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KATY TURTON

CHILDREN OF THE REVOLUTION: PARENTS, CHILDREN, AND THE REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE IN LATE IMPERIAL RUSSIA

Abstract: While there has been a considerable growth in scholarly interest in Russian childhood and youth, the presence of children in the revolutionary movement has largely been overlooked. Studies of female revolutionaries have acknowledged that family concerns often had an impact on women’s party careers, but few have explored fully the relationship between mothers and their children. Similarly, “general” historical works on the Russian revolution have rarely engaged with questions about the family lives of the predominantly male party members. This article will assess how becoming a parent affected the careers of both male and female revolutionaries, as well as the ways in which familial concerns and the presence of children had an impact on the movement itself. It will highlight that children could have both positive and negative effects on the operations of the underground, at times disrupting activities, but at others proving to be useful decoys and helpers. Children’s attitudes to their parents’ revolutionary careers will also be examined, highlighting that while some children wished they had less politically active parents, others enthusiastically helped the movement. Though expanding the scholarly gaze on the Russian underground to take in the presence of children does not change the grand narrative of the revolution, it enriches our understanding considerably and offers a new insight into the daily struggles of the revolutionary movement.

One of the most famous photographs of Vladimir Ilich Lenin is a shot of him leading a group of male and female Bolsheviks through Stockholm, a stopping point on the revolutionaries’ journey back to Russia in 1917 (fig. 1). At the back of the group, his close comrade G. E. Zinoviev can be seen, holding the hand of his nine-year-old son, Stepan. This detail is striking as it fundamentally challenges the traditional historiographical portrayal of the revolutionary movement and its agents. Histories of the Russian revolutions of 1917 and of specific revolutionary parties have tended to depict such organizations and their communities in Russia and abroad as male-dominated affairs and have focused on the theoretical debates and political maneuverings of leading men. Only a few
scholars have integrated the growing body of scholarship on women’s involvement in the underground, as party activists and as so-called technical staff who dealt with correspondence, maintained safe houses, and saw to the daily organization of local party groups. Similarly, while historians of female revolutionaries have acknowledged that personal and family concerns often had an impact on women’s party careers, few scholars, with the exception of some biographers, have applied the same investigative criteria to their male subjects.

Thus, the presence of children in the revolutionary movement has been dealt with in a limited way, with a focus usually on the experience of mothers, not fathers, and on personal concerns, rather than the place and role of children in the revolutionary struggle. In her study of Bolshevik women, Clements posits that the majority of her subjects had children, but she notes only that some women were forced to leave the revolutionary movement to care for their children and that the lifestyle of those who continued as party agents while raising their young often caused trauma to the children. Hillyar and McDermid’s prosopographical study highlights that a significant proportion of revolutionary women were mothers, but acknowledges only briefly that while most children were handed to relatives and friends to be cared for, others became “unwitting participants in their parents’ illegal activity.” It is also striking that the growing body of scholarship on Russian—and more specifically Soviet—childhood
and youth has overlooked the presence of children in the revolutionary movement. These studies explore children’s education, state policy towards orphans, children’s experiences of war, and involvement in crime, but virtually nothing has been written on children’s involvement in the revolutionary underground. Nonetheless, work on children in the criminal world, in times of civil unrest, and in wartime in Russia and further afield provides an instructive point of comparison, for it takes in the themes of struggle, illegal activity, and children’s responses to traumatic experience, as well as deals with the way in which parents, children, and other adults interact in such situations.

In exploring the place of children in the Russian revolutionary movement, it is important to make clear at the outset that, as Hillyar and McDermid have suggested, in some situations children lacked agency in, or even awareness of, the role they were playing. This may be because they were infants or because their dependence on their parents meant that they had a limited ability to reject their parents’ lifestyle even if they disagreed with it. Thus, while their presence had an impact on events, that impact is often best understood from the parents’ perspective and that of other adults.

This article will set out how many revolutionaries were parents, as well as how individuals responded to having children and fulfilled their political and parental responsibilities, whatever form they understood them to take. Secondly, it will investigate the ways in which the presence of children and parental concerns of party members complicated the functioning of the movement on a daily, practical level. Children did not simply have an effect on the private lives of individual revolutionaries, but rather had an impact on the movement itself. Party agents often had to limit or cease their activities on becoming a parent, or made a conscious choice to do so, thus reducing the number of members in the movement. Those parents who remained active regularly involved their children in their work. These children were a potential risk to the movement; a careless word or gesture from them could expose party agents. At other times, however, children proved to be reliable conspirators. Just as studies of the criminal world have shown, with training from parents, children could prove to be adept as lookouts or decoys. Indeed, it is clear that children were exposed to their parents’ revolutionary outlook from an early age and that many youngsters consciously embraced the movement and willingly helped their parents where they could. Similarly, studies on children’s participation in the Troubles in Ireland have noted that youngsters participated enthusiastically in the political struggle, while work on child soldiers has noted that children “make good soldiers” because “they are easily motivated and natural ‘joiners,’ willing to take risks.” Lastly, whether wittingly involved or not, children often
shared and even affected the punishments their revolutionary parents received from the state, their presence at times making the experience of prison or exile more difficult, but at others mitigating the worst elements of punishment and even enabling escape and a return to the political struggle.

Investigating the presence of children in the revolutionary movement is constrained in a number of ways by the sources available. Firstly, establishing the number of revolutionaries who were parents or the number of children they had is difficult, certainly when going beyond the ranks of leading figures. Clements as well as Hillyar and McDermid acknowledge that often no data on an individual’s personal circumstances can be found.12 This is to be expected given the conspiratorial nature of the underground period, when records of any kind were a liability, and the fact that an individual’s political biography was generally viewed as being of more importance than their personal life when attempts to record the history of the revolutionary movement were made after 1917. Nonetheless, the evidence suggests that a significant number of revolutionaries were parents.

In terms of qualitative data, by far the richest source of information is the memoirs and autobiographies by revolutionaries or the children of revolutionaries, though the fact that there are far more by the former than the latter means that the parents’ perspective tends to dominate. The usefulness of such personal narratives to “introduce marginalized voices” of women and children and to illuminate aspects of daily life not usually covered by traditional historical sources is well documented.13 These memoirs are also invaluable for refuting the assumption that the revolutionary movement was dominated by solitary (male) adults who sacrificed their personal lives for the political struggle.14 Memoirs must be used with caution, however, for the version of past events which they offer is affected by numerous factors including unreliable recall, gender expectations, literary conventions, notions of collective identity, and political considerations.15 Autobiographical works by Russian revolutionaries were “governed by officially approved interpretations of Soviet history as well as by the party’s notions of what was appropriate in . . . autobiography.”16 In particular, memoirists were to stress their contribution to the political struggle, since reference to one’s family life was “an unseemly assertion of the importance of the individual.”17 It was also common to compare the new Communist society with the Tsarist regime, emphasizing the oppressive nature of the old regime and the great progress made by the new.18 Autobiographical accounts by non-Bolshevik revolutionaries or their children, often outside the Soviet Union, also show evidence of a collective identity based on the notion of the ideal revolutionary, and while they do not adhere
to the Soviet version of the pre-revolutionary struggle, they are nonetheless affected by the triumph of the Bolsheviks.\textsuperscript{19}

The impact of gender on personal narratives must also be addressed. Male autobiographers have a reputation for not discussing their home and family life to the same extent as female writers, and examples of this can be found in revolutionary memoirs.\textsuperscript{20} A particularly striking example of male reticence is to be found in the memoirs of socialist revolutionary Osip Solomonovich Minor. When Minor wrote about the death of his daughter en route to Siberia, he used his wife’s maiden name, (Anastasiia Naumovna) Shekhter, when identifying her as the mother so that the casual reader would not realize that he was referring to his own child.\textsuperscript{21} Yet, Minor’s approach is by no means representative. Indeed, memoirs by male revolutionaries can be candid about family life and the emotional experiences which went along with it, just as some female revolutionaries can be more detached.\textsuperscript{22} If there is a difference between memoirs by gender in this context, and it is not pronounced, it is that women are more likely to engage in a dialogue with gender expectations about motherhood. Despite attempts in the 1920s to transform family life, from the 1930s onwards, a more traditional image of motherhood was promoted by the Soviet Union, and some female revolutionaries, though not all, make efforts to justify their rejection of the role of mother or express regret in their memoirs for being poor mothers.\textsuperscript{23}

In more general terms it is important to note that references to family life, however few and limited, can be found in men and women’s accounts, and when they are included they are often emotionally expressive, unapologetic that family life was a part of everyday existence, and explicit about how family members unofficially supported the movement. Indeed, since so much underground revolutionary activity took place in private homes, it should be no surprise that descriptions of family life find their way into memoirs. It is certainly possible to gain from memoirs an understanding of the common issues having children raised for party agents and the types of activities into which the children of revolutionaries were drawn.

Gendered differences in approach are sometimes more noticeable in Soviet biographies of revolutionaries. The three Russian-language collections of short biographies of Bolshevik women used for this article include detailed discussions about their children and the challenges of being both a mother and party agent.\textsuperscript{24} A similar collection entitled Kommunisty, which includes only one female biography, of Nadezhda Konstantinovna Krupskaya, is written in a very different style with the family lives of the male revolutionaries only mentioned occasionally.\textsuperscript{25} When they are, it is without comment on the conflicting duties of fatherhood and political work. For example, while the
chapter on Feliks Edmundovich Dzerzhinskii comments that it was “hard” for Sof’ia Sigizmundovna “to be the wife of a professional revolutionary and underground agent,” it does not suggest that it was difficult for his son, Yan, to be the child of one, even though he did not see his father for the first seven years of his life.26 This possibly reflects the educational aim of these collected editions to promote ideal, but gendered, behavior in their young male and female readers, but it could also be a result of the attitude of the authors who sought out details of women’s but not men’s personal lives, choosing instead to focus on their political activities.27 In contrast, longer Soviet biographies of male revolutionaries often contain detailed descriptions of their family lives and personal concerns.28

Memoirs by children of revolutionaries, though less numerous, also provide a fascinating insight into how youngsters responded to their parents’ beliefs and activities. Many make attempts to recreate their thoughts as children, while also adding a layer of mature reflection and analysis. They reveal a range of responses to their parents’ revolutionary struggle, from resentment to sympathy, even when the memoir was written outside the Soviet Union and the author was not under pressure to prove him or herself as a loyal citizen.29 Like the biographies discussed above, the authors often direct criticism at the mother, not the father, which again shows the powerful influence of gender expectations about the duties of parents.30

Despite the difficulties posed by the sources, it is possible to reconstruct the way in which children affected the lives of their revolutionary parents and the work of the underground movement. Expanding the scholarly gaze on the revolutionary struggle to take in the presence of children does not change the grand narrative of the movement, but it enriches our understanding considerably. It helps bridge the gap between the traditional depiction of the male-dominated underground and more recent scholarship highlighting women’s involvement in the political struggle, forcing historians to recognize the daily interaction which occurred between men and women. It also demonstrates, as does the photograph of Zinoviev with his son, that even at crucial moments like the return of the Bolsheviks to Russia in 1917, children were a constant presence in the revolutionary community, and it provides an insight into practical and emotional considerations which affected the daily operations of the underground.

**REVOLUTIONARY PARENTS**

In order to understand the place of children in the revolutionary movement, it is first important to establish how many party agents were parents. In her survey of Bolshevik women, Clements was able to find relevant data on twenty-five
percent of her subjects. Of them, twenty-two percent were mothers. In their sample of eighty-nine female Russian Social Democratic Labor Party (RSDRP) members (1890–1904), Hillyar and McDermid found data for seventy-three percent, and of them thirty-four percent were mothers. In their study of fifty female members of the Socialist Revolutionary Party (SRs), they found that of the thirty-six percent for whom data was available, twenty-eight percent had children. My own small survey of the leading male and female Bolsheviks, Mensheviks, and SRs of 1917 produces higher results and shows that sixty-one percent of Bolsheviks and fifty percent of Mensheviks had children before the revolution. Of the eighty-one percent of leading SRs for whom data could be found, forty-seven percent were parents. Given the small samples of all the studies, with the exception of Clements, it is difficult to explain the range of results, though my higher figures may reflect the greater availability of personal data about these key figures. Each study, nonetheless, shows that a significant number of revolutionaries were parents.

The most common conception of the revolutionary parent is that of a mother choosing to leave her children in someone else’s care in order to begin a life of political activism. Ekaterina Konstantinovna Breshko-Breshkovskaiia (Socialist Revolutionary), Eva L’vovna Broido (Menshevik), and Aleksandra Mikhailovna Kollontai (Bolshevik) each found herself in a marriage which did not fulfill her, not least because her husband did not support her decision to devote herself fully to the campaign for revolution. With the patriarchal authority of the husband so strongly upheld in Russia at this time, the women were left with little choice but to leave their spouses. In each case, the woman felt it was better to leave her child or children in another’s care: Breshko-Breshkovskaiia gave her son to her brother and his wife; Broido’s two daughters went to her mother; Kollontai placed her son in her parents’ care. For them, as so many other revolutionary memoirists would note, the cause of the revolutionary was the priority, and nothing could be allowed to jeopardize their involvement. Of her decision to leave, Kollontai wrote, “Although I personally raised my child with great care, motherhood was never the kernel of my existence. A child had not been able to draw the bonds of my marriage tighter . . . I could not lead a happy, peaceful life when the working population was so terribly enslaved. I simply had to join this movement.” In her autobiography Breshko-Breshkovskaiia explains her decision to leave her child in similar terms to Kollontai: “I knew that I could not be a mother and still be a revolutionist . . . Among the women in the struggle for Russian freedom there were many who chose to be fighters for justice rather than mothers of the victims of terror.”


Men, too, faced this decision, though, as Engel has persuasively argued, it tended not to be as difficult for them, in terms of practicalities, to be both a father and a revolutionary. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century fathers assumed, and society and the law supported them, that children would be cared for by their mothers, freeing the fathers to pursue a career; men would not have to sacrifice their family life to become revolutionaries. Thus, one of the leading figures of the People’s Will, Andrei Ivanovich Zheliabov, could leave a wife and children at home when he joined the movement (and take another lover). The Menshevik Lydia Osipovna Dan observed that the so-called Father of Russian Marxism, Georgii Valentinovich Plekhanov, “thought that in effect he was not bound to his two daughters, though he loved them.” Similarly, the SR Boris Viktorovich Savinkov remembered a peasant and sympathizer, Karl Ivanovich Shtalberg, happily deciding to join the revolutionary movement even though it would mean leaving his wife, sister-in-law, and children to work the family farm without him. Savinkov in fact tried to dissuade Shtalberg from this course of action because becoming “an outlaw” would be hard on his children. To this Shtalberg replied, “The children will live, even without me.” Though he does not mention it in his memoirs, Savinkov himself left his children to be cared for by his wife, Vera Glebovna Uspenskaia, whom he later divorced.

Despite Shtalberg’s complacent attitude, there is evidence that the decision to hand over one’s child to another was traumatic for both sexes. Breshko-Breshkovskiaia remembered the pain she felt when she handed her child over to her brother and his wife, writing, “My heart felt torn into a thousand pieces. My feet were lame, my arms stiff. I could not move from the spot.” The SR terrorist Lev Ivanovich Zilberberg, who participated in attempts to assassinate Stolypin and Grand Duke Nikolai Nikolaevich, and who had a daughter with his wife, Ksenia Pampilova, experienced similar pain. He chose never to see the child because of his commitment to the revolutionary movement. His last letter to his wife from prison, before his execution, explains his decision and the pain it caused him:

I have refused to see the little girl . . . For every man there is a limit to his inner suffering. I can see mother. With great difficulty I could see you, but her . . . It is beyond my strength; here is my limit. I cannot. When I picture this little girl, whom I don’t know and whom I love so much, when I imagine how she would look at me and not understand what is happening, maybe even begin to cry, at seeing an unfamiliar face . . . I cannot. I know that even I, whom no one, apart from you, has seen with tears in his eyes, will begin to cry like a child before these gendarmes.
Further on, his letter draws on the same notions of sacrificing personal happiness to help others as the autobiographies of Breshko-Breshkovskaia and Kollontai. It also, perhaps, contains a hint that his wife should not hand the care of the child over to another in order to continue participating in the revolutionary movement: “My final and passionate wish is that our little girl will have a mother, with whom she will live and grow. And when she is grown up, you will show her the beautiful pages of your copy book and tell her how I loved you, how I loved her. You will tell her that I parted with what was dearest to me—with this great love, with life—in the struggle against the woes and sufferings of others.”

It should be noted that while Zilberberg was able to separate himself completely from his daughter until his death, not all “clean breaks” with children were permanent. Many revolutionaries found that they forever juggled their commitment to the political cause and their responsibilities towards their children. As Lydia Dan admitted, “Not everyone was able simply to abandon his wife and children—they would be lost. The party [RSDRP] could not be counted upon for support. Naturally, people were greatly tied down and restricted by this.” On top of this, feelings of love and guilt played a role in ensuring that at times some party agents broke their code of self-sacrifice and put their family first. Having joined the revolutionary movement, Broido and Kollontai took on the care of their children again, albeit for short periods.

For some children, however, the impact of separation from their parents was often long lasting. Although Breshko-Breshkovskaia was able to make contact with her son at the end of her almost twenty-year term of exile, the meeting was not a happy one, as her biographer describes:

Her son Nicholas had been brought up by kind but conservative relatives, who had told him that his mother was dead. Educated in the ideas of the aristocracy, he had no sympathy with her aims. [Breshkovskaia] had one interview with him, and then parted with him, as she supposed, for life, or until the coming of the revolution; for she could not keep up any communication with him without danger of bringing him under suspicion from the government.

Lydia Dan, who gave her three-year-old daughter to her brother-in-law and his wife to care for, wrote later about her child visiting her in prison at age five: “She had become unused to me . . . She didn’t have the faintest idea what to say to me.” Vera Broido paints a rather nuanced picture of her response to her mother’s absences, which highlights her resilience, but also acknowledges the pain she experienced. She writes, “I always cried when she reappeared though
I don’t think that I cried or missed her very much in between. Each time she seemed a stranger at first and I felt a bit shy of her but a good cry seemed to bring us together.”

Despite the above examples, it should not be assumed that children were always an unwished-for consequence of a relationship or that revolutionaries tried to avoid (or could avoid) becoming parents once fully committed to the movement and aware of the hardships of such a lifestyle. Indeed, my study highlights that children were born to revolutionaries both before and after they had joined the movement and in a variety of circumstances: while living in the relative stability of exile abroad, operating in a Russian town and trying to avoid the gaze of the Tsarist police, enduring the harsh conditions of a Russian prison, or inhabiting an exile community in Siberia. Krupskaia was obviously disappointed not to have become pregnant when she wrote to her mother-in-law from exile in Siberia in 1899: “With regard to my health, I am perfectly well, but concerning the arrival of a little bird, the matter is, unfortunately, bad: no little bird intends to come.” It seems too that Lenin shared his wife’s disappointment, expressing once his sorrow that he did not have a child of his own. Although Lenin’s sister, Anna Elizarova, had doubts about her ability to combine raising a child with her involvement in the Bolshevik party, she nevertheless adopted a young boy in 1913.

Fathers and mothers faced the same dilemma of how to care for their young and participate in the political struggle, though gender often determined the choices available to each parent. Many revolutionaries expressed strong feelings of devotion to their children and welcomed the distraction from their difficult lives that they provided. Lydia Dan noted of her comrade, Pavel Borisovich Aksel’rod, that he “felt that he had very serious obligations as regards his children and . . . met them very honourably.” Liubov Vasil’evna Krasin wrote in her biography of her Bolshevik husband, Leonid Borisovich, “[He] was very fond of children, and quickly won their affection, too. Indeed, I could not help noticing that some of his happiest moments were when he could forget all about the storm and stress of his political life and become a child again with them.”

Even those without children of their own enjoyed the company of other people’s family. Yuli Osipovich Martov happily spent whole days with his comrade Fedor Il’ich Dan’s first family while in self-imposed exile abroad. Krupskaia remembered how her husband, Lenin, “once related, laughing, how [Stepan Ivanovich] Radchenko’s little daughters Zheniurka and Liuda teased him and [Aleksandr Nikolaevich] Potresov. Putting their hands behind their backs they went round the room, side by side, one saying: ‘Bernstein’ and the other replying ‘Kautsky.’” This anecdote also reveals the way in which children of
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revolutionaries absorbed elements of their parents’ political lives even before they understood it fully.

PARENTS AND PARTY MEMBERSHIP

Regardless of the happiness they brought, children complicated the lives of party agents and the operation of the movement itself. Given the very real dangers which revolutionaries faced on a daily basis, it is not surprising that some chose to give up their political careers when they became parents. While this was potentially the best course of action for the family, for the revolutionary movement it often meant losing experienced agents, particularly women. Indeed, for them, the perils associated with the movement tended not to be the only factor in ensuring they left the movement. While the equality of women was accepted on a theoretical level amongst socialists, in practice most male and female revolutionaries retained fairly traditional expectations about the division of household labor and childcare responsibilities.

Lev Davidovich Trotsky, for example, implied in his memoirs that it was his wife’s responsibility to care for the children: “There were months when my work for Pravda left me no time to write a single paying line. The crisis set in. My wife learned the road to the pawnshops, and I had to resell to the booksellers books bought in more affluent days. There were times when our modest possessions were confiscated to pay the house-rent. We had two babies and no nurse; our life was a double burden on my wife. But she still found time and energy to help me in revolutionary work.” In his theoretical writings Trotsky railed against the double burden which “chained” women, but like most theorists of this time, including Kollontai, he waited for the revolution, when the state would take over these burdens and emancipate women. Only Lenin suggested, and only once, after the Bolsheviks had taken power, that in the absence of state intervention, men might help women with domestic chores and childcare. Similarly, even if female revolutionaries rejected the role of mother and housewife, they often relied on other women—nurses, as Trotsky states above, housekeepers, or their own mothers—to take on these duties.

The Bolshevik Cecelia Samoilovna Bobrovskaiia noted the consequence of these assumptions, writing, “During the many years of illegal work I often came across women—wives of revolutionaries—who, because of their children, were obliged to play the unenviable role of mother and housewife even though they had all the attributes required to make them real party workers.” Her comment is all the more pointed because she herself felt unable to immerse herself fully in her revolutionary work when her son was born. She remembered, “On my return from exile I could not find either the Moscow or the Regional Party
organizations to which to go . . . Perhaps if I had gone to the districts and had
got into my old harness of professional district worker, everything would have
looked much brighter, but I could not do that because of a purely personal dis-
ability, I had a new born child on my hands, a sick little boy, who unjustly had to
pay for my restless life.” Here it is striking that Bobrovskia tuyến admits her failure
as a revolutionary for letting her personal life interfere with her underground
activities, but also expresses maternal guilt that her son was unfairly punished
for her lifestyle. As Liljestroem has argued, it is often in these “disjunctures”
from the “normative ideal” that the “person” rather than the “personae” of “the
revolutionary” or “the mother” can be seen. Similarly, Ekaterina Ivanovna
Lorberg, the wife of future Soviet head of state Mikhail Ivanovich Kalinin, gave
up her involvement in the Bolshevik party and moved to her husband’s home
village, temporarily, to raise her three children out of harm’s way. There are
many more examples of women who left the movement, at least for a short
time, for their children.

Some male revolutionaries did defy the traditional expectations about their
role as father. One example of a husband taking on the care of his children is
that of Platon Vasil’evich Lunacharskii, brother of the future Commissar of
Enlightenment, Anatolii Lunacharskii. His wife Sof’ia Smidovich regularly
left their daughter with her husband while she fulfilled her revolutionary
duties. That this was a fairly rare occurrence is suggested in an anecdote to
be found in the memoirs of Land and Liberty member Ol’ga Spiridonovna
Liubatovich. She remembered that she was amazed to see the Ukrainian activist and scholar Mikhail Petrovich Dragomanov take a “hands on” approach to fatherhood, highlighting her own assumptions about male and female parenting duties. As she put it: “[Dragomanov’s wife] was suffering from a serious illness . . . She couldn’t even look after her little eight-month-old daughter, and with my own eyes I saw Dragomanov himself change the baby! . . . I had to wonder at the courage of this man, who was able to reconcile serious literary work with caring for a sick wife and small child.” Other fathers ceased, at least temporarily, their revolutionary activities, but since they usually did so in order to protect their families from the hardships of the movement and to take on legitimate employment, they continued to play the traditional role of the father, the breadwinner. The Bolshevik Aleksei Ivanovich Rykov’s brother-in-law, Vladimir Nikolaeavskii, abandoned his illegal revolutionary work to live with his wife and three children on a cooperative, and in 1908, Leonid Krasin, who also had three children, left Russia for Germany with his family to avoid further police harassment for his involvement in the RSDRP. It is worth noting that in the male cases above, the wife did not continue her revolutionary
activities either, causing their party to lose two agents, whereas in the female examples, the wife abandoned her political work while her revolutionary husband continued his. While most studies of the revolutionary movement put fluctuations in party membership down to the level of state repression or political or economic factors, this evidence points to more personal factors which affected member numbers.79

For some revolutionary men, it was impossible to remain with their family because of the danger of arrest. When the Bolshevik Ekaterina Vasil’evna Bezrukova had her child, her husband, who had been at the 1907 RSDRP Congress in London, was able to visit her only for a short time because he was being tailed by the police.80 Similarly, during 1905, the Bolshevik Sergei Ivanovich Gusev only had brief reunions with his wife Feodosia Il’inichna Drabkina and daughter Elizaveta Yakovlevna, in safe-houses, in order to protect them from his work in the Bolshevik combat group.81

Some revolutionary parents (usually mothers) chose to continue their activities and keep their children with them. This decision often had a direct impact on the trajectory of their political career, for it meant that they limited themselves to the so-called technical work of the party—hiding illegal literature, maintaining safe-houses, and helping to print pamphlets—which was important to the movement, but viewed as secondary to the main activities of the party like agitating amongst workers and participating in party conferences.82 Certainly, Natal’ia Alekseevna Aleksandrova, who conducted technical work because she was caring for her child, viewed it as “passive” involvement in the party.83

Parents who kept their children with them had to accept that their lifestyle would cause hardship for their offspring. Some mothers guiltily acknowledged in their memoirs that children often had to cope with the privations of the underground lifestyle, including poverty and hunger, as well as endure hardships specific to their own development, like a disrupted education.84 The Bolshevik Sof’ia Smidovich, for example, felt her three children grew up “uneducated,” and her comrade Ol’ga Evgen’evna Allilueva noted that because her family “continually roamed from one town to the other, [her] children studied by fits and starts, changing one school for another.”85 While it is rare to find male memoirists admitting to the same, there is clear evidence of revolutionary fathers feeling anguish at being separated from their loved ones. For example, Liubov Krasin’s comment that “the sore point” in their “family life,” which her husband also felt, was “the constant and apparently unavoidable separation from each other” and by implication from the children.86 Letters by Sverdlav and Gusev also point to such feelings but do not express fear that their absence
will damage their children. Children of revolutionaries often remembered their mothers as rather cold figures, who “seemed stern” and “reserved,” but did not make similar comments about their fathers. Vera Broido’s memoirs are a good example of this rather double standard. She acknowledges that she missed both her mother and father, Eva and Mark, when their revolutionary duties took them away from her and indeed is, from her mature perspective, sympathetic to their decision to continue their activities. Nonetheless, she devotes space to describing the conflict her mother experienced as a result but does not suggest that her father suffered similar anguish, nor that he should have. In doing so, she implicitly upholds a notion of the ideal mother against which Eva is measured.

PARENTS, CHILDREN, AND THE UNDERGROUND

Just as the children who remained with their parents had an impact on their careers, so too did they have an impact on the daily activities of the revolutionary movement, at times making operations more difficult—not only for their primary care-giver, usually their mother, but also for local comrades—while at others helping missions to be completed successfully. Without realizing it, children disrupted and sometimes even endangered the revolutionary movement. In order to operate in a city, revolutionaries required safe houses to meet, work, and live. These could be rented specifically for the movement, but it was also common for those who were sympathetic to a revolutionary party to offer their own homes while not becoming any more involved. Going to safe houses and meeting places usually required preparation—for example, acquiring a password—but further precautions were required if the sympathizer had a family. According to Lydia Dan it was “absolutely inadmissible, except in the most extreme circumstances” to go to a revolutionary’s or a sympathizer’s house “if he lived with his family” without contacting him first. This increased the danger to all concerned: “At that time the telephone was not so common, so it was impossible to call. You had to write, which was always risky. It was documentary evidence.”

Carrying out basic activities of the underground movement in Russia, like printing propaganda, also sometimes required taking into account the family lives of revolutionaries. For example, when setting up an illegal printing press in a private flat, Bobrovskaya deliberately chose a childless couple to rent the apartment to make concealing the operation easier. This decision was perhaps the result of a previous experience of working with an illegal press in a family’s home: she and her colleagues had had to wait for the children to fall asleep before starting work.
At times, party agents had to go beyond simply accommodating the family lives of comrades and actually offer them extra help to enable them to fulfill a particular revolutionary duty. During the revolution of October 1905, the Bolsheviks Evgeniia Samoilovna and Aleksandr Grigor’evich Shlikhter actively supported a railwaymen’s strike in Kiev, even though they had three young sons. Returning from a trip to St. Petersburg, Evgeniia discovered that her husband had successfully evaded arrest after a political demonstration but had since disappeared. She then had to find and collect her children, who had been divided up amongst friends to be cared for, and go after her husband, who, it turned out, was in Finland. In 1910, Sof’ia Smidovich was arrested at an illegal flat and then refused to give her own address to the police for three days. She knew her infant son and teenage daughter were waiting at home for her, unaware of what had happened and without their father to look after them, for he was in exile. Nonetheless, Smidovich chose not to reveal her address as the police would find illegal literature there. Like the Shlikhters, she relied on her comrades to intervene; once they discovered that Smidovich had been arrested, they moved quickly to retrieve both the literature and the children. Smidovich was held for almost a year, and it is worth noting that when Petr, her husband, returned from exile, it was he who took on the care of the children. This highlights the way in which party agents were drawn into the familial affairs of others and indeed that informal arrangements to care for children of comrades were a regular feature of the movement.

Of course, not all comrades and relatives were happy to take on the care of another’s child or sympathetic to the feelings of comrades who were parents. Lenin’s younger sister, Mariia Il’inichna Ul’ianova, had no children of her own and was able to dedicate herself whole-heartedly to working for the Bolshevik newspaper Pravda—until, that is, her sister Anna was arrested in October 1916. Mariia lived with her sister and brother-in-law at that time and soon found herself being left to care for their adopted son Gora, a responsibility which provoked in her “fits of hot-temper and irritability.” Some unmarried, childless party agents were often grimly stoic about the need for their male comrades to forget their family duties altogether. The Bolshevik Aleksandr Iakovlevich Arosev remembered Viacheslav Mikhailovich Molotov promising to help him escape exile, saying, “We sell out our wives, put our children aside, but we will free you.” It was, of course, rather easy for Molotov to uphold the standards of self-sacrifice of the movement at this point since he himself did not marry or become a father until after the revolution. When the Bolshevik Petr Anisimovich Moiseenko lost his young child he considered suicide, but his friend told him he ought to “be glad” that he had “escaped”
becoming a family man, for being a revolutionary would only bring hardship to loved ones.99

Family matters even caused disputes within party organizations, distracting from or contributing to political quarrels. Lydia Dan recalled the particularly extreme example of the Social-Democrat Klavdia Prikhodko. She conceived a child with a political exile shortly after breaking up with her partner, Nikolai Ernestovich Bauman, who was also living in the exile community. Bauman so tormented her for her pregnancy that Prikhodko complained to the party and later committed suicide. The scandal was intensified by the reactions of various party members. While Martov and others thought “the prestige of the organization” was compromised by “such people” and that Bauman “should leave the revolutionary movement,” Lenin insisted that it was a “private matter.”100 This was not the only time Lenin refused to accept that a “private matter” should interfere with political work. In Geneva in 1904, Lenin demanded to know why a fellow exile, Nikolai Vladislavovich Valentinov, had not signed a Bolshevik proclamation and asked if this meant he had left the party. Lenin admitted that he had heard that Valentinov had “had some kind of personal trouble just then,” but when Valentinov informed him that his son had died, Lenin replied, “Whether this or something else was the real reason doesn’t matter much in this case. I intend to talk about more important matters.”101 This response reflects Lenin’s demand for absolute loyalty and commitment to the cause, but presumably also the fact that he was not a father himself. This quarrel contributed to Valentinov’s decision to leave the Bolsheviks.102

Besides upsetting the routine of revolutionary work, there was always the potential that children could endanger party agents by speaking carelessly. For example, in 1879, when Aksel’rod, his wife Nadezhda Ivanovna, and their first daughter, Vera, were travelling through Russia by train, the three-year-old happily took up conversation with two policemen, who were in the same compartment as them. She innocently mentioned “Uncle Dragomanov” and “Uncle Kropotkin,” Aksel’rod’s revolutionary colleagues in Geneva. Luckily, in this case the child “mispronounced the names, and the unsuspecting officers did not associate Geneva with revolutionary activity.”103

In other families, parents took or at least threatened drastic measures to ensure that such situations did not arise in the first place. When Lenin and Zinoviev were forced to flee Petrograd after the abortive July Days of 1917, they were taken by a comrade, Nikolai Aleksandrovich Emel’ianov, to his family’s cabin in Finland. Lenin noted immediately that there were six children living in the cabin, aged two to sixteen, and voiced his concern that the youngest would
give them away. Emel’ianov’s wife, Nadezhda Kondrat’evna, was quick to reassure Lenin that he would not be exposed, saying of her two-year-old son, Gosha: “Although he’s young, he’s already seen a lot of police searches in his short life, and if I tell him he must not say to anyone that an uncle is staying with us, and that if he does tell, papa will cut out his tongue, then he won’t say.” This reassured Lenin, and Emel’ianova’s promise held true. Similarly, the Bolsheviks Lev Borisovich Kamenev and his wife Ol’ga Davidovna could rely on their eldest son not to give away information. Ol’ga remembered proudly, “When Liutik was little he was questioned by the Tsarist police, but they got nothing out of him.”

These examples of children learning not to expose their parents demonstrate that in at least some cases, the children were not always “unwitting” in their support for the revolutionary movement. There is evidence, however, that children found the perpetual need for silence burdensome. Elizaveta Drabkina paints a vivid picture of her young life:

When I remember my mama, a street under wet snow appears to me. I step in the puddles behind mama and wipe away tears. I’m cold, I want to eat, but mama goes on and on without end and drags me by the hand. When finally a door opens before us, mama wipes my nose with her perfumed lace handkerchief and says: “Silence! It is necessary.” That “it is necessary” oppressed me. My whole childhood passed under the sign “it is necessary” and “it is not allowed.” It is not allowed to talk about the strange people—the aunts and uncles. It is not allowed to give your surname, it is not allowed to say what your mama is called. It is not allowed to say who my papa is and where he is. In a word, it is not allowed to do what any five year old child does and is praised for.

As she grew older and as will be discussed below, Drabkina became reconciled with the strict rules of the underground and began to enjoy helping her mother in the political struggle.

REVOLUTIONARIES’ FAMILIES AND THE STATE

No matter how well trained children and their parents were in the conspiratorial techniques of the underground, encounters with Tsarist police were a common feature of revolutionaries’ daily lives. Here children could potentially be a liability, but in fact they regularly played an important role in helping their parents, whether consciously or unconsciously. On top of this, the threat of arrest, imprisonment, and exile was ever present. For most revolutionaries and indeed for their parties, their priority was to emerge from their punishment as unscathed as possible so that they might return to the political struggle quickly.
At times having children could worsen the experience of prison or exile and indeed, the authorities could exploit a revolutionary’s status as a parent to intensify his or her punishment. In other circumstances, however, the presence of children helped mitigate a revolutionary’s sentence.

In the first instance, it was not unusual for children to help their parents or other revolutionary comrades evade arrest and avoid punishment altogether. The presence of children often blinded police officers to the true nature of the scene in front of them. The Bolshevik Inessa Armand recorded being searched only cursorily by the police when traveling into Russia in 1904 because she had her five children, including an infant, with her. This enabled her to smuggle illegal Social Democratic literature into the country in her luggage. The Bolshevik and sister of Stalin’s second wife, Anna Sergeevna Allilueva, remembered as a child willingly helping to smuggle arms to Baku. She traveled by train to Baku with her father’s comrade, whom she knew as “uncle Vanya,” wearing a brand new overcoat made specifically to help hide the gun cartridges strapped to her chest. Indeed, from an early age she was aware of her parents’ revolutionary activities as well as those of their comrades and often happily helped them disrupt attempts by the police to arrest them.

Regardless of her positive descriptions of these experiences, Allilueva does capture the traumatic nature of police searches in her home, as do other children who wrote later about these stressful incidents. Inna Armand, Inessa’s daughter, for example, admitted that she remembered “all her life” one particular nighttime raid by police, during which her mother was arrested. Yet, it is also clear that despite the intensity of these situations, children were often able to keep their heads and even help to conceal incriminating evidence. Galina Petrovna, the daughter of Elena Fedorovna Rozmirovich, proudly remembered helping her mother to thwart a police search. She was only eight years old and ill in bed, but when her mother handed her a notebook and some revolutionary leaflets to hide as the police knocked on the door, she concealed the book under her dolls and the leaflets in amongst the doctor’s notes attached to her bed. Later she gave nothing away when she was questioned at the police prison. Other parents were able to exploit the domestic setting of their flats to disguise their illegal activities. The Bolshevik Mariia Petrovna Golubeva, a mother to three children, hid illegal literature in her daughter’s doll, and the toy was overlooked during a police search in 1907. In doing this, Golubeva took a relatively minor risk. Two years previously, during the revolutionary days of October 1905, her home had been the Petersburg Committee’s headquarters where revolutionaries met and weapons were stored. One comrade commented, “Her children slept on bombs.”
As the above examples suggest, in the main it was women who tended to benefit from these ploys. This is partly because they were the ones who usually cared for the children and were therefore in a position to use them, but also because of traditional expectations about the types of activity a mother would or would not undertake, especially the presumption that she would not use her children to facilitate dishonest behavior. That Tsarist police sometimes assumed a mother would be a law-abiding citizen is suggested by a conversation the terrorist Vera Nikolaevna Figner had with a gendarme when she was arrested in 1883. Having introduced himself, her interrogator commented, “You are a good person . . . Your misfortune is that, having married, you had no children.”

The police’s traditional attitudes towards child care could prove useful when a revolutionary was arrested, and again women were often the beneficiaries. There are several examples of mothers successfully applying for early release on the grounds that there was no one to care for their children. Of course, such a plea was often true, but, as has been shown above, having children to look after did not always prevent women from operating as party agents. One Bolshevik woman, A. Gazenbum, wrote about her experience of making such a petition. With her husband already in prison, she was responsible for the care of her mother and young child. Then Gazenbum herself was arrested, and Gazenbum’s mother had to look after her daughter’s child, as well as the child of another revolutionary couple who had been arrested on the same night. The following morning, Gazenbum’s mother took both children to the police station and left them there declaring that she could not care for them. Gazenbum and the mother of the other child were released the same day. In a similar case, when the Social-Democrat Konstantin Maksimovich Norinskii and his wife, Fenia Dontsova, were arrested, their lodger and fellow revolutionary, Ivan Fedorovich Tkachenko, had to take on the care of their three children. As Norinskii puts it in his memoirs: “It was immediately decided to make a petition to the police chief about my or my wife’s release in order to go to the children, who were left . . . completely neglected. I don’t know what to put it down to—but my request was granted on that very day and my wife was released and sent to the children; I remained in prison, with a celebration in my soul.”

When imprisonment could not be avoided, for revolutionaries, and their parties, it was important that they survived their incarceration or exile in as good physical and mental health as possible so that they could return to their political work quickly after their release or escape. Having children was often a double-edged sword in this situation, particularly for women. Some women had to take their children into prison with them when they were arrested for the want of alternative arrangements and others, as was mentioned above, gave
birth in prison. Occasionally children could provide a welcome distraction. While on her way into exile and spending the night in one of the forwarding prisons en route, the SR Marie Sukloff helped deliver a child to a fellow prisoner. She wrote, “I held the newly-born baby, wrapped in my underclothing. It was suddenly hard for me to part with that child. An unfamiliar feeling had awakened in my heart. Never before had I thought of a mother’s feelings. I hardly slept the following night, and whenever I dozed off, I heard the cries of the woman and the whole picture of the birth passed through my memory. It made me forget my position for a while.”

Some mothers were given special privileges in prison, including, for example, the member of the People’s Will, Anna Vasil’evna Iakimova, who was given better food and permission to sew baby clothes for her infant. Generally, however, the presence of children made the experience of prison much more difficult. Those who, like the Bolsheviks Klavdia Timofeevna (wife of Yakov Mikhailovich Sverdlov) and Glafira Ivanovna Okulova-Teodorovich, gave birth in prison did so in unsanitary and disease-ridden circumstances, often with only the help of their fellow prisoners during the labor. Not all children survived this start in life, particularly in view of the fact that special consideration was not always given to a mother and her child in prison. Bonch-Bruevich’s wife, Vera Mikhailovna, gave birth to her first child in prison, but it died soon after.

The authorities could also use a prisoner’s child to make a sentence harsher, and here fathers could be affected as well as mothers. When the Social-Democrats the Orlovs were imprisoned at the same time, the treatment of their child, whom Orlova had taken into prison with her, caused both parents great stress. For a minor offence, Orlova was ordered to be put into a punishment cell and her child was removed forcibly from her. The infant was only returned when the male prisoners rioted and Orlov attempted suicide. The helplessness which fathers experienced while imprisoned and unable to see their wives and children was often exploited by the authorities. Norinskii, mentioned above, remembered a fellow prisoner “tearing out his hair” because his wife was in labor when he was arrested. Similarly, the authorities rejected a petition by Zlata Evnovna that her husband Zinoviev be released from prison because she was expecting a child (their son Stepan), and his absence was negatively affecting what was already a “nervous pregnancy.” When Aleksandr, the brother of the revolutionary leader Petr Alekseevich Kropotkin, was being held in prison for a letter he had written to the socialist Peter Lavrovich Lavrov, he was denied permission to leave prison to see his dying son.

Perhaps the most infamous example of the authorities using a revolutionary’s child to intensify their punishment is the case of Gesia Mirovnna Gelfman,
one of the terrorists who assassinated Aleksandr II in 1881. Her sentence of
death was commuted to hard labor in view of the fact that she was expecting a
child, but she remained in prison in St. Petersburg during her pregnancy and
the birth itself. Once the child was born, the authorities revoked Gelfman’s right
as a female prisoner to hand her child over to others to be cared for during her
sentence. Instead, the child was placed in an orphanage, despite several peti-
tions to the authorities by her comrades to be allowed to look after the baby.
Here the “leniency” initially shown towards a pregnant woman was replaced
by extra cruelty in using her child in her punishment.

Of course, for the children who were incarcerated with their mothers prison
could be a traumatic experience. One of Elizaveta Drabkina’s friends “had
spent so many years in jail with his mother that he was afraid to walk through
an open doorway without permission.” On the other hand, Sof’ia Smidovich
recalled that her daughter, Tania, was upset not by being in prison with her
mother, but by being taken away by her grandfather to be cared for at home.

Older children were far more likely to be left in the care of others while their
parents were in prison. Prisoners were usually allowed regular meetings with
family members, and these no doubt helped alleviate the strain of prison life for
at least a short time. The Menshevik Mark Isaevich Broido was visited regularly
in prison by his two step-daughters, who, according to his wife Eva, “brought
a welcome note of gaiety and sweetness into the monotonous life of the prison-
ers.” The girls were received so warmly by the prisoners that they “came to love
their visits to the prison and always prepared for them as for a party.” Their
visits were not only social occasions, but also had a political importance too, for
“various notes and letters were carefully hidden in the belts and hems of their
dresses” for Mark and his cell mates. Indeed, visits from children were used
regularly to enable parents to remain in contact with the revolutionary move-
ment. Thus, Feodosiia Drabkina relied on her daughter Elizaveta to act as a
go-between for her while she was prison. Elizaveta later wrote with pride about
taking a message from her mother and her fellow political inmates to Anna
Elizarova, one of the editors of Rabotnitsa, and Lenin’s sister, which expressed
their support for the Bolshevik newspaper aimed at working women. However, remembering positively an association with a “renowned person,”
which in turn bolstered one’s own reputation, was a long-standing tradition
in Soviet and, indeed, Imperial Russian, writings which must also be borne in
mind in interpreting Elizaveta’s reminiscences. In 1916, Mark Timofeevich
Elizarov often took Gora to visit his adoptive mother, Anna, in prison. On at
least one occasion, Anna was able to hide a letter to her husband in her son’s
clothes as she made a show of fastening up his coat. Obviously such letters
were crucial since they could contain more conspiratorial information than could be conveyed in face-to-face meetings observed by guards.

From prison, a large percentage of revolutionaries were exiled by the courts or administratively, and again parents often endured extra hardship. Some revolutionaries handed over their children to others to be raised. Anna Iakimova, who had cared for her baby in prison for a year, handed the infant over to “some well-wishers” at a stopping point during the two-year-long journey to Kara, where she and her fellow prisoners were sent to do hard labor in the prison mines. When Mariia Pavlovna Vorontsova and her husband Kavalevskii were exiled on separate political charges to different places, they entrusted the care of their daughter, Hallie, to one of Vorontsova’s sisters.138

Others took their children into exile with them, including, for example, the Bolsheviks K. N. Gavrilova, who went into exile with her four-year-old daughter, and Klavdia Ivanovna Nikolaeva, who took her two-year-old son with her. I have found only one example of a single father taking his children into exile, though many male revolutionaries were accompanied voluntarily by their wives and children when they were sent to Siberia. In such cases, the physical hazards of exile were intensified by the presence of children and made surviving exile more difficult, and indeed, occasionally the authorities seemed deliberately to exploit the risks which exile posed to children to intensify the punishment of their parents. The journey itself posed grave danger to young children, given the harsh climates, the basic forms of transport, and the poor condition of transit prisons, which were often rife with disease. It was not unusual for infants to die en route into exile. Kennan wrote in stark, but somewhat sensational, detail about the hardships experienced by the Cherniavskis, for example, whose baby died as they travelled to the Irkutsk forwarding prison and who were made to wait for half an hour in the prison yard holding their dead child before they were admitted. Osip Minor’s wife, Anastasiia Shekhter, mentioned above, bore and lost her child while being transported to exile in Viliuisk. She had submitted a petition requesting that her journey be delayed until the weather was warmer because she was caring for an infant, but it was rejected.

If a revolutionary’s family did reach the place of exile unharmed, the presence of loved ones could help alleviate the mental suffering which the punishment of exile was designed to cause. Moiseenko remembered how his daughter, who was born in exile, was a “comfort” to the other local political. Children were also saved from the pain of separation from their parents. Vera Broido recalled that the summer she spent with her mother and brother in exile in Kurangino in 1915 was “nearly idyllic,” for her mother,
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whose revolutionary activities often took her away from her children for long stretches, was “always there.”  

Nonetheless, the physical hardships of exile and the poverty in which many exiles lived were harder to alleviate, and trying to protect children from these conditions was difficult. For example, the Orlovs mentioned above were exiled to the village of Ribinskoe, Eniseisk province, and took their young son with them. They experienced severe financial difficulties, with Orlova complaining to Sukloff (who was herself in exile about thirty miles away): “I don’t see how we can live here. The child is growing; he will soon be three years old. We cannot earn anything here. The money which I get from home is hardly sufficient to pay rent and buy fire-wood.” Sukloff observed their domestic situation, writing, “The cold in the house was fearful. The wretched poverty in which the Orlovs lived astonished even me.” While this description perhaps seems intended to illicit the sympathy of the reader, the poverty in which exiles lived is well documented.  

Thus, the focus of many exiled revolutionaries was to make their escape, partly to flee the often terrible living conditions they had to endure, but more usually so that they could return to their political work. Understandably, having children complicated plans to escape or even made them impossible and once again kept valued party members from working for the cause. Traditional notions of gender roles played a part in this situation, for it was not unusual for husbands to attempt escape while their wives continued to live in Siberia and care for their children. The Menshevik Ivan Adolfovich Teodorovich, who chose not to escape because he did not want to leave his wife, Glafira, mentioned above, and their newborn child, seems to have been an exception. Trotsky, however, made such an escape from exile. The unspoken assumptions, shared, it seems, by both members of this couple, that he had a greater contribution to make to the revolution than his wife, who was herself a devoted party agent, and that their children were more her responsibility than his, are clear in Trotsky’s account of his decision to leave:

A book by Lenin also reached us . . . entitled What Is To Be Done? . . . My handwritten essays, newspaper articles, and proclamations for the Siberia Union immediately looked small and provincial to me in the face of the new and tremendous task which confronted us. I had to look for another field of activity. I had to escape from exile . . .

At that time we already had two daughters. The younger was four months old. Life under conditions in Siberia was not easy, and my escape would place a double burden on the shoulders of Aleksandra L’vovna [Sokolovskaia, his wife]. But she met this objection with the two words: “You
must.” Duty to the revolution overshadowed everything else for her, personal considerations especially. She was the first to broach the idea of my escape when we realized the great new tasks. She brushed away all my doubts.151

For some men, the presence of the family they were leaving behind was invaluable to their plan. While travelling into exile in a convoy of horse-drawn carriages, Mark and Eva Broido were able to get the guard removed from their carriage after protesting that they did not want their children to be traumatized by the guard’s presence. The convoy officer, who obviously expected the Broidos to remain together, agreed to their request, saying, “Small chance of them running away, with two small kids!” When his moment came, Mark simply jumped from the carriage and ran.152 The arrival of the family of Iakov Sverdlov, including his infant son whom he was meeting for the first time, to his place of exile in Narym seemed to persuade the authorities that he would not try to flee. The authorities released Sverdlov from the local prison, where he was being held for a previous escape attempt, and postponed his dispatch to a more remote place of exile. Sverdlov exploited this reprieve and, leaving his family behind, escaped.153

Not all women in exile were disadvantaged by having children; some were able to use their young to help their escape. Sukloff was able to engineer her flight from exile using an infant as part of her disguise. Both she and the Orlovs wished to escape but realized that the police would be looking for a woman traveling alone and a couple with a child. It was decided, therefore, that Sukloff would take the child, delivering him to his grandparents, and the Orlovs would travel as a childless couple.154 Both escapes were successful, in Sukloff’s case because it played on traditional assumptions about mothers. She wrote,

The child proved the best protection from the searching eyes of the police and gendarmes. The spies who swarmed at every big station did not pay the least attention to me. They evidently could not think of such a combination. When we came to Cheliabinsk . . . and had to change trains, our car was suddenly locked, and the passengers were let out singly and their passports examined. I held the child in my arms, and the gendarmes passed me without a question.155

Thus, while children at times took their mothers out of the revolutionary movement, they could also prove vital in enabling them (or their comrades as in the above case) to return to underground activities.

The Land and Liberty member Ol’ga Spiridonovna Liubatovich, who lost a child during her revolutionary career, wrote, “Yes, it’s a sin for revolutionaries to start a family. Men and women both must stand alone, like soldiers under
a hail of bullets.” Standing alone proved to be an impossible standard for revolutionaries to hold to, and children were a regular feature of revolutionary communities. Very few parents were able or willing to cut themselves off completely and permanently from their children and as a result the functioning of the revolutionary movement was often affected by individuals’ need to juggle parenting and underground responsibilities. Thus, having children took many women out of the movement for periods of time. Besides this, the presence of children in safe houses or on operations jeopardized the strict conspiracy that revolutionary parties attempted to maintain, and being a parent made a revolutionary more vulnerable when being punished by the state. Children did not always have a negative effect on the movement, however; sometimes they in fact helped shield revolutionaries from the “hail of bullets.” Children quickly learned the vital necessity of silence around strangers and of not giving away who or what they had seen or had hidden in their toys. They could help their mothers in particular obtain early release from prison and were often central to plans for escape of both male and female revolutionaries.

Recognizing the presence of children in revolutionary communities enriches our knowledge of the movement, particularly its daily operations, and enhances our understanding of the relationships between male and female activists and the differing roles they played in the political struggle. It also acts as an important reminder that personal concerns could never be eradicated from the revolutionary struggle and that adhering to the ideals of the movement often proved difficult if not impossible, even for the most ardent of believers. The personal compromises that revolutionaries made during the underground foreshadowed the resistance the Bolsheviks faced, after their seizure of power, when they began to implement their agenda for the emancipation of women and the transformation of every day life. Changing attitudes towards children and parenthood in the new revolutionary state proved to be a huge challenge, with more traditional notions persisting long into the new regime.

Similarly, it should be acknowledged that none of the children discussed above ever fully escaped the shadow of their parents’ activities. Some children became estranged from their parents, but many joined the movement in their own right, with some fighting and dying in the civil war. The children of Mensheviks and SRs were deported along with their parents in the early 1920s by the Bolsheviks, and in the 1930s, Stalin targeted the children of those same, now Old, Bolsheviks. Stepan Zinoviev was shot a year after his father’s execution; many more children of Bolsheviks were incarcerated during the Great Terror. Those who escaped this fate, or survived it, became the keepers of their parents’ memory. It is the task of historians of the revolution to remember the children.
NOTES
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1. A brief note on terminology: there was no single homogenous revolutionary movement in late imperial Russia, but rather distinct ideological outlooks, tactics, and political parties; nonetheless it can be argued that in terms of practicalities and basic assumptions about the duties and responsibilities of “the revolutionary” there were commonalities. The need for secrecy, the need to limit contact with innocent parties to a greater or lesser degree, the expectation that the revolutionary cause came first, the use of safe houses, coded correspondence, and illegal printing presses, and the struggle with the regime’s police were all regular features of the daily operations of most revolutionary party cells, regardless of theoretical position (see, J. L. H. Keep, *The Rise of Social Democracy in Russia* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963], 11). Similarly, I would argue, parents and children of all revolutionary persuasions faced common challenges and dilemmas regarding balancing their familial responsibilities and party duties. Thus I will from time to time use “revolutionary movement” as an umbrella term to point to these commonalities, making party distinctions where appropriate.


breaks down the age structure of the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks, using as his youngest
category ten to nineteen years, and notes that there are more under-twenty-year-olds in
the Bolsheviks than in the Mensheviks. While it is clear that the individuals to whom he is
referring were in their late teens, rather than near the age of ten—the ten being included
presumably to keep the age groups equal for statistical analysis—this discussion does sug-
gest the intriguing possibility of youngsters being included as official members of the par-
ties. Unfortunately, Lane does not pursue this line of investigation any further.
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