Dressing the Shop Window of Socialism: Gender and Consumption in the era of 'Cultured Trade', 1934-1953

'Respected Consumer' (*Uvazhaemyi potrebitel'*), a 1950 article from the Soviet women's magazine *Rabotnitsa*, describes in intricate detail the author's recent shopping trip to a Moscow department store.[1] Lavishly praising the refinement of the store's decoration and the 'culturedness' of the shop assistants standing behind shining counters, the author devotes a number of paragraphs to an interaction between the male manager of the fabric department and three well-heeled female shoppers. The three women – a grandmother, her daughter and her young granddaughter – are dressed in furs, velvet hats and red spotted shoes. The grandmother is described as a *rabotnitsa*, a female worker, while her daughter is of unknown profession. As they approach the department manager to order some silk, he recognizes them from an earlier sale, and impresses them with his flawless memory of what they had bought and where they live. Pleased with the immaculate service and knowledgeable staff, the three are whirled away to be fitted for dresses. One of them is presumably the dark haired woman in the picture accompanying the article, adorned with a silk robe and attended to by three smiling and be-suited female shop assistants in front of a rack of brightly patterned ready-made clothes.

This two-page article, situated as it is between a story celebrating the outstanding productivity of the Soviet female worker and recipes for jam and sour cherry cake, exhibits many of the most consistent traits of post-war consumption discourse in the Soviet press. The characters include the paradigmatic post-war consumers of 'luxury' – women – and the article captures three substrata of this paradigm in the retired *rabotnitsa*, the profession-less mother, and the little girl. Importantly, they shop together rather than individually and rely on one another's opinions before making purchases. The male appears in this story as a manager of a department,

and it is significant that he is not one of the less prestigious fitters who help the pictured woman in the silk robe. The store is immaculate, the quality of the goods superlative, and entire experience of shopping painless and edifying.

This article exhibits the most common hallmarks of consumption discourse as it manifested in the late Stalin period. However, while many of these features were present from the beginning of the 'cultured trade' campaigns that rehabilitated consumption in the mid-1930s, others, such as the overwhelming emphasis on women as primary consumers, were specific to the post-war era. Prior to the war years men had often been featured as consumers in journalistic accounts of buying and selling. Like the women in this story, they sought attractive clothes, or furniture to beautify their homes. In the years after 1941, however, this paradigm of male consumer was notably absent.

Recently, historians have explored the 'Stalinist turn toward consumerism' that occurred after the end of rationing in the mid-1930s, during which the previous ambivalence toward retail trade was replaced with the injunction to buy and sell in a 'cultured' and refined manner.[2] An examination of the partial excision of men from the Soviet construction of cultured consumption in the post-war period can help us to re-consider the cultural dynamics at work in the various manifestations of this cultured trade discourse, and the ways in which the dissemination of the ideal of correct socialist consumption may have re-inscribed or disrupted existing social structures. Such norms include the reconfigured (and increasingly dichotomous) ideals of male and female, public and private, and the rehabilitation of the family as ideal social unit in the period of high Stalinism. As a result, an exegesis of the gendered discourse and practice of consumption in the Stalin period helps us to rethink what has been called the period of 'Great

Retreat' in Soviet history, and the extent to which this 'retreat' constituted a return to pre-revolutionary ideas or the invention of a new tradition.[3]

The period 1934-1953 is a central one for this history of consumption in the Soviet Union, as it was a period in which a traditional Bolshevik denigration of trade was eschewed for the ideological propagation of a certain, restricted mode of consumption. This mode, according to official pronouncements, was to be *cultured* and *socialist*.[4] The ways in which such a mode of consuming was discussed in the pages of newspapers and disseminated through advertisements, novels, films, and magazines can tell us much about the assumptions implicit in what 'cultured' and 'socialist' meant as paradigms for correct Soviet behavior. At the same time, the Soviet Union was undergoing a broad ideological shift that historians have come to term the 'Great Retreat', in which a pro-natalist conceptualization of motherhood as the primary goal of women, and of patriarchal oversight as the natural task of men, played an important role. These two phenomena – the development of 'cultured trade' and the re-inscribing of traditional gender norms – were not unrelated. Indeed, through the promulgation of specific 'feminine' and 'masculine' modes of consumption, the discourse of trade interacted with the reconfiguration of and renewed pertinence of the gender binary after World War II.

The paradigms of masculine and feminine consumption that developed in this period were not static, however, and nor were they isolated from contemporaneous social and political changes in the USSR. While the 1930s saw a significant shift away from the discourse that had proposed the equality of men and women in the 1920s, the separation between male and female consumer spheres was not fully delineated. World War II, however, which had a direct and tangible effect on gender relations through the massive loss of male life, engagement of women in heavy industry, and post-war exhortation for women to 'replace the dead' through childbirth at

the end of the war, also had a deep influence on gendered discourses of consumption.[5] After the war, male and female spheres of consumption appeared increasingly polarized, and whereas before they were not always clearly delineated, now consumption discourse produced highly differentiated understandings of male and female behavior in the post-war world, as well as of an imagined 'male' realm of the public and the 'female' realm of the private.[6] Thus if there was a 'Great Retreat' towards more conservative gender relations in the Stalin period, it was an unstable process whose iconography changed over time rather than staying the same from 1934-1953, and in which the production of femininity and masculinity though such everyday practices as consumption was in constant flux.

The seeming conservative shift in Soviet culture, law and society with regards to gender (including the re-criminalization of abortion and narrowing of opportunity for legal divorce in 1936) has been one of the chief foci of the literature emphasizing a Stalinist recoil from the radical social agenda of 1920s Bolshevism since Nikolai Timasheff first identified his *Great Retreat* in 1946.[7] However, David Hoffman has recently argued that, rather than a return to earlier conservative norms, the period of High Stalinism should be seen as one of revolutionary mobilization, in which the Soviet Union, like other contemporaneous European regimes, 'utilized the emotional power of traditional appeals and symbols, themselves removed from their original context and recast for political purposes.'[8] With regards to family policy more specifically, Hoffman argues that rather than a re-inscription of the norms of Tsarist patriarchal society, 'Stalinist pro-natalism and efforts to buttress the family reflected a new type of population politics practiced in the modern era.'[9] In this reading, the Soviet idealization of the family called not so much for the subordination of women and children to patriarchal heads of household but the subordination of all family members, male and female, to the need to reproduce for the state.

Similarly Anna Krylova has challenged the notion of a silencing of 1920s radicalism in 1930s discourse by emphasizing the multivalent and often contradictory nature of Stalinist ideas about both male and female social roles. She argues that the radical undoing of social structures that accompanied the massive economic and geographic upheavals of the 1930s allowed for, among other things, 'more sharing and overlapping versions of male and female being' than has previously been acknowledged.[10] This is not, as Krylova hastens to add, to deny the symbolic power of dichotomous notions of male and female in this period (as I argue, such binaries played an important, albeit shifting, role in consumption discourse), but rather to question their monolithic and apparently unchanging nature and hence the idea of a categorical 'retreat' to some ideal-type of gender conservatism.

While scholarship on a possible 'retreat' from family and gender radicalism in the 1930s has a long tradition in the literature on Stalinism, it is only very recently that historians have begun to consider the economic history of the Soviet Union from the angle of consumption rather than focusing entirely on production. As scholars such as Julie Hessler, Amy Randall and Randi Cox have recently argued, the eschewal of consumption in earlier Soviet historiography produced a major lacuna in our understanding of the social and economic history of everyday life in the USSR.[11] This led to a relative blindness to the often highly charged public discourse of consumption emanating from the Soviet leadership and bureaucracy in the Stalin period, predicated as it was on the Soviet state's promise to provide materially for its population, and problematized by its subsequent failure to deliver. Fortunately, a new generation of scholars focusing on the social history of the Soviet economy has not only revived the study of Stalinist consumption but also has also explored the ramifications of consumption discourse and practice, both pre- and post-1917, for ideas about gendered and sexual difference. Threaded through work

by Randall, Cox and Marjorie Hilton on the late imperial and Soviet retail systems are analyses of the ways in which both buying and selling were engendered through advertisements, pro-trade propaganda campaigns and hiring practices. All of these authors see the 1930s as a watershed period for these processes. In her work on the retail trade in the 1930s, Amy Randall argues that women became synonymous with retail in this period not only through shopping but also through selling; that is, after the push for full female employment in the early 1930s brought women pouring into the retail labor force.[12] At the same time, women retail workers were cast in the role of 'helpmates' (a dynamic we see clearly in the opening anecdote of this article) who were to reverse the negative connotations associated with trade in the 1920s through their cultured and refined influence on male bosses.[13] Randi Cox and Marjorie Hilton trace the shifts in representations of men and women shopping in the early Soviet period, both arguing that in the 1920s it was *men* who were framed as the primary consumers as part of the effort to 'overcome the association of female consumption with frivolity and self-indulgence' in the new state. By the early 1930s, they argue, this had given way to a dominant consumption discourse that targeted women as 'sentimentalized mothers' and 'glamorous urbanites' who were required to buy goods in order to exert their cultured influence in the home, just as they were supposed to in the retail workplace.[14]

This narrative of the feminization of both retail labor and advertising in the 1930s can be nuanced when we combine it with visual analyses such as those of art historian Susan Reid. Reid has argued that a complex interplay of competing images of women as workers *and* mothers (both construed as public rather than private roles) continued through the 1930s, albeit with a visual hierarchy that used female images to stand in for the subordination of the Soviet people to the state.[15] As I argue in this article, it can be nuanced even further when we take the

analysis past 1945 and compare pre-and post-war Stalinist consumption discourse through a gendered lens. By comparing the 1930s and the period after 1945, we can see that in fact the early Stalinist era maintained a multivalent discourse on the place of women and men in the new mode of 'cultured trade' followed by an excision of the male consumer only after the war, a finding that supports Krylova's call to recognize the existence of contradictory narratives of male and female in the 1930s.

This article will reconsider many of the conclusions of historians of gender and consumption in a Soviet framework, and in doing so rethink both the history of gender in the Soviet Union, and the broader history of consumption in a global perspective**.** In the process, it will draw specifically on three major insights of the literature on gender and consumption outside the Soviet Union. The first is the observation that, with the development of Western modernity, commodities have increasingly played a central role in shaping social identity and forging cultural meaning.[16] As a result, the processes by which people acquire commodities, and the products they are exhorted to consume, become deeply entwined with the formation of ideas about gender, race, class, nation and sexuality among myriad other forms of social identification. Secondly, and of particular resonance to this paper, historians of nineteenth century Europe have argued that in the 'specularized urban culture of arcade, boulevards, and department stores, woman was inscribed as both consumer and commodity, purchaser and purchase, buyer and bought'.[17] This notion speaks to the frequent re-appearance of the woman-as-consumer paradigm in recent history, something that, this paper will argue, was considerably more marked in the Soviet Union after World War II for historically specific and contingent reasons. This is not to argue that women have always been cast as the ideal consumers at specific geographic and historical moments, but rather to recognize the particularly strong connection that has been

drawn between consumption and the 'feminine' roles of mother and homemaker at particular times.

Finally, this article will engage with the conclusions of those historians who have highlighted ideas about sexuality and the erotic in practices fundamental to commodity culture, such as advertising and commodity branding. As social practices that engage with the operation of desire and the thin line between needs and wants, marketing practices have long used sexualized images of women *and* men as a 'supplementary emblem of the commodity itself.'[18] Examining Stalinist ‘cultured trade’ gives us the opportunity to test such insights in the context of a non-capitalist consumer culture, in which the state arguably had as much control as the market over the way in which commodities were regarded and consumed. A major argument of this article is that the incitement to desire products operated dialectically with an injunction to remain silent about all forms of sexuality that were not heterosexual and reproductive, directing the libidinal urges of Soviet citizens to both ‘correct’ people and ‘correct’ commodities.

The Rhetoric of Socialist Trade

The early 1930s saw a deliberate attempt by government agencies and the Soviet leadership to enact a wide-ranging rehabilitation of retail trade, which had for years been denigrated as the practice of capitalists and an agent of corruption. In the ideal Bolshevik world, life's necessities and indeed luxuries would be acquired by the proletariat through, at first, distribution by the state and second, the achievement of communism at which point they would be shared equitably among all.[19] The introduction of the New Economic Policy in 1921, which brought back private retail trade after the experiment with a money-free economy in the years of War Communism, was seen by many as a capitulation to a nefarious capitalist threat.[20] Despite this apparent

ideological backflip, Bolshevik propaganda and rhetoric continued to attack those who engaged in private trade as 'speculators', and represent the practice as a distasteful expedient that threatened to topple the whole socialist project.[21]

Thus during the period of NEP, which lasted until approximately 1928, an uneasy tension existed between official government policy allowing private trade and hegemonic anti-trade discourse.[22] As Eric Naiman has demonstrated, the antipathy towards retail trade emanated not only from official state organs, but was echoed through the popular press, fiction, theater, and film of the period.[23] Amidst this discussion of trade, influential archetypes of good and bad Communists emerged. The former was represented by the revolutionary ascetic who denied himself (or occasionally herself) anything but the very basic necessities of life.[24] The opposite of this revolutionary figure was the Nepman, the speculator who made money from the loosening of restrictions on private trade. The Nepman was rapacious, indolent and greedy, and represented in human form the nebulous threat of corruption many saw hidden behind the practice of retail trade.[25]

If the Nepman was usually figured as male, the revolutionary ascetic was also often imagined as a man. The position of women in this framework was more ambiguous. On the one hand, the emancipated woman was often held up as a great success of early Communism. On the other, the fear that women remained irrational, less educated, less devoted to the cause than men was prevalent.[26] This fear often manifested itself in the notion that women may corrupt their husbands with the desire for material goods, and may pull their husbands into an 'utterly unenlightened, petty-bourgeois life.'[27] Their husbands could be fine upstanding revolutionaries but women, it was suggested, continued to lust after luxurious possessions. Furthermore, if the archetypal internal enemy of the 1920s was the Nepman, his female equivalent was the

prostitute: the public woman who defied the ban on private trade by trading in her body.[28] One of the ways in which Soviet advertisers sought to overcome this association of consumption with rapacious self-indulgence in the 1920s was to attempt to re-code the acceptable form of retail as *male,* a script that served to underline rather than undermine the association of women with frivolous spending and materialism.[29] This early attempt at the rehabilitation of consumption was incomplete, however, as the revolutionary ascetic, refined male shopper, sensual woman and sentimental mother continued to jostle for space in the multi-directional discourse of NEP trade.[30]

The equation of women and rampant consumerism was not one unique to the Soviet Union in the 1920s. Scholars of Western Europe and North America have traced the image of women as particularly covetous and excessive consumers back to at least the eighteenth century, if not earlier.[31] Nonetheless, the NEP-era discourse had some Soviet-specific origins. One source of this anxiety was the fact that after the revolution, many prominent revolutionaries and party members married women who had belonged to the pre-revolutionary middle class. Commentators feared that they would taint their husbands with their petty bourgeois (*meshchanstvo*) ways.[32] Also present, however, was a more general fear that NEP could lead to the unbridled stimulation of consumer desires in both men and women, and a lust for possessions that was connected to sexual depravity and gluttony in general.[33] In this context, the uneducated, unenlightened female, who had long been framed as more sexually demanding and corrupt than the male in the Russian intellectual tradition, intersected uneasily with the figure of the prostitute. The prostitute's place in Soviet society was itself highly contested in the light of Bolshevik ideologues' promises to both protect prostitutes as victims of capitalism and Soviet attempts to repress prostitution through 'no-tolerance' policies in urban areas.[34] In this context,

women often seemed more in danger of capitulating to the desire for excessive consumption and the purchasing of unnecessary material goods than their husbands, brothers, fathers or male friends.

By the time Stalin had consolidated his hold on power in the late 1920s, and the USSR had embarked on the industrialization and collectivization drive often referred to as the 'Cultural Revolution,' NEP was supplanted by a return to restrictions on trade and re-centralization of the system of goods distribution.[35] An economic recovery mode typified by looser restrictions on retail trade re-appeared the early 1930s, with the end of rationing in 1935 heralding a shift in the ideological formulation of trade rhetoric emanating from Soviet economic and propaganda agencies.[36] At the Seventeenth Party Congress in early 1934, the then Premier of the Soviet Union Viacheslav Molotov gave a lengthy speech about the 'Tasks of the Second Five Year Plan,' which had been inaugurated two years before in 1932. Retroactively framing three main goals for the Plan, Molotov declared that along with eradicating class and developing heavy industry, the second *piatiletka* was set to 'further improve the well-being of the masses of workers and collective farmers and to increase the level of consumption of the toilers by two to three times.'[37] Molotov announced that the production of 'retail articles of general use' would leap by over 200 per cent, and that this increase would be accompanied by a rapid augmentation of variety in goods available.[38] To underscore the party's supposed commitment to reaching this goal, he quoted Comrade Stalin himself, stating that the Leader was 'annihilating in his flagellation of the aristocratically supercilious attitude towards Soviet trade, and of the nonsensical 'left' petit- bourgeois advocacy of an immediate adoption of direct exchange of goods.'[39] The toiling masses, Molotov argued, had a right to expect increased access to consumer

goods, and any hint that such access would besmirch the armor of revolutionary asceticism was an ultra-left heresy.

Gendering Abundance

'It's time you knew that I am also a contemporary man
I am a man of the *Moskvoshvei* epoch
Look how my jacket bulges on me.'
Osip Mandel'stam, 'Midnight in Moscow' *1931*.[40]

Enthusiastic claims of 'great leaps forward' in Soviet trade did not remain the preserve of political speeches, as they required campaigns to mobilize the public to engage in enlightened consumption practices, practices that were in turn supposed to revolutionize Soviet private life.[41] The Soviet press quickly took up the celebration of a new, more abundant consumer culture. An early example of enthusiasm for the new 'Soviet Trade' can be found in the July 1934 issue of Maxim Gorky's journal *Nashi Dostezheniia* ('Our Achievements'). 'Our Achievements' had been founded at the height of the First Five Year Plan in 1929 in order, in Gorky's words, to celebrate 'our victories over ourselves;' that is, the Soviet citizen's emergence from backwardness and full realization as an enlightened socialist individual.[42] Whereas the first half of the 1934 issue was devoted to arctic explorations, the second half concerned the apparent appearance of the 'new consumer' (*novyi pokupatel'*) in Soviet society. Among the articles espousing the dawn of a new era of consuming, there were descriptions of the new 'more decorative' furniture available to young Soviet couples ('*Pokupatel' mebeli'*), hagiographic descriptions of workers constructing miniature goods to go on sale in the toyshop *Detskii Mir* (Children's World), and descriptions of the new design aesthetic at work in the building of Soviet apartments and even pharmacies (*'Krasivaia Veshch'*").[43]

Most interesting from the perspective of the still inchoate discourse of gendered consumption was the eight page illustrated article 'New Consumer' ('*Novyi Pokupatel'*') which described, and showed ample photographic evidence of, new shops opening in Moscow and eponymous 'new consumers' visiting them.[44] Among the multiple images of cheerful Soviet shoppers there are distinct differences, but also potentially surprising similarities, between the concerns of male and female shoppers presented by the article's author. Women, for example, are pictured shopping communally with other women, while men always appear shopping alone. Similarly, pictures of children shopping in the *Detskii Mir* show mothers holding eager toddlers' hands, rather than fathers. Nonetheless, this early formulation of the 'new consumer' paradigm clearly intended to encompass both men and women in its scope. Both appear often, dotted across the eight pages of illustrations. On a page featuring new goods that can be bought for the house, a couple are shown sitting in their apartment among new furniture and crockery. The caption declares 'This family lives in a new house. Already they have acquired curtains for the window, a table, a buffet with glass doors. But still there are bare spaces on the floor, disturbing both husband and wife. The husband wants to buy a writing desk, as their son is growing older and needs to study at a table.'[45] As Randi Cox has argued, consumer advertising in the 1930s frequently endorsed the 'transformation of private space' as a means to turn the Soviet self into a more cultured, enlightened being.[46] Cox argues that this had the unintended side effect of 'placing the private, consumer sphere over the productive sphere and redefining public space as sentimentalized leisure space.'[47] Whether or not this elevation of private space over public space was as common as Cox suggests, the idealization of domesticity and gendered leisure in 1930s advertisements certainly undermines the common misconception that the private was entirely

eschewed for the public under high Stalinism. Furthermore, in the early-1930s articulation of a new socialist domesticity, men were to be involved in this private life as well as women.[48]

Taking the celebration of trade one step further was the official trade journal of the retail industry, *Sovetskaia Torgovlia* (‘Soviet Trade’). Founded in 1927 under the name *Voprosy Torgovli* (‘Questions of Trade’) it took the name ‘Soviet Trade’ throughout the height of the first push for cultured trade from 1931-1937.[49] *Sovetskaia Torgovliia* served both as a reference for those working in the retail trade industry and as a celebration of the abundance of goods apparently now available to the Soviet consumer. Articles ranged from ‘How to correctly arrange sales people and cash registers,’ to ‘How the Market Became Cultured’ and ‘How does this fashion please you?’[50] Directed not only at the consumer but also at the retail worker and director, *Sovetskaia Torgovlia* served as an early weathervane indicating the emphases of the new trade policy. Reading through the first years of the journal, it is quickly apparent that while the availability of bread and the end of rationing were the major themes of the first few issues, focus soon shifted to manufactured goods and particularly to clothing and fashion. This was true in terms of production as well as consumption, as evidenced by the many articles on the textile industry interspersed between those discussing new department stores and fashion ateliers. Articles about the sale of clothes focused on both the reputed improvement in the quality of clothes being produced in the Soviet Union, and in particular on the newly refined spaces in which clothes were being sold. Thus, a 1935 article praised the cultured environments in which consumers could shop for clothes by describing a women's fashion atelier in Moscow. The article was dominated by a large picture of five women sitting around a grand wooden table, in a richly furnished room, decorated with multiple vases of flowers. As the caption below explained, these women were leafing through fashion magazines from the fashion trust '*Moskvoshvei*', and

snacking on sweets while they pondered the important decision of their next clothing purchase.[51] As it had been in the July 1934 issue of *Nashi Dostezheniia*, female consumption was represented here as a communal activity, in which advice, contemplation and rational well-thought out choices were presented as hallmarks of 'cultured' female shopping.

1930s publications such as *Sovetskaia Torgovlia* and the popular evening newspaper *Vecherniaia Moskva* included stories about men shopping for clothes as well as women, albeit this paradigm of the clothing consumer was markedly less frequent. In addition, when men were pictured or described shopping for clothes, they never did so in such lavish surroundings as women. A picture from a 1935 issue of *Vecherniaia Moskva,* for example, shows two images side by side; one of a man being measured for a greatcoat by a male tailor, who is standing back to admire his handiwork, and the other of two women sitting under a large tasselled lamp, leafing through a fashion magazine. The women are shopping for clothing in the refined and cultivated surroundings of a special fashion room or hall*,* just like that described on the pages of *Sovetskaia Torgovlia,* consulting a female friend or relative on their possible purchases. The man's time seems more precious; he is shown with his (rather simple looking) new coat almost finished, and he stands resolutely looking ahead as the tailor tweaks some final measurements.[52] Indeed, although a number of articles and images from the press in this period showed women sitting and reading fashion magazines in the atelier, none represent men buying new clothes in the same way. In this way, the Soviet press produced clearly demarcated spaces of consumption in the new discourse of Soviet trade, and also a specific understanding of different practices: women were to ponder and consult friends, and men to choose immediately, apparently better able to make a quick (and perhaps utilitarian) decision about the clothing they bought. Nonetheless, it is

important to underline that in the 1930s, in contrast to the later, post-war period, men and women were both presented as target consumers, albeit their modes of consuming varied.

It was around the subtle differentiation of the path to *kulturnost'* for men and women that a gendered discourse of socialist trade coalesced in the 1930s. This was done through the differential modelling of male and female modes of consuming in a cultured manner, as described above, as well as through the development and promotion of stores that sold goods already specifically coded as male or female. The 1930s saw a veritable explosion of cosmetics production, with the state cosmetics company *Tezhe* claiming to be producing over five hundred different types of cosmetic products by 1938, and bureaucrats such as Politburo member (and fan of the 'American mode' of cultured trade exemplified by Macy's) Anastas Mikoian declaring the importance of beauty aids for the Soviet *rabotnitsa*.[53] This increasing emphasis on the development of cosmetics products for women was accompanied by the augmentation of the 'beauty discourse' in the Soviet press, both journals and magazines devoted specifically to women and those directed at a general audience.

Despite the earlier popularity of the image of the ascetic *proletarka*, whose only decorative flourish was a bright red headscarf, the exhortation to female beautification had never entirely gone out of fashion in the Soviet 1920s.[54] Indeed, as Anne Gorsuch has recently argued, Soviet women in the 1920s were active consumers of and participators in a globalized discourse of the 'modern girl' in which particular technologies of the self, such as the wearing of makeup and androgynous clothing, played a key role.[55] However, the question of whether true proletarian women could wear makeup or jewelry was a controversial one. When Party opinion makers or diligent columnists were asked to weigh in on the matter by anxious members of the public, they generally condemned such bourgeois concerns as an interest in cosmetics.[56] By the

mid 1930s, however, politicians were not only proudly declaring the increased production of cosmetics, but newspapers and journals were also encouraging women to take a greater interest in their physical appearance. Thus a 1935 article in *Nashi Dostezheniia*, ostensibly authored by a diligent *rabotnitsa* herself, described the growing necessity of manicures, even for working women who, she argued, needed to respect themselves by looking after their hands as much as anyone.[57] In a 1936 *Rabotnitsa* article entitled 'Culture and Beauty' (*Kultura i krasota*), a *Tezhe* employee criticized the disregard some Soviet women showed towards their face and body. To be 'cultured', the article suggested, a woman needed to pay attention not only to her behavior but also to her external appearance, the beauty of her hands and sweetness of her smell.[58]

Other forms of popular culture also perpetuated the image of the Soviet woman improved and made more cultured by her attention to her physical appearance. This can be seen clearly in the Pygmalion-like storyline of the popular 1940 musical film *Svetlyi Put'* ('The Radiant Path'). In this film the female lead character Tania Morozova (played by the famous film idol Liubov Orlova) climbs the social ladder from lowly maid to exemplary worker (*stakhanovite*).[59] She simultaneously undergoes a physical metamorphosis that sees her shed her headscarf and dirty face for well kept blond curls, a kohl rimmed eye, and a white chiffon dress towards the end of the movie. In case the viewer misses the message of self-transformation and redemption through physical manifestations of *kulturnost'*, towards the end of the film Tania performs a song and dance routine in which she catches a glimpse of herself in the mirror of the heavily gilted ceremonial hall to which she has been invited to win an award. Singing about how far she has come from the lowly life of a servant, Tania looks at her clean, soft new face and suddenly sees an image of the old, dirty, bedraggled face of her servant self. Laughing at her former visage, she whirls off in an ecstasy of self-congratulation.

At the end of the film, Tania receives accolades for her hard work as a *stakhanovite* in a textile factory. She also receives the love of the handsome Aleksei, and acquires a new car in which she can drive around Moscow like the sophisticated urbanite she has become.[60] That Tania's *political* ascendency is signalled by an elevation of her grooming techniques highlights the symbolic importance of correct consumption in high Stalinist Russia. It also supports Vadim Volkov's argument that consumption related to personal appearance – initially clothing but later also makeup and grooming aids – was the earliest and most continually important sphere for the performance of *kulturnost'*.[61] That the cultured mode of consumption could be written on to a woman's face through her use of cosmetics made women the privileged – but not only – canvas for the expression of correct engagement with the socialist market.

Fig.1 Tania at the factory early in *Svetlyi Put'* (above) versus *stakhanovite* Tania at the end of the film (below).[62]

Thus, despite the fact that a major ideological linchpin of earlier Bolshevik discourse had been the erasure of difference between male and female (to come through the shedding of decadent 'feminine' traits such as vanity and lust for possessions) journalistic discussions of cosmetics and the beauty industry were overwhelmingly aimed at a female audience. The shift to a state sponsored discourse of female attention to makeup and perfume can be seen as an indication of the re-orientation of Soviet ideas about ideal femininity in this period. Nonetheless, there was not a complete absence of male beauty discourse. In terms of outward appearances, *kulturnost'* in men was often supposed to manifest itself in the accrual of well tailored suits which replaced dirty factory overalls, a clean shaven appearance, and to a certain extent the wearing of cologne or fashionable hats and ties.[63] The pages of *Stakhanovets*, the journal of the elite group of Soviet workers known as *stakhanovites* who received special privileges for their achievement of great feats of over-production, are dotted with images of be-suited men in modish hats. Many of these well- dressed *stakhanovites* appear pictured in the factory beside non-*Stakhanovite* workers whose lower status is signalled by their tattered clothing.[64] Articles

about the exemplary department stores (*univermagi*) in *Vecherniaia Moskva* often featured descriptions and images of men shopping, while pictures in *Sovetskaia Torgovliia* presented them shopping for 'practical' items such as suits or greatcoats.[65] Further inscribing norms of male dress, the mid 1930s saw criticism in the press of those workers who did not pay sufficient attention to their clothing.[66] This crime was considered particularly heinous if the worker was a *stakhanovite*, as *stakhanovites* were expected to set the 'cultured' example for all other workers. In this way, the censuring of male 'sloppiness' in dress served to both outline a framework for correct male clothing, which included clean pressed suits and well made ties, and also to further solidify the growing hierarchy between 'exemplary' workers and the ordinary rank and file.

Speeches made at the First Conference of Stakhanovites, organized in 1935, indicate the importance of material benefit in the aspirations of these over-achieving workers, both male and female. One *stakhanovite*, the factory worker G I Likhoradov, proudly outlined the material benefit he had gained from his shock work.

> 'Now I will tell you, how I much I earned. In January 1935 without progressive salary I made 184 rubles and 20 kopeks, in February - 350 rubles, in March - 657 rubles, in April - 759 rubles, in May - 813 rubles, In June - 820 rubles in July - 997 rubles, in August - 1220 rubles and in September - 1315 rubles (Applause). My salary rose every day. But I want to earn even more - 2000 rubles, 3 and a half thousand, because our Soviet authorities give that possibility - if you work well, you earn well and *live in a cultured manner* [emphasis mine]. Why can't I go about in a good serge suit, why can't I smoke good cigarettes? I can. If some comrades envy me, what is it to me? (Laughter)'.[67]

The state rewarded *stakhanovites* not only through increasing their salaries, but by giving them gifts in recognition of their hard work. In early 1936, more than nine hundred Stakhanovite coal miners gathered for a congress in Stalino. They were showered with gifts, including 50 automobiles, 25 motorcycles, 500 bicycles, 150 phonographs, 200 hunting rifles, and 150 pocket watches.[68] These gifts are interesting in light of the fact that, as they were awarded to coal

miners (almost always men) they seem to have been chosen with masculine recipients in mind. A female *udarnik* (shock worker) from a Kiev sanatorium recalls the gifts she received from the state each May and October in recognition for the extra work she provided. These included dresses made of *crepe de chine*, perfumes and soaps.[69] A comparison of these two gift selections highlights the care officials took to code certain items as 'male' (hunting rifles, pocket watches) and others as 'female' (dresses, perfume) rewards.

Desiring Goods/Desiring People

It is clear that marketing discourse and the popular press promulgated an image of the female consumer as housewife and by extension, mother and primary care giver for the family. Images of women as workers continued to appear in articles in the general press and women's magazines such as *Rabotnitsa* in this period. They were largely absent, however, from consumer advertising.[70] Rather, in consumption imagery the ‘woman as housewife’ archetype existed alongside, and sometimes in combination with, the 'woman as sophisticated urbanite', a trope we see with reference to cosmetics and perfume advertisements in this period. The 1930s are often imagined historically as a prudish period in the Soviet Union, in which discussion of sexuality was erased from public sphere discourse.[71] However, as Catriona Kelly, Mark Banting and James Riordan have suggested, a period in which a re-emergent pro-natalism enjoyed the intense coverage it did in the 1930s is not one devoid of images of sexuality or implicit references to procreation.[72] Advertising is another sphere in which we can clearly see the importance of sexualized imagery even in official state- sponsored discourse, alongside a paradigm of womanhood that was turning more towards the private sphere and the 'angel in the house'.

As Jean Baudrillard has argued in relation to consumption in capitalist societies, sexuality is the specter that haunts advertising for the most mundane products, from soap to cheese to lawnmowers. Baudrillard differentiates between eroticism in advertising as a domain of signs and exchange and more basic human 'desire'. Sexuality in consumer discourse is represented by the former, not the latter, and it is used to simulate desire but does not necessarily have any relation to genuine desirability.[73] This harnessing of the 'desirable' potential of consumer products is clearly apparent in many Stalin era Soviet advertisements, even those purporting to sell products through images of wholesome families or 'sexless' mothers. The use of sexually suggestive imagery can be seen in marketing for sensuous products such as cosmetics, as in the case of a *Krasnyi Mak* (Red Poppy) lipstick advertisement from 1921.[74] From the bright red lips of the lipstick model to her lowered eyelids and face bent over a flowering poppy, the image is one redolent of both sexual availability and the long tradition of eroticization of the East in European symbolism. Sexually-tinged images were also ubiquitous, however, in the far more common and more quotidian images of wholesome Soviet women proffering soap or toothpaste. Thus in a 1937 advertisement for *Rekord* soap, a tanned woman with honey colored hair and an orange dress holds the soap up for the viewer, her elegant well manicured fingernails clearly on display.[75] She tilts her head to one side and offers a half-smile. Figures such as this woman managed to display both the bronzed and healthy wholesomeness of the ideal young Soviet woman, and the sexual potential of a seductively tilted head and an elegantly sinuous hand. Throughout the 1930s, sensual imagery – sensual in the literal, tangible sense and in the metaphorical, erotic meaning – appeared over and over again, and served to imbue the products they sold with intense desirability along with the promise of erotic self-transformation.

Fig. 2. 'The Best Personal Soap: Rekord.' 1937.[76]

The fact that many of these eroticized images used pictures of women to sell products to women may at first seem counter-intuitive, if we assume that sexualized images of women are aimed at men. However, as Sharon Marcus has recently pointed out, marketing can inspire (and is often predicated on inspiring) an erotic appetite for femininity in women, as well as an appetite for ideals of masculinity in men.[77] A similar dynamic at work in the advertisement of commodities coded as masculine is clearly discernible in the Stalinist 1930s, as we can see in another cigarette advertisement from 1939, this time for Captain cigars. Here, previously noted tropes of strength and decisiveness are combined with a clear focus on the finely chiseled face and firm mouth of the eponymous Captain smoking one of the cigars. Half of his face is in shadow, while light shines on the other half, illuminating his mouth and the cigar that dangles from it. The subtle combination of coverage and exposure of the model's face help contribute to the overall image of both masculine virility and clandestine desirability. This image is aimed not at women (who would be the presumed desiring subjects of men in the context of hegemonic

Soviet heternormativity) but at men. Once again, a sexualized vision of masculinity is engaged to arouse an appetite for the markers of male eroticism in the consumer, who is invited to both identify with, and desire, the object of the advertisement. In this context, the subject and object of the advertisement are collapsed; the intended viewer is encouraged to desire themselves, or rather the ideally eroticized image of themselves that they are sold.

Fig. 3. 'Smoke Captain Cigars.' 1939. [78]

For Baudrillard, desire is intrinsically linked to consumerism not so much because of a Foucauldian 'will to knowledge' about sexuality, but because consumption becomes a forum through which desire can be expressed without actually disrupting the existing social order.[79] If we take Baudrillard's formulation as a model, it can point to one potential driving force behind the development of (reasonably) uniform discursive patterns in 1930s advertising. As already

noted, the 1930s was a period of vast social, economic and political upheavals that has direct impacts on the functions of the family and the relative stability of the gender binary. During this period, the ideal image of femininity gradually became the image of the mother, the nurturer and the keeper of the private domestic sphere, while men dominated the imagined public of the factory floor and the political sphere.[80] We can see these images repeated over and over in the advertisements and much of the journalistic treatments of consumption from the period. However, advertising and other images of consumption also contain a clear element of eroticism which is missing from many of the supposedly 'serious' representations of women in the 1930s, such as photographs of skirt-suit adorned female delegates to the Supreme Soviet occasionally featured in *Rabotnitsa*.[81] Advertising was thus an important site in which anxieties about the role of sexuality in a society supposedly intent on procreation were played out in front of a background of desirable commodities. This function would become increasingly important when the job of mother and homemaker came to be more dominant in the imagery of Soviet women in the post-war period.

Wartime Consumption: Cultured Trade Comes Undone

The invasion of the USSR by Nazi Germany and subsequent onset of the Second World War brought the Soviet trade system to the edge of collapse. This is unsurprising, given that the Soviet Union was fighting the war on its own soil and thus had to mobilize the entire country in a total war for survival. All industry, including light industry and food production, was marshaled for the service of the war effort and the provisioning of the Red Army. In addition, a significant proportion of Soviet industry and in particular agriculture was concentrated in occupied land, and as a result the country lost a major source of vital commodities from grain to wool and pig

meat.[82] In their 1954 book S*ovetskaia Torgovlia v Poslevoennyi Period* (Soviet Trade in the Post-War Period), V Sokolov and R Nazarov claimed that the Nazi occupation cut the Soviet Union off from 204 sugar factories, 47 conserve factories, 157 bread factories, and 4490 meat, cheese, milk and oil goods factories.[83] In addition, the Soviet side lost hundreds of thousands of spinning wheels and looms for the production of woolen fabrics, and millions of pigs, domestic birds, and horses were confiscated by the Germans.[84] Such losses placed an enormous strain on the Soviet trade system, already suffering from one of its cyclical economic crises in 1940.[85] As a result, Soviet trade or *'sovetskaia torgovlia'* as people had begun to know it disappeared as all possible resources were strained to the limit in the struggle to defeat the invader.

One would expect to see a simultaneous excision of the discourse of *kulturnost'* in trade and the existing tropes of cultured (and subsequently gendered) consumers disappear from the pages of the popular press in this period. To some extent this is true, as the events that had fed consumption discourse of the 1930s – the opening of *univermagi*, the new 'cultured' methods of arranging canned foods in the *gastronom* – ceased altogether. Their column inches were filled by frequent articles and anecdotes about production and distribution of provisions for the Red Army.[86] Nonetheless, articles about personal consumption do appear in the popular press intermittently in the war period, albeit discussed in a more subdued register. Thus for example, a picture appears in a 1943 issue of *Vecherniaia Moskva* of a woman inspecting a summer dress held out to her by a somber looking sales assistant. The caption states that this summer dress is most suitable for 'civilian service', and gives the name of the sales assistant from whom to order it.[87] In the same period, *Vecherniaia Moskva* printed a number of articles boasting of the greater volumes of consumer goods 'of wide use' emerging from Moscow factories. These articles claimed that civilian shoes and cotton clothing were in fact being produced in greater numbers

than before the war.[88] The claims are spurious, and contradicted even by the Soviet statistics published soon after 1945.[89] Indeed, the severe shortage of goods during the war necessitated dramatic crisis practices, such as markets for bartering which arose as sites in which urban inhabitants could swap what few manufactured goods they had left for food provided by rural visitors to the city.[90] Nonetheless, the continued, if muted, appearance of aspirational 'abundance' discourse in *Vecherniaia Moskva* indicates the extent to which a discussion of shortages of consumer goods was clearly not acceptable in the popular daily newspapers, even during war time. It also suggests the almost talismanic quality claims of great volumes of new and high quality goods had acquired by this point; such that rather than talk about the sacrifices of the citizenry in wartime, newspapers such as *Vecherniaia Moskva* continued to focus on fantasmatic fashion abundance.

In the midst of this muted, but still present, wartime consumption discourse, the image of consumer played a slightly different role, largely brought about by the material circumstances of the war. Unsurprisingly, women were the primary consumers discussed in the press in this period while most men were assumed to be at the front. A negative conceptualization of women's supposed greater propensity to accumulate consumer goods, which had been an important aspect of NEP discourse on consumption, re-emerged notably. Thus we see in the popular satirical magazine *Krokodil* the paradigm the vacuous female war worker, more worried about her hair and makeup than the important tasks at hand.[91] A cartoon entitled 'The Sufferer' (*Stradalitsa*) mocked a blonde and heavily made-up woman, her tell-tale khaki skirt suit marking her affiliation to the armed forces, sitting behind a desk with her feet up. Putting on lipstick, she declares, 'Please don't speak to me about service! You think I'm here to stick at it? I simply needed to be somewhere to strengthen myself, to receive a better ration. My friend Sophia got

me this job. It is dullness itself. But above all I will live through it!'[92] The Soviet citizen (that is, woman) who would merely serve the war effort for personal gain was thus also marked as a vulgar consumer by her use of cosmetics and wearing of jewelry. The purchase and use of an attractive lipstick from *Tezhe* may have suggested *kulturnost'* in peacetime, but in war time it symbolized vulgarity and *meshchanstvo*, characteristics to which women seemed to be worryingly susceptible in the rhetoric of the period. As this demonstrates, the line between *kulturnost* and *meshchanstvo,* culturedness and petty bourgeois vulgarity, was a very thin one. Arguably, this instability always haunted the notion of *kulturnost* and helped to make it an ideologically powerful resource for the production of highly disciplined Soviet selves, anxious to consume but always aware that it was easy to fall into the trap of consuming in the wrong ways.[93]

The equation of women and a materialistic lust for consumer goods was re-affirmed in the oft noted anecdotes and snide remarks about generals' wives both during and after the war. In the *anekdoty* of this period, generals' wives came to signify the ultimate *nouveau riches*.[94] This was explained in part by the fact that many of the wartime generals had moved up very quickly in the army's ranks as a result of the purges in the late 1930s. Their wives were considered uncultured - *nekulturnyi* - and inappropriate figures to be occupying the upper echelons of society.[95] In addition, the privilege enjoyed by generals and their wives may have appeared flagrant and undeserving to a population suffering as severely as Soviet citizens did in 1941- 1945.

Many of the anecdotes that circulated about these women centered on their desire for certain 'high status' goods, and lack of cultural literacy to put them to good use. A paradigmatic example from the immediate post-war period tells of a general's wife who is having a piano

moved into her apartment. She asks the architect to help her move it into the bedroom rather than the spacious living room. 'But it won't have any resonance in there', he protests. 'Well,' she says, 'my husband lives in Berlin; he can get me resonance from there.'[96] This joke plays on both the wife's supposed lack of *kulturnost'* and her flippant assumption that her husband can buy her anything she wants in the Soviet-occupied West. Another joke tells of generals' wives who go to the theater in highly prized silver fox furs. To show off their wealth, they wear two or three at a time. One night, however, they notice a Marshal's wife sitting ahead of them. She is not wearing a single fur stole. The women whisper among themselves; is it possible fox fur is out of fashion and they did not know? They fling off the furs and walk into the foyer: there they see the Marshal's wife in a dress with seven silver fox fur tails dangling from the hem.[97]

As the generals' wives anecdotes suggest, the war was seen to have given some the opportunity to materially profit and continue to consume conspicuously while others starved. The particular circumstances of the war lent themselves to a re-idealization of asceticism and self-sacrifice, which sat uneasily with what was perceived as the thoughtless consumption of the generals' wives. What is interesting is that men rarely if ever appear as the butt of such jokes, notwithstanding the fact that it was acknowledged that they were often the ones purchasing these goods for their wives or girlfriends.[98] In addition, many men did indeed acquire consumer goods while serving at the front. Not only generals, but even the lowliest foot soldier had the opportunity to witness first hand non-Soviet goods and commodity culture during the Second World War. Stories emerged from Soviet occupied Poland, for example, of Red Army soldiers arriving in Lviv and eyeing 'even modest looking stores', impressed by the apparent embarrassment of riches on offer.[99] Norman Naimark has described the material opportunities afforded some Red Army soldiers in the Soviet occupation of Germany, stating that, especially in

the first years of the occupation, 'Soviet officers could ship back to Moscow with relative ease furs, jewellery, furniture, currency and even automobiles.'[100] Marshal Zhukov was said to have furnished three apartments in this way.[101] Many of the goods acquired in the war found their way on to the market back in the Soviet Union in the late 1940s, were sold privately in urban markets, and served as inspiration and models for those who sought to furnish their home or dress their body in a 'western' manner.[102]

Those who wielded the most power within the Army itself unsurprisingly were more likely to profit from the spoils of war. Nonetheless, the experience of the Red Army soldiers abroad, the vast majority of whom had never been outside the Soviet Union, had the potential to bring about a powerful ideological shift in the way they viewed the opportunities for consumption back home. Whether this occurred remained to be seen on their return home in the immediate post-war period.

Consumption in the Post-War World

The Second World War devastated the Soviet Union economically, socially, environmentally and physically. Despite the enormous upheaval that resulted and the experience of millions of returning Red Army soldiers abroad, however, the post-war period did not see any major structural or ideological changes in the Soviet polity. Instead, the immediate post war period was characterized by an intense 'return to normalcy' discourse that further inscribed the increasingly neo- traditional social norms of the 1930s.[103] Vera Dunham has famously identified the post-War Stalin years as the period in which the increasing (petty) *embourgeoisement* of the Soviet ruling classes ossified into a rigidly patriarchal and anti-progressive social and cultural system that was characterized by vulgarity and *meshchanstvo* above all.[104] In the sphere of

consumption, it is clear that what Dunham would have termed *meshchanstvo* (that is, the idealization of domestic and bourgeois consumer culture) actually began in the 1930s. However, as I shall argue, the post-war period did see a shift in the form of an increasing polarization of gender roles and their place in the economy of consumer culture. As a result, many of the trends observed in the 1930s, such as the shift to images of motherly women in advertising and the emphasis on home decoration and adornment were amplified in the 1940s and early 1950s. This resulted in a cult of domesticity in advertising and consumer culture that increasingly emphasized women's roles in the home and men's roles on the public stage, and paved the way for consumption to take center stage in the Soviet idea of 'peaceful competition' with the West in the Khrushchev period.[105]

The Soviet propaganda department or *Sovinformbiuro*, anxious to demonstrate a speedy recovery from the economic destruction of the war, released a series of photographs between 1947 and 1949 to English-speaking media that attempted to demonstrate the affluence Soviet citizens now enjoyed.[106] Many of the photographs they provided focused on consumer goods, in particular clothing, but also domestic goods such as cooking pots and crockery. Photographs featuring the successes of the Soviet clothing industry were taken at fashion parades of the Moscow House of Fashion. The people featured in these photographs are overwhelmingly women, although there is also a collection of children's clothing (arguably also a 'female sphere of consumption' given the fact that women bore the primary responsibility for children's welfare).[107] Where men are featured, it is generally either modeling leisure clothing along with a woman, as in the case of matching male and female beach suits or evening attire. There are also a few photographs of men shopping for suits; in contrast to the images of female clothing, these photographs show men with the tailor, consulting him on the correct fit and cut for the suit.

There is thus a striking contrast between the elegant world of decorative female fashion parades, and the pragmatic sphere of male clothes shopping. In addition, those photographs that feature household goods, both practical and decorative, feature women exclusively as consumers. No man is shown in the collection shopping for tea settings or cooking utensils, in contrast to the women who are often shown perusing for such items in small groups of two or three. The *Sovinformbiuro* archive thus portrays a world in which male and female spheres of consumption are clearly demarcated. This is in stark contrast to earlier discussions of 'cultured' consumption, such as the 1934 *Nashi Dostezheniia* issue devoted to the *novyi pokupatel'*, which presented both men and women as active participants in the furnishing and decorating of the tasteful home. At least in its idealized form, the space of domestic consumption in the post-war period was destined to be more clearly demarcated on gendered lines.

This augmentation of the late Stalinist discourse of separate spheres of male and female domestic consumption can not only be seen in propaganda aimed at the West but also in the local post-war press. Advertisements, newspaper articles, and bureaucratic publications utilized more clearly than ever before specific tropes of maternal femininity in the home and patriarchal sovereignty in the public, work and production-oriented spheres. Images of men were much less common in consumer advertisements, although they remained in ideological exhortations such as the well-known poster calling on men to 'Train!' featuring a muscly man showing his presumed son his well-toned bicep. Such imagery arguably incorporated more even rigidly stereotypical tropes of masculinity, virility, and strength than before, all the more striking when contrasted with the well coiffed and organized housewife of consumer advertising.

Fig. 4. 'Do you want to be like this? Train!' 1951.[108]

Fig. 5. 'Dumplings: Siberian and Meat.' 1952.[109]

The paradoxical combination of excision and augmentation of masculinity discourse in post-war advertising can be explained by the increasing coding of consumption as largely *female* in this period. The development of a feminized consumption discourse can be seen on the pages of both the general popular press and, unsurprisingly, the women's magazines such as *Rabotnitsa*

and to a lesser extent *Krestianka.* Although *Rabotnitsa* in the 1930s was not devoid of discussions concerning appropriate modes of shopping and advice on fashions and new consumer products, this content was often relegated to the last few pages of an issue. In this way, consumer advice was an important supplement to the many articles on production quotas in predominantly female industries, and new women who were elected as delegates to the Supreme Soviet - but a supplement no less.

This pattern can still be discerned in the immediate post-war period, but by 1946 and 1947 *Rabotnitsa*'s editorial board was clearly placing more emphasis on shopping, cooking, and adorning (oneself and one's home). This led to a proliferation of articles on the 'culturedness' of various department stores, detailed descriptions of new fashions and higher quality clothing, and didactic articles on housekeeping and new housework aids.[110] To a far greater extent than even 1945 and 1946, the late 1940s saw *Rabotnitsa* become an advice manual for the care of the home and the self, rather than one for correct behavior and work ethic in the factory and on the frontline of the class struggle.[111] Whereas previously, fashion plates had made frequent but inconsistent appearances in *Rabotnitsa*, from June 1947 the inside of the back page of the journal was always given over to fashion (*mody*), both for women and occasionally for children.[112] The fashions were also more extravagant than those before the war. Although post-war Soviet leaders criticized Christian Dior's 'New Look' for its excessive use of fabric and bourgeois frivolity, Soviet fashion plates themselves were more likely to feature evening dresses than before the war.[113] Such dresses, which were clearly intended for special occasions, contributed to the sense that one needed to own certain items for everyday and others for evening wear; just a small number of simple dresses would no longer suffice.[114]

As before, every issue of *Rabotnitsa* came with sewing patterns; more and more, however, the magazine seemed to propose the idea that women should buy ready-made clothes as well as (or perhaps instead of) sewing their own and those of their family. At the very least, the fashion plates at the back of the magazine gave women a model of stylish outfitting to which to aspire, and which they could copy on their own with their sewing machines, given access to the necessary material and spare time (both rare luxuries in the post-war Soviet Union). Ready-made children's clothes were also advertised in *Rabotnitsa*, although men's clothes never were.[115] No press organ consistently advertised men's fashions or contained male fashion plates, although the regularly appearing photographs of sharply dressed male Stakhanovites in *Vecherniaia Mokva* may be seen to constitute a 'celebrity' male fashion parade.[116]

Whereas fashion had long played a role, albeit a smaller one, in the pages of *Rabotnitsa,* a real innovation of the late 1940s was the inclusion of articles about and advertisements for cleaning and labor saving devices such as vacuum cleaners, cool boxes, and cooking utensils. Whereas the 1930s had been a period of acute housing shortage, the lack of adequate shelter abated slightly in the post-war reconstruction years.[117] An article from 1950 entitled 'Home Hygiene', for example, describes over two pages the many tasks women in newly built apartments must undertake to keep them looking sparkling and clean. Around the written text are fifteen photographs showing busy housewives undertaking the set tasks; these include washing the windows, dusting the door handles, vacuuming the rugs, beating the carpets, and making the beds with fresh white linen. One of the photographs shows four cleaning products – soaps and detergents – lined up with labels to the front for attentive readers to note down. Only one photograph shows men; it features an adult male and two young boys working in the garden, tying a tomato plant to a stake.[118] This article and others like it powerfully inscribed the notion

that women were the primary domestic laborers.[119] Such representations were not confined to women's magazines; in the late 1940s and early 1950s *Vecherniaia Moskva* carried a number of articles about and advertisements for domestic machines, cooking and cleaning products, always featuring women.[120] These articles and advertisements aimed 'product placement' of new housekeeping tools at women, building a vociferous discourse of domestic consumption that was a new addition to the picture of female consumers that had developed in the 1930s. As Leora Auslander has argued in the context of nineteenth century France, 'bourgeois wives not only had to produce *themselves* as cultural objects, but also needed to acquire, arrange, and use those goods – especially furnishings – defined as necessary for representing and constituting the family's social position.'[121] The same could indeed be said of the middle-class women (masquerading as *rabotnitsy)* represented in the pages of the women's press, who were exhorted to beautify their homes in order to engender pride not only in their own culturedness, but that of their children and family as a whole.

Although articles about or advertisements for furniture and cooking utensils do appear in *Vecherniaia Moskva* in the post-war period, consumption discourse as a whole was much diminished in this general readership newspaper in comparison with its mid 1930s high. The injunction to trade in a 'cultured' manner disappeared, although this is arguably not because such *kulturnost'* was no longer expected in the practice of shopping. The occasional article criticizing a dirty or disorganized shop suggests a continued expectation that shopping should be a culturally enriching experience implicit in the discourse.[122] Rather, the expectation of ‘cultured’ behavior became an almost unspoken discursive norm, the patina of refinement on which other conversations about new shops and higher quality goods were built. Thus as the 'cultured trade' discourse ossified, the thrust to exhort customers to buy certain products or worry about certain

material shortcomings (the wrong furniture or the wrong dress) moved very distinctly to the women's magazines. This further served to polarize male and female consumption; indeed, women became even more the paradigmatic consumers of the post-war period. This is despite the fact that women continued to earn less than men, and were far less likely to be among the cultural or political elite of the country who arguably had greater access to any of the goods discussed in *Vecherniaia Moskva* or *Rabotnitsa* than the population at large.[123]

When articles in the press did appear concerned with men's consumption, particularly of clothing, it was often less a concern for the quality or relative fashionability of the items, but rather their practical deficiencies. Thus, for example, a 1951 *Izvestia* article complained that clothes for tall men were not available in Leningrad department stores, quoting a young student who despaired 'I have been spending all my spare time making the rounds of Leningrad stores; I am looking for a suit size 56, height 5. But so far all my searches for a suit, as well as for an overcoat and a raincoat, have been futile.'[124] The newspaper article complained that bureaucrats in the city's trade department were not doing enough to provide for such men, and openly named the official (a Comrade Kirsanov) that they considered to blame. In contradistinction to occasional complaints about the potentially unstylish nature of some women's clothes on offer, however, the issue was an 'objective' one of insufficient size, not a potentially subjective one of questionable 'elegance' or beauty.

Conclusion

Susan Reid has argued that, while many political commentators have seen Soviet consumer culture as a key to the USSR's downfall, it was just as much a key to its long survival.[125] If we accept the argument of this article, that representations of 'cultured' consumption reflected, re-

inscribed and re-worked the (always in flux) Stalinist gender regime, Reid's argument is certainly compelling. Particularly in the post-war period, the re- domesticization of women, and increased separation of 'male' and 'female' spheres, was arguably a powerful stabilizing force in a country with a population in decline. The intense pro-natalism of the period was reinforced by the amplification of the 'angel in the house' paradigm presented to women through myriad advertisements, women's magazines and newspaper articles. At the same time, the increasing separation of private and public spaces, as represented in consumer discourse, gave the impression of a potentially active male public sphere, which drew men away from the home and such quotidian practices as queuing for food. The fact that this took place in an era in which ideological repression actually gave little room for negotiation of personal political power for men increased its potential as a politically stabilizing, rather than radicalizing, force.

Nonetheless, the gendered discourse of consumption was not static, and neither did it stay the same throughout the Stalin period. As this paper has argued, in the early years of 'cultured trade' the message was mixed, and indeed men were often featured as the primary shoppers for the home, or at least as equally interested in domestic consumer goods as women. Furthermore, in the era of pro-natalism, both male and female sexual desirability was mobilized in advertising and consumption discourse, arguably to redirect the libidinal urges of the buying public to ‘cultured’ ends. The fact that this discourse developed over time, and in part in response to the intense upheaval of the Second World War, belies the notion that the strict separation between male and female consumer spheres discernible by 1953 was part of a deliberate and planned 'Great Retreat' from revolutionary ideals. While the ideal of the female domestic consumer may seem a traditional one, in its apparently perfect reflection of patterns found in nineteenth century French and English bourgeois culture, it in fact arose from specific Soviet exigencies. Why this

discursive pattern – the woman as consumer, the man as producer and bread-winner – seems to recur in different guises across the modern era is a fundamental question for the history of consumption in a global perspective, and one to which Soviet history can offer important insights.

---

[1] Valeria Gerasimova, 'Uvazhaemyi potrebitel'' *Rabotnitsa*, April 1950, pp26-27. *Rabotnitsa* translates directly as 'Woman Worker.' The journal was first launched before the revolution, in 1914, commencing regular production in 1923. The primary Soviet women's magazine (officially aimed at the urban working class, in comparison with the magazine *Krestianka* or 'Peasant Woman') it had a print run of 165000 by 1928 and 400,000 in 1941. Lynne Attwood argues that the readership would have been much higher, as the magazine was usually passed around friends, families and in work places. Lynne Attwood, 'Women Workers at Play: the Portrayal of Leisure in the Magazine *Rabotnitsa* in the First Two Decades of Soviet Power,' in Melanie Ilic (ed), *Women in the Stalin Era,* London: Palgrave, 2001, p. 31.

[2] For a concise analysis of this shift see Julie Hessler, 'Cultured Trade: The Stalinist Turn toward Consumerism,' in Sheila Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Stalinism: New Directions,* London: Routledge, 2000, pp. 182-209.

[3] The term 'Great Retreat' itself comes from émigré sociologist Nicholas Timasheff's influential 1946 work *The Great Retreat: The Growth and Decline of Communism in Russia* (New York: E.P. Dutton & Company, 1946). Timasheff in fact saw what he termed a 'retreat' to the comfort of bourgeois values of the pre-1917 age as a positive sign that communism was indeed 'in decline', and Russia was returning to its true path in world history, that of a civilized, modern nation whose place was with Western Europe and the United States, rather than with the Communist international. Needless to say, Timasheff's ideologically charged interpretation is now largely discredited, but the term 'Great Retreat', though contested, has stuck as a way to describe the raft of changes that accompanied the ideological shift away from a 'cultural revolutionary' mode of iconoclasm that characterized the 1920s to one that emphasized social stability, prosperity, and order. That this occurred during what was arguably one of the most turbulent periods in Soviet history – that of the purges, the Second Five Year Plan, rapid industrialization and the immiseration of rural life – makes it a particularly thorny and confusing historical moment to examine. On 'neo-traditionalism' as a useful mode for thinking about both the uneasy combination of radical and conservative in the ideology of this period see Terry Martin, 'Modernization or neo-traditionalism? Ascribed nationality and Soviet Primordialism' in Sheila Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Stalinism: New Directions,* New York: Routledge, 2000, pp. 348-367.

[4] As Vadim Volkov has explored in his influential work on the Soviet idea of 'culturedness' (*kulturnost'*), the Stalinist injunction to become 'cultured' included calls to monitor the cleanliness, hygiene and appearance of oneself and one's home, exhortations that incorporated the idea of remaking private life through the purchase of the correct products, in the correct manner. Vadim Volkov, 'The Concept of *Kulturnost'*: Notes on the Stalinist Civilising Practice,' in Sheila Fitzpatrick, *Stalinism: New Directions,* London: Routledge, 2000, pp. 210-230.

[5] On the huge sex ratio imbalance in post-war Soviet society see Mie Nakachi, 'Replacing the Dead: The Politics of Reproduction and Demography in the Postwar Soviet Union, 1944–1968', PhD Chicago, 2008.

[6] It is important to emphasize that any separation between male/public and female/private spheres was *imagined* rather than actual in this period (although semiotic distinctions between public and private can of course have concrete effects in practice). Official state policy continued to enjoin women's participation in the workplace and the level of female employment remained high until the end of the Soviet Union; see Attwood, *Creating the New Soviet Woman,* pp.150-155. On the evolution of women's labor participation see Marcelline Hutton, 'Women in Russian Society from the Tsars to Yeltsin,' in Wilma Rule and Norma C. Noonan, *Russian Women in Politics and Society,* Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1996, pp. 63-76.

[7] See especially Chapter 8, 'The Family, the School, the Church,' in Timasheff, *The Great Retreat.*

[8] David Hoffman, 'Was there a Great Retreat from Soviet Socialism? Stalinist Culture Reconsidered,' *Kritika,*5:4, 2004, p. 674.

[9] David Hoffmann, 'Mothers in the Motherland: Stalinist Pro-natalism in its Pan-European Context,' *Journal of Social History,* 34:1, 2000, p. 36.
[10] Anna Krylova, 'Stalinist Identity from the Viewpoint of Gender: Rearing a Generation of Professionally Violent Women-Fighters in 1930s Stalinist Russia,' *Gender and History,* 16:3, 2004, p. 628.
[11] The recent surge of literature on Soviet consumption aiming to address this lacuna includes Julie Hessler, *A Social History of Soviet Trade: Trade policy, Retail Practices and Consumption 1917-1953*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004; Amy Randall, *The Soviet Dream World of Retail Trade and Consumption in the 1930s*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008; Randi Cox, 'All This Can be Yours! Soviet Commercial Advertising and the Social Construction of Space, 1928-1956,' in Evgeni Dobrenko and Eric Naiman, *The Landscape of Stalinism: The Art and Ideology of Soviet Space*, Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2003, pp125-162; Randi Cox, 'Nep without Nepmen! Soviet Advertising and the Transition to Socialism,' in Christina Kiaer and Eric Naiman, *Everyday Life in Early Soviet Russia: Taking the Revolution Inside*, Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 2005, pp119-151; Marjorie Hilton, *Selling to the Masses: Retailing in Russia, 1880-1930,* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2011; Sally West, *I Shop in Moscow: Advertising and the Creation of Consumer Culture in Late Tsarist Russia,* De Kalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2011.
[12] Amy Randall, 'Legitimizing Soviet Trade: Gender and the Feminization of the Retail Workforce in the Soviet 1930s,' *Journal of Social History,* 37:2, 2004, pp. 965-990. See also chapter 3, 'Legitimizing Soviet Trade,' of Randall, *The Soviet Dream World.*
[13] Randall, 'Legitimizing Soviet Trade,' p. 971.
[14] Randi Cox, 'All This Can be Yours!' pp. 144, 148; Hilton, *Selling to the Masses,* pp. 185-186.
[15]Susan Reid, 'Stalin's Women: Gender and Power in Soviet Art of the 1930s,' *Slavic Review,* 57:1, 1998, pp. 133-173.
[16] A classic work on mass consumption and social identification, focusing in this case on class and ethnic identity, is Lizabeth Cohen, *Making a New Deal: Industrial Workers in Chicago 1919-1939,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
[17] Roberts, 'Gender, Consumption and Commodity Culture,' p. 818.
[18] Abigail Solomon-Godeau, 'The Other Side of Venus: The Visual Economy of Feminine Display', in de Grazia and Furlough, *The Sex of Things*, p. 113.
[19] This idea drove the first, chaotic and uneven nationalization and municipalisation of the retail trade in 1918; see Hilton, *Selling to the Masses,* pp. 180-186; Hessler, *A Social History,* pp. 51-100.
[20] On the often rancorous debates surrounding the introduction of NEP among leading Bolsheviks see Alec Nove, *An Economic History of the USSR, 1917-1991*, London: Penguin Books, 1992, pp. 119-135.
[21] An undercurrent of anti-trade rhetoric continued throughout the Stalinist period, particularly in periods of shortage and rationing, albeit it was often drowned out by the cultured trade discourse. The ebbs and flows of Soviet anti-trade discourse and policies are expertly investigated in Hessler's *A Social History of Soviet Trade.*
[22] Eric Naiman, *Sex in Public: The Incarnation of Early Soviet Ideology,* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997, pp. 79-80.
[23] Naiman, *Sex in Public.*
[24] For a cultural history of revolutionary asceticism as Soviet ideal see Richard Stites, *Revolutionary Dreams: Utopian Vision and Experimental Life in the Russian Revolution,* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989, especially pp. 61-76.
[25] Alan Ball, *Russia's Last Capitalists: The NEPMEN 1921-1929,* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.
[26] Gail Lapidus, *Women in Soviet Society: Equality, Development, and Social Change*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978, p. 74.
[27] Ia Burov, 'Partiia i sem'ia partiitsa', *Pravda* August 8 1923, p. 1; cited in Elizabeth Wood, *The Baba and the Comrade: Gender and Politics in Revolutionary Russia*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997, p. 205.
[28] On prostitution under NEP see Frances Bernstein, *The Dictatorship of Sex: Lifestyle Advice for the Soviet Masses,* Dekalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2009; Natalia Lebina and Mikhail Shkarovskii, *Prostitutsiia v Peterburge,* Moscow: Progress-Akademiia, 1994.
[29] Cox, 'All This Can Be Yours!' p. 147; Hilton, *Selling to the Masses,* pp. 185-186.
[30] On the rise and fall of cacophonous NEP-era advertising see Cox, 'All This Can Be Yours!' pp. 131-133.
[31] See Jennifer Jones, '*Coquette* and *Grissette*: Women Buying and Selling in *Ancien Regime* Paris', in de Grazia and Furlough, *The Sex of Things*, pp25-52 and Victoria Thompson, *The Virtuous Marketplace*: *Women and Men, Money and Politics in Paris 1830-1870,* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 2000.
[32] Wood, *The Baba and the Comrade*, pp. 208.

[33] Naiman, *Sex in Public*.
[34] On the spatial marginalization of prostitutes as 'socially harmful elements' in the 1920s and 1930s see David Shearer, *Policing Stalin's Socialism: Repression and Social Order in the Soviet Union, 1924-1953,* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009, p. 59. For a discussion of the productive nature of the contradiction between Soviet promises to rescue prostitutes and policing practices that targeted them as socially harmful elements see Chapter Five: 'The Corporeal Politics of Socialism,' in Philippa Hetherington, 'Victims of the Social Temperament: Prostitution, Migration and the Traffic in Women in Imperial Russia and the Soviet Union, 1885-1935,' PhD Dissertation, Harvard University, 2014.
[35] For the original formulation of this period as one of 'cultural revolution' see Sheila Fitzpatrick, 'Cultural Revolution in Russia 1928-1932,' *Journal of Contemporary History,* 9:1, 1974, pp. 33-52.
[36] Hessler, *A Social History,* pp. 197-243.
[37] V M Molotov*, The Tasks of the Second Five Year Plan*, Seventeenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, New York: International Publishers, 1934, p. 9
[38] Molotov, *Tasks of the Second Five Year Plan*, p. 83.
[39] Molotov, *Tasks of the Second Five Year Plan*, p. 85.
[40] The original text reads 'Pora vam znat', ia tozhe sovremennik/ Ia chelovek epokhi Moskvoshveia/ Smotrite, kak na mne toporshchitsia pidzhak.' Osip Mandel'shtam, *Kamen'*, Kharkov: Folio, 2003, p240 ['Midnight in Moscow' was first published 1932, poem dated May-July 1931].
[41] As Randi Cox has explored, much of this work was done through Soviet advertising, which sought to transform social practices through the transformation of Soviet public space. Cox, 'All This Can Be Yours!'
[42] Gorky's description of his journal's goals are cited in Michael David-Fox, *Showcasing the Great Experiment: Cultural Diplomacy and Western Visitors to the Soviet Union,* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012, p. 153. His championing of the Soviet person's 'victory over themselves' echoes Volkov's notion that Stalinist *kulturnost'* called for individual to be constantly 'working on themselves' to produce a new, more enlightened being. Volkov, 'The Concept of Kulturnost,' especially p. 224.
[43] I Rudin, 'Pokupatel' mebeli'' *Nashi Dostezheniia* (further *ND*) July 1934, pp83-89; A Pis'mennyi, 'Inventar' Zdorov'ia i sily', *ND,* July 1934, pp91-95; V Lebedev, 'Krasivaia Veshch'', *ND*, July 1934, pp. 97-102.
[44] N Kal'ma, 'Novyi Pokupatel'', *ND*, July 1934, pp. 103-110.
[45] N Kal'ma, 'Novyi Pokupatel'', *ND*, July 1934, p. 104.
[46] Cox, 'All this can be yours!' p. 144.
[47] Cox, 'All this can be yours!' p. 127.
[48] The 1930s can thus be contrasted, for example, with the picture Anne Gorsuch has painted of the gender dynamics of the Soviet youth League, the Komsomol, in the earlier NEP period. Then, she argues, 'the masculine culture of the Komsomol asserted the pre-eminence and prerogatives of public life over private,' and ideal 'obviously easier for young men to achieve than young women.' Anne Gorsuch, *Youth in Revolutionary Russia: Enthusiasts, Bohemians, Deliquents,* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, p. 111.
[49] The journals' name changed again to *Voprosy Sovetskoi Torglovi* ('Questions of Soviet Trade') in 1938. See 'Sovetskaia Torgovliia,' *Bolshaia Sovetskaia Entsikploediia,* Moscow: Sovetskaia Entsiklopediia, 1968-1970.
[50] *Sovetskaia Torgovlia* (hereafter *ST*) February 1 1935; *ST,* May 1 1935; *ST,* August 29 1935.
[51] 'Damskoe atelier mod', *ST*, 25 August 1935. *Moskvoshvei* was the name of the 'Moscow Sewing Trust,' the collective of textile factories in the Moscow region, one of ten such trusts formed from the Russian textile and clothing firms nationalized in 1918. See Djurdja Bartlett, *FashionEast: The Specter that Haunted Socialism,* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2010, p274, n.8. For more on the Soviet clothing industry see Larissa Zakharova, *S'habiller a la Sovietique: La Mode et le Dégel en URSS,* Paris: CNRS editions, 2011.
[52] Untitled picture with caption, *Vecherniaia Moskva* (further *VM*), April 3 1935.
[53] Gronow. *Caviar With Champagne,* p56. For a history of *Tezhe* see Olga Kravats and Ozlem Sandikci, 'Marketing for Socialism: Soviet Cosmetics in the 1930s,' *Business History Review,* 87:3, 2013, pp. 461-487.
[54] Lynne Attwood, *Creating the New Soviet Women: Women's Magazines as Engineers of Female Identity*, *1922-1953,* London: Macmillan Press, 1999, pp. 66-71.
[55] Anne Gorsuch, 'The Dance Class or the Working Class: The Soviet Modern Girl', in Alys Weinbaum et al, *The Modern Girl Around the World: Consumption, Modernity, and Globalization*: Durham: Duke University Press, 2008, pp174-193. See also Gorsuch's discussion of internal Komsomol debates about makeup in the 1920s, in which the wearing of lipstick and powder was deemed 'hooliganism' by male commentators, in Gorsuch, *Youth in Revolutionary Russia,* p. 112.
[56] Atwood, *Creating the New Soviet Woman,* pp. 66-67.

[57] M Dal'tseva, 'Ruki', *Nashi Dostezheniia* (further *ND*), March 1935, p. 110.
[58] M. Iurina, 'Kultura i Krasota', *Rabotnitsa,* March 1936, p. 17, citied in Gronow, *Caviar with Champagne,* p. 56.
[59] A useful summary and critical analysis of *Svetlyi Put'* can be found in Chapter 4 'Svetlyi Put': The Radiant Path' in Rimgaila Salys, *The Musical Comedy Films of Grigorii Aleksandrov: Laughing Matters,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009, pp. 281-340.
[60] *Svetlyi Put'*, Dir. Grigory Aleksandrov, Performers Liubov Orlova, Evgeni Samoilov. Mosfilm, 1939. DVD Entsiklopediia Mastera Kino, 2006. In oral history interviews of women who lived in the Stalin era, Yulia Gradskova has found that imitation of film actresses and their appearance was a central 'beauty practice' for women in this period. She mentions Liubov Orlova specifically as an important source of inspiration. Yulia Gradskova, *Soviet People with Female Bodies: Performing Beauty and Maternity in Soviet Russia in the mid 1930s – 1960s*, Stockholm: Stockholm University, 2007, p. 176.
[61] Volkov, 'The Concept of Kulturnost,' p. 127.
[62] Screenshots from Grigorii Aleksandrov, *Svetlyi Put',* 1940.
[63] See for example *ND*, 'Novyi Pokupatel.' While commentators emphasized the importance of well-tailored suits and manicured appearances for men, they also harshly criticized those who had 'silk shirts but dirty underwear' for their superficial commitment to *kulturnost'*; see Pavel Polynskii, 'Kul'tura "na pokaz",' *Sovetskaia Torgovliia,* 2 January 1935, p. 3.
[64] See for example *Stakhanovets*, June 1940, p10; *Stakhanovets*, June 1940, p. 27.
[65] See 'Kak vam nravitsia fason?', *ST,* 29 August 1935, p. 3.
[66] See for example *Pravda,* April 20 1936.
[67] *Pervoe Vsesoiuznoe Sovershchanie Rabochikh i Rabotnits-Stakhanovtsev, 14-17 Noiabria, 1935, Stenograficheskii otchet,* Partizdat TsK VKP(b) 1935, p. 180.
[68] Cited in Lewis H Seigelbaum, *Stakhanovism and the Politics of Productivity in the USSR, 1935-1941,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988, p. 228.
[69] Harvard University Russian Research Center, *Harvard Project on the Soviet Social System*, Schedule A, Volume 25, Case 490, p. 14.
[70] It is important to note that consumption is one of the few spheres in which imagery of women as workers (both factory and agricultural) was unimportant in this period; for example, such imagery played an important ideological role in the representation of women as the Soviet people being subordinated to the Soviet state in art of the 1930s. This is a key argument of Reid, 'Stalin's Women.'
[71] See for example Orlando Figes, *The Whisperers: Private Life in Stalin's Russia*, London: Macmillan, 2007, p. 161.
[72] Catriona Kelly, Mark Banting and James Riordan, 'Sexuality', in Catriona Kelly and David Shepherd, *Russian Cultural Studies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998, pp. 311-351.
[73] Jean Baudrillard, *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures,* London: Sage, 1998, p. 14.
[74] Loose leaf from *Soviet Means Excellent! The Soviet Advertising Poster of the 1930s-60s,* Moscow: Kontakt: Kultura, 2002.
[75] Loose leaf from *Soviet Means Excellent!* 2002.
[76] Loose leaf from *Soviet Means Excellent!* 2002.
[77] Marcus, *Between Women*, p. 112.
[78] Loose leaf from *Soviet Means Excellent!* 2002.
[79] Baudrillard, *The Consumer Society*, p. 14.
[80] Susan Reid has examined in depth the importance of the image of woman as homemaker in the Soviet context; see for example Reid, 'Cold War in the Kitchen,' and Susan Reid, 'Communist Comfort: Socialist Modernism and the Making of Cozy Homes in the Khrushchev Era,' *Gender and History,* 21:3, 2009, pp. 465-498.
[81] Gradskova, *Soviet People with Female Bodies*, p. 148.
[82] V Sokolov and R Nazarov, *Sovetskaia Torgovlia v Poslevoennyi Period*, Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1954.
[83] Sokolov and Nazarov, S*ovetskaia Torgovlia,* p. 36.
[84] Sokolov and Nazarov, S*ovetskaia Torgovlia,* p. 36.
[85] On the crisis of the late 1930s and its social and political effects, see Roberta T. Manning, 'The Soviet Economic Crisis of 1936-1940 and the Great Purges,' in John Arch Getty and Roberta T. Manning, *Stalinist Terror: New Perspectives,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
[86] See for example 'Konservy dlia Krasnoi Armii', *VT*, Janurary 15 1943; Untitled illustration of women sewing underwear for the Red Army, *VT,* February 13, 1943; Untitled photograph of women working for *Voentorg,* preparing parcels for the front, *VT*, March 13, 1943.

[87] Untitled picture with caption, *VT,* January 12, 1943.
[88] See for example Untitled photo of female workers packing new shoes, *VT*, March 13 1943; Untitled picture of women sewing ready-made civilian clothing, *VT*, March 10, 1943. Both of these pictures have captions opening with a rousing 'More goods of wide use!' (*Bolshe tovarov shirokogo potrebleniia!*).
[89] *Sovetskaia torgovlia poslevoennyi period.*
[90] Gradskova, *Soviet People with Female Bodies*, p. 172.
[91] Interestingly, I did not observe an analogous paradigm of the vacuous and irresponsible male war worker or soldier.
[92] 'Stradalitsa', *Krokodil*, 41, p. 8.
[93] The notion that *kulturnost* was a cultural discourse that served the 'inculcation of disciplines that proceeded without recourse to open violence and terror' in the Stalinist period is from Volkov, 'The Concept of Kulturnost,' p. 211.
[94] Russian literary scholar Seth Graham defines the Russian *anekdot* as having 'a primary connotation similar to that of the word "joke" in the Anglophone West: an exceptionally productive form of oral culture consisting of a brief, terminally humorous narrative and/or dialogue.' Seth Graham, 'A Cultural Analysis of the Russo-Soviet *Anekdot*' PhD. Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 2003, p. 1. On the role of the *anekdot* in Stalinist culture see Robert W. Thurston, 'Social Dimensions of Stalinist Rule: Humor and Terror in the USSR, 1935-1941,' *Journal of Social History,* 24:3, 1991, pp. 541-562.
[95] Bruce Friend Adams, *Tiny Revolutions in Russia: Twentieth-century Soviet and Russian History in Anecdotes*, London: Routledge, 2005, pp. 41-42; Robert Magidoff, *In Anger and Pity, A Report on Russia,* Double City, NY: Doubleday Books, 1949, pp. 133-134.
[96] Magidoff, *In Anger and Pity*, p. 134.
[97] Adams, *Tiny Revolutions in Russia,* p. 42.
[98] It is of course entirely possible that jokes and anecdotes mocking materialistic men who profit from the war existed. Given the nebulous nature of jokes as a source, it is very difficult to get anything approaching an exhaustive collection of them; I am only able to state that such jokes do not appear in anthologies such as the Bruce Friend Adams *Tiny Revolutions* cited above, or in the contemporaneous first-person accounts I have accessed such as Robert Magidoff's memoir.
[99] Jan T Gross, *Revolution From Abroad: The Soviet Conquest of Poland's Western Ukraine and Western Belorussia,* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002, p. 48.
[100] Norman Naimark, *The Russians in Germany: a History of the Soviet Zone of Occupation*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996, pp. 173-175.
[101] Naimark, *The Russians in Germany,* p. 174.
[102] Gradskova, *Soviet People with Female Bodies*, p. 142.
[103] Elena Zubkova, *Russia After the War: Hopes, Illusions and Disappointments 1945-1957*, Hugh Ragsdale (trans.), Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1998, pp31-39, 101-108; Sheila Fitzpatrick, 'Postwar Soviet Society: The Return to Normalcy, 1945-1953,' in Lloyd E. Lee (ed.), *World War II: Crucible of the Contemporary World,* New York: M.E. Sharpe, 1991, pp. 248-275.
[104] Vera Dunham, *In Stalin's Time*, pp. 3-23.
[105] This is the topic of Susan Reid's article 'Cold War in the Kitchen.'
[106] A collection of over five thousand of these photographs are currently at Harvard University, comprising the *Sovinform Bureau Photograph Collection*. This particular collection of Sovinform photographs made its way to the United States via the Moscow and Prague offices of the World News Service, to which they had been distributed. A journalist working in Moscow, Andrew Steiger, brought them to the United States in 1953, after he left the World News Service for Reuters. Steiger was tried as a Communist during the Macarthy era, and during this time the photographs found their way into the archival collections of the Russian Research Center at Harvard. See Ernest A Zitser, 'Picturing the Soviet Union's 'Greatest Generation': The Soviet Information Bureau Photograph Collection of the Davis Center for Russian and Eurasian Studies,' *Slavic and East European Information Resources,* 8:1, 2007, pp. 3-10.
[107] On postwar pro-natalism, as official policy and cultural discourse, see Mie Nakachi, 'N.S. Khrushchev and the 1944 Soviet Family Law: Politics, Reproduction, Language, *East European Politics and Societies,* 20, 2006, pp. 40-68; Deborah Ann Field, *Private Life and Communist Morality in Khrushchev's Russia,* New York: Peter Lang, 2007.
[108] Loose leaf from *Soviet Means Excellent!* 2002.
[109] Loose leaf from *Soviet Means Excellent!* 2002.

[110] See for example 'Na vistavke tkanei', *Rabotnitsa,* April 1947, p. 16; 'Sukhaia kozha i ukhod za neiu', *Rabotnitsa*, May 1947, p19; 'Gigienia Kukhni', *Rabotnitsa*, November 1947, p. 19.
[111] Attwood, *Creating the New Soviet Woman,* pp. 149-167.
[112] For the first example of the regular back page fashion spread see 'Mody' *Rabotnitsa*, June 1947, inside of the back page.
[113] On Dior in Moscow see Susan Reid, 'Cold War in the Kitchen: Gender and the De-Stalinization of Consumer Taste in the Soviet Union Under Khrushchev', *Slavic Review*, 61:2, 2002, p. 237.
[114] Gradskova, *Soviet People with Female Bodies*, p. 152.
[115] For an example of the advertising of ready-made children's clothes in *Rabotnitsa* see Untitled fashion plate, *Rabotnitsa*, July 1947, p. 24.
[116] See for example Untitled photo of five Stakhanovites, *VT*, October 20 1950.
[117] On the 1930s housing shortage see Seigelbaum, *Stakhanovism,* p. 217.
[118] 'Gigena zhilishcha', *Rabotnitsa,* January 1950, pp. 28-29.
[119] For further examples of *Rabotnitsa* articles concerning domestic labor and 'home hygiene' see 'Byvaet tak', *Rabotnitsa,* March 1950, p. 27; 'Bol'shaia zabota', *Rabotnitsa*, August 1950, pp. 12-13.
[120] See for example 'Vistavka letno-vesenaia plat'ia', *VT*, February 28, 1949.
[121] Leora Auslander, 'The Gendering of Consumer Practices in Nineteenth Century France', in de Grazia and Furlough, *The Sex of Things*, p83.
[122] See for example 'Prodavtsi i pokupateli', *VT*, 11 February 1949.
[123] For a discussion of the female-male wage differential in the Soviet Union and its trajectory during transition see Elizabeth Brainerd, ‘Women in Transition: Changes in Gender Wage Differentials in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union,’ *Industrial Labor Relations Review,* 54:1, 2000, pp. 138-162.
[124] G. Ryklin. *Izvestia*, June 3, 1951.
[125] Reid, 'Cold War in the Kitchen,’ p. 212.