

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

sympathy for the People's Team is quite obvious and he manages to turn this special locus into a book that will appeal both to scholars of the Soviet Union and to aficionados of Spartak football. As anyone who has any experience of or connection to academic sports history will know, this is no small ambition. This marriage of passion and scholarly interest has its own kind of advantage, as it leads to vivid descriptions of matches and players, but also its own brand of shortcoming, such as the scholar's diminished interest in periods during which his team was not very successful.

While the Spartak Voluntary Society was an organization involved in more than 40 sports and famous for its football, hockey, basketball and volleyball sections, it is on the football club that Edelman focuses his attention. He gives its entire history, from the side's beginnings in the Moscow district of Krasnaya Presna under the name of MKS (*Moskovskii Kruzhok Sporta* or Moscow Sport Circle) to the present. In nine chapters Edelman tells the story of the Soviet Union's best known and perhaps most popular football team from a largely chronological perspective, with admirably inserted thematic sections that place the soccer team into its political, social and cultural contexts in a very flowing fashion. Besides the obvious underlying objective of writing the first academic history of the club, Edelman aims at highlighting two particular aspects of sport history in general and Spartak's history in particular. First is the link between politics and popular culture, mostly around the issue of working-class leisure and political protest, as Spartak is known for its independence from power organs such as the army or the Ministry of Internal Affairs, which sponsored clubs like the TsDKA (later TsSKA or Central Sports Club of the Army) or the Dinamo. The second is the link between politics and the body, namely the models of masculinity that Spartak athletes have offered to their millions of fans.

The first two chapters tell the story of Spartak's beginnings in the overwhelmingly working-class district of Krasnaya Presna, which achieved a certain notoriety for its violent clashes with the authorities in the Russian Revolution of 1905. Spartak emerged from two predecessors, first the ZKS (Moscow River Sports Club) and then the MKS (Moscow Sports Club), receiving its charter in 1935 as 'Spartak'. Heavily involved in the birth of the club were the legendary Starostin Brothers, Ivan Artem'iev and Aleksandr Kosarev, the chair of the Communist Youth League; also important was the sponsorship of the Promkooperatsiia or Retail Trade Trust, which may account for the spread of the nickname 'meat' (*myaso*) among its opponents. The early success of Spartak once it entered the new Soviet Premier League in 1936 (the subject of the next two chapters), its working-class origins and the fact that Spartak was not linked to the power ministries do much to explain the aura of independence from the regime that its supporters have attributed to the People's club. However, the postwar boom in Soviet soccer, the changes in Spartak's fan base that saw the arrival of more educated and middle-class fans, and the fierce competition on

the field from TsDKA and Dinamo have somewhat nuanced the early associations between the club and Soviet politics. Nonetheless, the club enjoyed a second golden age during Khrushchev's Thaw with the shining stars of Nikita Simonian and Igor Netto. Success during the Brezhnev and Perestroika periods was more sparse, a fact which, along with a weaker source base, may explain why the author devotes to these eras a mere chapter.

In short, the history of Spartak is wonderfully integrated into the major developments in Soviet politics, society and culture. But there are a few flaws. First, the December 1935 invitation to Spartak by the French businessman Bernard Levy to play in France could not be "in the best spirit of the Popular Front" (79-80), as the Popular Front was elected only six months later. More troublesome are the claims that Spartak's image was much more cosmopolitan than were those of the other clubs during the 1950s, solely for fielding a few Russified non-Russians, and that the models of masculinity it spread were different. In both cases the claims should be more grounded in evidence. The masculinity issue almost disappears from the narrative after the Stalin period, probably due to lacunae in documentation. Also, given the depth of changes affecting post-Soviet football for better and worse, it is difficult to understand why the author deals with it in a mere two pages. Nonetheless, Edelman's *Spartak Moscow* is a labour of love that spans across decades and should set the standard for much needed histories of Spartak's competitors.

Jean Lévesque
Université du Québec à Montréal

Jessica Ellen Sewell, *Women and the Everyday City: Public Space in San Francisco, 1890-1915* (University of Minnesota Press, 2011).

Jessica Sewell's readable and visually stimulating book examines the way women traversed and domesticated a variety of urban and commercial public spaces at turn-of-the-century San Francisco. In the process, women of all classes but particularly middle-class white women transformed the public sphere into a political stage from which they ultimately demanded and won the right to vote.

Starting with historian Nancy Cott's now classic notion of separate spheres, Sewell examines a contradiction that middle-class women faced: relegated to home and hearth, women nonetheless increasingly occupied the public sphere in ways that demanded negotiation and, finally, a redefinition of women's proper place in the urban environment. Sewell observes that tensions over the mixed use of public space mark a difference between ideology and reality. Matching ideology with "imagined landscapes" and reality with "experienced landscapes", Sewell draws from the theoretical work of Lefebvre and others to