of its director Sergei Parajanov. Ukrainian cinema of the '60s and early '70s is often referred to as Ukrainian Poetic Cinema and the book justly allots substantial space to demonstrate how Ukrainian Poetic Cinema tried to position itself as heir to the Ukrainian films of the 1920s, particularly Oleksandr Dovzhenko masterpieces.

First needs to be commended for his meticulous research in both Ukrainian and Russian archives in Moscow. Consequently, he is able to juxtapose his findings in order to establish how filmmakers, studio executives and party officials in Moscow and Kiev (Kyiv) differently approached the question of national cinema as well as the problem of Ukrainian "bourgeois nationalism." First's research and analysis go beyond films canonized in Ukrainian scholarship and include films derided by critics as "genre films," which in Soviet jargon meant a form of a sell-out on the filmmaker's part. Moreover, First's book moves beyond the production side of the film business and tries to grasp the disingenuous concern with movie audiences during the Thaw, a welcome addition to the studies of Soviet cinema.

In this reviewer's mind, two concerns with the book need to be directed to its publisher. First, the quality of stills and pictures reproduced in the book is extremely low, to the point that it is impossible to discern anything in the pictures, not to mention any aesthetic qualities that the stills are supposed to illustrate. It is not just I.B. Tauris's problem but an unfortunate general trend among publishers. The second concern is the annoying editorial shortcut wherein the notes do not describe archival documents, just their location. The reader cannot possibly evaluate whether the information used in the text comes from a newspaper clipping, a private letter between two individuals, an official document, or a KGB informer report; not a negligible aspect of dealing with Soviet documents.

Joshua First makes a significant contribution to our understanding of national cinema in the post-Soviet space. By challenging the Russocentric view of Soviet cinema, he manages to delineate the complex relationship between the ideological state and the national aspirations of its constituents. Soviet cinema as we know it requires fresh approaches and careful reconsideration and First's book is a big step in the right direction.

BOHDAN Y. NEBESIO
Brock University

Breaking the Tongue: Language, Education, and Power in Soviet Ukraine, 1923–1934. By Matthew D. Pauly. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014. xx, 456 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations. Photographs. $85.00, hard bound.

Breaking the Tongue asks how the efforts of the world's first communist state to create a new society through institutional transformation were shaped by the structures of everyday life, the limits of local and regional institutions, and the complexities of national, ethnic, and linguistic alignments and affiliations. This clearly written and effectively researched monograph focuses on educational policy as it was implemented, challenged, and ultimately practiced in the schoolhouses of Ukraine. By focusing on the daily implementation of educational policies, Matthew D. Pauly acknowledges the complexities of early Soviet education, including significant differences among educators based on training, location, generation, and political position; the tensions between the state's progressive vision for educational reform and its centralizing impulses that intensified with Stalin's rise to power; and grave social problems, especially the crisis of homeless and orphaned youth, which shaped the context, participants, and outcomes of this educational experience. Devoting atten-

https://doi.org/10.5612/slavicreview.75.2.493 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tion to the *agency* of teachers, students, and parents, the *power* of key actors involved across multiple institutions, and *differences* reflecting the structural, historical, and ideological alignments of Ukraine, *Breaking the Tongue* makes a strong case that understanding the early years of the Soviet Union requires careful study of the active engagement with the present, the daily, and the local.

The title of this book clearly illustrates the complex intersections between language, power, and education in Soviet Ukraine in this era. A 1925 article published in *Narodnyi uchitel'* included complaints that teachers in Ukrainian schools who did not know Ukrainian and were teaching children incorrect forms of pronunciation. In particular, they could not "break the tongue" as they, and their pupils, frequently used a hard 'G' common in Russian but not in Ukrainian. Asking the rhetorical question, "Why?" a correspondent provided an answer that summed up the challenge of assigning professional obligations and transformative agency to teachers who often possessed neither the capacity nor the will to enact their attributed roles: "When you do not know, do not direct speech. Do not attempt to cripple children, too!" (91).

As this example suggests, the most notable contributions of this book are the moments when Pauly penetrates beneath the layers of official discourse to explore the tensions between action, intention, and consequence in the making of educational practice. Pauly devotes considerable attention, for example, to the ways that the desires and intentions of parents related to both the structured inequalities of Soviet schools and the ideological objectives of the regime. While some Ukrainian parents preferred to send their children to Russian schools, recognizing that this language was key to future mobility, in other contexts, Ukrainian parents welcomed and actively embraced policies that provided education in their children's native language. Yet these tensions between ideology and practice acquired sudden, and devastating, force in the late 1920s, as those accused of "bourgeois nationalism," especially among the professions, became the objects of repression. Pauly's careful use of interrogation transcripts and trial records clearly illustrates how individuals, including teachers, became vulnerable to charges of "bourgeois nationalism." The allegations of "counter-revolutionary" children's groups and "anti-Soviet actions by children" in the early 1930s (289), emerged as tragic, yet also logical, extensions of the increasingly repressive worldview of the Soviet state.

Breaking the Tongue will make an important contribution to scholarly fields that have been shaped by some of the most active and influential historians in Eurasian studies. Pauly's analysis of the paradox of Ukrainization as the core of a policy designed initially to accentuate national identity in a centralizing and increasingly repressive political system will prove a model for future research. *Breaking the Tongue* adds an important dimension to Soviet childhood studies by encompassing the vast numbers of "non-Russian" children that were equally (or unequally) part of the Soviet project to create a new generation of communists. Most importantly, *Breaking the Tongue* is a valuable contribution to understanding the Soviet system in its incipient stages by demonstrating how the policy of Ukrainization could serve the seemingly contradictory objectives of modernity and repression.

TOM EWING
Virginia Tech

https://doi.org/10.5612/slavicreview.75.2.493 Published online by Cambridge University Press