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**Historical Appendix**

I. *Introduction*

The historical material that we have assembled for this project is vast, and the brief discussion in the main body of the paper and the Appendix does not do justice to the rich resources that we possess and that allow us to shed light on the causal mechanisms that we propose in the paper. The historical materials are presented and analysed in detail in one of the author’s forthcoming book manuscript on the social and political implications of the legacies of Imperial social structure in Russia (Lankina 2021). Following Ian Lustick’s injunction to declare transparency in selecting, leveraging and interpreting historical sources as good practice in historical political science (Lustick 1996), we here provide an overview of historical debates. We then present some annotated tables with descriptive statistics that corroborate our hypothesised causal mechanisms.

II. *Historiography on estates*

We begin with an overview of the historiography on estates and the *meshchane* in particular. Although several widely cited papers and books have been written on the estate structure of late imperial Russia (Freeze 1986; Wirtschafter 1997; Orlovsky 1991; Hildermeier 1985), recent works by the Russian historian Sergey Mironov are particularly valuable in presenting new historical data, in corroborating extant accounts, in refining or interrogating them (Mironov 2015a, 2015b, 2014, 2003). Where previous accounts tended to refer to the generic “petty bourgeoisie” or “town dwellers” or have analysed the *meshchane* in the period preceding the Great Reforms (see esp. Hildermeier 1985), Mironov supplies considerable detail on distinct urban categories of *meshchane*, merchants and honorary citizens as these estates evolved in the period leading up to the Bolshevik Revolution. As with other historical accounts, the data are aggregated at the level of the Russian Empire or European Russia; additional archival materials are provided for separate regions in ways that are fairly eclectic and not very systematic.

What we take from Mironov’s work is that the modernization processes unleashed by the Great Reforms of the 1860s inequitably affected the various estates. Those already privileged in terms of human capital, material resources or law-inscribed freedoms and rights, notably the aristocracy, clergy and the urban estates, enjoyed far greater advantages in the market of educational and professional opportunities in late Imperial Russia. By contrast, many peasants, decades after emancipation, continued to be shackled to the manorial estate due to high redemption fees to landlords, or simply were not endowed with the same kinds of educational access opportunities characteristic of the more privileged estates. Mironov’s work is not concerned with estate per se, but with features of late feudal society as they interacted with modernization processes. In our view the most significant recent work specifically focusing on estate and the *meshchane* is Alison Smith’s superb monograph on the urban estates and estate corporations in late Imperial Russia (Smith 2014). Smith’s work complements recent research of Russian historians working with sources from provincial archives and published in Russian (Kobozeva 2014, 2013, 2012b, 2012a; Dolgopyatov 2009; Koshman 2016). These new contributions are highly pertinent for revising prior assumptions about social structure in Russian society.

We here briefly summarise how the new research interrogates the “received wisdoms” concerning estate and broadly transformation of Russian estates-based society after the Bolshevik Revolution. First, in these new accounts, estate does not appear as an irrelevance or an “embarrassing anachronism” at the time of the Revolution, as some historians have claimed earlier (Fitzpatrick 2005, 72). In fact, as Smith masterfully demonstrates, estate continued to matter as an institution structuring social possibilities, but also social closure. “Th[e] *sosloviia*,” wrote Smith, “were still living institutions with real meaning—but with a meaning that had changed since the earlier parts of the [XIX] century” (Smith 2014, 149.). Smith writes that at the start of the XX century, only a few years before the Revolution, corporations of *meshchane* and merchants not only continued to screen prospective entrants into towns based on “moral worth,” evidence of civic contribution, income and profession, but did so with greater vigilance than before. This is because modernization processes unleashed by the Great Reforms resulted in influx of peasants into towns, social groups that merchants and established *meshchane* burghers were keen to keep out of towns (Smith 2014, 150, 161).

Second, it is no longer the case that *meshchane* is construed as an estate characterised by poverty and squalor (Hildermeier 1985), or one inspired by clichéd portrayals of this stratum in Soviet propaganda as mired in greed, kitsch or bad morals (Dunham 1990). We now possess more tangible information about this category as we find it in 1917, which is in sync with our own angle on the *meshchane* as Russia’s aspirational, trading and professional middling bourgeoisie. Furthermore, because we have data on *meshchane* share in secondary schools, universities and specialized professional training institutions in 1900-1917 (see Tables 1-3 below), we can extrapolate these data in analysing the extent to which this group will colonize the professions in Soviet Russia.

Third, and relatedly, earlier foundational historical works on education and the professions, even if not directly concerned with estate, and certainly new accounts, have provided statistics strongly suggestive of what we label the professionalisation of Russia’s estate society following the Great Reforms. Nobles lost income from serfs and land, so many increasingly moved into prestigious professions (Becker 1985); merchants were engaging in a form of hedging for their children, paying for expensive education that would enable sons and daughters to either help run the family business or become teachers, medics and engineers. The *meshchane* tended to colonise middling professions of medics, pedagogues and engineers as well; many attended technical colleges (Mironov 2014). Unlike the professionalised nobles and merchants, the *meshchane* were a very sizeable stratum, making their contribution to the bulk of the pre-Soviet and Soviet middle class more tangible than that of the other relatively privileged groups. The raw numbers in Table 3 demonstrate that the *meshchane* or the generic “urban estates” were the most sizeable single group in the student body of universities preparing graduates who will enter the Soviet labour market.

*III. Tables and Figures*

Table 1 below illustrates that it would be simplistic to postulate that meshchane stand for “urban” and proxy for urbanization in late Imperial Russia. It is evident that many town residents were in the status of peasants, and consequently they had been denied the same kinds of rights in trade, property ownership and transactions that meshchane enjoyed. It is also clear that many meshchane lived in villages, again, challenging simple assumptions that the meshchane status straightforwardly co-varies with, and proxies for, “urban.” The rural meshchane are likely to be those that engaged in the professions and pursued trades. The meshchane are therefore a good proxy for a bundle of socio-economic characteristics that we associate with the middling or petit bourgeoisie, and for the most wealthy ones, there was always a route open to become merchants through wealth and thereby become haute bourgeoisie.

**Table 1.** Distribution of population based on estates between towns and villages in European Russia in XIX century (%)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1802 | 1857 | 1897 |
| Nobility | | | |
| Town | 48 | 32.9 | 57.6 |
| Village | 52 | 67.1 | 42.4 |
| Clergy | | | |
| Town | 11.1 | 11.1 | 28.5 |
| Village | 88.9 | 88.9 | 71.5 |
| Urban estate | | | |
| Town | 59 | 50.2 | 51 |
| Village | 41 | 49.8 | 49 |
| Peasant | | | |
| Town | 3.4 | 2.5 | 6.7 |
| Village | 96.6 | 97.5 | 93.3 |
| Military | | | |
| Town | 21.9 | 20.9 |  |
| Village | 78.1 | 79.1 |  |
| Others | | | |
| Town | 20.6 | 11.9 | 28.4 |
| Village | 79.4 | 88.1 | 71.6 |

*Note*: includes territories outside of present-day Russia.

*Source*: Mironov, Vol. 1, Table V. 15, 850.

Table 2 below illustrates that in European Russia, whether urban or rural dwellers, urban estates were consistently, from at least the mid-XIX century, and significantly more literate than peasants; and in 1917 an urban peasant on average had a 64 percent literacy rate as compared to *meshchane* and the other urban estates, at 73 percent. These data again challenge assumptions that the meshchane are the same as urban residents.

**Table 2**. Literacy in European Russia by estate in 1847-1917, above age 9 (%)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Estate | 1847 | 1857 | 1867 | 1877 | 1887 | 1897 | 1907 | 1917 |
| Nobility | 76 | 77 | 80 | 82 | 84 | 86 | 88 | 90 |
| Town | 89 | 91 | 92 | 94 | 95 | 95 | 97 | 98 |
| Village | 59 | 62 | 64 | 67 | 68 | 71 | 73 | 76 |
| Clergy | 68 | 72 | 77 | 81 | 85 | 89 | 92 | 95 |
| Town | 82 | 85 | 88 | 91 | 93 | 95 | 97 | 98 |
| Village | 59 | 64 | 70 | 76 | 82 | 86 | 91 | 94 |
| Urban estate | 30 | 37 | 39 | 44 | 48 | 54 | 59 | 64 |
| Town | 33 | 36 | 41 | 47 | 54 | 60 | 66 | 73 |
| Village | 30 | 32 | 34 | 37 | 44 | 47 | 51 | 56 |
| Peasant | 10 | 12 | 14 | 18 | 21 | 27 | 30 | 32 |
| Town | 25 | 27 | 31 | 36 | 43 | 50 | 57 | 64 |
| Village | 9 | 11 | 13 | 16 | 20 | 22 | 27 | 32 |

*Source:* Mironov, Vol. 3, Table 12.16, 483.

*Note*: includes territories outside of present-day Russia.

Tables 3-5 and below demonstrate that while we observe significant social mobility of peasants and that considerable social fluidity characterised Russian society in the years leading up to the Revolution, some estates were clearly better positioned to colonise modern institutions of learning leading to white-collar professions. In fact, the data make clear that some estates like nobles hugely exceeded their population share in the most prestigious schools (gymnasia). It is clear also that there were more than three times the number of *meshchane* in the prestigious fee-paying high schools in proportion to their population. Women’s gymnasia featured meshchane and artisans as the numerically single largest group of nearly 110,000 pupils in 1914 (Table 5). These women would be in high demand as Soviet educated professionals—we know also that women were less likely to be executed under Stalin. Peasants tended to flock into vocational schools for artisans, and even so, were significantly under-represented in proportion to their population share. Even though the Bolsheviks sought to socially elevate peasants and workers, peasants would not have possessed the human capital enabling ascent into high-skilled professional white-collar occupations. This is because the gymnasium and *real’noye uchilshe* prepared entrants to university to study classical/ humanities and to acquire modern occupations like engineering, respectively. Estates that colonised these institutions are therefore likely to be professionals in the Soviet labour market.

**Table 3.** Share of pupils belonging to various social strata, in primary and middle schools in Russia in 1913.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Middle schools | | | Primary schools | |
| Social origin |  | Male gymnasia | Female gymnasia | Realnyye uchilishcha | Urban and uezd uchilishcha | Remeslennyye (artisan) uchilishcha |
| Nobles and civil servants (*Chinovniki*) |  | 32.3 | 21.6 | 22.6 | 5.0 | 3.0 |
| Honorable citizens and merchants |  | 9.9 | 9.4 | 9.5 | 2.4 | 1.1 |
| Clergy | | 5.6 | 4.8 | 2.8 | 1.0 | 0.9 |
| Meshchane and artisans (*tsekhovyye*) |  | 26.9 | 35.3 | 29.6 | 34.3 | 30.5 |
| Peasants and Cossacks |  | 22.0 | 25.5 | 32.2 | 55.5 | 62.9 |
| Foreigners |  | 1.0 | 0.7 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 0.2 |
| Others | | 2.3 | 2.7 | 1.8 | 1.2 | 1.4 |
| Total | | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

*Source*: Mironov, Vol 3, Table 11.58, p. 315.

**Table 4.** Social origin of pupils of gymnasia and universities in 1843-1914 (in %).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Estate | Male gymnasia | | | | | Universities | | | | | |
|  | 1843 | 1863 | 1880 | 1898 | 1914 | 1855 | 1863 | 1880 | 1895 | 1914 | 1914\* |
| Nobility | 78.3 | 73.1 | 52.1 | 52.2 | 32.5 | 65.3 | 64.6 | 46.6 | 45.4 | 35.9 | 29.2 |
| Clergy | 1.7 | 2.8 | 5.1 | 3.4 | 7.1 | 8.2 | 8.3 | 23.4 | 4.9 | 10.3 | 3.8\* |
| Urban |  |  | 31.6 | 34.6 | 37.4 | 23.3 | 23.5 | 21.5 | 40.9 | 35.3 | 42 |
| Peasants |  |  | 6.9 | 7.1 | 20 | 1 | 1.6 | 3.3 | 6.8 | 14.5 | 20.8 |
| Others | 20 | 24.1 | 4.3 | 2.7 | 3 | 2.2 | 2 | 5.2 | 2 | 4 | 4.2 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

\* Composition of students in higher educational institutions of a technical profile.[[1]](#footnote-1)

*Source*: Mironov, Vol. 1, Table 2.43, p. 456.

*Note*: includes territories outside of present-day Russia.

**Table 5.** Number of pupils and shares of different estates in the pupil body, 1914.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | *Middle (sredniye) Technical colleges* | *Male Gymnasiums* | *Real’nyye uchilishcha* | *Women’s gymnasia* | | *Total pupils* | 8272 | 147751 | 80800 | 311637 | | Nobility | 10.71%    Hereditary: 259 (3.13%)/ Personal and officials: 627 (7.6%) | 32.67%  Hereditary: 12618 (8.54%)/ Personal and officials: 35659 (24.13%) | 22.57%  Hereditary: 4776 (5.9%)/ Personal and officials: 13465 (16.66%) | 21.9 %  Hereditary: 17005 (5.45%)/ Personal and officials: 51250 (16.44%) | | Clergy | 1.85  153 | 5.66  8,360 | 2.84  2,296 | 4.85 %  15,114 | | Merchants and honorary citizens | 5.31%  440 | 10.03%  14,832 | 9.54%  7,715 | 9.6%  29,889 | | Meshchane and artisans | 35%  2,892 | 26.82%  39,625 | 29.6%  23,953 | 35.23%  109,787 | | Peasants | 42%  3,471 | 19.74%  29,167 | 27.34%  22,094 | 23.17%  72,220 | |

*Source:* Data based on Imperial Ministry of public enlightenment reports for 1913, compiled by (Anfimov and Korelin 1995), Table 5, pp. 332-333. Percentages calculated by authors.

*Note*: includes territories outside of present-day Russia.

Tables 6 and 7 below come from a classic study of the emergence of the Soviet medical profession. The study found that vast numbers of ostensibly Soviet-trained doctors in the first decades of Soviet rule actually were educated in Imperial Russia. The study did not include estates. But because we know from the Tables presented above that Imperial tertiary institutions did not feature all estates equally in proportion to their population share, the medical profession like other white-collar high skilled occupations will have a proportional over-representation of those who came from the estates of nobles, clergy, merchants or meshchane. Again, because many nobles and clergy were targeted for persecution, we anticipate that many *meshchane* survived as professionals as Soviet Russia. Their human capital and professional aspirations would be passed on to their children who would ascend into more elite occupations if, for instance, the parent had trained as a school teacher.

**Table 6**. Number of registered doctors in the Russian Empire

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | Civilian | Military | All | Of whom female | Civilian doctors per 10,000 population | All doctors |
| 1897 | 13,813 | 3,186 | 16,999 | 608 | 1.09 | 1.26 |
| 1914 | 24,031 | [4,000] | 28,031 | 2,322 | 1.38 | 1.61 |
| 1915 | 18,320 | [11,000] | 29,320 | 3 | 1.31 |  |
| 1916 |  | [15,000] |  |  |  |  |
| 1917 | 14,000\* | [15,000] | 29,000 |  | 1.00 | 2.07 |

*Source*: data extracted for select years from Wheatcroft (1984), p. 21.

*Note*: excludes occupied territory; in 1915—Poland Vilno, Kovensk and Kholmsk Provinces; in 1917—pre-1939 area f USSR. Sources: official Russian (up to 1917) and Soviet (1917-) statistical compilations.

**Table 7**. Doctors listed in the USSR census of December 1926.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | Number of doctors | | | Annual additions of doctors at age of 25, excluding deaths and retirements | | |
| Year born | Year aged 25 | Aged in Dec 1926 | Male | Female | All | Male | Female | All |
| 1912-16 |  | 10-15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1910-11 |  | 16-17 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |
| 1908-09 |  | 18-19 | 7 | 11 | 18 |  |  |  |
| 1906-07 |  | 20-1 | 29 | 65 | 94 |  |  |  |
| 1903-05 |  | 22-4 | 640 | 1,369 | 2,009 |  |  |  |
| 1898-02 | 1922-26 | 25-9 | 5,089 | 6,911 | 12,000 | 1,018 | 1,382 | 2,400 |
| 1893-97 | 1917-21 | 30-4 | 7,175 | 4,675 | 11,850 | 1,638 | 935 | 2,370 |
| 1888-92 | 1912-16 | 35-9 | 5,974 | 3,438 | 9,420 | 1,195 | 688 | 1,882 |
| 1883-87 | 1907-11 | 40-4 | 4,303 | 1,740 | 6,043 | 861 | 348 | 1,209 |
| 1878-82 | 1902-06 | 45-9 | 2,548 | 1,048 | 3,596 | 510 | 210 | 719 |
| 1873-77 | 1897-01 | 50-4 | 2,205 | 460 | 2,665 | 441 | 92 | 533 |
| 1868-72 | 1892-96 | 55-9 | 1,509 | 176 | 1,685 |  |  |  |
| 1863-67 | 1887-91 | 60-4 | 973 | 63 | 1,036 |  |  |  |
| 1858-62 | 1882-86 | 5-9 | 60,635 | 641 |  |  |  | Before |
| Before | 70+ | 291 | 32 | 323 |  |  |  | Unknown |
|  |  | 32 | 25 | 57 |  |  |  | All |
|  |  | 31,381 | 20,049 | 51,430 |  |  |  |  |

*Source*: Wheatcroft (1984), p. 23.

*Note*: Annual additions to cohorts aged over 55 in Dec 1926 have not been calculated, because for these groups mortality and retirement would be far more significant. Wheatcroft (1984), p. 23.
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