

for “anti-Soviet crimes,” sentenced to death, and shot in 1952. His expressionist leanings resisted the pressure to write in socialist realist mode, further contributing to the paradoxical dynamic of belonging and marginality. The next chapter introduces a Yiddish-language novel by Moïshe Kulbak, *The Zelmenyaners*, in the historical context of First Five-Year Plan. It shows authorial irony in the tale of a Jewish courtyard and its inhabitants in Minsk. While the courtyard is erased in the construction of the Soviet city, its scattered dwellers ostensibly remain a “breed into themselves” (80). This text allows Senderovich to write about *proste yidn*, simple and often illiterate Jews, who collectively are distinct from Jewish elites in the Soviet system. Chapters 3 and 4 deal with the texts and films that relate to the theme of Soviet Jewish people moving to new territories, which include Siberia and Birobidzhan. Some of these narratives rework the stereotypical “Wandering Jew” who not always victoriously arrives to Birobidzhan but continues his/her wanderings across the USSR and around the world. The final chapter revisits the decades of the 1920s and 30s and presents Isaak Babel’s stories about the folkloric trickster Hershele Ostoloper as a cipher for the Soviet Jew.

This well-researched book convincingly demonstrates that the figure of the early Soviet Jew characterized by both modernizing and preservationist tendencies is distinct from the figure of the Jew as a New Soviet Man.

HENRIETTA MONDRY  
University of Canterbury

***The Art and Science of Making the New Man in Early 20th-Century Russia.***

Ed. Nikolai Kremontsov and Yvonne Howell. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2021. xiv, 280 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations. Photographs. \$115.00, hard bound.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2023.339

Arising from a conference held in 2019, Nikolai Kremontsov and Yvonne Howell’s edited collection offers a refreshingly interdisciplinary investigation of the seemingly ubiquitous “new man” (*novyi chelovek*) of the early twentieth century, exploring what this ideal meant to various authors, scientists, thinkers, and state officials in the years following the 1917 revolutions. Covering topics ranging from children’s dolls to ethnographic museum displays, taken as a whole this series of essays provides a wide-ranging, and oftentimes provocative, exploration of the multifarious imaginings, representations, and manifestations of the new man, in both its distinctly Soviet and international context.

Starting with the theme of “nurturing the new man,” the first chapters revolve around the question of how practices of knowledge production and dissemination were challenged by the post-revolutionary desire to create and sustain “new people.” Michael Coates explores the efforts of Aleksandr Bogdanov in particular to create a “socialist” encyclopedia, which was envisaged as a series of volumes not simply dedicated to capturing the world as it existed on its pages but building a new world by helping to develop a “proletarian system of cognition” (42). Lyubov Bugaeva hones in on the problematic demographic of the *besprizorniki* and state attempts to transform these youths through labor, health, and hygiene, how this came to be represented in contemporary culture, and how these Soviet approaches were influenced by American pedagogologists such as John Dewey. Staying with this focus on Soviet children, Olga Ilyukha’s chapter explores the place of dolls as a proxy for the new person, shaping play and reinforcing social ideals, from gendered behaviors to physical appearance. The author traces the evolution of these ideals from the pre-revolutionary period to

the “year of the toy,” 1937 (75), compellingly demonstrating how something as seemingly simple as a children’s toy can be mapped onto the vicissitudes of the period.

The second section explores the “imagining” of the new man, with a heavy focus on literary representations, particularly those coming from science fiction. Kremontsov’s opening chapter is by far the most expansive of the whole collection, both in its chronological coverage and its discussion of non-Russian writers, trends, and ideas that then found resonance in the post-revolutionary Bolshevik state. Here analysis ranges across texts from Charles Darwin and Aldous Huxley to Andrei Platanov and the more obscure Fedor Il’in, emphasizing the memetic qualities of the “new man” that bridged ideological and cultural divides. The chapters by Matthias Schwartz and Irina Golovacheva that follow offer the reader two complementary visions of the interplay between science and the new man. Schwartz focusses on the competing representation of the new man in popular scientific and scientific fantasy publications, which oscillated between stressing the enlightenment of man on one hand and the “fears and nightmares” of humanity transformed on the other (119). Golovacheva takes these monstrous visions of the new man transformed by science further in her comparative analysis of Mikhail Bulgakov’s *Heart of a Dog* and James Whale’s cinematic interpretation of *Frankenstein*, situating both cultural products in the wider debate concerning the “criminal brain” and divergent beliefs in the power of heredity and environment across the two societies at the time.

Finally, the last part of the collection focuses on the display of the new man as the chapters here investigate how museum and exhibition spaces were used to both create and represent the new man of the early Soviet period. Olga Elina examines the transformation of the peasant through a detailed discussion of the All-Russian Agricultural and Handicraft Industrial Exhibition of 1923, in which she argues that this exhibition was a site for transforming the peasant citizen, a place where the ideal could be made real through the educational activities offered as part of this experience. Likewise, Pat Simpson offers a detailed examination of this process of revolutionary transformation through the representation of human evolution and orangutans as found in the sculptures of Vasilii Vatagin situated in the State Darwin Museum in Moscow. Finally, in contrast to the preceding chapters, Stanislav Petriashin explores the museum space as a site for showcasing the completed evolution of the new man, with a particular focus on the representation of the ideal Stakhanovite worker in the State Museum of Ethnography and the tensions between the national and the socialist that this focus brought to light. Here, in this space, by the mid-1930s, the new man had ceased to be simply an ideal and was something made flesh, as the successful transformation of humanity was illustrated through the actual biographies of these celebrated individuals.

Drawing on the volume’s overarching themes, the conclusion by Howell offers a meditation on what this ideal of the new man might mean for us today, especially as we experience the ongoing challenges of climate change, the rise of artificial intelligence, and we might add the new crises caused by the pandemic and war that have occurred since the original conference was held. How might these upheavals and difficulties give “rise to the search for new definitions of who we are and what we can or should ideally become?” (194); only time will tell.

However, as stimulating as many of the essays are, the book as a whole does fall short in providing the coverage of the first four decades of the twentieth century as it claims (3); all the chapters here focus on the Soviet period, with the vast majority focusing on the decade following the creation of the USSR, and while many offer contextualization with other earlier developments, both foreign and domestic, the years prior to the Revolution are never the focus in their own right and no chapter really puts the issue of continuity or change over the revolutionary divide at the

heart of its analysis. To be sure though, while perhaps more chronologically limited than the title would imply, it is the interdisciplinary nature of the collection, its focus on some of the more understudied dimensions of Soviet society and culture, and its consistently comparative analysis that will draw readers to this thought-provoking volume.

CLAIRE E. MCCALLUM  
University of Exeter, UK

***Blood of Others: Stalin's Crimean Atrocity and the Poetics of Solidarity.***

Rory Finnin. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2022. xii, 352 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations. Maps.  
doi: 10.1017/slr.2023.340

“Crimean Strolls” (1959), a poem by Russophone Kharkiv poet Boris Chichibabin about Iosif Stalin’s brutal 1944 deportation of Tatars from their native Crimea, did much to inspire Ukrainians’ solidarity with the displaced. In Uzbekistan, the poem galvanized the deported Crimean Tatars, as they organized the largest dissident movement in Soviet history. The poem, which defiantly recasts Crimea from a Soviet Riviera to a land soaked with the “blood of Others,” made Chichibabin a hero to Mustafa Dzemilev, the leader of the Tatar repatriation movement in Central Asia. And since then, it has been a staple on Ukrainian social media sites following Russia’s 2014 annexation of Crimea.

This is one of dozens of such transnational networks of socially and politically impactful art that are traced in Rory Finnin’s extraordinary new book *Blood of Others: Stalin's Crimean Atrocity and the Poetics of Solidarity*. The book’s big value is that the author empirically establishes this impact through deep research in diverse sources and archives from Moscow to Kharkiv to Ankara. Avoiding a sentimental reduction of literature to wholesome moral nourishment, Finnin nonetheless lays out a moving argument about literature’s power to invite prosocial concern for the welfare of strangers, and to build solidarities across linguistic, cultural, and ethnic divides that have led to demonstrable political effects.

Finnin shows in illuminating detail how Russian, Ukrainian, and Turkish writers—and let us pause here to admire the linguistic range that made this original comparison possible—forged ties around their response to the Soviet-era ethnic cleansing of Crimea’s Tatars and to the settler colonialism aiming to cement their displacement. Wise to abandon the dichotomy of the canonical and non-canonical, Finnin is as probing on modern Turkey’s historical pulp fiction as on Aleksandr Pushkin’s “The Fountain of Bakhchisarai”—a cultural touchstone of “talismanic power” (55) for the transnational literature on Crimea. Finnin moves effortlessly between a lyric and a dissident pamphlet, between Taras Shevchenko and a Eurovision song by Jamala, while engaging postcolonial theory, trauma studies, memory studies, and history. This is interdisciplinary humanities at its best, speaking to social scientist and humanist alike. One hopes that this book’s fruitful dialogue between Slavic and Middle Eastern studies will find other interlocutors.

The book is composed of eight chapters arranged in three parts. Part One, “Possession” (Ch. 1–2), explores the cultural discourse that paved the way to Stalin’s atrocity. It establishes the study’s principal conceptual thread and political index: the way authors negotiate the relations between the Crimean place and the Crimean Tatar people (the latter somewhat awkwardly termed “the Tatar personality”). Educators eager to decolonize their Russian literature curriculum may take note of the arresting