Gender & History ISSN 0953–5233
Elizabeth A. Wood, 'The Trial of the New Woman: Citizens-in-Training in the New Soviet Republic'
Gender & History, Vol.13 No.3 November 2001, pp. 524–545.

The Trial of the New Woman: Citizens-in-Training in the New Soviet Republic

Elizabeth A. Wood

> Our task consists in making politics accessible for every labouring woman and in teaching every [female] cook [*kukharka*] to run the government.
>
> – Vladimir Lenin, Third Congress of Soviets, 1918

The accusations were flying thick and fast against the defendant. She had pretensions to running the government and meddling in public affairs. She had taken part in strikes and demonstrations. She was trying to put all women on an equal footing with men. She had destroyed her own femininity, ceasing to be an object of beauty and pleasure for men, ceasing as well to raise her children and, instead, giving them into others' hands. All these things, it was alleged, contradicted woman's very nature, which was to serve as decoration in men's lives.

The setting was *The Trial of the New Woman*. The prosecution witnesses included a factory director, a lady secretary, a rich peasant, a priest, and a traditional family woman. The so-called 'bourgeois' court initially found the defendant guilty, but then workers appeared on stage, and her judges ran away. Her rights were restored, and she was recognised to be 'equal to men in all respects'.

This *Trial of the New Woman* was, of course, a mock trial, and the new woman herself emerged as the heroine of the play. It was staged

© Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 2001, 108 Cowley Road, Oxford OX4 1JF, UK and 350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148, USA.

under the auspices of the local women's section of the Communist Party in Voronezh, a provincial city in the Soviet Union, in late February 1921.[1] A few months later a similar *Trial of the New Woman* was performed in the Great Columned Hall of the House of Unions in Moscow, the same hall where the famous Moscow Show Trials would be enacted in the 1930s.[2] Other such trials of women and women's issues were held in provincial cities and in the countryside for the next six years.[3]

The mock trials emerging at this time were a new form of political education known as 'agitation trials' (*agitatsionnye sudy*). In the first half of the 1920s the central women's section of the party and local women's sections used these trials of new women as a vehicle to publicise the regime's claim of a revolutionary commitment to women's participation and equality.

Yet, as I will show, their representation in these dramatic works in fact served to undermine the Soviet assertion that women were fully equal citizens. Analysis of the portrayal of these heroines suggests instead that they should be characterised as citizens-in-training, i.e. as citizens who ostensibly enjoyed fully equal rights, but who nonetheless needed constant monitoring and training because they were not yet capable of being full members of the body politic.

This article is part of a larger study of agitation trials that were staged in a wide variety of contexts.[4] These courtroom dramas were performed by amateurs, including in this case political activists in the women's sections of the party. They put fictional characters on trial in order to condemn pre-revolutionary and, above all, 'backward' forms of behaviour. Sometimes, as in the cases of the *Trial of the New Woman*, the dramas were improvised along generally accepted political lines without a formal script. In other trials of women delegates formal scripts were usually twenty to thirty pages long. They were printed in inexpensive editions ranging from 3,000 to 100,000 copies.

The trial format permitted relatively easy staging by amateur actors at low cost. All that was needed was a red cloth to cover a table for the judge, a few benches for the accused and witnesses, plus a few incidentals such as a bell for keeping order, a carafe of water for verisimilitude. The actors went through the ritual motions of declaring the court in session, inviting the witnesses and the defendant to give testimony, presenting closing arguments, and pronouncing a final verdict.

The trials in which women and women's issues figure as the central subjects form a distinct minority of the scripts and accounts I have

© Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 2001.

collected. Only nine accounts and texts are devoted to women's involvement in political issues.[5] Yet in this subset of the agitation trials one can see important assumptions about males and females, political consciousness and ignorance.[6]

On the surface, Soviet ideology was unambiguously committed to women's citizenship and full gender equality. The 'new woman' in these plays was not only acquitted; she was officially presented as the heroine who had endured much at the hands of men and other women who failed to understand her important new role in society. As Lenin himself noted in 1917, 'Unless women are induced to take an independent part in political life generally, but also in daily and universal public service, it is no use talking about full and stable democracy, let alone socialism'.[7] Revolutionary laws from the first decrees after October 1917 explicitly eliminated any gender inequalities in marriage, divorce and private property, in voting rights and land use, and in labour policies.[8] Soviet officials insisted tirelessly that they wanted women to be involved in politics and the public sphere. They did not want women to be trapped in the kitchen any more. As Lenin had noted, every female cook should be able to run the government.

In this article I argue that the revolutionary authors' depiction of their own heroines reveals an underlying ambivalence about women's emancipation and citizenship. In the Russian and Soviet context historians have tended to focus almost exclusively on official discourses of women's equality (i.e. pronouncements of the law, the party, or prominent women within the party). Yet what the new authorities gave with one hand in terms of the public announcement of women's 'objective' equality, they took away and undermined discursively with the other, in their 'subjective' representations of female characters, as we shall see. The trials turn out to be steeped in mixed messages, a combination of explicit, official ideological representations of women as equals, on the one hand, and competing presentations of women, even the heroines, as still locked in older behaviours that put them in need of special tutelage and restraint.

Citizenship itself is not a fixed and unitary term even in the most liberal of 'modern' societies. As scholars have been showing in rich detail recently, citizenship as a concept has to be viewed in both political and social terms. One must ask not only who can vote, but also who can receive social services from the state and on what terms, who is required to serve the state and in what capacities. Citizens

© Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 2001.

'belong' to their states, as historical sociologist Rogers Brubaker has shown; but, at the same time, states make certain promises to those citizens.[9]

The issue of Soviet citizenship is particularly complicated because of the nature of this new state, its history and ideology, and the often unexamined preconceptions of those involved in the actual creation and administration of the new polity.[10] Many scholars might argue that the term 'citizenship' should not be applied at all in the Soviet context because this was a quintessentially 'illiberal' state. It did not permit free and contested elections. Competing political parties were quickly muzzled. The state did not provide legal guarantees as basic as habeas corpus, freedom of speech, assembly. There was no separation of the branches of government, no independent judiciary, no freedom of the press.[11]

Yet the new Soviet authorities themselves began using the term 'citizens' from their very first decrees. They eliminated the older term for 'subject' (*poddannyi*), declaring that it deserved to be 'relegated to the museum of antiquities'.[12] In its place they substituted 'citizen' (*grazhdanin*) and reiterated everywhere imaginable that they were declaring citizenship without regard to race, religion, domicile, or sex. The Constitution of 1918 claimed a series of freedoms explicitly for citizens: freedom of religious and anti-religious propaganda; the right freely to hold assemblies, meetings, processions, etc.; the right to vote and to be elected to the soviets. It also declared 'the duty of all citizens of the Republic' to be labour on the premise that 'Whoever does not work shall not eat'.[13]

Are we to view this as entirely a matter of hypocritical self-serving, a ploy to deceive the Russian and non-Russian peoples who otherwise might reject the revolution? I don't think so. In the first place, these were revolutionaries who had been following in the footsteps of the French Revolution and the Paris Commune for almost half a century.[14] Lenin himself had written extensively on the two-stage nature of the revolution he and his colleagues were creating: first, they would create a bourgeois democracy, then proceed to a socialist revolution and a socialist state.[15]

The question of who actually had citizenship is, however, rather tricky. In 1929 the American scholar Samuel Northrup Harper published his now almost entirely forgotten *Civic Training in Soviet Russia*.[16] He had lived in Russia before the October Revolution of 1917 and then spent the summer and fall of 1926 investigating questions

© Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 2001.

of 'civic education', 'civic cohesion', and the like. These were fashionable questions at the time, and the University of Chicago published an entire series on citizenship in different countries. Harper's conclusion, which I endorse, was that one can see a tripartite hierarchy in early Soviet Russia, with the *lishentsy* or non-citizens at the bottom, ordinary workers and peasants in the middle, and party members at the top. Those on the bottom, the *lishentsy* (or disenfranchised persons), were denied suffrage and citizenship on the grounds that they had been tsarist officials, members of classes that exploited the labour of others, officers in the tsarist army, religious personnel, those convicted of crimes by the courts, or mentally ill.[17] Ordinary workers and peasants in the middle, both male and female, could both elect and be elected. The top category of what Harper calls 'a kind of super-citizenship' consisted of comrades who fulfilled active duties at the request of the party. The ideal of this kind of citizenship, Harper noted, was 'the stalwart, revolutionary, Communist fighter'.[18]

The proof that a 'comrade' was a higher rank than a 'citizen' can also be seen in the courts themselves. By the early 1920s, court practice had established that the defendant and all the witnesses in a trial were to be referred to as 'citizens'. Only the court personnel itself could be referred to by the judges as 'comrades'.[19] The defendant now had no right to refer to the judge or anyone else in authority as 'comrade'. Thus, a person on trial was demoted to the position of a mere 'citizen' – in other words, a mere resident of the Soviet Republic.

An excellent example of this can be seen in an agitation trial in which a woman delegate named Cherepanova is ultimately vindicated by the courts and shown to be the real heroine of her village. The judge who has consistently addressed her as 'citizenness' (*grazhdanka*), a term emphasising her status as defendant, turns to her in his very last speech, for the first and only time calling her 'comrade':

> Comrade Cherepanova, you are now free. Go and work yet more for the benefit of the government, for the benefit of all toilers. Call others to follow you as well.[20]

As long as she occupied the liminal status of someone on trial (i.e. someone who had not yet been found either guilty or innocent), Cherepanova had to be addressed as 'citizenness'. Only once she had regained the ranks of those working for the Soviet state could she be referred to as 'comrade'.

In the agitation trials under study in this article, the main tension revolves around the issue of women's public service to the party

© Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 2001.

through their roles as *delegatki*, i.e. female delegates. Invented in about 1919, the delegate meeting (*delegatskoe sobranie*) was intended to provide a place for women workers and peasants to meet and learn about current political affairs. Larger conferences of local women would elect the *delegatki* to serve for a year. During that time the *delegatki* would study political literacy; they would visit various model Soviet organisations (museums, factories, courts, day care sites); and they would support mobilisation campaigns that the regime was running. Sometimes they would hold what might be called 'office hours' in their factories to hear the problems of other women and try to help them out. At the end of their year of service they were supposed to report back to the constituents who had elected them.[21]

In practice the delegate meetings were entirely insular. In the first place, they were set up only for women workers and peasants, with no equivalent for men. Women were deemed to be particularly in need of remedial work in a way that men were not. (While it is true that 86 per cent of women were illiterate on the eve of the October Revolution, fully 67 per cent of men were illiterate as well.)[22] Secondly, these meetings were designed primarily for those women considered most illiterate and least involved in public campaigns.[23] So, clearly it was not the most capable and/or committed women who were asked to join these meetings and contribute their skills to political work. Finally, these delegate meetings did not actually report to anyone other than the women who elected them. In other words, they were a kind of self-sufficient political organisation. They were thus not designed to have any serious influence on the political process, even at the most local level. Rather they were intended primarily to teach a few women a few political skills. Even that training did not usually translate into increased party membership for women or increased political involvement. After their year of service in the delegate meetings, women workers and peasants typically did not join the party, although they might remain working in the kindergarten or public cafeteria where they had done an internship.

The women's section of the party usually took the lead in publishing agitation trials of women delegates. This set of trials tended to focus on the harassment of *delegatki* and women electors by local men. The stated goal was to show the harm this harassment could do and to vindicate the women, showing that they had triumphed over their male harassers. Fictional trials of the heroine *delegatka*, obviously, gave playwrights an opportunity to show the obstacles she

© Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 2001.

faced and to turn the tables on her opponents, showing that they were in fact the ones hindering the new order.

At the same time, however, these trials reveal new assumptions that only public work and service made the individual a member of the new order. The woman delegate who is the ostensible heroine of the trials is never portrayed as having already *attained* full political consciousness. Even when she does break out of the clutches of the domestic sphere to become involved in the public sphere, she is nonetheless depicted largely in terms of traditionally negative 'female' qualities of indiscipline, meddling, gossip, and/or, their opposite, a kind of saintliness.

The male characters in these plays express stereotypical peasant misogyny.[24] Politics, for example, 'is no women's matter [*ne bab'e delo*]', says one peasant husband.[25] Another says his wife can't be a boss, because he is the boss, and because women have 'stupid heads'. If you let them run things, 'you might as well put your head in a noose'. If the women want to go off and form their own 'women's council', that's fine, but we don't need them in ours. It's also not women's place to wander idly into various reading huts (created by the regime to encourage literacy) and 'stick their noses' into newspapers.[26]

Women delegates in these plays themselves subscribe to many of these views. Before being put on trial for not fulfilling her responsibilities as a delegate, Maria Tikhonova herself thought she did not have a good enough head for politics. She was barely literate. She did not really understand that being elected as a delegate meant that she actually had to do work in that role. Everything would be taken care of by the woman organiser from the women's section of the party, she thought. After all, she noted, people had got along fine without women delegates before the revolution. Furthermore, she needed to go home right after work in order to take care of the house and the farming: 'My female responsibility is to get my work done and get home as soon as possible'.[27] Her neighbour defends her, saying, 'Look, from childhood no one bothered to teach us, so now what are we supposed to do? Once a female [*baba*], always a female.'[28]

The way out of this problem ('once a female, always a female') was to make women 'human', or so the intelligentsia had long believed. In the nineteenth century, radical members of the Russian intelligentsia had envisaged the solution to the 'woman question' as making women into 'people', giving each a personality (*lichnost'*), and in the

© Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 2001.

process making them the equals of men.[29] Through careful intervention and tutelage by male members of the educated classes, women could be 'brought up to' the level of men. This was the starting point of the early Bolshevik government's stated commitment to women's emancipation, though the new leaders came to this issue somewhat reluctantly.[30]

In the agitation trials, women delegates invariably speak of themselves as having become fully human only through the outside intervention of the Communist Party, which has brought them a new consciousness. On the one hand, this fits well with Lenin's assertions, in his famous essay 'What Is to Be Done?', that social-democratic consciousness could be brought to the workers only from outside, only by the Social Democratic Party itself (known as the Communist Party from 1918).[31] Yet this transition from 'backward woman' to 'human being' also has striking overtones of a kind of Pygmalion myth. The party will infuse the inert, uninvolved woman with breath in the form of political consciousness, and she will come alive, now able to serve the revolution and society.

In *The Trial of the Peasant Woman Delegate*, Maria Cherepanova, whom we have met before, is accused by her husband of abandoning her household and children in order to attend political meetings. In her own defence at the end of the play she tells why she became a woman delegate. 'I didn't consider myself a person', she begins. For years she worked only for her family. But then Soviet power came, and 'they' (presumably Soviet authorities) began to explain everything. Instructors came from the women workers' section in the city. 'It was as if a bandage fell from my eyes, [...] as if I had been blind and now I saw everything'. When they sent in a rural organiser to set up delegate meetings for women peasants, she became involved. 'All of a sudden I felt that I was, after all, also a person, really a person, and that I have all the rights; but before that wasn't the case. I felt so good, so joyful.'[32]

The main foil to her character, who illustrates someone stuck in the 'old' way of life, is her elderly mother-in-law, aged sixty-five. A widow who must live with her children in order to receive support, the mother-in-law complains bitterly of how young people 'have become smarter than us', and how it is a 'disgrace' that this family conflict between Maria and her husband has come to court. What kind of a wife and housewife is Maria, she asks. She doesn't listen to her husband; she leaves her children. Of herself, she says that she never

© Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 2001.

tried to teach her husband; and if he beat her, well, then that was his business. 'We tolerated everything. You'll never hear of a life more bitter than that of our women. But what can you do? That's our women's lot. It's obviously God's will. It's not made by us, and not up to us to redo it. [...] We suffered, and she should do the same.'[33]

Another example of a character who becomes 'a person' through the process of the courtroom trial is the wife, Anna Grigor'eva, who has been beaten by her husband, in *The Trial of the Old Way of Life*. Although she is described as a 'conscious woman worker', she has tolerated her husband's abuse because of the remains of her 'old, slavish habits'. Once she realises, however, that the bourgeois ideal of domestic bliss is really an illusion and once she has found the courage to bring a suit against her husband, then she becomes, in her words, 'a completely different person'. Where earlier she was terrified to speak out and act, now nothing frightens her. She is the first to arrive at every meeting, lecture, and political discussion circle.[34]

Though the plays speak of 'freedom' and even of 'rights' (words which are rather unusual in the context of later Soviet writings), the freedom and the rights of women are linked irrevocably in these trials to their responsibility to work for Soviet state and society. The crime of several husbands in these plays is in failing to see that their wives are 'conscious' women workers, that they are 'respected and trusted comrades at work'.[35] Working as a *delegatka* and in other public spheres becomes 'the duty of every honest, conscious woman citizen'.[36] Grigor'eva, the wife whose husband has been beating her, also comes to see that 'a woman is not a slave, not a bitch for breeding [*samka*], but a free person, *engaged just as much in productive labour as the man*, and capable of fulfilling the same public work as he is'.[37] In saying this, she asks for a divorce from her husband not in order to have some abstract rights or freedoms but so that she can engage in productive labour and public works. She promises that from now on she will engage in fighting for women's emancipation, for public cafeterias, for nurseries, cooperatives, and clubs. While these institutions clearly assist women, Grigor'eva and the other defendants are not being 'emancipated' for their own sake either as women or as individuals. Rather they are being emancipated so they can work for Soviet power.[38]

These plays rely for some of their drama on the contrast between husbands who try to 'teach' their wives by beating them and dragging them around by the hair, on the one hand, and the new Soviet

© Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 2001.

authorities, on the other hand, especially the women's sections and the local executive committees, who take the women delegates in hand and teach them through example, showing them the new Soviet order. In the old world, God had allegedly created an order which obliged women to submit to their husbands. In the new world, women could divorce their husbands and become involved in building a whole new social order.[39]

Yet the women are always in need of tutelage. The local authorities, especially organisations like the village executive committee, play a crucial imaginary role in 'developing' them. Then the women can 'be transformed into good workers' (*vyrabatyvaiutsia iz nikh i khoroshie rabotniki*).[40] Once they are turned into those good staff members, even the nouns lose their gender designations: the *delegatki* (a marked, female noun) become *rabotniki* (a general word for worker or staff member which does not have a gender marking). It is the party and its political organisations which must show women the way. On her own, Cherepanova, for example, is characterised as having only 'an instinct, a feeling' (*instinkt, chuvstvo*) which 'makes her feel drawn [to the new life]' (*ona tianetsia k nei)*. She does not have 'a clear striving, a knowledge of the essence of this new life'. If she's to be sentenced, the defence argues, it should be to a term in school, so she can learn more and gain in knowledge, so she can 'sow light among her co-citizens and awaken the peasant women'.[41] In none of the agitation trials of women delegates, even those who are acquitted and vindicated as 'useful citizens', are they portrayed as fully formed, ready to hold positions of leadership.

Ostensibly, the heroines share a common commitment to telling the truth and helping to clean up village life. They appear to be doing good by blowing the whistle on individuals' and groups' bad habits, habits such as moonshine distilling, hindering the new political processes, and failing to implement political directives from the centre. Yet at the same time, these heroines come across as not very likeable. The question is, how and why.

The main character in the play *The Trial of the Peasant Woman-'Delegatka'* is named Maria Gudkova, i.e. the whistle-blower (from the Russian word *gudok*).[42] If her actions were being tried in a US court of law today, the case would probably be considered at least partly a libel case, since the male plaintiff sues that she has publicly defamed his character. It is also in part a corruption case, since she is charged with bribe-taking. Her accusers, the plaintiffs Kosorotov

© Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 2001.

(whose name means 'crooked mouth'), and his wife and daughter-in-law, note that she has called Kosorotov a 'bloodsucker' and a *kulak* (a derogatory term for a rich peasant). She has even drawn a picture of him on the wall newspaper in the official reading hut, portraying him with a fat belly. Kosorotov, who admits that he has a history of moonshine distilling, wants the court to free him from her harassment.

In the course of the trial Kosorotov's main charge in the case, that Gudkova took a bribe from a woman moonshine distiller, is proven to be false. A number of prosecution witnesses bring other charges, however. The men claim that she has been stealing their wives, 'stirring them up' to become involved in public affairs, making them 'contrary' and difficult. Kosorotov's nephew, for example, claims that his wife was just a female (*baba*) like any other. Now, though, Gudkova has 'commanded' her to learn to read and write, while he, the husband thinks her 'women's work' should be to attend to the house and fields; so, of course, they are quarrelling. In his view, Gudkova is usurping his male role: 'And I say, who is your husband – me or Maria Gudkova?' He's also upset that his wife might become literate and leave him behind: 'Am I supposed to be her fool then?'[43] Even his parents have been upset by all this. His father calls the wife a *bolshevichka* (female Bolshevik), while his mother, on the contrary, wants to follow Gudkova and become a *delegatka* herself.

The nephew's wife has a different perspective, however. For her Gudkova is nothing short of a saint.[44] 'She takes care of us, showing us the light, teaching us good things', she notes. She helps the downtrodden women of the village while fighting off their enemies, the *kulaks* who exploit them, say other witnesses. Even the woman distiller whom Kosorotov had tried to force to bear false witness against Gudkova recants and rues her own behaviour. 'Why should anyone do Maria harm for no reason?', she asks; 'she does us a good turn, but we do her wrong'. The woman Communist who is the organiser for the whole region comments too that Gudkova is doing her duty in 'revealing all falsehoods and wrongdoing, defending the poorest'.[45] In her own brief final speech, Gudkova declares that she is not afraid of the likes of Kosorotov: 'Where something is bad or unjust, I will reveal it, without fearing anyone.' She gives a simplistic account of her transformation to a *delegatka*: 'There was a time', she claims, 'when I was ignorant [literally 'dark'] and didn't know what needed to be done in order to make life better, but now I know, and I want

© Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 2001.

to teach all women to fight for the new, bright life under the direction of our Communist Party.'[46]

Yet Gudkova's own words are barely recorded in the twenty-nine-page script of the trial. When she does say anything (aside from her final speech which is a scant one-paragraph long), it is often without permission, interrupting the plaintiff and speaking out of order. In response to this behaviour, the judge disciplines her verbally. 'You will speak when you are given the floor', he insists. Whilst the primary motivation of the judge's interventions is undoubtedly to show the court's impartiality (even the heroine could be rebuked for not following the court's rules), a secondary effect is to show Gudkova as impulsive and not in control of her own speech. 'I know, citizen judge,' she tells the judge, 'but I don't have any patience'.[47]

After she has been rebuked for the second time, Gudkova falls completely silent until the judge asks her for her final speech at the very end of the trial. This brief speech begins with Gudkova's confusion: 'What should I say?' Ostensibly her question refers to her insistence that she has not done anything wrong. Yet in the context of the judge's rebukes, it also appears that she has in fact been successfully silenced by the court. She may be the delegate in the village, the one who can blow the whistle on others' misconduct, but ultimately it is the judge who has the power of speech and the power to determine guilt and innocence.

Nor does the audience learn from her short final speech what her motivations were in choosing to become a *delegatka* and work for the state. The audience is told nothing of her personal situation. We never learn whether she is married or has children, whether she has parents whom she cares for and whether she has land (though we learn a great deal about the family situations of the other witnesses in the course of the trial). Instead she is inscribed primarily as a vehicle to help, and in fact push, others in the village to find their way to the reading huts, the schools, the cooperatives, and other Soviet institutions.

The image on the cover of the printed scenario reinforces a sense of the saintliness and mediating role of Gudkova (see illustration overleaf). It pictures a smiling peasant woman posing her hand on a boy's head and showing him the way to the schoolhouse. Above her are the judge with his bell and two people's assessors. Below her stand three peasant men with their fists clenched. With the help of the wise judge above (now a secular figure instead of God), she helps the

© Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 2001.

Cover of *The Trial of the Woman Peasant-Delegate* by N. Bozhinskaia, with the heading 'The Little Library of the Woman Worker and Peasant' (State Publisher, 1926).

© Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 2001.

ignorant peasants, and especially the youth, find their way to the institutions of the new, brighter world.[48]

The contrast between the presiding male judge and the female lay assessor in this play is also instructive.[49] The male presiding judge plays the central role of father in Gudkova's trial. He is described as having a grey beard and being very calm. Several characters address him as 'my father' (*otets rodnoi, batiushka*). When the woman distiller becomes frightened of speaking in court (because of the threat of retaliation from Kosorotov), the judge tells her not to be frightened of anyone. When she bursts into tears saying that Kosorotov (Mr Crooked Mouth) is really a wolf and not a person and will harm her if she speaks the truth ('he will eat me', she says), the same male judge adopts a reassuring tone: 'Don't be afraid. We have good shepherds [to protect you] against wolves'. The male judge is thus associated with the strong (Christian) father figure who will protect the hapless female (the sheep) against the evil (wolf-like) male peasant who threatens to eat her.[50]

The female lay assessor who is assisting the judge is, by contrast, like Gudkova herself, undisciplined in her comments. Several times she breaks into the dialogue to tell other characters how they should live their lives. She angrily instructs one witness to give maternity benefits to his peasant wage labourer despite the fact that she cannot work. She tells another he shouldn't be fighting with his wife. She warns a woman who does not want to send her children to school that if she does not help them attain literacy, 'your children will never thank you when they grow up'.[51] Unlike the male judge, her tone lacks impartiality. She intrudes in a meddlesome way that makes her appear an interloper instead of an authority figure.

Another moralising *delegatka* who threatens to disrupt all the men's plans appears in the play *The Trial of the Peasant Medvedev Who Wrecked the Election of the Women's Candidate to the Village Council.* From her first appearance in court, the woman delegate Gracheva (whose name means 'rook' or 'crow'), interrupts other characters, challenging their interpretations of events and procedures. In her first appearance in the scripted court scene, she angrily interrupts Medvedev, the defendant: 'Who then instructed the men to hold their women down by the braids at home during the elections?'[52] Gracheva presents herself as having lost all patience with the 'gang' of peasants (including a *kulak* and a priest) who want to keep women out of elections. She wants women to learn to read so they can learn

© Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 2001.

their rights and go after the 'new lords', i.e. the *kulaks* who are making money off the people. She too thus appears to be protecting the poor and downtrodden, especially women, against the oppressions of their husbands who want to keep them from even learning to read and write.

The defendant Medvedev and his cronies, however, take a different view of Gracheva's 'righteousness': 'Why does she stick her nose in with her morality?', asks Zabubennyi, a former chair of the village council and now a freelance scribe (whose name means 'unruly' or 'dissolute'). He defends a law-and-order perspective on moonshining, arguing that one cannot simply go into any hut and search for illegal stills without a warrant, as Gracheva (according to him) has done. Others criticise Gracheva for gossiping to outsiders when they come to visit, telling them everything that is wrong with the village. When she hears foreign words such as *Mopr* (the acronym of an international Soviet propaganda agency at this time) and *Dobrolet* (a Soviet organisation dedicated to supporting the extension of the air force), she wants to know what they are and to introduce them into the village council even though the council already has too much work just taking care of the village's own affairs. Nor, they argue, does she know anything about the really important local matters of land divisions, peasants who want to separate from the commune and live on their own, and the running of tractors.[53]

The male defendants obviously need to find reasons to criticise Gracheva in order to protect themselves against the charges that they have hindered the elections of women as delegates. But Gracheva also betrays herself as a less than fully sympathetic character. She addresses her husband in a simultaneously patronising and threatening manner: 'Oh yes, my Akimushka [little Akim], I can abandon you and I can take you to court for beating me. The comrade judge will affirm that for you. But what I find much more painful than your beatings is your ignorance.' She berates him for not knowing anything and for letting the rich peasants take advantage of him. She takes a high moral tone too, in arguing that if the judges were to acquit the defendants, they would be directly attacking her, and with her the whole worker-peasant government. Often she uses the pronoun 'we': 'we'll figure out who should have their tax lowered and who should have it raised'. 'It's just too bad we don't respect moonshine,' she concludes, making it clear that she has no intention of respecting any village traditions. Instead – and this was what the Soviet government was clearly

© Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 2001.

counting on – she is offering to come in and clean up the whole nest of those engaging in moonshining and illegal kickbacks.[54]

In general, the heroines are almost never granted full, flesh-and-blood characters. They can sing the praises of the party and state, but they cannot evince a broader range of interests and desires. Moreover, they can move seamlessly from the 'we' of the family into the 'we' of the state, extending their apparently maternal qualities to the whole collective. But they cannot do so in an authoritative fashion.

Nor do the trials depict the history of the heroines' development. The narrative trope that their eyes 'have been opened' is presented exclusively in a passive voice. The women show little agency of their own, never taking actions that are not directed by the party. While the plays do mobilise their female characters into the public sphere, they simultaneously undermine a sense of their competence. Many *delegatki* are marked by passivity and insecurity. Others show their intemperance, breaking in while other witnesses are speaking. Still others blow the whistle without regard for local customs or even for the law (Gudkova conducts searches without proper search warrants).

Ostensibly the *delegatki* are presented to the public as victims of harassment by others. Yet they themselves need to be counselled and restrained. The judges emerge as those with the power and the authority to determine who will speak, on what basis, and when. It is they who determine who can be elevated from the status of 'citizen', i.e. defendant, to the status of 'comrade', one who is the equal of those on the bench. The plays thus ultimately *tame* these activist women even as they allow them to have minimal roles as delegates in closed organisations that have little real influence.[55]

In the end this portrayal of women as not quite citizens in the agitation trials reveals an important aspect of Soviet citizenship in general. No one, male or female, was granted unconditional citizenship; and many individuals residing in the Soviet Union spent years trying to prove their worthiness to attain that status.[56] Citizenship could not be attained definitively through one's birth or residency (*jus sanguinis* and *jus soli*, to use the juridical terms). Since it was not defined by objective criteria, it could not, I would argue, provide closure in Rogers Brubaker's sense.[57] Where the French and German states at the turn of the twentieth century identified one set of persons as citizens and another as non-citizens, Soviet authorities, including the women's sections themselves, identified certain groups as something in between, as a kind of citizens-in-training.

© Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 2001.

For women this absence of fixed citizenship was especially problematic because in the absence of objectively defined and enforceable rights and obligations, prerevolutionary misogyny and resistance to women's participation in the political sphere could be mobilised by opponents. It was easy to point to women's illiteracy, inexperience, and intemperance as reasons to continue to exclude women from the public sphere. While the rates of women's participation did rise over the course of the 1920s, their representation in urban and village soviets did not exceed 30 per cent of the total even as late as 1934.[58] Only in the most local soviets in the 1960s and 1970s did women's participation reach 40 per cent of all deputies. Still more tellingly, in the whole history of the Soviet Union (up to 1977) women never constituted more than 25 per cent of the membership of the Communist Party.[59]

The agitation trials present what are essentially conversion stories. Individuals 'see the light'. They 'find the truth'. They recognise Soviet power. In this context women's stereotypical backwardness provides more dramatic interest than would stories of competence and creativity. Soviet power plays a tutelary role, bringing the women delegates up to the level of 'becoming human'. As Cherepanova notes in her final speech, she fell in love with Soviet power and the party of the communists: 'They opened my eyes, taught me literacy, taught me how to work – they made a person out of me.'[60]

Once such women delegates become at least partially conscious, then they can begin to teach others. The defence lawyer for Cherepanova praises her for 'sowing light among women peasants, as much as she herself has become imbued with it'.[61] She should 'awaken the women peasants who don't yet understand the truth/justice [*pravda*] of the new life'.[62] Individuals, and especially women, who represent this tutelary state can then take over husbands' traditional roles as teachers and enforcers of discipline within the household. Kosorotov, as we saw above, expresses fear that his wife is listening more to Gudkova than to him: 'And I say, who is your husband – me or Maria Gudkova?'[63] Emancipating women as citizens-in-training could thus provide a wedge in the conservative household, a way for the Soviet state and the new Soviet order to penetrate the countryside.

The state in these narratives is the ultimate Pygmalion creator, permitting some women and men to attain citizenship while remanding others to Soviet 'schools' such as literacy programmes and delegate programmes for further development and transformation. Ironically,

© Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 2001.

the Soviet state in these plays is itself rather faceless. While the judges, the prosecution and defence do appear on stage, the organisers and party representatives who originally 'awaken' the heroines have always appeared before the narrative action of the plays takes place. They are also mentioned in vague terms, without reference to concrete persons, events, or institutions. In this way too the narratives illustrate not rules and procedures for attaining citizenship, or even common paths toward promotion, but rather indeterminate psychological states of 'unconsciousness' and 'consciousness'.

If citizenship can be analysed as a spectrum, as Nancy Cott has recently argued, ranging from nominal membership in the polity to full participation, then it may be that a person's or group's degree of citizenship must be measured not only by the laws of a country (which in this case declared women to be the full equals of men), but also by the practices of the day, the ways in which individuals' roles are or were scripted in public discourses.[64] The various agitation trials of the new woman and of the *delegatki* prove amply that even the new Soviet heroines had to be tamed and controlled by the authorities.

Notes

1. 'Sud nad novoi zhenshchinoi', *Pravda*, 38 (20 February 1921). The women's sections of the Communist Party were officially created in the fall of 1919 and served to draw women into the party until they were abolished in 1930. For more on their history, see Elizabeth A. Wood, *The Baba and the Comrade: Gender and Politics in Revolutionary Russia* (Indiana University Press, Bloomington, IN, 1997); Mary Buckley, *Women and Ideology in the Soviet Union* (University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1989); P. M. Chirkov, *Reshenie zhenskogo voprosa v SSSR (1917–1937 gg.)* (Mysl, Moscow, 1978); Richard Stites, *The Women's Liberation Movement in Russia: Feminism, Nihilism, and Bolshevism, 1860–1930* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1978); Gail Warshofsky Lapidus, *Women in Soviet Society: Equality, Development, and Social Change* (University of California Press, Berkeley, 1978); Carol Eubanks Hayden, 'Feminism and Bolshevism: The Zhenotdel and the Politics of Women's Emancipation in Russia, 1917–1930' (PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1979); Carmen Scheide, '"Einst war ich Weib und kochte Suppe, jetzt bin ich bei der Frauengruppe": Das Wechselverhältnis zwischen sowjetischem Frauenalltag und Frauenpolitik von 1921 bis 1930 am Beispiel Moskauer Arbeiterinnen' (dissertation, Historische Seminar der Universität Basel, 1999).
2. A. Sergeev, 'Zhenskii samosud', *Pravda*, 265 (21 November 1921).
3. B. Kanatchikova, 'God raboty (na mestakh)', *Kommunistka* 16/17 (1921), p. 29; N. Tr-ii, 'Rabota sredi zhenshchin v Sibiri', *Pravda*, 8 (13 January 1923), p. 4; Delegatka M. Genert, 'Vypusk delegatok glavnogo Pochtamta', *Rabotnitsa i krest'ianka* (journal), 6 (1923), p. 25; Rossiiskii Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Sotsial'no-Politicheskoi Istorii (RGASPI, formerly the Party archives), f. 17, op. 10, d. 11, l. 244; f. 17, op. 10, d. 20, l. 2; *Biulleten' no. 15 Otdela TsK RKP po rabote sredi zhenshchin: Tezisy i rezoliutsii IV Vseross: soveshchaniia zavgubzhenotdelami* (Moscow, 1921), p. 21; 'Tsirkuliar TsK RKP 'Ob oktiabrskikh torzhestvakh: Vsem gubzhenotdelam' *Izvestiia TsK*, 34 (15 November 1921), p. 17.

© Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 2001.

4. The larger book project is entitled *Performing Justice: Agitation Trials in Revolutionary Russia* (University of California Press, Berkeley, forthcoming). For more on agitation trials see also Julie A. Cassiday, *The Enemy on Trial: Early Soviet Courts on Stage and Screen* (Northern Illinois University Press, Dekalb, IL, 2000), esp. ch. 2, 'The Mock Trial'; Julie A. Cassiday and Leyla Rouhi, 'From Nevskii Prospect to Zoia's Apartment: Trials of the Russian Procuress', *Russian Review*, 58, no. 3 (1999), pp. 413–31.
5. In addition I have found dozens of references to such trials being performed in a range of provincial cities and towns. Since the texts have not come down to us, however, it is impossible to provide detailed analysis of their content.
6. Other topics of agitation trials that were not specifically devoted to women's issues include political trials of Lenin and the Communist Party, army trials of soldiers who committed infractions of garrison regulations, trials of individuals who violated correct sanitation and hygiene, trials of farm animals, and trials of literary characters. All of these trials were used by political instructors and agitators to stimulate public discussion of contemporary social issues.
7. V. I. Lenin, 'Zadachi proletariata v nashei revoliutsii', *Polnoe Sobranie Sochinenii*, 5th edn (Gospolitizdat, Moscow, 1960–65), vol. 31, p. 165.
8. In addition to the sources listed above, see also Rudolf Schlesinger (ed.), *The Family in the USSR: Documents and Readings* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1949). Soviet Russia also pioneered the notion that marriage did not require a woman to take her husband's citizenship; instead the two could each make their own decisions about keeping or changing their citizenship, as well as deciding what citizenship they wanted for any children they might have (articles 103 and 147 of the Code on Marriage, the Family and Guardianship, *Sobranie uzakonenii i rasporiazhenii rabochego i krest'ianskogo pravitel'stva* (Gos. izd.-vo, Moscow, 1920), 1918, no. 76/77-818; discussion in S. S. Kishkin, *Sovetskoe grazhdanstvo* (Iuridicheskoe izd-vo NKIu RSFSR, Moscow, 1925), pp. 24–5).
9. Rogers Brubaker, *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1992); Susan Pedersen, 'Gender, Welfare, and Citizenship in Britain during the Great War', *American Historical Review*, 95 (1990), pp. 983–1006.
10. One of the few sources to address citizenship directly is Elise Kimerling, 'Civil Rights and Social Policy in Soviet Russia, 1918–1936', *Russian Review*, 41 (1982), pp. 24–45.
11. Laura Engelstein, for example, speaks of 'the pervasive disdain for the law' in tsarist Russia which 'came into its own as public policy after 1917' ('Combined Underdevelopment: Discipline and the Law in Imperial and Soviet Russia', *American Historical Review*, 98 (1993), p. 349). Of course, this view is substantially correct. Yet at the same time we must note in the phenomena of the agitation and show trials an extreme fascination with the ritual and, above all, with the *performance* of law. Law and courts constituted places of show, where the authorities could present examples of good and bad behaviour to the population at large. On the absence of democracy and hence of citizenship the literature is enormous. Some of the most important sources on the erosion of any meaningful notion of citizenship include Leonard Schapiro, *The Origin of the Communist Autocracy* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1954); Robert C. Tucker, 'Leadership and Culture in Social Movements', in *Political Culture and Leadership in Soviet Russia: From Lenin to Gorbachev* (Norton, New York, 1987); A. J. Polan, *Lenin and the End of Politics* (Methuen, London, 1984); Peter Kenez, *The Birth of the Propaganda State: Soviet Methods of Mass Mobilization, 1917–1929* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1985).
12. Kishkin, *Sovetskoe grazhdanstvo*, pp. 22, 74.
13. Articles 13, 15, 64, 18 of the Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the RSFSR of 1918, *Sobranie uzakonenii*, 1917–1918, no. 51-582.
14. On the French Revolution and citizenship, see Brubaker, *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*, ch. 2, 'The French Revolution and the Invention of National Citizenship', pp. 35–49. On Russian revolutionaries' fascination, and almost obsession, with the French Revolution, see Tamara Kondrat'eva, *Bol'sheviki-iakobintsy i prizrak*

© Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 2001.

termidora (izd. 'Ipol', Moscow, 1993); Dmitry Shlapentokh, *The French Revolution in Russian Intellectual Life, 1865–1905* (Praeger, Westport, CT, 1996).

15. Lenin, 'Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution', July 1905, *Selected Works* (Moscow, 1950–1952), vol. 1, book 2, pp. 48–142.
16. Samuel Northrup Harper, *Civic Training in Soviet Russia* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1929).
17. For a brilliant discussion of the disenfranchised, see Golfo Alexopoulos, 'Rights and Passage: Marking Outcasts and Making Citizens in Soviet Russia, 1926–1936' (PhD dissertation, University of Chicago, 1996).
18. Harper, *Civic Training in Soviet Russia,* p. 17.
19. Andrei Sinyavsky, *Soviet Civilization: A Cultural History,* trans. Joanne Turnbull (Arcade Pub., New York, 1990), p. 212–13.
20. 'Politsud nad krest'iankoi-delegatkoi', in *Mezhdunarodnyi den' rabotnits,* ed. G. S. Maliuchenko (Rostov na Donu, 1925), p. 51.
21. For general discussion of *delegatki,* see Wood, *Baba and Comrade,* pp. 85–93, 172; Scheide, '"Einst war ich Weib und kochte Suppe"', pp. 138–43, 240–8; Chirkov, *Reshenie zhenskogo voprosa v SSSR (1917–1937 gg.),* pp. 86–100; Buckley, *Women and Ideology in the Soviet Union,* pp. 71–82; Hayden, 'Feminism and Bolshevism', pp. 143–6, 151, 187–9, 199–203, 210–11.
22. Stites, *Women's Liberation Movement,* pp. 166–7.
23. Chirkov, *Reshenie zhenskogo voprosa v SSSR (1917–1937 gg.),* p. 92.
24. The historical literature on changing intelligentsia images of the peasantry is rich and nuanced, showing how often members of the educated class tended to project their own ideas onto 'the people'. See especially Cathy A. Frierson, *Peasant Icons: Representations of Rural People in Late Nineteenth-Century Russia* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1993); Laura Engelstein, *The Keys to Happiness: Sex and the Search for Modernity in Fin-de-Siècle Russia* (Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY, 1992); Richard S. Wortman, *The Crisis of Russian Populism* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1967); Esther Kingston-Mann, *Lenin and the Problem of Marxist Peasant Revolution* (Oxford University Press, New York, 1983). On images of peasant women, see Christine Worobec, 'Temptress or Virgin? The Precarious Sexual Position of Women in Postemancipation Ukrainian Peasant Society', *Slavic Review,* 49 (1990); and her 'Victims or Actors? Russian Peasant Women and Patriarchy', in *Peasant Economy, Culture, and Politics of European Russia, 1800–1921,* ed. Esther Kingston-Mann and Timothy Mixter (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1991).
25. 'Politsud nad krest'iankoi-delegatkoi', p. 32.
26. *Sud nad krest'ianinom Medvedevym sorvavshim vybory kandidatki ot zhenshchin v sel'sovet* (Rabochee izdatel'stvo 'Priboi', Leningrad, 1925), pp. 12, 6–8.
27. Glebova, *Sud nad delegatkoi,* p. 11.
28. Glebova, *Sud nad delegatkoi,* p. 27.
29. Stites, *Women's Liberation Movement*; G. A. Tishkin, *Zhenskii vopros v Rossii 50-60e gody XIX v.* (Leningrad, 1984); Jane McDermid, 'The Influence of Western Ideas on the Development of the Woman Question in Nineteenth-Century Russian Thought', *Irish Slavonic Studies,* 9 (1988), pp. 21–36; Derek Offord, '*Lichnost'*: Notions of Individual Identity', in *Constructing Russian Culture in the Age of Revolution, 1881–1940,* ed. Catriona Kelly and David Shepherd (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1998), pp. 13–25; Arja Rosenholm, 'The "Woman Question" of the 1860s and the Ambiguity of the "Learned Woman"', in *Gender and Russian Literature: New Perspectives,* ed. Rosalind Marsh (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996), pp. 112–28.
30. See Wood, *Baba and Comrade,* pp. 28–34, on the Bolsheviks' resistance to devoting attention to 'the woman question'.
31. V. I. Lenin, 'What Is to Be Done? Burning Questions of our Movement', in *The Lenin Anthology,* ed. Robert C. Tucker (Norton, New York, 1975), pp. 12–114.
32. 'Politsud nad krest'iankoi-delegatkoi', pp. 50–51.
33. 'Politsud nad krest'iankoi-delegatkoi', pp. 34–5.

© Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 2001.

34. Boris Andreev, *Sud nad starym bytom* (Doloi negramotnost', Moscow-Leningrad, 1926), pp. 15, 17–18. Her evolution is reminiscent of the title character in Gorky's novel *The Mother.*
35. Andreev, *Sud nad starym bytom*, p. 15.
36. 'Politsud nad krest'iankoi-delegatkoi', p. 46.
37. Andreev, *Sud nad starym bytom*, p. 14; emphasis added.
38. One trial even brought a fictional woman to court 'who did not use the rights given her by the October Revolution': 'Sud nad zhenshchinoi, ne vospol'zovavsheisia pravami Oktiabria', *Rabochii klub*, 7 (1924), p. 37.
39. 'Politsud nad krest'iankoi-delegatkoi', pp. 36–7.
40. 'Politsud nad krest'iankoi-delegatkoi', p. 39. This language is repeated by the defence at the end of the play which characterises Cherepanova as a 'very necessary, useful worker for her society' (p. 49); and by the judge who calls her a 'useful member of society'. Once she has become useful, her 'femaleness' falls away.
41. 'Politsud nad krest'iankoi-delegatkoi', pp. 47, 49.
42. N. Bozhinskaia, *Sud nad krest'iankoi-delegatkoi* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1926). In parts of pre-revolutionary Russia the verb *gudit'* also meant to reproach, find fault with, or defame someone (V. Dal', *Tolkovyi slovar'* (1978; Moscow-Petersburg, 1880), vol. 1, p. 405).
43. Bozhinskaia, *Sud nad krest'iankoi-delegatkoi*, pp. 15–16; he uses the Russian word *dura* for 'fool' which is female rather than the masculine form *durak*.
44. Gudkova's first name, Maria, may not be accidental. The author Bozhinskaia is probably descended from the clerical estate (since her last name contains the Russian word for God) and may have chosen the name Maria in order to create a secular heroine in place of Maria, the Mother of God.
45. Bozhinskaia, *Sud nad krest'iankoi-delegatkoi*, pp. 17, 25, 21.
46. Bozhinskaia, *Sud nad krest'iankoi-delegatkoi*, p. 28. For an account of nineteenth-century female revolutionaries who are portrayed as saintly and therefore rather bloodless, see Christine Faure, 'Une violence paradoxale: Aux sources d'un défi, des femmes terroristes dans les années 1880', in *L'Histoire sans qualités*, ed. Christiane Dufrancatel et al. (Paris, 1979), pp. 85–110.
47. Bozhinskaia, *Sud nad krest'iankoi-delegatkoi*, pp. 10–11.
48. This type of 'triptych' would have been familiar to Russian churchgoers. For more on the relationship between pre-revolutionary icons and post-revolutionary pictorial art, see Victoria E. Bonnell, *Iconography of Power: Soviet Political Posters under Lenin and Stalin* (University of California Press, Berkeley, 1997) and Stephen White, *The Bolshevik Poster* (New Haven and London, 1988). As I have noted, Bozhinskaia's own clerical background may have made her particularly cognizant of parallels to Russian hagiography.
49. Two lay judges or assessors usually presided in public trials, both real and agitational, as (untrained) associates of, and assistants to, the presiding judge. In some agitation trials these assessors were elected from the audience as people's representatives at the start of the trial.
50. Bozhinskaia, *Sud nad krest'iankoi-delegatkoi*, p. 26. Another (probably unconscious) inversion can be seen near the beginning of the play when Kosorotov claims that this 'baba' (Gudkova) has worn him out; literally, that she has 'eaten' him up (*zaela menia baba*) (p. 7).
51. Bozhinskaia, *Sud nad krest'iankoi-delegatkoi*, pp. 3, 9, 15, 14. While the judge addresses the witnesses using the formal 'you' (*vy*), the people's assessors tend to use the informal *ty*, suggesting that they (the people's assessors) are closer to the witnesses than is the judge (presumably an outsider) who can therefore have more impartiality.
52. *Sud nad krest'ianinom Medvedevym*, p. 7.
53. *Sud nad krest'ianinom Medvedevym*, pp. 19, 9, 18.
54. *Sud nad krest'ianinom Medvedevym*, pp. 22–3.
55. In some sense this ambivalence about women's participation in the public sphere can be seen as fairly overdetermined given the Russian language's ambivalence about 'public women' (*publichnye zhenshchiny*), a phrase which means prostitutes.

© Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 2001.

56. For one example, see Jochen Hellbeck, 'Fashioning the Stalinist Soul: The Diary of Stepan Podliubnyi (1931–1939)', *Jahrbucher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, 44 (1996), esp. pp. 348, 351, 354.
57. Brubaker, *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*, esp. ch. 1, 'Citizenship as Social Closure'.
58. G. N. Serebrennikov, *The Position of Women in the U.S.S.R.* (Victor Gollancz, London, 1937), p. 211.
59. Lapidus, *Women in Soviet Society*, p. 210.
60. 'Politsud nad krest'iankoi-delegatkoi', pp. 50–51. For a comparative discussion of conversions, see Igal Halfin, 'From Darkness to Light: Student Communist Autobiography During NEP', *Jahrbucher fur Geschichte Osteuropas*, 45 (1997), pp. 1–27.
61. 'Politsud nad krest'iankoi-delegatkoi', p. 49. Even this formulation expresses some doubt that a woman like Cherepanova has become fully imbued with the light of Soviet power.
62. *Pravda* in Russian means both 'truth' and 'justice'.
63. Bozhinskaia, *Sud nad krest'iankoi-delegatkoi*, p. 15.
64. Nancy F. Cott, 'Marriage and Women's Citizenship in the United States, 1830–1934', *American Historical Review*, 103 (1998), pp. 1440–74.

© Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 2001.