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Preface

This book is the work not of a historian, but of a comparative historical and political sociologist. So I note at the outset that there is no claim to have exhausted – or even extensively mined – the primary archival data on ninety-three Bolsheviks, or, to be sure, on the Russian Empire as a whole. Rather, this book is intended as a comparative historical sociology of a revolutionary elite, a collective biography of the emergence of “charisma” in the form of an excluded, but empire-oriented and multiethnic, intelligentsia. So I have made use of primary biographical sources as well as numerous political and historical studies of the Russian Empire and its many diverse constituent parts. I have drawn on these latter works quite shamelessly, in fact. But I have read both primary and secondary sources simply with a view to trying to understand lives and experiences, so my hope is that although there may be disagreement with an interpretation here or there, and although there may be errors or omissions here and there, in its totality I might have done justice to the cause of interpretive comparative historical sociology by getting right the essence of Bolshevism.

Guided by a broadly Weberian search for “elective affinities,” much of my thinking in this book has been inspired by Barrington Moore’s Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World (1967) and Ernest Gellner’s Language and Solitude: Wittgenstein, Malinowski and the Habsburg Dilemma (1998). Although there is little substantive or direct engagement with these two very different works, they suggested ways of organizing the material, and, taken together, they offered a way to combine very particular social worlds with a more general comparative social explanation – mindful that although there are no straight causal lines, it is still worth trying to discern those political alignments and social patterns that do seem sociologically powerful. More specifically, they prompted me to think about how to interpret individual internal landscapes against those external landscapes that can shape the contours of social thought as much as they can the possibilities of its political expression; that is, I thought to combine an account of the larger forces that impact individual radicalizations with
a deeper and richer elaboration of the diverse ways in which smaller and more intimate contexts might themselves seek to valorize those larger forces – especially in lives experienced along boundaries of assimilation and exclusion. I also came to appreciate that, in addition to the class dislocations inherent in the “making of the modern world,” living in complex diversity could also produce relevant social experiences; so I took the idea that as important as its class analyses no doubt were, socialism’s political implications might also be crucial to defining both internal and external landscapes.

In short, my aim has been to offer a substantive social explanation, and to extend a tradition of comparative historical sociology of revolutions by contextualizing – and indeed by re-embedding – revolutionary Bolshevism into the imperial context from which it emerged. Accordingly, I prefigure a methodological point made in Chapter 1: the biographical reconstructions that comprise this book are interpretive accounts, pieced together from autobiographies, biographies (official and non-official), census data, Tsarist police records, studies of specific political mobilizations, area studies, studies of nationality policies or specific ethnic groups, urban and rural studies of specific locations, studies of working classes, and the like. I have attempted as carefully and as plausibly as possible to reconstruct the intricate variety of social worlds that produced the Bolshevik revolutionary elite. My aim has been to ensure that the macro explanations offered are also sociologically true, in their most intimate and relevant implications, at the individual level. So while contextual biographical details obviously differed across the many individuals, to the extent that there was a universally shared dimension of experience in the particulars, that is where I began, and I built outward from there.

In doing so, it seemed to me that a particular sociology of political marginality – one often inflected by the failed promises of assimilation – constituted a very potent and defining social experience with considerable political implications. As individuals negotiated social worlds characterized by quasi-integration, ambiguous social statuses and dislocations, socioethnic marginalities, and political exclusions, they also marked out new boundaries around both cultural and class assimilations. And this, it seemed to me, produced its own quite distinctive kind of alienation and political aspiration. Or, to put it another way, the dislocations, exclusions, and rootlessness that paid the costs of empire also enabled considerable reinvention, assisted by underlying social and political crises that helped define the qualities of a generation.

More practically, some biographical reconstructions involve greater detail than others – partly because of the unevenness of the sources and partly because of the dictates of the data set itself: there were too many Russians, for instance, to treat each in detail even if the sources had allowed it; and some of the ninety-three Bolsheviks are treated briefly, or not discussed at all, if sources were too limited. So the chapters that comprise Part II are purposely uneven: Chapter 4 considers three Bolsheviks in some detail to provide a more textured and nuanced sense of distinct, but overlapping, individual worlds; Chapter 8, on the other hand, offers only brief, illustrative summaries of individuals to
allow the presentation of a more general finding. The remaining chapters are
arrayed somewhere in between. Taken in their totality, however, my hope is
that a sense of collective biography emerges through the accumulation of these
variations in the presentation of the data.

Nevertheless, it may be that if for some readers there is too much biographi-
cal detail, for others there may not be enough. For the former reader, it is
possible to simply ignore the “local detail” of the various biographical recon-
structions and to extract the central claims of each chapter from its introduc-
tion and conclusion, and from the setup pages to Part II, mindful of their place
in the wider claims of the book. The concerns of the latter reader are more
difficult to satisfy, other than simply referring to the more extensive primary
and secondary sources.

And finally, a comment on the *matryoshka* organization of the chapters in
Part II and their relation to the wider argument: although this is a single case
study – that is, a study of a single elite – there are six comparative ethnicity/nationality case studies within it, and within them still further nested compar-
sions. But the six chapters are each differently organized. For instance, Chapter
3 on the Jewish Bolsheviks is organized “ethnically,” to examine comparatively
Lithuanian Jewry, Ukrainian Jewry, and Russian Jewry; Chapter 9 contrasts
three nationalities – Georgians, Azerbaijani Turks, and Armenians – but it
does so against a view of the South Caucasus as a single imperial borderland;
and whereas Chapters 6 (the Latvians) and 8 (the ethnic Russians) divide the
Bolsheviks by their respective class compositions, Chapter 5 explores the diver-
sity within Ukrainian Bolshevism geographically or regionally. In other words,
different elective affinities within Bolshevism’s constituent groups dictated the
chapters’ internal organizations – mirroring the general argument. Table 2.1
(Chapter 2) seeks to capture these analytical pieces, tying the politics of the
empire’s intricate socioethnic mosaic to the socioethnic composition of both
leftist and rightist politics in revolutionary Russia; and the four strategies of
empire, also outlined in Chapter 2, provide the frame on which the subsequent
empirical material hangs. The chapters in Part I, then, present the broad con-
text and the main contours of the argument, whereas those in Part II decon-
struct it in case studies.

Several acknowledgments are due. Most immediately, I owe an enormous
debt to John A. Hall. His early intellectual guidance, incredible knowledge, and
consistent encouragement have meant everything. As importantly, John’s own
scholarly work – elegant and important sociology, articulated with clarity and
substance – has been a North Star, an intellectual vision that has influenced me
immensely.

I am also extremely grateful to Michael Mann for carefully and generously
reading the manuscript. His critical comments greatly helped sharpen and clar-
ify the argument, while the methodological influence of his *Sources of Social
Power* will be evident throughout. Jack Goldstone and Dingxin Zhao read an
earlier version of the general argument and offered incisive and very useful
suggestions for improving it, and I am very appreciative. For early comments
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or suggestions on pieces of the manuscript, I thank Dominic Lieven and John Klier. I thank Terry Cox for the very kind support of an Honorary Fellowship at the University of Glasgow’s Centre for Russian, Central and East European Studies, and Norman Naimark for allowing me to conduct research at a key moment with a Visiting Scholarship at Stanford University’s Center for Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies. The University of Edinburgh has provided a wonderful academic home for the past several years, in large part attributable to the sustained support of Donald MacKenzie, for which I am very appreciative. I am grateful to Svetlana Klimova for mixing critical conversation with warm friendship. But I am especially grateful to James Kennedy, a fellow political sociologist, for innumerable helpful discussions on almost every part of this project, each one making it better.


This book is dedicated my parents, Carla and Giorgio, and to my sister Roberta. I also owe so very much to Catterina Paschetta Larese. And for love and friendship, I thank Valerie Collette, Scott Rezendes, Francesca Benevento, Sheila and Graham Kennedy, Janice Lindsay, and Kirsty, David, Emma, and Rachel Wylie. My deepest debt is to James Kennedy, however, for love, patience, intellectual advice, belief, and bloody-minded constancy – and especially for knowing when, and in what doses, each has been needed most.
Note on Transliterations and Names

I have generally followed the Library of Congress system for transliteration, except where sources themselves differ substantially, or where the most common usage is otherwise. For the Bolsheviks’ names, I adopt the form that is most commonly used in the general secondary literature: so I use Trotsky, not Trotskii. For some, the Russified form (Dzerzhinskii) is now less commonly used than their “ethnic” form (Dzierżyński), so in those cases I use the latter. But at the place where the Bolshevik is first introduced, and if I adopt a more common usage, I note both Jan Danishevskii (Julijs Daniševskis).

For cities and provinces in the Russian Empire, I generally follow the typical or most common usage in the primary sources or, if more common, in the secondary literature. So I refer to Tiflis, not Tbilisi, and Vilna, not Vilnius or Wilno.