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THE METRO METROES: SHAPING SOVIET POST-WAR SUBJECTIVITIES IN THE LENINGRAD UNDERGROUND

by James Allen Nealy, Jr.

The thesis explores the relationship between the spatial relations of the first line of the Leningrad Metro system, completed in 1955, and subjectivity in the post-war Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Soviet subways were not simply mechanisms by which one travelled; often referred to as “underground palaces,” these facilities featured art and architecture that informed passengers about the history, and the future, of the Soviet Union. Thus, the metro offers a glimpse of how the USSR conceived of itself and its position along the dialectical path to communism. I argue that the messages in the underground’s walls, and the memoirs of the workers who constructed them, suggest that many of the reforms often associated with Nikita Khrushchev’s Thaw period were actually well under way during Iosif Stalin’s lifetime.
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Introduction

In November 1955, the Soviet Union celebrated the opening of the first line of its second underground transport system, the V.I. Lenin Leningrad Metropoliten.¹ Similar to its “brother metro” in Moscow, which opened in 1935, the Leningrad Metro stations featured elaborate architecture and art that often elicited comparison to “palaces.”² In addition to providing aesthetically pleasing environments for its passengers, these characteristics also offered lessons in socialism, inculcating passengers with the values and priorities of Soviet Communism. But the USSR had changed considerably between the interwar period and the post-war era, and the messages in the walls of the underground differed accordingly. Whereas the Moscow system reflected the interwar Stalinist commitment to portraying Soviet Communism’s radiant future (svetloe budushchee), the first line of the Leningrad Metro focused on the story of the polity’s theretofore development, what might be referred to as the “consolidation of Stalinist gains,” and the mythologizing of the USSR’s own historical trajectory.

The Leningrad Metro stations venerated Russo-Soviet history by celebrating its art, domestic progress, and military triumphs, perhaps envisaging a relaxing of tensions and an emphasis on domestic issues. This view challenges traditional periodization of Soviet history that tends to see Nikita Khrushchev’s Thaw (ottepel’) as a liberal departure from Late Stalinism.³ Simply put, the art and architecture in the Leningrad underground space suggests that, in many ways, the path to relative liberalization, particularly in the form of a relaxation of pressures on workers, was laid in Leningrad, during Iosif Stalin’s lifetime, under his nose though it may have

---

been, and at least some of the characteristics often associated with the Thaw were in fact rooted in the Late Stalin period.⁴

First, the metro improved people’s daily lives by dramatically increasing their mobility throughout Leningrad, allowing for a more convenient commute to and from work, and providing them with easy access to the city’s cultural center. Second, by encouraging the metro’s passengers to consider the stations’ historical messages, architects and city-planners foreshadowed a cultural “breathing spell” from the breakneck pace of industrialization, militarization, warfare, and fixation on the future that had characterized the early Soviet epoch. Whether this development was a response to, or an endorsement of, post-war demands for a better life, its genesis occurred before Stalin’s death.⁵ Finally, artists adorned subterranean stations with images of Vladimir Lenin and dedications to the October Revolution, sometimes with nary a mention of Stalin, suggesting that post-war re-Leninization, typically associated with de-Stalinization, was an important part of public discourse in the Late Stalinist period.⁶

But the Leningrad underground served another ceremonial function. Both termini of the first line, Ploshchad’ Vosstania and Avtovo, rest upon reclaimed spaces once controlled by the vanquished foes of Soviet Communism, tsarism in the case of the former, and Nazism in the latter. The corresponding underground spaces below these hubs are dedicated to the memory and cultural legacy of these victories. Thus, the first line of the Leningrad Metro is not merely a series of “palaces” or homage to Russo-Soviet cultural heroes and history; it is the culmination of a gathering of Bolshevik lands, and a monument to the two wars that shaped the Soviet century.

Michel Foucault once described the train as “an extraordinary bundle of relations because it is something through which one goes, it is also something by means of which one can go from

---

⁴ Yoram Gorlizki and Oleg Khlevniuk have suggested that some reforms were considered in the political apparatus but were frustrated by Stalin’s presence in Cold Peace Stalin and the Ruling Circle, 1945-1953, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 61-62, 166-167. Anna Krylova has argued that it would be unwise to assume that Soviet political thought was necessarily bifurcated between “pro-Stalin” and “anti-Stalin” in “The Tenacious Liberal Self in Soviet Studies,” Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History, Vol. 1 No. 1 (Winter 2000), 119-146.
one point to another, and then it is also something that goes by.”²⁷ By virtue of its inherent qualities, the metro’s form simultaneously complicates and simplifies Foucault’s observations. On the one hand, the underground adds yet another dimension to the relationships between passenger, vehicle, and space by serving as a constructed space, complete with its own artistic and architectural “bundle of relations,” to which one must go for the purposes of accessing a commuter train and from which one departs after having done so. On the other hand, a metro’s space is absolute and rigidly defined. The underground’s borders are anything but imagined; despite architects’ best efforts to create structures which provide the illusion of cohesion with the outside world, the metro’s ceiling is very real. Thus, as Henri Lefebvre might say, it is subways and trains with their tunnels, viaducts, and tracks that represent “activity in space” that “is restricted by that space,” par excellence.⁸ The history of public transportation, in this case the Leningrad Metro, would therefore seem ideal for exploring Foucault’s “bundles.”⁹

The construction of the Leningrad Metro provides a prism through which numerous themes may be explored. The building project necessarily complicates conventional chronometry. Though plans for the subway’s construction were approved in the late-1930s, they were not completed until well after Stalin’s death; ergo, while the building of the Leningrad Metro was a Stalinist post-war scheme, it was not a re-construction project. Furthermore, the first line’s completion was celebrated eleven days after Khrushchev publicly criticized excesses in architectural design and construction, and just months before his “Secret Speech” at the Twentieth Party Congress.¹⁰ Therefore, the project also provides a view of the production of

---

post-war Soviet space. The metro’s construction is additionally complicated due to its location in Leningrad, a space of great symbolic importance both to Russian and Bolshevik cultural identities.

If during the Soviet period the extravagant Moscow Metro overshadowed its sibling in Leningrad, the same can certainly be said about the treatment of the two projects in Western historiography, where the former has been the topic of some scholarly investigation, and the latter languishes in relative obscurity. Though the literature that examines the Moscow Metro has tended to remain divided between explorations of the sociopolitical nuances of the construction and studies of the propagandizing effects of the system’s architecture, both approaches suggest that the underground served multiple purposes, only one of which was transportation.

Sheila Fitzpatrick once remarked that the “pervasiveness of the state” in the Soviet interwar era makes writing a “bottom-up” history of the period problematic, if not impossible. Similarly, the architectural features of the Moscow underground are an imposing and seductive force that demands attention even from those who expressly intend to avoid them altogether. The first scholarly exploration of the Moscow Metro in the English language, William Wolf’s “Russia’s Revolutionary Underground” offers a history of the labor and political process of the metro’s construction. For Wolf, the Metro system provided the Stalinist leadership with an example of the superiority of Soviet socialism over capitalism by virtue of its lavishness and the speed with which it was constructed. His focus on labor and politics notwithstanding, Wolf concludes that the decorative elements of the project gave it an iconographic quality that provided evidence of the future glories of Soviet Communism.

14 Wolf, “Russia’s Revolutionary Underground,” 1, 3-4.
Andrew Jenks, meanwhile, has placed these iconographic qualities at the center of his research. Jenks’ “A Metro on the Mount” provides an insightful look at how the Stalinist leadership, through an intricate system of architecture, images, and technologies, used the USSR’s first underground system to remake Moscow, the workers who produced it, and the citizens who utilized its services.\(^\text{16}\) For Jenks, the metro was an “exemplar of Soviet technological display” that infused its passengers with the “ethos of Stalinist civilization” and its mythology.\(^\text{17}\) In the depths of the underground, the Moscow Metro served the function of a school that would aid in the development of the New Soviet Man.\(^\text{18}\)

The implications of Jenks’ argument are significant. Among the more developed threads in recent historiography of the USSR is the debate over subjectivity during the Stalinist epoch. And while this scholarship has certainly brought new and innovative arguments to the fore, it has tended to privilege textual “laboratories of the soul” over spatial and vocational variables, sometimes ignoring the latter two considerations altogether.\(^\text{19}\) Though he does not make the connection explicitly, Jenks harks back to one of the foundational tenets of Bolshevism— that the advancement of culture, technology, and work were each part and parcel of the cumulative, grandiose dialectical process that would lead to the elimination of Russian “backwardness.”

Much of this advancement, from the doldrums of backwardness to the glories of the radiant future, was predicated on a desired shift in peoples’, but especially industrial workers’, mentalities, from a loose collection of individuals that composed a class \textit{an sich}, existing but not yet conscious of itself, to a class \textit{fuer sich}, for itself and for its interests.\(^\text{20}\) But mentality, or subjectivity, was only part of the equation. Of at least equal importance was the formation of a competent and skilled labor force. Lenin’s statement that electrification would “enlighten” Russia was therefore a double entendre.\(^\text{21}\) As the primary agent of progress in all facets of society in the Soviet Republic, it was thus the Bolshevik Party’s responsibility, Lenin wrote, to


“realize this change” (osoznat’ etot perelom) and to “stand at the head of the exhausted people” and “lead them along the true path, along the path of labor discipline.” Russia, Lenin said, must “learn to work.”

But processes are, by definition, dynamic. As Lewis H. Siegelbaum has noted, the Soviet leadership’s goal to improve labor production, as well as culture, vis-à-vis their capitalist counterparts did not end after the Great Patriotic War, or even after Stalin’s death in 1953. And as recent work has shown, the Soviet approach to managing social evolution changed considerably throughout its seventy-four year existence. Ultimately, Jenks’ work suggests that one way to explore how the administration of this growth was modified may be through examining messages encoded in the art and architecture of Soviet spaces.

The few works on the Leningrad Metro have tended to focus almost entirely on the propagandistic elements of the edifice’s design. For example, Karen L. Kettering has observed that the architects of the Leningrad underground, like those who worked on the subway in Moscow, intended to create a spacious and elaborate structure that fostered “feelings of joy and happiness.” Other scholars have complemented this continuum thesis. W. Bruce Lincoln once described the Leningrad Metro as a luxurious “People’s Palace” which allowed “every citizen”

25 For their part, political scientists, economists, and geographers have offered significant contributions to the study of the Leningrad Metro and the development of Soviet transportation in general. Holland Hunter’s Soviet Transportation Policy (Cambridge, 1957) has suggested that Marxist theory, particularly the disdain for uneven economic development, held considerable influence on the development of Soviet infrastructure, a notion supported by J.N. Westwood’s “Transport” in The Economic Transformation of the Soviet Union, 1913-1945, ed. R.W. Davies, Mark Harrison, and S.G. Wheatcroft, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994, 158-181). Martin Crouch, however, has suggested that this attention to theory amounted to little; for him, the twenty year gap between the completion of the Moscow and Leningrad subways was a direct product of an “uneven pattern of development that prevailed under Stalin as in the nineteenth century” (“Problems of Soviet Urban Transport,” Soviet Studies, Vol. 31, No. 2 (April 1979), 231-256). Crouch’s thesis has been supported by Denis J.B. Shaw who has argued the Soviet Union’s inability to correct Leningrad’s issues with uneven development both placed a great deal of importance on the services offered by the city’s metro system, as well as created problems with overcrowding (Denis J.B. Shaw, “Planning Leningrad,” Geographical Review, Vol. 68, No. 2 (Apr., 1978), 1983).
to experience the life of a “prince or princess of the future,” remarks that certainly resemble descriptions of the Moscow underground.\textsuperscript{27}

More recently, two scholars, Karen Ohlrogge and Julia Bekman Chadaga, have posited, in accordance with Jenks, that the architectural approach to the construction of Soviet metro systems sought to serve both a pragmatic purpose, the transportation of people, and a political agenda, including the suggestion of a radiant Soviet future, conveyed through sculptures and art.\textsuperscript{28} Where their arguments diverge, however, is in their interpretation of the content forged to create Soviet identity. For Ohlrogge, the adornment of the metro with symbols, such as the sickle and hammer, signaled the triumph of the Soviet era over St. Petersburg’s imperial past.\textsuperscript{29} This argument challenges an entire faction of modern historiography that has highlighted a perceived Russification of Soviet imagery and culture which began in the 1930s and intensified after the defeat of Nazi Germany.\textsuperscript{30} For Ohlrogge, the initial design of the stations of the Leningrad Metro suggests a prevailing commitment to the promotion of socialist ideology that challenges the claims made by those who have supported the Russification thesis.\textsuperscript{31} Chadaga, meanwhile, buttresses the notion of Russification, without expressly saying so, by suggesting that the transfer of raw materials, from the periphery to the center, made the metro a “microcosm of imperial spaces.”\textsuperscript{32} Though both Ohlrogge and Chadaga acknowledge the metro architects’ stated goal to

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{29} Ohlrogge, “Stalins letzte Kathedralen,” 228-230, 232.
\item \textsuperscript{31} Ohlrogge, “Stalins letzte Kathedralen,” 238. Though Ohlrogge acknowledges the motifs dedicated to inherently Russian themes- such as Aleksandr Pushkin, she does not indicate that this is a result of any sort of privileging of Russian ethnicity or culture (238-239). Furthermore, it is worth questioning whether or not “Soviet Socialist” and “Russian” are mutually exclusive categories. Ohlrogge does not comment on this matter.
\item \textsuperscript{32} Chadaga, “From Lenin’s Tomb to Avtovo Station,” 170.
\end{itemize}
honor important historical events in Leningrad’s history, they nonetheless argue that the system of constructed spaces, like its predecessor in Moscow, predicted the inevitability of the *svetloe budushchee*. Looking back in time while foreshadowing the future, Ohlrogge and Chadaga see a “Janus-faced” message in the art and architecture of the first line of the Leningrad Metro.

Due to the nuances of the Leningrad underground’s form, it may be appropriate to adopt an approach that, while accounting for a multitude of relationships, is particularly suitable for analyzing a “bundle of relations” between spaces, metro stations, and subjects, the metro’s passengers. One methodology that lends itself to accomplishing such a task derives from the work of Martin Heidegger, whose *fourfold* offers a totalizing conception of space that encapsulates consideration for multiple relationships.33 Explicated in his “Building Dwelling Thinking,” the *fourfold* is built upon the notion of human dwelling, a notion integral to the human condition that is akin to being in a familiar, as opposed to a “foreign,” place.”34 One’s dwelling-space reveals itself as such when it exhibits the *natural* elements of the earth and the sky, as well as the *cultural* components Heidegger calls the mortals, or human beings, and the immortals, who are the heroes and heritages of a given culture.35 These elements, however, are not divulged independently of one another; each component is an essential attribute of the same “one”- what Heidegger calls the “primal oneness of the four.”36

In order for the *fourfold* to be present, its essence must be gathered by “the thing.” Heidegger offers several examples of objects capable of gathering; the most useful for the purposes of the argument that follows are the highway bridge and the jug. Due to its position within a rising and falling system of avenues which “leads” mortals from one space to another, always “before” a peoples’ divinities, the highway, Heidegger explains, provides a “location,”

---

33 The utilization of the fourfold to examine cities has thus far been almost entirely unique to the field of environmental geography, which has utilized it to consider the natural city. For example, Ingrid Leman Stefanovic and Stephen Bede Scharper, eds., *The Natural City: Re-Envisioning the Built Environment*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, Scholarly Publishing Division, 2011); Ingrid Leman Stefanovic, *Safeguarding Our Common Future Rethinking Sustainable Development*, (New York: SUNY Press, 2000). However, as Jeff Malpas has argued, what is and is not “natural” is not readily apparent (*Topology*, 237 see full citation 32n ).


within which the oneness of the four can be examined. Although many fourfolds exist, their common characteristics include the equal gathering of the material (earth and sky) and the subject (mortal) before his or her cultural heritage (divinities) within a defined space (however big or small).

It would be incorrect, Heidegger informs us, to conceive of space as something that “faces” us, is forced upon us, or is experienced by us; rather, humanity is an essential component of space’s formation and therefore the two cannot be separated. It is thus through building, which produces the locations that grant space its “being,” such as a bridge or, as will later be shown, a metro, whose vestibules, wagons, tracks, and stations conjunctively and independently create “an extraordinary bundle of fourfolds” that exhibit the characteristics of both “the bridge,” and “the jug,” where gathering may occur, that brings man closest to understanding space and its genesis.

The original Leningrad Metro stations qua Heideggerian locations held their own cultural icons, shaped into the underground by mortals, before which the latter poured throughout tunnels and across the city. As Heidegger might say, “the Metro metroes.” The most prevalent of historic immortals depicted underground was Lenin, who is featured, in some way, in half of the first line’s eight stations. But the people were also featured prominently, and their likenesses showed themselves in a unique form of Russo-Soviet immortals in the underground space. Individual stations, dedicated to the progressive social qualities of the theretofore Soviet experiment’s history, workers, sailors, builders of technology, and the like, then portrayed these subjects in and on bas-reliefs and sculptures, making cultural heroes out of the people themselves. The result was a “bundle” that might confirm Nietzsche’s contention that even “the hands of the greatest artist-thinkers” can only hope to produce images of themselves.

---


Chapter 1: “A Journey Through the Fourfolds of the Leningrad Underground.”

Although the entirety of the first line of the Leningrad Metro was conceived of holistically, architects of the individual stations were permitted some level of autonomy in the planning. The result is that, collectively, the first eight stations of the metro can be “read” like a history of significant people and events in the Soviet Union from the October Revolution to the victory in the Great Patriotic War. Designed to invoke feelings of relaxation, satisfaction, and ease, these “cultural” spaces were, according to primary architect A.M. Sokolov, expressly intended to “continue the tradition” of the Moscow subway’s design by highlighting the “ideological content of our Soviet era.” Marshal Kliment Voroshilov confirmed this notion by remarking that the metro and its architecture would have a “beneficial effect” on each passenger, who, by dwelling within it, would “be inspired to become a better person, to behave as if in a gentlemanly society.” Put another way, passengers’ cultural level would improve, and along with it, their work. But “continuation” (prodolzhaia) is not synonymous with “mimicry,” and while the Leningrad Metro did seek to politically educate its passengers, the messages it advanced were quite different from those encoded in the walls of the Moscow Metro.

The chapter that follows will explore each of the eight individual stations of the first line of the Leningrad Metro, in order to elucidate the evolution of the Soviet socio-cultural polity in the post-war and late Stalinist periods.

Ploshchad’ Vosstaniia

Station Ploshchad’ Vosstaniia, the northernmost station of the first (red) line of the Leningrad Metro, stands at the heart of St. Petersburg in a city space, Square of the Uprising, that was gradually Bolshevized throughout the Soviet period. Square of the Uprising, Znamenskaia Square during the tsarist period, had been a vital locale for early twentieth century revolutionaries, who viewed the entire space as a “sacred” one for the imperial regime. The space, located at the conjoining of Nevskii Prospekt, which Gogol once called “the making of the city,” and Ligovskii Prospekt, took on a sacredness for the revolutionaries too when, on February 4th...

---

45 In order to avoid confusion, the station Ploshchad’ Vosstaniia will be referred to as such; the square by the same name will be referred to as “Square of the Uprising.”
26, 1917, fifty people were shot and killed by a tsarist army regimen.\textsuperscript{46} Given the importance the Bolsheviks placed on symbolism, the incorporation of this space must have been ceremonial for Soviet leadership.\textsuperscript{47}

*Ploshchad’ Vosstaniia* itself rests atop land once occupied by the Znamenskii Monastery, demolished in 1940, and overlooks the space where, from 1909 until 1937, the “equine statue” of Alexander III, among the favorite targets of the demonstrators during the February Revolution, formerly stood.\textsuperscript{48} Across from the station is Moskovskii Vokzal, the terminus of the Moscow-St. Petersburg Railway and a landmark of sorts in its own right; as Grigory Kaganov has observed when examining nineteenth century depictions of the city’s landscape, it is this structure, then named for Tsar Nicholas I, that most clearly allows for the differentiation between St. Petersburg and “some provincial city.”\textsuperscript{49} Steven Maddox has recently asserted that, during the post-war period, the Leningrad Communist Party leadership emphasized the protection of the history and appearance of Leningrad by prioritizing the reconstruction of imperial-era monuments.\textsuperscript{50} The CPSU’s renovation of Znamenskaia Square suggests that, in at least some cases, post-war city planners did not shy away from creating utilitarian monuments of their own, sometimes where imperial constructs once stood.

The gathering of Bolshevik lands had its limits in post-war Leningrad. As Jenks and Wolf have argued, during the construction of the Moscow Metro, builders set out to fundamentally change Moscow from “a city of medieval churches to a fitting symbol of world socialism;” the


\textsuperscript{50} Maddox “Healing the Wounds,” 3.
plan for Leningrad, however, differed altogether.51 As Maddox has pointed out, the preservation of Leningrad’s aesthetic beauty was, in fact, paramount for architects in the post-war period.52 This was certainly true for the builders of the metro stations. According to Sokolov, planners remained mindful of their responsibility to maintain the city’s “international reputation” and took measures to ensure that none of the above ground edifices disrupted the “harmony” of the city’s architectural atmosphere.53

The maintenance of the St. Petersburg aesthetic might have ramifications regarding how the post-war USSR is viewed more generally. As Alexander Etkind has recently shown, the Russian colonial experience was a unique one in that the colonizer colonized itself.54 One aspect of this dialectical paradox was the process of Russification, which entailed reshaping places and people into more Russian-like subjects. By virtue of its origins, St. Petersburg was often at the center of this course of action. Built during Peter the Great’s reign in the early eighteenth century to represent Russia’s place within the European continent, the St. Petersburg-Petrograd-Leningrad space has always been a unique one for Russians.55 Whether this distinctiveness is a positive or a negative trait tends to correspond with one’s view of Europeanness vis-à-vis Russianness. What for Alexander Pushkin was a “window to the west” that “put Moscow in the shade” was, for Fyodor Dostoevsky, an “abstract and intentional city” which, by virtue of its lack of national characteristics, had nothing at all in common with authentic Russianness.56

Alexander III and Nicholas II tended to agree with Dostoevsky and, in trying to cope with their plight as Russian autocrats in a European capital, tried to reshape the city to suit their own tastes.57 Efforts to mutate the city notwithstanding, it is rarely debated that St. Petersburg has,

52 Maddox “Healing the Wounds,” 3.
53 Sokolov, Stantsii Leningradskogo Metre, 21. According to Ohlrogge, the architects complemented Leningrad’s architecture so effectively, in fact, that even its interior is befitting of the city-space, prompting her to compare the lighting in Ploshchad’ Vosstania to that in a church, creating a feeling that “Lenin is always present” within (232).
architecturally at least, more in common with the West than with Russia’s Byzantine lineage. That the Leningrad Metro’s architects would take special measures to ensure the city’s European stylings would not be compromised by the underground’s construction complicates the argument put forward by some scholars that, in the post-war setting, the Communist Party had adopted its own form of overt Russocentrism, a nuanced process meant to foster a “usable past” around Russian history. At the very least it would seem to call into question the universality of its application as well as the duration of its enforcement.

Underground, Ploshchad’ Vosstaniia looks back on the October Revolution, prominently featuring the key events in the revolutionary life of the highest of Soviet immortals—Lenin. Bronze sculptures adorn both sides of the tunnel, depicting the famous pillars of the triumphs of Leninism. In order, the bas-reliefs display the cultural hero’s arrival at Finland Station; his moments of reflection during the July Days; the apocryphal shot from the Aurora, an event that, for Sokolov, “heralded a new era in the history of mankind;” and finally, the Bolshevik seizure of power at the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets in October 1917. Frederick C. Corney has recently asserted that Bolshevik myth-making was predicated on creating “multiple possibilities” for citizens to view the October Revolution “as both a personal and historical foundational event.”

58 Figes, A People’s Tragedy, 8-9.
60 For proponents of the USSR’s decision to move away from Socialism, however defined, and toward Russification see Maddox “Healing the Wounds” (Toronto, 2008); Brandenberger, Propaganda State in Crisis, 5; Nicholas Timasheff The Great Retreat: The Growth and Decline of Communism in Russia (New York: EP Dutton, 1946) and Leon Trotsky, The Revolution Betrayed, trans. by Max Eastman, (Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, 2004). For opponents see David L. Hoffman, “Was There a ‘Great Retreat’ from Soviet Socialism? Stalinist Culture Reconsidered,” Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History, Vol. 5 No. 4 (Fall 2004), 652; Kotkin, Magnetic Mountain (Berkeley, 2005). Two examples of the debate over the development of nationalism in Russia include Geoffrey Hosking’s Russia: People and Empire, 1552-1917, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998), which argues that Russian nationalism did not exist until the collapse of the USSR. In contrast to Hosking is Norris’s A War of Images, which utilizes lubki to suggest that Russian nationhood existed at least as early as the nineteenth century.
moments of the revolution, would have offered one such opportunity for thousands of
Leningraders every day.

This portrayal of the revolution as a historical event is in stark contrast with the version
told at Ploshchad’ Revolutsii in Moscow. While the dramatic sculptures in Ploshchad’ Revolutsii
certainly reflect historical figures, sailors and tractor drivers for example, it would be incorrect to
describe them as icons of a static period.64 Positioned under arches, these figures are affixed in
crouched positions, almost imposing in their form, that betray the CPSU’s contemporary sense of
urgency. Furthermore, as Jenks has noted, Ploshchad’ Revolutsii includes depictions of a
traditional family, a group which would have been anathema before the mid-1930s.65 Moreover,
Mike O’Mahony has shown that the sculptures of revolutionary and partisan fighter appear aged
and haggard; by contrast, the depictions of students, families, and industrial workers appear
young.66 The inclusion of these figures, at least two of which are rightfully associated with the
equivocally called “Great Retreat” era, may have served to remind passengers that, in the late
1930s, the revolution had not yet been fulfilled and that its successes were concomitant with their
resiliency.

Ploshchad’ Vosstaniia, like Avtovo Station, discussed later in this chapter, is an important
part of a reconstitution of spatial relations in an area of Leningrad once dedicated to an enemy of
Bolshevism. Above ground, functional monuments to Bolshevism supplanted former imperial-
era structures, buttressing Ohlrogge’s argument that the aesthetic elements of the metro’s space
represent socialist victory over empire. But Late Stalinist architects did not have carte blanche to
completely redesign Leningrad. In fact, builders made concerted efforts to ensure that new
structures did not disturb the city’s European qualities, characteristics not generally associated
with Russianness, suggesting the limits of Russification. And given the fact that Ploshchad’
Vosstaniia connected the most densely populated region of Leningrad with the industrial region
near Avtovo, the station must have immediately and tangibly improved peoples’ lives by
minimizing travel time. This undermines the suggestion that Soviet leadership did not make
attempts to better the material lives of its citizens until the Khrushchev period. Underground, the
lessons on the station’s walls turn away from the “radiant future” promised in Moscow’s Metro

64 O’Mahony, “Arcaeo logical Fantasies,” 140.
Peoples” and the Stalin Constitution,” Studies in the Decorative Arts, Vol. 7 No. 2 (Spring-Summer 2000), 23-25;
Fitzpatrick, Everyday Stalinism, 142.
66 O’Mahony, “Archaeological Fantasies,” 146-148.
and instead invoke the Bolshevik past, mythologizing the revolution’s trajectory and the revolutionary life of its primary cultural hero, Lenin. This too would seem to foreshadow tactics employed by the CPSU in the post-Stalin era, which sought legitimacy by drawing on its Leninist origins.

**Vladimirskaja**

Originally, *Ploshchad’ Vosstaniia* was meant to connect directly with the Vitebsk Railway Station at Pushkin Station. However, for technical reasons, it was determined that another station, *Vladimirskaja*, was needed to serve as a link between *Ploshchad’ Vosstaniia* and Pushkin Station. As a consequence of its unique role in the metro’s first line, Vladimir Station is characterized by its smaller stature and its “understated simplicity.” Simple or not, the station possesses an excellent example of a Late Stalinist era ode to Soviet nationalities in the form of a large mosaic above the escalators in the ground hall.

Kettering has recently remarked that Moscow’s Kiev Station portrayed life for Soviet national groups as so “joyful, spontaneous, and harmonious that it could be represented as a dance.” In Vladimir Station, life in the national regions is depicted as one of plenty in a mosaic that occupies the space over the station’s escalator shaft. Titled “Abundance” (*Izobilie*), the artwork shows the myth of the development of collective farming in Central Asia, fraught with Orientalist tropes that portray Asiatic and Caucasian peoples in ethnic costumes, delivering wheat, furs, and produce. This depiction of Central Asians brought a glimpse, one that closely resembles interwar depictions of the non-Slavic peoples, of Soviet ethnography to Leningraders, perhaps providing a post-war extension of what Francine Hirsch has called the “virtual tourism” of the 1930s.

Stalin and nationalities policy are, for good reason, inextricably linked. And while it would be a stretch to assert that the USSR had answered its national questions by the time of the completion of the first line of the Leningrad Metro in 1955-1956, a framework *was* established
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that would go without serious alteration until the collapse of the USSR in 1991; and even then the Soviet era borders remained largely intact.71 "Izobilie" does not portray a radiant future of plenty for the peoples of Central Asia. Instead, it depicts the past, however mythologized, in which the region’s political organization was remade along national lines and its economy altered via collectivization.72

**Pushkinskaia Stantsiia**

Pushkin Station, named for the poet Alexander Pushkin, is the only station along the first line of the Leningrad Metro that is entirely devoted to an immortal from the Tsarist era. Pushkin’s image underwent several changes in the Soviet period. Once deemed a “monarchist” by the fledgling Soviet government and its supporters, Pushkin’s path to Soviet immortal began by 1921, when the state allowed the organization of a series of readings that celebrated his life and works.73 Thereafter, with the help of the Soviet leadership, the poet’s already substantial reputation developed into something almost cult-like. In 1934, Maxim Gorky and Nikolai Bukharin spoke of Pushkin’s genius at the 1934 Soviet Writers’ Congress;74 in 1937, at the Pushkin Jubilee in Moscow, Strastnaia Square was renamed for Pushkin;75 in 1950, Pushkin Square in Moscow was “purified” when a church was removed and subsequently replaced by a statue of Pushkin, affording the poet preeminence over “his” space;76 that same year, Andrei Platonov published “Pushkin and Gorky,” an essay which declares that Lenin had been heir to Pushkin’s cultural and intellectual legacy.77 Thus, while the Pushkin cult may have peaked in the late 1930s, by the time the poet’s station opened in 1956, his renown was anything but waning.

**Pushkinskaia Stantsiia**, the last station on the line to open after serious problems with quicksand delayed its fully operational status until April 30, 1956, is perhaps the most distinctive
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of those along the first line. The architects of the station set out to create a mood that would suit Pushkin’s “clear and concise style” of writing. The centerpiece of the station is the monument to Pushkin, which stands in a “poet’s corner” near the entrance to the escalators; he is portrayed seated on a bench, clutching flowers before a mural of Catherine Park in Tsarskoye Selo, the town where he spent his adolescence. A bas-relief medallion hangs above the escalators, featuring an image of the poet’s profile. The Pushkin Station, then, represents an “art for art’s sake” milieu which is, save for the loosest of definitions, devoid of political or revolutionary sentiment.

This type of station would have been impossible on the first line of the Moscow Metro, a product of the Chernyshevskii school of thinking that declared art without a political purpose useless. True to this form, the Soviet Union’s premier metro paid homage to poetry at Maiakovskii Station, named for V. Maiakovskii, a futurist who attempted to create a proletarian poetry unencumbered by bourgeois influence. In essence, Maiakovskii Station is a tribute in name only. As Jane Friedman has observed, the station focuses on military defense and aviation. Even the material, stainless steel, used for decor in the station was inspired by these themes. In accordance with the tenets of Socialist Realism, a concept one scholar has summarized as the “synthesis of the arts,” a description that brings to mind Wagner’s Gesamtkunstwerk, thirty-five mosaics, depicting mechanized farming, electrification, and aviation, among other things, line the inside walls of the station.

The Leningrad Metro’s tribute to poetry is markedly different. Perhaps Pushkin Station’s purer form of art explains why it is common, even today, for visitors to place flowers at the feet of their beloved immortal Pushkin. The apolitical motif was certainly embraced by other artists,
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who created similar pieces, dedicated to the station no less, devoid of all but political subtleties. Vs. Azarov, for example, wrote a poem extolling the virtues of the station that perhaps best exemplifies Pushkin’s position as an immortal underground:

Here, where the steel lines run
We meet with a dear friend
He was the same when we met in Pushkin
His image is gently kept in our hearts.
Thoughtful, clutching leaves in his hand
He is with us, he is very close to each of us
And behind his shoulder, Pushkin's shady
Garden, is reflected in the clean water,
And anyone who rushes into the busy life
Will stop here, at least for a moment, amused (by)
An unexpected encounter…
Hello my friend, from far away
To you we come from all sides
From the Baltic Station, from Ploshchad’ Vosstaniia
From the shops, schools, and decks of ships
And we bring sensitive consideration to you,
And our love for your poetry.87

True, one might detect a trace of industrialism in the phrases “where the steel lines run” and “from the shops, schools, and decks of ships.” But these hints, if indeed that is what they are, pale in comparison to the odes to the Moscow Metro produced just twenty years earlier, some of which included stanzas such as:

Our wise Stalin,
And his disciple
Lazar Moiseevich Kaganovich,
Have created many miracles for us,
Under the earth, thirty meters deep.
They’ve built such stations
And they’ve introduced street cars,
And put airplanes in the air-
When their engines start up,
They want to set out into space.88

What is significant about this comparison is not the artistic stylings of the former or the panegyric in the latter, but the focus of the respective authors. Azarov looks backward in time, with admiration for the career and influence of an immortal who helped shape Russian language and literature; the second poem focuses on the contemporary period of rapid industrialization and a future of space exploration. If it is true that the Leningrad Metro told a history of the USSR while the Moscow Metro depicted the svetloе budushcheе, then these works might suggest that these messages were clearly understood by passengers, or at least contemporary poets who travelled on the first line.

**Teknologicheskii Institut**

The Dionysian nature of the Soviet twentieth century notwithstanding, scientific literacy and technical prowess among the population had vastly improved by the time of Stalin’s death in 1953. Khrushchev recalled that, just twenty years before the Leningrad Metro was completed, Soviet engineers and workers did not have even the “vaguest idea of what the job [metro construction] would entail. We thought of a subway as something supernatural. I think it's probably easier to contemplate space flights today than it was for us to contemplate the construction of the Moscow Metro in the nineteen-thirties.”

For the Moscow scheme, the solution to the problems associated with the dearth of experienced personnel led project managers to solicit assistance from the West. By the time the Leningrad Metro was built, the USSR had no shortage of scientists and laborers with metro construction experience to draw on. Workers and managers from the Moscow Metro were so influential in the construction that the manager of the Lenmetrostroy, K.A. Kuznetsov, referred to the first Soviet subway as the Leningrad underground’s “brother metro” (brat metropoliten).

These relations occasionally bore out in the artistic themes in respective stations, including Teknologicheskii Institut.

Whereas Pushkin Station’s design represents a departure from the Party’s dogmatic separation of science and art, Station Technological Institute embodies it. Located adjacent to the
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former Leningrad Technical Institute, the station pays tribute to various important Russo-Soviet *immortals* of science by emblazoning their profiles on bas-reliefs along its walls. Among the twenty four scientists heralded underground are Ivan Michurin, a prominent botanist; Ivan Pavlov, a psychologist; Alexander Karpinskii, a geologist; and Konstantin Tsiolkovsky, a pioneer in astronautics. Between the bas reliefs are large laurel wreaths, academic symbols of science, styled after similar emblems that formerly “adorned” (*ukrasheno*) an old portion of Moscow State University. Originally, the central hall featured depictions of “great luminaries of science” (*velikikh korifeev nauki*)- Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, Lenin, and Stalin.

As a part of the Soviet leadership’s determination to infuse science with politics and politics with art, the three variables often coalesced in propaganda and architecture. As Jenks has shown, science first made its appearance in the Moscow underground in the 1937-1938 lines. To assert that, in the Moscow Metro, scientists represent a progression is to advance something of an ambiguity. In Jenks’ reading, the metro walls suggest that not only would science improve the technological basis of society, but it would do so as a part of a new generation of Soviet people, including athletes, students, and collective farmers. The inclusion of a more diverse conglomeration of citizens on the walls of *Teknologicheskii Institut* represents a move away from the 1935 line’s emphasis on only “soldier, sailor, worker, collective farmer” in the representation of the Soviet- promised radiant future.

The depictions of science and scientists in the station are not at all similar to their counterparts in Moscow. Of those subjects memorialized in bronze medallions in Station Technology Institute, just over one-third experienced the Soviet period for any length of time, none were alive to see the Great Patriotic War, and all are depicted in their twilight years. Whereas Jenks has suggested that the *minutiae* of the Moscow Metro depictions may be a tribute to, or perhaps simply an acknowledgment of, the influx of young people into Soviet urban
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spaces, the depiction of older generations of scientists at Teknologicheskii Institut reads more like recognitions of the accomplishments and contributions of the past.99

Some historians have suggested that the advancement of Russocentric images, like those in Pushkin Station and Station Technology Institute, may have been merely a product of Stalinist efforts to promote Russian nationalist sentiment. Often this narrative suggests that, after the CPSU failed to develop a federation-wide Soviet identity, the leadership turned to the promotion of a distinctly Russian form of nationalism in the 1930s, a campaign that carried over into the post-Stalin period, in an effort to locate a digestible “usable past.”100 Without completely rejecting the notion of Russification, it might also be true that the CPSU had little choice in the matter. As Hegel once wrote, “In history, thinking is subordinate to the data of reality,”101 and the reality was that the Soviet Union was comprised of territories that had been subject to centuries of imperial rule which, despite its own host of problems, produced writers like Pushkin and scientists like Tsiolkovsky. Thus, when the USSR told its own story in the Leningrad underground, as well as elsewhere, what was usable was limited by what was available.

Furthermore, recognition of achievement under a capitalist system was not inherently anti-Bolshevik. Lenin, ever the dialectician, had, after all, once remarked that advancement “must be the logical development of the store of knowledge mankind has accumulated under the yoke of capitalist, landowner, and bureaucratic society.”102 From the beginning then, the USSR conceived of itself as the benefactor of the entirety of human experience and knowledge, including the tsarist period. In the mid-1950s, this socialist fatherland could count, warts and all, the world’s first socialist revolution; a wildly successful literacy program; industrialization; victory over Fascism; the rapid expansion of its sociopolitical system; and a somewhat successful, though painful, rebuilding project, among its victories. And, as Hegel might say, the reality was that Pushkin was a central figure in the cultural foundation of that fatherland, and many Russian scientists were integral to its technological successes. In this way, the history told in the Leningrad underground celebrates what might be called the “consolidation of Bolshevik gains.”
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Dialectics aside, as David L. Hoffman has argued, there was a rational explanation for the promotion of nationalism in the Soviet context. Simply put, the Soviet Union had provided the proletariat with a socialist fatherland, for which it was perfectly logical and theoretically sound to express nationalist support. That nationalism was exacerbated by victory in a mechanized form of warfare predicated upon industrialization and science, the bases for all that was Bolshevik. \textit{Teknologicheskii Institut} would therefore seem a fitting commemoration to the available history of Russian scientific development that, for the CPSU, laid the groundwork for the maturation of science and victory over Fascism.

\textbf{Baltiskaia Stantsiia}

Though \textit{Baltiskaia Stantsiia} is sometimes described as the “simplest” (\textit{samaia prostaia}) and most “modest” (\textit{skromnaia}), station along the first line, Sokolov called it “a fine monument to the valor and revolutionary courage of the Baltic sailors.” The station is located directly at the \textit{Baltiiskii Vokzal}, which links St. Petersburg with the Baltic States, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, who became SSRs shortly before, and again after, the Great Patriotic War. Above the ground-level lobby entrance are images of Russian admirals. Until the XX Congress in 1956 a large monument of Stalin stood on a pedestal near the ground lobby. The hall of the underground station is characterized by an “illusion of spaciousness,” created through an absence of colors or decorations on the walls along the side of the walkway, and a lighting effect, borrowed from Moscow’s “Palace of the Soviets” and “Novokuznets,” that makes the large columns seem “light and airy” (\textit{legkimi, vozдушными}).

The walkway leads to a large mosaic called “1917” (\textit{1917 god}), which was made from marble and stones. Intricately detailed, the image portrays the actions of the Baltic Fleet in the October Revolution and in the Bolshevik foundational myth. In the center of the depiction is a group of sailors that surrounds a cannon and a red flag; one sailor’s hand is raised, gesturing forward while the others look on, a pose Victoria E. Bonnell has equated with a suggestion of
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“forward movement.”¹⁰⁹ Behind the sailors, a group of soldiers, apparently caught up in revolutionary fervor, charges forth. In the background, revolutionaries storm across the Neva, a significant event due to Provisional Government leader Alexander Kerensky’s purported order to close the bridges to prevent just that, toward the Winter Palace, where the October Revolution was ultimately consummated.¹¹⁰ There is no discernible difference between the ages of the sailors and the students; “1917” is a portrayal of a revolution that has already occurred. The second of four stations that evoke the October Revolution, Baltiiskaia Stantsiiia represents another example of the Late Stalinist effort to equate post-war Soviet rule with the Leninist legacy.

Narvskaia Stantsiiia

Narvskaia Stantsiiia is located across from the Narva Triumphal Arch, itself a war monument constructed to honor Russia’s victory over Napoleon. One hundred years after the gate’s erection, the area had become a factory suburb “famous for its long revolutionary tradition” (slavilis’ svoimi davnimi revoliutsionnymi traditsiama).¹¹¹ True to the architects’ mandate to avoid compromising the city’s aesthetic characteristics, the fixtures above the ground lobby’s doors match the deep green of the arch itself.¹¹² It is to the workers of this suburb, and the proletariat in general, that the station is dedicated.

Narvskaia Stantsiiia tells a conflicting story about de-Stalinization. Originally called Stalinskaia Stantsiiia, the name was changed before the first line’s opening in November 1955, during what Elena Zubkova has called an “interlude” after Stalin’s death in 1953, but well before Khrushchev’s “Secret Speech” in 1956.¹¹³ However, a mosaic of Stalin, titled “Stalin on the Platform” (Stalin na Tribune), survived until after the XXII Congress in 1961.¹¹⁴ “Stalin na Tribune” featured the vozhd’ behind a podium, with an outstretched hand that suggested pragmatism and a welcoming, but stern, disposition, and was to be accompanied with the
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inscription “Do not rule out the possibility that Russia will be the country to lay the road to socialism...We must discard the antiquated idea that only Europe can show us the way.”

Today, in place of Stalin’s likeness, are two doors and an air conditioning unit.

Upon descent into the underground, visitors are welcomed by a high-relief (gorel’ef), titled “The Glory of Labor,” (Slava Truda) which shows Lenin, frozen in what Nina Tumarkin might call an “active” position, in the midst of an oration to dozens of workers who hoist flags and listen attentively. Jenks has noted that change in Soviet demography, primarily from older revolutionaries to younger “New Soviet” people, was depicted in the increased number, from four to eight, of “categories” of people portrayed in sculptures between Moscow’s premier 1935 line and its first extension in 1937-1938. In the walkway underground, the station’s pillars are topped by sculptures of twelve different professions, created in quadruplicates (v chetyrekh ekземплиарахk) and mounted throughout the station for a total of forty-eight works of art. The twelve groups represented at Narvskai, however, do not appear especially youthful; instead, they are able adults at the zenith of their professional lives, perhaps a metaphor for the emergence of “mature socialism” in the late Stalinist period.

The Great Patriotic War, in Amir Weiner’s words, “affected every Soviet individual, family, and community,” loyal Communists and former class enemies alike. And many former enemies of the people also contributed, in one way or another, to the victory over Germany. Without arguing that post-war Soviet society was a paragon of inclusiveness, the peoples’ efforts, in some sense, were depicted in Narvskai, reflecting a change in the post-war socio-political atmosphere. As Fitzpatrick has argued, for example, even the old class prejudices generally did not prevent people from declaring themselves a Soviet person in the post-war
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setting; for those who assisted in the struggles against Nazi Germany, in production or in combat, “Sovietness” was almost taken for granted.\textsuperscript{121} Put simply, part of the process of re-inclusion, which was probably never completed, actually began, as evidenced by a greater representation of “categories” of people, in the Late Stalin period.

Stephen Norris has shown that the Soviet leadership often borrowed images from previous eras of Russian history to galvanize support for war efforts or to express nationalist sentiment.\textsuperscript{122} At Narvskaia, the same practice was employed to make cultural heroes out of men. The most striking example of this is the metro-builder (metrostroevets). The figure stands tall, holding a miniature rendition of a metro station close to his person, a pose that brings to mind centuries-old Russian icons. In this way, the Leningrad Metro, where thousands of worker mortals, would, on a daily basis, pour through underground stations that made immortals out of their own likenesses, challenges Lefebvre’s charge that the Soviet Union failed to create a “socialist space” vis-à-vis capitalist forms.\textsuperscript{123} It would certainly be hard to imagine a subway system in the mid-twentieth century West with stations dedicated entirely to industrial workers.

_Narvskaia Stantsiia_ would seem to perfectly exemplify the quandary in which the Soviet Union found itself after Stalin’s death in 1953. Try as it might to distance itself from Stalinism, by renaming cities, metro stations, and removing mosaics, the Soviet polity could not escape the Stalinist past. Though builders did not engrave Stalin’s words into the walls, his direct connection to the station, in particular his statue outside the ground lobby, remained until eight years after his death. What is more, the station’s focus on industrial workers, a motif inextricably linked with Stalin, probably rendered a complete break with Stalinism impossible. The station would thus seem to confirm Robert Service’s observation that “Stalinism would outlast Stalin.”\textsuperscript{124}

_Kirovskii Zavod_

Station _Kirovskii Zavod_ stands within a short walk from the plant, the embodiment of socialist industry, Azarov declared, for which it is eponymously named.\textsuperscript{125} Due to its proximity to the factory, the station must have had a profound impact on workers’ lives and their conceptions of space. According to V.A. Azetov, a former plumber’s assistant on the Moscow
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Metro cum Leningrad Metro machinist, one could travel the entire length of the first line, from *Ploshchad’ Vosstaniia* to *Avtovo*, discussed in the next section, in just 16.5 minutes. This would have made a trip to the city center, which previously required much “jostling for space” and considerable time aboard a *tramvai*, much more convenient and feasible, a point emphasized by I.M Pastukhov, a shaft-sinker (*prokhodchik*) on the construction project. Thus workers, many of whom lived in dormitories associated with their respective place of employment, were within a short walk and a roughly fifteen minute underground ride to *Ploshchad’ Vosstaniia* at *Nevskii Prospekt*, the most populated area of the city and its premier cultural space.

*Kirovskii Zavod*, appropriately dedicated to the theme of industrialization, is designed in a classical manner that resembles Greek temples complete with forty-four Doric columns (*doricheskie kollony*) and a granite staircase. Below ground, the station’s walls are made of a Caucasian light gray marble, designed to mimic the interior of a factory. The high-reliefs that rest above the underground columns are dedicated to the four pillars of heavy industry- coal, iron and steel industry, and electrification- a central theme of Stalinism, which Sokolov called “the unshakable economic fundamentals of our socialist state” (*nezyblemye osnovy ekonomiki nashei sotsialicheskoi derzhavy*). A special configuration of light diffusers (*svetovykh plafonov*) arranged along arches combine with so-called “eyelet punching” (*liuversnoe osveshenie*) allowed for the “illusion” of an open sky. The *fourfold* is *gathered* at the end of the station’s hall, where *mortals*, having walked through *earth*, under the manufactured *sky*, met a massive bust of Lenin, Soviet *immortal* par excellence.

*Kirovskii Zavod* represents the final homage to Lenin in the V.I. Lenin Leningrad Metropoliten. This recurring Leninist theme is striking. Jan Plamper has recently posited that the
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Khrushchev years represented a return to the Party’s “Leninist origins.” Similarly, Tumarkin has suggested that it was not until 1956 that Khrushchev “introduced a new cult of Lenin.” The Leningrad Metro problematizes both claims and suggests that, while the Lenin cult might have been dormant for some time during the Stalinist, but particularly post-war, period, it was not removed entirely. As evidenced by the Leningrad Metro, when Khrushchev exalted the merits of Leninism in 1956 and thereafter, he was not restoring the Lenin cult as much as he was restating what had already occurred during the Late Stalin period.

Avtovo

Though the Moscow’s Metro stations certainly include images of reverence for war-heroes, for example Park Pobedy and Elektrozavodskaja, it would be disingenuous to suggest that any are equivalent to Avtovo. The first line’s southernmost terminus, Avtovo is located in a former suburb of St. Petersburg that underwent considerable change during the early part of the twentieth century. What was once, in Sokolov’s words, a collection of “wastelands” (pustyrei) during the imperial period was turned into a modern space with highways (prolozheny shirokie magistrali) and multi-story buildings (mnogoetazhnye doma) by the end of the 1930s. During the Great Patriotic War, Avtovo was a part of the sixth and final zone of fortification against Nazi aggression; the workers in the region had orders to destroy their plants in the event that they were unsuccessful in their mission. Eventually, Avtovo did become a focal point of belligerence. The fighting there was so intense that Pravda once referred to Avtovo as the region through which “the main defense line passed.” The suburb’s role in the defense of Leningrad and the USSR served as the inspiration for the design of Avtovo Station. As such, it stands as a monument to Leningrad’s war efforts and the Soviet Union’s victory over Nazi Germany.
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In the post-war period, the Avtovo space was remade yet again. Among the most densely populated suburban areas of Leningrad, linking Avtovo to Nevskii Prospekt had long been an integral component of the scheme of the first line. By 1951, thirty six-story apartment buildings had been built and plans had been made to develop an additional thirty-five by the end of the following year there. However, according to I. Grishmanov, then Deputy to the Leningrad City Soviet, roads in the area were few and those that existed were in poor condition. Furthermore, the area lacked basic infrastructure requirements such as access to hospitals and telephones. In order to alleviate some of these problems, the ground lobby was placed near neighborhoods, “against a backdrop of apartment buildings” (na fone zhilykh domov), until planned developments eventually surrounded it. As with the other stations, builders aimed to complement the extant architecture of Avtovo rather than remake it.

Although the ground lobbies at other stations feature decorative elements, none are quite as intricate as Avtovo. Outside, a pair of high-reliefs honors two Soviet military victories, the defense of Red Petrograd in 1919 and the repulsion of Nazi forces in 1945, particularly significant for the St. Petersburg-Petrograd-Leningrad space. In concert with sculptures in the other stations of the Leningrad Metro, both groups of soldiers are depicted as adults; the most vivid difference between the images is the advances made in equipment between the revolutionary period and the 1940s. The revolutionaries, for example, do not wear any armor and rely on rifles while their counterparts don helmets and are supported by large tanks in the background. As the shallowest of all stations, Avtovo is the only one that lacks escalators. Windows run underneath the lobby’s dome structure, allowing for natural light to partially brighten the interior, but perhaps more importantly, illuminate the inscription that traces the inside of the structure: “Glory to the heroic defenders of Leningrad centuries, in the battle to defend the hero-city” (Slava v vekakh doblesnym zashchitnikam Leningrada, v boyakh otstoiavshim gorod-geroi). Inside the Avtovo Station lobby, the fourfold is gathered beneath the erection’s domed ceiling.
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Two rows of forty-six columns line the underground hall at *Avtovo*.146 While the thirty bare pillars are elegant enough in their own right, it is the remaining sixteen that demand the most attention. Very detailed glasswork depicts the “emblem of victory” (*emblemy pobedy*) that adorns sixteen of the columns.147 By lining the pillar itself with a thin gold flagella (*tonkimi zolotymi zhgutikami*), artists, architects, and scientists were able to protect the glass from otherwise inevitable cracking due to its affixture with concrete pillars.148 In order to alleviate reflection from the glass’s transparency, physicists determined that artists needed to cut the interior of the glass at an eighty degree angle. This practice allows for one to see only the glass and its etchings unburdened by the pillar within.149 The tops of the furnished columns are lined by symbols of the Soviet Order of the Great Patriotic War. Originally, all forty-six were to be uniformly covered in glass. One recent publication has claimed that “technical difficulties” (*teknologicheskimi trudnostiami*) with design prevented the final thirty from being decorated;150 it seems just as likely, however, that Khrushchev’s mandate to curb excesses in architecture influenced the decision to stop at sixteen.151

The glass-lined columns also produce an iridescent effect that contributes to the atmosphere of the station. For Chadaga, this lighting represents a continuation of the Moscow Metro’s radiant future theme that dominates the 1935-1938 stations.152 But as Jenks, and Wolf before him to some degree, showed, the *svetloe budushchee* was contingent upon much more than simply lighting. The Moscow Metro’s radiant future was one that advertised the forthcoming era of the New Soviet Man, embodied by youthful sculptures that contrasted with the older depictions of the revolutionary generation and the former’s participation in cultural events and technically skilled vocations; military prowess; industrial output; evolving demography; and so forth. In complete contrast, the Leningrad Metro does not depict any age discrepancy of any consequence and most of its figures are of roughly the same age. Moreover, it displays a poet and a collection of scientists from the tsarist period; symbols of the foundations
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of an industrial economy that had long since been established; and homages to the completed military victories that defined the Soviet century, one of which the Moscow Metro all but predicted. The radiant future topos is one that encompassed many variables beyond lighting, and none of them are present in the first line of the Leningrad underground.

The Soviet approach to monument building was therefore markedly different than that employed by its Allied counterparts. According to George L. Mosse, the United Kingdom anguished over the question of the form, purely ornamental or utilitarian, its World War II monuments would take. Ultimately, the UK’s “principal” monument to the war, the National Land Fund, consecrated in 1946, was comprised of “great country houses and areas of nature”
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that served the dual purpose of commemorating the war dead and providing a public space that allowed for the entire nation to enjoy its “rural heritage.” Mosse notes that, for the British, the National Land Fund was a utilitarian memorial in that it was devoid of abstract symbols that had characterized monuments to previous wars, and because it was something that the masses could enjoy, and interpret, “long after the war.” More specifically, Mosse suggests that British post-World War II tributes were intended to honor individual soldiers and “democratize” the mourning of the dead via widely accessible monuments; in fact, among the stated goals of the British War Memorial Advisory Council was to produce a monument that was “indistinguishable” from non-monuments. In other words, collective venerations for the general population were shunned in favor of more personal expressions of sacrifice and sorrow. While the celebration of the self was not necessarily exclusive to the United Kingdom, it was certainly an expression of classical liberalism that runs counter to the sorts of common memorials intended for popular audiences in the USSR, where such an ideology was anathema. Moreover, by purposefully avoiding images of soldiers and national heroes, as well as an emphasis on one “specific location,” the National Land Fund could not have met the requisites for gathering Heidegger’s fourfold.

In contrast, Soviet World War II memorials, as seen in the example of Avtovo Station, were decidedly illiberal, emphasized collectivism and were focused on specific locations that prominently featured cultural heroes, allowing for such a gathering. The depiction of improved armaments in the high-reliefs at Avtovo, for example, is no doubt a celebration of the Stalinist industrialization project that provided the material basis for the Soviet military victory. In other words, the Great Patriotic War was to be remembered as a victory over Nazi Germany made possible via heavy machinery and industrial production, a necessarily collectivist endeavor achieved by the Soviet nation-state. Like the National Land Fund in the UK, the Leningrad Metro was a war memorial and a public space meant for mass consumption. But the metro was no park or organic space- it was a massive monument that defined and redefined urban space, in many ways complementing Mosse’s assertion that the Soviets were concerned with constructing
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“mammoth memorials” to their war dead. But the metro’s form was lent additional significance by virtue of the Soviet fetish for heavy industry. Specifically, the metro was an industrial edifice that expressly connected Soviet power with industrial power and industrial power with military victory. The Soviet Union, in some ways, celebrated its victory in the same way that it achieved it—via large, public industrial projects.

Ohlrogge’s contention that the Leningrad Metro represents “Stalin’s Last Cathedral” is most apt at the end of the underground hall at Avtovo. While Kirovskii Zavod was de-Stalinized, at least aesthetically, in 1961, any such effort in Avtovo would have been impossible without removing a mosaic that, even today, possesses the most anodyne of Stalinist-era quotations. In a radio address on June 22, 1941, V.M. Molotov stated, on behalf of the Soviet leadership and Stalin himself “Our cause is just. The enemy will be defeated. Victory will be ours.” The image at Avtovo includes a variant of this statement, “Our cause is just—We Won” (Nashe pravoe delo—My pobedili), on a wreath below a mother, who holds her child on her left shoulder. The artwork, titled “Rodina-Mat’,” (Motherland) is completed by two shields that note the years, 1941 and 1945, that demarcate the era of the Great Patriotic War. While the mother-child motif might suggest some focus on the future, it is important to consider that the mother is the dominating centerpiece of the mosaic, not the child, who rests on her shoulder. In other words, the image emphasizes the mother’s ability to raise her child safely rather than the child’s right to experience a safe childhood.

Avtovo Station, qua war memorial, depicts warfare in an altogether different way than its forebear in Moscow, which portended the inevitable conflict with the capitalist world. At Maiakovskii Station, Red Army planes “rumbled in formation” across the inside of the structure’s walls, images that denoted growing Soviet military strength. Friedman describes parachuters whose parachutes are shown wide open in mid-flight, and Red Army pole vaulters depicted at the height of their jump. In the Moscow Metro’s stations, even when military personnel are not shown in official regalia, they are in motion. Avtovo, by comparison, has no
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such images. The soldiers in the bas-reliefs, for example, hold weapons while standing upright, in an apparently stationary position; others have put their weapons away entirely. Meanwhile, swords that line the left side of the track underground are shown in their sheath. This is not a prognostication of a radiant future ripe with military victories; it is a commemoration of a war already fought.

Avtovo, in its entirety, served several functions during the Soviet epoch. As a metro station, it allowed for the movement of people throughout the Leningrad city-space; as a cultural device, it depicted the heroes of the Soviet Union in its bas-reliefs; as a political tool, it taught of the USSR’s successful industrialization; and as homage to the victors and the dead, it stood as a monument to the efforts of the soldiers and the hero-city itself. Finally, it was a bookend to the historical narrative begun by the dedication to the October Revolution at Ploschad’ Vosstaniia and explicated collectively by the first line of the Leningrad Metro.

Conclusion

Elidor Mehilli has recently remarked that the decade-long period after Stalin’s death in 1953 was partially characterized by the “realization” of “a system that had programmed its own planners.” The resulting “bundles of relations” between the planner, plan, and manifestation, which began with the establishment of the Soviet state and continued throughout its existence, was not immune to dialectical processes, and were necessarily adapted to suit contemporary developments. Simply put, while the Party leadership may have programmed planners, the blueprint itself was not a static one. As a part of the plan, Soviet metro systems provided passengers with instructions in Soviet socialism through magnificent artwork and architecture in “palace-like” metro stations.

By virtue of the era in which it was completed, the spatial relations created by the stations of the first line of the V.I. Lenin Leningrad Metropolitan offer a glimpse of how the CPSU conceived of itself during the post-war era; when “read” alongside similar features of the Moscow Metro, it displays evidence of how this understanding had changed over time. The “bundle of relations” in these stations suggests that, by the Late Stalinist period, part of the method of programming was predicated on the formulation of a cohesive Soviet historical narrative. Some facets of that story, the cult of Lenin and the mythology of the storming of the

White Palace, for example, would have been familiar for those who experienced the early Soviet era; other aspects, such as the veneration of scientists and military leaders from the tsarist-period, as well as the acceptance of an apolitical artistic motif, would have been less so.

Most significant, however, is the absence of the promise of the radiant Soviet future, a central feature in the Moscow stations, in the first lines of the Leningrad Metro. By focusing its “lessons on socialism,” on the events and accomplishments of the available Soviet past, these stations suggest a consolidation of revolutionary gains, cultural progress, industrial proficiency, and military victories that may have laid the groundwork for subsequent changes in the Thaw period. Nietzsche, who once wrote that “Historical education” is only worthwhile “in the service of a powerful new life-giving influence,” may have understood the decision to orient these lessons around such achievements, thereby providing early passengers, most of whom experienced the painful and violent interwar period, with “the capacity to live unhistorically,” or the ability to be “forgetful of the whole past,” in order that they might know some peace.165 The first line of the Leningrad Metro, qua Bolshevized space, was itself one such attainment, erected atop land once claimed by the peoples’ enemies. No longer inundated with notions of future glories, metro riders were encouraged to think about the past and appreciate the present. This may have contributed to the rise of Thaw-era demands that life be more enjoyable, a request Kristin Roth-Ey has suggested the CPSU took seriously.166

Myriad factors may have produced this shift away from focus on the future. Domestically, as Vladimir Andrl has suggested, post-war Soviet society was composed of educated citizens hungry for “rising living standards and civilian normality.”167 Simultaneously, the USSR’s efforts in the Great Patriotic War, as seen from inside the country, afforded it considerable international esteem, superpower status, and the apparent expansion of its own political model. This sort of consolidation strategy would not be unprecedented in Soviet history and does not necessarily suggest an abandonment of the goal of spreading the Soviet system further; a comparison with the Brest-Litovsk Treaty, a “breathing spell” that the Bolsheviks hoped would provide “internal stabilization” before a renewal of revolutionary vigor, might be
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appropriate.\textsuperscript{168} Without positing that the Leningrad Metro was a harbinger of a Late Stalinist liberalization period, which would be an absurd claim considering the homages to Stalin that the original decor contained, these points should alter traditional temporal organization by suggesting that some of the characteristics associated with the Thaw period in fact began during Stalin’s lifetime.

\textbf{Chapter 2: “Building Tunnels, Building Workers”}

This chapter will consider the published testimonies of workers from the Late Stalinist-early Thaw era who labored on the construction of the first line of the Leningrad Metro. It will attempt to elucidate certain characteristics regarding worker subjectivities on the eve of Nikita Khrushchev’s reforms. The chapter argues that the workers of the \textit{Lenmetroproekt} practiced what Anna Krylova has called an “individualising discourse” to frame themselves and their identities. Specifically, laborers tended to focus on their own individualized, personal contribution, particularly their developing professional skills, to the collective endeavor to build a metro in Leningrad and aid in the improvement of the city at-large. The focus on personal efforts should not be viewed as an indication of an abandonment of collectivist values; rather, workers emphasized how their individual skills enabled them to more effectively serve the aggregate collective. Finally, workers’ testimonies exhibit no indication of any inner-struggle to prove one’s self an ideologically pure, conscious citizen.

By strict Marxist terms, the Soviet population of 1917 was not one comprised of a large, conscious proletarian class. As a consequence of this less than ideal demographic circumstance, the task of reshaping of workers’ mentalities from individual, atomized laborers preoccupied with trivial immediate concerns to “conscious” New Men defined by an illiberal, collectivist commitment to building Communism fell to the Bolshevik Party itself.\textsuperscript{169} And while this endeavor was often designed, with varying success to be sure, to appeal to the broadest masses of workers, via clubs, libraries, and so forth, wholesale transition “from darkness to light” was complicated by the economic and political backwardness inherited from the Tsarist regime;\textsuperscript{170}
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the violence of World War I and the civil war that followed; and famine. Moreover, “consciousness” was itself a rather slippery concept, best described, by one scholar, “not as a fixed entity” or “selfhood” or “something one could possess once and for all.” Maintaining this temperament, therefore, necessitated “an ongoing effort to situate oneself” via a “locus of discourse” in a world that itself remained ever-changing. Thus, while general guidelines for what did and did not constitute consciousness certainly existed, the ideal Soviet mentalité changed according to society’s position within the dialectic; in other words, it was determined largely by place and time.

Despite its prevalence for the better part of a quarter century, scholarship on Soviet subjectivities has not yet fully addressed the topic’s inherently transitory attributes. Pioneered by Stephen Kotkin in the mid-1990s, the debate over subjectivities has, like the aggregate subfield of Soviet Studies, tended to focus its attention on the 1930s. For Kotkin, Stalinist “civilization” created new and, more importantly, voluntarily accepted categories of identity that were largely framed discursively. In establishing these identities, which were determined by the Leninist understanding of Marxism, Soviet people utilized the linguistic tropes of the revolution, a practice Kotkin calls “speaking Bolshevik,” to position themselves as loyal subjects on the path to becoming the New Soviet Man. Once adopted as a de facto temporal dialect, the language of Bolshevism proved ready-made for both expressing grievances and denouncing traitors. What it lacked, according to David L. Hoffmann, was the requisite discursive elements to allow for genuine resistance against the Stalinist leadership, a point that was later challenged by Jeffrey Rossman.

The Bolshevik course of action was, of course, predicated on Marxist class categorizations that were particularly problematic for revolutionary Russia given the fact that the proletariat was in disarray, dispersed throughout the countryside in relative anonymity, after the
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calamities of the civil war. For Russia in the 1920s then, the practice of determining exactly who was and was not of the desired class conscious mindset took the form of a ritualized, dialectical process between purportedly conscious Soviet citizens and the ultimate arbiter of such a quality, the Bolshevik Party. Inspired by Kotkin, Igal Halfin and Jochen Hellbeck have primarily concerned themselves with analyzing this development, which they collectively treat as the Bolshevik attempt to “engage individuals with their soul” in order that citizens might “understand the Communist program” and help usher the USSR along the eschatological road to the radiant future (svetloe budushchee) of Soviet Communism. Where Fitzpatrick sees the interrogation process as one designed to overcome the pragmatic, “technical” problem of locating the working class requisite for the construction of their proletarian dictatorship, Halfin sees a logical, theoretically consistent rubric for determining a subject’s “readiness to fulfill his eschatological role.” While one’s relationship to the means of production may have made the development of consciousness more likely, Halfin explains, it did not necessarily guarantee it; as it turns out, workers who did not develop a collective disposition were denied Party membership, cast asunder as “eschatological waste.”

Because both Halfin and Hellbeck seek to explain how the transition from “darkness” (atomized individuation) to “light” (collective consciousness) occurred for the individual subject, both place ideology at the center of their work or, as the former once remarked, “move Marxism from the status of subject to the status of object of historical analysis.” This emphasis on Marxism-Leninism as a linguistic ritual that defined one as “class-conscious,” or otherwise, has led both scholars to challenge a prevailing Western supposition that the Soviet subject conceived of the private-public bifurcation intrinsic for the development of an “identity distinct from the political system.” Throughout their analyses of Russian Marxism from the late nineteenth
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century Legal Marxists\textsuperscript{184} to New Economic Policy (NEP) era Party admissions reports\textsuperscript{185} to 1930s era diaries, which Hellbeck tellingly refers to not as “private” documents but as texts produced “outside the public,” both scholars point to a consistent rejection of the notion of liberal identities and an apparently genuine aspiration to become the New Soviet Man.\textsuperscript{186} Cumulatively, this scholarship has tended to buttress Kotkin’s assertions that the Stalinist period fostered new categories of identity and that the language of Bolshevism severely limited a subject’s ability to espouse anti-Stalinist sentiment.\textsuperscript{187}

In response, Anna Krylova has argued that the subjectivities debate has itself been determined by, to borrow a notion from Pierre Bourdieu via Kotkin, the “little tactics of the Cold War habitat” that led American scholars on a decades-long quest to locate vestiges of Russian liberalism.\textsuperscript{188} Krylova argues that both Kotkin and Hoffmann have erred in their appraisals by assuming that Soviet actors had a pre-existing, essentially liberal-Western, sense of self which naturally yearned to develop, a sentiment that would seem to lend itself to arguments made by Halfin and Hellbeck.\textsuperscript{189} For her, this perspective has had the effect of creating three primary categories for the Stalinist subject: the deceased liberal self (the Stalinist subject is a helpless victim of his nation’s tyrannical government), the so-called careerist (who accepts the Stalinist system because it provides him with an opportunity to improve his relative position in society), and the dissenter (who is brave enough to oppose the Stalinist system and, more often than not, emigrate to the West).\textsuperscript{190} Ultimately, Krylova is particularly concerned with perceived limitations placed on the theretofore understanding of Soviet subjects, in particular the notion that a “static” identity was at all possible in the Soviet Union in the 1930s.\textsuperscript{191} In other words, Krylova rejects the suggestion that, at any point, Soviet society was a frozen, unchanging one comprised of singular, political like-mindedness.

Though few would challenge the merits of pursuing the study of Soviet subjects, the debate is not without its detractors. Elena Zubkova has remarked that the contemporary usage of
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autobiographies and diaries has only served to reify stereotypes of Soviet people and their era. Eric Naiman has challenged Halfin’s thesis that to analyze a Stalinist-era diary is to consider the Soviet soul by questioning whether or not it was the soul that “was the object of Communist Inquisition.” Alexander Etkind has questioned Halfin’s and Hellbeck’s supposition that Stalinism was, in any way, “successful.” And Rossman has noted that Hellbeck’s claims were made using a “narrow milieu” of source material that cannot provide a sufficiently large picture of the number of identities Soviet people perceived available to them.

Perhaps the most obvious criticism of the debate on Soviet subjectivities, however, is that work on the theme has failed to properly explore the topic in the post-war setting. What is more, as Krylova has recently pointed out, many discussions of Soviet post-war subjects have tended to apply scholarly frameworks used to consider the 1930s period, specifically “speaking Bolshevik,” to the post-war period, a development that effectively denies the possibility of any process of change in the USSR and obfuscates understanding of its post-war history, a period characterized by fundamental socio-economic and cultural change. What remains then, is an unfinished picture of the transition to consciousness that was, at least according to Bolshevik orthodoxy, the sine qua non of the building of Soviet Communism.

In an effort to better understand the post-war Soviet subject, Krylova offers what she calls “post-Bolshevism,” a “modern socialist discourse that encompasses the individual and the social.” This “individualising discourse” should not be viewed as contrary to the collectivist goals of the Soviet experiment. Rather, the process of “re-individualization” of Soviet subjects was intended all along; in 1936, for example, Alexei Tolstoy remarked that the development of
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the New Soviet Man would be contingent on a “personality, nourished by the collective and, in turn, nourishing the collective.”\textsuperscript{200} In other words individuals, fostered by the collective and through developing collectivist values, would necessarily acquire individual characteristics that were, in turn, beneficial to the collective. Hence, Leon Trotsky’s vision of a future in which “average” people would “rise to the type of heights of an Aristotle, a Goethe, or a Marx.”\textsuperscript{201} Thus, “individualising discourse” can be seen as a product of social and cultural growth made possible by the so-called “alternative modernization” project of the 1930s. Stagnation was not, it turns out, the order of the Soviet century.

This chapter aims to contribute to filling this historiographical lacuna by exploring the subjectivities of industrial workers who built the Leningrad Metro, a project that was completed during the Communist Party’s second interregnum (1953-1956) in 1955. Taking cues from both Krylova and Halfin, it will take Marxist-Leninist ideology seriously, in particular its purported efforts to “lead” workers through the incremental stages of constructing Communism. Halfin finds the suggestion that the First Five Year Plan was motivated by the “consolidation of social groups” problematic and instead suggests that the decision to end the NEP was inspired by the Bolshevik estimation of the USSR’s eschatological position. Put simply, by 1925, the Soviet economy had been largely rebuilt, allowing for the Party to usher Soviet society forward into the “next stage” on the road to Communism.\textsuperscript{202} What followed was a period that was, at least ostensibly, “closer to full-blown Communism,” complete with the termination of the relative class-tolerance that characterized the NEP era and therefore required the Party to demonstrate that a “pure proletariat” had come into fruition.\textsuperscript{203} As Hellbeck has shown, the result was an era partially defined by “work-in-progress” Soviet subjects burdened with advancing, vis-à-vis the Soviet state, and the responsibility to exemplify the “full-fledged personality” of the New Soviet Man, complete with the requisite qualities of (socialist) heroism, collective consciousness, and “social leader(ship).” This subject was itself “historically determined” and thus restricted by the conceptual limitations of his or her respective epoch.\textsuperscript{204} Mere knowledge of the dialectic’s functionality, it would seem, does not preclude one from being subject to its designs.
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If, as Halfin has suggested, the rubric the Communist Party utilized to estimate its position along the path to the svtlo\textit{e budushchee} was gross economic output, a notion Donald Filtzer would likely accept as valid, then the Late Stalinist period might offer an opportunity to analyze subjectivity at yet another stage of eschatological development.\textsuperscript{205} According to Filtzer, the Soviet economy “began to reach prewar levels of production” at least as early as 1948, a condition that resulted in improved standards of living; fewer corrective labor sentences; and, after 1950, a “relaxing of pressure” on the typical Soviet worker.\textsuperscript{206} Though he stops short of suggesting that the Last Stalinist period represents, in any way, a “liberalizing” period in Soviet history, Filtzer nonetheless argues that, for workers, the period was marked by “less fear of direct repression” and a newfound security in their material survivability, characteristics Zubkova sees as part of a transition “toward an open society.”\textsuperscript{207} Whether changes in Soviet society were products of a new stage of development, consolidation of relative domestic stability, or something else entirely, worker accounts from the period reveal linguistic practices that buttress Krylova’s assertions of a post-war cultural “shift” in the “relationship between the socialist self and society” toward an accepted “differentiation between the two.”\textsuperscript{208}

Where this study differs with previous studies of subjectivities is in its utilization of published documents, particularly a brigade diary containing metro workers’ recollections of their lives and their labor on the first line of the underground. Followed to its logical ends, the notion of the illiberal self not only affects how scholars understand the Soviet subject but also necessitates a reconsideration of what does and does not constitute a worthwhile source base. Specifically, Hellbeck has argued that scholars who eschew analysis of texts produced for general readership on the grounds that they could not have represented authentic beliefs err by

\textsuperscript{205} True, by the late 1940s, and certainly into the 1950s, the rubric the Soviets used to determine the aggregate success of its form of socialism was direct competition with the West, specifically the American form of liberal capitalism. But the acceptance of “Socialism in One Country” meant that eschatological stages \textit{within} the USSR were not entirely dependent on the relative advancement of global, or even regional, social and cultural development, much less those of its dialectical opposite. More specific to the topic at hand, as the introduction to this thesis notes, plans for the development of a subway system in Leningrad dated, tangibly, to 1938, well before the beginning of the Cold War; thus, the decision to follow through with such a plan cannot reasonably be reduced to one exclusively motivated by the desire to compete with Western urban development.
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“project[ing] a liberal understanding of selfhood into the Soviet context.”

209 The suggestion that Soviet citizens would have sought out and explored a private sphere for self-realization is, for him, a flawed one in that such a quest would have been anathema for the evolving New Soviet Man.210 In a civilization that viewed fetishism for private thoughts and actions as remnants of bourgeois indulgence, it would be a mistake to assume that personal notations provided a view of more genuine Soviet-era beliefs.211

What is more, published materials were an integral tool for the spread of ideology for the Communist Party. Workers who did not, or could not, read were unable to “learn to work,” speak, or think as conscious laborers, thereby slowing the drive toward Communism. Ergo, circulated publications, be they books, pamphlets, brigade diaries, or newspapers, written by and about industrial workers, might offer a glimpse of how this group purported to see themselves and how they, along with the Party, thought others in their position should identify themselves as well. Because the Communist Party’s eschatological ends were tied to the relative allegiance of these workers and their inexorable convergence with the intelligentsia in the form of the New Soviet Man, such a focus may prove particularly effective for estimating where Soviet leadership saw itself along the dialectical path to Communism, a goal Miriam Dobson has suggested the CPSU took quite seriously throughout the Late Stalin period.212 At the very least, as Halfin might say, such documents provide insight into “what a [conscious] worker should be like.”213

The first chapter of this study explored how the art and architecture of the first line of the Leningrad Metro imparted a sense of history and cultural memory, predicated primarily on re-Leninization, a focus on the Great Patriotic War, and an estimation of contemporary political values, devoid of an emphasis on the svetloe budushchee, on its passengers. Influenced by Heidegger’s notion of the fourfold, it posited that, in the USSR, spatial surroundings were essential elements in the developing of the subject’s notion of self. But if, as Heidegger suggests, human mortals are a fundamental component in the gathering of the fourfold, then the language, godheads, and cultural symbols contained therein must necessarily be those with which the subject, or the “reader,” is intimately familiar. Put simply, it was workers, fluent in the language
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of “post-Bolshevism,” who constructed the Leningrad Metro stations that were designed to shape the mid-twentieth century Soviet subject.\footnote{Here the term “post-war” refers to the period after the war more broadly rather than the immediate post-war period (1945-1948/1949). As Amir Weiner has argued, the war had such a profound influence on Soviet history that the epoch can be logically delineated between two periods: pre-war and post-war. Weiner, \textit{Making Sense of War}, 7.}

Accordingly, this chapter will complement the first by exploring the subjectivity of the workers who built the subterranean \textit{fourfolds} of the first line of the Leningrad Metro. For workers, the construction of the Leningrad Metro was a cultural event in and of itself. First and foremost, the underground-workplace culture was one based on a particular kind of work, the \textit{building of a thing or a location}, which, Heidegger suggests, brings mankind closest to understanding space and its genesis.\footnote{Heidegger, \textit{“Building Dwelling Thinking,”} 156.} As evidenced by their accounts, the workers of the \textit{Lenmetroproekt} came to understand their place both within, and as producers of, this space. What is more, their experiences were unique to time and place, lending credence to Krylova’s assertion that Soviet society was anything but a static one. First, their writing suggests that many took the Nineteenth Party Congress’ mandate, a product of the Late Stalinist period that went unaltered throughout the metro’s construction, to “innovate,” focus on technical progress, and prioritize the collective seriously, thereby confirming their position at the head of the assault on production. Moreover, through their \textit{building of location}, they perceived their labor as a process that would improve their own individual lives, their families’ lives, and the lives of other Soviet citizens, thereby confirming themselves as cultured workers and possessors of an individualized collective consciousness. And as they developed technical prowess and applied experience through labor, they developed, individually, as professionals, as \textit{prokhodchik}, \textit{tyubingshchik}, or \textit{metrostroevts}, the most highly-skilled worker at the top of a benign underground social hierarchy, thereby defining their personal role in the \textit{building of space} and the transformation of Leningrad. What is more, they had fulfilled the Leninist mandate that they “learn to work.” Simply stated, as the workers made the metro, the metro made the workers.

In December 1955, Kliment Voroshilov, then the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, celebrated the completion of the Leningrad Metro, the Soviet Union’s most recent “labor victory,” (\textit{trudovuiu pobedu}) by presenting the collective of Leningrad subway builders with the Soviet Union’s most prestigious honor, the Order of Lenin. In all, over one thousand medals and awards were presented to the metro builders of the
Lenmetroproekt and the enterprises that assisted in the construction process. During his speech, Voroshilov hailed these “active and energetic” workers who, “with great skill peculiar to the Soviet people,” showed “a spirit of innovation” while completing a construction project that was previously thought impossible. The working people of the metro, the Chairman went on to say, were an avatar of the conjoined “front” of “science, technology, and work” in the USSR that had produced the Leningrad Metro, a “major contribution to Soviet culture.”

Pierre Bourdieu has argued that “cultural competence” cannot evolve into “cultural capital” until it becomes “inserted into the objective relations set up between the system of economic production and the system producing the producers.” Bourdieu’s requisites were “inserted” into the Lenmetroproekt at the Nineteenth Party Congress of 1952 which placed great emphasis on “introducing advanced technology in all branches of the national economy, improving the organization of labor and raising workers’ level of skill and technical knowledge,” particularly in industry and construction. And while some positions certainly paid more than others, engineer and factory director were particularly lucrative positions, the contemporary production campaign, through its stated emphases, diversification of skill and innovation, created the parameters within which those individuals who mastered the greatest number of professions carried with them a certain cultural allure. Thus, the Leningrad Metro construction project created its own form of cultural standard bearers, the metrostroevtsy, or metro-builders.
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For the *mortals* of this collective “front,” the construction of the Leningrad Metro was indeed culturally significant. N.A. Tverdokhelev, a railway worker with experience in electrical engineering before working on the metro construction project, was an enthusiastic proponent of diversification of skills, or what he called “interchangeability” (*vzaimozameniaemosti*).\(^222\) Tverdokhelev’s first day underground was in March 1951, when he was approached by an “already famous” (*uzhe togda proslavlennogo*) metrostroevts who assigned him the task of hauling rocks.\(^223\) Within days, Tverkholebov recalls, he was moved to another crew to learn the skill of the *tyubingshchikov* (tube-workers) where he noted that training was conducted “while working” and through an emphasis on hands-on practice.\(^224\) Later, Tverdokhelev was among the first groups to learn the functionality of a mechanized shield for tunneling, a machine that proved particularly helpful for the *prokhodchikov*; and, in 1952, he accepted the responsibility of leading his own team, an accomplishment he could not have achieved, he remarked, without the “exceptional love” his foreman showed him by sharing with him “experience and knowledge” when Tverdokhelev was but a *novichka*.\(^225\)

When his cohort later won the Red Banner of the Lenmetrostoi, an event which brought “universal joy” to the entire team, Tverdokhelev attributed this success to the “collective” which carried the values that “no work” should be considered “shameful,” as well as its characteristic “friendly support” of all comrades.\(^226\) Though Tverdokhelev’s brigade completely rejected concentration on “individual records,” a fetish of previous labor production movements, that was likely to, in his view, disrupt production by shifting the priority away from the collective, they nonetheless organized labor in such a way that considered, first and foremost, the individual worker. Specifically, while the underground work culture certainly placed a priority on the diversification of labor skills, laborers were not forced into acquiring new professions before their respective abilities made such a decision prudent; instead, the brigade simply waited until an individual worker had met certain criteria that established that he or she had mastered a given skill before moving on to the next.\(^227\) Ergo, “mutual aid” (*vzaimopomoshch*) from one
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individual worker to another was the basis of the “strength of the collective,” through which individualized skillsets improved, contributing to the efficacy of the brigade at large.\textsuperscript{228} For Tverdokhlebov personally, learning to work “on the basis of precise technical calculations” (\textit{osnovyvaia\'s na tochnom tekhnicheskom raschete}) brought immense “satisfaction” to the entire brigade.\textsuperscript{229} Finally, his view of the individual-collective relationship is perhaps best summarized in his commentary on his acquired skills: “Needless to say,” Tverdokhlebov wrote, “all the new things that I have mastered in the courses were immediately the property of the whole brigade” (\textit{Samo soboi razumeetsia, vse novoe, chto osvaival na kursakh, nemedlenno delalos’ dostoianiem vsei brigady}).\textsuperscript{230}

In his early years on the metro’s construction, Tverdokhlebov wrote, the \textit{prokhodchik} was commonly viewed as the single most important laborer on the job site.\textsuperscript{231} As work, and along with it workplace culture, progressed, however, crews learned that the “construction of the subway is not just sinking tunnels;” metro-building was, in fact, “the most complex and diverse form of work,” which relied equally on a number of trades.\textsuperscript{232} Thus, the prestige of a mastery of a single profession declined, while the versatile worker’s esteem climbed. Only those who had mastered “a wide variety of specialities,” vital for building the metro earned the “highest honor” of the title- \textit{metrostroevets}. Despite performing at least four such types of labor, Tverdokhlebov did not refer to himself as a \textit{metrostroevets}, yet he nonetheless observed the esteem they enjoyed in the underground.\textsuperscript{233}

Others noticed the particular pride with which the \textit{metrostroevtsy} performed their duties.

\textsuperscript{228} Tverdokhlebov, “\textit{Sil`a Kollektiva},” 144; “\textit{Shchokola Zhizni n Masterstva},” \textit{Izvestiia}, Nov 15, 1955, 2. As Hiroaki Kuromiya has shown, during the early days of the drive toward industrialization, the Communist Party promoted the tactics of shock-workers (\textit{udarniki}), typically young, male skilled workers, eager to build a new, mechanized society, in order to instill labor discipline and improve production (Kuromiya, \textit{Stalin’s Industrial Revolution, 1928-1932}, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 102). By 1930, the Party, ever willing to explore means to produce more and do so quickly, began experimenting with Taylorism, the management system eponymously named for its creator Frederick A. Taylor, which was based on the delegation of many highly specialized tasks to large numbers of workers (Kuromiya, 155). To some extent these two concepts, both of which were part of the broader practice of “socialist competition,” shock-work and the emphasis on specialized functions, coalesced during the second Five Year Plan, giving rise to the Stakhanovism, a largely political movement that emphasized individual “norm-breaking” as a method of increasing production (Siegelbaum, \textit{Stakhanovism and the Politics of Production}, 295-296).
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V.I. Volkov, a Party official who also worked on the construction project, observed that the cross-training had a notable effect on workers’ conceptions of themselves. When Volkov asked laborers to describe their profession, he received replies of as many as “five or six specialities” per person, all of which had been “mastered” (osnovatel’no ovladel). 234 These workers were, unlike Tverdokhlebov, quick to proudly proclaim themselves metrostroevtsy. 235 Similarly, V.G. Shartsev, a Lenmetrostroii chairman, noticed that an increasing number of people referred to themselves as such as work progressed; these workers, whom he distinguished from the aggregate collection of metro-workers (stroitelei metro), were “able to do everything.”236

According to Lewis Siegelbaum the post-war rebuilding effort “recapitulated and combined pre-war techniques” toward labor production, including socialist competition, a notion remained a hallmark of the Soviet economy until its ultimate demise.237 Socialist competition, it seems, necessitated the existence of some form of Stakhanovism, which Siegelbaum suggests took the form of the “communist attitude toward labor” as exemplified by “collectives of communist labor” in the Late Stalinist period.238 And while the metrostroevtsy can certainly be seen as an extension of the Stakhanovite movement, these workers remained quite different in fundamental ways. First, an individual’s right to proclaim himself metrostroevts was not determined by quantifiable sets of data such as “norms.”239 A worker who mastered four skills did not suddenly become a metrostroevts once he perfected a fifth. Furthermore, unlike Stakhanovites, metrostroevtsy were not subject to vacillating production quotas that might “relegate” them from “honored-worker” to mere shock worker. In other words, while the movement certainly required that all of its members meet base qualifications, most notably a diverse set of professional skills, it was nonetheless almost entirely a discursive category.

Second, perhaps as a consequence of the fact that the metrostroevtsy eschewed norm-breaking, their performance did not foster resentment among “non-member” workers in the way

235 Ibid.
237 Siegelbaum, Stakhanovism and the Politics of Productivity, 305-306.
239 I use the term “himself” here as a product of the fact that I did not find an example of a metrostroevka. This should not suggest they did not exist, merely that I did not locate evidence of one.
that sometimes Stakhanovism did.\textsuperscript{240} To be sure, the noticeable lack of antipathy toward metrostroevtsy could be a result of censors or the fact that, as Siegelbaum has elucidated, such behavior ceased once it was readily apparent that Stakhanovism was but “one in a series of campaigns” that would become key to Soviet product relations.\textsuperscript{241} But reaction against the movement could also have been influenced by its form. Devoid of the pressures of meeting quantifiable standards and instead motivated by the mastering of skills, the metrostroevtsy were necessarily also lacking the characteristics of Stakhanovism that, according to Joseph S. Berliner, made the latter movement so wasteful, the result of which was, in many cases “overwork” leading to “increased subquality output.”\textsuperscript{242} What is more, the construction of the first line of the Leningrad Metro was a relatively short term event; it could not, of course, continue after the completion of the line, though workers could definitely utilize their newfound skills in other projects, or be applied to other work environments the way that Stakhanovism could. In other words, the metrostroevtsy were particular to a unique space and time within the dialectic.

But it was not only the metrostroevtsy who testified to the advantages of the restructuring of labor. I. M. Pastukhov was raised on a collective farm (kolkhoz) in the Khmelnytsky region of Ukraine. As an adult, he wrote fondly of his childhood, recalling his love of music and his dream of becoming a professional singer or a dancer in an ensemble. Though Pastukhov never abandoned his love for song, in his words, “the industrialization of the country, erected in the first five year plans,” afforded him the option to adopt a profession that was “more befitting of [his] desires” (bolee svoistvennye moim zheleniiam).\textsuperscript{243} Upon completion of military service in the Great Patriotic War, where he was, incidentally, his company’s lead singer (zapevalov), Pastukhov became a prokhodchik, a profession Voroshilov called part of the “backbone” of the construction project, responsible both for digging the metro’s vast tunnels and simultaneously performing the work of an assistant surveyor.\textsuperscript{244}

Pastukhov described his own work in literary terms, comparing the work of the
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prokhodchiki to that performed by the laborers in Jules Verne’s *From the Earth to the Moon*. In Verne’s book, scientists and engineers design a massive cannon buried in the earth for the purposes of launching three men into outer space. The workers in this fictitious tale, Verne’s *prokhodchiki* so to speak, were tasked with the chore of boring a mine strong enough to hold the spaceborne projectile in place, but brittle enough to break apart to allow it to ascend into space. The metro’s *prokhodchiki*, Pastukhov explained, had to achieve the inverse; their shafts had to be strong enough to withstand any sort of increase in soil pressure in order that the metro’s tubings might stay in place.

That Pastukhov referenced Verne, whose popularity in Russia transcended both generational and demographic divides, is significant for a number of reasons. First, according to Terry Martin, just one generation before the grand opening of the Leningrad Metro, less than forty-two percent of those living in Ukraine were literate in any language. Yet Pastukhov, the product of a Ukrainian kolkhoz, had not only read, he did so with some sophistication, as evidenced by the fact that he drew vivid parallels between his own individual labor and work in Verne’s novel. Thus, whether Pastukhov’s reading of *From the Earth to the Moon* suggests an increased sophistication of the proletarian class; the increased proletarianization of Soviet culture; or simply that the genealogy of Verne’s readership was quite diverse, Pastukhov remains an archetype of the success of the Soviet literacy campaign.

What is more, it would not be a stretch to conclude that Pastukhov, whose account of the metro construction project is titled “Dreams Become Reality” (*Mechta Stala Deistvitel’nost’yu*), saw himself and his fellow *prokhodchiki* as revolutionaries, vanguards in their own right, in the
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realm of transportation construction. After all, they had forged a path through the unforgiving depths of the Leningrad marsh, a notion that, much like a flight from earth to the moon, was once thought unrealistic, to create an elaborate system for convenient and fast mobility throughout Leningrad, a city of extraordinary political and cultural importance for Russians; and they had done so only one decade after emerging victorious from the most devastating war in human history.  

Finally, the theme of space travel is worth considering. Science fiction has held a prominent place in Russian culture since at least the late Tsarist period when authors such as Konstantin Tsiolkovsky, a rocket scientist who developed the so-called “Tsiolkovsky rocket equation,” wrote classics about interstellar exploration. During the Soviet period, the genre of science fiction increased, owing largely to the Communist Party’s lionization of science and the espousal of the notion that everything is reducible to one, unifying scientific theory- Marxism-Leninism; the subsequent treatment of science, complete with terminology such as “proletarian science” in newspapers, schools, books, and so forth had the effect of reifying this vaunted position. Less than two years after the opening of the Leningrad Metro and the publication of Pastukhov’s article, the Soviet Union successfully launched Sputnik 1, making his the last generation to merely dream of spaceflight and taking the first significant step toward turning Verne’s *mechta* into reality.

If the priority placed on diversification and education played an important role in workers’ culture underground, it contemporaneously solved the immediate concerns of the *Lenmetropreokt* management. The building of the metro was no exception to Filtzer’s

---


253 “Pervii v mire iskusstvennii sputnik Zemli sozdan v Sovetskoi strane!,” *Pravda*, October 6, 1957, 1.
supposition that “chronic labour shortages” were among the defining characteristics of the Soviet epoch, leaving managers burdened with the tasks of locating an adequate number of skilled workers. In accordance with the Nineteenth Party Congress directives, crews turned to cross-training, producing a bevy of individual workers with a diverse set of skills to solve this problem. According to the manager of the Lenmetrostroy, K.A. Kuznetsov, it became commonplace for a prokhodchik to become (stanovilis') a “fitter, then a concrete reinfacer, then an insulator, and a finisher.” The aggregate effect was, Kuznetsov claims, the development of a “mass character in our mastery of many specialties,” an emphasis embodied by the individual metrostroevts.

The fulfilment of the metro builders’ goals was, at least according to Pastukhov, largely a product of efforts toward developing “innovations” that improved worker efficiency and speed. “We cannot work,” he plainly remarked, “without creativity” (bez tvorcheskoi initsiativii). For the prokhodchikov this included improvements to equipment, construction edifices, building methodology, and tunnel excavation, all of which contributed to the realization of a “better life” for Pastukhov’s family, whom he thought of while writing, as well as his fellow Leningraders who would soon enjoy a “more convenient” method of travelling home, to work, or to the city center as a direct result of his labors. In recognition of his contribution to these efforts, the Leningrad Communist Party organization elected Pastukhov to serve as a delegate at the Twentieth Party Congress in February 1956, an event he attended with “great joy” and “a thrilling feeling...imbued with Lenin’s eternally living ideas” (proniknuty vechno zhivymi leninskimi ideyami).

N.S. Ryakov was another worker who lauded the process of cross-training. A native of Siberia, Ryakov had already been trusted with the task of supervising a small team of workers at a foundry repair plant at the age of seventeen. After serving in the war, he moved to Leningrad, the “city of metalworkers,” to find employment; three days later, he was underground, participating in what he described, in militarized terms like many of his colleagues,
the “attack on the thickness of the soil.” Eventually, Ryakov’s team was entrusted with the tasks of concrete workers, and though the work was initially foreign to them, in time his team was recognized as a “sort of school-masters of prokhodchiki and concrete workers,” that later produced numerous team leaders. Ryakov continued to learn and advance, adding the skill of oblitsovshchik, or wall-tile specialist, to his repertoire. When describing his own team, Ryakov commented, with some ambivalence, “We were prokhodchiki, we were concrete workers.” For him, the opportunity to learn multiple trades and, at the behest of the chief of construction, be a part of the solution to labor problems was “a great honor” because it signified not only trust but an indication that management “believed in” him (uvereny v tebe). It is significant here that Ryakov uses the singular, familiar form of you (tebe), suggesting that management’s approval was predicated on a belief in his individual ability to perform tasks that benefit the collective, despite the fact that he conceived of himself as part of a collection of highly-skilled workers.

Some workers insisted that the renewed sense of comradely spirit allowed for the fulfillment of other, more individual goals, including the pursuance of education. In Behind the Urals, John Scott describes a Magnitogorsk bustling with energy and adult students “hurrying to and from school with books and notebooks” in tow. For some metro-workers, the fourfold of the metro possessed similar qualities. Those with vocational ambitions, but particularly the metrostroevtsy, over six hundred of whom finished some sort of educational training between 1950 and 1955, had the opportunity to combine their on the job training with technical schooling, emerging from the underground “highly qualified professionals, craftsmen, and shift supervisors (nachal’niki sten).” This effort to educate and train the metrostroevtsy was a deliberate one. As one party organizer of the project stated, “it is in work and study that our metrostroevtsy grow” (vot tak v trude i uchebe rastut nashi metrostroevtsy).

Others, including some women, reported that the comradely environment underground
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helped them to prepare for jobs outside of the underground. Z. Makarycheva, an insulation worker (*izolirovshchika*), had been denied entrance into university after performing poorly on an entrance exam. Through diligent study, and with the help and encouragement of her comrades, she was soon admitted to the Institute of Economics. According to Makarycheva, others also spent their time off studying, including at least two of her team members. Though Makarycheva was not, and did not intend to be, a *metrostroevka*, she nonetheless expressed pride and comradely appreciation for the collective’s accomplishments. “When the metro starts operating it is especially good for the soul when you know your work and your friend’s work brings people joy,” she wrote. That a woman not only performed vital labor in the underground but was able to work her way into an improved occupation would seem to contradict Filtzer’s claims that, during the Late Stalin period, women workers had “no prospects for upgrading their skills” and little to no opportunity to “advance to better jobs.” According to Makarycheva this was no aberration; her friend and co-worker, Nina Nikolaeva, also studied and aspired to attain a new position once construction was completed.

If whether or not a Soviet citizen’s commentary necessarily corresponded with genuine belief, or even reality, was less important than their ability to utilize the linguistic tropes of a given period, then the memoirs of the workers of the Leningrad Metro suggest that a key component of the language of “post-Bolshevism” was an emphasis on collectivism and a diverse set of individualized working skills. This is an important distinction vis-à-vis Kotkin’s notion of pre-war “Bolshevik-speak,” which evidently tended to accept the language of “innocent peasant” and other lapses into linguistic “errors” as apropos for an epoch that re-launched the ongoing “process” of forming the New Soviet Man. By the 1950s, however, that language had changed quite significantly. Most workers had apparently absorbed collectivist notions sufficiently enough that erstwhile “errors” became insignificant, if not non-existent; and their updated vernacular was one defined by the conceptualization of how individual priorities and goals might benefit the collective-minded socialist self. Put succinctly, the new, “mature” form of “post-Bolshevik” speech took collectivized identities for granted while allowing room for personal
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autonomy within. Individualism, which for Filtzer was the result of the particular form of Soviet product relations, may have instead been the manifestation of more complex cultural developments in the form an emerging “individualist-collective” Soviet subject, an explanation that would help to provide some explanation of Hellbeck’s observations that, after the Great Patriotic War, the Soviet citizens’ focus on “the conflict of origins and deeds” dissipated rapidly.\(^\text{274}\) The language of “post-Bolshevism,” it seems, was largely devoid of the urgent concerns for the purity of one’s collectivist-self, a change that, at least in discursive practice, allowed for the conceptualization of pursuing individual success in order to benefit the collective’s existence.

In *The Phenomenology of Spirit*, G.W.F. Hegel wrote that “the labour of the individual for his own needs is just as much a satisfaction of the needs of others as of his own, and the satisfaction of the needs of others as of his own needs he obtains only through the labour of others.”\(^\text{275}\) For Hegel, these “needs” are both materially and culturally significant. And yet a laborer’s individual output is necessarily a collective effort that benefits those outside one’s self; it is not exclusively an individual pursuit to achieve individual aims. Labor is, in Hegel’s words, the “desire and work in which consciousness finds confirmation of that inner certainty of itself” through the pleasure taken in “the form of independent things.” Without an understanding of the relationships between humanity and work; work and its “independent things;” humanity and “independent things;” and humanity and humanity, the “Unhappy Consciousness merely finds itself desiring and working, relegated to “a still incomplete self-certainty,” devoid of “confirmation” of itself achieved through work.\(^\text{276}\) The metro-workers, metrostroevets or otherwise, of the Leningrad Metro construction project seem to have met Hegel’s requirements for a “conscious self.” Each communicated an awareness of the metro’s “bundle of relations”-between themselves and their profession(s); their profession(s) and the “independent thing” they produced (the metro); how humanity would benefit from such a thing; and how humans had helped humans to *build* a place where the *fourfold* may be gathered. Put simply, as the workers made the metro, the metro made the workers.
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Historians have, perhaps to their detriment, traditionally treated the accounts and commentary of Soviet citizens like those discussed above with some skepticism. As Krylova has observed the “believing Soviet subject” has been either forgotten, as was the case during the “totalitarian school” era, or denied altogether, deemed unfit to function as a “reliable interpreter of reality.” Such treatment has the effect of, in Hannah Arendt’s words, denying subjects’ “self-understanding” and “self-interpretation” and, ultimately, “robb[ing] them of the very faculty of speech.” This is not to deny the problematic nature of the published documents used in this thesis. First, the workers who built the Leningrad Metro worked on a massive engineering and construction project, over forty hectares at an average depth of between 1500 and 2300 meters, a condition that required sensitive handling in the press. Second, metro construction occurred in Leningrad, the Soviet Union’s second city, so to speak, the site of colossal damage during the Great Patriotic War. It would therefore be a mistake to assume that developments there were an indication of change across the entirety of the Soviet space. Ultimately, while brigade diaries might provide little more than a view of the most idealized industrial workers, this view reveals a change in what constituted an exemplary Soviet worker in the first place. Soviet workers’ notion of self did not stagnate in the 1930s; the memoirs of the laborers of the Leningrad Metro indicate that, by the mid-1950s, Soviet workers wrote about themselves as individuals with individual concerns and priorities and, perhaps most importantly, with individual skills that allowed them to contribute significantly to the greater collective good.
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Conclusion

Construction on the first line of the Leningrad Metro began in the early 1940s, before Operation Barbarossa and the beginning of the Great Patriotic War. Delayed by the fighting thereafter, construction was not completed until 1955, two years after Iosif Stalin’s death and one year before Nikita Khrushchev delivered his not-so “Secret Speech.” Thus, the metro stations’ art and architecture provides a unique lens through which one may consider a period of transition in the Soviet century. Perhaps the last structure to take such a form, the first line’s design was a product of the Stalinist-era practice of using art and architecture to help develop a particular type of “conscious” citizen. The spatial qualities of the underground’s stations therefore offer clues regarding how the Communist Party leadership envisioned society’s progress along the dialectical path to socialism.

The art adorning the walls of the first line of the metro suggests that by the 1950s, at least in Leningrad, the newest stage of development was partially characterized by an emphasis on the USSR’s history, predicated largely on the mythical origins of the Soviet state, and the “consolidation of Stalinist-era gains,” specifically industrialization, collectivization, and military victories. But this history also included Tsarist-era cultural and scientific heroes. Recently, Michael David-Fox has asserted that the so-called Iron Curtain in fact behaved more like a “semi-permeable membrane” through which distilled information was allowed to enter and exit the USSR’s borders. The Late Stalin-early Thaw period filtered Tsarist-era history in much the same fashion. Influential poets, like Pushkin, and scientific luminaries, like Tsiolkovsky, were acceptable in the underground stations; images of the glory of empire and Orthodoxy were not. With the firm establishment of Soviet power and the successful industrialization of the country, it was perhaps appropriate for the CPSU to encourage a broader celebration of the past. Broader view of history or not, the metro’s narrative prioritized the accomplishments of the Soviet period. Both termini, after all, of the first line were built atop space formerly controlled by the most reviled of Soviet enemies- Tsarism and Nazism.

But the first line also addressed the contemporary period. Stations included depictions of
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a large collection of professional laborers as well as multiple venerations of the Red Army’s victory over Nazi Germany. The diversity of workers, specifically with regard to age, suggests a reverence for the mature, skilled workers who rebuilt the country after the devastation of the war. The soldiers, meanwhile, are shown as the USSR’s modern day liberators who embody the Soviet epoch. Their weapons, specifically the swords that represent their efforts, are depicted sheathed in defense rather than readied for combat. Theirs is not an aggressive responsibility, but a reactive one. Collectively, the workers and soldiers suggest a Leningrad region that fixed its reverence on both the workers who constructed the metro and rebuilt the city after the war, as well as the soldiers who made general rebuilding possible.

The decision to orient the metro’s design around the past and the present stands in marked contrast to the focus of the messages of similar structures completed in earlier periods of Soviet history. The Moscow Metro, the USSR’s first such system, completed during the 1930s, possessed qualities that exclusively highlighted the Soviet radiant future (svetloe budushchee), a characteristic consistent with place, time, and the contemporary concentration of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The Leningrad Metro, meanwhile, does not at all concern itself with the future; the svetloe budushchee is completely absent from Leningrad Metro stations. Rather than focusing on the future, the art and architecture of the first line invited passengers to reflect on past Soviet glories and sacrifices, allowing for a relaxation of the pressure of building for tomorrow, thereby permitting some consideration for the quality of contemporary existence. That these sorts of messages lined the walls of a Late Stalinist era structure suggests that the roots of Thaw-era reforms may be found in events that took place during Stalin’s lifetime.

Changes in Late Stalinist culture are reflected in the testimonies of workers who labored in the construction of the first line of the Leningrad Metro. This is particularly significant given the CPSU’s long-standing emphasis on the significance of labor in the development of a conscious citizen. In 1934, for example, Maxim Gorky criticized the bourgeois tendency to ignore the labor processes’ role in “creat[ing] the basic elements of culture” by suggesting that, in the Soviet Union, workers had been “armed with the full might of modern technique,” in order to allow work to become “easier and more productive, raising it to the level of an art.” For Gorky, Soviet labor was, in fact, synonymous with “creation.” Through work as a creative outlet, he claimed, Soviet workers exhibited a “Socialist individuality” which represented the “flower of
the working class,” a personal and collective growth which would, inevitably, produce, in terms Heidegger would have understood, “a beautiful dwelling place for mankind.”

Without denying the pitfalls of employing such a source, memoirs written by a collection of workers from the first line’s construction corroborate these notions of change in a way that is largely consistent with the suggestion that, in Leningrad at least, the Late Stalinist era represented a new stage in Soviet development. By focusing on a diversification of professional skills and work, many of the workers from the Leningrad Metro project echoed the priorities of the Late Stalin period. More significant, however, is the language they used to describe these values. Workers’ accounts suggest that individual development and personal goals were not at all anathema in the Late Stalin-early Thaw era. Instead, testimony suggests that individualized endeavors were often pursued with the intent of benefitting the collective. In other words, the collective educated, shaped, and informed individuals who subsequently necessarily possessed a sense of self primarily based on collectivist values. In “post-Bolshevik” Soviet society, individualist pursuits and collectivist ideology were not mutually exclusive concepts. Largely, though certainly not entirely, free from the concentration on building the svetloe budushchee, the workers of the first line of the Leningrad Metro seemed to have embodied Gorky’s vision of a “Socialist individuality” defined by the determination to achieve collectivist ends.

---
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Appendix

Zdes’ gde begut stali nye magistrali,
My povstrechalis’ s drugom dorogim.
Takim ego i v Pushkine, vstrechali,
Takoi on v serdtse berezno khrapim.

Zadumchivy, v ruke szhimaia list’ia,
On vme ate s name, kazhdomy rodnoi.
A za plechami Pushkina tenisty
Sad, otrazhennyi yasnoyu vodoi.

I kazhdyi, kto sneshim v lyudskom potoke,
Zdes’ khot’ na mig pomedit, izymlen,
Nezhdannoi vstrechei...
Zdravstvui, drug dalekii,

K tebe prokhodim my so vsekh storon-
C Baltiiskogo i s ploshchadi Vosstan’ya,
Iz tsekha, shkoly, palubkoralei-
I my prinosem chutkoe vhiman’e,
Svoyu lubov’ k poyezii tvoei!

Vs. Azarov.\textsuperscript{282}
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