasulich, which, we hope, will help to give proper shape, within our revolutionary circles, to the question of terror, which is once again floating to the surface.

APROPOS OF CONTEMPORARY EVENTS

The government has taken up a struggle with the students that is useless and senseless, even from the standpoint of the perfection of the autocracy, and it has, from this struggle, grown for itself so broad a political ferment as Russia has never before lived through. Indeed: student unrest has now lasted forty years, throughout the whole of the post-reform period. The government ought, by now, to have grown accustomed to the thought that, whatever it does to the universities, it will never obtain a wholly quiescent student body. But, on the other hand, this same forty years of experience ought equally to have proved to the government that purely student unrest alone will do it no great harm. Everyone has grown accustomed to the fact that students periodically grow restless, and are for this expelled and exiled; one would have thought that, in this sphere at least, it would be conservative.

It is hard to explain the 'Provisional Rules' by anything other than a wish, here as everywhere, to draw as close as possible to pre-reform arrangements. There was no student unrest under Nicholas I, and if there had been, students would certainly have been sent into the army as soldiers: we must try sending them there.

True, the unrest of 1899 which gave the occasion for this reform was more unanimous than ever before, but the whips, too, set loose against a deliberately gathered peaceful crowd of students, were also relatively new and entirely unexpected. In any case, the Kiev meeting, whose participants were the first to have these harsh 'rules' applied to them, was in no way distinguished from the countless string of such meetings that have gone on since the very beginning of the 1860s.

But if the Kiev students merely made use of their natural right of assembly, of which the best part of the student body has never renounced, then the verdict passed on them made all further protests obligatory, and therefore inevitable. Such protests were demanded by the law written in every man's conscience, in his heart. They were demanded by the feeling of solidarity — the most elementary, and at the same time the most basic and necessary of all social feelings. One need not instruct people in it; it springs up of itself everywhere that collectivity encounters a hostile force. It manifests itself at every disturbance among peasants, among workers — not only among organised workers fighting for a cause, but among the first ones who happen to be caught, in their very first clash with their employers. To extirpate this feeling in oneself requires long years of practice at its suppression, requires much sophistry, much calculating cowardice, called 'practical wisdom,' of which some student proclamations speak with such justified contempt.

Students possess none of this wisdom, and cannot possess it, for the simple reason that, happily, it is not inherited but is acquired, in every generation, by personal practice.

'To abandon comrades, full of trust in us, is impossible! It is dishonest, heartless!' These simple words of one of the Moscow student appeals give voice to the immediate feeling of every honest and warm-hearted person. It must have stirred, surely, in the majority of students too, who at first hesitated to join their protesting comrades. New sentences, new cruelties, intensifying this feeling, led to new and further protests.

That there would be protests, everyone knew, and of course the government knew it too; committing its own cruelty against the Kiev students, it could not fail to know that ahead lay an indeterminate, avalanche-growing mass of further cruelties. And through all this, our educated society was expected to sit with folded hands, having, through long years of practice in the suppression of every impulse toward active engagement with public life, brought itself to a state of what seemed

complete atrophy of all active energy. But this time the government touched such feelings as could not be stifled by any amount of practice, and forced many to say to themselves what one 'mother' expressed so well in an open letter now lying before us, answering the question: 'Who is to blame?'

'We are to blame,' she answers. — 'We live meekly without that which is unthinkable to live without, even in a minimally cultured society: without freedom of speech, without inviolability of person, without inviolability of the home. For this meekness of ours, we must find some degrading justification for ourselves: we have not yet matured to all this... No, there is no justifying our silence and our submissiveness, where even the animal cries out and protests... A man, before taking a puppy or a kitten, looks about him to see whether there is a dog or a cat nearby. The Pobedonostsevs do not look about them; they have no one to reckon with. Whom should they fear? Society? They know its worth, they despise it and spit on it. Are they right? Yes! A thousand times yes! We are boors, slaves, lackeys, we have earned all this; we have also earned the fact that our children may throw at us... their curse for their own ruined young lives: they will be right.'

This is a cry of unbearable pain, and it is hard to doubt that this pain is shared by very many, though it is understood only by those who have not sold their language, once and for all, to the police.

In this atmosphere of pain and rage, of tormenting inaction and silence, the shot fired by the student Karpovich, who sacrificed himself for the sake of avenging his comrades, could not fail to call forth the warmest, most general sympathy. When there is no way to prevent an outrage taking place before one's very eyes, the desire for vengeance becomes the most lawful of social feelings.

But the students' protest, growing ever wider, at last broke the surrounding wall of general silence and inaction built up by the police around it. On the one hand, it went out into the street*, and the street, in the person of the working folk of every class, met the protesting student body with the warmest sympathy and full readiness to share with them, where possible, the whips intended for them.

* In Moscow, it was actually the street itself, in the person of the workers, without any summons or arrangement, that came to the defence of the students trapped in the Manège during a meeting within the walls of the University. Twenty-three years ago, the Moscow street (in particular, the butchers) beat a crowd of students and was elevated for this by Katkov into a representative of the 'Russian people,' answering, supposedly, the 'scandal got up by the Petersburg liberal intelligentsia.' Now the Moscow street will, of course, be stripped of its title as 'representative of the people.' It has become, more than anything, 'liberal,' and, had the police succeeded in finding a few suitable butchers, the workers would not even have let them budge a finger, since they were not particularly afraid even of the Cossacks and the gendarmes. The reactionary press continues, however, to try to depict students as demonstrating 'in the name of the people,' evidently the villagers, who have not, in fact, expressed any view whatever on the 'Provisional Rules.' This is the most brazen and obvious slander against the peasantry.

On the other side, the protest rose upward and forced even those spheres of our educated society, which had met every previous counter-reform with nothing but 'noble silence,' to stir and speak out at last. For the first time, the government has run up against loud indignation directed at one of its own measures, expressed by a significant majority of every stratum of the population that knows anything at all of this measure, and for the first time no savagery, no whips, no arrests are able to restore the usual silence. For several years running now, this same powerlessness has, no doubt, been felt by the special department charged with the suppression of the illegal workers' press and organisations. All this continues to exist and to multiply, despite ceaseless arrests, many times exceeding even the largest round-ups of the seventies and early eighties, so that at times there is nowhere left to put people. But this unsuccessful struggle against the growth of the consciousness and unity of the working class has, until now, gone on somewhere out of sight, deeply and remotely, so that for

Europe, for the respectable clean public, and even for the highest governmental spheres, the inscription over the picture of Russian life continued to read, if one looked at it with eyes tightly shut: 'All quiet on the Shipka.' Now this inscription has been torn down, and the 'Provisional Rules,' in all likelihood, will be repealed. It has become too unpleasant and disadvantageous for the government to go on proving, to itself and to the whole world, that it has succeeded in so exasperating broad strata of the conscious population that they have lost their fear and now prefer to risk every kind of penalty rather than continue in obedience.

The writers who added their names to the honourable list of signatories under the witness statement to the whole world about the atrocities at Kazan Cathedral say that they are horrified by the future of a country handed over as prey to fists and whips, but to us their courageous statement seems one of the signs that a better future is far closer than one might have thought a month ago. They say, further, that they have long been deprived of the possibility of performing their duty toward their homeland, but that, at the very moment they were writing this statement, they were in fact performing it. The whole question is: will the forces awakened by the application of the 'Provisional Rules' fall asleep again, or will the newly acquired energy be preserved?

Already several years have passed since Russia entered upon a period of upsurge, incomparably broader than the one that ended twenty years ago; but even now the success of these liberating efforts can be considered assured only if the whole of the liberation work is not thrown onto the shoulders of the advanced strata of the working class and revolutionary youth alone, but if, in this work, this or that feasible share is taken by all the enemies, of every kind, of the whip.

But alongside the news that speaks of the enormous broadening of the political movement, we come, at every turn, across reports that, in 'the public,' among the 'peaceful liberals,' the 'ordinary man on the street,' there are now heard hopes, predictions and wishes that 'terror' should be resumed, that terror with which the revolutionary movement of the 1870s ended. This, it seems to us, speaks of that very same broad excitement, and yet the strengthening of such hopes would, in our opinion, have precisely the opposite tendency: to narrow, not to broaden, the field of battle.

Isolated acts of self-sacrifice, like Karpovich's shot, not proceeding from any organised force, cannot concentrate public hopes upon themselves. One cannot count on them. They are not acts of struggle, but only an expression of the general anger and pain called forth by particularly hateful manifestations of arbitrary rule. Premeditated, of course, on the part of the acting individuals, they are instinctive, but they are premeditated on the part of the social elements sympathising with them, elements which, by their irrepressible, warm sympathy, recognise these acts as an expression of their own pent-up feeling. Such shots cannot replace, in the minds of those who sympathise with them, any other form of liberating activity.

Something entirely different is represented by terror as it enters into the programme of an organised group as a means of struggle for freedom and appears, to the milieu surrounding the terrorists that sympathises with them, as a path to liberation. We are deeply convinced that, were terror of this kind, at the present moment, to become the focus of public hopes, it would not only fail to strengthen the liberation movement, but would, on the contrary, weaken it.

Not for the reason for which Bismarck found the attempts of Hödel and Nobiling advantageous, nor for the reason that Napoleon III's police busied itself, at times, staging exemplary conspiracies. Napoleon needed pretexts for introducing this or that 'temporary regulation'; Bismarck could not, without such attempts, push through the Reichstag his exceptional laws. But Russia already lives, in any case, under every kind of extraordinary, exclusive and temporary regulation, and, over a long

period of such suppressed public sentiment as any despotism could wish for, not one of the most hateful of the 'temporary rules' has ever been repealed, while every institution that was ever prized by Russians of anything other than a police cast of mind has been mutilated and destroyed. Russians have nothing to guard, and nothing to lose, but their chains. If there could have been any question about this in the 1860s, there can be none whatever now.

Terror seems to us, at the present moment, an unsuitable method of action — not in itself, but owing to its inevitable psychological influence upon the surrounding milieu. The enemy of Russian freedom that must be killed before all else, against which no assassinations whatever will help, is this: the preservation of the silence and inaction prescribed by the government, this obedience to orders which can in no case be considered laws, but are merely hostile measures of a government against that growing part of the Russian people which, by the government's own admission, cannot help but wish for its Europeanisation.

Measures of struggle, and not laws, are what all these decrees and orders concerning the press, assembly, unions, teaching and education really are. Thirty to forty years ago, this struggle against the growth of consciousness and unity among Russians, against the development in them of independent activity and energy, was felt almost exclusively by people who had received a secondary education; now it is waged against the whole working class, and to a considerable degree extends to the peasantry too, through every kind of obstacle to the spread and improvement of schools, village libraries, popular readings, through absurd catalogues and the persecution of village teachers. To break, through broad and universal disobedience, all these barriers erected by the government between the needs of its subjects and their consciousness, on the one hand, and between the subjects themselves, on the other, must, surely, be the first step on the road to liberation. The greater the number of Russians who throw off these barriers, the easier and safer will become the universal resistance to the violence of the government. But for this it is necessary that the widespread opinion, that it is not worth risking anything over trifles, should disappear; a conviction is necessary that, in the work of demolishing the barriers erected by the government against the political consciousness and unity of its subjects, there are no trifles, and that everything matters — everything that, in defiance of violence, creates publicity, creates a free press, secret political unions and political demonstrations prepared by all of this, loud declarations of a unifying public will.

In all of this, every step, every action is as necessary as is necessary, for the life of the organism, every drop of blood coursing through its veins. The final, decisive moment of liberation is not made — it usually simply happens — but this happenstance is prepared, and becomes inevitable, as a consequence of the activity, energy, and will to be free of a society that has developed, in spite of every barrier.*

* Over the last century and a half, similarly self-serving barriers, against 'enlightenment' and the unification of their subjects, have been erected by every government of continental Europe that has outlived its own usefulness, and everywhere they have, sooner or later, been overturned by populations straining toward freedom. Almost the entire literature of the French 'Enlightenment' was printed in Holland, and, despite the burning of books and the Bastille, was avidly read in France. Metternich's Austria almost entirely stopped reading books not sanctioned by the Austrian censor. The whole of continental Europe of the first half of the nineteenth century swarmed with secret societies, from the relatively moderate to the most extreme. And, in our own country too, workers have, in recent years, a free press of their own, in whose midst organisations do not cease. All this is still far from perfect and leaves much to be desired, both in quality and in quantity, but the fear of a forbidden little book found on one has been irrevocably killed, and demand for it far exceeds supply. When students grow restless, they too create their own kind of publicity — bulletins, committees. If our broad, educated public generally does without a free press, the reason for this lies only in a lack of activity and energy.

To this very same free development of public activity and energy, terror is not only unhelpful but, by its very nature, cannot help but present psychological obstacles, since it represents itself as a path to liberation and begins to concentrate public hopes upon itself.

Terror has, undoubtedly, greatly stirred the whole freedom-thirsting Russian society, but this was a passive stirring, self-sufficient, not spurring to action, akin to the aesthetic excitement called forth by great works of art. Some liberal member of the public might weep with emotion before the heroism of the terrorists, but this did not increase his own thirst for action or capacity for risk. Between the heroes and himself lay an abyss. Those who acted as terrorists could, by the very nature of the task, only be very few, exceptional in their energy, fearlessness, conspiratorial skill and experience; while the very force of the impression made by their deeds caused every other undertaking to pale and lose its attractiveness, beginning to seem like mere 'trifles.' All the activity, all the energy, was concentrated in a handful of heroes; the spirit of struggle did not spread outward as it grew ever more focused, but found its only outlet in sympathy, in a belief that 'the Executive Committee' would do the freeing: it will liberate us.

Given this direction of public energy, no force was created that might have made use of the certain psychic disorder produced by terror within the government, since illegal organisation could, in no case, make use of this at all. And the narrowing of the revolutionary upsurge, however sharp its intensification, was, by that very fact, bound to lead to its own exhaustion. To hand over the struggle for liberation into the hands of a handful of heroes, however superhuman the strength they might possess, not only does no harm to the autocracy, but is itself a consequence of feelings and notions inherited from the autocracy itself. Its faithful servants are bound to think that all the affairs of their native country, its laws and institutions, depend entirely on the highest authority — in principle, on one man — while the remaining subjects may, on their own initiative, do nothing but shout 'hurrah.' But if the supporters of freedom, leaving its conquest to a handful of heroes, reserve to themselves nothing but this same 'hurrah' in the depths of their souls, or in conversation with friends — is this not itself a legacy of autocracy?

And, on the other hand, I recall a certain conversation, in *The Brothers Karamazov*, between Ivan and Alyosha. Ivan asks his brother whether he could permit that people, if their happiness required the torment of one tiny, innocent creature — one small child — should be able to agree to this. Alyosha answers that this cannot be agreed to.

To answer Ivan's question in the affirmative, to say that 'happiness' (or deliverance from a prolonged calamity, called autocracy) is worth suffering, with full right, may — but only, only those — is it not true? — who set themselves alongside this 'child,' who are themselves ready to take their own share of the work, and the risk, and the suffering, should it be required. The heroes of terrorism had many admirers, but on them alone fell not only all the work, but all the suffering too. Fortunate were those executed at once; but think what those endured who, year after year, were tormented in the Shlisselburg fortress! Their thinned-out remnant still lives on there, by the graves of their tormented comrades...

It would be good if all those now wishing for a resumption of terror asked themselves: what will they do during the time of terror, and where will they be at the time of the reckoning for it?

More than twenty years ago, terror was born of the hopelessness of ever waking the peasantry. For many of the terrorists it was but a weapon of despair, forcing them to give their lives for nothing more than, in Stepnyak's phrase, to make the boa constrictor writhe that was crushing Russia's body in its coils.

At the present moment, Russians who wish for freedom have no grounds whatsoever for despair. It is only necessary that all the supporters of freedom, all the enemies of the whip, should understand

that victory this time is possible, if all of them take part in the struggle, each contributing whatever share they can; that it is dishonest and heartless to sit idle and watch the struggle from the sidelines, that — with them or without them — it will go its own way, toward victory, if everyone is willing to assist it, — or toward new ‘eighties,’ toward a new (though temporary, of course) triumph of that tranquillity that once reigned on the Shipka, if the common task is left to be borne on the shoulders of a single hand-picked vanguard detachment.

V. Zasulich

DEDICATED TO THE READER-FRIEND

‘Love your native literature above all things, and prefer the calling of a writer to any other,’ wrote Saltykov, dying, to his son.

We would put it this way: above all else, uphold the dignity and honour of free human speech, and, while loving your native literature, prefer the calling of a revolutionary to any other.

The history of the printed word in Russia is a sorrowful history of endless humiliations and refined mockery. In the dungeon of autocracy, the muse of the Russian writer has been endlessly tortured and tormented — ‘this pale muse, whipped and bloodied.’ And if, now and then, once in a blue moon, it becomes easier for her to live and breathe more freely, this is only because, somewhere, powerfully and passionately, the revolutionary ‘word and deed’ has rung out. Look to the past: in the ‘liberties’ of *Sovremennik* and *Russkoye Slovo*, in the censorship reform of 1865, you will hear the distinct ringing of Herzen’s *Bell*. And if, in 1880-1881, an unexpected ‘spring’ briefly breathed upon our literature, know that this was the self-sacrificing cohort of *Narodnaya Volya*, blazing by like a brilliant, but soon fading, meteor across the dark sky of Russian reality.

Where has it gone, this once-mighty word, where is the charm of the underground? There is no doubt that in our present time of anxious expectations and wavering hopes, the revolutionary is out of fashion; his work goes on behind the scenes of the historical stage, unheard and unseen by the broad public, and his word does not resound to summon free-spirited people,

*Like a bell in the belfry
On days of triumph and popular grief!*

A grey time, small men — not so long ago there was still a murmur to be heard. Some kind of historical intermission: the past has concluded in catastrophe, the future is gathering its forces. Underground currents stir, mole-like work goes on, but when, oh when will the moment come when the secret becomes manifest, and the languor of the intermission gives way to the heroism of an all-Russian tragedy?

We Russian Social-Democrats would do well to give some thought to this reaching murmur. Right yesterday, we may find ourselves guilty tomorrow, and, unless we become the helmsmen of the movement, we may drown in its stormy waters.

Children of a gloomy time, we set out to work once, at the barely gleaming light of a dawn just beginning. Everything around slept, or muttered half-asleep, when we began our building. Stone by stone we raised our edifice, laid the foundation and, groping our way at every step, blazed our path, moving forward, toward the crowning of our building.

Along with the heap of shattered illusions, we inherited from the past the memory of those whose...

*Song flew by leaving no trace
And never reached the people...*

The shades of the fallen stood before us, and unceasingly there rang in our ears: the glory of the skirmishers, the first fighters, who drew the masses along and inspired them. But — the shame of those who shut themselves up in circles, who lost themselves in partisan heroics. Then the frozen whisper of liberal praise greets, and it accompanies them to the grave — the kiss of Judas. In a decisive moment the slave will betray the hero and slink back into his warm burrow... Take your place in the ranks of the great army, orderly and in step with those marching toward the goal. All for one and one for all: the fighting proletariat will stand up for itself, will avenge its own sacrifices...

Russian life — an amorphous whole, over which broods the spirit of the insolent predator and of the self-serving bureaucrat. In an atmosphere of barely smouldering consciousness, and of an unconsciousness aware of itself, there proceeded — slowly, but surely — the process of crystallisation of a new social element. Of course, to an outside observer (of the breed of strict critics) it presented only unappealing forms and grey shades of process: what tedium, what prose! A kopeck to the rouble — and this is our slogan!

And at that very same time, as the Platonic lover of revolutionary aesthetics grew impatient with the growing movement, the Social-Democrat had his hands full — in the laboratory of the Russian revolution. So much small, invisible, but absorbing work, that it was not always given to him, when needed, to look beyond the walls of his own laboratory. His eye, riveted to one spot and sharpened in the detection of details, at times grew short-sighted and lost the broader public perspective. But this misfortune was only half a misfortune so long as the seemingly hopeless stagnation deadened everything living, the ray of consciousness crept but slowly into the heads of ordinary people, and every ‘cricket’ in Russia knew only his own ‘hearth,’ granted him by his superiors. Then the laboratory was — a whole world, self-sufficient and complete.

The position became different once ferment began to spread all round. The crack of the Cossack whip is more effective than the most eloquent of speeches, more conscience-awakening than any revolutionary siren’s song. Piercing the thick crust of indifference, it ‘struck the hearts with unknown force,’ and stirred up the swamp of the general public. The question of the ‘rights of man and citizen,’ a political question, arose — sharply and irresistibly — before the whole motley crowd of an indignant people. It arose before the student, drafted into the army as a soldier; before the worker, come to pay his own debt to the young; before the writer, punished for the very fact that within him a voice of honour had spoken; before the whole of that people who did not wish to look on dispassionately at this human slaughter, and for this — were themselves beaten. It arose, and imposed upon the Social-Democrat a heavy burden. To whom much is given, from him much shall be required. Years of accumulation have given Social-Democracy that which no one else possesses — among Russian opposition currents — the elements of organisation. Arriving at the crossroads where the manifold paths of social movement converge, Social-Democracy must take stock and sum up what it has gained. Will it prove itself equal to its position, equal to the responsible moment of the history now being lived through? In its hands lies a priceless weapon — the press, sharpened and honed against the autocratic-bureaucratic clique. The advanced proletariat has emancipated itself from the censor’s leading-strings, and it is its task now to carry this freedom to others too — into the midst of all the discontented. And for this we need to perfect our instrument, bringing it into correspondence with the more complex task before us; we need to learn to plunge the knife of analysis into every fold of reality, to learn to reflect its many-sidedness — under our own particular angle of vision. Is Social-Democracy ready for this?

Newspaper work is choral work; it succeeds not in the hands of soloists, but of the precentors who lead a responding chorus. And ill will it fare for the singer-writer who does not hear behind him the answering support of a chorus of reader-listeners. Reader-friend, reader-collaborator — these are the necessary pillars of the writer: one falls ill, another suffers, the whole body aches. As Saltykov once implored the reader: friend, defend me! — so now, too, the Social-Democratic writer must cry out: friend, help me, fix your searching gaze on all that lives and bring to the printing press’s free voice your concentrated pain, the overheard groan, the suffering cry of your homeland. Broaden the horizon, one must learn to look far into the distance!

And only then, when Social-Democracy, in full armour, approaches the pivotal point of history, will there once again ring out that long-forgotten, once-mighty word, and revolutionaries will be honoured across the whole of Russia by all those to whom the name — freedom — is dear!

[A. Potresov]

CHRONICLE OF THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

LETTERS FROM FACTORIES AND WORKS

Tsarist Consolation for the Unemployed.

Unemployment in the south keeps growing. As the correspondent of *Novoye Vremya* reports, by January 15, in the Bakhmut and Slavyanoserbsk districts alone, there were already some ten thousand unemployed. By the beginning of February, when the coal-industrialists' hopes for an improvement in business were not borne out, the number of unemployed 'began growing not by the day, but by the hour.' As the same paper's correspondent reports, 'for a more precise clarification of the causes of the unemployment,' the Ekaterinoslav governor, Count Keller, convened, at Gorlovka, a congress 'of well-informed persons closely connected with the mining and metallurgical industry.' But, likely so that this congress should not come 'too precisely' upon the true causes of the unemployment, Count Keller said, before its opening: "On his passage through here, His Majesty the Emperor was pleased to express his confidence that this decline in the output of factories, works and coal mines must be considered a temporary hitch in production, and by no means a crisis, and that this hitch is merely temporary." Take comfort, unemployed! His Majesty is confident that you are starving not because of an industrial crisis, but merely on account of a 'hitch'! What a great consolation. When 40 million peasants starved, in 1891-92, the government forbade the use of the word 'famine,' replacing it with 'crop failure.' This circumstance did nothing to stop the peasants dying of famine-typhus. But workers, unlike peasants, know how to answer starvation not only with death, but with riots too. This is why, not content with replacing the word 'crisis' with the more soothing 'hitch,' the government, in the person of Count Keller, took measures 'to relieve the need.' Namely, Count Keller proposed transporting, free of charge, to their home villages, all those workers already dismissed and those due to be dismissed by March 14. This measure was adopted by the congress. To put it more plainly: on the subject of unemployment, the tsarist government is helping the workers by shipping them free of charge back to their native villages, where they may starve without hindrance, troubling no one with the sight of them and raising no fears of a disturbance of public order. Be calm, unemployed! His Majesty is confident that this is only a 'temporary hitch'; once it is over, the capitalists will hospitably invite you back, and the traders in human flesh — the labour contractors — will readily supply you with money for the — now paid — return journey from your home village!

BIALYSTOK

On March 4, Bialystok, for the first time, witnessed a large street demonstration — the funeral of the Jewish bristle-worker Vysotsky, who had died of consumption. Up to two thousand people took part in the funeral procession. The coffin was decorated with a red ribbon bearing a Jewish inscription: 'Socialists — to a fighter for freedom.' On the main street, Nikolayevskaya, along which the procession made its way, revolutionary songs were struck up. Near the prison, cries of 'Down with the autocracy! Long live socialism!' were added. The day was a holiday, and there was an unusual liveliness in the streets. A large crowd joined the procession and accompanied it a few versts out of town, to the cemetery. Gendarmerie and police were at a loss, not knowing what to do. Revolutionary speeches were delivered at the cemetery, one of them mentioning, among other things, the assassination of Bogolepov. Having paid their last respects to their comrade, all turned back to the town together. Only then did the police venture to intervene, and made an attempt to disperse the gathering. A small clash occurred, and one worker was arrested. In the town there is talk of nothing but this demonstration. The impression is enormous. Sympathy of every circle is on the side of the workers.

NIKOLAYEV

In the past week (March 15 or 16) our commercial harbour saw a strike of workers employed in loading grain onto foreign steamers. The stevedores are recruited largely from tramps or persons who have found no other work; not a few are local people who have taken up this work from an early age. Ordinarily the workers are hired by contractors, for whom they work for whole years, and who, thanks to this, make great profits, some amassing considerable fortunes. Workers are hired by contractors' agents at three in the morning in taverns, and work until late evening, with a short break for breakfast and an hour's rest for dinner. Daily pay fluctuates between one and two-and-a-half roubles, sometimes, in summer, reaching three to four roubles at the height of the season. Payment is made in the tavern, on the same day or the next, and it seldom goes without some cheating, in the form of a shortfall against the sum owed, which finds its way into the pockets of the contractors' agents or of the contractor himself.

The work is very hard. Sacks of five to eight poods have to be lifted from the cart onto one's shoulders, carried, bent double, along a gangway some 7-8 sazhen long and up a height of 2-3 sazhen, and then the grain poured into the hold, without letting the sack slip off one's shoulders. The work is done in sun and foul weather alike, monotonous and exhausting, and, on top of this, brings on eye and lung disease from the mass of dust, which coats one's sacks. All winter there was no loading work here. Only last week did urgent work appear. Berg, the largest of the contractors, received an order to supply 300 labourers. He hired them at 1 rouble 20 kopecks a day. Work began, but suddenly, around midday, everyone dropped their work, gathered on the square near the harbour, and there began talk that the pay ought to be raised to two roubles (since, they said, why shouldn't we manage what the Marseilles dockers managed?), that they would only work until the whistle (at six in the evening), and that hiring and payment should be done at the harbour, not in the taverns. These demands were presented verbally to the contractor Berg himself. He at first pretended not to understand, and then tried in every way to intimidate the workers, but they would not give in. And, given the urgency of the loading, the contractor had no choice but to give way. But he could not, of course, forgive them their persistence. Indignant at the workers' stubbornness, he turned for help to the police. And the next day, at first light, chiefs of police appeared at the harbour, who tried to persuade the workers, but, seeing their firmness, left them in peace. Meanwhile, the workers, aware that Berg intended to bring in labourers from other towns, decided not to permit any competition, and, should any competitors appear, to propose that they work under the same conditions, or else prevent them from working at all. They elected a foreman, who was to distribute the work, establishing a rota, and to see that the conditions were observed. The workers even thought of raising their wages further still. Learning of this through his agents, the contractor Berg tried once more to influence the workers, but received the answer from one of them: "Well, it's obviously to your advantage, since you gave in." The contractor entirely lost patience at this. "Do you understand," he said, — "he told me: it's to your advantage — and 'obviously' too." This 'obviously' gave him no peace, and he decided to seek relief in the office of the gendarme administration. The colonel took a great interest in his grief. Berg pointed to the worker Polovinkin, whom the workers had elected as their foreman, as the culprit behind it all. The gendarme colonel did not need to be asked twice, and Polovinkin was arrested on March 18 and then sent back to his home in Tver province. But the affair continues nonetheless. The workers get two roubles a day, are hired at the harbour and work only until the whistle. And the rota they arrange among themselves.

FROM IVANOVO-VOZNESENSK WE ARE WRITTEN

"On January 18, there was, at our Bakulin mill, a minor clash between the mill manager Gryaznov and the assistant factory inspector

Kapitsa. The occasion was frequent delays in the payment of wages, then a lowering of piece-rates, brought about by the introduction of new kinds of fabric, coarse treatment and frequent fines. All negotiations with Mr Gryaznov led to nothing. To our demand that the rates for the new fabric be posted at once, since otherwise workers would earn only about seven roubles a month instead of the usual fifteen to eighteen, Gryaznov answered rather brazenly: 'Well, then work for seven roubles, since I won't pay more.' Then we demanded to see the assistant factory inspector. Gryaznov replied with irony: 'Go ahead, ask for him too; it'll all be my way regardless.' That same day the assistant factory inspector arrived and, seeing the huge crowd of workers gathered, flew into a rage and set upon us with foam at his mouth. Of course, we workers were not frightened by this, and reminded him of the duties of the factory inspector, and that he ought to look into the matter properly. The elected delegates (fifteen of them) presented Kapitsa with the following demands: 1) timely payment of wages; 2) equalise earnings at the new job so that the total monthly wage would not be lowered; do away with the 'saruchi' fabric, since it is very injurious to the workers' health; 3) reduce fines, so that fines should be levied only for genuine negligence; 4) pay more attention to the cleanliness of the latrines and improve hygienic conditions; 5) remove the manager (he is also the foreman) for his very bad treatment of the workers. The assistant inspector wrote all this down, giving an evasive answer — well, I'll talk it over with the mill owner, and you go back to work. The next day we waited in vain for the assistant inspector at the appointed time — he did not appear, and had to be summoned again. This time the assistant inspector no longer shouted at us as he had the day before, but tried to talk the workers into submissiveness and servile obedience to the owner and his manager Gryaznov, since, he said, this is what the law requires. 'By law you have no right to complain about, or to demand from, the owner actions which he finds undesirable. You must accept the rates he offers you, and whoever does not wish to may quit; give your notice and don't stand in the way of others working.' Concerning the fines, the assistant inspector said that at our mill fines are very small, that at other mills they fine far more, that our latrine is likewise excellent, though he had seen dirtier and worse ones; and that the manager Gryaznov, in the assistant inspector's own words, turned out to be a very good man. To this the workers answered that, if he did not remove Gryaznov, they would try to do it themselves. So we treated our demands presented to the government's own appointed protector of the working class. But the workers stood their ground and for a whole week almost daily called out the inspector, who by now was heartily sick of it. In the end, Mr Kapitsa took the most severe measures against the workers, and though the workers pointed out to him that he was the assistant factory inspector, not a police official, he nonetheless summoned the police chief, who arrived with Cossacks. It ended, all the same, with a partial satisfaction of the workers' demands: they paid the old rate for the new fabric and made a few other concessions."

We can advise comrades who have to deal with such factory inspectors as Mr Kapitsa to boycott them — that is, to refuse to explain their grievances to them, pointing to their police-like conduct. Capitalists have long had the custom of communicating to their fellow employers the names of those workers dismissed for insubordination, so that they should be taken on nowhere. Do likewise, comrades, and appeal to fellow workers at other mills not to have dealings with Messrs Kapitsa, to whom the workers must explain that they were appointed to oversee the observance of the factory laws by the manufacturers, and not to be a police watchdog. Likewise we recommend the same conduct toward police chiefs who show up with Cossacks where there is no sign of any disorder whatever. Refuse to discuss your needs with the police, and declare that you will discuss such matters with the inspection staff (only those willing to conduct themselves as inspectors, not as policemen), only once the police has cleared off. If the police will not leave, we advise, in such cases, acting as follows: cease all discussion of

your grievances and work calmly until the police leaves, and when it does, take up the matter again and summon the inspection. In conclusion, let us add that Russian workers will only achieve the goal of having the factory inspectorate perform its duty when inspectors, like every other official, depend not on ministers, as now, but on a nationally elected and state-wide governing Zemsky Sobor (parliament); and when workers have freedom of assembly and of the press, so as to be able, in the name of the whole people, to brand and keep in check the zealous lackeys of capital, such as various Messrs Kapitsa.

FROM THE PARTY

The St Petersburg 'Committee of the Workers' Organisation' continues to publish its periodical *Listok* ('The Leaflet'). We have received issues 5-8. The content of these leaflets bears the traces of the critical moment being lived through by the St Petersburg workers, as by workers throughout most of Russia. Unemployment and the general stagnation in industry could not but be reflected in a complete halt of that strike movement which, until now, has constituted the main basis of activity of our local organisations, and has determined the content of their agitation. In the face of the general worsening of the position of the working masses and of mass unemployment, the facts of particular struggles between labour and capital, which have until now absorbed the chief attention of our comrade practitioners, have grown pale. It has been necessary to direct agitation toward the fundamental questions of the position of the working class, toward questions of the class struggle as a whole, of its ultimate goals and of the nearest general tasks of the Russian labour movement. In this way, life itself compels the party's practical workers to take up such agitation as proceeds from the fundamental elements of the proletariat's class position and illuminates, in the consciousness of the masses, the historical meaning of their social struggle. The leaflets issued by the 'Committee of the Workers' Organisation' bear, in this respect, a character entirely different from that which distinguished the proclamations of the 'Union of Struggle' over the past two or three years.

It goes without saying that our sympathy is entirely on the side of such broad agitation. But we think that the tactic which the 'Committee of the Workers' Organisation' is at present striving to hold to must determine the content of agitation, waged by any well-established organisation, not only in moments of crisis, but equally during periods of industrial revival as during periods of stagnation. Only such a broad, principled and steady tactic, pursued at all times by the advanced detachment of the labour movement, can foster the socialist and political development of the working masses. On the contrary, the tactic that the St Petersburg comrades of the 'Union of Struggle' have held to until now — a tactic entirely conditioned by particular clashes of workers with capitalists on the ground of purely professional questions — was bound to leave the masses, and their advanced detachment — the organised groups — unprepared for the firm and resolute agitation that has become an obvious necessity for everyone in this moment of general crisis.

It is precisely this unpreparedness of the St Petersburg organisation for the successful organisational exploitation of the conditions created for the working class by unemployment that the leaflets of the Petersburg 'Committee' testify to. We see an undoubted striving to free itself from the narrowness of an exclusively strike-oriented movement, which has taken root among St Petersburg workers in recent years. One feels that thought is straining beyond these narrow bounds in search of more effective means of struggle. And, at the same time, it is noticeable that people have not made sufficiently clear to themselves what means of struggle are, at present, applicable for the Russian proletariat.

In the first leaflets we notice merely a bare call to the working masses to organise, though the immediate goals of this organisation are still formulated in the old spirit of *Rabochaya Mysl* — struggle with capitalists through strikes for better conditions of labour in a given trade. In Leaflet No. 5 (December 1900), explaining to the workers the impossibility of a strike during the industrial stagnation, the 'Committee' proposes that the workers organise and wait until a new industrial upturn arrives (expected, for some reason, after the Christmas holidays), so as then to arrange a general strike. Meanwhile it is proposed to put forward the most varied demands: from a reduction of

the working day to an improvement of sanitary conditions of labour, and from the 'right to run consumer co-operative shops' to freedom of strikes, unions and assembly.

In Leaflet No. 6 (January 1901), the 'Committee,' foreseeing the possibility of prolonged unemployment, points the workers toward another means of struggle, suitable also during a period of stagnation — the demonstration, discussed in more detail in No. 7, where the basic political demand of the working class is already clearly stated — 'the right to participate in the drafting and passage of laws, and in the government of the state, through elected representatives.' But this call to demonstration stands in sharp contradiction with the counsel which the 'Committee,' following the teaching of *Rabochaya Mysl*, gave in its earlier leaflets. There, calling for a strike, it rejected any public demonstration, citing Kleigels' famous remark that he could deal with 10,000 workers taking to the streets, but could do nothing against a few dozen workers sitting quietly at home.

In this way, the 'Committee of the Petersburg Organisation' apparently reflects, in its agitational literature, the very course of development that the consciousness of the St Petersburg working masses went through over the period of the industrial crisis. But the advanced organisational detachment of the working class cannot confine itself to the role of a passive mouthpiece for the understanding drawn from the masses. It must stand at the height of an understanding of the whole labour movement, and only then can it play an active role in guiding the movement of the masses. It must unceasingly and untiringly set forth to the masses the Social-Democratic programme, propagandise and apply every tactical device suitable for the movement, and every critical moment must find it ready for action.

Had the Petersburg 'Committee' embarked on its activity fully armed in this respect, had, above all, in the period preceding its emergence, a deeper understanding of the fundamental tasks of our movement developed among the workers of St Petersburg, there is no doubt that its political agitation, over the past winter, would have led to far more notable results. Then, both the political crisis brought on by the student movement, and its fortunate coincidence with the economic crisis, would not have caught the St Petersburg workers' vanguard unawares, and the latter would have succeeded in placing itself at the head of the mass of workers who took part in the anti-government demonstrations of February 20 and March 4, and in lending their participation a more conscious character.

Leaflet No. 8, published for February 19, favourably stands out among all the previous ones, both for the vividness of its presentation and for the seriousness of its political thought. Let us wish the 'Committee of the Petersburg Workers' Organisation' a swift recovery from the blows dealt it by the gendarmerie, and, through steady, principled agitation, to make up for lost time in the period when the labour movement in Petersburg was dominated, without division, by the 'Economists' of *Rabochaya Mysl*.

We note with satisfaction that the 'Committee' has put out a proclamation about the demonstration of March 4, in which the Petersburg workers are called upon to apply this method of struggle for political freedom.

Issue No. 4 of *Yuzhny Rabochy*, which appeared in March, is just as gratifying a phenomenon in our illegal press as was No. 3, which enjoyed enormous success throughout Russia. Every article, written on the most varied of themes, is imbued with one and the same rigorously sustained direction; both the socialist and the political goals of the movement are underlined in the treatment of every question. The leading article calls upon south-Russian workers to active political struggle by means of demonstrations and a general strike, and concludes with an invitation to prepare for the May Day festival. A lively article, 'Who Is to Blame' (why wages are falling at south-Russian works), sums up the

development of south-Russian industry over the last decade, which has ended in crisis, and examines how this course of development has affected the workers. An article on the inviolability of the person in Russia calls for struggle against the autocracy 'for a better lot for the workers, for the liberation of the countryside from the last chains of bondage, for the victory of light over darkness and ignorance, for the freedom, equality and brotherhood of nations.' Let us note that articles on such themes — a new and very welcome phenomenon in our workers' press. The article '19th Century' gives a concisely, and at the same time fairly thoroughly compiled, survey of social evolution over the century just past. The section of correspondence is very rich.

There can be no doubt that this new type of agitational press, created by *Yuzhny Rabochy*, will meet with many attacks. We counsel our southern comrades not to be embarrassed by these attacks, and to continue their work, for they stand on the right path. We counsel them not to believe claims that their newspaper falls short, in the seriousness of its content, of the level of understanding of the Russian working masses; we counsel them to pay no attention to the demand to become 'more accessible.' As far as we know, *Yuzhny Rabochy* enjoys great success among workers who, evidently, hold a somewhat different opinion of their own ability to understand political literature than do their friends, of a certain kind, among the intelligentsia.

THE POST-BOX

Received by the editors of Iskra: from the Monk, 1,500 roubles; from F. Ya. U., 150 roubles; from his friend, 200 roubles; from one of the St Petersburg representatives of Iskra, 387 roubles 50 kopecks has been collected (monthly contributions: L. G. Yaza, for J., F., M., 18 r.; M. A. P. for J., F., 20 r.; T. O. for J., F., M., 9 r.; P. O. for J., F., M., 9 r.; Kh. O. for M., 3 r.; — — — for M., 1 r.; through Ch. for M., 75 r.; Lelya for M., 5 r.; collection, 53 r., again 34 r., again 15 r., W., 75 r.; T. I., 10 r.; T. I., 5 r.; participants of the demonstration of March 4, 25 r.; Bb., 11 r.; for literature, 15 pieces at 4 r. 50 apiece). Total income 387 r. 50 k., expenditure 17 r., the money not yet received. From Manchester, 19 r. (£2).

Into the treasury of the Iskra organisation there came, from September 1, 1900, to March 1, 1901: from Kiev, 35 r.; from S., 10 r.; from P., 15 r. 20 k.; from Kharkov, 3 r. 25 k.; from Siberia, 50 r. (of which 41 r. from the 'Society for the Aid of Political Exiles and Active Work'); from the Caucasus, 25 r.; from M. through P., 40 r.; from St Petersburg, 440 r. 30 k. (through M., 284 r. 10 k.; workers' contributions, 26 r. 20 k.; A. B. and M., 90 r.; through Ya., 15 r.; through T., 25 r.). Total, 618 r. 75 k.

The editors of *Zarya* ask us to publish the fact that it has received: from Paris, 350 francs (of which 325 fr. from the Paris support group and 25 fr. from an old Narodovolets), from America, through Axelrod, 250 fr., from Geneva, from the 'Sotsial-Demokrat' organisation, 150 fr.

To all correspondents: We received everything. Thank you. Keep writing.

Postponed, for lack of space: the articles 'Autocracy and Finance,' 'Autocracy and the Zemstvo,' and 'Foreign Review.'

Printed at the "Iskra" press.

ENDNOTES

[RECONSTRUCTED TEXT] These endnotes are later scholarly annotations, appended to a subsequent reprint edition of this issue; they are not part of the original April 1901 issue. They are translated here, kept under their own heading, for completeness.[END RECONSTRUCTED TEXT]

Note 1

Lenin's article, 'The Workers' Party and the Peasantry,' may seem, at first glance, a chance item, overshadowed by the rest of the issue's content, given over to the burning question of the day — the stormy eruption of the student youth onto the path of struggle. In actual fact, however, it is precisely this article by Lenin that represents the centre of gravity of the issue. It aroused the liveliest interest among workers and among the peasant masses. And indeed, in it the position of Iskra on the peasant question is set forth so fully and so clearly that it is the best, most exhaustive commentary on the agrarian programme adopted at the Second Congress.

Note 2

This section was compiled chiefly by Martov (see *Letters of Axelrod and Martov*, p. 23).

Note 3

Concerning the role of the 'Union' in the student movement of this period, Martov writes in a letter to Axelrod: "The Petersburg 'Union of Struggle,' which has been slowly evolving leftward of late and has now come, roughly, to the position occupied by the right wing of *Rabocheye Dyelo*, has, in these recent events, given proof of its complete political impotence. It did not summon the workers to the demonstration of March 4, confining itself merely to 'bringing to their attention' the invitation of the student committee."

Note 4

The group 'Sotsialist' formed in the summer of 1900 out of the remnants of 'Group 20,' broken up by the gendarmes (of whom N. Iordansky and P. Shchegolev survived). Into the group 'Sotsialist' entered B. Savinkov, P. Rutenberg, E. Broido-Gordon, and others. Although the emergence of this group might be viewed as a result of the discontent of a certain part of the socialist intelligentsia with the 'Economist' bias of official Social-Democratic organisations, nonetheless the group's own physiognomy was of an extremely indeterminate character. It is enough to say that it sought literary collaboration from such figures as V. I. Semevsky, P. N. Milyukov, V. Portugalov, Struve, Tugan-Baranovsky and others of that kind. One of the group's prominent figures, B. Savinkov (later a right-wing SR and a bitter enemy of Soviet Russia), demanded a rapprochement with the Narodnik groups. For a time the group's weight increased considerably owing to its connection with the 'Workers' Library' press, which had just arisen in Vilna. The 'Workers' Library' group had already made a stir, putting out 4-5 pamphlets, but, thanks to a provocation by the notorious [informer] Gurovich, was smashed in January 1901, and a few months later this same fate overtook the group 'Sotsialist' as well.

Shortly before its own end, the group 'Sotsialist' held negotiations with another such 'wandering comet' — the group 'Rabocheye Znamya' ('Workers' Banner'). This latter group had arisen in 1897-98 out of oppositionist circles of the Bialystok organisation of the Bund, a group of St Petersburg Social-Democrats, and also of Kievites. The inspirer and initiator of the group 'Rab. Zn.' was a worker — the jeweller Mikhail Lurye. He was not in solidarity with the Kiev group of

Rabochaya Gazeta, which had prepared the First Congress of the Party, and resolved simultaneously, together with the Kiev attempt, to create an independent party under the name of the 'Russian Social-Democratic Party.' The peculiarity of the 'Party,' which formed around *Rabocheye Znamya*, consisted in the fact that it sharply counterposed to the 'Economist' orientation of many other Social-Democratic organisations its own bias toward political struggle. With interruptions, the group survived until 1901, putting out 3 issues (the first and third in Russia, and the second in London), as well as a number of pamphlets. Among its most prominent activists, besides M. Lurye, were: Aron Lurye, I. M. Romm, S. Antropov, V. P. Nogin, S. O. Yezhov-Zederbaum (Martov's brother), A. Solts and others. In 1901 the majority of them joined the 'Iskra' group. Antropov and Nogin, who arrived in Russia from London in 1901 as agents of Iskra, were soon tracked down and arrested.