

Research Article

Winner of the 12th Annual Graduate History Symposium
Best Paper Prize, University of Toronto, 2016

Popular Liberalism: Vladimir Anzimirov and the Influence of Imperial Russia's Penny Press

Felix Cowan

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

This article examines the founding of the Russian penny newspaper *Gazeta-Kopeika* and the influence of its first publisher, Vladimir Anzimirov. First published in June 1908, *Kopeika* was the Russian Empire's first newspaper to target the poor and working class as its primary audience and reached hundreds of thousands of Russians every day. Analyzing the content of *Kopeika's* first month of publication, this article argues that it served as a mouthpiece for Anzimirov's particular political views. It further contends that Anzimirov did not fit into defined trends of Russian political thought. Instead, he advocated a form of "popular liberalism" that combined a belief in liberal values and Russian backwardness with older populist ideas about the centrality of agriculture and the peasantry to Russian development. Bypassing traditional political parties and media, Anzimirov took his political ideas directly to the people via *Kopeika*, giving his views a wide popular audience and highlighting the blurred categorizations of political belief and ideology in the late Russian Empire.

IN THE WAKE OF RUSSIA'S 1905 revolution, the press found a new audience in Russia's lower classes. The newspaper *Gazeta-Kopeika* (Kopeck Gazette, hereafter *Kopeika*), first published in St. Petersburg on June 19, 1908,¹ rapidly established itself as the most popular newspaper in the Russian Empire because it was the first to make Russia's impoverished lower classes its primary audience. Expressing a liberal stance on most issues, *Kopeika* championed workers' rights and democratic institutions. But its first publisher, Vladimir Anzimirov, used *Kopeika* as an outlet for his own vision of Russian modernity, an agrarian rather than urban plan that combined elements of liberalism and development along western lines with older Russian populist ideas about the centrality of agriculture and the peasantry. Anzimirov did not neatly fit into any defined Russian political party or category, and instead existed in the marginal space between established programs. Yet his ideology—which I term "popular liberalism," to reflect both its ideological progenitors and the popularity of the papers with which he spread it—reached a potential audience of hundreds of thousands every day. Anzimirov wielded considerable influence by communicating his ideal vision of modernity directly to Russia's lower classes. His writing reminds us that formal political organizations were not the only forces in society advancing policies or shaping public opinion, and that private individuals could be more influential than grandiose political figures.

I use the term "lower classes" to refer to a nebulous group of Russians

that included the traditional "working class" of industrial labourers, but also those who might be called the working poor in industries such as day labour, petty trade, and domestic service, as well as the much larger peasantry. Drawn from multiple social estates, working in multiple professions, with multiple identities, associations, and cultures, it is nearly impossible to categorize these Russians into one neat group, hence the ambiguous term "lower classes." At times, these Russians distinguished themselves by who they were not, rather than who they were: they were included in neither the wealthy and privileged elite nor the small Russian "middle class" of professionals and merchants who were the typical audience for Russian newspapers before *Kopeika*. Russia's lower classes did share a paucity of disposable income, however, making them an ideal readership for *Kopeika*, which offered a chance to read the news for a single kopeck each day.²

This article builds on the work of several scholars who have studied *Kopeika* and the wider world of Russian newspapers. The classic study of Imperial Russia's mass circulation press is Louise McReynolds' *The News under Russia's Old Regime*.³ McReynolds describes *Kopeika* as essentially similar to existing middle class newspapers, St. Petersburg's so-called "boulevard" press. She highlights the role of the paper's editor, Mikhail Gorodetskii, rather than Anzimirov, in part because Anzimirov left St. Petersburg after less than a year to found and run the Moscow version of *Kopeika*. To McReynolds, *Kopeika* sought to integrate and assimilate workers, especially peasant migrants to the city, into urban bourgeois society

and the middle class liberal vision of Russia.⁴ Another renowned study, Jeffrey Brooks' *When Russia Learned to Read*, examines *Kopeika* and the kopeck papers it inspired as a site of cultural production for lower class print culture in the form of serialized fiction.⁵ Recent works of urban history have used *Kopeika* to explore daily life in St. Petersburg, particularly focusing on its regular columns on crime, accidents, suicides, and other events in the city. These works analyze how the press constructed urban modernity by populating the urban landscape with people, landmarks, and incidents.⁶ Offering a more partisan view, the Soviet historian of journalism B. I. Esin dismissed *Kopeika* and other penny press newspapers as creations of bourgeois "hucksters" that were derivative of earlier boulevard papers.⁷ Some studies of Russia's penny press have even left out *Kopeika*, focusing on the earlier boulevard papers rather than the first publication actually available for a single kopeck.⁸ Finally, other works on the press mention *Kopeika* briefly or not at all, but speak more broadly to the press's role in creating Russia's public sphere.⁹

Building on these works, I examine *Kopeika* as a source of political activism that sought to influence its readers toward a specific view of Russia and a specific program of agrarian development as described by Anzimirov's articles, as well as the paper's broader content. Despite wide circulation, *Kopeika*'s activism was not necessarily successful in influencing the newspaper's readers. Just because a popular newspaper commented on an issue does not mean its readers adopted the newspaper's view.¹⁰ Newspapers in

general, and Russian newspapers in particular, have been accepted as playing a role in shaping public opinion through editorial choices, in dialogue with readers' pre-existing biases and the newspaper's need to appeal to its readers in order to achieve commercial success.¹¹ However, commercial success meant greater influence in society. When successful newspapers linked sensational and commercially appealing journalism to social and political issues, they could exert a "subversive" influence far greater than the radical press.¹² This was the situation in which *Kopeika* found itself during Anzimirov's time as publisher. Its dramatic commercial success may have been due to sensational daily journalism and popular fiction rather than Anzimirov's political writing, but either way, its wide readership meant a wide potential audience for Anzimirov.

His writing reminds us that formal political organizations were not the only forces in society advancing policies or shaping public opinion

If some readers flipped through his articles, surely others read every word and perhaps even adopted his popular liberal ideas.

Gazeta-Kopeika in 1908 St. Petersburg

KOPEIKA OCCUPIED A RAPIDLY changing city when it began publication in June 1908. A massive wave of migration brought over one million new residents to the city in two decades, predominantly from peasant villages in the Russian countryside.¹³ New migrants entered the St. Petersburg industrial labour market but more commonly found jobs in other low-skill occupations like petty commerce, domestic service, day labour, transportation, and construction.¹⁴ The wages these industries offered were well below the urban cost of living, and most workers had trouble making ends meet.¹⁵ In popular culture, peasant migrants were often pilloried as backward, and they were pressured to abandon village culture in favour of urban norms. Popular culture reflected the stresses placed on migrants who were pulled between different classes, locales, and identities. Conversely, some peasants feared the city as a corrupting influence on traditional peasant morality.¹⁶ Most importantly for this study, literacy was rapidly increasing. St. Petersburg's inhabitants were mostly literate by the time of the 1897 Russian census, with men and youths particularly likely to be literate. Literacy, though, was fairly limited: most had only completed one or two years of school and were unable to write, though they could read well enough to follow the basic print culture that targeted the lower classes.¹⁷

In such circumstances, *Kopeika* offered St. Petersburg's cash-strapped lower classes the opportunity to read the news while saving a few kopecks. Where conditions previously had not allowed for a lower-class newspaper, *Kopeika* took advantage of the relaxation of censorship since the 1905 revolution and the advancement of printing technology, in addition to the emergence of a lower-class readership.¹⁸ *Kopeika* was founded in this new environment by Mikhail Gorodetskii, credited as editor and publisher, and Vladimir Anzimirov, credited only as publisher. Gorodetskii was a liberal Jew from Donetsk province who had worked his way up through the news business from selling newspapers to running them, and whose journalism had previously focused on the poor workers of southwestern Russia.¹⁹ Most scholarship on *Kopeika*'s staff centres on Gorodetskii, who remained in place as editor and publisher until 1918, when he died and the Bolsheviks shut down the paper. But Gorodetskii rarely wrote for the paper. In later years, *Kopeika*'s tone would be set primarily by two leading journalists and feuilletonists, Olga Gridina and O. Ia. Blotermants.²⁰ In its first months, however, *Kopeika*'s tone was dictated by Anzimirov, who penned numerous articles under his own name and multiple pseudonyms, and whose articles set the broader tone for the paper's reporting.²¹

Anzimirov was born in 1859 in Barnaul, Western Siberia, to a noble family. His mother's uncle was Count Fedor Litke, an admiral and at one time the president of the Russian Academy of Sciences. In his youth, Anzimirov was a radical. During four years (1877–1880) at the Moscow Petrovskiaia Academy

of Agriculture and Forestry he helped organize populist groups, including a circle at his school representing *Narodnaia Volia* (The People's Will), a revolutionary populist organization responsible for the assassination of Tsar Alexander II in 1881. Anzimirov even spent a month in prison in 1879, suspected of murdering a secret policeman, before joining the more peaceful populist group *Chernyi Peredel* (Black Repartition) at the end of 1879. He was expelled from school in 1880 and retreated to an estate in Ryazan province, but was kept under state surveillance for 15 years. Turning to legal activism, Anzimirov became deeply involved in efforts to promote Russia's social and economic development, particularly in agricultural productivity—for example, he was one of the first people in Russia to mass produce phosphate fertilizer. He published numerous articles on the subject in the journal *Khoziain* (Landlord), as well as monographs with titles such as *On Fertilizer*, and articles in publications, such as *Russkoe Bogatstvo* (Russian Wealth), *Russkoe Slovo* (Russian Word), and *Birzheviia Vedomosti* (Stock Exchange News). He was also involved in *zemstvo*²² institutions in the Ryazan, Klinsky, and Moscow districts, serving on *zemstvo* boards, as the secretary of agricultural societies, and as a local magistrate. Anzimirov's involvement in the press extended beyond *Kopeika*—he set up several other publications between 1908 and 1912: *Derevenskaia Gazeta* (Village Gazette), *Put'* (The Way), *Kinematograf* (Cinematography), and *Detskii Mir* (Children's World), sometimes with surrogates listed as editor and publisher and sometimes under Anzimirov's own

name. He also directed two publishing houses, "The People's Benefit" after 1895 and "The People's Publishing House" after 1909. But *Kopeika* was where Anzimirov was most influential.²³

Gorodetskii and Anzimirov's newspaper was an instant success. Circulation rose from its initial 11,000 copies to 150,000 in 1909 and peaked at 250,000 in 1910, a level that held for several years. In addition, street sales climbed from two million copies sold in 1908 to 10 million in 1909 and reached a peak of 17 million in 1911. *Kopeika* rapidly became the most popular newspaper in St. Petersburg and even in the whole empire, with the highest circulation and some of the highest street sales of all Russian newspapers. Actual readership was even higher since copies were often shared among multiple readers.²⁴ Indeed, *Kopeika* was so successful that it was able to outfit its own modern press capable of printing 112,000 issues per hour.²⁵ In terms of readership, evidence points to *Kopeika* reaching a previously untapped market. Sales of established boulevard papers like *Peterburgskii Listok* (Petersburg List) were unaffected by *Kopeika*'s growth, implying that *Kopeika*'s readers were not drawn from the middle-class audience of the existing boulevard press.²⁶ Finally, *Kopeika* was also influential within the newspaper world, as dozens of other kopeck dailies sprang up across the empire.²⁷

Compared to other newspapers, *Kopeika*'s unprecedented characteristics were its low price, its intended readership, and its success. Previous papers, such as *Moskovskii Listok* (Moscow List), had included lower-class readers in their audience, but were

not primarily targeted at them and never reached the heights of *Kopeika*'s circulation.²⁸ Large national newspapers had for decades offered the same kind of content as *Kopeika*: political editorials, brief news stories from across Russia and the world, crime and justice columns, and so on.²⁹ In many ways, *Kopeika* followed in the footsteps of middle-class boulevard newspapers like *Peterburgskii Listok*, which synthesized cultural, political, and social news in a single publication primarily focused on daily events in St. Petersburg.³⁰ *Kopeika*, though, provided broader coverage: in its first months, compared to *Peterburgskii Listok*, *Kopeika* offered less local and more international news.³¹ Finally, the Russian press also included an official outlet of the liberal Constitutional Democratic Party (the Kadets), *Rech'* (Speech), which was edited by the Kadets' leader, Paul Miliukov. But *Rech'* was unsuccessful as a mass paper: it had a small circulation, failed in attempts to reach the lower classes, and relied on subsidies from wealthy benefactors because it never turned a profit.³²

One area where *Kopeika* distinguished itself was its relative lack of advertising, which may point to financial support from Anzimirov. In its early years, *Kopeika* carried proportionally less advertising than other mass circulation papers.³³ What advertisements it did carry tended to be less conspicuous: papers like *Peterburgskii Listok*, *Peterburgskaia Gazeta* (Petersburg Gazette), *Novoe Vremia* (New Times), and *Russkoe Slovo* typically filled their front pages with advertisements that could cover half the page or even leave just a small corner for newspaper content. On the other hand, *Kopeika* carried

very few front-page advertisements. In its first weeks it carried none, typically only including a few advertisements on the back page. Even by the end of 1908, issues typically had only one or two front-page advertisements and held the rest to the back of the paper. In this respect *Kopeika* was similar to the unprofitable *Rech'* rather than the other mass circulation papers, indicating that *Kopeika* may have also relied on subsidies at the beginning of its life, before its circulation reached its height.³⁴ If *Kopeika* did receive subsidies at the start, they likely came from Anzimirov himself given his involvement in setting up other newspapers and publishing houses, his own personal wealth compared to Gorodetskii's background of poverty, and the degree to which early issues of *Kopeika* were filled with his articles and centred on his favourite themes.

Vladimir Anzimirov's Popular Liberalism in *Gazeta-Kopeika*

THE DOMINANT STRAIN OF RUSSIAN liberalism grew out of the *zemstvo* and by 1908 was concentrated in the Kadets. Ideologically closer to the period's interventionist liberals than classical liberalism, the Kadet program advocated traditional liberal values like the rule of law, personal liberty, judicial independence, and legal equality, but also included more specifically Russian and broad-based policies like free movement, decentralization of political authority, the right to unionize and strike, and progressive tax reform.³⁵ Miliukov claimed with pride that the Kadets were the most left-wing major political party in Europe, and the Kadets

wanted to build a mass party that would include workers.³⁶ But, despite their best efforts, the Kadets remained primarily an urban bourgeois party populated by professionals, academics, and white-collar workers.³⁷ Anzimirov closely resembled the older *zemstvo* liberals whose ideas about mass education, the rule of law, representative government, reformism, and professional service to the Russian people had evolved into the Kadet platform.³⁸ But his agrarian proposals also seem derived from Russian populism, a defunct ideology emphasizing the centrality of Russia's vast peasantry and countryside to revolutionary progress.³⁹ Anzimirov's unique proposal was a Russian homestead system of peasant settlers onto land reclaimed by the state, and the resulting centrality of the peasantry to his popular liberalism set him apart from his contemporaries. When Anzimirov's writing reached hundreds of thousands of readers, he promoted an ideology that was not represented by Russia's established political parties and movements.

Anzimirov was a remarkably prolific writer. In the first month of *Kopeika's* publication, he authored more articles than anyone else. Under his own name and the pseudonyms Bat'ko and Mirskoi, Anzimirov signed off on 20 articles, editorials, and even fairy tales.⁴⁰ The next most productive writer, N. I. Vasil'ev, signed 14 articles under his own name and pseudonyms, followed by the sport columnist Kitych with 11 articles and the pseudonym Svoi who authored nine, neither of whose identities could be verified.⁴¹ Pseudonyms were so common in *Kopeika* that Anzimirov alone, in just 12 articles signed with

his real name—primarily in his lengthy serialized editorial “How to Get Rich?”—accounted for 29 per cent of all articles, in the first month of publication. His influence over *Kopeika's* editorial stance was even greater. Editorials in *Kopeika* occupied a prime location at the front of the paper: first page, first column. Like other Russian newspapers of the time, *Kopeika* led most issues with an untitled and unsigned editorial followed by one or two additional editorials, sometimes signed and sometimes unsigned. Anzimirov wrote 67 per cent of all *Kopeika's* signed editorials in the first month of publication, under his own name or the pseudonym Mirskoi. Including all editorials, signed and unattributed, Anzimirov personally wrote 30 per cent of the 54 editorials *Kopeika* published in its first month. Considering how much he wrote for the paper, it is also highly likely that Anzimirov wrote, co-wrote, or influenced the writing of many of *Kopeika's* unsigned editorials. In short, in numerical terms, Anzimirov was the most prolific of *Kopeika's* staff and wielded a considerable degree of influence over its editorial page and editorial policy. His prolificacy, editorial influence, and willingness to openly attach his name to the ideas presented in the paper also reveal how closely Anzimirov and *Kopeika* were linked. Even when Anzimirov did not personally write or sign *Kopeika's* articles, I argue that they still reflected his ideas and his influence.⁴²

The content of *Kopeika's* articles, both by Anzimirov and others, clearly demonstrates how the paper followed Anzimirov's lead editorially and served as an outlet for his popular liberalism.

Anzimirov's signed writing appeared as early as the second article of the first issue. Following *Kopeika's* opening editorial proclaiming its “peaceful, creative work,” Anzimirov (writing as Mirskoi) penned an editorial about rural education, remarking that “ignorance” was “the most tender spot of our life” and “the most necessary person in the village is, of course, the teacher.”⁴³ Later in the same issue, under the pseudonym Bat'ko, Anzimirov included a fable with the moral to be open to new ideas and “let everyone live as they like.”⁴⁴ Anzimirov's interest in fiction, often with heavy-handed morals and metaphors that suggested his interest in proselytizing directly to an unsophisticated audience, would continue: from the first issue

reason.”⁴⁶ Appeals to reason, personal freedom, education, and constructive work were emblematic of Anzimirov's popular liberal politics, and also of Russian liberalism more broadly.

As Mirskoi, Anzimirov published multiple editorials calling for broader education, frequently crediting the West's success to mass education. He attributed the importance of an eight-hour workday to workers' pursuit of education in their increased leisure time, while also emphasizing education's role in increasing worker productivity so that the eight-hour day could be realized.⁴⁷ He clearly had a high opinion of *Kopeika's* potential, at one point declaring “let a monument of education be created, for one kopeck each, with the

When successful newspapers linked sensational and commercially appealing journalism to social and political issues, they could exert a “subversive” influence far greater than the radical press

on, notices regularly proclaimed that *Kopeika* would, in the future, publish Anzimirov's serialized novel *The Dregs*.⁴⁵ As Bat'ko, Anzimirov published another fable a week after his first, a piece that showed Anzimirov's shortcomings as a writer but contained two messages: warmth, light, and growth can overcome darkness and destruction; and “One need not be intrusive, even for the best of intentions! Otherwise you will sooner or later become hated and you will kill the best idea with excess zeal, not

hands of the people! Before the eyes of all mankind it will show that our people [...] are not worse than the peoples that gave the world Goethe, Shakespeare, Lessing, and Washington!”⁴⁸ Education was even the answer to famine, as Anzimirov noted that “The educated countries have not known hunger for a long time,” and the solution to Russia's frequent famines was therefore “broad education of the masses.”⁴⁹ Although calls for wider education, a common liberal refrain, were primarily found in

Anzimirov's articles—indeed, they were frequent enough that at one point he exasperatedly asked “do I have to repeat the alphabet?” before advocating an expanded education system⁵⁰—anxiety over Russia's backwardness compared to the “western” countries of Europe and North America was not unique to his writing. Rather, this theme recurred throughout *Kopeika's* coverage of numerous issues, which typically argued for liberal reforms to align Russia more closely with the West.

Criticism of the government and calls for reform were hardly new to newspapers in either Russia or the West.⁵¹ *Kopeika* was no different. At various times, editorials called for progress toward an independent judiciary, equal rights for women, state support for single mothers, safety regulations for dangerous industries such as construction and mining, action against corruption, and support for unemployed workers.⁵² Most frequently, though, *Kopeika* touted the benefits of Russia's State Duma, the new parliament set up due to the 1905 revolution, which was dramatically and undemocratically restructured to benefit the nobility and other conservative groups in 1907. *Kopeika's* writers acknowledged the new Duma's drawbacks, but attempted to soothe budding discontent at its takeover by insisting the Duma's symbolic value was greater than its instrumental one. “Is it possible to sum up the work of the Third Duma in its first session?” a *Kopeika* editorial asked, before concluding, “No, this time has not yet come. [...] The results of all this work will only manifest themselves at a later date.” This editorial went on to claim that the Duma's primary purpose

was not passing legislation, but rather “strengthening national representation in Russia,” a goal it achieved simply by continuing to exist.⁵³ Furthermore, *Kopeika* depicted the Duma as the place where “the pulse of national life” beat, and when it was not in session “life comes to a standstill.” If some of its deputies did not deserve their positions, *Kopeika* implored its readers not to let their bad behaviour “undermine the people's inclination towards the very idea of popular representation.”⁵⁴ Indeed, *Kopeika* thought it self-evident “that without the people's representatives, without the Duma, it is impossible to cure the chronic diseases of our homeland.”⁵⁵ Editorials even claimed that Russia's Duma was the envy of countries outside Europe.⁵⁶ In addition, *Kopeika* combined its calls for liberal reform and democracy with critiques of Russian backwardness. Anzimirov himself implored two Duma deputies planning a duel to resolve their dispute with “the noble, peaceful weapon of words” rather than violence, and alcoholism was a frequent subject of criticism that was depicted as actively harming Russia's youth.⁵⁷ More frequently, though, *Kopeika's* critiques of Russian backwardness were simply lines within articles stating that in Europe or North America they had a solution to whatever problem Russia faced, or that such a problem no longer happened in the West at all.⁵⁸

In many respects, then, *Kopeika* was a traditionally liberal Russian paper.⁵⁹ It followed a tradition of liberalism in Russian newspapers that advanced the expansion of political and civil rights, criticism of older, arbitrary forms of rule, advocacy of the rule of law and

private property, and a sense of duty to the public in a mass sense, rather than to narrow political goals.⁶⁰ *Kopeika*, in turn, at times backed the Kadets and Miliukov. Both Miliukov and *Kopeika* vehemently attacked the same right-wing groups;⁶¹ *Kopeika's* coverage (including an article by Anzimirov) of a legal battle between Miliukov as editor of *Rech'* and the Russian newspaper *Rus'* strongly favoured Miliukov;⁶² *Kopeika* also gave Miliukov a glowing review for a speech to the All-Russian Congress of Journalists in which he praised the press's role in Russia's ongoing democratization.⁶³

However, it is too simplistic to say *Kopeika* was entirely a liberal paper in the vein of the Kadets. Indeed, Anzimirov differed from them in significant ways and his importance to the newspaper in its first months meant that during that time *Kopeika* acted more as an outlet for his own popular liberalism. In his serialized editorial, “How to Get Rich?” Anzimirov delineated a view of agrarian modernity for Russia that differed sharply from the Kadet vision for the future of the Russian countryside. In these articles, billed as “Simple talk about serious things,” Anzimirov laid out the basis of his agrarian program. His primary argument was for Russia to unlock the potential of its vast geography in order to reach the levels of productivity and wealth in Europe and North America by expanding onto the unused “wasteland, swamp, taiga, tundra, and steppe” that occupied 94 per cent of the Russian Empire. Since Russia was “predominantly agricultural,” the solution to Russia's problems would also be agricultural.⁶⁴ Some of his proposals were common

Kopeika rapidly became the most popular newspaper in St. Petersburg and even in the whole empire

sense modernization strategies like the introduction of modern fertilizers, seeds, and agricultural techniques, but others included a call for the state “to conduct economic policy in the interests of the main occupation of the people, agriculture” rather than urban trade or industry.⁶⁵ It was this prioritization of the countryside that set him furthest apart from mainstream Russian liberalism as represented by the Kadets, who tended to express vague and indecisive views on agrarian issues so as not to alienate any part of their big tent party. When the Kadets did articulate a position, it was for a land bank to provide state, crown, church, and some expropriated land to poor peasants, a contradictory compromise between Kadets who favoured widespread expropriation and those who wanted strong respect for private property rights.⁶⁶ The confused nature of Kadet agrarian policy likely further entrenched the popular view of them as an urban bourgeois party whose reformism protected entrenched interests.⁶⁷

It would be hard for any reader to describe Anzimirov's agrarian proposals as confused or vague. They laid out in

Anzimirov wanted a return to the land with economic policy that favoured agriculture and uplifted the peasantry

specific detail all the ways Anzimirov thought Russian peasants, if equipped with the correct tools, could improve agricultural productivity. He firmly believed Russia had the capacity to achieve such goals, writing that “To increase our crop yield (*sam*⁶⁸) is entirely in our hands,” both in individual agricultural activities and in the state’s capacity to assist the peasantry.⁶⁹ Anzimirov’s own experience in agronomy shone through as he listed the various ways to improve crop yields. Based on his understanding of agriculture in the West, he described in precise detail the need for agricultural mechanization; the uses of different kinds of fertilizers; and the most efficient sizes and shapes for new individual plots of farmland, rejecting both traditional Russian strip holdings and new plots of land, known as *otruby*, created by the ongoing agrarian reforms of Prime Minister Petr Stolypin.⁷⁰ Moreover, Anzimirov described the crucial role of the state in western

countries, conducting “a thorough land survey” during the construction of new railroads and even giving away land “on favourable terms, sometimes for free (based on future taxes or goods from the farmers who settled there).” Such a policy yielded further benefits: entrepreneurs and settlers following the railroad “erected factories, farms, mines, schools, hospitals, etc., earning huge fortunes from turning [acres] of wasteland, which cost pennies or rubles, into land that quickly amounts to hundreds and even thousands of rubles.”⁷¹

Anzimirov wanted a similarly involved role for the Russian state, the only force capable of enacting his desired changes. Reclamation of unproductive land was “beyond the power of the emaciated peasant, who has neither the knowledge nor the capital to do so, but is even beyond wealthier entrepreneurs.” Instead, the process of mass land reclamation and the construction of communications infrastructure to new land was “a state matter,” an investment that would be recovered through nonspecific remuneration after the land was given away to peasants. Such an effort would solve Russia’s land problem by allowing millions of peasants to productively relocate from crowded and inefficient agricultural land in the most populated parts of Russia.⁷² Anzimirov criticized recent government policies as too short-term. He claimed Russia needed lengthy work over several generations, again following his vision of western development.⁷³ Most importantly, he argued, “It is necessary to abandon the idea of creating industry at agriculture’s expense.” Rather than promote urban industrial development,

Anzimirov wanted a return to the land with economic policy that favoured agriculture and uplifted the peasantry. “A dense network of schools” in rural areas would create “a new Russian generation” that, from the “land-nurse,” could “gain new strength, harden their health, and strengthen their souls.” By such means, “future Russian leaders” and “real workers” would emerge from the peasantry and create “private and social welfare, like in America.”⁷⁴ But, to achieve this success required extensive state support for homestead settlers on new land.

At the time, there was an ongoing resettlement program relocating Russian peasants to the east, but its budget was stretched very thin.⁷⁵ To Anzimirov, such a program only attracted the weakest peasants and was thus doomed to failure. To attract strong settlers, who could remain on their new land and thrive, as they supposedly had “in Germany, England, and America,” required state support in the form of agricultural technicians and associations that could organize the new land productively.⁷⁶ If such efforts to enrich the peasantry were successful, Russia would then establish a massive internal market for industry and commerce, in turn strengthening those areas of the Russian economy. After all, to provide one example of Anzimirov’s reasoning, “If the Russian peasant woman, like the German, began to wear two pairs of long underwear a year, then for this *one* new demand we would need to build 30 new cotton-weaving factories.”⁷⁷

Anzimirov’s agrarian ideas did not fit established political thought. He promoted private property in the form of settler homesteads, which set

him apart from the left wing of the Russian political spectrum.⁷⁸ His ideas about the development of a peasant market found their closest analogue in the columns of A. I. Chuprov, a populist professor who wrote on economics for the liberal newspaper *Russkiiia Vedemosti* (Russian Bulletin).⁷⁹ Anzimirov’s interest in personal improvement through agricultural work resembled earlier Russian populists’ notions of learning from the peasantry. But, Anzimirov’s adoption of western economic ideas set him apart from the 1870s populist movement. By advocating state involvement in nation building, Anzimirov’s program in some ways resembled older Russian liberal traditions carried on by the Kadets.⁸⁰ Indeed, in many ways, in both his personal background and his writing, Anzimirov resembled a classic *zemstvo* liberal. *Zemstvo* liberalism had mostly disappeared after the 1905 revolution in a wave of conservative reaction, and in any case, *zemstvo* liberals were ineffectual at mobilizing support for their ideas through means such as newspapers or political action outside the insular world of the provincial gentry.⁸¹ Anzimirov clearly defied this rule. Even if his political ideas corresponded to *zemstvo* liberalism and the Kadets, the centrality and specificity of his agrarian ideas did not place him ideologically in line within any of the existing political parties.⁸²

In his autobiography, Anzimirov described himself as a “nonpartisan progressive-populist” and in his writing he explicitly rejected party views on agrarian issues.⁸³ In short, his popular liberalism defied contemporary classifications. However, even as he

refused to fit into any ordered political category, Anzimirov’s writing reached hundreds of thousands of lower-class Russians, a wider readership than any official party newspaper could claim. Of course, it is impossible to guarantee that Anzimirov’s readers adopted his ideas; many surely ignored his lengthy essays on economics. Yet Anzimirov’s personal views were deeply embedded in *Kopeika* in several ways. First, as its most prolific writer in its first month of publication, he set the editorial tone that others followed. Second, he may have acted as a financial backer for the paper in

rapidly reached its own high circulation numbers of 60,000 in 1909 and 150,000 by 1912 but frequently clashed with the authorities over its radicalism.⁸⁴ In the Moscow edition, Anzimirov quickly reprinted much of his own writing, including his fairy tales, his serialized novels, and “How to Get Rich?” Clearly, he felt these pieces remained relevant and worthy of spreading to the lower-class readership of Moscow as well as St. Petersburg. Indeed, through the daily publication of both *Kopeikas*, Anzimirov’s popular liberalism may have reached a larger and broader

Anzimirov reminds us of the blurred boundaries that prevent neat categorizations of political beliefs

its early days, ensuring an outlet for his own writing. Third, he attempted to communicate his ideas in ways that would appeal to his lower-class audience, by billing his own writing as a simple take on complex issues and advancing concepts through fables and editorials as well as lengthy essays.

Anzimirov left St. Petersburg after less than a year to found and edit a Moscow edition of *Kopeika*, which

audience than the more classically liberal ideas spread by newspapers like *Rech’* and *Russkiiia Vedemosti*. In the process, Anzimirov reminds us of the blurred boundaries that prevent neat categorizations of political beliefs and points out that those individuals who existed between defined political programs could still exert powerful and widespread influence in society.

Appendix A: Attributed authors of signed *Gazeta-Kopeika* articles

IN TOTAL, *GAZETA-KOPEIKA* PUBLISHED 131 signed articles in its first 26 issues, covering the first month of publication from June 19, 1908 to July 18, 1908 (*Kopeika* did not publish on Mondays at the time). Forty-one of these articles were signed using the author’s real name, typically in the form of first initial and last name (e.g. “V. Anzimirov”), or what could conceivably have been an author’s real name.⁸⁵ The other 90 articles were published under pseudonyms or merely initials. Signed articles included not only journalism and regular columns, but also fiction, poetry, sport, and theatre sections, as well as letters to the editor, jokes, and historical articles.

During the month under review, Vladimir Aleksandrovich Anzimirov wrote 12 articles under his own name (one editorial, one feuilleton, and 10 entries in his serialized editorial essay “How to Get Rich?”), six articles under the pseudonym Mirskoi (five editorials and one regular article), and two fables under the pseudonym Bat’ko. He may have also written three articles (two editorials and one regular article) under the initial A, but this could not be verified. In total (not counting articles published by “A”), Anzimirov authored 15 per cent of the paper’s total signed content and 29 per cent of the paper’s content signed under a real name rather than a pseudonym.

During this single month, *Kopeika* published 54 total editorials—meaning argumentative pieces published in the traditional editorial space at the beginning of the first page—before any other columns. Twenty-four out of 54

were signed with a name or pseudonym. The other 30 were unsigned. Sixteen of the 24 signed editorials were attributed to Anzimirov, under his own name and the pseudonym Mirskoi, meaning that he was directly responsible for 67 per cent of signed editorials and 30 per cent of all editorials. It is likely he also played a role in writing at least some of the unsigned editorials, but this cannot be verified.

Kopeika’s editor, Mikhail Borisovich Gorodetskii, did not sign any articles or editorials during this month, either under his own name or a known pseudonym. If he played any role in writing for the paper, it was solely in the form of unsigned pieces or editorial influence over other writers’ articles.

The paper’s second most prolific author was Nikolai Ivanovich Vasil’ev, who published 14 articles in total. Vasil’ev published four articles under his own name (three editorials and one regular article), nine articles under the pseudonym Smaragd Gornostaev, or “Emerald of the Ermines” (including five entries in the regular columns “Around Russia” and “The Maelstrom of Life”) and one article under the initials N. V. The third most prolific author published 11 entries in *Kopeika*’s regular sport column under the pseudonym Kitych, real name unknown. The fourth most prolific author published under the pseudonym Svoi, a Russian word roughly translating to “One’s Own,” which was a common pseudonym at the time and may have represented more than one author, real name or names unknown. The pseudonym Svoi was attached to nine articles, including two editorials and two entries in the regular column “Around Russia.”

ENDNOTES

¹ Dates in this paper follow the Julian (Old Style) calendar, in use in Russia until 1918. In 1908, this calendar was 13 days behind the Gregorian (New Style) calendar.

² In making this classification, I draw on the analysis of Mark Steinberg and Stephen Frank, who express similar difficulties in finding a single term to describe the “tenuous relativity and ambiguity of social boundaries” and the corresponding “inadequacy of simple and rigid categories such as *peasants* or *workers* to express the variety of situations, mentalities, and even identities among the urban and rural poor” (italics in original). See Stephen P. Frank and Mark D. Steinberg, eds., *Cultures in Flux: Lower-Class Values, Practices, and Resistance in Late Imperial Russia* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 3.

³ Louise McReynolds, *The News under Russia's Old Regime: The Development of a Mass Circulation Press* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991). McReynolds' section on *Kopeika* is on pages 225–239.

⁴ McReynolds has expanded on this theme in “St. Petersburg's ‘Boulevard’ Press and the Process of Urbanization,” *Journal of Urban History* 18, no. 2 (1992): 123–40. This vision of *Kopeika* conflicts to a degree with Mark Steinberg's writing about the *Kopeika* columnist Olga Gridina, who warned Russians, especially women, against the city as a debauched and immoral showcase for the darkest parts of modernity. See Mark D. Steinberg, “Feeling Modern on the Russian Street: From Desire to Despair,” in *The Routledge Handbook of Gender and the Urban Experience*, ed. Deborah Simonton (New York: Routledge, 2017). Elsewhere, McReynolds has described *Kopeika*, in the context of the First World War, as encouraging its readers to abandon class identities in favour of wartime nationalism, moving away from the sense of it as a primarily urban paper found in her work on *Kopeika* before the war. See McReynolds, “Mobilizing Petrograd's Lower Classes to Fight the Great War: Patriotism as a Counterweight to Working-Class Consciousness in *Gazeta-kopeika*,” *Radical History Review* 57 (1993): 160–80.

⁵ Jeffrey Brooks, *When Russia Learned to Read: Literacy and Popular Literature, 1861–1917* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), 130–41.

⁶ See, for example, Joan Neuberger, *Hooliganism: Crime, Culture, and Power in St. Petersburg* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993); Mark D. Steinberg, *Petersburg Fin de Siècle* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011); Julie A. Buckler, *Mapping St. Petersburg: Imperial Text and Cityshape* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005).

⁷ B. I. Esin, *Ruskaia dorevoliutsionnaia gazeta, 1702–1917 gg.: Kratkii ocherk* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo Universiteta, 1971), 72–73.

⁸ Daniel R. Brower, “The Penny Press and Its Readers,” in *Cultures in Flux: Lower-Class Values, Practices, and Resistance in Late Imperial Russia*, ed. Stephen P. Frank and Mark D. Steinberg (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 147–67.

⁹ See, for example, Daniel Balmuth, *The Russian Bulletin, 1863–1917: A Liberal Voice in Tsarist Russia* (New York: Peter Lang, 2000); Octavie Bellavance, “Fourth Estate, Fifth Power: The Daily Press, the Public and Politics in Russia, 1861–1907” (PhD diss., Yale University, 2015). Representing a similar trend, Solomon Volkov briefly mentions *Kopeika* but adds nothing that is not covered in other works. See Solomon Volkov, *St. Petersburg: A Cultural History*, trans. Antonina W. Bouis (New York: Free Press, 1995), 153.

¹⁰ McReynolds has characterized Russia's press and influential journalists as not telling their readers “what to think” but rather telling them “what to think about,” that is, setting the agenda for public discourse. See Louise McReynolds, “V. M. Doroshevich: The Newspaper Journalist and the Development of Public Opinion in Civil Society,” in *Between Tsar and*

People: Educated Society and the Quest for Public Identity in Late Imperial Russia, ed. Edith W. Clowes, Samuel D. Kassow, and James L. West (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), 247; McReynolds, *The News*, 28. On the other hand, the idea that the press has the ability to set the agenda for public discourse is ambiguous and contested. Another theory has been put forward by David Paul Nord, stating that newspapers are one of many potential agenda-setting institutions and often, rather than set the agenda themselves, do so on behalf of other powerful interests. See David Paul Nord, *Newspapers and New Politics: Midwestern Municipal Reform, 1890–1900* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1981), 16–18.

¹¹ Neuberger, *Hooliganism*, 19–20; McReynolds, *The News*, 146–47; McReynolds, “‘Boulevard’ Press,” 125–26; Balmuth, *The Russian Bulletin*, 6; Nord, *Newspapers and New Politics*, 9, 13; Jacob Walkin, “Government Controls Over the Press in Russia, 1905–1914,” *Russian Review* 13, no. 3 (1954): 209; Brower, “The Penny Press,” 150; Peter Fritzsche, *Reading Berlin 1900* (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1998), 6. In addition, not all Russian newspapers had political goals; some merely sought profit. See Brower, “The Penny Press,” 151.

¹² Jonathan W. Daly, “Government, Press, and Subversion in Russia, 1906–1917,” *The Journal of the Historical Society* 9, no. 1 (2009): 26.

¹³ James H. Bater, “Between Old and New: St. Petersburg in the Late Imperial Era,” in *The City in Late Imperial Russia*, ed. Michael F. Hamm (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986), 46; Robert B. McKean, *St. Petersburg Between the Revolutions: Workers and Revolutionaries, June 1907–February 1917* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 16, table 1.vi. On peasant migration, see also Evel Economakis, *From Peasant to Petersburg* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998). Much of this migration could be temporary or precarious, as close to 60 per cent of migrants to St. Petersburg either died or left the city within 10 years. See Elise Kimerling Wirtschafter, *Social Identity in Imperial Russia* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1997), 146.

¹⁴ Richard H. Rowland, “Urban In-Migration in Late Nineteenth-Century Russia,” in *The City in Russian History*, ed. Michael F. Hamm (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1976), 120–22; Bater, “Between Old and New,” 48–50; Daniel R. Brower, “Urban Revolution in the Late Russian Empire,” in *The City in Late Imperial Russia*, ed. Michael F. Hamm (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986), 324–25; McKean, *St. Petersburg*, 3–5.

¹⁵ Bater, “Between Old and New,” 50–51; James H. Bater, *St. Petersburg: Industrialization and Change* (London: Edward Arnold, 1976), 256; W. Bruce Lincoln, *In War's Dark Shadow: The Russians Before the Great War* (New York: The Dial Press, 1983), 119; Walter Sablinsky, *The Road to Bloody Sunday: Father Gapon and the St. Petersburg Massacre of 1905* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976), 9; McKean, *St. Petersburg*, 34–36.

¹⁶ James von Geldern, “Life In-Between: Migration and Popular Culture in Late Imperial Russia,” *Russian Review* 55, no. 3 (1996): 368–372, 382; Barbara Alpern Engel, “Russian Peasant Views of City Life, 1861–1914,” *Slavic Review* 52, no. 3 (1993): 449–50.

¹⁷ McKean, *St. Petersburg*, 23; Brooks, *When Russia Learned to Read*, 35–58. Literacy was especially prized for workers as it increased productivity, and as a result factory schools and adult education classes also became increasingly widespread, though these in many cases faced difficulties from the authorities and tended to enrol those who were already at least somewhat literate. See Leonid Borodkin and Evgeny Chugunov, “The Reading Culture of Russian Workers in the Early Twentieth Century (Evidence from Public Library Records),” in *The Space of the Book: Print Culture in the Russian Social Imagination*, ed. Miranda Remnek (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011), 144–47; Madhavan K. Palat, “Casting Workers as an Estate in Late Imperial Russia,” *Kritika* 8, no. 2 (2007): 334;

Daniel R. Brower, *The Russian City Between Tradition and Modernity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 165.

¹⁸ See Daly, “Government, Press, and Subversion,” 27–42; Charles A. Ruud, “Russia,” in *The War for the Public Mind: Political Censorship in Nineteenth-Century Europe*, ed. Robert Justin Goldstein (Westport: Praeger, 2000), 247–49; Benjamin Rigberg, “The Efficacy of Tsarist Censorship Operations, 1894–1917,” *Jahrbücher Für Geschichte Osteuropas* 14, no. 3 (1966): 327–46; McReynolds, *The News*, 228–29.

¹⁹ McReynolds, *The News*, 228–29; Brooks, *When Russia Learned to Read*, 130–31.

²⁰ McReynolds, *The News*, 230–31. On Gridina, see Steinberg, “Feeling Modern.”

²¹ Of course, *Kopeika* was not shaped entirely by either Anzimirov or Gorodetskii. As David Paul Nord has pointed out, there are two competing visions of newspapers’ origins: formed by the actions of “Great Men,” press barons who use newspapers to push their own agendas, or by “Great Forces,” changing circumstances making it inevitable that a newspaper will emerge to fill some newly created gap. See David Paul Nord, *Communities of Journalism: A History of American Newspapers and Their Readers* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2001), 133–34. The circumstances of *Kopeika*’s founding seem to confirm Nord’s view that newspapers can emerge from a middle ground between the two. Certainly, *Kopeika* seems to have been shaped by “Great Men” like Anzimirov. But, *Kopeika* also depended on changing circumstances. As mentioned above, without the relaxation of censorship, advances in printing technology, and the emergence of a lower-class readership, its success would not have been possible.

²² The *zemstvo* was a Russian local government institution mostly populated by the nobility.

²³ A. I. Reitblat, “Anzimirov, Vladimir Aleksandrovich,” in *Russkie pisateli, 1800–1917: Biograficheskii slovar*, ed. P. A. Nikolaev (Moscow: Sovetskaia entsiklopediia, 1989).

²⁴ Brooks, *When Russia Learned to Read*, 131; McReynolds, *The News*, Appendix A, tables 5–6; Steinberg, *Petersburg*, 35; Brower, “The Penny Press,” 148.

²⁵ Esin, *Russkaia dorevoliutsionnaia gazeta*, 72.

²⁶ Neuberger, *Hooliganism*, 52–53. Brooks has also examined the readership of the kopeck press and concluded that, compared to previous newspapers that had tried to include lower-class Russians in a broad audience, such as *Moskovskii Listok* (Moscow List), *Kopeika* likely had a higher proportion of lower-class readers. See Brooks, *When Russia Learned to Read*, 139–41.

²⁷ McReynolds, *The News*, 226.

²⁸ See Brooks, *When Russia Learned to Read*, 128–29; McReynolds, “V. M. Doroshevich,” 235–36. *Moskovskii Listok*’s innovation was its brazenly commercial character, with little political content, and its attempt to appeal across classes to urban residents by including entertainment and satisfying its readers’ “desire to read about their own lives” (McReynolds, “V. M. Doroshevich,” 235).

²⁹ Bellavance, “Fourth Estate, Fifth Power,” 35.

³⁰ Neuberger, *Hooliganism*, 15–17; Esin, *Russkaia dorevoliutsionnaia gazeta*, 47, 72–73.

³¹ McReynolds, *The News*, Appendix C, Tables 17 and 23.

³² Thomas Riha, “Riech’: A Portrait of a Russian Newspaper,” *Slavic Review* 22, no. 4 (1963): 663–66. Miliukov, notably, still believed that “*Rech*’ did more for the popularization of our ideas than all the other public activities of the Kadets” despite its low circulation of 17,000, possibly because it was read by influential members of the Russian elite (Riha, “*Riech*’”, 664).

³³ McReynolds, *The News*, Appendix C, tables 17–23.

³⁴ Notably, in North America, the mass circulation press by this time had shifted towards advertising as a form of financial support, instead of funding itself through subscriptions.

Thus, *Kopeika*’s relative lack of advertising implies a greater stream of income or support from other sources even before it reached its later sales heights. See Hans Ibold and Lee Wilkins, “Philosophy at Work: Ideas Made a Difference,” in *Journalism 1908: Birth of a Profession*, ed. Betty Houchin Winfield (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2008), 83.

³⁵ On the characteristics of Russian liberalism, see Melissa Stockdale, “Liberalism and Democracy: The Constitutional Democratic Party,” in *Russia under the Last Tsar: Opposition and Subversion 1894–1917*, ed. Anna Geifman (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), 153–78; Melissa Stockdale, *Paul Miliukov and the Quest for a Liberal Russia, 1880–1918* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996); William G. Rosenberg, *Liberals in the Russian Revolution: The Constitutional Democratic Party, 1917–1921* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), 11–46; Shmuel Galai, *The Liberation Movement in Russia, 1900–1905* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1973). On the regressive Russian taxation system, see Gregory M. Dempster, “The Fiscal Background of the Russian Revolution,” *European Review of Economic History* 10, no. 1 (2006): 36; Hans Rogger, *Russia in the Age of Modernization and Revolution, 1881–1917* (London and New York: Longman, 1983), 117–18.

³⁶ Stockdale, “Liberalism and Democracy,” 157–60; William G. Rosenberg, “Representing Workers and the Liberal Narrative of Modernity,” in *Workers and Intelligentsia in Late Imperial Russia: Realities, Representations, Reflections*, ed. Reginald E. Zelnik (Berkeley: International and Area Studies, University of California at Berkeley, 1999), 229.

³⁷ Rosenberg, *Liberals*, 23–24, 31.

³⁸ See Thomas Earl Porter, *The Zemstvo and the Emergence of Civil Society in Late Imperial Russia, 1864–1917* (San Francisco: Mellen Research University Press, 1991), 176; Roberta Thompson Manning, “The Zemstvo and Politics, 1864–1914,” in *The Zemstvo in Russia: An Experiment in Local Self-Government*, ed. Terence Emmons and Wayne S. Vucinich (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 146; Jeffrey Brooks, “The Zemstvo and the Education of the People,” in *The Zemstvo in Russia: An Experiment in Local Self-Government*, ed. Terence Emmons and Wayne S. Vucinich (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 243; Charles E. Timberlake, “The Zemstvo and the Development of a Russian Middle Class,” in *Between Tsar and People: Educated Society and the Quest for Public Identity in Late Imperial Russia*, ed. Edith W. Clowes, Samuel D. Kassow, and James L. West (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), 177–79; Galai, *The Liberation Movement*, 32; Thomas Porter and William Gleason, “The Zemstvo and the Transformation of Russian Society,” in *Emerging Democracy in Late Imperial Russia: Case Studies on Local Self-Government (the Zemstvos), State Duma Elections, the Tsarist Government, and the State Council Before and During World War I*, ed. Mary Schaeffer Conroy (Niwot: University Press of Colorado, 1998), 64.

³⁹ The classic account of Russian populism is Richard Wortman, *The Crisis of Russian Populism* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1967).

⁴⁰ Three articles, including two editorials, were also published under only the initial “A” which may well have been Anzimirov. However, signing articles with initials was common enough that this cannot be guaranteed, and so A’s articles are not counted as Anzimirov’s for my analysis of either his prolificacy or the content of his writing.

⁴¹ See I. F. Masanov, *Slovar’ psevdonimov russkikh pisatelei, uchenykh i obshchestvennykh deiatelei* (Moscow: Vsesoiuznoi knizhnoi palaty, 1956), 1: 298, 2: 190, 4: 37, 4: 96.

⁴² All calculations are my own based on an analysis of *Gazeta-Kopeika*’s first 26 issues, covering a one month period starting with its first issue (the newspaper did not publish on Mondays at the time). Gorodetskii, notably, published no signed articles during this period. For detailed numbers, see Appendix A.

- ⁴³ Mirskoi [Anzimirov], “Classes for Teachers,” *Gazeta-Kopeika* (hereafter GK) No. 1, June 19, 1908, 1.
- ⁴⁴ Bat’ko [Anzimirov], “The Pig and the Skylark,” GK No. 1, June 19, 1908, 2.
- ⁴⁵ In fact, *Kopeika’s* first serialized novel was Anzimirov’s *Scarlet Roses of the East*, which began publication on August 28, 1908. According to Brooks, serial fiction was one of the penny press’s main attractions for lower-class readers (see Brooks, *When Russia Learned to Read*, 135–139). Anzimirov’s interest in fiction and fairy tales extended as far as the publication of a collection of fables entitled *My Little Fairy Tales* (Moscow, 1911), which often included “political allusions” just as his early fiction in *Kopeika* did (see Reitblat, “Anzimirov”). Anzimirov’s repeated use of popular fiction to spread his political views, and *Kopeika’s* prominence as an early outlet for this tendency, only adds to the sense of Anzimirov using the newspaper as a means for his ideas to reach Russia’s lower classes.
- ⁴⁶ Bat’ko [Anzimirov], “The Sun and the Wind,” GK No. 7, June 26, 1908, 3.
- ⁴⁷ Mirskoi [Anzimirov], “Eight Hour Workday,” GK No. 6, June 25, 1908, 1.
- ⁴⁸ Mirskoi [Anzimirov], “On the Fund in the Name of L. N. Tolstoy,” GK No. 8, June 27, 1908, 1.
- ⁴⁹ Mirskoi [Anzimirov], “A New Disaster,” GK No. 4, June 22, 1908, 1.
- ⁵⁰ Anzimirov, “How to Get Rich?,” GK No. 19, July 10, 1908, 1.
- ⁵¹ Bellavance, “Fourth Estate, Fifth Power,” 4–5; Betty Houchin Winfield, “1908: A Very Political Year for the Press,” in *Journalism 1908: Birth of a Profession*, ed. Betty Houchin Winfield (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2008), 30.
- ⁵² “Independent Judiciary,” GK No. 3, June 21, 1908, 1; A. Gorev, “Women’s Rights,” GK No. 2, June 20, 1908, 2; A., “Half Measure,” GK No. 26, July 18, 1908, 1; GK No. 5, June 24, 1908, 1; “Doomed,” GK No. 13, July 3, 1908, 1; GK No. 18, July 9, 1908, 1; N. Vasil’ev, “A Good Idea,” GK No. 20, July 11, 1908, 1.
- ⁵³ GK No. 10, June 29, 1908, 1.
- ⁵⁴ GK No. 14, July 4, 1908, 1.
- ⁵⁵ GK No. 4, June 22, 1908, 1.
- ⁵⁶ “Light From the West,” GK No. 15, July 5, 1908, 1; GK No. 4, June 22, 1908, 1.
- ⁵⁷ Anzimirov, “No Need for Blood!” GK No. 4, June 22, 1908, 1. On alcoholism, see Svoi, “Around Russia: ‘Respectable Persons’” GK No. 17, July 8, 1908, 4. McReynolds has also discussed the frequency of GK’s criticisms of Russian traditions, rural conditions, and alcoholism compared to the supposedly sophisticated, safe, and sober West. See McReynolds, “‘Boulevard’ Press,” 133–34.
- ⁵⁸ See, for examples, “Doomed,” GK No. 13, July 3, 1908, 1; GK No. 17, July 8, 1908, 1; Mirskoi [Anzimirov], “A New Disaster,” GK No. 4, June 22, 1908, 1.
- ⁵⁹ This is the image put forward by McReynolds. See McReynolds, *The News*, 225; McReynolds, “‘Boulevard’ Press,” 132; McReynolds, “Mobilizing.”
- ⁶⁰ Bellavance, “Fourth Estate, Fifth Power,” 14; Neuberger, *Hooliganism*, 18; Balmuth, *The Russian Bulletin*, 4–5; McReynolds, *The News*, 5, 7.
- ⁶¹ GK No. 4, June 22, 1908, 1; Stockdale, *Paul Miliukov*, 183.
- ⁶² “The Case of the Attack on P. N. Miliukov,” GK No. 9, June 28, 1908, 3 and GK No. 10, June 29, 1908, 3; Mirskoi [Anzimirov], “The Case of ‘Rus,’” GK No. 10, June 29, 1908, 2–3.
- ⁶³ GK No. 7, June 26, 1908, 1.
- ⁶⁴ Anzimirov, “How to Get Rich?,” GK No. 5, June 24, 1908, 1.
- ⁶⁵ Anzimirov, “How to Get Rich?,” GK No. 9, June 28, 1908, 1.
- ⁶⁶ Victor Leontovitsch, *The History of Liberalism in Russia*, trans. Parmen Leontovitsch (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2012), 155–61; Rosenberg, *Liberals*, 19;

- Stockdale, “Liberalism and Democracy,” 158. This compromise policy reflected the Kadets’ nature as “a loose association” of liberals with differing views rather than “a tightly knit monolithic group in the Bolshevik mold” (Rosenberg, *Liberals*, 13).
- ⁶⁷ Rosenberg, *Liberals*, 19–20.
- ⁶⁸ The Russian word *sam* roughly translates to “oneself.” It was used as a measurement of agricultural productivity by Russian peasants. See “Mera izmereniia – ‘sam,’” November 26, 2014, accessed February 28, 2017, <http://www.vedom.ru/news/2014/11/26/15828-mera>. Its presence here indicates how Anzimirov tailored his message to potential peasant readers by using colloquial terms with which they would be familiar.
- ⁶⁹ Anzimirov, “How to Get Rich?,” GK No. 9, June 28, 1908, 1.
- ⁷⁰ Anzimirov, “How to Get Rich?,” GK No. 14, July 4, 1908, 1; GK No. 12, July 2, 1908, 1; No. 11, July 1, 1908, 1; No. 16, July 6, 1908.
- ⁷¹ Anzimirov, “How to Get Rich?,” GK No. 11, July 1, 1908, 1.
- ⁷² Anzimirov, “How to Get Rich?,” GK No. 14, July 4, 1908, 1.
- ⁷³ Anzimirov, “How to Get Rich?,” GK No. 17, July 8, 1908, 1.
- ⁷⁴ Anzimirov, “How to Get Rich?,” GK No. 19, July 10, 1908, 1.
- ⁷⁵ Thomas Earl Porter, “The Development of Political Pluralism in Late Imperial Russia: Local Self-Government and the Movement for a National Zemstvo Union” (PhD diss., University of Washington, 1990), 270–71; Porter, *The Zemstvo*, 212–14.
- ⁷⁶ Anzimirov, “How to Get Rich?,” GK No. 23, July 15, 1908, 1.
- ⁷⁷ Anzimirov, “How to Get Rich?,” GK No. 25, July 17, 1908, 1. Italics in original.
- ⁷⁸ On the Socialist Revolutionaries, Russia’s most popular party among peasants, see Michael Melancon, “Neo-Populism in Early Twentieth-Century Russia: The Socialist-Revolutionary Party from 1900 to 1917,” in *Russia under the Last Tsar: Opposition and Subversion 1894–1917*, ed. Anna Geifman (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), 73–90; Manfred Hildermeier, “The Socialist Revolutionary Party of Russia and the Workers, 1900–1914,” in *Workers and Intelligentsia in Late Imperial Russia: Realities, Representations, Reflections*, ed. Reginald E. Zelnik (Berkeley: International and Area Studies, University of California at Berkeley, 1999), 206–27.
- ⁷⁹ See Balmuth, *The Russian Bulletin*, 267–70.
- ⁸⁰ See Susanna Rabow-Edling, “Liberalism and Nationalism in Russia. Boris Chicherin as a Modernist Nationalist,” *Nations and Nationalism* 18, no. 4 (2012): 701–18; Rosenberg, *Liberals*, 15.
- ⁸¹ Manning, “The Zemstvo and Politics,” 147, 161; Francis W. Wcislo, *Reforming Rural Russia: State, Local Society, and National Politics, 1855–1914* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), 195; Stockdale, *Paul Miliukov*, 171.
- ⁸² In Reitblat, “Anzimirov,” he is classified as between the Left Kadets and Right Socialist Revolutionaries, meaning he fit neither party well since both of these wings were relatively marginalized by the mainstream of their parties. See Melancon, “Neo-Populism,” 80; Rosenberg, *Liberals*, 32–38.
- ⁸³ Quoted in Reitblat, “Anzimirov.” Anzimirov, in “How to Get Rich?,” GK No. 17, July 8, 1908, 1, explicitly rejected the views of the peasantry, the Kadets, the Socialist Revolutionaries, the Social Democrats, and the right wing, saying that all of them took the wrong approach and without following Anzimirov’s own approach to the land question “it is impossible to achieve the well-being of the masses.”
- ⁸⁴ Esin, *Russkaia dorevoliutsionnaia gazeta*, 72; Reitblat, “Anzimirov”; McReynolds, *The News*, 229. Anzimirov even spent a year in prison for an article entitled “Fermented.” See Reitblat, “Anzimirov.”

⁸⁵ Many of these authors were not famous and their names and pseudonyms have not been recorded, even in Masanov's excellent *Slovar' psevdonimov russkikh pisatelei*. Unfortunately, many attributions thus come down to a judgment call. I have chosen to count articles signed by "N. Levitskii," "Arnold'ov," "Zhosef Chuprina," "A. Gorev," "K. O. Min," and "Ia. Murzin" as articles signed with real names despite the fact that these, too, may have been pseudonyms and the authors' full identities could not be verified. If any of these indeed were pseudonyms, it would only enhance Anzimirov's proportion of the newspaper's signed articles.

Felix Cowan is a PhD student in the Department of History at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. His research focuses on the Russian penny press from 1908–1918 as well as larger issues of urban poverty and inequality in the late Russian Empire. Felix's research has been supported by the University of Illinois Graduate College, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, and the Centre for European, Russian, and Eurasian Studies at the University of Toronto.

Critical Commentary

Looking Beyond the Archive: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Dealing with Difficult Archives

Kelsey Kilgore
University of Toronto

As historians, our work can be seriously compromised when access to archives is complicated by factors beyond our control. Perhaps they are permanently classified, or caught in the middle of political conflicts that threaten not only their contents but also the lives of those pursuing them. Some collections defy easy cataloguing, and others have been collected without organization in an attempt to simply preserve an increasingly obscured history. And, sometimes, archives just disappear. In the course of my own research I have fortunately not encountered the more dangerous of these problems. However, my work on the history of a recently-closed United States military base introduced me to the difficulties of archiving places in transition, and revealed the possibilities of working across disciplines to research beyond the archive. Based on my own recent archival difficulties on a dissertation research trip, I suggest that employing

the theoretical tools and research methods of multiple disciplines—a methodological synthesis—can help us find new ways of working around formal archives.

In formulating my dissertation research project, like any historian, I relied heavily on institutional archives and records. This process left me frightfully underprepared when I arrived at my research destination to find that one of my key archives did not exist. Although some of the material had been digitized, the physical collection was inexplicably gone. Having travelled 4,000 miles on grants, it was troubling (to say the least) that no one knew what had happened to the materials. Moreover, only one of a dozen contacts even responded to my requests for information. Despite my advance preparation, I was at a loss for how my research could effectively proceed in the absence of a formal archive. It was by sheer chance that my one reliable contact connected me to a community