stock, he "made his way to Moscow University, shed his peasant self, and became a sophisticated professional." Both authors blame the cult of personality on tsarism (but can you imagine Nicholas II writing a book on linguistics or anybody much caring if he did?). Haynes, I am glad to say, does not resort to this easy line of thought and indeed demonstratively includes the kolkhoz peasantry in the working class.

None of the authors endorses the "Ukrainian genocide" explanation of the 1932-33 famine. Read, who provides the best discussion, remarks that such explanations were accepted in the "hostile atmosphere" of the early 1980s, implying that this hostility has now passed. Maybe this is true in the UK, but not on this side of the Atlantic. Indeed, a teacher who assigned Read's book in some parts of Canada might get in serious trouble.

Gooding and Read are surprisingly pro-Gorbachev while Haynes is very cool although not hostile. Both Read and Haynes stress the continuity of elites between the Soviet era and the 1990s. Read uses this observation to argue that we should not call the Soviet elite a "class" while Haynes uses it to argue that it was indeed a "class." Even those of us with no great stakes in the "class" label will find this debate brings up interesting structural and comparative issues.

There are many other issues sparked off by these three essays. All of them can be profitably used as a source of intellectual stimulation in the classroom, although, for reasons given, I particularly recommend Haynes for this role.

Lars T. Lih

Montreal, Quebec


In her first book Anne Gorsuch intermeshes description of the lives of urban teenagers in NEP Russia with analysis of various levels of official discourse about those youths. The result is a solid, insightful work that engages, and effectively summarizes, recent scholarship on NEP culture. Gorsuch addresses such important topics as the struggle of militant young Communist activists to come to terms with the NEP, the near-exclusion of young women from Komsomol life by male activists and their gendered discourse, the attraction for urban youth of "bourgeois" luxuries from lipstick to the foxtrot, the anxiety of Bolshevik officials about the supposed decadence of Soviet youth, and actual living conditions for urban youth from activists to bezprizornye orphans and runaways. Youth in Revolutionary Russia would be an excellent addition to reading lists for advanced colloquia and seminars on Soviet history. It is required reading for specialists who seek a deeper understanding of the complicated relationship between NEP culture and the Bolshevik state.

One of the central themes of Youth in Revolutionary Russia is the Bolsheviks' project for transforming the culture -- in the broad sense of habits, customs, and modes of thought -- of Soviet youth. While historians have tended to focus on the economic policies of the Soviet government in the 1920s (this focus is explicit in the very use of "NEP," the Soviet acronym for "New Economic Policy," as the shorthand term for the
period), Gorsuch foregrounds the project of cultural transformation and its attendant anxieties. In this emphasis Gorsuch’s book converges with recent monographs by Michael David-Fox, Eric Naiman, and the reviewer, which point to the centrality of cultural transformation to the Bolshevik program in the 1920s. The most important target for cultural “enlightenment,” as Gorsuch points out, was youth.

The cultural enlightenment drive reflected, of course, the Bolsheviks’ attempt to create an entirely new socialist society, but it also reflected, and reinforced, the anxieties of Russia’s educated elites about urban disorders. Party and non-party commentators alike ascribed violent crime, vandalism, drunkenness, “sexual excesses,” and the belligerence of young “hooligans” to the corrosive effects of personal desire run riot, the penetration of Western consumer culture, the uncivilized and primitive mentality of peasants and the urban lower classes, and neglect of personal hygiene. These kinds of complaints were common to educated reformers in much of the world at this time, but in the Soviet context they took on additional peculiar meanings. As Gorsuch, in an argument that parallels Eric Naiman’s in Sex in Public, explains, the Bolsheviks saw all of the disorders enumerated above as symptoms of the rotting of the collective body of Soviet society resulting from the spread of the “infection” of capitalism under the NEP. Bolshevik officials expressed their anxiety about the resurgence of capitalism through talk about, and action against, such delinquencies. They also connected them with the “hooliganistic” Trotskyite opposition to Stalin, which was particularly strong among university youth. As party officials moved to stamp out social deviancy and political opposition, they laid bare the authoritarian underpinnings of their cultural enlightenment project.

In a self-reinforcing cycle, the Bolsheviks’ drive to transmogrify youth culture and its apparent failure to yield quick results only intensified their fear of delinquency among urban adolescents. The end result, Gorsuch argues, was the official anti-hooliganism campaign of 1926-27, which included front-page newspaper coverage of events such as the trial of Komsonol activists accused in the so-called “Chubarov Alley” gang rape of September 1926. Gorsuch attributes the anti-hooliganism campaign to generalized Bolshevik anxiety about social deviancy and the renaissance of capitalism under the NEP, and to more specific fears provoked by the rise of the United (Trotsky-Zinov’ev) Opposition and the wave of youth suicides following the death of poet Sergei Esenin by his own hand.

The most thought-provoking part of Youth in Revolutionary Russia for me was a short section entitled “Children Without Fathers,” which described how many Komsonol activists rejected both parental and party control. As anyone who has spent much time researching the biographies of early Bolshevik activists knows, many of these Communist youth were literally without fathers, having lost them to combat in World War I or the Civil War, or to disease, or to famine. In a sense the party served these men and women as a surrogate father. One can only speculate about the consequent psychological effects on the activists, but they must have been huge.

Gorsuch’s book is a model of how to integrate relevant theory unobtrusively into an analysis of historical data. In this respect I have to differ completely with a recent review of Youth in Revolutionary Russia on the H-Russia discussion list by Sonja Pujals. Pugals expresses some annoyance with what she describes as Gorsuch’s exces-