

The nation at the change of epochs. Russian state and society at the turn of the XX century

EVGENIY M. KOZHOKIN, OLGA N. ZHERELINA

The greatest paradox in the destiny of Russia and the Russian revolution is that the liberal ideas, concept of legal rights, as well as the ideas of social reformism have proved to be utopian in Russia. Bolshevism, on the contrary, turned out to be least utopian and most realistic, most suitable to the situation that developed in Russia in 1917, most loyal to certain originally Russian traditions and Russian pursuit of universal social truth which is generally understood in maximalist terms, as well as Russian administration and domination methods based on violence. Communism became the inevitable destiny of Russia, the internal moment of the destiny of Russian people¹.

N.A. Berdyaev

1. Mixed economy of Russia in the late XIX century was changing dramatically, the predominance of capitalism seemed as inevitable as ever. Development of industry and railway sectors were determining the transformation of social structure of the country. In 1897 the Minister of Finance S. Witte stated:

Even considering the current level of its industrial development Russia can no longer be called

an entirely agrarian state, as its factory sectors' performance indicators are already reasonably high and the future development of its wellbeing is closely related to the success of the processing industry. The annual production of agricultural products does not exceed one and a half billion rubles, while the annual mining, industrial and manufacturing production amounts in more than 2 billion².

Even the ones who were quite far from comprehending economic statistics tables or factory inspectors' reports, felt that the rapid industrial development was destroying the old patterns and undermining the foundations of the former paradigms and moral orientations. Ivan A. Bunin both as a writer and as a man admired rural life, which was expressed in his short novel *Epitaph* (1900) by means of outstanding images and questions:

With no regret the people are trampling the scarce rye, still growing here and there without sowing, they are covering it with mud in pursuit of sources of new happiness, – they are seeking it in the abyss, where the mascots of future are hiding... The ore! Maybe the pipes of the facto-

ries will soon be smoking here, the solid railway line will soon replace the old road and a city will rise up on the wrecks of the savage village. And the one thing that consecrated the old life here – the fallen gray cross – will soon be forgotten. What will the new people consecrate their new life with? Who will bless their cheerful rackets labor?³

The country was on the rise, which was also evidenced by a hasty increase of population, and it was rushing towards the triumph of capitalism that seemed however as if it was being done against both its old and new cultural patterns.

Back then many young men would get education not for the sake of professional occupation but in order to have an opportunity to enlighten the masses, including enlightening them revolutionarily.

The example of the future philosopher G.P. Fedotov was quite typical: though he had an obvious inclination for human sciences, after graduating from the gymnasium he decided to become an engineer, which let him approach the workers and spread propaganda among them. In 1904 he enrolled at the St. Petersburg Institute of technology⁴.

The environment of “new people” praised by the sensitive Russian writers from Chernyshevsky to Chekhov and Bunin failed to give birth to any masterminds or theoreticians of capitalist progress. Russia didn’t have its own Condorcet, Jefferson, Ricardo or Fichte... The most profound and prominent Russian *maîtres à penser* – all of them denied capitalism. Its true protagonists always constituted the minority that was not capable of securing the rational course of development of the new socio-economic system due to its weakness. While capitalism was developing rapidly the spirit of capitalism completely failed

to outpace this process as it was rejected by every possible population stratum and therefore could not break through the marginalization.

The irrational approach of influential and powerful groups of the ruling class to the economic policy led to the aberration in functioning of the Russian economy which rendered it significantly peculiar. From the middle of the XIX century up until 1908 there was an upturn not only in agricultural products prices, but also in prices of yarn and mineral commodities. This steady price increase was explained by the governmental policy of high customs duties and excise taxes, as well as the lack of cooperation among customers. The salaries of the workers were also augmenting but while between 1897 and 1906 the average salary growth was slightly ahead of the food prices, since 1907 the real earnings started to decrease as the result of faster growth of the food prices. The number of factory workers rocketed between 1887 and 1897 and reached the level of 59,2% or 7.803000, which was determined by an extensive phase of economic upsurge. Thereafter due to crisis phenomena the number of workers in certain industries, such as metalworking and engineering, decreased. The new growth in these industry sectors started in 1910⁵.

Affected by Western social theories and, first of all, Marxism a part of the Russian intelligentsia started developing the ideas of a special historical purpose of a new social macrogroup – working class. In 1895-1896 the young protagonist of the theory of Karl Marx Vladimir Ulyanov, who didn’t know back then that he would become Lenin, already called to admission of the proletariat to the «big politics». Working on the

Russian social-democratic party program Ulyanov suggested an imperative plan-scheme of the proletarian consciousness. His personal experience of communication with St. Petersburg workers and participants of revolutionary groups, as well as the strong desire to rely upon the force that is able to crush the autocracy, determined such opinion about the Russian workpeople that would seem obviously idealistic to any of Ulyanov's contemporaries who had vast knowledge of the working environment.

The working class, however, did not at all constitute an industrial army of ready for class battles soldiers. The equal positions in the system of labor differentiation and in the system of industrial relations did not cause neither the uniformity of worldviews, nor psychological particularities. Even the financial status of the workers in the same city could frequently differ a lot.

And still there's no doubt that despite all the internal differences, by the end of the XIX century the Russian working class represented a unique social macrogroup with its own core distinguished by literacy, desire to change its social status and the ability to affect more passive members of the class. The workpeople separated themselves from the other social groups.

When thinking and writing about the Russian working class, Ulyanov, as well as his older contemporary and predecessor G.V. Plekhanov, was bearing in mind not the image of entire Russian proletariat in its controversial variety, but the proletarian core, as the vanguard of the working class claimed later.

First of all, this core included literate, qualified and reasonably well-paid workers. They generally could afford to rent a room or even a flat, which they shared with

one or two companions. They had a certain educational habit as they usually studied in Sunday or technical schools. According to their memoirs, most of the well-known 18 male and female workers-members of the clandestine groups of the late XIX century, had an opportunity to study at this or that school. Some of the representatives of this class occasionally went abroad. This is how the toolsmith D.N. Smirnov remembers it: «At those times the workers were wishing to go and work abroad. One of my comrades, Alexey Zvonnikov, left our plant for England. He wrote to me from Hull that he was working in a factory and was paid 2 pounds sterling a week, though he would not be earning less at our factory». Smirnov himself was earning up to 100 rubles a month and he claimed that some of the men working with him at the instrumental workshop used to earn even more⁶.

However let us have at least a mosaic and schematic look at the Russian workers as a whole. Back then the children from proletarian families had to start working in a factory or manufactory at an early age for the sake of the earnings. The harsh working and living conditions hindered them from getting even the most elementary education. In 1874 the Head of the Standing commission for technical education of St. Petersburg Imperial Russian technical society E. Andreev pointed at «the two significant obstructions to development of education within the working class environment: the first one is excessive work hours for the adult workers, whereas the second one is a too young age of beginning of work in factories and manufactories by the children»⁷.

According to the Moscow habitation researcher I. Kulakova, no plant in the district of Moscow had regulations that would

determine the process of housing of the workers. They lived in the barracks either in enormous rooms with plank beds that were actually solid wooden boards with no separation screens, or they lived in tiny rooms for families, each room was occupied by several families. Most of these dwellings were overcrowded, stuffy and unhygienic⁸.

F.M. Dmitriev who wisely and diligently managed the the manufactory of Ramenki for many years, stated during his speech at the ceremonial act of Moscow Imperial Technical school in 1876:

After examining our industrial premises can we confidently declare that all the possible measures to secure the health and progressive development of the power of the worker have been taken? I regret to say that the answer to this question, as well as to many similar ones, is negative. In most of the cases the workers are placed in such conditions of work, recreation and sleep that may negatively affect their health⁹.

Humbleness, surrendering to fate, distinction between insiders and outsiders were very common within the working class. For example, during the disturbances at the Ural mining plant the workers frequently demanded the work to be primarily given to the insiders, not the ones who came from the outside. This was the leading demand expressed by the workers of the Votkinsk plant during the strike in 1902, as well as by the craftsmen of the Motovilikha plant in the Urals¹⁰.

The term "workers" as the general self-designation of the industrial workforce of plants, factories and workshops was established in the end of the XIX century. There had been a sharp distinction between craftsmen and workers before. The qualified workforce had called itself "craftsmen" and had protested against be-

ing called "workers". A series of *Factory life sketches* written by the worker P. Timofeev were published between 1903 and 1905 in the «Russian treasures» magazine. The author noted:

The words "craftsman" and "worker" are now frequently used as though there was no difference in their meanings. However the word "worker" as the intelligentsia understands it, was adopted by the working class not so long ago. In the nearest past calling a craftsman who had certain professional occupation that had taken him 3 to 6 years to obtain - a "worker", would have offended him deeply¹¹.

Even within the St. Petersburg proletariat there were groups of workers whose appearance and manner of speaking and thinking corresponded more to the peasantry than to the class of city dwellers engaged in physical labor. More than two thousand workers were employed by the Baltic naval shipyard and mechanical plant in 1890. The workers of the ship unit stood out from the rest. «They were less cultivated... consisted mostly of peasants that maintained close connections with the village», - remembered the worker of the Baltic plant, member of social-democratic group V. Fomin, - «... all their principles, their worldview and customs were purely rural, from their turns of speech to the mode of dressing and lifestyle...»¹². There was a great antagonism between the workers of the ship fabrication department and the other employees of the plant, mechanics in particular. The representatives of the ship fabrication department were mocked at whenever possible for their looks and manners that were completely different from the urban ones.

They were ironically called «dappled». The ship unit workers were very religious



Lenin with other members of the League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class in 1897

and worshiped John of Kronstadt. The books they read were mostly of religious content, such as *Life of Seraphim of Sarov* and the choice of secular literature of the ship artel workers (they lived and boarded together) was limited to legends of different kinds – *Legend of the brave knight Franciscan*, legend of prince Bove, legend of ataman Epanch. The editions of «The intermediary» magazine that had an enlightening character could hardly reach those artels¹³.

Significant part of the workers still had faith in the Tsar. During the strike at the New cotton mill in St. Petersburg in 1878 the workers addressed the heir apparent, future tsar Alexander III, with a petition which ended with the following words: «We

are appealing to you as to the father. If our fair demands are not satisfied, we will know that we have no one to rely upon, no one to come to our defense and that we should only rely upon ourselves and our hands»¹⁴. The demands of the strikers were satisfied but next year the administration of the factory fired 44 weavers who were accused of instigating the strike.

Back at the time Russian workers had little experience of organizing economic strikes that were often followed by violent acts with the elements of traditional Russian revolt. However by the end of the century spontaneous violent acts during the strikes tended to become less frequent. Battle in the extreme conditions of Russian capital-

ism compelled the workpeople to form organizations. Establishment of strike funds ("strike cash desks"), also known as opposition funds, became a common practice. During the Nineties such funds were set up in St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kostroma, Ivanovo-Voznesensk, Odessa, Ekaterinoslavl, Nikolaev and other cities. A lot of funds of such kind were established in Poland and in the northwest – within the Jewish pale. In the northwest among the Jewish workers these funds were initially tightly connected with the social-democratic circles. In St. Petersburg the funds generally covered the workers of one enterprise¹⁵. But only the minority of Russian workers somehow participated in operational activity of mutual aid societies or practiced any form of mutual insurance policies.

The revolutionizing significance of the strikes was worriedly noted by the owners and directors of the enterprises. After analyzing the strike that took place from 31st of May till 3rd of June 1901 the managing board of the Baltic naval shipyard concluded that «if the organizers of disturbances under different tempting pretense managed to hype up the inert mass of the workers, it will be more and more easy to do so next time»¹⁶.

By the end of the XIX century among the workers of major cities such as St. Petersburg and Moscow there were already several quite formed revolutionaries of both populist (*narodnik*) and social-democratic ideological orientations.

Russian radical intelligentsia was engaged in propaganda and enlightening activities since early Seventies of the XIX century. So-called "Going to the people" became an integral part of the life of many young men and women from educated

classes. Communication with the plebeians inspired them, especially given that their grateful listeners, and later companions, were the workers with rather high educational level who were seeking means of changing their way of life. L. Trotsky remembered how he, yet being a youngster, started his revolutionary propaganda in Nikolaev, where there were about eight thousand factory workers and two thousand craftsmen in the late XIX century. According to him «the cultural level of the workers, as well as their earnings, were rather high. The number of illiterate people was insignificant. The place of revolutionary organizations was to certain extent taken by sectarianism that successfully fought against state Orthodoxy». The group of yesterday's grammar-school boys, who learnt the basics of Marxism, hurried to share their knowledge with local workers and unexpectedly for themselves the overwhelming number of the workers was most willing to address them, as if they were being awaited at the factories for quite a long time. «Everyone was bringing a friend, some of them came with their wives, several elderly workers entered the circles with their sons, – L. Trotsky said, – Every word met a response. Such clandestine readings and conversations took place in apartments, in the forest or by the river and gathered 20-25 people or more»¹⁷.

Experience of propaganda among the workers was completely different from the experience of going to the rural people, as the peasants frequently just turned the propagandists to the police.

The efforts of revolutionary and socialist-oriented intelligentsia yielded the fruits. The increasing number of workers learnt the basic provisions of socialism and

accepted them. On February 6th, 1903 during the session of the commission attached to the Ministry of Finance, the Police department director Zvolynskiy reported (obviously exaggerating the influence of revolutionary ideas):

The working organizations are now rapidly developing under the influence of the massive secret propaganda within the working environment, especially within the major industrial centers. Around 80% of all workers are engaged in clandestine organization in Moscow, St. Petersburg and in Vladimir district. Clandestine literature is widely distributed among the workers, many of them even learnt to speak the language of this literature¹⁸.

2. Neither in the late XIX century, nor in the early XX century, and up until the First Russian revolution, had the ruling classes of Russia an opportunity to create political parties, but the lack of political structure of the society did not indicate the absence of pluralism of ideas and serious battle within the ruling classes themselves on all the key issues of socio-economic development of the country.

The bureaucrat-reformers of the Russian state machine gave vote even in the years of triumphing reaction: they acted within the recognized official procedure – gave notes, spoke at internal ministerial meetings, worked for creation of interdepartmental commissions on the matters that required state interference. Their conservative opponents usually succeeded in making the notes “be shelved” and rendering the work of commissions inefficient. Nevertheless this deaf bureaucratic war, with its dramas and even tragedies, continued steadily.

In 1859-1862 Shtakelberg's commission that was engaged in revision of the Industry charter, suggested to give the workers certain freedom to form organizations and the right to establish industrial courts and form them from the delegates of the workers and the owners. Such suggestions did not receive legislative recognition. There were no mechanisms of coordination of interests between the workers and the owners, and the conservative-minded bureaucrats, not even acknowledging it, preferred to radicalize the labor and capital relations. The reformist efforts of Ignatiev's commission in 1870-1872, as well as the commission of Valuev in 1874-1875 were blocked.

Struggle between the supporters of legislative regulation of labor relations and the conservatives, who were standing up for total freedom of the owners, was witnessed among the Russian industrialists as well.

The congress of mechanic engineers that took place in St. Petersburg in 1875 where the civil servants and professorship participated along with the industrialists, adopted almost unanimously the resolution that suggested «that the scope of actual work per day for the task-work at all the factories, plants and craft institutions should be reduced to 10 hours a day»¹⁹ with the condition that the total number of holidays and days off would not exceed 65 days, the congress also petitioned for the prompt adoption of the law that would govern the labor of the minors. At the same time a number of congress participants for the sake of the «freedom of national labor» protested against the attempts of legislative labor protection of workers. However the congress of the year 1875 did not have any real consequences.

It the Eighties of the XIX century the commission for drafting of the new Criminal code suggested to vacate criminal sentence for the strikes, but these attempts of mitigation of the labor legislation did not succeed.

Nevertheless the continuous and repeated, though fragmentary efforts of the reformers yielded their results. On June 1st, 1882 the *Law on child labor working at the factories, plants and manufactories* was passed. This Law forbade the labor of children below the age of 12 in the industry sector, while the labor of minors of 12-15 years old was limited to 8 hours per day, the night shifts for the children were banned and the institution of factory inspectors was established²⁰. The adoption of the Law was achieved by N.H. Bunge, the Kiev professor, economist, Head of Ministry of Finance since 1881.

Department of trade and manufactories sent requests to 48 cotton mill managers in order to estimate the consequences of enforcement of the new Law. Most of the respondents were against the governmental innovation. As the result, a defamation campaign against the Minister of Finance began in the right-wing press.

In spite of that, upon the initiative of N.H. Bunge on June 3rd 1886 the emperor Alexander III approved the *Rules of supervision of manufacturing industry institutions, of relations between workers and manufacturers and of the increase in the number of ranks of factory inspections*, which prohibited to pay the wages in kind and specified the grounds for imposition of fines on the workers. The aggregate amount of fines could no longer exceed one third of earnings of the worker. Transfer of penalty money to profit was forbidden, as it had to accumulate in a special

order and be spent only on the employees' benefits. At the same time the Rules increased the level of legal liability for incitement to strikes and participation in them, as well as for the threatening the administration.

However, careful innovations of Bunge created a completely new situation: with the advent of such employee as the factory inspector who enforced the implementation of legislative requirements, with the advent of the statutory instruments that provided minimum protection for some of the rights of workers, – the autocratic state acquired a chance that a part of workers would believe in its impartiality, ability to protect the workers from arbitrariness of the owner and his administration²¹.

But the chance was missed. Bunge soon lost his political influence and high social position. The majority of Russian manufacturers took *The rules of supervision of manufacturing industry institutions* extremely hostilely, which was eloquently confirmed by the assistant of the factory inspector of Vladimir district Mikulin and later by economist and historian M. Tugan-Baranovskiy. In March 1887 the body of Moscow manufacturers – «Society for assistance to industry and commerce» filed two petitions to the new Minister of Finance Vyshegradskiy for alteration of the procedure of governmental supervision of factories. This resulted in the adoption of the new act of factory legislation: the matters that were previously governed by the law, were transferred to the administrative discretion of the Minister of Finance, Minister of Internal affairs and governors, which gave rise to the arbitrariness. This reverse movement away from construction of the law-governed state was accompanied by the utter imposture of the

manufacturers. According to Mikulin, «In order to formally comply with legislative requirements concerning timely wage payments, such payments were most accurately written down in the relevant books, but not actually paid out; in circumvention of the law that prohibited payments in kind...»²² such payments were effected but written in the books as effected in money. Being reluctant to give away the penalty money, the manufacturers recorded the insufficient number of working days instead of the unexcused absence. Apart from that there were many other ways to avoid the “inconvenient” legislation.

Nevertheless the technical progress, competition between various industrial centers of the Russian Empire and the growing strike activity of the workers indicated to the manufacturers the need of legislative regulation of duration of the working day of the adult toilers. The ones who carried out regular technical modernization of production, were the most understanding. The duration of the working day at Lodz textile plants was shorter than at similar Moscow factories, moreover, there was almost no such practice as night shifts at Lodz's.

In 1894 the Lodz branch of the Society for assistance to Russian industry and commerce submitted the project of legislative limitation of working hours at all factories, plants and craft institutions of Russia. This initiative found support not only among industrialists, but also among such civil servants as factory inspectors, who were perfectly knowledgeable about the state of industrial production. Factory inspector of Petrovsk district Rykovskiy wrote: «All Russian manufacturers could easily cut the common 13-14 hours of work by 1-2 hours

and increase productivity of their plants if they only paid more attention to the technology of production». In response to the Lodz manufacturers' project Moscow «Society for assistance to enhancement and development of manufacturing industry» formed a Commission that conducted a poll among the majority of manufacturers and factory inspectors in order to learn their opinion about the legislative regulation of working hours.

Discussions continued and seemed to be leading nowhere when major strikes in St. Petersburg in May, 1896 and in January, 1897 happened. On June 2, 1897 the law governing the duration of the working day was adopted. However it entirely corresponded to the interests of the most retrograde part of manufacturers, restricting the night work instead of prohibiting it, and contained no provisions for liability in the event of non-compliance with its requirements. On March 14, 1898 Minister of Finance issued a circular that allowed unlimited overtime work, which leveled down all the few positive novelties contained in the 1897 Law.

The stubborn conservatism based on pure greed of the significant part of the Russian manufacturers, fear of their own people, inflexibility and the same old inert conservatism of the bureaucracy led to radicalization of the situation in the country and rendered fatal the rapprochement of the already to some extent revolutionary-minded intelligentsia and potentially revolutionary-minded proletariat. And the failures of reformers from amongst the ruling classes turned into defeats of the reformers from the opposite flank of social life as well.

3. One of the objectives of social democracy mentioned in the program written by V. Ulyanov is as follows: «...To help the fight of the Russian working class by means of development of class consciousness of the workers, assistance in their organization and outlining the objectives and purposes of their fight»²³. The program defined class consciousness as the result of co-authorship of the working class itself and of the social-democratic party. Analyzing the independent movement of Russian proletariat, Lenin pointed at how the workers were gradually developing the understanding of the need in unity of their actions, the understanding that combative class solidarity is the only means to assert their right to life and human existence. The program provided for the conditions that prepared the workers for connection, and developed their ability to connect. There were three main conditions: 1) A large machine production plant that required permanent employment and therefore developed connection of the worker with the land; 2) Collaborative work of hundreds and thousands of workers that implied collective discussion of their needs and collective actions, that demonstrated the equality of status and interests of all the mass of workers; 3) Ongoing transfers of workers from one plant to another that would teach the workers to compare discipline at different plants and assure themselves in the equality of operation at all the plants, as well as it would teach them to adopt experience of other workers in their fight with the capitalist...»²⁴. Under the influence of the listed conditions and according to the logic of development of the strike movement, the program said, from the local struggle with one or several manufacturers, the workers move on to the

national war against the capitalists. However, as the state machine is not a neutral force in that war, the workers do not only become aware of the need to unite, need of collective action of the entire class, but they also come to a conclusion that it is essential for them to obtain influence over the government. As the class consciousness, according to Ulyanov's definition, acted as

the worker's understanding of the fact that the only means to improve his conditions of life and to achieve his release is to fight against the class of capitalists and manufacturers...., the consciousness of the workers also implied understanding that the interests of all the workers of this country were identical, solidary and that they all constituted one class which was separate from all the social classes; finally, the class consciousness of the workers meant their understanding that in order to meet their objectives the workers needed to obtain influence over the public affairs, just as the land owners and the capitalist did and continued to be doing²⁵.

This obviously evidenced that V. Ulyanov believed that many of the essential components of the class consciousness of the workers were formed in course of their daily struggle, as well as it was the result of constant existence in conditions of capitalist exploitation.

Rapid run of the thought of the young Marxist did not submit to the logic of scientific analysis, which strives for impartiality, but to the imperatives of the political struggle. When future Lenin (he took this pseudonym in 1901 and never changed it later on) wrote about class consciousness of the Russian workers, he did not try to reconstruct and analyze the information he had at that time (his knowledge of working mentality, owing to his youth, features of his intellectual life and the small number of scientific publications about workers, was inevitably

limited), but to explain, if not to dictate, to the workers what consciousness they must have.

By the time of the First Russian revolution, the most active workers of the Russian Empire were already guided by class approach in their social estimates and actions, but their approach was far not as violent as Ulyanov's one. Feeling this difference, Ulyanov soon questioned the ability of the working class to independently develop authentic proletarian ideology.

In the late Nineties of the XIX century such social democratic editions as «Rabochaya Mysl» newspaper and the body of The union of the Russian social democrats abroad, «Working Business» magazine, considering the gradually developing conditions for legal struggle of workers for their rights, urged the workers to concentrate their efforts on the involvement in factory affairs, in city self-government and promotion to the government of the laws that contained requirements for protection of labor. Supporters of this movement: E.A. Kuskova, S.N. Prokopovich, A.S. Pikker (A. Martynov), V.N. Krichevskiy – received the name “economists”.

Young and decisive Vladimir Ulyanov came down on them with furious criticism. He also pointed out the insufficiency, even lameness of trade-unionism as a frame of reference, created by workers. In fact he began to bring the theoretical basis for the corner thesis of Leninism about the supremacy of ideological party over common people, including the workers.

The key divergence of Lenin's and his adherents' views with the “economists” was that Lenin believed that the release of the proletariat could only be achieved by destruction of capitalism as a system, and

that all private economic struggle must be subordinated to this common goal. According to the “economists”, first of all, it was crucial to fight for immediate improvement of living conditions of the working class by means of creation of insurance funds, fight for pay rise, etc.

Rejecting the argument of the “economists” that the proletariat can independently develop authentic class ideology, Lenin proved that without the assistance of theorists from the intelligentsia, the workers spontaneously come only to trade-union, but not to social democratic consciousness. By the “theorists from the intellectuals” Lenin meant, first of all, himself.

As for the trade-union consciousness, Ulyanov-Lenin determined it as understanding by the workers of antagonism of their interests and the interests of owners, as «belief in the need to gather in unions, to combat the owners, demand from the government the adoption of certain laws necessary for the workers»²⁶. Ulyanov recognized the political nature of this consciousness, but did not consider trade-unionism a specific ideology. The term “trade-union ideology” does not occur in any of Ulyanov's (V.I. Lenin's) texts. Moreover, he claimed: «...The independent ideology, chosen by the working masses in the course of their movement, is out of the question»²⁷. In capitalist society, believed Ulyanov, there are only two ideologies: bourgeois and socialist. Trade-unionism, not being an ideology, can coexist in consciousness and policy of masses either with bourgeois, or with socialist ideology. If the labor movement is not controlled, it will inevitably choose trade-unionism which in turn will be inevitably subordinated to

bourgeois ideology as it «is more comprehensively developed, than the socialist and possesses immeasurably strong means of distribution»²⁸, – V. Ulyanov wrote. But socialists, by persistent, purposeful work with the masses can pull them out from the ideological influence of the bourgeoisie. And the trade-unionism can find the end of its existence within social democratism, not in the bourgeois trade-unionism. According to this, Ulyanov specified that the aim of social democracy is to fight against spontaneity, to drag «labor movement from this spontaneous aspiration for the bourgeois trade-unionism and to shelter it under the wing of revolutionary social democracy»²⁹.

The apology of working class and mistrust to its independent ideological searches was added by Ulyanov and his adherents by a not less dual attitude towards the intelligentsia. These anti-intelligentsia moods were expressed in the unexpected identifications of the intelligentsia with the bourgeoisie³⁰.

The violent consistence of Lenin in upstanding for his views drew to it the increasing attention of social democrats. It was incredibly difficult to contradict him. By then there was a constantly broadening circle of people, and the short-term colleague of Lenin, Potresov, wrote about:

Plekhanov – was worshiped, Martov – was loved, but only Lenin was inviolately followed as if he was the only indisputable leader, because it was only Lenin who represented, in particular in Russia, the rare phenomenon of the person of iron will and unrestrained energy, who merged fanatical belief in the movement, in the aim, with overwhelming self-confidence³¹.

In 1902 the changed political situation (strengthening of social democratic and labor movements and at the same time

emergence of the “economism” and, therefore, the necessity to fight it) determined the need to specify the problems of social democracy, as well as the further development of its conceptual framework. In his work *What is to be done?* Lenin did not reject neither his earlier concept of formation of class consciousness, nor the term itself. He used this term when he described development of proletarian consciousness at early (presumably trade-union or even pre-trade-union) stage. He wrote: «In the most advanced European countries even now it is possible to see how accusations of some forsaken trade or some forgotten housework serves as starting point to awakening of class consciousness, to the beginning of professional struggle and spread of socialism»³². This approach is identical to the one that was presented in *The project and explanation of the program*. At the same time within the new approach, according to which class trade-union consciousness may become the subordinate to the bourgeois ideology, Lenin suggested division between true and false class consciousness. The false class consciousness is either the past of the Russian labor movement, or its present, which must be desperately fought with, instead of indirect acceptance of its right to existence due to the “class” epithet. This is the reason why there is only the definition of the true class consciousness in Lenin’s works. As it is stated in *What is to be done?*,

the consciousness of working class cannot constitute a truly political consciousness, if workers are not accustomed to responding to any and all cases of arbitrariness and oppression, violence and abuse, to whatever classes these cases belong: – and to respond from the social democratic, not any other point of view. Consciousness of working masses cannot constitute a truly class

consciousness if workers fail to observe each of the other social classes basing on the examples of certain important political facts and events³³.

Throughout his adult and sensible life V.I. Lenin was first of all a politician in every possible way. Philosophy, political economy and sociology served him only as means of applied character. Even the laws of logic were not axiomatic for him. Purposefully, with great determination was he creating the ideology of action. Lenin's intellection differed essentially from the intellection of the person whose follower he considered himself to be. Marx never supported the idea of the revolution by all means. He viewed history as an organic process which could be influenced only to some limited extent. Crafting history through political violence was not only an undeniable postulate for Lenin, but also his personal invincible belief. The analysis of Lenin's intellection sets extremely difficult tasks for the researcher, as traditional tools of philosophical epistemology in most cases proves to be powerless in attempt of definition of the paradigms that this outstanding person of the last century operated.

Lenin firmly and categorically connected ideological currents with social groups. He did not take into consideration one simple and obvious thing – autonomy of the personality from the society, and therefore from a certain social group. He never discussed the fact that the class is primary, and the individual is secondary – it was a fundamental truth to him.

However, ignoring the personality also led to aberrations in understanding of social classes, as the class itself consists of personalities. At the same time Lenin ingeniously seized the certain intension, which was present in consciousness of mil-

lions of people; he formulated it, developed and returned to those people in the form of precise and unambiguous slogan. He dominated over the people who had lived by absolutely different rules, customs and norms before they perceived the ideas of Lenin.

The birth of political genius always leads the society he operates in to dramatic changes, but the fact that the genius of Lenin happened to be revolutionary is not only the consequence of Ulyanov's (Lenin's) profound psychological devotion to radicalism, but also the result of the radical character of the Russian society itself, which was typical of both ruling classes, represented by the majority of bureaucrats and manufacturers (in the form of uncompromising conservatism), and of the intelligentsia (in the form of socialist utopianism, nihilism and determination to make heroic sacrifice for the sake of the common people). Revolution and victory of bolshevism was rendered inevitable for Russia by many people of most diverse positions and beliefs.

- ¹ N.A. Berdyayev, *Origin of Russian communism*, Moscow, Nauka, 1990, p. 93.
- ² A. Nikolaenko, *Brief history of the working class in Russia*, Moscow, Gudok, 1926, p. 70.
- ³ I.A. Bunin, *Poetry and prose*, Moscow, Prosveshchenie, 1986, p. 63.
- ⁴ Foreword to the book: G.P. Fedotov, *The face of Russia. Collection of articles (1918-1931)*, Paris, Ymca-Press, 1967, p. V.
- ⁵ K.A. Pazhytnov, *Results and perspectives in the field of the working issue in Russia*, Sankt Peterburg, s.e., 1910, pp. 50-51.
- ⁶ E.A. Korol'chuk (ed.), *Beginning of the way. Memories of St. Petersburg workers 1872-1897*, Leningrad, Lenizdat, 1975, p. 156.
- ⁷ M.I. Tugan-Baranovskiy, *Russian factory in the past and present*, Vol. 1: *Historical development of Russian factory in XIX century*, Moscow, Nauka, 1938, p. 323.
- ⁸ Ref.: I.P. Kulakova, *History of Moscow housing*, Moscow, OGI, 2006, p. 138; I.I. Yanzhul, *Factory life in Moscow province*, Sankt Peterburg, s.e., 1884; P.A. Ovchinnikov, *Some data on the issue of organization of life of workers and trainees at factories and craft organizations*, Moscow, s.e., 1881; M.O. Perfilev, *Outlines of life at plants and factories in Russia*, Sankt Peterburg, s.e., 1887.
- ⁹ *Annex to the congress Cg. of the members of The Russian Imperial technical society in Moscow in 1882*, Sankt Peterburg, s.e., 1885, p. 16.
- ¹⁰ V.V. Adamov, *Peculiarities of formation of metallurgical proletariat in the Urals. Working class and labor movement in Russia*, Moscow, Akademija Nauk SSSR, 1966, pp. 181-182.
- ¹¹ P. Timofeev, *What is the life of the plant worker like*, Sankt Peterburg, s.e., 1906, p. 5.
- ¹² Korol'chuk (ed.), *Beginning of the way* cit., p. 198.
- ¹³ *Ibidem*.
- ¹⁴ Nikolaenko, *Brief history of the working class* cit., p. 128.
- ¹⁵ S. Einzaft, *Professional movement in Russia in 1905-1907*, Moscow, s.e., 1925, pp. 18-19.
- ¹⁶ I.I. Shelymagin, *Factory labor legislation in Russia. 1900-1917*, Moscow, 1952, p. 43.
- ¹⁷ L.D. Trotskiy, *My life. An attempt at an autobiography*, Moscow, Sovetskiy pisatel', 1991, p. 115.
- ¹⁸ Shelymagin, *Factory labor legislation in Russia* cit., p. 47.
- ¹⁹ *Works of the Congress of key figures of Mechanical Engineering Industry. 11 Magazine of collective assemblies*, s.l., s.e., 1875, pp. 65-66; Tugan-Baranovskiy, *Russian factory* cit., p. 322.
- ²⁰ Shelymagin, *Factory labor legislation in Russia* cit., p. 168.
- ²¹ *Complete collection of the Laws of the Russian Empire*, 3rd edition, Sankt Peterburg, His Majesty's Own Chancery, 1888, Vol. 6. - №3769.
- ²² A.A. Mikulin, *Outlines from the history of application of the Law on employment at plants and factories in Vladimir province, dated June 3, 1886*, Vladimir, 1893, p. 70; Tugan-Baranovskiy, *Russian factory* cit., p. 340.
- ²³ V.I. Ulyanov (Lenin), *Collected works*, 55 volumes (5th edition, updated), M, Progress, 1965-75, Vol. 2, p. 84.
- ²⁴ Ivi, vol. 2, pp. 91-92.
- ²⁵ Ivi, vol. 2, p. 93.
- ²⁶ Ivi, vol. 6, p. 30.
- ²⁷ Ivi, vol. 6, p. 39.
- ²⁸ Ivi, vol. 6, p. 41.
- ²⁹ Ivi, vol. 6, p. 55.
- ³⁰ Young I. Dzhugashvili wrote at that time in Georgian: «Whether the working class will manage to take charge of the democratic movement or it will stay at the rear of it serving as the "intelligentsia's", i.e. bourgeoisie's assistant force, is extremely important for the democratic development in Russia» (I.V. Stalin, *Works*, vol.1: 1901-1907, Moscow, Gosdarstvennoi Izdatelstvo, 1946, p. 30). Lenin repeatedly demonstrated suspiciousness towards the intelligentsia, blamed it for inclination for bourgeoisness which was expressed, as he thought, in all spheres. He told to Clara Zetkin in the Soviet period: «I am disgusted by the disguised respect to the bourgeois morality, as well as the loving discussion of gender issues. No matter how rebellious and revolutionary this occupation is trying to express itself, it still is quite bourgeois. This is the beloved occupation of the intellectuals and related classes» (C. Zetkin, *About Lenin. Memories and meetings*, Moscow, Moskovskiy rabochiy, 1925, pp. 11-12).
- ³¹ V.A. Nikonov, *Molotov: Youth*, Moscow, Vagrius, 2005, p. 41.
- ³² V.I. Ulyanov (Lenin), *Collected works*, cit., vol. 6, p. 55.
- ³³ Ivi, vol. 6, p. 69.