

Pre-October Historiography of the Question of Public Prigovory and Nakazy Drawing up by Russian and Ukrainian Peasantry (years 1905-1907)

Dmytro Kudinov

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine
Department of history, doctoral candidate at the chair of ethnology and area study
Doctor of Philosophy
Service address: 60 Volodymyrska Street, City of Kyiv, Ukraine, 01033
Home address: 36/13 Kondratieva Street, Town of Sumy, Ukraine, 40030
E-mail: dmytro.kudinov@gmail.com

Abstract. Prigovor movement turned out to be a phenomenal peasants' claim of their civil rights and economic interests. It made both governing authorities and the opposition to reconsider their views on the peasant question, begin to conceive peasantry as a real social power dependant of which were Russian state prospects. Literary heritage of the first peasant movement researches – K. Sivkov, B. Veselkovskiy, P. Marev, P. Maslov, M. Kr-l – is studied particularly under this perspective. The article provides the analysis of the prigovory and nakazy investigation methods and classifications, applied by pre-revolutionary scientists, their vision about objective overview of peasants aspirations and interests, parties participation in petitions drawing up, peasants attitudes to Duma. Generalized conclusion is made that all the researches agreed on the idea of agriculturists claims for “land and liberty”, on the decay of their monarchy feelings and forming of peasant public conscience.

Keywords: prigovor; nakaz; prigovor movement; petitions; State Duma; historiography; peasantry.

Introduction

The revolution of 1905-1907 involved population masses in political processes and demonstrated deep conflict between different social groups interests, which was determined by all the previous development of society. Barricade fights and estates demolitions were sometimes proceeded by acute ideological struggle, which was followed by prigovory (petitions) and nakazy (resolutions) drawing up at different public events. This was also depicted in the press publications of Russian revolution of 1905 time, in leaflets distributed by public organizations and, finally, in political parties pogroms. In general, revolution left a big massif of corresponding sources which can depict real events and sentiments of social –minded population, social and political behavior motives and make a panorama of personal interests and future society development understanding. Large documents amount issued during Russian revolution of 1905 is represented by the prigovory of peasant communities. They make a special group of written sources which are valuable indications of peasant active participation in revolution and they are also the examples of peasant rule-proclaiming activity. As one publicist of Russian revolution of 1905 stated with the view in future, «in front of a future historian will arise a gratifying task to find out basing on many thousands of peasant prigovory the interests which peasantry considered to be near and dear and what measures it suggested in order to satisfy daily needs» [1]. We can consider this message from the past as task formulation for scientific publications devoted to the prigovor movement research, summarizing and systematizing of which within the territory of Under-Russian Ukraine is the purpose of this article.

Thus, the term “prigovor movement” is synonymous to the notion “movement for petitions (prigovory, nakazy) drawing up” “petition movement” and is used according to the definition given by Soviet and Russian historian L. Senchakova as documented appeals approved by peasants collectives and addressed to higher authorities, which, apart from local requirements also contain general economic and political claims [2]. In connection to this, the notion “prigovor” is understood as documented decision of village or volost meeting addressed to official government authorities. The notion of “nakaz” is used in terms of Imperial Duma times meaning “compelling, instruction to a deputy”, which, from the beginning of the process of the requirements lists to

delegates for Russian parliament drawing up, acquired the old sense of “instruction to government authorities”. So, the world itself has acquired a revolution meaning: nakazy could be issued not only by the Emperor and government authorities, but also by common people. Understanding of this notion by its intellectual contemporary is also notable: “nakaz for a peasant ... is his precept, imperative mandate” [3].

Coming from definitions we shouldn't take into consideration prigovory, which did not have a certain addressee and were accepted as declarative resolutions (for example prigovory about community entrance to All-Russian Peasant Union (ARPU). Correspondingly, the object of current research is represented by that particular historical literature, which studies prigovor movement according to the definition given by Senchakova.

Literary review

In spite of the considerable interest in prigovor movement, specific historiographical researches on this subject are scarce. Soviet Russian historian O. Buhovets was the first who analyzed the scientific heritage of pre-revolutionary researchers on this matter. He distinguished three stages in prigovor movement historiography: 1) years 1906 – 1917; 2) 1920s – middle 1950s 3) from middle 1950s to the end of 1970s 4) since 1980s. According to him, the main scientific achievements in petitions submission movement were the following: structuring of the information contained in prigovors; expression means determination; historiographical classification according to formal and contentive criteria. This aspects O. Buhovets obviously saw also in pre-revolutionary prigovor movement investigators – K. Sivkov, P. Maslov and other. Summarizing their contributions the historian distinguished some moments covered by the researchers: prigovory drawing up process influence on political consciousness development; authorship question, apocryphy and, alternatively, independent peasant thoughts, peasant self-expression in petitions, understanding by petition signers of the necessity to reorganize state system; defining agrarian requirements difference and determining the influence on them by parties programs [4].

The work of Russian philosopher and sociologist O. Kazhanov studying peasant political consciousness of M. Kr-l, K. Sivkov, A. Smirnov, P. Marev, A. Vasiliev and V. Kudriavtsev, is close to our essay. It should be noted that the scientists' work didn't fall outside the scope of historical-sociological research and, correspondingly, he reviewed the chosen works of above mentioned authors in terms of “electoral journalism”, “applied research of political consciousness of Russian muzhik” opposition. Hence, Kazhanov narrows pre-revolutionary studies into “electoral” genre, which disguises purely scientific researchers motives [5].

O. Kazhanov's attention was not so much focused on their fact-findings results (the author preferred rather to quote them than to analyze) as on the researchers' methodology, which he estimated with greater optimism than O. Buhovets. Thus, he noted that K. Sivkov work is characterized by high methodological level of documents processing (style analysis, determination of prigovor movement expansion zones, text structuring), application of statistical method. O. Buhovets didn't “note” these methodological advantages, pointing out that statistical method was used for the first time by Marev, though his work was published one year later than K. Sivkov's article.

Pre-October historiography of prigovor movement at Dnieper Ukraine during the years of Russian Revolution of 1905 has not been examined in contemporary Ukrainian science, which generated a certain research interest.

Research results

Mass prigovor movement initiated by decree from 18-th of February 1905 suggesting to submit petitions addressed to supreme authority which contain projects of state system improvement and national welfare advancing. It awakened the strongest echo at the most distressed and numerous population group – peasantry. Russian scientists K. Sivkov, B. Veselovskiy, P. Marev, P. Maslov and the author of “Narodnyi vestnik”, who signed his article as M. Kr-l», were the first who studied the petitions of peasant meetings. M. Kr-l called nakazy, which on his just opinion “were in tight inheritant connection with prigovory” to be the reflection of hopes and desires of homogeneous peasant-agrarian class”. K. Sivkov estimated peasant prigovors as important source for political and social ideas study on the eve of “Provisions of State Duma” approval. For P. Maslov prigovory served as vivid examples to his land municipalization theory as

well as confirmation of democratic reforms impending, which became a battle-cry of peasant movement. P. Marev viewed nakazy to the First Duma deputies as demonstration of peasant mentality transformation from “land” to “freedom”. B. Veselovskiy in petitions saw an ideological component of peasant movement. The scientist was mainly interested in procedures of prigorov movement and in case of nakazy to Duma deputies of 1906 – cooperation between constituents and parliamentarians.

11 out of 49 documents, on which K. Sivkov based his study, related to the Ukrainian governments. The examples according to them were also made by M. Kr-l, B. Veselovskiy and P. Maslov. There are certain divergences in peasants prigovory characteristics by the authors, which on my opinion is determined by different chronological frames of their analyses: K. Sivkov confined himself by petitions submitted before the law of the 6th of August, M. Kr-l was limited by published in press petitions to the deputies of the first called Duma before it was convoked while P. Maslov mainly referred to a wide range of peasant nakazy to the deputies of the First and the Second Duma. Meanwhile, for K. Sivkov petitions were independent research object while for P. Maslov they rather represented illustrative material. B. Veselovskiy, pointing at a big amount of peasants' nakazy to the First Duma deputies, encouraged his contemporaries to study in depth documents, which are “the voice of the people” [6]. Such nakazy positioning can be found in M. Kr-l's work: since the peasantry (this “redoubtable sphinx” in legislative authority), which claimed its aspirations and ideals in the language of nakazy, will perform a leading role in Russia reorganization, it worth to consider these compellations as a certain program of reforms the time of which the author called “threatening, but remarkable future”: «if Duma meets their (peasants – D. K.) requirements, than the country will calm down, and if it won't – great disaster will occur in the country” [7]. Whatever were Russian Revolution contemporaries positions, their works have a great historical importance. It is particularly remarkable that even at the initial stages of prigorov movement study first steps of petitions classification were performed. Particularly, K. Sivkov arranged them into three conventional groups: 1) written according to peasants own initiative, 2) composed with “the third element” support, 3) submitted under the influence of opposition parties. The author separately distinguished «patriotic addresses» – compellations written under local authorities' dictation [8]. O. Buhovets indicated on this matter that among pre-October researchers only K. Sivkov quite completely defines author “contingent” of prigorov movement documents [9].

Estimating the petitions according to the mentioned groups, K. Sivkov came to the conclusion that the best for peasants real aspirations understanding are the petitions written by the peasants independently. In the same time “progressive” prigovors written with the help of kadets or socialists are associated with “ground ones”, since agitators found common ground with peasants. The author emphasized relative political maturity of peasantry, which in both pointed prigovory types demanded not only to liquidate government institution of zemstvo, but also change all the state legal system. Moreover, they pointed out the ways in which, how they think, this could be done [10]. O. Kazhanov commented K. Sivkov's conclusions as peasants conservative ideology, at wish government spheres depended on at the beginning of the revolution, crisis [11]. At the same time O. Buhovets indicated that K. Sivkov's onerous conclusions are kind of prejudged: it is “obviously not enough” just to declare that peasants didn't always understood certain phrases from prigovory (here revolutionary according to problem statements prigovory are ment) referring to the spring of 1905 – it is not possible to claim mass revolutionary consciousness of peasants at the Russian Revolution of 1905 beginning [12]. Buhovets reasoning is supported by the examples of strong external influence, when the peasants, possessing the springs of political consciousness, were literally “guided at the beginning of prigovory movement. For example, in Sumy district in spring of 1905 we see high activity of peasantry, emersion of leaders from peasant environment, but the petition authorship still belongs not to peasantry, but to A. Shcherbak, a member of local agrarian club, or possibly to several intellectuals [13].

K. Sivkov ranged peasant misfortunes as follows: land scarcity, rightlessness and ignorance. Namely in this sequence they were presented in prigovory, which first of all gave evidence to the importance of revolution economic tasks. Correspondingly, noted O. Kazhanov, the program part of prigovory was formed [14]. Peasants saw satisfying of their economical needs in the next steps: land privatizing, rent relations regulation, open field system liquidation, migration organization, low-cost credits providing, village schools establishment, and indirect taxes cancellation. Also the

author mentions peasant position on classes equalization, self-government reform, liberty of conscience, introduction of affordable education, calling of representative body possessing legislative power. Thus, K. Sivkov summarized that rural community was well ahead of those limited steps, taken by the government in agrarian and political systems optimization [15].

Expectations in problems solving laid on the monarch by peasants then were transferred to deputy corps of the first Russian parliament. M. Kr-l, on the basis of nakazy, published by «Rech» and «Navaya Zhizn» at the first third of year 1906 (author made no difference between petitions from various Russian regions and he repeatedly adverted to Poltava peasants prigovory) made an emphasis on the requirement of “liberty” understood by peasants from one side as inherent value – freedom of expression, public rights realization, and from the other, in applied sense – without liberty received land could be taken away again. If the first position was according the author’s believe a sequence of peasants participation in revolution, the second was developed due to peasants’ experience of facing bureaucracy, total distrust in system [16].

O. Kazhanov payed attention to the abstract from M. Kr-l’s article, where he observantly noted about «mystified perception by peasants of requirements stated in nakazy», addressee of which now we obliged to bear the burden of “great holy work” non-fulfillment of which was considered to be a crime [17]. O. German, a soviet researcher of elections to the second Duma in Ukraine, wrote on this matter that peasants tracked the elected authorized representatives not to evade from community requirements – didn’t take upper class parties’ part. The following case dramatically illustrates this matter. The incident happened to elected by peasants representative from Skvirskiy district – V. Bobyr, who was accused by home-folks in voting on hearsay for pomeshchiks (landowners) and he was threatened by his house arson. Only the interference of Kyiv province “peasant” deputies helped to protect V. Bobyr from infuriated dwellers of his native village [18]. Responsibility of peasant representatives to their electors was emphasized by V. Milko. He wrote that, though the principle of free mandate (according to it deputies were independent and non-beholden to their voters and their nakazy), was fixed in “Provisions of State Duma establishment” in practice some parliamentarians having accepted voters nakazy tried to fulfill them by all means and made public statements about it from tribune. V. Milko giving an example cited the words of peasant-deputies from Kyiv and Poltava provinces, who announces about their liabilities towards electors, which, in the opinion of the author, demonstrates electors’ moral pressure on elected by them deputies [19].

Analyzing nakazy and prigovory to I Duma, P. Maslov basing on the content of these documents came to the conclusions similar to K. Sivkov: peasants, first of all, demanded land. They believed that the precedent of State Duma Calling was conditioned by the necessity to consider mainly the land question. In this, the author of «Agrarian movement in Russia» saw the lack of opposition influence in the countryside. After the fail to receive land with the help of force in 1905, peasants returned to peaceful ways of struggle, voting for “parliamentary” socialization or nationalization of land. At that the remark of O. Buhovets is important: P. Maslov correctly marked the peasantry mood dynamics: peasants economic requirements in nakazy of 1906 are more radical than those drawn up in prigovory of 1905. At the same time the claims for land expropriation were presented even in nakazy written under the influence of the right parties [20].

Since Trudoviks party was mostly composed of peasants themselves and of the elements sympathetic to peasant moods, the agriculturists mainly referred to trudoviks in their nakazy. This nakazy were opposed by P. Maslov to peasant prigovory of the revolution beginning. At this he confused prigovory addressed to public authorities and those to the landowners, which brought him to a false conclusion that peasantry prigovor movement in 1905 was aimed solely at meeting limited economical interests [21].

Possessing a big quantity of nakazy to I Duma deputies P. Maslov subjected them to detailed analysis, widely citing compellations peculiar to his land municipalization theory. For instance, he quotes the text of Poltava district petition, where the peasants strived for land transfer in region property with further decision of its destiny be elected deputies from local population [22]. Such random samples, however, do not reflect general peasant mood. Particularly, soviet scientist E. Vasilevskiy did not found among 600 documents any example containing peasants claims for municipalization [23]. The conclusion is: this idea was not popular among peasantry.

In spite of certain subjectivism, P. Maslov partly executed documents statistical analyses. Convenient table performed by the scientist allows recreate the hierarchy of Ukrainian peasants

claims. So, P. Maslov used 64 nakazy concerning 8 Ukrainian districts (without Volyn). In 38 of them peasants demanded land transfer, 42 contained political requirements and 17 claimed for political prisoners' oblivion. Such petitions favored the statement of the question on compulsory land expropriation by deputies from left and Kadet parties [24]. P. Maslov was the first who adverted to the estimation of petition company influence on political mood of peasantry. He believed that nakazy and prigovory drawing up process consolidated peasants, taught them to formulate their requirements, understand parties programs and unite themselves around accepted petitions. Unfortunately, the author didn't make an analysis of nakazy to II Duma, which made his research on petitions content, and, correspondingly, on the dynamics of social and political consciousness of peasants incomplete.

Another menshevist researcher, P. Marev, took rather different position in the study of prigorov movements. He used statistical method in the analysis of prigorov. Casually settling upon prigorov of 1905 p., he pointed that then the socialists were the makers of peasants public consciousness. But, in fact, he in the same time rejected this statement saying that the left parties capitulated in front of the peasant mass in prigorov paragraphs concerning land [25]. O. Buhovets noted the schematism of P. Marev's deductions and his confidence to conclude sometimes on the basis of only one document [26]. Such approach could make us to refer to P. Marev article, but O. Kazhanov made an explanation by defining research method of pre-revolutionary scientist as the method of ranking estimation applying which the author tried to evaluate real state of peasants political consciousness at the time of the first Duma campaign holding. So, 61 out of 68 petitions of program character contained requirements on land reform, 60 of them demanded political freedoms, 13 – calling of Constituent meeting and 14 claimed for electoral law reform [27].

Distinguishing the variety of political claims, P. Marev draw attention to the homogeneity of peasant attitude to the land: it should be nationalized by means of legislative way. While economic part of prigorov is very racy of the soil, the political ideology of peasantry was formed under the influence of "city democracy" [28]. This, in particular, could be seen in the petition points concerning political prisoners oblivion, labour issue solving and other questions, which didn't concern peasant life directly.

P. Maryev classified array of petitions submitted to the Duma fractions as follows: 1) prigorov without certain requirements, the authors of which limited themselves by ensuring deputies in support of the parliament by the folks; 2) nakazy presenting the programs of legislative activity; 3) documents where peasants complained on local problems and asked deputies to solve them. P. Marev also distinguished nakazy according to their addressants. Thus, he found "kadetsky" prigorov to be more "restrained" while "labor" – more radical. This remark points out that peasants had learned to distinguish parties programs and to work out their own tactics toward them. Advancement of public consciousness of peasants is also apparent in the content of political requirements in nakazy. According to P. Marev $\frac{1}{3}$ of prigorov told about arbitrary constitution adjustment. "A year of struggle managed to change considerably social-economic movement in the countryside into political one" – this is how the author commented the given fact [29].

Unlike the previous two authors B. Veselovskiy restricted himself just by shallow analysis on the prigorov of 1905 and studied in-depth only "Duma" petitions. The author of «Peasant question and peasant movement in Russia» stated that peasants arranged continuous communication with deputies, mostly from Trudoviks fraction via prigorov and telegrams. The deputies, in turn, visited their voters, organized meeting with them. By peasants-deputies tandem agriculturists tried to position themselves as controlling side, which orders to its representatives in parliament. Peasants put big hopes on legislative power: Duma can and must simplify peasant life. Per contra, its dissolution strongly hit power authority. Peasants assured themselves in Duma powerlessness, effectively called by B. Veselovskiy «nationwide focus on which folksy expectations for better fortune, for land and rights receipt are concentrated» and came to the belief that they can attain land and liberty only by themselves [30]. Hence, the conflict between Duma and government only intensified revolutionary mood in peasantry, which can be observed within peasants protest actions activation in summer of 1906.

B. Veselovskiy unlike K. Sivkov in prigorov was mostly interested not in defining existed requirements, but in the ways the authors of petitions suggested to solve problems pointed out by them. Investigating the solutions of land question in nakazy, B. Veselovskiy came to the conclusion

that on the average peasant program of agrarian reform could be demonstrated next way: cession without compensation to previous owners of the lands existing due to the exploitation of someone else's labor, which should be done according to the principle "all land to working class". Such approach B. Veselovskiy treated as "small bourgeoisie" and highlighted the inconsistency of conventional peasant program: liquidation of private property on land and simultaneously keeping it for means of production. In such a way, prigovory reflected peasant understanding of economic efficiency in agrarian sector: establishment of the right for everyone to use land within the limits of labor norm and inviolacy of the other sides of commodity economy [31]. In such a way, for B. Veselovskiy prigovory are vivid evidences of non-socialistic by nature peasants' economic desires. In Ukraine only 5 communities known to the author from nakazy declared for private property on land demolishing and land transfer to labors on the base of equalizing land use [32]. It is characteristic, that P. Marev stated the same: peasants, voting for left parties candidates chose them "not for their socialism, but, first of all, for radical formulation of land question solution and democratic reforms" [33]. The drawback of B. Veselovskiy work is narrowed characteristic of non-land requirements. As O. Buhovets noted, B. Veselovskiy pointed at the absence of considerable differences in peasant vision of tax and political reforms and in the same time at the existence of big divergences in perspectives of land reorganizations, which evidences about descriptive and not qualitative analysis made by the researcher. Hence comes the generality of his conclusion [34]. The same was confirmed by O. Kazhanov towards all the pre-revolutionary researchers of prigovor movement: illustrative method gives place to the method of formalized evidences in case of big array of documents systemizing [35]. Nevertheless, B. Veselovskiy was the first who studied Russian Revolution of 1905 prigovory as an object of peasant legal consciousness – the fact that emphasizes the value of his work.

Conclusion

Literature complex devoted to the petition movement at the beginning of the previous century could be evaluated in several dimensions: authors' levels of analytics and referring to scientific methods; distinguishing by them of peculiar characteristics of peasant psychology and social focus; studying of the connection between parties programs and prigovory content as a reflection of parties agitation influence on the peasantry, estimation by peasants of the Duma role in solving of fateful tasks, which faced the country and society. It should be mentioned that the guiding among the means of analysis was a traditional illustrative method. Nevertheless, the authors, trying to systematize petitions materials approached the methods of statistics, ranking and elements of content-analysis (especially characteristic of P. Marev's work), which allowed them to support their conclusions with quantitative indexes. It was defined that the majority of peasants craved for "land and liberty", were not satisfied with their social and legal position, showed the elements of public consciousness, that the level of parties influence on peasants was not too strong, but peasants still included to prigovory certain components of parties programs, especially of social-revolutionaries, that in 1906 peasants laid big expectations on Duma and expressed distrust to the government which indirectly appeared in the liability of peasant deputies to fulfill nakazy even if they had to forfeit life for that.

In general, the works of Russian researches of prigovor movement at the time of the Russian revolution of 1905 is now a returned to scientific space complex of sociological and political works, which were not considered in national science before 1980s and therefore were not a starting point for historiographical researches of the phenomenon of petitions drawing up by peasant communities. Their study by contemporary scientists will enable to extent our understanding of peasants social psychology, dynamics of their political consciousness, geography of challenging peasant requirements, which together with comparison with the data on the degree of peasants provision with land and peasant movement statistics will allow to regionalize social aspirations of peasants and, taking into account the requirements of political reform, to develop a map of peasants social and political ideals.

References:

1. Kr-l M. Krestyanskie nastroyeniya po sostavlennym dlya Gosudarstvennoy dumoy «nakazam» // Narodnyy vestnik. 1906. № 6. p. 34.

2. Senchakova L. T. Krestyanskoe dvizhenie v revolyutsii 1905-1907 gg. M.: Nauka, 1989. p. 208.
3. Kr-l M. Krestyanskije nastroeniya po sostavlennym dlya Gosudarstvennoy dumoy «nakazam» // Narodnyy vestnik. 1906. № 6. p. 45.
4. Buhovec O. G. «Prigovornoe» dvizhenie krest'jan v 1905-1907 gg. (metody izuchenija po materialam Samarskoj i Voronezhskoj gubernij): Dis. kand. ist. nauk: 07.00.09. M., 1984. p. 8-15; Buhovec O. G. Social'nye konflikty i krest'janskaja mental'nost' v Rossijskoj imperii nachala HH veka. Novye materialy, metody, rezul'taty. M.: MOSGORARHIV, 1996. p. 117; Krinko E.F., Taran K.V. First russian revolution within Black sea province (1905-1907): modern historiography survey // European researcher. 2011. № 6 (9). C. 971-976.
5. Kazhanov O. A. Krestyanstvo v Gosudarstvennoy dume: analiz elektroalnoy publitsistiki nachala HH v // Sotsis. 2012. № 11. p. 124-125.
6. Veselovskij B. Krest'janskij vopros i krest'janskoe dvizhenie v Rossii (1902-1906 gg.). SPb.: Zerno, 1907. P. 146.
7. Kr-l M. Krestyanskije nastroeniya po sostavlennym dlya Gosudarstvennoy dumoy «nakazam» // Narodnyy vestnik. 1906. № 6. p. 34, 45.
8. Sivkov K. Krestyanskije prigovoryi 1905 goda // Russkaya myisl. 1907. № 4. p. 27-28.
9. Buhovec O. G. Social'nye konflikty i krest'janskaja mental'nost' v Rossijskoj imperii nachala HH veka. Novye materialy, metody, rezul'taty. M.: MOSGORARHIV, 1996. p. 118.
10. Sivkov K. Krestyanskije prigovoryi 1905 goda // Russkaya myisl. 1907. № 4. p. 31-35.
11. Kazhanov O. A. Krestyanstvo v Gosudarstvennoy dume: analiz elektroalnoy publitsistiki nachala HH v // Sotsis. 2012. № 11. p. 128.
12. Buhovec O. G. Social'nye konflikty i krest'janskaja mental'nost' v Rossijskoj imperii nachala HH veka. Novye materialy, metody, rezul'taty. M.: MOSGORARHIV, 1996. p. 119.
13. Kudinov D. Revoliutsiina diialnist Sumskoho silskohospodarskoho tovarystva u rozghortanni selianskoho rukhu v Kharkivskii hubernii navesni-vlitku 1905 roku // Chasopys ukrainskoi istorii. 2007. Vyp. 7. p. 69-76.
14. Kazhanov O. A. Krestyanstvo v Gosudarstvennoy dume: analiz elektroalnoy publitsistiki nachala HH v // Sotsis. 2012. № 11. p. 126.
15. Sivkov K. Krestyanskije prigovoryi 1905 goda // Russkaya myisl. 1907. № 4. p. 42-44, 48.
16. Kr-l M. Krestyanskije nastroeniya po sostavlennym dlya Gosudarstvennoy dumoy «nakazam» // Narodnyy vestnik. 1906. № 6. p. 44-45.
17. Kazhanov O. A. Krestyanstvo v Gosudarstvennoy dume: analiz elektroalnoy publitsistiki nachala HH v // Sotsis. 2012. № 11. S. 130; Kr-l M. Krestyanskije nastroeniya po sostavlennym dlya Gosudarstvennoy dumoy «nakazam» // Narodnyy vestnik. 1906. № 6. p. 45.
18. German G. O. Vybery vo II Gosudarstvennuju dumu na Ukraine: Dis... kand. ist. nauk: 07.00.02. K., 1948. p. 219-220.
19. Mylko V. I. Uchast deputativ ukrainskykh hubernii i mist u roboti I-IV Derzhavnykh dum Rosiiskoi imperii (1906-1917 rr.): Dys... kand. ist. nauk: 07.00.01. K., 2012. p. 89-90.
20. Buhovec O. G. «Prigovornoe» dvizhenie krest'jan v 1905-1907 gg. (metody izuchenija po materialam Samarskoj i Voronezhskoj gubernij): Dis. kand. ist. nauk: 07.00.09. M., 1984. p. 14-15.
21. Maslov P. P. Agrarnoe dvizhenie v Rossii / Maslov Petr Pavlovich. SPb.: Izd. Obschestva «Obschestvennaya polza», 1908. Kn. 2. p. 276-280.
22. In the same place, p. 280-281.
23. Vasilevskij E. G. Social'no-jekonomicheskoe sodержanie krest'janskikh prigovorov i nakazov vo II Gosudarstvennuju Dumu // Uchenye zapiski MGU. M., 1956. Vyp. 179. p. 144.
24. Maslov P. P. Agrarnoe dvizhenie v Rossii / Maslov Petr Pavlovich. SPb.: Izd. Obschestva «Obschestvennaya polza», 1908. Kn. 2. p. 282-283, 302.
25. Marev P. Politicheskaya borba krestyanstva // Borba obschestvennykh sil v russkoy revolyutsii: [v 4-h vyip.] / V. Gorn, V. Mech, Cherevanin. M., 1907. Vyip. 3. p. 72.
26. Buhovec O. G. Social'nye konflikty i krest'janskaja mental'nost' v Rossijskoj imperii nachala HH veka. Novye materialy, metody, rezul'taty. M.: MOSGORARHIV, 1996. p. 120.
27. Kazhanov O. A. Krestyanstvo v Gosudarstvennoy dume: analiz elektroalnoy publitsistiki nachala HH v // Sotsis. 2012. № 11. p. 133; Marev P. Politicheskaya borba krestyanstva // Borba obschestvennykh sil v russkoy revolyutsii: [v 4-h vyip.] / V. Gorn, V. Mech, Cherevanin. M., 1907. Vyip. 3. p. 111.

28. Marev P. Politicheskaya borba krestyanstva // Borba obschestvennyih sil v russkoy revolyutsii: [v 4-h vyip.] / V. Gorn, V. Mech, Cherevanin. M., 1907. Vyip. 3. p. 107-109.
29. In the same place, p. 110-111.
30. Veselovskij B. Krest'janskij vopros i krest'janskoe dvizhenie v Rossii (1902-1906 gg.). SPb.: Zerno, 1907. p. 153.
31. In the same place, p. 148-149.
32. In the same place, p. 150.
33. Marev P. Politicheskaya borba krestyanstva // Borba obschestvennyih sil v russkoy revolyutsii: [v 4-h vyip.] / V. Gorn, V. Mech, Cherevanin. M., 1907. Vyip. 3. p. 136.
34. Buhovec O. G. Social'nye konflikty i krest'janskaja mental'nost' v Rossijskoj imperii nachala HH veka. Novye materialy, metody, rezul'taty. M.: MOSGORARHIV, 1996. p. 119.
35. Kazhanov O. A. Krestyanstvo v Gosudarstvennoy dume: analiz elektroalnoy publitsistiki nachala HH v // Sotsis. 2012. № 11. p. 133.