

“blocks,” passages of music that are coherent within themselves but which either do not play out as expected or which move from one to another without transition. “Borrowed musical materials are fractured, reconfigured, denied their expected development. Stravinsky seems to be longing to return to a world that he knows has already been shattered” (p. 47). Speaking of *Symphonies of Wind Instruments* (1920) and *Pulcinella* (1920), Cross remarks that “Stravinsky’s neoclassical music articulates alienation, the hallmark of modernism” (p. 104). Here, Cross is making the analogy between unmediated musical transition and an inability to reclaim the past. Thus, Stravinsky’s neoclassical resources are baroque and classical, and not romantic. The subjects of his three Greek ballets—*Apollo*, *Agon*, and *Orpheus*—extend backward even further. On this historical distance, Cross comments, “ancient Greece is an idea, a utopian ideal, that stands for an inaccessible past, and associated values of order, wholeness and unity, from which the late modern age has become alienated” (p. 135). These descriptions portray a music that is frustrated, and that, once fragmented, is denied reconciliation. (Here, one may be reminded of T. S. Eliot, who comments in the essay “Philip Massinger” that “a good poet will usually borrow from authors remote in time, or alien in language, or diverse in interest.”)

Because of its more technical nature, I suspect Carr’s book will find its audience among musicians and Stravinsky scholars, an audience that will be rewarded with a trove of ideas and information. Cross’s book, on the other hand, is written for a general, nontechnical audience. Nevertheless, Cross has produced an account of the life of Igor Stravinsky that is at once sophisticated and thoughtful.

Neil Minturn, University of Missouri

Khan-Magomedov, Selim Omarovich. *Georgii Krutikov: The Flying City and Beyond*. Translated by Christina Lodder. Barcelona: Tenov, 2015. 159 pp. \$26.00 (paper). ISBN 978-84-939231-8-1.

For scholars and students of the early twentieth century Russian avant-garde, and especially those of Soviet architecture of the 1920s and 1930s, a recently translated book on one of the more gifted architects of the younger generation, Georgii Krutikov (1899–1958), will add another dimension to their knowledge of innovative and future-oriented ideas of the period.

Published in Russian in 2008 and excellently translated by a British scholar of the Russian avant-garde, *Georgii Krutikov* is the work of a recognized Soviet art historian and specialist in the history of architecture who has devoted some fifty years to researching and extensively publishing on such pioneers of Soviet architecture as Konstantin Melnikov, Nikolai Ladovskii, Aleksandr Vesnin, Moise Ginzburg, Ivan Leonidov, and many others.

Transformations in Soviet architecture of the 1920s and 1930s marked an important point in the history of European modernist architecture. It was the period of the rise and evolution of innovative concepts, theories, and visionary utopian projects, a continuation, as it were, of the forward looking ideas of the prerevolutionary Russian avant-garde, in a recently established Soviet state. They originated at the newly created progressive higher education institution in Moscow—The Vysshie khudozhestvenno-tekhnicheskie masterskie (Vkhutemas), in 1927 renamed the Vysshii khudozhestvenno-tekhnicheskii institute (Vkhutein). Under the aegis of distinguished professors, themselves renowned architects, such as Vesnin (proponent of Constructivism) or Ladovskii (Rationalism), the younger generation of students devoted themselves, for the most part, to utopian ideas and futuristic theories, intended to create structures and urban spaces that would be considered uniquely suitable for the purposes of the communist state and its modern society.

Using public and private archives, writings, interviews, and personal conversations with the still surviving artists, their family members, and contemporaries, Selim Omarovich Khan-Magomedov presents an enlightening analysis of the work by Krutikov, a talented pupil of the Rationalist architect Ladovskii. To convey the depth and innovative, analytical spirit of Krutikov’s projects, Khan-Magomedov probed particularly the archives and collections of the Schusev Museum of Architecture

in Moscow, Krutikov's private archive, and drew extensively on interviews and personal conversations with Krutikov's widow, Klavdiia Krutikova.

In this concise and highly informative study the author traces the professional trajectory of the talented young architect, starting with the background and the analytical, complex premises of his diploma project at the Architectural Faculty of the Vhutemas/Vkhutein in 1927–28, through the final years of his life, when removed from an effective professional activity, yet still in an official post, he tirelessly defended preservation of Russian historical monuments.

The book is divided into short, informative chapters devoted to Krutikov's interests, his specific projects containing detailed theoretical and historical discussions by Khan-Magomedov supported by extensive quotations from Krutikov's own definitions and analyses of the presented ideas as well as reproductions of related drawings and other visual materials, required for architectural presentations of the designs such as models, explanatory boards and photographs. Krutikov's diploma project unveiled his creative, complex, visionary ideas both for architecture and town planning, viewing the city as a "social phenomenon" and not only as a group of physical buildings and their placement. The young architect's early interest in aeronautics, combined with his concepts for ideal cities of the future, led him to develop a scheme for a "flying city" as the best solution for the future society. His theses for the "City of the Future" proposed the units/buildings be composed of spatial capsules circulating according to "rational economic organization," using the cosmic space around the Earth to implement flexible housing and town planning (p. 85). All this was to be developed according to the most current technology, using lightweight materials. His cosmic housing solutions are fascinating and can be seen as forerunners of the visionary architectural ideas of the 1960s by Yona Friedman, Nicolas Schoeffler, or Richard Buckminster Fuller.

Krutikov's much talked about diploma project led him to a successful professional career, embracing different types of memorials and buildings as well as exhibition spaces, from 1928 through the end of the 1930s. Yet the second half of the 1930s, when what Khan-Magomedov calls "Stalinist Empire style" became the dominant directive, Krutikov—an original and independent thinker—found himself in a creative crisis, not being satisfied with the dominant architectural tendencies. By the end of the decade, and for the rest of his life, he suffered a move from an active architectural career to that of a preservationist of architectural landmarks. Yet, he found that position unsatisfying as well, as the wave of demolitions of old Russian monuments, ordered by Stalin, to be replaced by tasteless blocks of flats or ugly monumental governmental buildings, increased exponentially. He loudly protested these decisions in speech, writing, and actual obstruction. He fought to the end, but the fight, which resulted in demotion from important functions, led to his illness and death in 1958. Neither he nor his widow were able to restore his reputation. The present book finally brings to public attention the achievements of this extraordinary architect.

Magdalena Dabrowski, Independent Curator, Art Consultant

Levitina, Marina. *"Russian Americans" in Soviet Film: Cinematic Dialogues between the US and the USSR*. London: I. B. Tauris, 2015. 256 pp. \$99.00. ISBN 978-1-7845-3031-0.

Marina Levitina offers a thorough study of Soviet star-identification with American film. Early American film actors, particularly Mary Pickford and Douglas Fairbanks, embodied much-admired characteristics: energy, self-sufficiency and self-improvement, qualities needed for the new Soviet man and woman. In the 1920s the Soviet Union attempted to adopt "Fordism or Fordization" in its industry. To support this, Soviet society, and film as its most important propaganda tool, promoted new images of men and women speeding through space with the help of technology, particularly cars and locomotives. By the 1920s, America had become a "kind of measuring stick" of success on the road to the new technological developments that were taking place in the United States "and were much admired by the Soviets" (p. 2). "Americanism and Americanization" were terms used in a sympathetic way, hinting at envy.