CHAPTER ONE

Placing the Child in Twentieth Century History: Contexts and Framework

Nick Baron

Of the happy childhood that is our gift,

Joyful song, loudly chime!

Thanks to you, great Stalin

For our miraculous time!

Eulogy by Pioneer Valia Shevchenko, December 1936¹

In the Ukraine ragged homeless boys came and beat on the train doors and begged, many of them hanging onto the train in hopes of getting to somewhere where there might be food. [...] Miss Daunt says bitterly that there are no girls in Leningrad. She exaggerates, but she has cause to speak bitterly, as she lives down a street where there is a sailors' club and she sees girls, who she thinks cannot be more than twelve, accosting sailors there.

Diary of British diplomat Reader Bullard, 13 June 1933²

I should like to thank Elizabeth Harvey and Maiken Umbach for their helpful comments on earlier drafts of this chapter.

¹ *'O detstve schastlivom, chto dali nam/Veselaia pesnia, zveni!/Spasibo velikomu Staliniu/Za nashi chudesnye dni.'* Report on All-Union Congress of Wives of Red Army Commanders, *Trud*, 30 December 1936, p. 1; reprinted nationwide, e.g. *Sovetskaia Sibir*, 1 January 1937, p. 2.

The Germans have robbed us in the worst way: they took our children to Germany. Many boys and girls of twelve and thirteen have been deported to Germany to be Germanized and put to work. Many other children have been torn away from their mothers and taken God knows where. The fascists have inflicted a serious wound on our nation. We shall not recover from it for a long time to come.

Soviet Ukrainian film director Aleksandr Dovzhenko, 'Notebooks', 28 November 1943³

Across Eastern Europe and Russia in the first half of the twentieth century, conflict and violence arising out of foreign and civil wars, occupation, revolutions, ethnic restructuring and racial persecution caused countless millions of children to be uprooted and displaced from their homes. States of the region implementing visions of radical social change regarded 'their' children not just as national property to be preserved and protected, but as a means of securing a better future. Children in these states became objects and instruments of extensive programmes of social engineering, which often also entailed their forcible displacement. For these children, ideals of a 'happy childhood' under benign state tutelage (as proclaimed in the Soviet Pioneer's eulogy to Stalin quoted above) all too often contrasted with the hardships of homelessness and life on the street (as noted in Bullard's diary) or the harsh realities of state institutions. Children 'out of place' became the focus of ever greater anxiety and alarm on the part of adults, who viewed them as both a symbolic injury and physical loss to the nation (as

2 Julian Bullard and Margaret Bullard (eds), *Inside Stalin's Russia. The Diaries of Reader Bullard, 1930-1934* (Charlbury: Day, 2000), p. 193. Dorothea Daunt was a British charity worker in Leningrad. In 1922-25 she had worked for the Society of Friends' Famine Relief Mission to South Russia.

3 In Marco Carynnyk (ed.), *Alexander Dovzhenko. The Poet as Filmmaker* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1973), p. 94. It is ambiguous whether Dovzhenko is referring to a 'wound' to the Soviet state or the Ukrainian nation.

Dovzhenko lamented with regard to the Nazis' theft of national children). But children 'out of place' were also seen as instigators of social disorder and emblems of degeneration.

Children were in danger and they were dangerous. States therefore acted to reclaim and replace their displaced children, and their interventions frequently subjected the children to yet further upheaval and hardship.

In this volume we address multiple forms of child displacement and re-placement as both state practice and social experience, and examine these practices and experiences in relation to questions of ideology, spatiality, mobility, identity and selfhood. We hope that the case studies will demonstrate the value and relevance of this framework for deepening our understanding not only of childhood and population displacement in the last century, but also the forces that shape children's lives, the factors that impel and constrain human mobility, and the sources and nature of state power and social experience in the contemporary world.

In this introductory chapter I start by outlining briefly the main aims of the book, its thematic scope and its principal sources. In the next three sections I consider in more detail our core themes, highlighting their interconnections and establishing the historical, conceptual and methodological contexts of the subsequent case studies. Here I discuss first the interrelations among modern statehood, population displacement and normative notions of childhood and the place of children; secondly, the possibilities and challenges of a new history of childhood that seeks to elucidate not only adult ideologies and interventions but also children's realities; and thirdly, the role of space and time in structuring official discourses of childhood, the experiences of children and our own scholarly analysis.

Having sketched out the general framework of analysis, I then turn to the specific significance of studying Russia and Eastern Europe in this period. During these decades of war and violent peace, new post-imperial states launched campaigns of political reconstruction and social renewal across the region that mobilized existing ideas about state

power, the management of populations and the regulation and cultivation of children, but applied them with unprecedented scope and intensity. The case studies explore how state officials, experts, activists, welfare workers and others in this time and place, through their interventions, and in responding to crises and catastrophes caused by their own or others' actions, crystallized new discourses, practices and processes with profound consequences globally throughout the century and beyond. In the final section of this chapter, I provide an outline of each case study, identifying their main themes and concerns.

Our primary aim in this volume is to contribute new perspectives to the scholarship on modern childhood and to the study of population displacement in the twentieth century, as well as new ways of framing and understanding the interrelations between childhood and forced mobility.⁴ However, these subjects cannot be studied in isolation. Children exist in society, and as they mature and become acknowledged as social beings (normative notions of 'childhood' and the 'child' are discussed later), their lives and experiences are singularly shaped by the ways in which states and communities perceive them and act towards them. By studying children as both socially-situated objects and self-aware subjects, therefore, we gain valuable insights also into the environments in which they live, elucidating dimensions of theory, practice and experience that an analysis of adult subjects may not reveal or illuminate so vividly. Similarly, population displacement cannot fully be understood, as either state practice or social experience, without close critical examination of its political, economic, cultural and many other contexts. By studying forced mobilities as a factor or function of these wider conditions, we develop new ways of looking at states and their exercise of power

⁴ In this volume we understand the term 'population displacement' as 'a rupturing of established spatial norms of demographic distribution, sometimes as a result of deliberate state engineering, and sometimes as a result of forces over which the state has little or no direct control, and which may indeed contribute to its destabilization, collapse, and reconstitution.' It thus encompasses more forms and instances of non-voluntary mobility than the concept of 'forced migration'. See Nick Baron and Peter Gatrell, 'Population Displacement, State-Building, and Social Identity in the Lands of the Former Russian Empire, 1917–23', *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, Vol. 4, No. 1 (winter 2003), pp. 51–100, here p. 60.

as well as the forces that shape the lives and life-worlds of individuals and populations, both those displaced from their homes or homelands and those who remain ‘in place’.

By integrating diverse historical and conceptual perspectives on childhood, spatiality and mobility, the essays presented here thus offer a new scholarly lens on many wider themes of central importance for understanding the twentieth-century world and the formation of present-day political and social realities. These include the impact of conflict and political violence on communities and individuals; the rise of modern population politics and its role in state-building and governance; social reform as state project, its forms, aims and instruments; the evolving principles and practices of modern welfare and humanitarianism; the interrelations and interactions of sovereign states, civic interests, non-governmental organizations and transnational agencies; the changing character of state-society relations, categories of social identity and constructions of contemporary selfhood and subjectivity; and the nature of social experience, including the experience of childhood as mediated in children’s own testimonies and in adult memory narratives.

Contributors to this volume have drawn on rich and varied source materials to inform their analyses, including government documents; the records of relief agencies and international organizations; personal diaries and correspondence; published and unpublished memoirs; data from sociological, pedagogical, psychiatric and other research reports; film and oral history. These sources have enabled the authors to reflect on and elucidate the unifying themes of the volume from many standpoints – those of politicians and bureaucrats; nationalist organizers and communist activists; philanthropists and welfare workers; political police, jurists and judges; educationalists and psychologists; filmmakers, propagandists and social campaigners; and parents, both ‘natural’ and adoptive.

Crucially, most of the contributors to this volume also attend closely to the words and voices of the displaced children themselves, many orphaned as well as uprooted, in order

to reconstruct how these children viewed and understood their experiences and how they conceived of themselves in relation to the tumultuous worlds in which they lived. Several of the contributors also engage with the words and voices of adults who endured displacement as children and who, in their memoirs or interviews, offer unique insights not only into the subjective experience and longer-term impact of violent upheaval but also into the resiliency and ingenuity of humans in the midst and aftermath of the most terrible and tragic circumstances. This book will stand, we hope, as a testament as well as tribute to them.

Nurturing the Nation: State Practices of Child Displacement and Re-placement

Already a growing focus of anxiety for nineteenth-century European and North American politicians, administrators and activists, children became a central, even defining, concern of early twentieth-century governments and societies.⁵ Modernizing states, preoccupied with present strength and future self-preservation, viewed ‘their’ children as the incarnation of the

⁵ Hendrick writes of a transition in English social concerns, policies and practices between 1872 and 1918 from an emphasis on ‘children of the state’ (those in institutional care or needing protection) to ‘children of the nation’ (the whole juvenile population), and an associated shift from a discourse of moral discipline to one of regulating the child’s body (that from the 1920s also concerned itself with the child’s mind, in accordance with new theories of psychological development). See Harry Hendrick, *Child Welfare. England, 1872-1989* (London: Routledge, 1994), Part II. He is citing Florence Davenport-Hill, *Children of the State. The Training of Juvenile Paupers* (London: Macmillan, 1868, revised e. 1889) and Sir John Gorst, *The Children of the Nation: How Their Health and Vigour Should be Promoted by the State* (London: Methuen, 1906). See also James Schmidt, ‘Children and the State’, in Paula S. Fass, *The Routledge History of Childhood in the Western World* (London: Routledge, 2013), pp. 174-190. For diverse perspectives on nineteenth century anxieties and twentieth century preoccupations with regard to children, see John R. Gillis, *Youth and History. Tradition and Change in European Age Relations, 1770-present* (London, New York: Academic Press, 1981); John Springhall, *Coming of Age: Adolescence in Britain, 1860-1960* (London: Gill and Macmillan, 1986), Introduction and Chapter One, pp. 1-37; Hugh Cunningham, *The Children of the Poor. Representations of Childhood since the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991); Sylvia Schafer, *Children in Moral Danger and the Problem of Government in Third Republic France* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997); Laura Lee Downs, *Childhood in the Promised Land: Working Class Movements and the Colonies de Vacances in France, 1880-1960* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2002); André Turmel, *A Historical Sociology of Childhood. Developmental Thinking, Categorization and Graphic Visualization* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008); Dirk Schuman (ed.), *Raising Citizens in the Century of the Child. The United States and German Central Europe in Comparative Perspective* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2010).

future in the present: nurtured correctly, new generations would build, populate, pay for and protect the nation; a select few would grow to be the new guardians and managers of power.⁶

However, children were not only symbols and instruments of social renewal and regeneration. They also embodied the potential for destabilization and degeneration. For nineteenth and early twentieth century state officials and social reformers, juvenile ‘delinquency’ and adult crime against minors were more troubling than adults offending against other adults.⁷ Children raised in unsanitary, deprived or depraved conditions were ‘the nation’s wasted wealth’, who would enervate ‘national vitality’.⁸ The younger children were when ‘rescued’ from such pernicious environments, the more likely it was that they could be redeemed; the younger they were when ‘lost’ to these milieus, the more irredeemable they became.⁹ Children personified the nation’s hopes and fears. Childhood

⁶ Thus in England *The Child Welfare Annual*, Vol. 1 (1916/17), p. vii, declared: ‘The child of today holds the key to the morrow; the child that now is will be the citizen of coming years and must take up and bear the duties of statesmanship, defence from foes, the conduct of labour, the direction of progress, and the maintenance of a high level of thought and conduct, and all other necessities for the perpetuation of an imperial race.’ In the same year an American scholar, Isabel Simeral, stated her belief that during the nineteenth century a new ‘vision’ had arisen ‘of all children, as the assets of the race, to be conserved at any cost, - as the torch bearers to the civilization of the future ...’. Quotation in Cunningham, *The Children of the Poor*, p. 218.

⁷ There is a rich scholarship on the history of social constructions of and responses to juvenile ‘delinquency’. See for example Platt, *The Child Savers*; Robert S. Pickett, *House of Refuge. Origins of Juvenile Reform in New York State, 1815-1857* (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1969); Joseph M. Hawes, *Children in Urban Society. Juvenile Delinquency in Nineteenth-Century America* (New York: OUP, 1971); Robert M. Mennel, *Thorns and Thistles: Juvenile Delinquents in the United States, 1825-1940* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1973); Margaret May, ‘Innocence and Experience: The Evolution of the Concept of Juvenile Delinquency in the Mid-Nineteenth Century’, *Victorian Studies*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (1973), pp. 7-29; Victor Bailey, *Delinquency and Citizenship. Reclaiming the Young Offender, 1914-1948* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987); Stephen Humphries, *Hooligans or Rebels? An Oral History of Working-Class Childhood and Youth 1889-1939* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 1995); Peter King, ‘The Rise of Juvenile Delinquency in England 1780-1840: Changing Patterns of Perception and Prosecution’, *Past and Present*, No. 160 (1998), pp. 116-66; Heather Shore, *Artful Dodgers. Youth and Crime in Early Nineteenth Century London* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1999).

⁸ Mrs. Arthur Phillp, ‘A “Spoilt Child”: The Nation’s Wasted Wealth’, in *Essays on Duty and Discipline* (London: Cassell, 1910), p. 19; Fleet Engineer Quick, R.N., ‘National Decay, or National Vitality? The Cost in Human Life of Lack of Discipline’, in *Essays*, p. 251. In 1906, Sir John Gorst called for state intervention to regulate the physical wellbeing of children on grounds of public safety, public economy and national interest. See *The Children of the Nation*, pp. 3-10. I have borrowed the phrase ‘deprived and depraved’ from John Muncie, *Youth & Crime*. 2nd ed. (London: Sage, 2004), Chapter 2.

⁹ On ‘child rescue’ and ‘child saving’, see Margot Hillel and Shurlee Swain, *Child, Nation, Race and Empire: Child Rescue Discourses, England, Canada and Australia, 1850-1915* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010); Anthony M. Platt, *The Child Savers. The Invention of Delinquency* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969); Ronald D. Cohen, ‘Child Saving and Progressivism, 1885-1915’, in Joseph M. Hawes and N. Ray Hiner (eds), *American Childhood: A Research Guide and Historical Handbook* (Westport, CT:

became, as a scholar has written with regard to postcolonial and postwar Uganda, ‘a primary space in which national prosperity will either be made or broken.’¹⁰

Even more urgent anxieties were manifested in relation to children viewed as ‘out of place’, that is to say dis-placed from normative sites of child-rearing and socialization –home, school, club - to the margins of the established social order.¹¹ These were children who were neglected or had been abandoned by destitute, desperate or otherwise ‘unfit’ parents; who had run away from exploitation or abuse; or who had been orphaned. Increasingly, in the early twentieth century, these were also children who had been separated from family by war, civil conflict or social upheaval, or who had fled political violence or been expelled or evacuated from their homes (sometimes with their parents, often without) to become refugees in their own country or abroad. These displaced children, especially those without adult care or support and struggling for survival on the street, were seen and represented in various, often contradictory ways: they were associated with violence and vice yet also with vulnerability and victimhood. Particularly the youngest children (and perhaps also those displaced from ‘cultured’ homes) sometimes elicited sympathy, but often even they, and invariably the older

Greenwood Press, 1985), pp. 273-310; and Hamilton Cravens, ‘Child-Saving in the Age of Professionalism, 1915–1930’, in Hawes and Hiner (eds), *American Childhood*, pp. 415-88; Leroy Ashby, *Endangered Children: Dependency, Neglect, and Abuse in American History* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1997). See also works on delinquency cited in fn. 7 above.

¹⁰ Kristen E. Cheney, *Pillars of the Nation. Child Citizens and Ugandan National Development* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), p. 2.

¹¹ For discussion of ‘displacement’ as a relational concept that acquires meaning by reference to notions of normative ‘place’, see Baron and Gatrell, ‘Population Displacement, State-Building, and Social Identity’, pp. 52-60. The concept ‘out of place’ derives from Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (London: Ark Paperbacks, 1966). For a rich analysis of displacement as the condition of being (seen as) ‘out of place’, see Siobhan Peeling, ‘Dirt, disease and disorder: population re-placement in postwar Leningrad and the ‘danger’ of social contamination’, in Nick Baron and Peter Gatrell (eds), *Warlands: Population Resettlement and State Reconstruction in Soviet Eastern Europe, 1945-1950* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 117-39. For children ‘out of place’, see M. Connolly and J. Ennew, ‘Introduction: Children out of Place’, *Childhood: A Global Journal of Child Research* (‘Children out of Place: Special Issue on Working and Street Children), Vol. 3, No. 2 (1996), pp. 131–45. It is also important to stress that the concept of ‘socialization’ is used in this volume to refer to historically contingent strategies of social integration and identity-formation (we also use the term ‘normalization’), without reference to normative theories of child socialization, the subject of substantial recent sociological critique. See William A. Corsaro, *The Sociology of Childhood* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press, 1997); Alan Prout and Allison James, ‘A New Paradigm for the Sociology of Childhood? Provenance, Promise and Problems’, in James and Prout (eds), *Constructing and Reconstructing Childhood. Contemporary Issues in the Sociological Study of Childhood*. 2nd ed. (London: RoutledgeFalmer, 1997), pp. 7-33; Turmel, *A Historical Sociology of Childhood*, pp. 17-27.

‘hardened’ street children, were considered ‘savages’, perpetrators of crime and forces of social dissolution.¹²

Modernizing states developed different ways to manage perceived challenges to social stability arising from within their populations, and especially from juveniles ‘out of place’. Some tended more towards coercion: excluding, isolating, institutionalizing individuals or social groups considered alien or socially dangerous; at the most extreme, annihilating them. Others tended towards more ‘co-optive’, welfare-oriented interventions: providing the disadvantaged or disenfranchised with care, protection and material support and creating opportunities for their social re-integration.¹³

Many of these interventions, both excisionary and welfare-oriented, involved subjecting already marginalized individuals, communities or entire populations to planned displacement. Coerced mobility took various forms, many of which we examine in the case studies: transfers and exchanges between states; internal resettlement; deportation, exclusion or expulsion on the basis of ethnicity, socioeconomic status or other categories of classification and discrimination; re-placement through fostering or adoption, sometimes legally-grounded but often more akin to theft or kidnap; incarceration in prisons, colonies or camps, or institutionalization in orphanages, hospitals, asylums, boarding schools or reformatories.¹⁴ Often, as we shall discuss in this volume, these actions were targeted

¹² For the ‘hardened souls’ of street children, see Alan M. Ball, *And Now my Soul is Hardened: Abandoned Children in Soviet Russia, 1918-1930* (Stanford, CA: University of California Press, 1994), p. 82. English social reformer Henry Mayhew wrote in 1864 of the ‘hardening consequences’ of ‘a street career’, quoted in Cunningham, *The Children of the Poor*, p. 110. For the representation of street children as ‘savages’, see Cunningham, *The Children of the Poor*, Chapter 5. See also discussion of Figure 1.1 and characterizations of Soviet street children below and fn. 36. For sociologies of street children, see fn. 50 below.

¹³ For a history of modern Europe that emphasizes these twin tendencies, see Mark Mazower, *Dark Continent. Europe’s Twentieth Century* (London: Penguin, 1998). Also see Amir Weiner (ed.), *Landscaping the Human Garden. Twentieth Century Population Management in a Comparative Framework* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2003). Specifically with regard to systems of justice for juveniles, Muncie writes of ‘tensions between reclamation and punishment’ that initially shaped the concept of the ‘delinquent’ and continues to ‘impact on the rationale and practices’ of youth justice to the present day. See Muncie, *Youth & Crime*, p. 63.

¹⁴ Baron and Gatrell, ‘Population Displacement, State-Building, and Social Identity’. For scholarship on East European and Russian/Soviet population displacements, see fns. 65 and 66 below.

specifically at children and youth perceived as ‘out of place’. Even when benign in their aims, such displacements often entailed violence, wrenching upheaval and loss for those uprooted and transferred to new homes or places of resettlement. Most modernizing states deployed, at different times or in different places, a range of strategies along the spectrum between brute force and accommodation.¹⁵ Increasingly, states developed means of avoiding overt coercion and violence in favour of more sophisticated, cost-effective and humane means of constructing cultural conformity and normalizing behaviour. Still, intrinsic to ‘biopolitics’ as a form of twentieth century government, as it emerged and has evolved, has been violence, implicit or explicit.¹⁶

The differing interventions of modernizing states in the lives of displaced children, to rescue them, redeem them, punish them or provide for them, often entailing their further displacement and re-placement, were a function of how state authorities conceived and strove to project their own role, their legitimating principles, their visions for the future, their organizational capacities and their relationship with citizens. Their interventions, however, also served to constitute the state itself, as the structured outcome of conflict and compromise among diverse political, social, economic and bureaucratic interests, each with their own prescriptions for managing populations and social groups - including, often especially, children – and arbitrated, regulated or directed by a central executive authority. Finally, these

¹⁵ Thus Muncie cites David Garland’s notion of a new ‘penal-welfare complex’ emerging in Britain in the period 1895–1914, ‘in which classical conceptions of punishment and generalized deterrence were contested and disrupted by positivist conceptions of reclamation and individualized treatment. The end result was new means of “normalizing”, “correcting” and “segregating” young people, which in their complexity and interrelation could no longer be simply viewed as either humanitarian or repressive.’ Muncie, *Youth & Crime*, pp. 76-77. See also John Clarke, ‘The Three Rs – Repression, Rescue and Rehabilitation: Ideologies of Control for Working Class Youth’, in John Muncie, Gordon Hughes and Eugene McLaughlin (eds), *Youth Justice. Critical Readings* (London: Sage, 2002), pp. 123-137.

¹⁶ Not least because the provision of welfare requires the institution of surveillance and discipline. On ‘normalization’, see Stanley Cohen, *Visions of Social Control. Crime, Punishment and Classification* (London: Polity Press, 1984); Nikolas Rose, *Powers of Freedom. Reframing Political Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); David Garland, *Punishment and Welfare: A History of Penal Strategies* (Aldershot: Gower, 1985). On ‘biopolitics’, see Claudia Minca, ‘The Biopolitical Imperative’, in John Agnew, Virginie Mamadouh, Anna J. Secor and Joanne Sharp (eds), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Political Geography* (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2015), pp. 165-185; T. Campbell and A. Sitze (eds), *Biopolitics: A Reader* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2013). On the modern state, see fn. 58 below.

states' interventions aimed to transform society, reinforcing reconceived categories of social belonging, strengthening the reformed social base of state power, consolidating new strategies of acculturation and socialization, and physically excluding undesired elements. In the process of working on the displaced child, that is to say, modernizing states were also working on themselves and reworking their relationship with citizens. Studying these states' conceptions of children 'out of place' and their policies towards them, therefore, we gain much wider insights into the history of modern statehood and social relations.¹⁷

In elucidating how states, and also non-state actors such as émigré communities, international organizations and transnational agencies, conceived of and acted towards displaced children, the case studies here are also concerned to examine how 'childhood' itself, in the time and place under survey, was constructed conceptually, inscribed in discourse and institutionalized in social norms and legal structures, and to consider how different understandings of childhood shaped practice with regard to children and children's own realities. Acknowledging that childhood is a social construct (see next section), this volume adopts no normative definitions of 'the child' or of 'childhood'. At the same time we recognize, of course, that age matters. Gabriels Matrosovs, as a teenager in a Latvian orphanage in the early 1920s, recalled his family's flight from home during the First World War, when he was five years old. In the midst of burning houses and crowds of desperate refugees, his mother in anguish because she had to abandon his older brother, the little boy had only positive emotions: '[I] liked going by train. I was happy, but the other people were

¹⁷ For literature on the modern state, see fn. 58 below. The crucial nexus between displaced children and modern statehood is perhaps revealed most starkly with regard to the 'problem' of stateless children, a category which includes not only refugee children but a growing number with irregular immigration status or who belong to marginalized communities who cannot document their legal identity. See, Jacqueline Bhabha (ed.), *Children Without a State. A Global Human Rights Challenge* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2011), here p. xii. See also Jo Boyden and Jason Hart, 'The Statelessness of the World's Children', *Children & Society*, Vol. 21, No. 4 (2007), pp. 237-48.

upset. I still did not know what fleeing meant'.¹⁸ Gabriels was not greatly affected even when his father died after their arrival in central Russia. At that time, he later remembered, 'life was pretty good'. However, they subsequently moved further eastwards, and the death of his mother from typhus during a long Siberian winter and then his own serious illness scarred his memory: that was, he wrote in his autobiography, 'the worst time of my life'.

Thus both age and experience produce a more 'mature' self-awareness, albeit at a different pace for individual children, and possibly at a different rate for girls and boys.¹⁹ Older children and adolescents become ever more conscious of the complexity and contingency of life as well as of the potential meanings and wider ramifications of events. At the same time, they become physically stronger, cognitively more developed and more able to take care of themselves and others. Over and again in this volume, we witness not just children's terrible suffering but their resourcefulness, courage and capacity to survive. A key theme of several chapters – addressed most directly by Kaznelson and Baron – is the impact that the experience of violent displacement has on children and on their future lives and wellbeing as adults. What we may see as evidence of childhood resiliency (such as working to maintain their family), many of these adults construed in retrospect as signifying their 'loss' of childhood. Prompted by the same assumptions of childhood as a time of sheltered innocence, Russian adults working with child refugees in the mid-1920s commented on their

¹⁸ For Gabriels' story, see the chapter by Purs in this volume.

¹⁹ The role of gender in shaping children's lives, experiences, perceptions and understandings is an important theme that deserves greater attention than accorded in this volume. For historical treatments, see for example Alla Sal'nikova, *Rossiiskoe detstvo v XX veke: Istorii, Teorii i Praktika Issledovaniia* (Kazan': Kazanskii gosudarstvennyi universitet, 2007), pp. 139-209; Jennifer Helgren and Colleen A. Vasconcellos (eds), *Girlhood. A Global History* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2010); Mary Jo Maynes, Birgitte Soland and Christina Benninghaus (eds), *Secret Gardens, Satanic Mills. Placing Girls in European History, 1750-1960* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004); Susan A. Miller, *Growing Girls. The Natural Origins of Girls' Organizations in America* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2007); Mary E Odem, *Delinquent Daughters: Protecting and Policing Adolescent Female Sexuality in the United States, 1885-1920* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995). For sociological analysis: Sara Meadows, *The Child as Social Person*. (London: Routledge, 2010), pp. 186-205.

‘unchildishness’ [*nedetskost*’].²⁰ What, then, is the appropriate role of the child? Where is the child’s proper place? When is ‘childhood’? These are vital questions of context, standpoint, perception and construction with which the case studies engage, as they examine official discourse and practice, adult myths and memories, and children’s own lives and evolving self-consciousness and sense of identity.

Ideology, Identity and Experience: Childhood as Social Construct

The last two decades have seen an explosion of new sociologies, anthropologies and histories of modern childhood and youth that critically examine the discursive constructions and reconstructions that shape children’s lives and experiences.²¹ Among these a growing number of works adopt a child-centred perspective. This scholarship explicitly rejects the traditional standpoint of the grown-up observer, whether politician, parent, policeman, welfare worker or academic, who views ‘minors’ principally ‘as objects and motivators of adults’ actions’.²²

²⁰ For example, N. Tsurikov, ‘Deti emigratsii’, in V.V. Zenkovskii (ed.), *Deti emigratsii. Sbornik statei* (Prague: Izdanie Pedagogicheskago Biuro po Delam Srednei i Nizshei Russkoi Shkoly Zagranitse, 1925), p. 121.

²¹ Among new sociologies that have informed the framework of the present volume: James, Prout (eds), *Constructing and Reconstructing Childhood*; Corsaro, *The Sociology of Childhood*; Allison James, Chris Jenks and Alan Prout, *Theorizing Childhood* (London: Polity Press, 1998); Jens Qvortrup, William A. Corsaro and Michael-Sebastian Honig (eds), *The Palgrave Handbook of Childhood Studies* (London: Palgrave, 2009); Sara Meadows, *The Child as Social Person*. (London: Routledge, 2010). For an overview of recent anthropological approaches: Heather Montgomery, *An Introduction to Childhood. Anthropological Perspectives on Children’s Lives* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009). Among useful recent general histories and historiographies of western childhood: N. Ray Hiner and Joseph M. Hawes (eds), *Growing up in America. Children in Historical Perspective* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1985); Elliott West and Paul Petrik (eds), *Small Worlds. Children and Adolescents in America, 1850-1950* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1992); Roger Cox, *Shaping Childhood. Themes of Uncertainty in the History of Adult-Child Relationships* (London: Routledge, 1996); Egle Becchi, Dominique Julia (eds), *Histoire de l’enfance en Occident. Tome 2. Du XVIII^e siècle à nos jours* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1998); Colin Heywood, *A History of Childhood* (London: Polity, 2001); Paula S. Fass (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Children and Childhood in History and Society*. 3 vols. (New York: Macmillan, 2004); Hugh Cunningham, *Children and Childhood in Western Society since 1500. 2nd ed.* (London: Pearson, 2005); Peter Stearns, *Childhood in World History* (New York: Routledge, 2006), Chapters 9-11; Schuman (ed.), *Raising Citizens in the Century of the Child*; Heidi Morrison (ed.), *The Global History of Childhood Reader* (London: Routledge, 2012); Fass, *The Routledge History of Childhood in the Western World*. For histories of developmental psychology, see Turmel, *A Historical Sociology of Childhood*; Willem Koops, ‘Historical Reframing of Childhood’, in Peter K. Smith and Craig H. Hart (eds), *The Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of Childhood Social Development, Second Edition*, (Oxford: Blackwell, 2011), pp. 82-99; Koops and Michael Zuckerman (eds), *Beyond the Century of the Child: Cultural History and Developmental Psychology* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003).

²² West and Petrik, *Small Worlds*, p. 2.

Instead, it focuses on children as autonomous subjects, whose lived experiences, understandings of reality and histories are distinct from, though entangled with, those of their adult counterparts in a particular period or place. Some sociologists have proclaimed that this approach represents a ‘new paradigm’ in child studies.²³ Childhood is now investigated as a separate social category, institution or identity - the child is no longer merely an embryonic adult passively undergoing socialization, but an agent of social change in their own right.²⁴ Much of the new child-centred sociological work on children is ethnographic. For historians, of course, this perspective raises thorny questions of sources, as I discuss below.

Despite these innovations, much of the recent historical work on children remains concerned with official conceptions of childhood and strategies for the care and acculturation of children; in short, with what adults ‘did for (or to) children’.²⁵ The present volume seeks to combine both ‘old’ and ‘new’ perspectives by examining moments and sites of intersection or interaction between adults’ interventions and children’s experiences, directing attention, when sources permit, to children’s ‘partial and situated’ capacity to re-imagine and act on the worlds in which they lived.²⁶

A child-centred research agenda demands that we reflect on the distinctiveness of children’s perceptions as well as the ways these are conditioned and constrained by adult views of childhood. This directs our attention to issues of ideology and identity and the interconnection of the two. We understand ideology here not solely as state doctrine, as an intellectual framework for political action, but as discourse that shapes a particular view of the world, including notions of selfhood and social relations. Ideology in this sense orders

²³ Alan Prout and Allison James, ‘A New Paradigm for the Sociology of Childhood? Provenance, Promise and Problems’, in James, Prout (eds), *Constructing and Reconstructing Childhood*, pp. 7-33. See also William A. Corsaro, *The Sociology of Childhood* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press, 1997).

²⁴ Turmel, *A Historical Sociology of Childhood*, pp. 25-26 and *passim*. This new perspective liberates the child from the teleology of traditional socialization theory, see fn. 11 above. On agency, see David Oswell, *The Agency of Children. From Family to Global Human Rights* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

²⁵ Colin Heywood, *Growing Up in France. From the Ancien Régime to the Third Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), p. 4.

²⁶ Oswell, *The Agency of Children*, Chapter 4.

and gives meaning to reality, including our sense of individual being, our apprehension and experience of space and time and our relationship to our physical body. It articulates a particular historical configuration of powers and serves both to constitute and sustain these powers. It is reinforced, reproduced and reified through everyday speech and action as well as through official pronouncements and practices – in Foucault’s words, in the ‘little tactics of the habitat’ as much as in ‘the grand strategies of geopolitics’²⁷ This approach generates questions about how children and childhood have been discursively constructed in the past; how children have become implicated, in different periods and places, in normative discourse (one might say, in history); and how children grappled with, negotiated, resisted, subverted or eluded socially dominant accounts of their identity and behaviour (and, in such instances, how the historian can re-inscribe the displaced child, on the margins of discourse, in new critical histories of childhood)?²⁸ These questions have both conceptual and methodological dimensions.

A consideration of research strategies developed by new sociologies of childhood is, of course, a useful starting point for tackling issues of method in the historical study of children.²⁹ But historians exploring the experiences of children in the past do not have access to the same range of sources, especially qualitative data based on direct observation of child subjects or interaction with them. As historians, we must recognize that the available

²⁷ Michel Foucault, ‘The Eye of Power. A Conversation with Jean-Pierre Barou and Michelle Perrot’, in Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. Ed. Colin Gordon (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980), p. 149.

²⁸ Oswell, *The Agency of Children*, especially Chapters 4 and 5.

²⁹ For general discussion of researching children’s perspectives and experiences, see e.g. Allison James, ‘Researching Children’s Social Competence’, in Martin Woodhead, Dorothy Faulkner, Karen Littleton (eds), *Making Sense of Social Development* (London: Routledge, 1999), pp. 231-49 (positing four ‘research strategies’ that correlate to four ideal types: the developing child, the tribal child, the adult child, the social child – it is the final vision of children as active social participants, albeit with different social competencies to adults, that we find most useful for our present purposes); James, Jenks and Prout, *Theorizing Childhood*, pp. 169-193; Sheila Green, Diane Hogan (eds), *Researching Children’s Experiences. Methods and Approaches* (London: Sage, 2005), esp. pp. 1-21 (on definitions of ‘experience’ and methods and limitations of constructing knowledge of others’ experiences). For a critical perspective on ‘subjective’ child-centred approaches, Jim McKechnie, ‘Children’s Voices and Researching Childhood’, in Barry Goldson, Michael Lavalette, Jim McKechnie, *Children, Welfare and the State* (London: Sage, 2002), pp. 42-58.

evidence imposes constraints and limitations on our research. Most sources for reconstructing children's lives in the past are written by adults, shaped by their assumptions and interests and represent their viewpoints. Even when these sources reproduce children's words, they are selected and cited for a purpose – we hear but faint echoes of the children's own voices. To compensate for this, several of our case studies draw on children's autobiographies and adults' retrospective oral histories or written memoirs of childhood.

Yet first-person testimonies of childhood present considerable difficulties of interpretation.³⁰ Adult memories of childhood are often conceived in fragmented, dream-like images, characterized by complex indeterminate spatialities and temporalities. For Mikhail Nikolaev, introducing his memoir of childhood in a Stalinist orphanage, remembering was like a cinematic flashback, a reversal of time, visual in form: 'And my memory went back, spinning round like a spool of film'.³¹ Anne, a child Holocaust survivor interviewed as an adult, similarly compared remembering to a sequence of images, into which she placed herself as third-person protagonist rather than first-person subject:

I have to start my story when I was three and a half. [...] I have no doubts about what I remember. I have *talked to myself* about it, I have *seen it in front of my eyes*, in my pictures, slides if you like, and *I can see myself in them*.³²

The challenge for scholars, then, is to understand how a subject transforms and re-orders a confusion of mental images into narrative through speaking (to themselves or others) or

³⁰ See Yvonne Rieker, *Kindheiten. Identitätsmuster im deutsch-jüdischen Bürgertum und unter ostjüdischen Einwanderern, 1871-1933* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1997), pp. 21-27; Roy Pascal, *Design and Truth in Autobiography* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1960); Dori Laub and Shoshana Felman (eds), *Testimony. Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History* (New York: Routledge, 1992); Philippe Lejeune, *On Autobiography* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989); David C. Rubin (ed.), *Remembering our Past. Studies in Autobiographical Memory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995). See also the works cited in the chapter by Kaznelson and Baron in this volume.

³¹ 'I poshla moia pamiat' nazad, zakrutilas', kak v kino'. Mikhail Nikolaev, *Detdom* (New York: Russica Publishers, 1985), p. 9. I am grateful to Robert Chandler for suggesting this translation in a personal email, 8 September 2015.

³² The testimony of 'Anne', in Paul Valent (ed.), *Child Survivors of the Holocaust* (New York: Brunner-Routledge, 2002), p. 249. Emphasis added.

through writing. Which discursive structures provide a framework of significance for recollected experience? What does it mean for the narrator to recreate themselves in memory as object rather than subject of remembering and then revert to the first person to render experience in the form of self-narrative? If childhood is a staged and contested entry into discourse, what difference does age make in remembering and narrating?³³ How do experiences of violence affect or shape memory practices? To address these questions, we must understand testimonies of childhood, whether composed by children or adults, as a poetic rather than documentary genre: they decontextualize and essentialize impressions or intuitions of the past retrieved and assembled because these bear on present concerns, as well as accord with present-day norms and notions of ‘truth’.³⁴ Historians must be aware that the meaning of testimonies derives as much from affect, imagination and impulse as from any ‘authentic’ past experience. The challenge, then, is to re-contextualize and de-essentialize the elements and structures of self-narrative. (In this regard, Finder’s chapter in this volume offers a revealing study of questions of ideology, narrative form and identity with reference to *fictionalized* first-person testimonies presented in film, including through the use of flashbacks.) None of these considerations, of course, devalues first-person testimony as evidence of children’s experiential worlds and of the impact of their childhood lives on adult narrators. Rather they prompt us to reflect on the questions such sources answer in relation to those that historians generally ask. I discuss issues of narrative, memory, trauma, temporality and selfhood further in Chapter Four.

Normative Childhoods: Spatial and Temporal Perspectives on Child (Dis)Placement

³³ For suggestive psychological and legal perspectives on questions of children’s testimony, see Maria S. Zaragoza et al (eds), *Memory and Testimony in the Child Witness* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1995).

³⁴ For elegant discussions of these themes, see Richard N. Coe, *When the Grass was Taller. Autobiography and the Experience of Childhood* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1984); Heywood, *Growing up in France*, Chapter 1; Kate Douglas, *Contesting Childhood. Autobiography, Trauma, and Memory* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2010).

Elsewhere I have sought to understand the historical meanings of population displacement, as both state practice and social experience, with reference to the opposition between ‘spaces of movement’ and ‘places of being’.³⁵ Contributors to the present volume have been encouraged to reflect on their materials in light of this framework. As analytical concepts, neither has any intrinsic moral value: mobility in space may be associated with freedom, adventure and self-development or with deprivation, danger and loss of identity; rootedness in place with security, stability and nurture or with surveillance, dependency and oppression.

Conventionally, however, as we saw earlier with regard to street children, this opposition has most often been constructed as such within stridently moralizing discourses that valorize the condition of being sedentary ‘in place’ over that of being itinerant and ‘out of place’.

Soviet culture of the 1920s demonstrated an ambivalence towards street children (*besprizorniki*) characteristic of a system intent on transforming social structures and norms, yet with no consensus on either ends or means, while at the same time securing social order. Whereas many Bolshevik officials and experts pointed to the prevalence of violence, exploitation and abuse among street children, and others viewed them as a social threat, some believed that their experience of life outside the conventional sites of childhood (especially the traditional family), the resourcefulness they developed and the unity of the gangs they formed made them ideal material to be ‘reforged’ into model new socialist citizens.³⁶ One Soviet official told a foreign visitor that street children were ‘very energetic’ and possessed a strong ‘sense of honour’; another noted: ‘You find they have an extraordinary amount of

³⁵ Baron and Gatrell, ‘Population Displacement, State-Building, and Social Identity’, pp. 52-53.

³⁶ Ball, *And Now my Soul is Hardened*, pp. 40, 80-81, 192-93. A Soviet psychiatrist distinguished between ‘passive’ and ‘active’ *besprizorniki*. The former were on the street mainly because of social hardship, manifested only minor symptoms of nervousness and easily re-integrated into society. The latter were often ‘career’ runaways, impelled by existing psychological conditions or made ‘so dissolute by life on the street that they become almost like child-psychopaths’. These children demonstrated a more deep-seated ‘anti-sociality’ [*antisotsial’nost’*], having become ‘untrusting, embittered, deceitful, aggressive, etc.’ But, the expert stressed, even they had ‘positive qualities: loyalty to comrades [*tovarishcheskaia predannost’*], mastery of life-skills [*zhiteiskaia snorovka*], lively imagination, etc.’ See D. Futer, ‘K Voprosu o Tipologii Trudno-Vospituemykh Detei’, *Detskii dom. Sbornik*, Vol. 1 (1928), pp. 29-30. For the extensive literature on Soviet attitudes and policies towards *besprizorniki*, see fns 74 and 75 below.

vitality and talent.’³⁷ A Soviet newspaper cartoon of the mid-1920s (Figure 1.1) illustrates these multiple identifications of the street child. It depicts two *besprizorniki* riding on the undercarriage of a locomotive. They are dirty, emaciated, destitute and unruly. Yet they are also clearly tough, enterprising and even humorous in their desperate circumstances. The image simultaneously elicits horror at the plight of these children, trepidation at their precocious independence and respect for their resilience. It thus captures the ambivalence of early Soviet conceptions of displaced children and the contradictory character of post-revolutionary practice, vacillating between the impulse to exclude and punish and the desire to rescue and redeem. (I further discuss Soviet views of *besprizorniki* later in this chapter, and Green’s chapter addresses the persistence of these tensions in subsequent decades).

FIGURE 1.1 HERE (HALF-PAGE)

These modes of spatial experience and discourse also have temporal axes that we consider in relation both to subjects’ life-worlds and to questions of memory and trauma. That is to say, the displaced children whom we study in this volume generally experienced a sequence of displacements and re-placements that shaped how they understood their own lives as well as constructed their own histories, as children writing autobiographies and as adults seeking through memory practice to impose order and meaning on earlier experience.³⁸

As remarked earlier, childhood itself is constructed on spatial and temporal axes:

traditionally, the child has been defined in large part by identification with specific sites

³⁷ Lenka von Koerber, *Soviet Russia Fights Crime* (London: George Routledge and Sons, 1934), pp. 88-90.

³⁸ Thus Riccardo Lucchini writes of the ‘career of the street child’ whose perceptions and understandings of the ‘street’ evolve with age and experience, in *Enfant de la Rue. Identité, sociabilité, drogue* (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1993), pp. 134-61. In her exploration of immigrant identity, Andreea Deciu Ritivoi notes that we prefer to conceive of ‘exile and homesickness in spatial rather than also temporal and even less so in existential terms’, since space (and, in relation to the concerns of the present volume, displacement) allows for returns (re-placement), while time is irreversible, in *Yesterday’s Self. Nostalgia and the Immigrant Identity* (Lanham, Boulder, New York, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002), p. 117. See the chapter by Kaznelson and Baron in this volume for further discussion of this theme.

(especially home and school) and, by implication, with rootedness ‘in place’; reaching adulthood, they ‘move on’ from these places, and it is this mobility that marks their maturity.³⁹ As Figure 1.1 illustrates, the displaced child is seen to have foregone childhood, to have grown up prematurely, to exhibit ‘unchildishness’ (thus also pointing to the disconnection between biological age and social ideas of childhood).⁴⁰

This framework highlights the fact that the modern citizen has become fixed ‘in place’, or within a network of interrelated places, from which they derive a more or less stable sense of identity, and where state authorities can register, classify and monitor them. The experience of being affiliated with a place or nexus of places has been associated, for most adult citizens, with both the rights and the obligations of belonging in a settled community: it renders them both visible and accountable.⁴¹ By contrast, itinerant populations and individuals, whether their mobility has been ‘voluntary’ or ‘forced’ (a distinction itself loaded with moral judgement and fraught with analytical complexity), have been marginal or intermittent participants in the community, often outside the purview of authority.⁴² Since not only state officials but also historians invariably conceive and view their subjects from a

³⁹ For discussion of the spatial dimensions and contexts of children’s lives, experiences and subjectivities, see Sarah L. Holloway and Gill Valentine (eds), *Children’s Geographies. Playing, Living, Learning* (London, New York: Routledge, 2000); Stuart C. Aitken, *Geographies of Young People. The morally contested spaces of identity* (London: Routledge, 2001); Peter E. Hopkins, *Young People, Place and Identity* (London: Routledge, 2010). For consideration of how ‘the social space of childhood is also a temporal phenomenon’, see James, Jenks and Prout, *Theorizing Childhood*, pp. 59-78, this quotation from p. 41.

⁴⁰ Muncie writes of concerns expressed by nineteenth century English social reformers that street children demonstrated a ‘premature precocity’. See John Muncie, *Youth & Crime*. 2nd ed. (London: Sage, 2004), p. 56. Thus Matthew Davenport Hill, Recorder of Birmingham, wrote in 1855 that the delinquent is ‘a little stunted man already - he knows much and a great deal too much of what is called life [...] He consequently has much to unlearn – he has to be turned again into a child ...’; the Reverent Micaiah Hill wrote in 1863 that child vagrants and criminals were ‘never children in heart and mind’; S. Robins in 1851 described the delinquent as ‘an infant in age, a man in shrewdness and vice’. Quotations in May, ‘Innocence and Experience’, pp. 7, 20, 21.

⁴¹ For discussion of Foucault’s conception of the interrelations of space and power and theorization of surveillance as applied to one of the ‘institutional spaces of childhood’, see Tom Disney, ‘Complex Spaces of Orphan Care – a Russian Therapeutic Children’s Community’, *Children’s Geographies*, Vol. 13, No. 1 (2015), pp. 30-43.

⁴² For lucid exploration of these issues, see Tim Cresswell, *Place: A Short Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004); and Cresswell, *On the Move. Mobility in the Modern Western World* (London: Routledge, 2006). For Soviet attempts during the 1920s to accommodate and encompass nomadism in state construction, before the Stalinist state resolved on their forcible sedentarization, see Alun Thomas, ‘Kazakh Nomads and the New Soviet State, 1919-1934’, unpublished PhD dissertation (University of Sheffield, 2015).

sedentary standpoint, I have suggested elsewhere the need to re-envision the history of population displacement from an ‘itinerant perspective’, taking account of migrant subjectivities and experiences through making use where possible of first-person testimonies and other ‘ego documents’, which might include literary or visual sources⁴³

For the modern child, excluded from most of the rights and duties of citizenship (although they have usually been held to account before the law), the experience of place has conventionally been spatially more restricted and socially more restrictive.⁴⁴ In the words of a contemporary sociologist: ‘Children’s lives are structured by boundaries of time and place set by adults; their daily lives marked by permission seeking, negotiations and rules.’⁴⁵ For adults, the principal sites of childhood, where ‘minors’ are to be nurtured, regulated and instilled with appropriate values and norms of behaviour, have traditionally been school and home – usually in the sense of the family hearth, but at times its functional substitutes or symbolic extensions: this volume considers institutional homes and adoptive families as well as notions of the national ‘homeland’.⁴⁶

At times, these modernizing processes of ‘scholarization’ and ‘familization’ have come into conflict with one another, as radical states strove to use public institutions, such as the school or youth organizations, to subvert, substitute or transform the traditional family as a private institution.⁴⁷ Later in this chapter, I discuss the vilification of the family in early Soviet ideology, citing communist activist Zlata Lilina’s demand for the ‘nationalization’ of children. An anti-Soviet cartoon of the 1920s, titled ‘An Ideal Child’,

⁴³ Nick Baron and Peter Gatrell, ‘Population Displacement, State-Building, and Social Identity’, pp. 52-56.

⁴⁴ For discussion of children’s rights, see fn. 59 below, White’s and Zahra’s chapters in this volume, and Chapter 10, especially works cited in fns. 21-25.

⁴⁵ Nigel Thomas, *Children, Family, and the State: Decision-Making and Child Participation* (Gordonville, VA, USA: St. Martin’s Press, 2000), p 139.

⁴⁶ On diverse conceptions of ‘home’, see Alison Blunt and Robyn Dowling, *Home* (London, New York: Routledge, 2006).

⁴⁷ Helga Zeiher, ‘Institutionalization as a Secular Trend’, in Jens Qvortrup, William A. Corsaro and Michael-Sebastian Honig (eds), *The Palgrave Handbook of Childhood Studies* (London: Palgrave, 2009), pp. 127-39. See below and Green’s chapter in this volume for discussion of the Soviet conceptualizations of the family.

satirizes these ambitions (Figure 1.2). The émigré artist, A. Uspenskii, has been inspired to draw this image by an alleged Soviet news story, cited above the picture, about a two year-old girl who had been expelled from the Communist Youth League (Komsomol) because of her failure to attend meetings. For Uspenskii, such a case evidently exemplified, to the point of absurdity, the Soviet regime's design to destroy the family and revolutionize the essence and experience of childhood. The communists, in this account, through their endeavours to indoctrinate and mobilize the young generation, were transforming children into unnatural creatures such as little Rosa, who rejects loving nurture in the private family home for public work in political committees and government offices.⁴⁸ In so doing, Uspenskii implies, the communists were in effect destroying childhood.

FIGURE 1.2 HERE (FULL PAGE SO TEXT IS LEGIBLE).

Children may be displaced from their conventional sites of belonging in various ways. If a state believes that parents are unable or unwilling to provide adequate care for their own children or to instil in them appropriate norms and values, it may remove these minors from their homes to an alternative place, to be reared in accordance with official conceptions of the community's – and hence, in its view, the child's – best interests. As I have just noted, some radical early Soviet activists demanded full 'nationalization' of children, though this was never implemented. Several of the case studies address issues of child-parent relations, family policy, child welfare and institutionalization (when the state acts *in loco parentis*) in relation to child displacement and re-placement. At other times, political, societal or natural catastrophes may cause the child to be separated from their parents and family, who may or

⁴⁸ For the Komsomol as a means of reconstructing youth, Ann Gorsuch, *Youth in Revolutionary Russia: Enthusiasts, Bohemians, Delinquents* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000), especially Chapter 3.

may not remain alive. In some desperate circumstances, parents may decide to abandon their children. Or children may independently resolve to escape the 'boundaries of time and place set by adults' that structure their lives, especially if they experience abuse, neglect or deprivation. Displacement does not necessarily entail children's loss of kin – they may flee or be uprooted from their home in the company of their parents or other family members (though frequently, in the chaos of movement, they subsequently become separated). The case studies in this volume touch on all these forms of displacement.

The studies also reveal that most displaced children experience more than one form of displacement and re-placement: itinerancy, as noted above, is a condition characterized by alternating motion and stasis. Thus Purs and White consider children who, with their families, fled from home and homeland because of war, civil conflict or fear of political persecution. In the course of repeated settlement and resettlement, these child refugees became separated from their parents or lost their immediate family to violent death or disease and were placed in orphanages. Baron and Kaznelson as well as Balkelis examine the experiences of children deported by state authorities, during peacetime, with their entire families to special settlements. In most cases the children's parents, sometimes all their kin, perished in exile and they were left to fend for themselves and then placed in state institutions. Qualls looks at children who were evacuated from one country to another in organized groups, with adult carers but without their parents, and then placed in special children's homes. Finder's chapter focusses on a home for children who had lost all their relatives to genocide. The children in Green's and Zahra's chapters had been separated from parents, and many had become orphans, as a result of wartime occupations, evacuations or deportations – some had been formally or informally fostered, others taken for illegal adoption, and many were homeless and without adult care at the moment they were collected for re-placement. In all these diverse cases it is evident that violence was the context, catalyst and condition of the

children's displacement and itinerancy. For many children, violence persisted during their re-placement, overshadowed their subsequent experiences and haunted their memories. War, conflict and violence are not the principal focus of our analysis, but they are a prominent leitmotif throughout all the case studies.⁴⁹

Those separated from their parents, and especially those who had no adult support, found themselves for longer or shorter periods of time on the 'street'. In the case studies, the notion of the 'street' stands for a range of different spaces constructed discursively in opposition to conventional notions of 'home'.⁵⁰ The 'street' is as much about existence in a marginal social milieu, often (though not always) without fixed abode or adult oversight, as

⁴⁹ See Mark Mazower, 'Violence and the State in the Twentieth Century', *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 107, No. 4. (October 2002), pp. 1158-1178; Donald Bloxham and Robert Gerwarth (eds), *Political Violence in Twentieth-Century Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011). For children and violence in the twentieth century, see for example: Irina Grudzinska-Gross and Jan Tomasz Gross (eds), *War Through Children's Eyes: The Soviet Occupation of Poland and the Deportations, 1939-41* (Stanford: Hoover Institute Press, 1981); Emmy E. Werner, *Through the Eyes of Innocents: Children Witness World War II* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2000); Nicholas Stargardt, *Witnesses of War: Children's Lives Under the Nazis* (London: Jonathan Cape, 2005); Olga Kucherenko, *Little Soldiers. How Soviet Children Went to War, 1941-1945* (Oxford: OUP, 2011). For general studies of childhood and violence in the modern world: Peter Stearns, *Childhood in World History* (New York: Routledge, 2006), Chapter 11; James Marten, *Children and War. A Historical Anthology* (New York, London: New York University Press, 2002); Elizabeth Goodenough and Andrea Immel (eds), *Under Fire. Children in the Shadow of War* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2008); James Garbarino, Kathleen Kostelny and Nancy Dubrow (eds), *No Place to be a Child. Growing up in a War Zone* (San Francisco: Josey-Bass Publishers, 1991); Graca Michel, *The Impact of War on Children* (New York: UNICEF, 2001); Ed Cairns, *Children and Political Violence* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996). On children as combatants: P.W. Singer, *Children at War* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006); David M. Rosen, *Armies of the Young: Child Soldiers in War and Terrorism* (Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2005); Ilene Cohn and Guy S. Goodwin-Gill, *Child Soldiers. The Role of Children in Armed Conflicts* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994). On other forms of violence towards children: Laurence Brockliss and Heather Montgomery (eds), *Childhood and Violence in the Western Tradition* (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2010).

⁵⁰ On 'street children' see: Lucchini, *Enfant de la Rue*; Tobias Hecht, *At Home on the Street. Street Children of Northeast Brazil* (Cambridge: CUP, 1998); Roslyn Arlin Mickelson (ed.), *Children On the Streets of the Americas: Homelessness, Education, and Globalization in the United States, Brazil, and Cuba* (London, New York: Routledge, 2000); Kristina E. Gibson, *Street Kids. Homeless Youth, Outreach, and Policing New York's Streets* (New York: New York University Press, 2011). For conceptual definitions and critique, see Sarah Thomas de Benítez, *State of the World's Street Children: Research* (London: Consortium for Street Children, 2011), pp. 7-15, available at: <http://www.streetchildrenresources.org/> [accessed 31 August 2015]; Benno Glauser, 'Street Children: Deconstructing a Construct', in Allison James, Alan Prout (eds), *Constructing and Reconstructing Childhood: Contemporary Issues in the Sociological Study of Childhood*. 2nd ed. (London: Falmer Press, 1997), pp. 145-64; Angela Veale, Max Taylor and Carol Linehan, 'Psychological perspectives of 'abandoned' and 'abandoning' street children', in Catherine Panter-Brick and Malcolm T. Smith (eds), *Abandoned Children* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 130-45. For historical accounts of street children, see David Nasaw, *Children of the City: At Work and at Play* (New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1985); Timothy J. Gilfoyle, 'Street-Rats and Gutter-Snipes: Child Pickpockets and Street Culture in New York City, 1850-1900', *Journal of Social History*, Vol. 37 (Summer 2004), pp. 853-62. See also works on delinquency cited in fn. 7 above, discussion of Figure 1.1 and characterizations of Soviet street children above and fn. 36 and histories of Soviet street children cited in fns. 74 and 75 below.

about presence in a specific locale. If a child's life at 'home' is circumscribed and constrained by the explicit or implicit rules of adult society, life on the 'street' entails contestation of adult values – it is a space in which children 'out of place' are forced to improvise their own order and establish their own norms, in the face of many hazards and hardships, to secure their own survival.⁵¹ Their challenge to adult norms often manifests itself in conflict over the occupation and use of public space. According to a memoir source, waifs in a southern Russian city in the early 1930s put up a sign each night at the entrance to a public square which read: 'By day it's yours, by night it's ours. Not responsible for ourselves after 10pm.'⁵² In becoming 'streetwise', unaccompanied children may borrow and adapt conventional social structures, but such adaptations often subvert these structures, exposing the raw relations of power that underlie social institutions but that are normally held in check and rendered invisible by established rules and norms. These are revealed all the more brutally when street children, as frequently occurs, are subject to adult exploitation and abuse.

Street children are regarded with such disquiet and fear precisely because their perceived loss of rootedness and lack of self-restraint and social accountability ('not responsible for ourselves after 10pm') subverts the myth of childhood as a stable, situated life-stage of naivety, passivity and subordination. These children, as noted above and discussed in several of the case studies, are construed as symbols as well as agents of disorder and degeneration. Among Soviet street children in the 1930s, recalled a former waif, there developed a 'powerful, inseparable bond that united us and gave us a freedom which allowed us to trust and be open with each other, and made us fearless with the authorities'.⁵³ Several of the case studies address the lives and experiences of separated, lost or orphaned children

⁵¹ On child agency, see Oswell, *The Agency of Children*. For a judicious review of literature on the agency of street children, see de Benítez, *State of the World's Street Children: Research*, pp. 21-37.

⁵² Nicholas Voinov, *Outlaw. The autobiography of a Soviet waif* (London: Harvill: 1955), p. 38. This memoir romanticizes many aspects of life on the street.

⁵³ Voinov, *Outlaw*, pp. 104-105.

while they existed on the ‘street’. All the chapters examine official and public concerns for this population; measures taken to rescue, re-place and redeem these children; and the later lives and experiences of children who had spent periods of time ‘out of place’.⁵⁴

Chronological and Geographical Scope of the Volume

The essays in this volume offer diverse perspectives on the history of child displacement and re-placement in Eastern Europe and Russia from 1915 to 1953. The start date witnessed the first waves of East European refugees fleeing eastwards into Russia during the First World War, as discussed in the chapter by Aldis Purs.⁵⁵ By the end date, the year of Stalin’s death, East European states and societies had, in the main, stabilized after the turbulent transition to peace following the Second World War.⁵⁶ In fact, the concern of several chapters with longer-term consequences of displacement, with questions of memory and with adult narratives of childhood experience gives the volume a deeper temporal perspective. Earlier in this chapter, I discussed conceptions of statehood, population management and the place of the child, and associated practices of displacement and re-placement, that had evolved in modernizing states during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Here I outline why the region on which we focus, in the period under survey, is especially significant in terms of the subsequent development and diffusion of these conceptions and practices.

Globally these were decades of warfare, civil conflict and societal catastrophe on a hitherto unimagined scale; of imperial decay and collapse; of new state-formations seeking legitimacy in visionary projects of social transformation and radical programmes of political, territorial or economic reconstruction; of rapid technological innovation and dissemination;

⁵⁴ For Soviet street children, see fns. 74 and 75 below and works cited in Green’s chapter in this volume.

⁵⁵ See also Peter Gatrell, *A Whole Empire Walking. Refugees in Russia during World War I* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999).

⁵⁶ See Mark Mazower, Jessica Reinisch and David Feldman (eds), *Post-War Reconstruction in Europe. International Perspectives, 1945-1949*, in *Past & Present*, Vol. 210, Supplement 6 (2011).

of a new populist politics, effected via expanding mass media, geared to social mobilization; and of vast population displacements, both state-decreed and spontaneous, that mixed and ‘unmixed’ demographic distributions and overturned social structures across continents.⁵⁷

This period of cataclysmic destruction on a worldwide scale and ambitious, often equally calamitous experimentation in state and social reconstruction marked a key transitional stage in the consolidation of modern statehood, as well as in the formation of institutions of international governance proclaiming transnational prerogatives.⁵⁸ As noted earlier, by the early twentieth-century states, as well as their adversaries and interlocutors, defined and constituted themselves, discursively and structurally, in large part through their attitudes and policies towards children. Thus these decades represented a crucial transitional stage also in the consolidation of modern notions of childhood and of the modern child as social subject and object of social practice. We see this, for example, in the growing engagement with new psychological, medical and sociological theories of childhood and of child development; in the spread of pronatalist rhetoric and policy; in new structures and practices of child welfare; in the expansion of mass state education; and in the initial formalization of a discourse of children's rights.⁵⁹ Inevitably, this ‘remaking’ of childhood

⁵⁷ For ‘unmixing’, see Rogers Brubaker, ‘Aftermaths of Empire and the Unmixing of Peoples: Historical and Comparative Perspectives’, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 2 (1995), pp. 189-218. For suggestive overviews of European and world history in this period: Richard Vinen, *A History in Fragments. Europe in the Twentieth Century* (London: Abacus, 2002), pp. 81-323; Mazower, *Dark Continent*; Eric Hobsbawm, *Age of Extremes. The Short Twentieth Century, 1914-1991* (London: Abacus, 1994), Chapters 1-7.

⁵⁸ For diverse perspectives on modern statehood: Patrick Joyce, *The State of Freedom: A Social History of the British State since 1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); Michael Mann, *The Sources of Social Power. Vol. 3. Global Empires and Revolution, 1890-1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012); Pierre Bourdieu, *On the State. Lectures at the Collège de France, 1989-1992* (London: Polity, 2014); Mark Mazower, ‘Violence and the State in the Twentieth Century’, *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 107, No. 4. (October 2002), pp. 1158-1178; James Scott, *Seeing Like a State. How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999); Rose, *Powers of Freedom*; Charles Tilly, *Coercion, Capital, and European States AD 990-1992* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1992). On transnational governance: Mark Mazower, *Governing the World. The History of an Idea* (London: Allen Lane, 2012), especially Chapters 5-8.

⁵⁹ For insightful discussions of continuities and change in early twentieth century notions of childhood, and of associated practices, see Schuman (ed.), *Raising Citizens in the Century of the Child*; Hendrick, *Child Welfare*; Downs, *Childhood in the Promised Land*. For a (now slightly dated) literature review: Hendrick, *Children, Childhood and English Society, 1880-1990* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), especially Chapter

and children was a contentious process, in which, as Kirschenbaum wrote with regard to early Soviet family policy, ‘the revolutionary and the traditional, the visionary and the practical, the imaginary and the real often overlapped and complicated one another’.⁶⁰ Debates over the nature, role, regulation and cultivation of the child raged among politicians, officials, experts, activists and citizens and among states, nationalist lobbies and transnational organizations.⁶¹ The chapters in this volume address key moments and interventions in these debates.

Geographically, this book focuses on the Eastern European lands of the former Russian empire, i.e. those territories which after 1918 achieved liberation from tsarist rule - in all cases, sooner or later, to find themselves subjugated to more vicious and violent regimes.⁶² We do not examine in any detail the new states which arose out of the territorial dissolution of the Habsburg or Ottoman empires, although many mobilized the same discourses, strategies and technologies of population displacement, including those encompassing or targetting children, that we examine in this volume.⁶³ The new countries

2. See also the works cited in fns. 5, 7, 9 and 21 above. On national and international discourses of children’s rights, see White’s and Zahra’s chapters in this volume. For historical perspectives on children’s rights, see Susan J. Pearson, *The Rights of the Defenseless: Protecting Animals and Children in Gilded Age America* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2011); Hugh Cunningham, *Children and Childhood in Western Society since 1500*. 2nd ed. (London: Pearson, 2005), pp. 137-70; Kriste Lindenmeyer, “A Right to Childhood”: *The U.S. Children’s Bureau and Child Welfare, 1912–46* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997); Joseph M Hawes, *The Children’s Rights Movement: A History of Advocacy and Protection* (New York, NY: Twayne Publishers, 1991); Mary Ann Mason, *From Father’s Property to Children’s Rights: The History of Child Custody in the United States* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994). For legal perspectives, see works cited in Chapter 10, fns. 21-25.

⁶⁰ Lisa F. Kirschenbaum, *Small Comrades: Revolutionizing Childhood in Soviet Russia* (New York: RoutledgeFalmer, 2001), p. 4.

⁶¹ Conflict of course persists today. See Chapter 10 in this volume for debates around the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989).

⁶² The volume’s regional focus was determined by its origins in the UK Arts and Humanities Research Council-funded programme ‘Population Displacement, State Practice and Social Experience in the Lands of the Former Russian Empire’, directed in 1999-2004 by Peter Gatrell (University of Manchester), and in 2004-2012 jointly by Peter Gatrell and Nick Baron (University of Nottingham).

⁶³ Note, however, that White’s chapter looks at Russian child refugees in Constantinople, offering insights into the interrelations and cross-currents between two disintegrating empires; and Zahra’s chapter examines international efforts across Central and Eastern Europe to re-place ‘lost children’. For recent studies of childhood in former Habsburg Eastern Europe, see Slobodan Naumović and Miroslav Jovanović (eds), *Childhood in South East Europe: Historical Perspectives on Growing Up in the 19th and 20th Century* (Münster, Litverlag, 2004); Tara Zahra, *Kidnapped Souls: National Indifference and the Battle for Children in the Bohemian Lands, 1900-1948* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008). Regrettably, the geographical focus of this volume excludes discussion of Turkish state policies towards its Armenian population or the Turkish-Greek population exchange of 1923. For recent works on these topics and comparative studies of imperial collapse and

that emerged from the former Russian imperial domains – here we mainly consider Soviet Russia and Ukraine, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland - were the site of radical early experiments in twentieth-century post-imperial state-building and social reconstruction. Over the next three decades, populations across the region found themselves embroiled in state-orchestrated schemes of unprecedented scope aimed at creating territories that were ethnically or socially homogenous.⁶⁴ States both ‘nationalizing’ and ‘revolutionizing’ in their ideological self-legitimation deployed coercive population displacement as a primary means of achieving their visions.⁶⁵ From late 1939, Soviet and Nazi regimes that had already brutally repressed

post-imperial state-building after the First World War, see: Ronald Grigor Suny, Fatma Müge Göçek, Norman M. Naimark (eds), *A Question of Genocide: Armenians and Turks at the End of the Ottoman Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); Michael Reynolds, *Shattering Empires The Clash and Collapse of the Ottoman and Russian Empires 1908–1918* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Julia Eichenberg and John Paul Newman (eds), ‘Special Issue: Aftershocks: Violence in Dissolving Empires after the First World War’, *Contemporary European History*, Vol. 19, No. 3 (2010); Aviel Roshwald, *Ethnic Nationalism and the Fall of Empires: Central Europe, Russia, and the Middle East, 1914–1923* (London: Routledge, 2005); Karen Barkey, Mark von Hagen (eds), *After Empire: Multiethnic Societies and Nation-Building: The Soviet Union and the Russian, Ottoman and Habsburg Empires* (Boulder, Co: Westview Press, 1997); Donald Bloxham, *The Great Game of Genocide: Imperialism, Nationalism, and the Destruction of the Ottoman Armenians* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); Peter Gatrell and Jo Laycock, ‘Armenia: The “Nationalisation”, Internationalisation And Representation Of The Refugee Crisis’, in Nick Baron and Peter Gatrell (eds), *Homelands. War, Population and Statehood in Eastern Europe and Russia, 1918-1924* (London: Anthem Press, 2004), pp. 179-200; Manoug Somakian, *Empires in Conflict: Armenia and the Great Powers, 1912-20* (London: IB Taurus, 1995).

⁶⁴ On Eastern European state ideologies and projects in this period, see especially Rogers Brubaker, *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996). See also Alexander V. Prusin, *The Lands Between. Conflict in the East European Borderlands, 1870-1992* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), especially Chapters 3-8; Ivan T. Berend, *Decades of Crisis. Central and Eastern Europe before World War II* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1998), especially Chapters 5-14.

⁶⁵ I borrow the terms ‘nationalizing’ and ‘revolutionizing’ from Brubaker, *Nationalism Reframed*, p. 63 and *passim*. For major recent studies that engage with the interrelations of population displacement state construction in Eastern Europe in the early to mid-twentieth century, see Peter Gatrell, *The Making of the Modern Refugee* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), especially Chapters 1-3; Lewis H. Siegelbaum and Leslie Page Moch, *Broad is my Native Land. Repertoires and Regimes of Migration in Russia’s Twentieth Century* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2014); Jessica Reinisch and Elizabeth White (eds), *The Disentanglement of Populations. Migration, Expulsion and Displacement in Postwar Europe, 1944-9* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011); Panikos Panayi and Pippa Virdee (eds), *Refugees and the End of Empire. Imperial Collapse and Forced Migration in the Twentieth Century* (London: Palgrave, 2011), especially Chapters 1, 3-5; Baron and Gatrell (eds), *Warlands*; Benjamin Lieberman, *Terrible Fate. Ethnic Cleansing in the Making of Modern Europe* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006); Joshua A. Sanborn, ‘Unsettling the Empire: Violent Migrations and Social Disaster in Russia during World War I’, *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 77 (June 2005), pp. 290–324; Baron and Gatrell, *Homelands. War, Population and Statehood in Eastern Europe and Russia, 1918-1924* (London: Anthem Press, 2004); Weiner (ed.), *Landscaping the Human Garden*; Eric Lohr, *Nationalizing the Russian Empire: The Campaign against Enemy Aliens during World War I* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003); Pavel Polian, *Against their Will. The History and Geography of Forced Migrations in the USSR* (Budapest: Central European University, 2003); Baron and Gatrell, ‘Population Displacement, State-Building, and Social Identity’; Timothy Snyder, *The Reconstruction of Nations. Poland,*

sections of their core populations unleashed all-encompassing campaigns of social or ethnic cleansing in newly-occupied areas across the region, involving mass deportations and genocide.⁶⁶ During wartime chaos and postwar reconstruction, as well as peacetime crisis and conflict provoked by state interventions, the lands of the former Russian empire thus became a testing ground where many of the ideas and practices of population management that I discussed earlier were implemented on a scale and with an intensity hitherto unimagined.

In this context, ideas and practices of child displacement and re-placement were given greater force and urgency by revolutionary visions of social change, which in their orientation towards the future placed strong emphasis on the socially transformative significance of the child's social formation. New regimes promoting powerful ideologies of collective regeneration, whether socialist or nationalist in form, and asserting radical models of modernization, saw children as the makers or breakers of fundamental change, and were accordingly preoccupied with questions of family policy and child socialization, welfare and control.⁶⁷ For many proponents of change, the parental home represented a symbol and site of

Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus, 1569-1999 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), especially Chapters 3-4, 7-9; Philip Ther and Ana Siljak (eds), *Redrawing Nations. Ethnic Cleansing in East-Central Europe, 1944-1948* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001); Gatrell, *A Whole Empire Walking*.

⁶⁶ See Prusin, *The Lands Between*, Chapters 5-7; Mark Levene, *The Crisis of Genocide. Vol. 2. Annihilation: The European Rimlands, 1939-1953* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); Norman Naimark, *Fires of Hatred: Ethnic Cleansing in Twentieth-Century Europe* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001), especially Chapters 2-4; Jan Gross, *Revolution from Abroad: The Soviet Conquest of Poland, Western Ukraine and Western Belorussia* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988); Amir Weiner, *Making Sense of War: The Second World War and the Fate of the Bolshevik Revolution* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000); Mark Mazower, *Hitler's Empire: Nazi Rule in Occupied Europe* (London: Penguin, 2009).

⁶⁷ For literature on Soviet childhood and family policy from the mid-1930s onwards, see the chapters in this volume by Qualls and Green. On early Soviet childhood and children in general: Catriona Kelly, *Children's Worlds. Growing up in Russia, 1890-1991* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007); Kelly, *Comrade Pavlik: The Rise and Fall of a Soviet Boy Hero* (London: Granta Books, 2005); Kirschenbaum, *Small Comrades*; Ann Livschiz, 'Growing Up Soviet: Childhood in the Soviet Union, 1918-1953', unpublished PhD dissertation (Stanford University, 2007); Andrew B. Stone, 'Growing up Soviet? The Orphans of Stalin's Revolution and Understanding the Soviet Self', unpublished PhD dissertation (University of Washington, 2012); Loraine de la Fe, 'Empire's Children: Soviet Childhood in the Age of Revolution', unpublished PhD dissertation (Florida International University, 2013); Judith Harwin, *Children of the Russian State, 1917-1995* (Aldershot: Avebury, 1996), Chapter 1; Sal'nikova, *Rossiiskoe detstvo v XX veke*. On Soviet youth: Gorsuch, *Youth in Revolutionary Russia*; Corinna Kuhr-Korolev, Stephan Plaggenborg, Monica Wellman, *Sowjetjugend 1917-1941. Generation zwischen Revolution und Resignation* (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2001); Corinna Kuhr-Korolev, *Gezähmte Helden: die Formierung der Sowjetjugend 1917-1932* (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2005); There is a large literature on early Soviet child science, educational policy and pedagogy, for example: Andy Byford,

stasis, regression or corruption. These activists proposed that children should to be re-placed in institutional homes to be nurtured by the nation as sound and healthy citizens. Even when states accepted or promoted the family as the normative place of the child, it was now an open focus of public concern and scrutiny not an occluded private space.⁶⁸

Among these radical new regimes improvising strategies of post-colonial state-building, social transformation and modernization (and thereby establishing models that would be adopted by other new states later in the century), the Soviet Union, as noted earlier, was merely the most explicit in its pronouncements on the political significance of children. Only seven weeks after the October Revolution, at the behest of Lenin's wife Nadezhda Krupskaya the new communist government passed a decree establishing the basic principle of family policy in the new system: 'Concern for the child is the direct responsibility of the state'.⁶⁹ The following year, Zlata Lilina, prominent communist ideologue and wife of leader Georgii Zinov'ev, declared to a conference on education:

We must transform the young generation into a generation of communists. We must make children – for, like soft wax, they are very malleable – into genuine, good

'Parent Diaries and the Child Study Movement in Late Imperial and Early Soviet Russia', *The Russian Review*, Vol. 72 (April 2013), pp. 212-41; Larry E. Holmes, *The Kremlin and the Schoolhouse: Reforming Education in Soviet Russia, 1917-1931* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991); Holmes, *Stalin's School: Moscow's Model School no. 25, 1931-1937* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1999); E. Thomas Ewing, *The Teachers of Stalinism: Policy, Practice, and Power in Soviet Schools of the 1930s* (New York: Peter Lang, 2002). On Soviet policies towards homeless children [*besprizorniki*], see fns. 74 and 75 below. On Soviet welfare policy, see: Maria Galmarini, 'The "Right to be Helped": Welfare Policies and Notions of Rights at the Margins of Soviet Society, 1917-1950', unpublished PhD dissertation (University of Illinois, 2012); Dorena Caroli, 'Bolshevism, Stalinism, and Soviet Welfare (1917-1936)', *International Review of Social History*, Vol. 48 (2003), pp. 27-54. On social control: Rosaria Franco, 'Social Order and Social Policies toward Displaced Children: The Soviet Case (1917-1953)', unpublished PhD dissertation (University of Manchester, 2007). On East European interwar children and childhood: Tara Zahra, *Kidnapped Souls*; Zahra, 'Reclaiming Children for the Nation: Germanization, National Ascription, and Democracy in the Bohemian Lands, 1900-1945', *Central European History*, Vol. 37, No. 4 (2004), pp. 501-543; Schuman (ed.), *Raising Citizens in the Century of the Child*; Sabine Hering and Berteke Waaldijk, *Guardians of the Poor - Custodians of the Public: Welfare History in Eastern Europe, 1900-1960* (Opladen and Farmington Hills, 2006).

⁶⁸ For comparative discussion of European family policy at this time, see Paul Ginsborg, *Family Politics. Domestic Life, Devastation and Survival, 1900-1950* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014).

⁶⁹ Decree of Council of People's Commissars (Sovnarkom) of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (RSFSR), 'On the Organization of a Collegium for the Protection and Welfare of Motherhood and Childhood' ['Ob organizatsii Kollegii po okhrane i obespecheniiu materiinstva i mladenchestva'], 31 December 1917, published in *Sobranie uzakonenii RSFSR*, No. 13 (1917), Art. 193.

communists. [...] And to do this the first priority must be to sweep out of the schools and orphanages all those bourgeois stooges, all those pedagogues and teachers, who are steeped in the poison of the bourgeois worldview [...] We must [also] remove children from the harmful influence of the family. We must register them all, to speak frankly – nationalize them. From their first days they will come under the benevolent influence of communist kindergartens and schools. There they will learn the A to Z of communism. There they will grow to be real communists. To compel the mother to give her child to us, to the Soviet state – that is our practical task.⁷⁰

Civil war and foreign intervention, epidemics, massive social dislocations, lack of resources, scepticism on the part of many leading (male) communists and the prioritization of other policy areas meant that Soviet children remained un-nationalized; indeed, within fifteen years the state had rehabilitated the family as a site and means of socialization, albeit the new ‘Soviet family’ was now refigured as a ‘cell’ in the wider socialist body politic, subordinate to Stalin, the ‘father of the nation’, as discussed in Green’s chapter.⁷¹

Yet owing to recurrent crises during the first three decades of Soviet rule, millions of children found themselves without family, homeless and itinerant. In effect, the *bezprizorniki* became the ‘direct responsibility’ of the Soviet state, even though, as we have already discussed, it was ambivalent about their social status and had no coherent conception of how to respond to a challenge that it viewed as simultaneously humanitarian, social and political.⁷² Eight years after the October Revolution, the Soviet President Mikhail Kalinin warned of the urgent need to ‘save’ the many hundreds of thousands of children who were still living on the streets. In his eyes, they posed not only a menace to public order in the

⁷⁰ Quoted in V. Zenzinov, *Bezprizornye* (Paris: Sovremennyya Zapiski, 1929), p. 36.

⁷¹ Wendy Goldman, *Women, the State, and Revolution: Soviet Family Policy and Social Life 1917-1936* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993). See also other works cited in Green’s chapter, fn. 5.

⁷² On this crisis, see the works cited in fn. 74 below. See also Figure 1.1. and Soviet characterizations of street children above and fn. 36.

present but a threat to cultural renewal and a test of the legitimacy and integrity of the socialist system: 'The situation here threatens grave dangers for the future if we are not able to eradicate promptly in youths the bad habits that a vagrant life imparts to them.'⁷³

The Soviet government continued to be concerned about and to involve itself, albeit with no consistent or coherent policy and often with disastrous effect, in the lives of the country's children and youth. As an experiment in 'utopian' modernization, grounded in ideals of individual and collective welfare, and undertaking comprehensive political, economic and social restructuring, the Soviet Union exerted a powerful influence on ideas and practices of development worldwide during the twentieth century, among states that sought to emulate its 'model' and among those that found themselves forced to respond to the ideological challenge that it posed. In this way, the Soviet Union in the period surveyed here, as well as other states of the region that shared similarly high hopes and bitter anxieties for 'their' young generations, drawing on pre-existing principles and practices of child displacement and re-placement, crystallized new radicalized discourses and interventions and established precedents that, directly or indirectly, reshaped global conceptions, visions, strategies and solutions with regard to the place of children and the government of childhood.

Thus the region on which we focus in this volume within the chronological bounds that we have defined offers rich opportunities to engage with a crucial themes in the history of twentieth century child displacement and re-placement, as well as the many broader issues of state-building, population policy and social experience that this study opens up. The volume also affords the possibility of comparative analysis by its inclusion of case studies focussing on the Soviet Union and on other East European states and nations professing different, often opposed ideologies, as well as several chapters that address perceptions, policies and practices on a transnational scale – a vital perspective, since mobility frequently

⁷³ *Pravda*, 7 November 1925, No. 277, p. 2, cited in Ball, *And Now my Soul is Hardened*. p. 193.

entails border-crossings and since territorial borders in this tumultuous period underwent many changes.

Outline of Chapters

While the case studies, as noted, engage with a range of different forms and aspects of child displacement and re-placement, use diverse sources and engage with various disciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches, they are bound together by many shared thematic, conceptual and methodological concerns. In particular, they all address questions of ideology and identity and of children and childhood as social constructs; the challenge of reconstructing children's lives in the past and of gaining insight into their subjective experiences of past worlds; the role of space and time in structuring children's lives and state practice, and also as analytical concepts for understanding mobility and settlement; and the tensions between official impulses, on the one hand, to repress and, on the other, to rehabilitate and reintegrate.

In Chapter Two, Aldis Purs draws on a unique set of archival texts to examine the experience of Latvian child refugees during the First World War and after their resettlement in an orphanage in the newly independent Latvian nation-state. This collection of autobiographies written by young people as they graduated from the children's home, together with accompanying commentaries by the institution's director, offers insight not only into their earlier experiences of displacement and of loss and exile, their notions of home and belonging, and the routes they took back to their 'native' land (which some had never before seen), but also into the new state's administrative and symbolic self-construction as a 'homeland' for the displaced and as a 'home' for the orphans. Purs concludes that, paradoxically, the Latvian state excluded refugee children from its narrative of national birth, which stressed historical continuity and rootedness in the land, while at the same time working to incorporate these children in the national community.

In Chapter Three, we turn our attention to Constantinople, which in 1920 became a temporary haven for many thousands of Russian refugee children fleeing the Russian Civil War and Bolshevik depredations in their homeland. Using a large collection of first-person testimonies written by the displaced children a few years later, Elizabeth White analyses how they remembered and recounted their experiences of revolution, war, escape and resettlement, focussing like the previous chapter on children's sense of loss and nostalgia for the homeland and on their hopes and aspirations for the future. The chapter also discusses the humanitarian relief work carried out by the League of Nations, by transnational agencies such as the Save the Children Fund and by the Russian émigré community. On the basis of official records and personal papers, it considers how different organizations and interests constructed and represented the children as deserving beneficiaries of relief, reflecting especially on tensions that arose between nationalist and internationalist discourses of the rights, needs and interests of the displaced children.

My own Chapter Four, co-written with Michael Kaznelson, is based on oral history interviews that Kaznelson conducted with former child deportees in western Siberia, as well as on our analysis of published and unpublished memoirs written by former victims of Stalinist terror. It investigates how the children experienced deportation and exile and how, as adults, they remembered and narrated their experiences. A central theme in all their accounts is the significance of the lost *rodina*, their place of origin, even though, as in the case of the Latvian orphans discussed by Purs, few of the former 'kulak' children remembered their original homes and homeland. By considering the meaning of *rodina* in adult narratives of child displacement, we suggest ways in which the experience of displacement and orphanhood, and the double stigma that attached to this status, shaped their lives and evolving sense of self. We relate their accounts to the evolution of the society in which they lived and the changing contexts in which they undertook their labours of memory. The chapter also

engages with theoretical and methodological questions of agency, trauma, memory, identity and subjectivity that recur throughout this volume.

The focus of Chapter Five is the mass evacuation of children of Spanish Republican families during and after the Spanish Civil War and their resettlement in special children's homes in the Soviet Union. In these institutions, as Karl D. Qualls discusses, their adult carers were meant not only to restore their physical health, to educate them and to provide ideological training, but also to instil Soviet values and norms of behaviour while maintaining their connection with Spanish culture. Using the children's own testimonies, as well as later memoirs, Qualls considers the children's experiences of escape and resettlement. Drawing on Soviet archival materials, he also analyses the strategies of their Soviet hosts to transform the *niños* into model Soviet citizens, in particular by establishing adult role models, and the problems they encountered in this process of cultural and social 'reforging'.

The Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union and the intensity of warfare on the Eastern Front generated momentous demographic upheavals and catalyzed a third crisis of Soviet child displacement, following the first crisis caused by the Civil War and the second crisis generated by collectivization and dekulakization, addressed in earlier chapters.⁷⁴ In Chapter

⁷⁴ I chose not to include a chapter addressing the first major crisis of child displacement during and after the Russian Civil War as it developed *inside* the Soviet Union (as opposed to outside its borders, as discussed in White's chapter), since this topic has already been substantially treated. See especially Ball, *And Now my Soul is Hardened*. Other monographs include: Zenzinov, *Bezprizornnye*; René Bosewitz, *Waifdom in the Soviet Union: features of the sub-culture and re-education* (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag P. Lang, 1988); N.V. Riabinina, *Detskaia besprizornost' i prestupnost' v 1920-e gody: po materialam gubernii Verkhnego Povolzhia: uchebnoe posobie* (Iaroslavl': Iaroslavskii gosudarstvennyi universitet im. P.G. Demidova, 1999); Dorena Caroli, *L'enfance abandonnée et délinquante dans la Russie soviétique 1917-1937* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 2004); Svetlana Gladyshev, *Deti bol'shoi bedy* (Moscow: Zvonitsa, 2004); A.A. Slavko, *Detskaia besprizornost' v Rossii v pervoe desiatiletii sovetskoi vlasti* (Moscow: INION, 2005). Articles and chapters include: Jennie A. Stevens, 'Children of the Revolution: Soviet Russia's Homeless Children (Besprizorniki) in the 1920's,' *Russian History/Histoire Russe*, Vol. 9, Pts. 2-3 (1982), pp. 242-64; Peter Juviler, 'Contradictions of Revolution: Juvenile Crime and Rehabilitation,' in Abbott Gleason, Peter Kenz and Richard Stites (eds), *Bolshevik Culture: Experiment and Order in the Russian Revolution* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985); Margaret K. Stolee, 'Homeless Children in the USSR, 1917-1957,' *Soviet Studies*, Vol. XL, No. 1 (January 1988), pp. 64-83; Dorena Caroli, 'Il bambino collettivo,' in O. Niccoli (ed.), *Infanzie. Funzioni di un gruppo liminale dal mondo classico all'Eta moderna* (Firenze: Ponte alle Grazie, 1993), pp. 301-326; Caroli, 'Lettere autobiografiche dei bambini abbandonati in URSS (1924-1936),' in A. Semeraro and E. Becchi (eds), *Archivi d'infanzia. Per una storiografia della prima eta.* (Milan: La nuova Italia, 2001), pp. 199-229; Kelly, *Children's Worlds*, Chapter 6.

Six, Rachel Faircloth Green looks at Soviet policies aimed at re-placing the huge numbers of children orphaned, lost and abandoned during wartime and in the immediate postwar years, focussing especially on attitudes and practices of adoption.⁷⁵ On the one hand, orphans were seen as the most innocent victims of the invaders' barbarism. On the other, they were seen as a threat to present and future social order. The Soviet authorities and public demonstrated a corresponding ambivalence towards the adoption of these orphans. Soviet newspapers and journals launched and supported campaigns to promote and valorize adoption as a long-term solution to restoring orphaned children to health and reintegrating them into society. By caring for an orphaned child, Soviet newspapers declared, families could help to repair the damage wrought by war. The Soviet government made adoptive families equivalent in law to 'natural' families. Yet at the same time, as Green demonstrates on the basis of archival documentation and personal testimonies, the courts gave precedence to family claims on orphans based on 'biological' ties, and adopted orphans continued to be stigmatized by society, as already discussed in the chapter by Kaznelson and Baron.

As the Second World War ended, millions of children displaced from their homes in Eastern Europe found themselves stranded in Germany and Austria. Many had been separated from parents who had been deported to Germany. Others had been orphaned or lost in the chaos of war or had been kidnapped by the Nazis for Germanization. Tara Zahra in Chapter Seven examines the history of international activism and diplomatic conflict around these 'lost children' in the context of postwar reconstruction, the contentious emergence of new international norms and regimes concerned with children's rights and the incipient Cold War. Echoing many of the themes addressed earlier (in particular, in White's chapter on Russian refugee children), Zahra investigates custody battles over post-1945 East European

⁷⁵ On Soviet unaccompanied children during the war, in addition to works cited in Green's chapter, see Olga Kucherenko, *Soviet Street Children and the Second World War: Welfare and Social Control under Stalin* (London: Bloomsbury, 2016).

child refugees that erupted into bitter controversies among international relief agencies, nationalist activists, western military and civil authorities, and representatives of the new communist governments of the region. These conflicts, Zahra argues, were shaped by a longer tradition of nationalist activism around children in Eastern Europe, through which children had come to be seen as a form of precious national property. In these disputes, and often despite the wishes of the displaced young people themselves not to be repatriated, international agencies, notwithstanding their internationalist ideals, mostly favoured returning them from Germany to their countries of origins, on the grounds that children could not grow into healthy individuals without a stable sense of national identity and belonging.

Chapter Eight by Gabriel Finder explores how Polish Jewish intellectuals in the early postwar years studied, defined and represented Jewish children who had survived the Holocaust, focussing on interrelations between diverse adult perceptions and practices and the challenge of rebuilding Jewish identity and community. To understand the role of child survivors as both subjects and objects of postwar reconstruction, Finder first considers the work of the Central Jewish Historical Commission to record and present the children's testimonies of displacement, bereavement and escape. He then offers an in-depth analysis of the film *Undzere Kinder* (*Our Children*, 1948-49), the last Yiddish-language feature made in Poland, which was both set and filmed in a children's home and featured child survivors who were residents in the institution playing fictionalized versions of themselves. The filmmakers' agenda, Finder argues, was to create a positive image of Jewish child survivors who would lead the Jewish people into a bright future after unprecedented tragedy. Striving to construct an inspirational stereotype, the filmmakers consciously rejected a traumatic representation of Jewish children, using flashbacks in order to transform the child survivors who acted in it into narrators and, by implication, agents of their own (fictionalized) survival. In so doing, Finder suggests, the filmmakers excluded from representation the significant number of Jewish

children who were recognized by physicians, psychologists, educators and social workers as suffering, owing to their experiences of displacement, extreme violence and loss, from profound problems of individual adjustment and social integration.

Finally, Tomas Balkelis in Chapter Nine reflects on the experience of Lithuanian child deportees in Soviet labour camps and places of exile after their forcible displacement during the 1940s. The chapter explores the specificities of children's perceptions and actions – most of these children were deported with their families - by paying close attention to their own voices. Central themes are the children's strategies of survival and the meanings of ethnicity and homeland for their self-identity. It argues that in the social environment of the Soviet camp and forced settlement system, their ethnicity functioned as a defence mechanism and source of solidarity, in large part shaped by shared perceptions of 'homeland' as an idealized imagined site of harmonious social and political order. Homeland thus became the most significant symbolic trope of their 'displacement utopias'. In the adult memoirs of the deported children, as in the narratives of the former kulak children considered in the chapter by Kaznelson and Baron, 'homeland' became a spatiotemporal motif for their early lives.

In Chapter Ten, I attempt to draw together the key findings of the chapters, as regards both the history of child displacement and re-placement in the region and period and, more generally, the evolution of state practice and social experience in the early to mid-twentieth century. I also suggest some directions for future research. I conclude by stressing the actuality and urgency of engaging critically with the powerful and persisting nexus between state power and human mobilities.

As I write this in early September 2015, Europe has been moved, belatedly, by a photograph of the drowned body of three year-old Syrian refugee Alan Kurdi on a Turkish beach to take action to relieve the immediate plight of tens of thousands of refugees displaced

from their homes by civil wars and political violence.⁷⁶ Yet the asylum-seekers who are risking their own and their families' lives to find safety and succour within European borders are only a small proportion of the millions of people who are currently fleeing conflict and repression at home and find themselves internally displaced within their countries of origin or in overcrowded refugee camps in neighbouring countries. The leaders of European states need to acknowledge that the 'refugee crisis' demands more than a half-hearted and transient commitment to humanitarian relief.⁷⁷ States and citizens globally must recognize that this crisis, like the many crises of population displacement throughout the last century, raises essential questions about the political and economic power that states wield, the principles they proclaim to legitimize their authority, the ways in which they define and demarcate their duties towards citizens and non-citizens, and the stories they tell about place and displacement, identity and otherness, entitlement and exclusion, both at home and beyond their borders. We hope that the historical case studies in this volume help to elucidate these questions.

⁷⁶ Helena Smith, 'Shocking images of drowned Syrian boy show tragic plight of refugees', *The Guardian*, 2 September 2015: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/sep/02/shocking-image-of-drowned-syrian-boy-shows-tragic-plight-of-refugees> [accessed 8 September 2015].

⁷⁷ 'UNHCR chief issues key guidelines for dealing with Europe's refugee crisis', *UNHCR News*, 4 September 2015: <http://www.unhcr.org/55e9793b6.html> [accessed 8 September 2015]. The head of the UN refugee agency António Guterres here declares lays out six principles to guide European states' responses, declaring: 'Europe is facing a moment of truth. This is the time to reaffirm the values upon which it was built.'