Lachaise, her resting place close to that of the martyred communards. Although many of Capa's biographies have described Taro as a member of the Communist party, Maspero argues that her politics was not Stalinist Left but her personal charm and the obvious contribution of Capa's and her photography made her a valuable asset to the French left and to the Comintern front organizations that flourished in mid 1930s. Her work appeared in *Regards*, in *Vu* and on her first trip to Republican Spain she carried a press accreditation from Louis Aragon, the founding editor of the Popular Front newspaper *Ce Soir*. The great strength of Maspero's book is the dense context in which he locates Taro and Capa and their photographic output in the 1930s. The political groups that surrounded Taro in Spain and in Paris are laid out with clarity as are his reflections on the origins and development of the new medium of photojournalism and the weeklies and magazines in which her work and Capa's appeared.

François Maspero is a distinguished French publisher and writer whose own life was marked by many of the events that a decade earlier influenced the course of Taro's story. Maspero's parents were rounded up during the German occupation: his father a distinguished Sinologist died in Buchenwald; his mother survived Ravensbrük. As a young man he was part of the French Resistance and after the war became a noted publisher of postcolonial literature, specializing in writing about the Algerian war and the violence of French colonialism. *Out of the Shadows* is beautifully written, a tribute to the translator, and enriched by Maspero's insight about Taro and Capa and the political and artistic surroundings in which their lives were played out. For anyone interested in art, politics and culture in the 1930s, this is a must-read.

Judith Keene
University of Sydney

Djurdja Bartlet, *FashionEast: The Spectre that Haunted Socialism* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2010).

FashionEast is the first comprehensive history of fashion in the East- European socialist countries. This richly illustrated volume covers the whole life span of socialism from after the Russian Revolution until the collapse of the socialist system. Not only was the garment industry socialized but so too was fashion. It was a state affair, which was controlled by experts and state officials. Bartlett relies in her work mainly on written sources like fashion journals and women's magazines, but also uses other documents and official declarations. In addition, she has met and interviewed many former fashion specialists in these countries. The first hundred pages deal with Soviet fashion before the establishment of the socialist bloc after the Second World War. She takes up, for instance, the well-known con-

structivist experiments of functionalist anti-fashion popular among the Soviet artistic vanguard in the 1920s, as well as Stalin's rehabilitation of *haute couture* in the mid 1930s. Bartlett focuses largely on five other socialist countries she analyses, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland and German Democratic Republic.

The economic and political conditions of the fashion industry were quite similar in all the socialist countries. The Eastern European countries followed rather loyally the Soviet example. They copied the organization of the central fashion institutes from the USSR, whose main responsibility was to design, plan, propagate and control socialist fashion. (Yugoslavia was an exception even in this respect.) The conditions of fashion design and industry in the Eastern European socialist countries also differed from the USSR in some important respects. They allowed private, or semi-private, fashion ateliers to continue their activities under the new rule catering for the upper scale fashion markets that sold to the members of the political elite as well as the artistic and scientific intelligentsia. These countries had closer contact with their bourgeois past and they were economically and culturally more open to the West than was the Soviet Union. Bartlett pays due attention to these differences, but at the same time she presents and analyses only those organizations in the Soviet Union which had a counterpart in the other countries, most notably the central fashion institutes with their prominent fashion journals, as well as state-owned big fashion ateliers. She does not consider the existence of several extensive and parallel organizations of fashion design in the Soviet Union since the 1960s, which covered all the regions and republics of the country. In addition to the houses of clothes patterns (fashion houses) under the Ministry of Light or Consumer Goods Industry with the Moscow ODMO at their head, similar organizations existed under the Ministry of Trade, the Ministry of Everyday Services and the Ministry of Local Industry. They all had quite similar functions in servicing both big garment factories and fashion ateliers with new seasonal designs. The propagation of fashion in fashion shows and journals was also among their functions. It would be interesting to know if similar administrative systems existed in the other socialist countries.

Fashion was a problem to the economic planners and the political ideologists. Spontaneously changing fashion did not fit into the principles of a planned economy. Culturally it was problematic since the real socialist woman or man should not be carried away by the temptations of the world of commodities, neither should they try to distinguish themselves too much from their fellow citizens. The Communist parties could not control fashion, but they learned to live with it. Since the 1950s, they developed an aesthetic stance according to which Socialist fashion was moderate and avoided extravagance. Bartlett identifies two contradictory aesthetic strains in socialist fashion: grandiose and modest. The first had its origins in Stalin's times in the 1930s. It took its stylistic ideals

from classicist aesthetics. It represented timeless elegance and fitted into the "socialist slowly moving time." The other style fulfilled the stylistic synthesis of modesty and prettiness "by advocating modesty in the cut and quality of fabric and by suggesting creativity within standardization" (p.212). It was originally introduced as a contrast to the Stalinist grandiose style and in fact resembled petit bourgeois taste while relying on practicability, comfort and moderation.

The ideals of classical beauty and harmony certainly were understood to be timeless, as Bartlett claims, yet seasonal changes guided the creativity of Soviet haute couture just like in the rest of the world. The post-Stalinist prettiness was not supposed to change all that much. It aimed at finding functional cuts, harmonious compositions and colours which would not lose their appeal after the next season. Bartlett reads too much into the opposition of these two aesthetic principles. Other equally important ambivalences plagued socialist fashion. Fashion designers and experts were very well aware of the gap which existed between mass produced and individually sewn clothes. It was much easier to follow fashion in designing individual clothes than it was to meet the demands of mass production under the limitations of the planned economy. The Soviet Union never legalized small production series of clothes and boutiques which were practiced in other Eastern European countries because of their small scale private production and fashion ateliers. Both the numerous Soviet state owned ateliers as well as the four parallel administrative systems of fashion design were in fact created to overcome this gap. However, to the disappointment of the Soviet experts and economic planners, this gap seemed only to widen with economic growth and well-being.

What makes Bartlett's work especially impressive is that she deals with the fashion histories of altogether six socialist states. It lays a solid foundation to this previously largely neglected area of history.

Jukka Gronow
University of Helsinki

Robert Edelman, *Spartak Moscow: A History of the People's Team in the Workers' State* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009).

With the notable exception of James Riordan, Robert Edelman has done more than any other scholar to elevate the study of Soviet sports to academic respectability. His *Serious Fun: A History of Spectator Sports in the USSR* (1993) laid the groundwork for the cultural analysis of Soviet sports and can already be judged a classic in the genre. This was confirmed with its translation into Russian a few years ago. In this new work, Edelman provides us with a good example of a special intellectual intersection where the scholar meets the fan; Edelman's