

Rafaela Božić

University of Zadar

rbozic@unizd.hr

ORCID: 0000-0002-0850-6626

POZNAŃSKIE STUDIA SLAWISTYCZNE

NR 22 (2022)

DOI: 10.14746/pss.2022.22.2

Data przesłania tekstu do redakcji: 16.09.2021

Data przyjęcia tekstu do druku: 13.01.2022

## The Motif of Nature in Early Russian Soviet Utopian and Dystopian Novels<sup>\*</sup>

**ABSTRACT:** Božić Rafaela, *The Motif of Nature in Early Russian Soviet Utopian and Dystopian Novels*. "Poznańskie Studia Slawistyczne" 22. Poznań 2022. Wydawnictwo "Poznańskie Studia Polonistyczne," Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, pp. 47–66. ISSN 2084-3011.

In this paper the most important works of Russian-Soviet literary utopia and dystopia have been analysed to investigate the role of nature. In literary utopias, people and their needs are the measure of all things, and the image of a utopian future is the vision of a nature so subdued that the need to eat and sleep have been subdued as well. Yet authors, such as Chayanov, emphasise the importance of a coexistence with nature. Dystopian authors (Platonov and Zamyatin) see the meaning of nature symbolically. They see nature not only as an unconquerable force, but also as a force entirely impermissible to defeat and that should not be defeated: for Platonov and Zamyatin nature is the eternal source of all that is to come.

**KEYWORDS:** utopian literature; dystopian literature; nature as symbol

---

\* This article was co-financed by the University of Zadar (project number IP.O1.2021.09).

The period of the first fifteen years of the October Revolution saw the ascent of a belief in a better future founded on scientific development and a faith in the positive heritage of the Revolution. This shift manifested itself in Russian utopian and dystopian literature of the time in the following themes:

- urbanism
- food production
- energy and conservation of the environment
- climate
- nature as symbol.

### 1. Urbanism

A.V. Chayanov's 1920 novel *Puteshestvie moego brata Alekseia v stranu krest'ianskoi utopii* (My brother Alexei's Journey into the Land of Peasant Utopia) is a work which must be cited when considering the views on the relationship between humans and nature. The action of this novel takes place in Moscow in 1984. It is an ecologically sustainable community, and every family is almost entirely self-sufficient. Peasant parties, convinced that too great an increase in the urban population is a danger to democracy, issued a decree for the destruction of all cities whose population exceeded 20,000 people. Many buildings in Moscow have been destroyed and the city consists of private homes with accompanying plots of land. Chayanov (1920) believed that rural life is the life of the best quality in which the human being does not oppose nature.

Dobrynina states that Chayanov's ideas shared affinities with those of Friedrich Engels, who believed that large cities were a thing of the past (2011). Lenin also promoted the idea of a new kind of settlement which would end, on the one hand, the backwardness of the village, and on the other, the excessive density of people in large cities (Dobrynina, 2011). Large cities were viewed as the inheritance of capitalism.

In other utopias we find very similar descriptions of the city. In Yakov Okunev's 1923 novel *Grjadushchij mir: 1923–2123* (The Coming World: 1923–2123) we find this description of a great world city:

Beautiful cottages-properties one or two storeys high which were submerged in flowers and greenery, cottages of papier-mâché fortified to the strength of steel and hemmed with aluminium. The flat rooves of houses were joined to one another by lace-like bridges into a gigantic and infinite terrace surrounded by straight rows of trees and green parks with fountains and pavilions. In certain spots large university buildings and communal buildings would appear which shone with the gold and azure of their cupolas and spires. [...] Yet in this World City and its streets, one can breathe as easily as one can in the woods. Ozone is produced in numerous chemical factories. It flows through a net of chimneys onto the streets and enriches the air (Okunev, 1923).



Fig. 1. Alexander V. Chayanov (17 January 1888–3 October 1937). Author unknown, Wikimedia Commons, public domain

The question concerning the quest for an ideal topos is not new; it is a recurring motif in the utopian tradition (Paniotova, 2019, 15). The majority of literary utopias in various periods have been characterised by “the regular orderly geometrical structure of the utopian city” (Dobrynina, 2011). The symmetry of geometrical forms symbolises the ideal of a perfection which cannot be further perfected.

Hans Günther has singled out two models of the harmonious organisation of space: the “city” and the “garden,” and in Günther’s opinion the model of the garden only leads to pastoral or an idyll (Günther, 1991, 253). Yet we cannot fully agree with this notion because we can observe a movement among Russian utopian writers in which the city becomes a garden. In this way the city becomes pastoral or an idyll, yet the pastoral and the idyll also acquire certain characteristics of the city, leaving the opportunity open for historical development—and this differentiates it from pastoral and an idyll, in which there is no such historical development. Even before the revolution, we read in Bogdanov-Malinovsky’s *Red Star*: “The surface part of the city was scattered over the park which spread for tens of square kilometres” (1908), and this amalgam of urban and rural elements can also be observed in Charles Fourier’s *phalanstère* as the eighteenth century became the nineteenth.

The concept of the garden-city has its origin in the thought of Ebenezer Howard, who proposed the foundation of a new type of city which would erase the differences between the village and urban agglomerations (Mirkov, 2007, 314). Visions of city-gardens can be observed in relation to the urbanistic tendencies of their time, such as the most well-known soviet project—the city of Magnitogorsk, which was conceived as an ideal city (Tverdunova, 2017).

Magnitogorsk was not the only project in Russia in which the Soviet architects of the time sought an ideal form of habitation. Soviet architects were of the belief that a great change in the conditions of habitation could significantly contribute to the creation of the New Man (Paniotova, 2019, 13). There were two opposing stances during the 1920s and 30s on questions concerning urbanism: urbanism and de-urbanism (in Russian, dezurbanizm) (Dobrynina, 2011). Urbanists supported the idea of constructing compact and contained urban

units,<sup>1</sup> while de-urbanists supported the idea of the construction of an equally distributed network of smaller settlements.

The de-urbanists believed that a consequence of the revolution must be a change in the way of life which had preceded it. For example, all



Fig. 2. Magnitogorsk. Image: Google, © 2022 Maxar Technologies

segments of life would become public and would take place in clubs and stadiums. Meals would no longer be eaten in separate homes or apartments but organised in communal kitchens. Child-rearing would be the responsibility of “children’s conglomerates.” Radical projects proposed the complete elimination of the family and urged a life in house-communes, in which a small room for sleeping would be allotted

---

1 Such an idea did not take root in Russia alone. Even in 1905, skyscraper-cities fascinated the French architect Auguste Perret and in 1910, the inventor King Camp Gillette proposed that the population of the USA should be gathered into a few gigantic homes etc. (Frolov, 2016).

to every person (Dobrynina, 2011). But this type of building was not to last: tenants would renovate living spaces of their own accord, following their own needs (Dobrynina, 2011).

As the 1920s became the 1930s, this form of communal/collective life was abandoned. Families were acknowledged as units of the wider society and their right to a choice of lifestyle was acknowledged as well (Surova, 2019, 109).<sup>2</sup>



Fig. 3. Narkomfin building, Moscow. User: Retired electrician, Wikimedia Commons, public domain

This period of enthusiasm in the 1920s is one of the reasons why the transition was made from the, quite often unsanitary, buildings of the pre-revolutionary period, to city quarters with all available social services, different types of residential buildings, apartments and social content (Dobrynina, 2011).

As we have seen, these ideas among the soviet utopians were not abstract ruminations entirely removed from the situation at hand.

---

<sup>2</sup> In a certain way, this sheds some new light on the *kommunalka*—a communal, collective apartment in which more than one family would live.

In this period much intense work was enacted to realise the ideal Soviet city.

## 2. Energy and the conservation of the environment

The question concerning an ideal society is related to advances in technology, and this is imminently related to the problem of energy. We can find various approaches to the problem of energy sources in these novels.

The first type of novel presents a surplus of technology as well as a surplus of energy. In V.D. Nikolsky's vision there is no lack of energy sources. Humankind now utilises a more efficient and ecologically acceptable source of energy—hydrogen. Society understands the ethical problems of exploiting other living creatures, and even trees are now considered friends who are not to be exploited. Science has succeeded in producing something like a cognisant plant.

In Okunev's novel *The Coming World: 1923–2123*, automobiles are powered by the nuclear energy of radium (yet there is no mention here of the problems concerning the disposal of nuclear waste), and people are constantly traversing streets under constant light; light flowing freely from the terraces and rooves of houses—at first glance a harmless and lovely image that means something else in this day and age, as light and sound pollution lead us to this question—should everyone like the same kind of music?

In Zelikovich's novel *Sledujushchij mir* (The Next World), wind-power and hydroelectricity are utilised, and energy is taken directly from the atmosphere. Streets are paved with matter which glows in the dark (again, no questions are raised concerning light pollution).

In Belyaev's novel *Bor'ba v èfire* (The Battle in Ether), a wealth of energy is derived from various sources: wind and volcanoes have been subdued to human needs, even terrestrial magnetism, sea waves, as well as ebbs and tides have been put to the same use. Cultural heights are measured in kilowatts. In V. Itin's *Strana Gonguri* (Gonguri Land) there is so much energy that almost all is possible (even gravity has been subdued), and it is possible to rearrange the continents in different parts of the world, and to do the same to mountains.

Yan Larri was only (partially) aware of the effects of an excess of industrial production, as seen in his 1931 novel *Strana schastlivyh* (Land of the Happy). It was in this year that E. Zamyatin unwillingly left the Soviet Union. The atmosphere was such that novels of anticipation were then viewed in a very negative light: soviet criticism in the periodical *ROST* in 1932 stated that Larri's work "was a chauvinistic and libellous work by a class-enemy" (*ROST*, 1932). At the very core of this novel is the problem in which the utopian communist/socialist solution of the formula for happiness is questioned.

A biologist by profession, Larri had a greater sense of the needs and possibilities of nature. Much of the phenomena mentioned in his novel are common today, so that his novel seems strangely contemporary. Larri spoke of the engineering (!) of food, solar powerhouses, automated hotels, traffic jams... There is an interesting relationship toward houseplants, which were considered at the time the novel was written as remains of a bourgeoisie worldview, yet he (as a biologist) "justifies" them by claiming that they greatly assist in purifying the air. The actual and basic problem in this novel is of special interest—this is the problem concerning the lack of energy sources, overpopulation<sup>3</sup> and space travel. Socialism obviously isn't the answer to everything.

As Larri (also the case with other Russian utopians at the time) does not follow his premises to their logical conclusion (i.e., he makes no mention of the damage to the ecosystem which undoubtedly arises from the burning of such large amounts of coal, which is the basic foundation of the civilisation in his novel), what is clear is that socialism is ecologically unaware and the welfare it has bequeathed has obviously had a negative impact on the possibility of existence on Earth. Although today this is a conclusion that we can clearly understand, and we can also congratulate Larri on his "clairvoyance," it is impossible that such a conclusion would have been considered acceptable to the communist government.

---

3 In Vadim Nikolsky's novel *In a Thousand Years* the Earth has a population of 180 billion. On the one hand, we can see that Nikolsky understands the possibility of population growth due to increased life expectancy and a drop in mortality, yet on the other, Nikolsky shows an absolute lack of understanding of the sustainability of a such a large human community.



The only way in which this eternal means of production in utopia does not lead to pollution (to which none of the authors analysed here have given any thought) or to the complete exhaustion of energy sources (to which Larri has given thought), is the relatively ascetic utopian way of life. All utopians work as much as is necessary for them and they endeavour not to need that much. Apart from a surplus of food, in other respects their lives are rather humble. They are dedicated to the attainment of knowledge and art, not to consumption.

There are few novels that discuss some of the ecological problems that are in focus today—waste and climate change for example. We saw, for example, that in his novel *The Coming World*, Okunev writes about automobiles powered by nuclear energy, yet he is completely unaware of the problems concerning the disposal of nuclear waste.

In *Battle in Ether*, Belyaev has something to say on the problem of waste disposal, although briefly: “In this small room there is an oven for the burning of waste. Please throw hair and suit into it...” (Belyaev, 1927).

The utopian vision of a future communism is also reflected in the fact that revolutionaries believed that the new world would be built from everlasting materials that would never reach a state of decay, which is another example of the incongruence between reality and the utopian imagination.

It is interesting that V.D. Nikolsky predicts the need for protection from the electromagnetic waves emanating from natural and artificial sources (metal clothing and mesh which protects the body when clothing is removed), which is something recognised today.

We can conclude that most problems in these novels are seen exclusively from an anthropomorphic perspective—without analysis, or even interest in how such solutions affect the Earth’s flora and fauna. Human society sees the world as its slave, a resource that can be exploited without end. There is, generally, no mention of the right to life of other beings. Even clouds are unnecessary, rain and humidity are derived from a regulated system, and are not left to the “whims” of nature.

On the relationship toward nature, which is not only given the role of a slave but also treated as one, the words used in the context of how energy is sourced are entirely clear: people use the wind’s work, people

have **subdued** volcanoes, have **forced** the Earth's magnetism to **work**, atmospheric electricity **serves**, and even storms have been **employed**, sea currents, ebbs and tides—are **workers-knights** in the service of humans (all examples from Belyaev).

### 3. Climate

In most of the novels analysed here, humankind changes climate according to its needs. Polar regions have been transformed into a tropical paradise. All this is possible thanks to the inexhaustible wellspring that is available to human beings. There is neither the slightest doubt, nor any analysis, in how such actions may have influenced life on Earth and the influence of such actions on the Earth itself.

*Holodnyj Gorod* (Cold City) from 1917 is entirely different. This novel was written by Nikolay Stepanovich Komarov, an engineer who specialised in refrigeration. The novel's themes (unsurprisingly involving the author's area of interest) centre primarily on a global climate catastrophe which occurred when (and the reasons for this are barely explained in the novel) global warming began on Earth (!).

The reasons for this warming are not even clear to the novel's characters, nor to us, as Komarov does not provide a clear explanation for such a change in climate. Increased solar activity is cited as one of the possible reasons for this, as well as increased activity in the Earth's core, and the influence of the digging of the Panama Canal is mentioned (thus, human influence) only in passing.

The novel is set in the United States of America in the 22nd century. The temperature of the environment is approximately 55 degrees Celsius, the Earth's population has significantly increased and various parts of the ecosystem have been subdued to serve humans, and many bodies of water have been drained. The basis of the story is the foundation of Cold City where the temperature is at a constant of +15 degrees Celsius (it is difficult to understand why such a low temperature is perceived as the ideal one). At the end of the novel (resembling many of the exciting Hollywood blockbusters of today) Chinese workers, due to unjust treatment and the fact that only those who could purchase

land in this city were allowed to live there, destroy the city and its two million inhabitants. The novel's focus is on the technological solutions to the problem of global warming and life in an artificially created setting (a "refrigerator" city), yet the novel lacks both artistic value and full-bodied characterisations.

The novel can be criticised on both aesthetic and scientific grounds and it is difficult to read it as a serious work. The author almost completely ignores the possibility of humans' negative influence on nature (although he mentions the digging of the Panama Canal as a potential cause of global warming, he completely ignores the destruction of mountains and the pouring of debris into the sea as a cause).

The solution to this problem places humankind in a position against nature—i.e., nature is a negative force that people can control and contain with the aid of science. Flattening mountains into the ocean to satisfy the human need for space clearly reflects a worldview in which human needs come first: satisfying human needs is so unwise in this case as little thought is given to the consequences of such actions on human beings themselves. Also, the author does not follow the logical premises of climate change—i.e., there is no mention on the melting of polar caps, rises in sea levels etc. The social aspect of this novel is of interest though, as the workers are African-American and Chinese. The capitalist world of the United States is portrayed as being extremely socially unjust and exploitative. This novel was written before the October Revolution as there are no references to it, but even before the revolution, many Russian writers and intellectuals noted the callousness of capitalism, in the United States in particular, e.g., even as early as Pushkin and Dostoevsky. In the end, the Chinese destroy Cold City—a marker of the possibility of the class (and race) struggle for a more just society through terrorist means, as well as disgust due to the innocent lives sacrificed in this struggle, while also raising the question—how innocent can be those who live comfortable lives with many benefits, who do not think about the exploitation of those whose hard labour forms the basis of their comfort? In this way, an aesthetically substandard work, in its final explosion, provides a provocative impulse in a contemporary context, on the nature of exploitation and the legitimate means to fight it.

#### 4. Food production

Food is important as one of the basics of life, so that the types and qualities of food have an influence on whether a society is to be considered ideal (Božić, 2013). Both utopias and dystopias research not only the importance of food in the satisfaction of human biological needs, but also its importance in a cultural, social, psychological and aesthetic sense (Božić, 2013).

What must be noted is that most utopian novels propagate vegetarianism. Prior research on the semantic field of 'food' in Russian utopia and dystopia (more in Božić, 2009 or 2013) led to the conclusion that when discussing food in the utopias under analysis, we can distinguish three approaches to human food (Božić, 2013).

In the first approach, food is ignored (sufficient food is a given, so the focus is on other aspects of society). In the second type of novel, there is mention of societies that are at an advanced stage of development and this is confirmed not only by types of food, but by the fact that this food fulfils its role as nourishment much better than the food that existed at the time of writing (and even today). In such novels, food is processed and served in an unusual and highly advanced form (nourishing liquid, jelly or pills). The whole process of food consumption is an aesthetic experience in which the other arts are included (Božić, 2013). The third approach to food is indicated by the quality and plenitude of food, of a kind which existed at the time of writing: pâté, cheese, caviar, buns and salads (Božić, 2013). In the descriptions of ideal utopian societies, individuals eat as much as they find necessary and there are no obese or undernourished people.

In A. Platonov's dystopias, *Chevangur* and *The Foundation Pit*, there is never enough food, and anything edible is eaten (including soil—by the character named God).

In many of the novels analysed here one will notice the idea that food production should not be bound to separate agricultural spaces but that some (or all) food should be produced in spaces where cultivated gardens and urban space are combined.

Vadim Nikolsky (1927) mentions the problem of "bad" food in his novel *In a Thousand Years*, when describing how, in the future, the

good qualities of food are the result of research into the mistakes of earlier food production. He cites an example when rice, with all its vitamins removed, entered the marketplace. Such rice was the cause of an entire epidemic of a certain disease which led to the removal of this kind of rice and the return of older, unprocessed kinds.



Fig. 4. *Worker and Kolkhoznitza Woman*, sculptor: Vera Mukhina, Moscow.  
Image by Evgeni Tcherkasski from Pixabay

Humanity had “liberated itself from all the caprices of nature and the chance of crop failure” (Nikolsky, 1927) which led to the disappearance of rural landscapes: swaying fields and green woods remain only as ornaments in regions with settlements.

In Chayanov’s novel we find the harmonious conjuncture of architecture and nature. Climate is regulated so the time of rainfall and wind is fixed. Special care is given to every plant which results in a high

percentage of yields, necessary due to an increase in population—yet we hear little about nature and the wilderness: nature has been thoroughly tamed.

As a leading world authority on rural development, whose scientific works had been translated into English, French, Japanese and German, and whom Lenin deeply respected, Chayanov was suspected of being a ‘kulak’ ideologue after Lenin’s death (Petrikov, 2018). Chayanov’s concept of cooperation resulted in the great successes during the NEP, yet the NEP was replaced after Lenin’s death by the Stalinist concept of collectivisation, the results of which were catastrophic (Babanov, 2020). Chayanov was first arrested in 1930, and was shot dead in 1937, so that his scientific works were unavailable to the Soviet scientific community until 1988.

It can be stated that after Lenin’s death the conflict between town and village intensified and city and industry gained victory.

### 5. Nature as symbol

In the same year as Chayanov’s “rural utopia,” Zamyatin’s *We* was written. Neither is this a utopia, nor is there any place for rural life in this novel. The action takes place in the One State, sequestered from the rest of the (wild) world by a glass wall. The One State’s society has been completely industrialised—even food is produced from petroleum. The main theme of this novel—the correlation between a stable life and the necessary randomness of life—is elaborated in this novel in a specific style, and one of Zamyatin’s procedures can be termed as minimalism (Božić, 2013). Much is left unsaid and left to the reader. Thus, Zamyatin says little about nature, yet in certain episodes nature represents a factor of chaos and Zamyatin does not portray it in a negative light: it is in fact a principle and source of progress and creation. The society of the One State, separated from nature by a glass wall, is doomed to collapse due to entropy.

The novel’s ending is open—although it seems that the One State remains victorious: a large proportion of the population/unifs (including D-503) are subjected to lobotomization and “tamed,” but the space of the

One State has diminished, and a large number of the population continues to fight against the regime. Even I-330, the fatal revolutionary, will be executed the next day—i.e., a day not included in the novel, so that we do not know exactly how it ends.

A. Platonov had a special relationship with nature. Alexey Makarkin emphasises that in *Kotlovan (The Foundation Pit)*, there is an evident struggle with nature (Makarkin, 2019). Yet Platonov's relationship with nature is more complex.

Here we will focus on his most well-known dystopian novel, *Chevengur*. The novel concerns the travels and arrival of the main protagonist Sasha Dvanov to the fictional city of Chevengur in which communism has supposedly been achieved. Communism, as represented in *Chevengur*, has no relation to industry and cities. The novel begins with a drought and a great famine. Droughts and famines appeared in Russia throughout its history. Considering that Platonov's profession dealt with problems in irrigation, one can suppose that he was well informed of the problems of famine both before and after the October Revolution.

Only the famine of 1932 and 1933 was caused by political "intervention" into rural life, i.e., by the collectivisation that the peasantry barely accepted. Also, during the civil war, both warring parties requisitioned food from the peasantry.

The time and place of the action in *Chevengur* leaves no place for idealism. This is the period after the civil war and foreign intervention. Various armies pass through the village and requisition food for their needs. In a certain way, nature takes back what people have "stolen" from it, so that domesticated animals are not under human strictures, and more or less thrive in their new-found freedom.

One of the characteristics of Platonov's work is the equality of humans and animals. Animals live their own lives just as people do. They have thoughts and feelings. Life, as it is in nature in fact, does not have its centre in the human being.

Food in this novel serves as an associative symbol as well as the second part of the opposition: abstract—concrete, ideal—reality. I.e., the quest or the ideal (communism) is in constant opposition to the quest for food (Božić, 2013), yet food appears in Platonov's work independently

in a series of abstract themes: for example, Dvanov compares culture to an overgrown field in which nothing more can grow. The philosophical and ideological problems of existence are represented through the motif of nature, for example, wind is like Chepurny's "spiritual doubt" (Platonov, 1978, 97), and in his thoughts a burdock "wanted communism" (Platonov, 1978, 184).

In Chevengur, the revolutionaries believe that in communism a "chicken ought to come out here by itself" (Platonov, 1978, 220). This is in opposition to the utopian novels in which all participate in work, but also to Soviet ideology in which labour and hard workers were celebrated in slogans.

There is sufficient sun "only for repletion and not for greed" (Platonov, 1978, 227) according to the people of Chevengur. It can thus be concluded that according to the revolutionaries of Chevengur, socialism/communism is in harmony with nature. They believe that nature is on the side of communism. And yet, as befitting even the best of utopian novels, the people of Chevengur interpret nature's decisions as a sign of its obedience. The confusion among the revolutionaries of Chevengur is made evident in their logically controversial conclusion—nature itself has decided to be obedient—but they also fail to notice the fact that the sun had risen during the time of capitalism.

The second approach to nature is the entire opposite of the first, and in this concept the proletariat "does not admire nature, but rather destroys it, with labor" (Platonov, 1978, 137) and this was a relationship that we saw in the utopian novels analysed here. As there are no industries or cities in Chevengur, there are few images of vanquished or destroyed nature. Yet the combination of a lack of education and incomprehension of the importance of biological sustainability, as well as an ideological stubbornness are also evident in the episode when Dvanov, due to his calculation that cultivated land is more financially viable than forest, decides to cut down the entire forest following his own initiatives.



## 6. Conclusion

This is certainly not an analysis of all the novels that we can relate to literary utopia and dystopia, yet this overview provides insight into the basic tendencies of such novels after the October Revolution. The new directions in social governance also found their reflection in the literature of that time: the wish to portray a desired future, and the belief that this future must be the future of people who are equals—for most of them (but not for all of them, and Chayanov is an example) this certainly meant a communist future. Yet all these writers thought autonomously, so that we cannot claim that there was a uniform Soviet representation of the future. As we had seen, in literary utopias, humankind and its needs are most often the measure of things, and the image of a utopian future is also the vision of a nature subdued to the point that the need to eat and sleep have also been subdued; others, such as Chayanov, emphasise the importance of a coexistence with nature and a vision, after the intense development of industry and agriculture, that we could also term the only sustainable one. On the other hand, writers who approached the possibilities of the development of an ideal society on the foundations of the society in which they lived, and who did so with greater criticism (Platonov and Zamyatin), openly see nature not only as an unconquerable force, but also as a force it is entirely impermissible to defeat and that should not be defeated. To Platonov and Zamyatin nature is the eternal source of the future.

## References

- Aínsa, F. (1999). *La Reconstrucción de la Utopía*. Mexico: Correo de la UNESCO.
- Božić, R. (2017). *Revolucija—od utopije do distopije*. “Književna smotra” 3, pp. 7–15.
- Božić, R. (2013). *Distopija i jezik, distopijski roman kroz oko lingvostilistike*. Zadar: Sveučilište u Zadru.
- Mirkov, A. (2007). *Vrtni gradovi Ebenezeroa Hauarda*. “Sociologija” vol. XLIX, no 4, pp. 313–332. <https://doi.org/10.2298/SOC0704313M>
- Бабанов, И. (2020). *Наследие Чаянова*. “Proza.ru.” <https://proza.ru/2020/5.07.2145>. (12.02.2021).

- Беляев, А. (1928). *Борьба в эфире*. "Lib.ru." [http://az.lib.ru/b/beljaew\\_a\\_r/text\\_1927\\_borba\\_v\\_efire.shtml/](http://az.lib.ru/b/beljaew_a_r/text_1927_borba_v_efire.shtml/) (12.04.2020).
- Вогданов-Малиновский, А.А. (1908). *Красная звезда*. <https://www.rulit.me/books/krasnaya-zvezda-read-57550-1.html>. (14.08.2019).
- Чаянов, А. (1920). *Путешествие моего брата Алексея в страну крестьянской утопии*. [http://az.lib.ru/c/chajanow\\_a\\_w/text\\_0020.shtml](http://az.lib.ru/c/chajanow_a_w/text_0020.shtml) (7.05.2020).
- Добрынина, А. (2011). *Элементы классических утопий в архитектуре СССР в 1920–30 гг.* <https://archi.ru/print/elpub/91582> (2.02.2021).
- Фролов, Ю. (2016). *Дом на миллион жильцов*. "Наука и жизнь" № 7. [https://pikabu.ru/story/dom\\_na\\_million\\_zhiltsov\\_4364408](https://pikabu.ru/story/dom_na_million_zhiltsov_4364408) (2.12.2020).
- Гюнтер, Г. (1991). *Жанровые проблемы утопии и «Чевенгур» А. Платонова*. Утопия и утопическое мышление. М.: Прогресс, pp. 252–277.
- Итин, В. (2014). *Страна Гонгури*. "Библиотека электронной литературы." <http://litresp.ru/chitat/ru/%D0%98/itin-vivianazarjevich/strana-gonguri/1/> (12.03.2020).
- Комаров, Н. (1917). *Холодный город*. <https://e-libra.ru/read/472595-holodnyy-gorod.html> (1.08.2020).
- Критика романа Я. Ларри Страна счастливых*. "РОСТ" 1932, №1. <https://www.litmir.me/br/?b=88942> (12.03.2021).
- Ларри, Я. (1931). *Страна счастливых*. Ленинград: Ленинградское областное издательство. <http://larri.lit-info.ru/larri/proza/strana-schastlivyh/> (12.04.2018).
- Макаркин, А. (2019). *Андрей Платонов и его современники в революции и после нее. От радикализма к умеренности*. Размышляя о Платонове. Москва: Голос. <https://iphras.ru/uplfile/philec/razm.-o-platonove-19.pdf> (14.08.2021).
- Никольский, В. (1927). *Через тысячу лет*. "Лит мир—электронная библиотека." <https://www.litmir.me/br/?b=95496&p=1> (7.05.2020).
- Никонов, А. 1988. *Наследие Чаянова*. "Znanie—Sila" 5, pp. 55–60.
- Окунев, Я. (1924). *Завтрашний день*. "Lib.ru." [http://az.lib.ru/o/okunew\\_j\\_m/text\\_1923\\_gryadushiy\\_mir.shtml/](http://az.lib.ru/o/okunew_j_m/text_1923_gryadushiy_mir.shtml/) (12.05.2018).
- Панитова, Т. (2019). *Архетип города в истории утопической мысли*. In: Т. Панитова и др. *Утопические проекты истории и культуры: материалы II Всероссийской (с международным участием) научной конференции*. Ростов-на-Дону: Тагаронг—Издательство Южного федерального университета, pp. 12–15.
- Петриков, А.В. (2018). *6 февраля 2018*. "ВИАПИ им А.А. Никонова." <http://www.viapi.ru/news/detail.php?ID=160979> (14.08.2020).
- Платонов, А. (1978). *Чевенгур*. Прев. А. Ollcot. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis.
- Сурова, Е. (2019). *Социальные утопии в жилой архитектуре России 1920-х годов*. In: Т. Панитова et al. *Утопические проекты истории и культуры: материалы II Всероссийской (с международным участием) научной конференции*. Ростов-на-Дону—Тагаронг: Издательство Южного федерального университета, pp. 108–110.

- Твердунова, А. (2017). *Магнитогорск задумался как идеальный город, но идеал был у каждого свой*. "Вечерний Магнитогорск." <https://vecherka74.ru/news/obsh/10116-magnitogorsk-mog-byt-drugim.html> (7.03.2021).
- Зеликович, Э. (1930). *Следующий мир*. "Борьба миров" 1–7, <http://maximalibrary.org/citate/b/421230/read/> (12.05.2018).
- [Babanov, I. (2020). *Nasledie Čaânova*. "Proza.ru." <https://proza.ru/2020/05/07/2145> (12.02.2021).
- Belâev, A. (1928). *Bor'ba v èfire*. "Lib.ru." [http://az.lib.ru/b/beljaew\\_a\\_r/text\\_1927\\_bor-ba\\_v\\_efire.shtml/](http://az.lib.ru/b/beljaew_a_r/text_1927_bor-ba_v_efire.shtml/) (12.04.2020).
- Bogdanov-Malinovskij, A. A. (1908). *Krasnaâ zvezda*. <https://www.rulit.me/books/krasnaya-zvezda-read-57550-1.html> (14.08.2019).
- Čaânov, A. (1920). *Putešestvie moego brata Alekseâ v stranu krest'ânskoj utopii*. [http://az.lib.ru/c/chajanow\\_a\\_w/text\\_0020.shtml](http://az.lib.ru/c/chajanow_a_w/text_0020.shtml) (7.05.2020).
- Dobrynina, A. (2011). *Èlementy klassičeskijh utopij v arhitekture SSSR v 1920–30 gg.* <https://archi.ru/print/elpub/91582> (2.02.2021).
- Frolov, Ū. (2016). *Dom na million žil'cov*. "Nauka i žizn'" № 7. [https://pikabu.ru/story/dom\\_na\\_million\\_zhiltsov\\_4364408](https://pikabu.ru/story/dom_na_million_zhiltsov_4364408) (2.12.2020).
- Günter, G. (1991). *Žanrovye problemy utopij i «Čevengur» A. Platonova. Utopiâ i utopičeskoe myslenie*. Moskva: Progress, pp. 252–277.
- Itin, V. (2014). *Strana Gonguri*. "Biblioteka èlektronnoj literatury." <http://litresp.ru/chitat/ru/%D0%98/itin-vivianazarjevich/strana-gonguri/1/> (12.03.2020).
- Komarov, N. (1917). *Holodnyj gorod*. <https://e-libra.ru/read/472595-holodnyy-gorod.html> (1.08.2020).
- Kritika romana Â. Larri Strana sčastlivyh*. "ROST" 1932, №1. <https://www.litmir.me/br/?b=88942> (12.03.2021).
- Larri, Â. (1931). *Strana sčastlivyh*. Leningrad: Leningradskoe oblastnoe izdatel'stvo. <http://larri.lit-info.ru/larri/proza/strana-schastlivyh/> (12.04.2018).
- Makarkin, A. (2019). *Andrej Platonov i ego sovremenniki v revolúcii i posle nee. Ot radikalizma k umerennosti. Razmišlâo o Platonove*. Moskva: Golos. <https://iphras.ru/uplfile/philec/razm.-o-platonove-19.pdf> (14.08.2021).
- Nikol'skij, V. (1927). *Čerez tysâču let*. "Lit mir–èlektronnaâ biblioteka." <https://www.litmir.me/br/?b=95496&p=1/> (7.05.2020).
- Nikonov, A. 1988. *Nasledie Čaânova*. "Znanie–Sila" 5, pp. 55–60.
- Okunev, Â. (1924). *Zavtrašnij den'*. "Lib.ru." [http://az.lib.ru/o/okunew\\_j\\_m/text\\_1923\\_gryadushiy\\_mir.shtml/](http://az.lib.ru/o/okunew_j_m/text_1923_gryadushiy_mir.shtml/) (12.05.2018).
- Panitova, T. (2019). *Arhetip goroda v istorii utopičeskijh mysli*. In: T. Panitova i dr. *Utopičeskije proekty v istorii i kul'tury: materialy II Vserossijskoj (s meyhduнародnym učastiem) naučnoj konferencii*. Rostov-na-Donu: Tagarong—Izdatel'stvo Ūžnogo federal'nogo universiteta, pp. 12–15.
- Petrikov, A. V. (2018). *6 fevralâ 2018*. "VIAPИ im A. A. Nikonova." <http://www.viapi.ru/news/detail.php?ID=160979> (14.08.2020).
- Platonov, A. (1978). *Čevengur*. Prev. A. Ollcot. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis.
- Surova, E. (2019). *Social'nye utopii v žiloj arhitekture Rossii 1920-h godov*. In: T. Panitova et al. *Utopičeskije proekty v istorii i kul'tury: materialy II Vserossijskoj (s mezhduнародnym*

- učastiem) naučnoj konferencii. Rostov-na-Donu—Taganrog: Izdatel'stvo Ūžnogo federal'nogo universiteta, pp. 108–110.
- Tverdunova, A. (2017). *Magnitogorsk zadumalsâ kak ideal'nyj gorod, no ideal byl u každogo svoj*. "Večernij Magnitogorsk." <https://vecherka74.ru/news/obsh/10116-magnitogorsk-mog-byt-drugim.html> (7.03.2021).
- Zelikovič, Ė. (1930). *Sleduûšij mir*. "Bor'ba mirov" 1–7, <http://maxima-library.org/citate/b/421230/read/> (12.05.2018).]

- **RAFAELA BOŽIĆ**—full professor at the Department of Russian Studies, University of Zadar, Croatia. In her PhD thesis she analysed syntax in the poetic works of Joseph Brodsky. The topic of poetic syntax was further analysed in her book *Sintaksa i stih* (Syntax and Verse). The topic of dystopian and utopian literature is also her great interest, resulting in the book *The Language of the Dystopian Novel* (SFERA award in 2014). She published scientific articles in Croatian, English and Russian. As part of the Erasmus and Ceepus programs, she held lectures at the universities of Graz, Ljubljana, Olomouc and Lublin. She also held lectures at the universities of Moscow, St. Petersburg, Mostar and Göttingen.