From the Editor

Welcome to this issue of *SPSR*, which represents our third and final publication of 2017. The first article in this issue is entitled “Sexism on the Silver Screen: Misogyny and Cultural Continuity in Soviet Glasnost Cinema, 1987–1991” and is authored by Svetlana Y. Ter-Grigoryan of The Ohio State University (Columbus, Ohio USA). Ter-Grigoryan examines the discourse engaged by Soviet intellectuals during the era of *perestroika* (restructuring) and *glasnost* (openness) on the previously taboo topic of sex. By exploring filmmakers’ and journalists’ divergent views on sex as parts of a unified campaign to address a perceived moral crisis, she adds a new perspective to past conclusions that conservative and liberal ideas about sex were truly at odds with each other. Ter-Grigoryan argues that while late Soviet intellectuals approached the topic of sex with a combination of improvisation and distinctiveness, they also insisted on remedying a perceived crisis, which reveals their concern about the ability of the Soviet system to withstand the pressures of *glasnost* and *perestroika*.

Our second article is a Russian language piece entitled “‘Братские могилы’ и ‘вражеские могильники’: символическое означивание массовых захоронений в Советской России/СССР 1920-х–1940-х годов,” or “‘Mass Graves’ and the ‘Burial Grounds of Enemies’: The Symbolic Significance of Mass Burials in Soviet Russia and the USSR, 1920s–1940s.” Written by Svetlana Malysheva of Kazan Federal University (Kazan, Russian Federation), this article reveals that for several decades, the mass burial practices in Soviet Russia were strongly linked with Soviet ideology and the practices of everyday life. Malysheva demonstrates that Soviet military and state officials intentionally and unintentionally used mass graves as a political and ideological tool. The author also argues that Soviet authorities ascribed meaning to places of mass burials and characterized as them systems of ideological representation and the binary oppositions of “ours” versus “foreign.” Finally, Malysheva examines the practice of mass burials from the 1920s to the 1940s, and how this activity shaped and influenced Soviet ideological constructs.

The third article, by Jessica Werneke of the National Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow), is entitled “Reimagining the History of the Avant-garde: Photography and the Journal *Sovetskoe foto* in the 1950s and Early 1960s.” Werneke discusses the Thaw of the Khrushchev years, which fostered a climate of enthusiasm among both photojournalists and amateur

photographers. As these individuals sought to establish photography as an officially recognized art form, the era's cultural Thaw provided them with an opportunity to reopen discussions about the aesthetic properties of photography. These individuals actively promoted photography as a documentary tool while also reopening debates about photographic aesthetics. Werneke argues that these photographers found the reestablishment of the journal *Sovetskoe foto* (*Soviet Photography*) as a promising sign which they perceived as a signal to return to the previously silenced debates about the relationship between the documentary and aesthetic properties of photography.

Our fourth article is "The Gagauz Republic: An Autonomism-Driven De Facto State" by Marcin Kosienkowski of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin (Lublin, Poland). Kosienkowski reveals that the post-Soviet area is a home for a several de facto states, which are entities that resemble so-called "normal" states, but lack international recognition. Kosienkowski's focus is the Gagauz Republic (also known as Gagauzia), which was a de facto state that existed within the Soviet Union and later as a part of independent Moldova between 1990 and 1995. Kosienkowski utilizes new sources to argue that the leaders of the Gagauz Republic were not interested in independence, but rather sought autonomism, namely the pursuit of self-governance within Gagauzia's two parent states, first the USSR and then later independent Moldova.

The fifth and final article in this issue is authored by Andrei Znamenski of the University of Memphis (Memphis, Tennessee USA). Entitled "Joseph Grigulevich: A Tale of Identity, Soviet Espionage, and Storytelling," Znamenski explores the life of Joseph Grigulevich (1913–1988), a Soviet intelligence operative who played an important role in the Soviet espionage and intelligence communities during the Stalin years. Grigulevich participated in a number of assassinations, notably that of Leon Trotsky in 1940, and a botched attempt to assassinate Yugoslav leader Josip Tito in 1952. Employing a novel methodology, Znamenski details the formation of Grigulevich's identity as a cosmopolitan Jewish "other" from interwar Poland-Lithuania. In addition, the author explores Grigulevich's role in the field intelligence knowledge, which Grigulevich later used to begin his second career as a prominent scholar and bestselling writer.

Finally, this issue also contains a review essay entitled "Religion and Nationalism in Modern Russia; Or the Uses and Abuses of *Edinoverie*" by James M. White and Alexander S. Palkin of the Ural Federal University (Ekaterinburg, Russian Federation). White and Palkin's essay explores *edinoverie*, which is Uniate movement founded in 1800 to bring Old Believers into the Russian Orthodox Church. White and Palkin evaluate four recent works on *edinoverie* to

demonstrate how a politicized historical narrative has been reified by ecclesiastical writers to justify the revival of *edinoverie* in recent years. The authors also examine how contemporary nationalist and neo-traditionalist figures are employing the legacy of *edinoverie* to restore a distinctively Russian character to the Orthodox faith that, in their view, can protect Russia from the dangers of irreligiosity and globalization.

It is my hope that you will enjoy this latest issue of *The Soviet and Post-Soviet Review*.

Christopher J. Ward
Editor-in-Chief