NUMBER 148

CONSTRUCTIVISM AND EARLY SOVIET FASHION DESIGN

John E. Bowlt

Conference on

THE ORIGINS OF SOVIET CULTURE

Sponsored by

Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies
The Wilson Center

May 18-19, 1981

John E. Bowlt

Constructivism and Early Soviet Fashion Design[1]

The discipline of fashion design, especially fashion design of the 1920s, is still outside the main areas of academic enquiry, and except for a few scholarly analyzes as, for example, by Roland Barthes, it remains rather distant from art history. There are many reasons for this -- not least the fact that art history is concerned primarily with the traditional fine arts, i.e. painting, sculpture and architecture, and, despite the considerable strides in ethnic and folklore studies, in design and environment appreciation, there still exists an imbalance between what are called conventionally the high arts and the low arts.

This orthodox hierarchy with its alternate laudation and condescension does have particular validity in certain periods of the development of art, but it is quite inadequate in the context of Russian, German and Hungarian cultural developments just before and after the First World War. What is clear from the art of the Russian Revolution of October, 1917 is that its progressive styles in art -- Futurism, Suprematism, Constructivism -- were universal styles intended to apply to art and to life in equal degree: it was essential "to reconstruct not only objects, but also the whole domestic way of life ....both its static and kinetic forms".[2] If anything, the art of life, i.e. design, replaced, momentarily, the art of art. As a group of avant-garde artists declared in November, 1921: "We consider self-sufficient studio art and our activity as mere painters to be useless ....We declare industrial art as absolute and Constructivism as its only form of expression".[3] One of the key branches of design to which the new artists gave attention was textile and clothes design.

It is generally recognized that Constructivism received its primary stimulus as an art of design during the first years of the Soviet regime. Given its name in Moscow in 1921 by Kazimir Medunetsky and the Stenberg brothers, Georgii and Vladimir, Constructivism evolved rapidly into a revolutionary, topical and potential movement. However, it is wise to remember that the movement was not born in a vacuum and it should not be separated from its socio-political context (which we tend to do today through museum exhibitions, auctions, gallery sales, etc.). Constructivism should not be regarded as a school of permanent works of art: if in the remote past the work of art was created as a sacred act and as a metaphor for infinity, the Constructivist design and, indeed, much of the art related to it such as the paintings of Mondrian and Malevich, was produced as a momentary gesture, an intended transience -- the prelude to our own society of throw-away objects and built-in obsolescence. No doubt, the leading Constructivists such as László Moholy-Nagy, Liubov Popova, Alexandr Rodchenko, Vladimir Tatlin and Theo van Doesburg would be appalled to learn that their various projects and sketches were now being perpetuated in frames, in scholarly symposia and in museum catalogs. The question of impermanence and the Constructivist esthetic is a fascinating one and, undoubtedly, it is the chief element that distinguishes this boldly 20th century movement from previous styles and artistic systems.

A second characteristic of Constructivism is, indeed, its universality. During the 1920s, whether in Moscow, Berlin, Budapest or Warsaw, one could have spoken of a Constructivist painting, a Constructivist plate, a Constructivist building, a Constructivist chair, a Constructivist dress, a Constructivist stage design, a Constructivist

book cover, even a Constructivist garden. Normally, this was not the case with art movements immediately preceding Constructivism. There was no Cubist architecture, there were no Symbolist chairs, there were no Realist dresses. But before that, e.g. in the eras of the High Renaissance or Classical Antiquity, an artistic term or esthetic was often applicable to cultural endeavors outside of painting, sculpture and architecture. One can, indeed, refer to Renaissance furniture or Classical dress design inasmuch as the societies that supported these concepts were cohesive, integrated, whole. The 19th century with its social, political and artistic fragmentation destroyed this totality. Constructivism tried to synthesize the arts again, to put the pieces of that Victorian hero, Humpty-Dumpty, back together again.

These general remarks help us to elucidate the derivation and development of Constructivist textile and dress design in post-Revolutionary Russia. This particular medium, in fact, attracted many important artists, including Alexandra Exter, Kazimir Malevich, Popova, Rodchenko, Varvara Stepanova and Tatlin, and it can be regarded as a microcosm of the entire Constructivist movement, for its artistic principles closely parallelled the principles supported by architects, book illustrators, stage designers, etc. of the same period.

Although cultural life immediately after the October Revolution was confusing and in a state of flux, important statements were made either by politicians or by their artistic sympathizers concerning the role and potential of art in the new society. Of course, the central question was what kind of art could embody the aims of the Revolution. Answers were various, although the notion of a proletarian art or proletarian style was discussed by all parties concerned. What

exactly a proletarian art was, no-one fully explained, although Trotsky dismissed it as a nonentity, inasmuch as any art carrying the title proletarian presupposes a class art; however, he argued, within a short time, class divisions would disappear as a result of the international revolution and, consequently, it was misleading to consider the idea of a proletarian culture at all: there would be a culture of some kind very soon, but it would not be called proletarian.[4] Other interpreters of proletarian culture, including Alexandr Bogdanov, leader of the Proletkult movement, insisted that proletarian art was a mechanical, industrial art and that the concept of the inspired artist sequestered in his intimate studio was an anachronism: the revolutionary artist was the worker who freed himself from the weight of his cultural heritage and who worked in close proximity to the factory.[5] A third interpretation of proletarian culture was that it must be international and "anonymous" since the Russian Revolution was, it was argued, only the first in a series of worldwide revolutions; proletarian art, therefore, must not rely on narrow, nationalist motifs but on forms that were neutral, untrammelled by parochial associations -- one reason why abstract forms were offered by the new artists as the answer to this need: abstract form, they maintained, is international, independent of anecdotal, local content and readily accessible to the eye whether in Russia, in Europe or the US. A fourth interpretation of proletarian art was that it must be a dynamic, mobile and variable art because the Revolution was a perpetual and a universal one. A fifth interpretation was that proletarian culture or, rather, the proletarian style must affect the whole of the new society, so that every aspect would be transformed in order to reflect the socio-economic revolution: not only the more obvious manifestations of social

structure such as architecture and interior design, but also language, the way a person walks and behaves, human relationships, the way a person dresses.

To a greater or lesser extent, the above principles are identifiable with Constructivist fashion design in Soviet Russia in the 1920s. Fashion, perhaps, is an inappropriate term here because of its immediate associations with Paris haute couture. The leading Constructivists, in fact, aspired to create a consistent, democratic style that would replace both the notion of a fashion for the élite and, no less important, the mass eclecticism of the post-Revolutionary period. The sudden accessibility of luxury good from abandoned aristocratic and bourgeois homes such as Persian carpets, Sèvres vases and bamboo furniture led to the most bizarre combinations in workers' and peasants' homes and clubs.[6] A similar clash of styles and ideas was evident in dress design just after the Revolution. Popova, Rodchenko, Stepanova, Tatlin tried to counter this plurality with a single, rational style when they turned to textile and dress design in 1923 onwards.

While the emergence of a distinctive, Soviet style of textile and clothing in the early 1920s might seem unexpected and incompatible with the mediocre achievement of Soviet fashion nowadays, it should be remembered that throughout the Modernist period Russian artists gave particular attention to the design of fabrics and clothes, and that Popova, Stepanova and their colleagues drew on an established tradition. In this connection, mention should be made of Lev Bakst since he presented the culmination of that process of stylization identifiable with pre-Revolutionary design -- with the style moderne exemplified by dress-makers such as Brisac, Florand and Gindus (St. Petersburg) or Worth, Paquin and Poiret (Paris). Bakst's immediate source of inspira-

tion in his fashion work was his own projects for ballet productions such as Schéhérazade (1910) and L'Oiseau du feu (1910) in which he introduced rsdical conceptions of costume and decor. What was innovative here was not the elaborate sensuality of the ensembles, but the underlying method of emphasis and exaggeration of the body's movement. Bakst treated the body as the primary organizational element on stage (and in the salon) and hence as the determinant of the costume's "expression". This induced him not only to expose the body at certain strategic points, but also to extend its physical movements outwards and not to conceal them, as 19th century European theatrical and social dress had done. Furthermore, Bakst used the feathers, pendants, veils, loose trousers of his creations not as mere ornaments, but as functional devices, intending them to amplify and expand the actions of the body itself.

Of course, in his individual dress designs of ca. 1910 onwards, Bakst was forced to reduce this exuberance so as to conform with the client's taste, but even in his plainest pieces the absence of the corset and sometimes of the brassière, the emphasis on the long, loose dress with cadential folds and a half-moon base maintained his conception of the female anatomy as a kinetic generator and not as a static figure 8. In this lay the more "democratic" element of Bakst's design principles, i.e. the notion that every anatomy creates its own rhythms and that the looser the garment, the easier the projection of these rhythms becomes, whatever the proportions of the figure. Until the Revolution, Bakst was the arbiter of haute couture in Russia. A glance at St. Petersburg fashion magazines for 1916-17 demonstrates this immediately.[7]

Paradoxically, Bakst pointed to important concepts of dress construction which early Soviet designers, especially Popova, also at-

tained and developed. Still, Bakst was both the creator of, and slave to, fashion. He created only for a small, wealthy class, and while his ideas of rhythm and freedom of the body were progressive, he himself did not regard that as the probable future trend. On the contrary, in 1913 Bakst envisaged a highly decorative, rhapsodical design and not a simple, functional one.[8] But by 1922 we read that "people have fallen out of love with Bakst and have fallen in love with industrial clothing".[9] This rapid development from "artistic" to "utilitarian" levels of fabric and dress design, in broader terms, from the "reproductional" to the "constructional",[10] was stimulated by the activities of many avant-garde artists involved directly or indirectly with applied art just before the Revolution.

For example, Natalia Goncharova made patterns for embroideries and over forty dresses, some of which were purchased by Natalia Lamanova, Moscow's most sophisticated couturière. In 1915-16 Rozanova, one of the original exponents of Suprematism, applied dynamic combinations of color planes to textiles for dresses and accessories such as purses. In 1916 the painter Ksenia (Xana) Boguslavskaia, wife of Ivan Puni, contributed three embroidery designs to the Petrograd "World of Art" exhibition, and, with Rozanova and Malevich, participated in a special show of contemporary applied art in Moscow in ~~the same year~~ 1917.[11] Their abstract designs were based on the same formal and textural contrasts evident in the contemporary studio paintings of Rozanova and Boguslavskaia. Even though these designs were "painterly" and had no practical connection with the medium of embroidery or the material of cloth, they signalled transition from the textile decoration applied in a sequential or "narrative" manner to the textile design used as a variable and versatile composition where the effect is not spoilt by a constant change of position. This con-

cern with the visual universality of the fabric and the dress is central to Constructivist textile design of the early 1920s.

The disruption of the Russian textile industry just after 1917, the traditional reliance of the clothing industry on the individual tailor and seamstress, and the sudden disappearance of that very class which had placed private commissions -- these circumstances meant that clothes design in the new Russia was scarcely contemplated until the conjunction of more clement conditions. Even with the urgent need to create a Red Army uniform, production of a standardized pattern was not established until after the end of the Civil War in 1922. By then the situation was better: the inauguration of Lenin's New Economic Policy (NEP) in 1921 (a policy that allowed a partial return to a free enterprise system) quickly brought forth a new bourgeois clientèle and hence the return of the private tailor, and the textile industry began to recover from its stagnation as materials and manpower increased. Moreover, the idea that studio art was a superfluous deception capable only of stylizing reality and not of transforming it quickly gained ground. As the critic Osip Brik affirmed in his article "From Pictures to Textile Prints": "The studio painting is not only unnecessary to our contemporary artistic culture, it is also one of the most powerful brakes on its development.... Only those artists who, once and for all, have broken with studio craft, who have recognized productional work in practise not only as an equal form of artistic labor, but also as the only one possible -- only these artists can grapple successfully and productively with the solution to the problem of contemporary artistic culture".[12] As a result, some artists began to describe their abstract compositions not as self-sufficient entities, but as models or projects for the cre-

ation of new objects. Popova made this clear in her statement in the catalog of the exhibition "5 x 5 = 25" in 1921: "All the pieces presented here....should be regarded merely as preparatory experiments towards concrete constructions".[13] In the case of Popova, this was certainly true, for her architectonic compositions of 1920-21 relied on principles such as asymmetry, stratification and counterpoint, principles that she used in her textile designs of 1923-24.

At the end of 1922 Popova and Stepanova entered the design section of the First State Textile Print Factory, a huge complex in Moscow that, before the Revolution, belonged to the German industrialist Emile Zindel. With the exception of Liudmila Maiakovskaia (sister of Vladimir Maiakovsky), who had been working as a designer at a local textile mill since 1910,[14] Popova and Stepanova were probably the first women artists to be employed as professional designers in the Russian textile industry. It was a curious world that greeted them. Despite the resonant call from the avant-garde for a constructive and industrial art, the prevailing form of design at Soviet textile mills ca. 1920 was a pastiche of styles differing little from pre-Revolutionary stereotypes. The ignorance and conservatism which Popova and Stepanova encountered on the factory floor contrasted sharply with the radical ideas on new Soviet dress that their intellectual colleagues were declaring. Indeed, the question "What should the new Soviet woman be wearing?" occasioned the most diverse answers. Certain extremists shouted "Away with Shame!" and advocated nudity as the only possible equivalent of technological, democratic form, an exhortation which culminated in a number of "Evenings of the Denuded Body" in Moscow in 1922.[15] Some championed throw-away clothing, referring to the paper clothing which, they alleged, America was already producing.[16] Others supported the idea of asexual, universal clothing, regarding the Isadora Duncan tunic as a a worthwhile solution.

Obviously, Popova and Stepanova found that they needed not only to design textiles, but also to formulate a total conception of what the new proletarian dress should be. Popova immediately came to terms with both problems.

Popova brought to the world of textile and dress design a rich and varied artistic experience. By the end of 1922 she had worked as a studio painter, a poster designer and stage designer. She had moved rapidly from Cubism (she studied with Le Fauconnier and Metzinger in Paris in 1912-13) to her so called painterly architectonics in 1916, she had taken part in major avant-garde exhibitions and had assumed artistic responsibility for important stage sets and costumes. Popova was one of the most serious and principled members of the Russian avant-garde, and however diverse her activities, she remained loyal to certain basic concepts of form and space.

As a matter of fact, the salient characteristic of Popova's architectonic paintings is the absence and not the presence of space. Often rejecting recognizable objects, collage and lettering, Popova manipulated planes of color devoid of any allusion to three-dimensional space. To this end, Popova sometimes dismissed the logical color progression of cool to warm and vice versa and used "non-sequences": in her paintings she might place red above black but put pink underneath or she might place blue above yellow and then cause both to interpenetrate. However, Popova's apprenticeship to Le Fauconnier and Metzinger, her experience of Cubism, imbued her with a respect for the "object" and hence for the principle of construction. Popova also possessed the rare faculty of being able to think in terms both of two and of three dimensions, and, ultimately, she could not remain satisfied with the flatness of the pictorial plane. Her desire to reintroduce space as

a creative element, encouraged by her friendship with the sculptress Vera Mukhina and with Tatlin, was even apparent in her occasional painted reliefs of 1916. But it was in her stage and textile designs that Popova finally gratified her wish to build with real materials in real space.

Even though Popova had no training in applied art, she recognized immediately the specific demands of the task before her and, accordingly, she adjusted her conception of "artistic" space. Instead of dealing with a flat, two-dimensional surface (the canvas), she was now concerned with an undulating, three-dimensional solid (the body); instead of a static quality which had to be viewed frontally, she was now working with a mobile sculpture to be seen from many angles; instead of a decoration which followed a single, logical sequence, she now needed a design which would still give visual and psychological satisfaction when creased, rucked or mixed with other forms. To this end, Popova took simple forms and extracted their maximum emotional effect.

In some of her compositions of 1920-21 Popova revived the sense of perspective by a method of linear stratification, i.e. the superimposition of a grid of regular or irregular lines on a complex of colored planes, the latter sometimes carrying letters or numbers to emphasize their flatness. Popova used a similar device in a number of her textile designs, superimposing a grid of diagonals on a series of verticals and horizontals or vice verse. Popova was also intriqued by the idea of syncopation and arhythmicality not only in sound (she was very interested in jazz) but also in visual imagery. She found, for example, that a counterpoint of regular and irregular forms produced a highly kinetic effect (e.g. circles in a regular pattern containing irregular horizontals). Popova's use of syncopation and occult symmetry bring to mind methods used by Van Doesburg and Domela,

and, in some cases, there are anticipations of the Op-Art of Vasarely.

That movement formed the basis of Popova's art is clear not only from her choice of specific geometric shapes (the triangle, the lozenge, the circle) which produce a sensation of ascension and levitation, but also from her recourse to the psychological game. For example, in one of her compositions of five circles, the textile pattern acts as a juggler interchanging sizes, sequences and combinations. Applied to a piece of clothing, i.e. placed into a condition of movement, such designs lose none of their effectiveness, and, conversely, even though the wearer may be sitting, the designs continue to move. This visual result was, of course, closely connected to the radical conception of the emancipated Soviet woman who no longer sat at home, but led an active, mobile life. Even so, very few of Popova's dress designs were implemented. Like her paintings, they call for the direct psychological involvement on the part of the spectator, and unless the spectator is prepared to participate, the designs may seem facile and monotonous. No wonder, then, that simple working people, accustomed to vivid flower prints and the accessories of lace, paper flowers and jewelry, requested that Popova "cover Constructivism with a haze of fantasy".[17]

Like Popova. Stepanova, the wife of Rodchenko, also worked in a pragmatic fashion. Regarding emotion, illusion and ornament as alien to productional or industrial art, Stepanova aspired to eradicate the "ingrown view of the ideal artistic drawing as the imitation and copying of nature; to grapple with organic design and orient it towards the geometrization of forms; to propagate the productional tasks of Constructivism".[18] In keeping with their wish that the decorative and decorating aspects of clothing be abolished, Stepanova and Popova

worked on various kinds of stereotype clothing -- the so called prozodezhda (industrial clothing), spetsodezhda (special clothing) and sportodezhda (sports clothing). Stepanova argued that each profession -- the factory worker, the doctor, the actor, the sportsman, etc. -- demanded its own costume and that this should be constructed according to the norms of convenience, hygiene and expediency dictated by that profession. As Stepanova wrote: "It is not enough to make a comfortable, clever costume design, one must make it and demonstrate it at work".[19]

An exciting example of Stepanova's experimental costume design was her projects for sports clothes. Incorporating lightness of form (for mobility), economy of material (to restrain the body's temperature) and bright, emphatic colors (for identification on the sports' field), these designs rely upon function as the only possible "esthetic".[20] Rodchenko was also active as a textile and clothes designer at this time and produced his own prozodezhda in the form of a worker's coverall. But the trouble with the Stepanova and Rodchenko experiments was that they contravened popular taste and also required a sympathetic, sophisticated manufacturer to produce them -- who was not forthcoming. Tatlin tried to solve the problem by designing clothes that could be assembled easily from cheap materials at home by the workman himself. Indeed, Tatlin made a coat and a suit in this way in 1924, although his proposal does not seem to have awakened mass enthusiasm. At this time Malevich, too, tried his hand at dress design, applying Suprematist compositions to standard forms, but they remained only as projects.

In the drive for a simple and effective dress for the proletarian woman, an influential role was played by Lamanova. As a celebrated couturière before the Revolution, Lamanova was one of the very few Soviet dress designers to have had experience in this discipline, and

despite the abrupt shift from aristocratic made-to-order to democratic ready-to-wear, she produced much important theoretical and practical work. Although Lamanova did not possess the artistry and inventiveness of Popova and Stepanova, she understood the needs of the time, as she indicated at the First All-Russian Conference on Industrial Art in 1919: "[Art] must penetrate all spheres of everyday life, it must develop the artistic taste and feeling of the masses. Clothes are one of the most appropriate vehicles for this... in the clothing business artists must take the initiative and work to produce very simple but pleasing forms of clothing from simple materials, clothing which will be suitable to the new structure of our working life".[21] Like Tatlin, Lamanova was an early proponent of simple cut-out clothing and home production.

The principle of maximum effect through minimum means, shared by Lamanova, Popova, Stepanova and Tatlin, was counteracted to some extent by the methods of a rival group of textile and clothes designers in Moscow attached to the so called Atelier of Fashions.[22] This establishment catered for the new Soviet bourgeoisie of the early 1920s, and although its most serious members, Exter and Mukhina, approached the issue of fashion design with imagination, they did not achieve the purity and simplicity identifiable with the Lamanova and Popova pieces. On the one hand, Exter declared that the dress should consist of rudimentary geometric shapes and that certain materials were appropriate to certain forms;[23] on the other hand, she added fur trimming to sleeves, used Egyptian motifs and included pearl necklaces and fans as ornaments. Exter's tendency towards the extravagant -- which must have appealed to the bourgeois lady -- attained striking results in the theatre and the cinema as, for example, in the movie Aelita (1924). Just as Erté

elaborated and extenuated the elements of the Bakst costume, so Exter did the same with the principles of Lamanova, Popova and Stepanova. In other words, her creations became, once again, esthetic objects and ceased to be industrial constructions.

It is significant that, when looking at the Soviet dress designs of the early 1920s, especially from the Atelier of Fashions, we are reminded of contemporary Paris designs. Even when we examine Popova's dresses, we are reminded somewhat of the European and American fashions of the "roaring '20s" with their sacks and bucket hats. This kinship with the mainstream of design did not particularly worry Exter or Popova, but it did cause concern among the more committed socialist critics in the Soviet Union. Their argument became a familiar one: if a revolution has been made and if this has given rise to a new, radical society with new systems and ways of life, then the artistic style of this new society should be distinctive, immediately identifiable, unprecedented. It became especially clear at the Exposition internationale des arts décoratifs et industriels modernes in Paris in 1925, where the Soviet Union was well represented, that new Soviet design, while audacious, attractive, functional, had much in common with the new wave of design in France, Germany and the US. The critic Yakov Tugendkhold commented on this in his review of the Exposition: "Many still think that Constructivism and non-objective art represent an extremely leftist trend, identifiable precisely with our proletarian countr . The Paris Exposition has revealed that Constructivism is identifiable equally with bourgeois countries too, where 'leftist' bourgeois bedrooms....and leftist ladies' manteaux of ermine and sable are being made....Does this mean that the revolutionary ideology is conquering the bourgeois consciousness, that it is entering the bour-

geois world or, on the contrary, that these principles are really not so revolutionary? The latter, I would think".[24] This argument served as a major weapon in the combat against Constructivist architects and designers in the late 1920s onwards and as a major stimulus to the creation of a definite, distinctive, nationally identifiable style in stead -- Socialist Realism.

The Constructivist contribution to textile and clothes design in Soviet Russia was brief, but remarkable. Popova, above all, reached a new definition of movement perceived visually and did, indeed, extend "art" into "life". Unfortunately, with Popova's death in 1924 and Stepanova's transference of interest to printing and photographic design, the Constructivist experience in textiles was soon forgotten. Ignoring the lessons of their elders, young designers at the key textile centers either reverted to a Victorian floridity or they treated the textile as a pictorial surface which could transmit an agitational or literary message. Of course, the new figurative textiles were a direct response to public taste, but as the critic Alexei Fedorov-Davydov wrote in 1931, they had little to do with Soviet reality: "....all attempts to sovietize the textile design for garment fabrics....have been confined to a very narrow choice of themes, in most cases lacking in any socio-political trenchancy. At best, the subject is a rather naive one -- a Pioneer, a Red Army soldier on skis, a little head with a smile....Pioneers on a piece of fustian....repeated endlessly in a single figure lose all representational value ....Or take the so called industrial motifs....What's Soviet about them? Why does a mere tractor have to be a Soviet theme? There are actually more tractors in bourgeois America than in the USSR....".[25]

By the late 1920s it was clear that Soviet textile design had

lost its clarity of purpose and, as in all spheres of design, the result was a curious eclecticism of styles. Abstract motifs vied with luxuriant cornucopias just as photo-montage vied with the new Realist painting or the austere lines of reinforced concrete buildings contained soft couches, pouffes, bearskins and classical vases. By the mid-1930s the contradiction was resolved, for art, once again, became "reproductional" and intensely decorative. Just as flowers are scattered above the tomb, so Soviet art reached its most florid phase at the sternest moment of Stalin's rule. The heroines of the Revolution arose from their divans upholstered in material carrying industrial motifs in rococo settings and donned kerchiefs recounting complicated episodes from the Civil War; they drank tea from cups depicting Slavic fairy-tales, entered Baroque subway stations and went to work in Neo-Palladian office buildings. Such was the "haze of fantasy" which clouded the pure visions of Popova and her comrades, such was the monstrous mixture that liquidated Constructivist design.

Notes to the text

1. Parts of this essay appeared in an essay entitled "From Pictures to Textile Prints" in The Print Collector's Newsletter, New York, 1976, March/April, pp. 16-20.

2. N. Tarabukin: Ot molberta k mashine, Moscow, 1923, pp. 23-24.

3. Quoted from V. Lobanov: Khudozhestvennye gruppirovki za poslednie 25 let, Moscow, 1930, p. 101.

4. N. Trotsky: Literature and Revolution, New York, 1924.

5. For information on Bogdanov see Dietrich Grille: Lenins Rivale. Bogdanov und seine Philosophie, Cologne: Wissenschaft und Politik, 1966.

6. This was noted by David Arkin in his article "Iskusstvo veshchi" in Ezhegodnik literatury i iskusstva na 1929 god, Moscow, 1929, p. 437.

7. See, for example, Damskii mir, Petrograd, 1917, especially January issue.

8. L. Bakst: "Kostium zhenshchiny budushchego (Beseda)" in Birzhevye vedomosti, St. Petersburg, 1913, 20 March.

9. V. Mass: "Pankrasy levogo fronta" in Zrelishcha, Moscow, 1922, No. 10, p. 9. Quoted from E. Rakitina (compiler): Khudozhnik stsena ekran, Moscow, 1975, p. 158.

11. See catalog of the "Second Exhibition of Contemporary Decorative Art", Moscow, 1916. Exter, Popova and others were also rep-d.

12. O. Brik: "Ot kartiny k sittsu" in Lef, Moscow, 1924, No. 2, pp. 30-31.

13. L. Popova: untitled, unpaginated contribution to the catalog of the exhibition "5 x 5 = 25", Moscow, 1921.

14. On Liudmila Maiakovskaia see

15. E. Kan: "Telo i odezhda" in Zrelishcha, 1922, No. 7, p. 16.

16. Yu. Annenkov: "Estestvennoe otpravlenie" in Arena, Petersburg, 1924, p. 114.

17. Quoted from T. Strizhenova: Iz istorii sovetskogo kostiuma, Moscow, 1972, p. 100.

18. Ibid., p. 97.

19. Varst (=V. Stepanova): "Kostium segodniashnego dnia--prozodezhda" in Lef, 1923, No. 2, p. 65.

20. It should be noted that Stepanova's sports designs found an important precedent in Bakst's costume designs for the ballet Les Jeux produced in 1913 with Nijinsky and Karsavina in the main roles.

21. N. Lamanova: "O masterskikh sovremennykh khudozhestvennykh kostiumov" in Pervaia Vserossiiskaia konferentsiia po khudozhestvennoi promyshlennosti, avgust 1919, Moscow, 1920, pp. 37-38.

22. For information see the journal issued by the Atelier, i.e. Atelie mod, Moscow, 1923, No. 1 (no more published).

23. Exter touched on this in her articles which appeared in Atelie mod. Extracts are quoted in Strizhenova, op. cit., p. 72.

24. Ya. Tugendkhold: Khudozhestvennaia kultura Zapada, Moscow-Leningrad, 1928, p. 190.

25. A. Fedorov-Davydov: "Iskusstvo tekstilia" in Izofront. Klassovaia borba na fronte prostranstvennykh iskusstv. Sbornik statei obedineniia "Oktiabr", Moscow-Leningrad, 1931, pp. 77-78.