



RELEVANT TOPIC

‘Oppressed and Brainwashed Soviet Subject’ [1] or ‘Prisoners of the Soviet Self’ [2]? Recent Conceptions of Soviet Subjectivity

Katharina Uhl

St Antony’s College, University of Oxford, UK

Abstract. The article explores the concept of ‘Soviet subjectivity’ in its various shapes and approaches. This concept was mainly elaborated by the historians Jochen Hellbeck and Igal Halfin during the late 1990s and early 2000s. Their sources were ego-documents of the 1920s and 1930s such as diaries, letters and autobiographies. Taking Stephen Kotkin’s idea of ‘speaking Bolshevik’ as a starting point, historians of ‘Soviet subjectivity’ used ideas of discursive analysis mainly influenced by the French philosopher Michel Foucault to analyze the Stalinist self. The main idea is that individuals constructed and moulded themselves according to a Stalinist set of discourses. Therefore the self appears as dominated by discourse which functions as an elaborated ‘technology of power’. The article focuses on three approaches to ‘Soviet subjectivity’: 1. when Juliane Fürst emphasizes the omnipotent power of Soviet discourse outside which no thinking was possible; 2. Hellbeck’s and Halfin’s ideas were less radical as they put language at the core of construction of the self but leave place for individual interpretation; 3. Kharkhordin, the most prominent representative of the third approach, puts his emphasis on social pressure which is regarded as crucial for implementing Soviet norms and practices. The article finishes by touching on other approaches to ‘Soviet subjectivity’ which have been applied in recent studies, such as the performative approach.

Keywords: Stalinism; historiography; Soviet subjectivity; Michel Foucault.

Introduction. Introduced for the Stalinist period, the concept of ‘Soviet subjectivity’ was elaborated on in the late 1990s by a young generation of historians who had been substantially influenced by the works of the French thinker Michel Foucault on the creation of the self. It applies a discursive approach to selfhood in the pre-war period of Soviet history and thus, referring to a poststructuralist perception of actuality, points out the significance and power of language for the individual constructing her [3] own personality. The results of these studies are in a sense startling as they resemble at first glance the findings of the totalitarian approach to Soviet society: there seems to be little difference between the notion of the ‘prisoners of the Soviet self’ which gives an account of the new vision of the Soviet individuals and the ‘oppressed and brainwashed Soviet subject’ as the Soviet people were viewed in the studies on the totalitarian character of the Soviet system [4]. The authors who are concerned with the concept of ‘Soviet subjectivity’ are trained historians who, benefiting from the newly possible access to archival materials since 1991 [5], developed their conception mainly for the high Stalinist period – i.e. the 1930s, whereas the scholars belonging to the totalitarian school worked generally as political scientists or sociologists,

stressing an overarching concept of the 'Soviet man' as a subject of a state that continued to be organised along 'totalitarian' lines. Thus, these authors draw no distinction between the pre-war years and late Stalinism of the kind that can be found in recent studies [6].

The mid-1990s saw the rise of a 'post-revisionist' approach to the history of Stalinism. It is Stephen Kotkin's study on the city of Magnitogorsk as a 'microcosm of the Soviet Union' that is usually viewed as the watershed of a new period of historiography regarding Stalinism [7]. I will argue, however, that this 'post-revisionist' work in regard to the handling of the self has more in common with its predecessor studies among revisionist work than with the works it has initiated. Kotkin bases his analysis on both a Foucauldian theory of subjectivity and on de Certeau's idea of the 'practice of everyday life'; his focus, however, mainly concentrates on the latter. Examining how the individual chose more or less consciously her identity in a process which is described as 'identification games' and how she acquires an identity by learning how to 'speak Bolshevik', this approach resembles the revisionist idea of social identities as 'the way people locate themselves in a social or group context' [8]. Thus the 'pragmatic self' is back on the historiographical stage reminding the reader not only of the revisionist subject who is mainly concerned with organizing his social upward movement but also of the totalitarian view of the Soviet man who, though oppressed, is able to apply certain 'adjustment mechanisms' to lessen his burden [9].

It is the very existence of the autonomy of this 'pragmatic self' that the Foucauldian approach to the Stalinist self rejects. The main creators of the 'Soviet subjectivity,' the German historian Jochen Hellbeck, currently teaching at Rutgers University, and his Israeli colleague Igal Halfin from Tel Aviv University, criticize in their essay on Kotkin's *Magnetic Mountain* the 'Romantic tradition' in which the self is characterized as an autonomous agent, which they see as elaborated in Kotkin's work, and debunk the notion of a 'conscious man' as a Stalinist blueprint that the latter uncritically adopted and elaborated for his own purposes. Their main argument against Kotkin's concept of the subject is that he neglects the Bolsheviks' concern with the 'soul' of the subjects [10]. By analyzing how individuals construct their selves in autobiographies according to the requirements of the regime, Halfin in one of his articles rejects the sheer existence of an independent historical subject which could emerge outside the discourses regarding the Stalinist subject [11]. Others of Halfin's works focus on the ways in which the 'oppositionists' during the Great Purge tried to prove their innocence by applying the terms of the official discourse. He argues that this was not a manipulative usage of the discourse, but clearly points to the non-existence of 'a preexistent authentic subject' [12]. In his works on diary writing in the 1930s, Hellbeck comes to the same conclusion: he also rejects the notion of a liberal subject as existing outside the discursive construction of the self [13].

This view of the self as the result of a permanent process of construction refers mainly to the ideas which Foucault expounded in his theory [14]. Elaborating in his earlier works the idea of 'technologies of domination,' Foucault focused on the creation of the subject, which he saw as being achieved through the subjugation and disciplining of the individual by various suppressive mechanisms of power including discourses as one of the sharpest weapons [15]. In his later works he moved the centre of his interest away from power towards the idea of 'technologies of the self', i.e. the way in which a 'human being turns him- or herself into a subject' [16]. Foucault refers to this idea of conscious and permanent construction and moulding of one's own subjectivity as the 'hermeneutics of the self' [17].

I will analyze three different approaches to the phenomenon of Soviet subjectivity which all lie on the continuum between the 'technologies of domination' and the 'technologies of the self'. The most extreme version of a Foucauldian interpretation with reference to 'domination' is Juliane Fürst's article on youth opposition in the immediate post-war years. Fürst demonstrates the omnipotent power of Soviet discourses by showing that even resistance to the system was possible only within the theoretical framework of the Soviet state. Thus language, whilst transmitting values and norms of the official discourse, becomes the crucial factor in constructing and determining the self of the Soviet citizens. In this reading, the people are regarded as prisoners – not of the state's control but of the language: 'prisoners of the Soviet self' [18]. Another example of this approach is Natalia Kozlova's article, which assumes that the writers of self-narratives wear a linguistic mask with 'nothing behind the face'. Referring to Stepan Podlubnyi's diary, Kozlova draws the conclusion that 'the language of ideology seems nothing but a tool of domination' [19]. Analysing the intransigent behaviour and way of life of impostors during the 1930s, Golfo Alexopoulos and Jeffrey Rossman come to a similar conclusion, that of the impact that cultural codes and discursive frameworks on the individual [20]. Similarly, Amir Weiner's study about the Second World War in

Ukraine draws the conclusion that the discursive framework of the revolution 'was the prism through which Soviet contemporaries made sense of the cataclysmic events that shaped their lives' [21].

A slightly different position is taken by Oleg Kharkhordin who does not consider discourses as constitutive of the self, so much as the social practices of individuals and groups. Focusing on the practices of self-development and self-fashioning during the Stalinist period, Kharkhordin thus argues that the individual was created through the interaction of external collective pressure on the one hand and the ability of the individual to regulate her own self on the other hand [22]. He thus reverts to both the original Foucauldian theories whereas the historians of 'Soviet subjectivity' dwell on the approach to subjectivity which Foucault developed near the end of his life, the 'technologies of the self', mainly focussing on the necessity of the 'verbalization of the self' and the need to be constantly aware of who one is and how to perform this self in a textual way. Choosing as major sources the written utterances of individual Soviet citizens, such as diaries and autobiographies, Jochen . Hellbeck and Igal Halfin concentrate on 'reading the Soviet experience and, particularly, Stalinism, as textuality' [23].

Hellbeck's initial vision of the Soviet subject can be located somewhere between the 'technologies of domination' and the 'hermeneutics of the self', as he is concerned with the conscious 'fashioning of the Stalinist self' but also regards his protagonists, the writers of diaries during the 1930s, as dominated by official discourses [24]. In his PhD dissertation, Hellbeck shows four different ways of conceptualizing the self as part of the Soviet system by analyzing four diaries of the Stalinist period. In a first part, he presents the Soviet vision of the 'New Man' as serving as a model for the diary writers who 'sought to remake *themselves* according to aesthetic and ethical standards of perfection' [25]. A later article shows the struggle of the young Stepan Podlubnyi to define himself as a subject according to the model provided by the Stalinist system. Analyzing his diary [26], Hellbeck shows how Podlubnyi actively 'engineered his own soul'. Thus we find a strong notion of the 'technologies of the self' in this article, however the article also draws a similar conclusion to that drawn by Fürst, namely that unbelief could not be expressed outside the Soviet discursive framework [27]. Hellbeck's approach thus offers both perspectives on the subject: the subject oppressed and dominated by 'mechanics of power' [28] – mainly language – as well as the self who voluntarily and consciously operates on his own soul according to the 'hermeneutics of the self'.

In an article reviewing four studies on the Stalinist subjects focusing on their applied approach to resistance, however, Hellbeck revokes this notion of the oppressed subject and shifts his focus to the process of conscious work on the self. Drawing the conclusion that the individual's self-transformation was rather due to the 'threat of self-marginalization and atomization', he not only refers to a term defined in the totalitarian context but also seems to re-introduce the assumption of an objective reality in which the desire to be part of a given society functions as a pre-existent and historical truth [29]. Hellbeck's following studies on subjectivity, however, do not pursue this perspective but rather focus decidedly on the 'hermeneutics of the self'. Analyzing various examples of diary writing in the 1930s as an active composition of self-narratives, another article is concerned with the processes of 'subjectivation' which appears as the agenda of the Bolshevik politics to foster the creation of revolutionary selves. The discourses of the regime constitute in this reading a mere 'transformative framework' for the production of the 'New Man'; the active re-fashioning of themselves plays a more significant role in this process. The diary thus is characterized as a 'self-disciplining technique'; on its pages the writers 'sculpt themselves as autobiographical subjects' [30].

In his latest monograph on Stalinist diary writing, Hellbeck clearly demonstrated that he had abandoned the approach towards the self as a product of the 'technologies of domination' when focusing on the 'self-transformation' of the subjects and stating that the 'language of the self' had not emerged due to a discursive pressure of the ideology. 'It thrived, rather, in a larger revolutionary ecosystem of which the Communist regime was as much a producer as a product.' [31]

In the promoting of the autobiographical self and the intense concern with the 'soul' of the Soviet subjects, one can find a striking similarity to Igal Halfin's approach is, as I will argue, the closest to Foucault's late theories about the self. For him as well as for Hellbeck, the main goal of the 'hermeneutics of the soul' lies in purification of the self by the scrutiny of one's own inner mind [32]. In both his articles and his main work on subjectivity, Halfin demonstrates that hermeneutics as a means to create a pure and conscious self is closely interlinked with both the terror and a

'Bolshevik eschatology' [33]. The individuals, in this reading, perpetuate Bolshevik hermeneutics, which represented an 'attempt to adduce from his outward behavior the essence of man, an essence that supposedly lay underneath and invited decipherment' in their own soul. The Great Purge thus functioned as a 'hermeneutical court' which not only liquidated the 'false' revolutionaries but also punished their relatives and friends for they had 'failed as hermeneuticists' in unmasking the accused. Halfin thus not only provides a new dimension of the terror but also demonstrates to what degree the individual voluntarily internalized the requirements of the system [34].

Analyzing the practice of autobiographical writing in the 1920s and 1930s, Halfin shows how the individuals voluntarily shaped their self-narratives according to the particular 'poetics of the Communist autobiography' and internalized the Bolshevik concern with the 'souls' of the subjects [35]. Thus Halfin reinterprets the language of self-expression, which was a crucial part of the public life, and links it to the creation of the Communist self: 'Autobiography does not only express the self; it creates it'. This does not, however, exclude the possibility for the individual to be part of 'alternative forms of self-identification' if he does not mind being marginalized by the system [36]. Linking these hermeneutics with the eschatological and messianistic worldview of the Communist regime, Halfin characterizes the autobiographical practice as a 'journey from darkness to light,' but he also assumes that a justification or inner logic of the terror lies in the obsessive striving for purification on the part of the state and in the soul of every individual [37]. This approach to the individual as consciously caring about the self and moulding it according to an eschatological framework places Halfin's works on the 'Soviet soul' as the closest to Foucault's late theories on the 'technologies of the self'.

As Eric Naiman remarks, Halfin's elaboration of subjectivity treats the individual as an 'historical actor' whereas Hellbeck promotes his protagonists rather as 'characters' and 'uniform figures' possessing 'richly constructed psyches' [38]. In the same article, Naiman observes that according to both approaches, 'ideology ... was transformed from an unconscious mechanism ... into something that could be acquired by speaking, thinking, acting, and feeling' and that it ceases to be a 'native language' but becomes an 'acquired tongue' [39]. 'Mastering a new language of power' thus became crucial in order for the individual to integrate into the system. Naiman apparently agrees with Halfin and Hellbeck that language is a critical factor in the creation of subjectivity and that the subject 'actively wrote himself into the Soviet order' and the discourse [40].

Anna Krylova argues that the Stalinist subject appears in Halfin's and Hellbeck's reading as 'an agent whose agency consists of the uncritical pursuit of a prescribed personality, or a portion of it'. Rejecting this passive notion of the self, Krylova promotes a self which remains, to a certain degree, an independent and autonomous agent, 'a Stalinist individual for whom the internalization of key terms of Stalinist official culture did not automatically lead to his disappearance as an active agent in his self-imagination'. Analyzing responses written by members of the 'first Soviet generation' to Ketlinskaia's 1938 novel *Courage*, she demonstrates the existence of 'a Stalinist subject that is neither lost in Stalinist culture nor securely untouched by its ideals and demands' [41]. Regarding the approach to 'Soviet subjectivity' primarily in relation to the early Foucauldian works, a second article by Krylova rejects the idea that 'the historical and cultural 'entrapment' of the author within a particular system of signification... exclude(s) the possibility of creative self-expression through that same system'. She demonstrates various ways of expressing this autonomous self in women's fictional writing during the Stalinist period [42]. In a similar way, Thomas Lahusen demonstrates the intersection of fiction and reality by deciphering the personality of the Soviet socialist realist author Vasilii Azhaev through his fictional works, his diary and his biography. He, however, demonstrates the impossibility of deconstructing all the layers of a subject in order to discover the 'real' self; on the contrary, the self seems to exist merely in this intersection of fiction and literature and in the permanent process of constructing and reconstructing [43].

Conclusions. The concepts of the Soviet subject that I have analysed here are far from being the only possible approaches to the self in the Soviet context, as I have tried to show by providing an overview of the revisionist view of the individual playing successfully the 'identification game' [44]. Other promising ways to approach this subject could be to include recognition of the performative dimension in one's approach to the individual's action and attitude. In his highly theoretically informed study about ritualised acts in the Komsomol work of the late Soviet period, Alexei Yurchak describes the acting of the Komsomol members as performative acts which are not clearly embedded in discourse. The performative reproduction of pre-existing forms endorses the emergence of unanticipated meaning – e.g. the justification of listening to rock music or an excuse

for leading an idle way of life. Yurchak observes a 'performative shift' after the death of Stalin when the 'authoritative discourse' came to be replaced by these performative ritualized acts [45]. Thus this approach to the self might seem to be mainly suitable for a study about the Thaw period or the era of stagnation than for the Stalinist period. However, such insight can in fact provide a further dimension also to the vision of the Stalinist self as is shown by Studer's article on the Stalinist terror including the performative framework as well as the 'technologies of the self' [46].

References:

1. C. Chatterjee and K. Petrone, 'Models of Selfhood and Subjectivity: The Soviet Case in Historical Perspective', *Slavic Review* 67(2008), pp. 967-86, quotation p. 972.
2. J. Fürst, 'Prisoners of the Soviet Self? Political Youth Opposition in Late Stalinism', *Europe-Asia Studies* 54 (2002), pp. 353-75.
3. Being aware of the importance of language, the author uses the male and the female in alternation, always having in mind both the sexes.
4. Quotations: see Fürst, 'Prisoners of the Soviet Self?' and Chatterjee/Petrone, 'Models of Selfhood and Subjectivity', p. 972.
5. For an overview of the opening of the archives in 1991 and its impact on the historiography of the Soviet Union see S. Kotkin, '1991 and the Russian Revolution: Sources, Conceptual Categories, Analytic Frameworks', *Journal of Modern History* 70 (1998), pp. 384-425.
6. Cf. e.g. J. Fürst (ed.), *Stalin's Last Generation: Youth, State and Komsomol 1945-1953* (London, 2003) and J. Fürst and M. Edele (eds.), *Late Stalinist Russia: Society between Reconstruction and Reinvention* (London, 2006).
7. Kotkin, *Magnetic Mountain*, quotation p. 144; Fitzpatrick and Anna Krylova, see Fitzpatrick, 'Revisionism in Retrospect' and Krylova, 'The Tenacious Liberal Subject in Soviet Studies'.
8. First two quotations in Kotkin, *Magnetic Mountain*, p. 215 and 219; third quotation in Fitzpatrick, *Tear off the Masks!*, p. 9.
9. For the idea of the 'pragmatic self' see Chatterjee/Petrone, 'Models of Selfhood and Subjectivity', p. 973-6; for the topic of the upward social mobility during pre-war Stalinism see e.g. the essays in Fitzpatrick, *The Cultural Front*.
10. I. Halfin and J. Hellbeck, 'Rethinking the Stalinist Subject: Stephen Kotkin's 'Magnetic Mountain' and the State of Soviet Historical Studies', *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 64(1996), pp. 456-63, quotations p. 463 and 458.
11. See I. Halfin, 'From Darkness to Light: Student Communist Autobiography During NEP', *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 45(1997), pp. 210-36.
12. I. Halfin, 'Looking into the Oppositionists' Souls: Inquisition Communist Style', *Russian Review* 60(2001), pp. 316-39, quotation p. 338; see also Halfin, *Terror in my Soul*.
13. See e.g. the conclusion in J. Hellbeck, *Laboratories of the Soviet Self. Diaries from the Stalin Era* (Columbia University, 1998), pp. 484-93; see also the introduction in J. Hellbeck's, *Revolution on my Mind: Writing a Diary under Stalin* (Cambridge/Mass. et. al., 2006), pp. 1-14 and J. Hellbeck, 'Fashioning the Stalinist Soul. The Diary of Stepan Podlubnyi, 1931-9' in S. Fitzpatrick's (ed.), *Stalinism. New Directions* (London, 2000), pp. 77-116.
14. I refer mainly to the three completed volumes of his *History of Sexuality*; see M. Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, 3. vol.: 1. The Will to Knowledge; 2. The Use of Pleasure; 3. The Care of the Self (London, 1981-1986); I also take into account other works such as M. Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (London, 1977) and M. Foucault, 'Technologies of the Self' in L.H. Martin (ed), *Technologies of the Self* (Amherst, 1988), pp. 16-49; a short overview of Foucault's approach to the constructed self can be found in Hutton's, 'Foucault, Freud, and the Technologies of the Self'.
15. Cf. Foucault's earlier works on the 'dividing practices' such as Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* and M. Foucault, *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason* (London, 1967); the first volume of the *History of Sexuality* also views the subject in this way. See as well M. Foucault, 'Technologies of the Self' in L.H. Martin's (ed), *Technologies of the Self* (Amherst, 1988), pp. 16-49 and L.H. Martin, 'Introduction' in *ibid.*, pp. 3-8.
16. M. Foucault, 'The Subject and Power', in H. Dreyfus and P. Rabinow's, *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics* (Chicago, 1983), pp. 208-26, here p. 208.
17. Cf. mainly the third volume of Foucault's *History of Sexuality*; for a shorter version of these ideas see Foucault, 'Technologies of the Self', quotation p. 17.

18. Fürst, 'Prisoners of the Soviet Self'

19. N. Kozlova, 'The Diary as Initiation and Rebirth. Reading Everyday Documents of the Early Soviet Era' in C. Kiaer (ed.), *Everyday Life in Early Soviet Russia. Taking the Revolution Inside* (Bloomington, al., 2006), pp. 282-98, quotations p. 285.

20. G. Alexopoulos, 'Portrait of a Con Artist as a Soviet Man', *Slavic Review* 57 (1998), pp. 774-90 and J. Rossman, 'Weaver of Rebellion and Poet of Resistance: Kapiton Klepikov (1880-1933) and Shop-Floor Opposition to Bolshevik Rule', *Jahrbücherfür Geschichte Osteuropas* 44(1996), pp. 374-408.

21. A. Weiner, *Making Sense of War: The Second World War and the Fate of the Bolshevik Revolution* (Princeton, 2001), quotation p. 17.

22. O. Kharkhordin, *The Collective and the Individual in Russia. A Study of Practices* (Berkeley, 1999).

23. Cf. Foucault, 'Technologies of the Self', first quotation p. 48-9 and E. Naiman, 'On Soviet Subjects and the Scholars who Make them', *Russian Review* 60 (2001), pp. 307-15, second quotation p. 310.

24. Such reads the title of one of Hellbeck's articles, see Hellbeck, 'Fashioning the Stalinist Soul'; as for his other works I refer to in this context see Hellbeck, *Laboratories of the Soviet Self* and J. Hellbeck, 'Speaking Out: Language of Affirmation and Dissent in Stalinist Russia', *Kritikal* (2000), pp. 71-96.

25. Hellbeck, *Laboratories of the Soviet Self*, quotation p. 19; italics in original.

26. It was Hellbeck who published this diary in German, cf. S. Podlubnyj, *Tagebuchaus Moskau: 1931 – 1939*, ed. by J. Hellbeck (München, 1996).

27. Hellbeck, 'Fashioning the Stalinist Soul', quotations p. 110. It is in this context that the scholar on Russian and Soviet literature and culture, Eric Naiman, criticizes Hellbeck for promoting a strongly tendentious vision of the Soviet subject 'as an individual damaged by discourse: a victim, ideologically speaking, of an abusive home, see Naiman, 'On Soviet Subjects and the Scholars who Make them', p. 315.

28. Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, p. 138.

29. Hellbeck, 'Speaking Out: Language of Affirmation and Dissent in Stalinist Russia', quotation p. 95.

30. Hellbeck, 'Working, Struggling, Becoming', quotations p. 136, 147 and 153.

31. Hellbeck, *Revolution on my Mind*, quotations p. 5 and 7.

32. Hellbeck, *Revolution on my Mind*, pp. 7 and 34 and the concluding chapter on 'The Urge to Struggle on', pp. 347-63; Hellbeck, 'Working, Struggling, Becoming' and the first chapter on 'Good and Evil in Communism' in Halfin, *Terror in my Soul*, pp. 7-42.

33. Referring mainly to Halfin, *Terror in my Soul* as well as to the following articles: Halfin, 'From Darkness to Light: Student Communist Autobiography During NEP'; Halfin, 'Looking into the Oppositionists' Souls'; I. Halfin, 'Intimacy in an Ideological Key: The Communist Case of the 1920s and 1930s' in I. Halfin (ed.), *Language and Revolution: Making Modern Political Identities* (London, 2002), pp. 185-213 and I. Halfin, 'Between Instinct and Mind: The Bolshevik View of the Proletarian Self', *Slavic Review* 62 (2003), pp. 34-40.

34. Quotations in Halfin, 'Intimacy in an Ideological Key', p. 185 and 208; second quotation in Halfin, *Terror in my Soul*, p. 8; see also Halfin, 'Stalin's Purges and the Question of Belief'.

35. Halfin, 'From Darkness to Light: Student Communist Autobiography During NEP'.

36. Halfin, *Terror in my Soul*, p. 19.

37. Cf. Halfin, 'From Darkness to Light: Student Communist Autobiography During NEP'; see also Quotations in Halfin, 'Intimacy in an Ideological Key' and Halfin, *Terror in my Soul*, p. 19, esp. the second chapter on 'A Voyage toward the Light', pp. 43-95. Halfin connects his approach to the 'Soviet subjectivity' to his earlier works which are mainly concerned with the analysis of Communism as eschatology and the proletariat as 'class messiah', see I. Halfin, *From Darkness to Light. Class, Consciousness and Salvation in Revolutionary Russia* (Pittsburgh, 2000), esp. pp. 39-84 and 96-104.

38. Naiman, 'On Soviet Subjects and the Scholars who Make them', quotation pp. 312-3.

39. Naiman, 'On Soviet Subjects and the Scholars who Make them', quotation p. 315.

40. E. Naiman, 'Discourse Made Flesh: Healing and Terror in the Construction of Soviet Subjectivity' in I. Halfin's (ed.), *Language and Revolution: Making Modern Political Identities* (London, 2002), pp. 287-316, quotation p. 288; Naiman, 'On Soviet Subjects and the Scholars who Make them', quotation pp. 312-3 and Hellbeck, 'Fashioning the Stalinist Soul', quotation p. 110.

41. A. Krylova, 'Identity, Agency, and the 'First Soviet Generation'' in S. Lovell's (ed.), *Generations in Twentieth-Century Europe* (Basingstoke et. al., 2007), pp. 101-21, quotations p. 102, 103 and 117.

42. A. Krylova, "In Their Own Words?" Soviet Women Writers in Search for their Selves' in A.M. Barker's (ed.), *A History of Womens Writing in Russia* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 243-63, quotations p. 243.

43. T. Lahusen, *How Life Writes the Book: Real Socialism and Socialist Realism in Stalin's Russia* (Ithaca et.al., 1997).

44. Kotkin, *Magnetic Mountain*, p. 215.

45. A. Yurchak, *Everything Was forever, until it Was no more: The Last Soviet Generation* (Princeton et. al., 2006), quotations pp. 24-5.

46. B. Studer, 'Liquidate the Errors or Liquidate the Person? Stalinist Party Practices as Techniques of the Self', in B. Studer and H. Haumann's (eds.), *Stalinistische Subjekte: Individuum und System in der Sowjetunion und der Komintern, 1929-1953* (Zürich, 2006), pp. 197-216.

**«Угнетенный и идеологически обработанный советский человек?»
или «Заклученные советской сущности?» Последние концепции
советской субъективности**

Катарина Уль

Колледж Св. Антония, Оксфордский университет

Аннотация. В статье изучается концепт «советская субъективность», его различные формы и подходы. Этот концепт был разработан, главным образом, историками Йоханом Хелльбеком и Иганом Халфиным в последние годы 1990х - начале 2000х, в качестве источников они использовали личные документы 1920х и 1930х гг., такие как дневники, письма и автобиографии. Используя идею Стивена Коткина «Говорить по-большевистски» в качестве отправной точки, историки «советской субъективности» для анализа сталинской сущности использовали идеи дискурсивного анализа, на которые, в основном, повлиял французский философ Мишель Фуко. Основная идея состоит в том, что индивиды сконструировали и создали себя в соответствии со сталинским комплексом дискурсов. Таким образом, над личностью довлеет дискурс, функционирующий как усовершенствованная «технология власти». В статье делается упор на изучение трех подходов «советской субъективности»: в то время как Юлиана Фюрст подчеркивает всемогущую власть советского дискурса, за пределами которого не было мышления, идеи Хелльбека и Халфина были менее радикальными, они считали язык основой построения личности, но оставляли место для индивидуальной интерпретации; Харходин, яркий представитель третьего подхода, делает упор на социальное давление, которое рассматривается как ключевое для принятия советских норм и практик. В конце статьи затрагиваются другие подходы к «советской субъективности», которые используются в современных исследованиях, такой как перформативный подход.

Ключевые слова: сталинизм; историография; советская субъективность; Мишель Фуко.