For two and a half centuries, Moscow has provided a convenient symbol for anyone who wished to contrast Russia and the West. M. N. Zagoskin, writing in the 1840s, saw the city as a "true representative of all Russia, which is as unlike all Western states as Moscow is unlike all European cities," and his sentiments have been echoed countless times. If St. Petersburg was the Russian nation's head, Moscow was its heart, the bearer of its traditions, the essence of all things Russian.

My own purpose in the present article is to examine certain peculiarities of Russian industrialization. Here too, I believe, Moscow exemplifies some of the contrasts between Russian and West European patterns of development. In Moscow city and the surrounding countryside, we find the clearest expression of one particular trend which had an enormous influence on the course of Russian industrialization: the synthesis between a modern factory system and the institutions, habits, and attitudes of an overwhelmingly peasant society.

Most features of this fusion are well-known to historians and economists. The continuance of peasant bondage until 1861; the restriction of individual mobility by the peasant land commune until 1906; the importance of peasants as the single greatest source of factory labor and urban growth throughout the post-Emancipation era—all these have long been recognized as national patterns which in some ways retarded economic development, and in other ways imparted to it a distinctively Russian stamp. When development did occur in Russia, it came not as a mechanical repetition of Western patterns, but rather as a synthesis of Western innovation and Russian tradition. Thus, in the time of Peter I, extractive and manufacturing industries were organized on the basis of serf labor. A little less than a century later, the textile industry began to flourish as a cottage industry among serfs of north-central Russia. When larger textile mills developed in the first half of the nineteenth century, they drew their wage laborers from the peasantry of the surrounding provinces. Most of the workers—manorial serfs and State peasants—remained legally bound to their native villages. Although they were nominally free in their wage contracts, they continued to pay taxes and feudal money dues (obrok)

1. M. N. Zagoskin, "Moskva i mogkyvichi," (1850; repr. in T. Il'ina, ed., Ocherki mos-Chast' 1, Vyp. 2 (Moscow: Gorodskaya tipografia, 1906), Table V, pp. 28-45 (my calculation.)
through the village commune. In some cases the worker's "freedom" was entirely fictitious, as the serf-owner negotiated the wage contract and received a substantial portion of the serf's wages directly from the employer.

All of these patterns were especially strongly developed in the Moscow region, where at the end of the nineteenth century upwards of 90 percent of the factory population consisted of persons who were migrants from the countryside and legally peasants. Like Russia's other industrial centers, Moscow experienced a great spurt of growth toward the end of the nineteenth century; unlike many other centers (e.g., the Donbas or the region of Baku), Moscow's growth was the culmination of two centuries of more or less steady development. The "Russian-ness" of Moscow's factories can be seen in the age and ownership of the largest textile mills, most of which had been founded before 1860, often by former serfs such as the Morozov and Prokhorov families. (Foreign capital and management, it should be noted, played a smaller role in the Moscow region than in other major Russian industrial centers.) In addition, Moscow was more Russian in the composition of its work force, which was uniformly Great Russian and Orthodox, recruited almost exclusively from the peasantry of a narrow radius of surrounding provinces, with no major ethnic or linguistic divisions.

Moscow should perhaps be seen as epitomizing one characteristically Russian mode of industrialization. In other regions of the Russian Empire, the pace of industrialization and the pattern of governmental and foreign involvement varied widely. Though the theme of peasant traditions could be discerned throughout industrial Russia, its local variations were often distinctive. In Moscow's case this theme was especially prominent, making that city and province an ideal locale for studying the central questions of the present paper: What was the impact of industrial experience upon the Russian peasantry, and how did that experience condition the future course of social unrest? To put it another way, how did the peculiarities of the Russian factory system affect the outlook and behavior of workers—to what extent were they uniquely Russian, and to what extent comparable to the outlook and behavior of workers in other industrial nations?

In a sense, this paper is an elaboration and test of an argument which I have advanced elsewhere, to the effect that peasant factory workers often

2. Of the twenty-two largest cotton mills in Moscow city and province in 1901, none was less than thirty years old, and all but eight had been founded before 1860. (Ministerstvo finansov. Ordel promyshlennostii, Spisok fabrik i zavodov evropeiskoi Rossii za 1900-1903 [St. Petersburg: Tip. V. Kirshauma, 1908], pp. 13-26 [my calculation]).

3. Only 5 percent of all factories in Moscow city and province listed by the Ministry of Finance were foreign-owned (my calculation from ibid.).