issue with Healey’s treatment of lesbianism. He argues that ignoring either men or women in discussions of homosexuality severely distorts the story; but in privileging sexuality as a commonality between these men and women, he overlooks key gender differences that permeated notions of authority, particularly after 1917. He acknowledges the archive’s bias on this issue; yet he cannot quite escape reproducing its attention to the male, with the result that his sections on women often seem extraneous to the main (male) story. Throughout the book he deconstructs Russian/Soviet notions of essentialized masculinity by positing different ways in which men subverted the heteronormative sex and gender system, yet he describes lesbians as “masculinized” women without qualifying the adjective in either his usage or the usage of his sources. Based on his research, the differences between the experiences of homosexual men and lesbians in Russia may in fact warrant separate treatments.

Like many scholars trying to open historical research into a relatively new topic, Healey in many ways seeks simply to fill in the gaps by asking “what is knowable?” (p. 9) about homosexuality in Russian history. Although he might not have all the answers yet, with this book Healey has offered historians a valuable new perspective on autocracy, reform, and several revolutionary moments in Russia, while also encouraging further research into more specific aspects of the broad questions he poses.

*Erica L. Fraser* University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign


In the wake of the Great Reforms of the 1860s, the tsar’s officials confronted the challenges of educating a linguistically diverse population. Wayne Dowler addresses efforts to incorporate non-Russian children into the empire’s schools. His research centers on the multi-ethnic, religiously diverse Kazan’ school administrative district.

Dowler begins by sketching official motivations for educating non-Russians. Since the conquest of the Khanate of Kazan’ in 1552, the Russian state had sought to assimilate the area’s population into Russian culture and political life. Most efforts had involved missionary activity and attempts to convert animist and Muslim peoples to Russian Orthodoxy. By the mid-nineteenth century, large-scale apostasy of baptized non-Russians had proved these efforts to be failures. In the 1850s, Nikolai Il’minskii – a scholar, linguist, pedagogue, and missionary – began developing new approaches to the assimilation of non-Russians. Influenced by Slavophilism, a powerful commitment to Orthodoxy, and a belief that a people’s native language expressed its national spirit, he developed a system that emphasized religious instruction and education in a student’s native language. Il’minskii’s teaching materials consisted primarily of religious texts translated into a student’s native language using a modified Cyrillic alphabet in order to ease the transition to study in Russian. By the late 1860s, Il’minskii had created a working example of his approach to education in Kazan’. Baptized non-Russians weak in their faith and pagan peoples were the primary intended audience for Il’minskii’s schools.
Il'minskii’s system of education for non-Russians gained influential followers. When Count D. A. Tolstoi became Minister of Education in 1866, Il'minskii’s system found an important champion in St. Petersburg. Support at the highest levels of the government along with Il'minskii’s dedication and charisma helped spread his favored type of school throughout the empire’s east. Regulations on education of non-Russians approved by Alexander II in March 1870 marked the official endorsement of Il'minskii’s approach. Il'minskii modified his system somewhat for Muslims suspicious of state goals. Schools for Muslims would not have the Orthodox religious emphasis – local communities were invited to support Muslim religious instruction. Language training using native languages written in the Cyrillic alphabet remained central, however.

Dowler carefully traces legislation regarding the education of non-Russians after 1870 and the spread of Il'minskii’s schools. Dowler clearly delineates the varieties of schools sponsored by the state. He identifies the central challenges facing officials as they sought to incorporate non-Russians in the empire’s east into the school system. By the time of Il'minskii’s death in 1891 and increasingly thereafter, social and economic changes created pressure for a thoroughly secular system of education. Muslim “new method” schools including more effective methods of language instruction in Arabic, native language study, and secular subjects also competed with state-sponsored schools. Since Kazan’s Tatars were some of the most active and influential Muslim teachers, the state feared Tatarization of non-Russians. After 1905, non-Russian and Russian nationalisms became increasingly powerful forces. Non-Russian national groups desired schools in which their children could learn their native languages and that would support limited cultural autonomy. Russian nationalists sought to create a unitary state based in Russian culture. These divisions caused Il'minskii’s system to remain controversial. As Dowler rightly argues, the debate over schooling for non-Russians reflected differing conceptions of what should unite the Russian Empire. Some argued that language rather than religion ought to serve as the empire’s cement. Although Il'minskii believed that all students should learn Russian eventually, others argued that learning Russian should be the first and main goal of education. They criticized Il'minskii’s approach as ineffective in achieving this. Despite these divisions, Il'minskii’s system continued to find supporters among the empire’s religious and educational officials until the end of the tsarist regime. Following Isabelle Kreindler, Dowler argues that Il’minskii’s emphasis on native language education served as a precedent for the Soviet regime. Dowler attributes the endurance of Il’minskii’s system to its success at reconciling cultural autonomy with political incorporation.

Dowler succeeds in situating debates over the education of non-Russians in a broad intellectual and political context. He demonstrates, for instance, connections between Il’minskii’s views and those of the Russian educator Konstantin Ushinskii, and between developments in Russian schools and New Method Muslim schools. The comparisons he draws with other empires and North American states are most welcome and could have been more extensive. Dowler argues that the Il’minskii system as reflected in the regulations of 1870 was “generally far more protective of local languages than later British and French education policies in West Africa and . . . only slightly more intolerant than contemporary British practices in India” (p. 83), and