Introduction

The Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia was of colossal significance for the fate of our country. It did away with the main social contradiction between the social nature of production and the private mode of appropriation, abolished the division of society into exploiters and exploited, oppressors and oppressed, and initiated fundamental socialist transformations in the economy, politics and culture of society.

Until 1921, the young Soviet state waged continuous wars against counter-revolution and intervention. Having defeated the armies of Yudenich, Kornilov, Denikin, Kolchak, Wrangel, White Poles and interventionists, thwarted all attempts to restore capitalism, the world's first Soviet socialist state, in the most dire conditions of devastation and famine, began to restore the national economy.

The Soviet people, led by the Communist Party and the Soviet government, led by the great Lenin, overcame all difficulties, endured all trials, found the strength to restore the national economy and begin the construction of socialism. What seemed to bourgeois writers a miracle, a fantasy, was the result of the consistent policy of the Communist Party, the implementation of Lenin's teaching on building socialism in a single country, the result of the creativity of the broad working masses awakened by the revolution. "Socialism is fraught with gigantic forces," said V. I. Lenin, "... humanity has now passed to a new stage of development that carries unusually brilliant possibilities" (V. I. Lenin Poln. Sobr. Soch., Vol. 45, p. 402.). These words were convincingly embodied in the intensive development and diversity of forms of Soviet socialist culture - in science, literature, theater, fine arts and architecture.

The process of restoring the national economy, naturally, was associated with the need to build a wide variety of buildings and structures. In this regard, the first foundations and forms of state regulation and management of construction and architecture are established, for which appropriate state institutions are created, as well as various public creative organizations of architects arise.

In 1920, the party and the Soviet government began to draw up the first ever nationwide plan for the development of the national economy, which foresaw the development of heavy industry, transport and energy. This plan was based on the Lenin plan for the electrification of all industry and agriculture in Russia - GOELRO, adopted in 1920 at the VIII All-Russian Congress of Soviets. Lenin attached great importance to this plan, calling it "the second program of the party."

The GOELRO plan provided for the construction of 30 power plants. The growth of industrial production within 10-15 years was supposed to exceed the pre-war level of 1913 by 180-200%.

The GOELRO plan was the first scientifically substantiated forecast of the reconstruction and further development of the socialist national economy, combining the primary practical tasks of restoration with the prospect of building the material base of socialism.

Back in 1919, construction began on the first-born of hydropower, the Volkhovskaya HPP. By 1922, according to the GOELRO plan, the Kashirskaya power plant near Moscow, the Krasny Oktyabr power plant near Petrograd were built, the Balakhninskaya, Kizilovskaya, Shaturskaya and other power plants

were being built. By 1921-1922. the extraction of coal, oil and peat has increased significantly. New workers' settlements arose near power plants, new industrial enterprises and mines.

Despite the fact that in the first post-revolutionary years the volume of real construction was small, the project activities covered the newly emerging diverse needs of society. It was a time when ideas about the ways of formation and development of socialist culture in general and architecture in particular were just taking shape among the technical and artistic Soviet intelligentsia. At first, these ideas were very different and contradictory. They were often far from a real understanding of the difficulties in creating the material basis of socialism in a country exhausted by wars and devastation, from understanding the need for a radical transformation of all production relations, moral and ethical norms of human behavior.

Many architects, whose creative personality took shape in the pre-revolutionary era, were fascinated by the opportunity that opened up to work not for the "whim of the customer", but to create for the people, to fulfill their dreams of reviving the artistic traditions of the world and Russian classics in architecture.

Middle-aged and younger generations of architects, especially students of architecture and construction universities, fascinated by the romance of the first years of the revolution, were embraced by the search for fundamentally new types of buildings and structures for the processes of work, life and culture. It seemed to them that the victory of the world revolution was close, and this instilled in them the conviction that only a fundamentally new ideological and artistic architectural form is capable of reflecting revolutionary transformations.

In numerous competitive projects of grandiose Palaces of Workers, Palaces of Labor, theater buildings designed to serve large groups of people, one could see, along with modernized architectural motifs of Roman baths, Romanesque and Gothic cathedrals and feudal castles, attempts to find expression of the pathos of the Great October Socialist Revolution fundamentally new spatial compositions based on the capabilities of new technology.

Early 1920s architecture was closely associated with the visual arts. Architects were looking for means that would make it possible to more concretely express the new social content of architecture, and the visual arts gravitated towards architecture in search of monumental and expressive forms.

Of great importance in the formation of Soviet monumental art were the decree adopted by the Council of People's Commissars in April 1918 "On the removal of monuments erected in honor of the tsars and their servants, and not of interest from either the historical or artistic side, and the decree on organizing a competition for the development of projects monuments ", as well as a government decree on the construction of monuments in honor of the founders of scientific communism, revolutionaries, writers and scientists. These decrees, adopted on the initiative of V.I. Lenin, and subsequent government decrees went down in the history of Soviet culture under the title of Lenin's plan of monumental propaganda. Vladimir Ilyich attached great importance to the implementation of this plan and personally supervised its implementation.

The problem of creating a new architecture worried the architects. The solution to this problem was accompanied by a struggle of opinions, violent mutual criticism, words and creative works. Since the beginning of the 20s. various creative groups of architects are formed and organized.

The Moscow Architectural Society (MAO, chairman A. Shchusev) and the Leningrad Society of Architect-Artists (chairman L. Benois) united mainly architects of the older generation. They had architectural and construction experience on their side. Their creative method rested on the use of traditional principles of composition and architectural forms of the past.

The Association of New Architects (ASNOVA), headed by N. Ladovsky, created in 1923, set the task of radically changing the figurative means of architecture by "developing the formal side of architecture" by constructing a new plastic form. Recognizing the formative value of new structures and materials, the ASNOVA figures considered the conditions of psychophysiological perception of volume, plane, rhythm and other elements of the architectural composition to be the defining moment in the formation of the architectural form.

In 1925, the Association of Contemporary Architects (OSA) was created, headed by A. and V. Vesnins, M. Ginzburg. The OCA's efforts were focused on finding building types that would respond to new social processes. In the construction of the volumetric-spatial structure of the building, decisive importance was attached to the functional organization of space in accordance with the needs of production, everyday life or cultural processes, as well as structures and building materials. At the same time, the problem of the artistic image was reduced to bringing the functional and technical elements of architecture into a harmonious unity by means of meter, rhythm, and proportions. Moreover, this stage of the architect's creative work was considered by the OCA ideologists "a function of the constructed material shell and the space hidden behind it" (M. Ginzburg, New Methods of Architectural Thinking. M., 1926). This direction was called constructivism.

However, it is rather difficult to understand the fundamental differences in purely professional terms by comparing the creative works of the participants of ASNOVA, OSA, ARU (the Association of Revolutionary Urbanists - an organization that spun off from ASNOVA in 1928, headed by N. Ladovsky). All these creative associations of architects, in fact, represented the front of the "new architecture", opposing the stylistic and eclectic tendencies of the MAO and the Leningrad Society of Architect-Artists.

Differences in the understanding of architecture could be determined mainly by the declarations of creative groups, numerous articles in the press, by debatable polemics between creative groups, on such problems as socialist settlement, the socialist city, the architecture of a new way of life, etc.

A variety of architectural concepts, sometimes contradictory, is most fully manifested in the field of urban planning. And this is understandable, since for the first time architects were given, in principle, broad opportunities for transforming existing cities and building new ones, based on the use of scientific and technical achievements, hygiene, sanitation, urban transport and landscaping. During these years, the foundations of the theory of regional planning were laid, which later, in 1924, received their first implementation in the project of the regional planning of the Absheron Peninsula.

In the area of the planning structure of new cities, various systems of their spatial construction were developed, but ultimately these proposals boiled down to two directly opposite concepts. On the one hand, there is the concept of de-urbanization in the form of various forms of a garden city with a limited population, with individual or semi-detached types of houses, on the other, the concept of urbanization based on the idea of constant growth of large cities, provided with the most advanced

engineering equipment. In accordance with these basic urban planning concepts, the principles of social organization and spatial construction of residential groups or a large socialist quarter as the main social and planning units of the city were developed.

With all the variety of proposals, they all proceeded from the progressive position that the functional organization of residential groups in a garden city or a large block in an urbanized city is determined by the interests of the convenience and rational organization of the hostel of large groups of people. The idea of a residential neighborhood was already in its infancy here. These works, undoubtedly, had a great influence on the subsequent development of the theory of the microdistrict.

The principle of socialization of various aspects of everyday life and cultural services of the population took various forms in the works of architects, in particular, proposals appeared for the construction of communal houses, and in some of them the solution to the problem was taken to an extreme, up to the separation of children from their parents and their complete transition to public education.

In 1921, the year of the beginning of the restoration of the national economy, the party passed from the policy of War Communism to the New Economic Policy.

The new economic policy inevitably led to the revitalization of the capitalist elements in the city and countryside and to an exacerbation of the class struggle. “Who will win - the capitalist or the Soviet government? This is what the whole current war boils down to: who will win, who will most likely take advantage of it - the capitalist, whom we let through the door or even through several doors (and into many doors that we do not know ourselves and which open besides us and against us), or the proletarian state power ... The whole question is, who will be ahead of whom? " - said V. I. Lenin in 1921 (Lenin V. I. Poln. Sobr. Soch., Vol. 44, pp. 160-161.). Consequently, the question of "who will beat whom" largely depended on the pace of restoration and further development of the national economy as the basis for an offensive against the capitalist elements of town and country.

The restoration of the national economy and its further development entailed an increase in the volume of construction and required the prompt commissioning of industrial enterprises in conditions of extremely limited material and technical capabilities.

The implementation of the new economic policy in the country yielded tangible results. Already in 1925, industrial production amounted to 80% of the level of 1913. The plan for the electrification of the country was successfully implemented. After the XIV Congress of the CPSU (b) (December 1925), the socialist industrialization of the national economy became the general line of the party.

In the second half of the 20s. the process of collectivization of agriculture began. The opportunity opened up for a transition to the path of gradual industrialization of agricultural production, conditions were created for a cultural revolution in the countryside.

The eradication of illiteracy was carried out on a large scale - the first and most important step of the cultural revolution, without which it was impossible to successfully solve the problem of industrializing the country.

The transition to real construction showed that many of the proposals put forward by representatives of ASNOVA, OSA, ARU and other groups turned out to be premature, out of touch with the capabilities

and needs of the current construction. Their theoretical content was too abstract, since the problem of a city, a dwelling house, a cultural and social building was most often considered contemplatively, without connection with the specific economy, technical capabilities of the country and the aesthetic ideals of the working masses.

Therefore, attempts to put into practice such urban planning ideas as a dynamically developing city-line, as was proposed for Magnitogorsk, or a city built on the idea of complete socialization of all aspects of life, as proposed for Novokuznetsk, did not and could not lead to any positive results. lead, especially in the conditions of construction of those years.

By the end of the 20s. divisions between and within the factions have intensified. In 1929, the All-Russian Society (later the All-Union Association) of Proletarian Architects (VOPRA) was established. The emergence of such a creative association was not accidental. Its founders believed that architecture creates not only material wealth, but, being art, also serves the artistic needs of society, in connection with which the ideological role of architecture is great. The VOPRA activists rightly criticized the theoretical positions of the OCA for their fetishization of technology, for their mechanistic understanding of the relationship between function and form, for belittling the role of the ideological influence of architecture on a person. They opposed the figures of ASNOV, who separated the form from the social and ideological content and created new forms of Soviet architecture in a laboratory way. At the same time, recognizing the need for critical development of the heritage, VOPRA rejected the method of eclectics, “mechanically copying the old architecture, blindly obeying the classical canons and schemes” (Declaration of the VOPRA. 1929 - In collection: From the history of Soviet architecture. 1926-1932 M. , 1970., p. 139.). At the same time, VOPRA did not avoid the extremes of pedagogy and group intolerance.

Although VOPRA proclaimed "dialectical realism" as its creative method, in their creative work, in projects and buildings, the VOPRA participants, in fact, did not differ from the architects OSA or ASNOVA.

It should be noted that VOPRA's criticism of the new architecture was not a revelation. Dissatisfaction with the "formalistic attitudes", as it was then classified, ASNOVA or the mechanistic essence of constructivism-functionalism is contained in numerous articles in the special architectural and general press of that time.

The struggle between various creative factions in architecture was no exception. An even sharper struggle was fought in the field of fine arts and literature. Some stood on almost complete denial of the traditions of realistic art, proclaiming, under the guise of ultra-revolutionary phrases, anarchist slogans "to blow up, destroy, wipe out old art forms from the face of the earth." Others, and especially Proletkult, whose ideologue was A. Bogdanov, implanted the idea of artificially creating a special proletarian culture, essentially denying Lenin's doctrine of proletarian culture as the natural development of “those reserves of knowledge that mankind has developed under the yoke of capitalist society, landlord society, bureaucratic society ”(VI Lenin Poln. sobr. soch., vol. 41, pp. 304-305). But a true artist is not limited to declarations and various programs. As a creative person, he is broader than the scope of his group, therefore, works of truly realistic art appeared in literature, painting and

sculpture, reflecting in artistic images the complex processes of the formation of new social relations and the socialist worldview of man - the builder of socialism.

Something similar happened in architecture. Along with fierce theoretical disputes about the creative method, the emergence of extreme, divorced from the vital interests of building theories, a number of progressive architectural works were created in real construction. Works such as the Volkhovskaya hydroelectric station, the Krasnaya Talka textile factories in Ivanovo and the Ivanteevka factory, the complex of the Electrotechnical Institute in Moscow, the residential areas of Usachevka, Dangauerovka and Krasnaya Presnya in Moscow, the development of Traktornaya Street in Leningrad, the Armenikend and Stepan Razin residential settlements in Baku and many others, convincingly show what significant amendments the practice of construction made to theoretical concepts.

By 1926-1927. the restoration of the national economy was practically completed. Under the leadership of the party, the country began to reconstruct the national economy, to build the foundation of socialism. In 1927, the 15th Party Congress adopted Directives for the preparation of the first five-year plan for the development of the national economy of the USSR, which was then approved by the V Congress of Soviets of the USSR in 1929. The development of enormous amounts of capital investments was associated with overcoming difficult construction conditions.

The material and technical base of construction was not developed, and the organization of construction production was handicraft in nature. The success of the plan for the construction of industrial, residential and public buildings required the introduction of industrial construction methods. Under these conditions, any separation from the real economy and technology in design became a brake on the development of the national economy.

The work of the architect acquired an important state significance, it was urgently required to concentrate the creative forces of architects on solving the problems of mass construction.

In June 1931, the Plenum of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) specially considered the question "On the Moscow city economy and the development of the city economy in the USSR." The plenum subjected the existing construction experience to a comprehensive analysis, outlined a number of practical measures to accelerate the pace of development of the urban economy in the USSR, and especially the housing economy in accordance with the pace of industrial construction, and condemned the enthusiasm for the ideas of an accelerated transformation of everyday life, which found expression "in the artificial planting of household communes."

At the Plenum, a program for the reconstruction of Moscow was outlined, a decision was made to build a subway and the Moscow-Volga canal to provide the capital with water and create a waterway connecting Moscow with the seas. The architects faced new complex tasks in their subject, which could only be done by large teams of designers united by a single creative method.

The caste isolation of creative groups, the lack of a unified ideological and creative platform in connection with this, the one-sided understanding of the tasks of proletarian culture inevitable in these conditions hindered the development of realistic principles of Soviet art and literature, which are of great importance in the formation of the socialist world outlook of the working people. These

phenomena were also intolerant in architecture, which creates a material and at the same time artistic environment for a person and society.

In 1932, the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) decided to dissolve literary and artistic groups and to create united creative unions, including the Union of Soviet Architects, designed to rally the forces of architects to solve major state problems that arose in the process of building a socialist society.

The organizational and creative restructuring of the ranks of Soviet architects, which began in 1932, is thus the beginning of a new - second - stage in the development of Soviet architecture.

The second period in the development of Soviet architecture took place in the conditions of the country's industrialization successes, the collectivization of agriculture and the cultural revolution. This stage is characterized by a wide scale of construction of industrial buildings and structures.

The success of the implementation of the first five-year plan has shown firsthand what enormous objective advantages lies in socialist planning of the national economy, which makes it possible to pose in practice the problem of the expedient geographical distribution of the country's productive forces in the interests of the harmonious development of the national economy.

The principles of district planning, which began to take shape back in the 1920s, are further developed in the process of developing district planning projects for such vast and complex areas of industrial development as Kemerovo, Orsko-Khalilovsky and Kuzbass.

The development of the prospects for the economic development of an industrial region made it possible to outline the appropriate location of industrial enterprises, energy centers, railway, automobile and air transport lines, to approach practically the design of the settlement system and the definition of the types of settlements; to solve the problem of engineering communications and structures as a complex problem of the district; to outline the creation of reserved forest parks and reservoirs.

The construction of industrial giants in Zaporozhye, Donbass, Urals, Siberia necessitated the construction of new cities: Magnitogorsk, Novokuznetsk, Bereznyakov, etc. .), therefore a great development in the 30s. gets the theory and practice of urban planning.

The master plan for the development of the city acquired particular importance as a document allowing to solve the current tasks of construction without prejudice to the prospects for the development of the city. In fact, for the first time in the history of architecture, the problem of urban planning has acquired great state significance as an essential element in the development of the national economy. It became necessary to scientifically substantiate the principles of socialist urban planning in the real conditions of a particular economy.

The developing theory of Soviet urban planning during this period was tested by practice. And this made the theory of life, capable of solving complex practical problems. The theory of urban planning has incorporated those objectively progressive provisions that were developed in the 1920s, only they were adjusted for the real economy.

In the decree of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks and the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR on the general plan for the reconstruction of Moscow in

1935, as well as on the general plan of Leningrad in 1936, the basic principles of the urban planning concept are clearly and convincingly expressed. For the first time, the idea of preserving the historically established planning structure of the city with a simultaneous decisive reconstruction is approved, the principle of functional zoning of the city's territory is reflected, the construction of a large socialist quarter, provided with networks of cultural and consumer services for the population, the need to create a forest-park belt around the city as a recreational event is considered, the level of technical and sanitary and hygienic improvement of the entire territory of the city, it is planned to limit the growth of industrial enterprises and the city is considered as a system of ensembles of squares and streets designed to reflect the greatness and beauty of the socialist era.

At the same time, the material support of reconstruction in terms of means and timing is consistent with the plan for the development of the national economy of the USSR. As a result, the city's master plan really becomes the basis for practical construction. Such a comprehensive consideration of all the factors that determine the diverse interrelated work on the reconstruction of a large city at a certain historical moment, their formative role, was an important milestone in the formation of the general theory of Soviet urban planning.

The introduction into the design and construction of cities of a comprehensive account of the various factors that form the city, in practice, was far from easy. The needs for the operational location of construction outstripped the pace of development of master plans, and this sometimes led to ill-considered decisions. At the same time, the constant communication of the designers with the construction practice, the need to make private decisions, if possible, not to the detriment of the city as a whole, were a good school for educating urban planners in the process of this new work, which has no historical analogies both in terms of its volume and content.

It was during this period that large design organizations for the design and reconstruction of cities were created - Giprogor, Giprograd, Gorstroyproekt, etc., in which the leading cadres of Soviet urban planners grew up and where, in fact, the foundations of Soviet urban planning science were formed.

In fact, it was in the 30s. practically develops, developing the progressive achievements of the previous period, the architecture of industrial buildings and structures. The ideas of a strict functional logic for constructing spaces put forward by members of the OCA in the interests of the most rational technology of industrial production, the formative significance of structures and scientific achievements of building physics in the architecture of industrial buildings are being applied in practice.

In 1932, the construction of an outstanding work of Soviet architecture - the V.I.Lenin Dneproges was completed. It was the largest hydroelectric power plant in Europe at the time. On its basis, a developed industrial complex of energy-intensive enterprises and the city of Zaporozhye arose.

Automobile plants were built in the city of Gorky, Moscow (now the Likhachev plant), an agricultural machinery plant in Rostov-on-Don (Rostselmash), Uralmash in Sverdlovsk, the Sergo Ordzhonikidze machine-tool plant in Chelyabinsk, a heavy engineering plant in Kramatorsk, tractor plants in Stalingrad and Kharkov, Chelyabinsk and many others. The architecture of these buildings - light and comfortable for work - had nothing to do with the gloomy buildings of pre-revolutionary factory buildings.

Along with this, in the 30s. the tasks of creating new architectural types of engineering structures were solved, such as stations of the Moscow metro (the first stage of which was commissioned in 1935) and hydraulic structures of the Moscow-Volga canal (1932-1937). In these structures, utilitarian in their functional purpose, the tasks of creating an expressive, ideologically rich architectural image were set and in a number of cases successfully solved (Kropotkinskaya station, Mayakovsky square, Sverdlov square, Karamyshevskaya dam, lock No. 3 on the Moscow-Volga canal, etc.).

The great progressive significance of this new attitude towards the artistic side of the architecture of utilitarian industrial and engineering structures cannot be overlooked when evaluating the above-mentioned works from the standpoint of today's architectural criteria.

In the 30s. the problem of mass housing and cultural and social construction became very important, since an acute shortage of housing complicated the process of development of the country's productive forces.

In connection with this circumstance, the typification of dwellings and cultural and domestic buildings is developing. The scientific foundations for typification were laid back in the 1920s. in the work of a group led by M. Ginzburg at the Stroykom of the RSFSR on the problems of mass housing (residential unit as a primary element of settlement in accordance with the demographic characteristics of families, rationing as a function of everyday life and the economy, unification of design parameters, etc.). These principles were developed taking into account the real economic and technical resources of construction.

The state organization of the standard design business pursued the goal of providing mass construction with projects and creating the prerequisites for the introduction of industrial methods. The State Committee played an important role in the organization of typification and standardization, in the creation of scientifically grounded design standards for settlements, industrial, residential and public buildings, in the development of standards and catalogs of sanitary equipment, windows, doors, hardware and other parts and elements of construction production. for construction under the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR.

The party and government, posing the problem of transition to industrial methods of construction, paid great attention to the development of scientific research. So, back in the 20s. the State Institute of Structures was created, which played a large positive role, uniting scientists in the field of construction and deploying comprehensive research. On the basis of this institute in the 30s. a number of institutes were created on various problems of industrial construction. In 1931, the Academy of Public Utilities of the RSFSR was created, and in 1933 - the Academy of Architecture of the USSR.

Large volumes and accelerated rates of industrial construction, the need to save materials such as metal, cement, led to the development of scientific research in the field of the theory of engineering structures and the creation of new structural compositions. In particular, new types of wooden structures were created (lattice and bar trusses on ring and nail joints, wooden frame, arched and vaulted mesh and solid structures). Much work has been carried out in the field of creating scientific methods for the design and use of concrete, reinforced concrete and frame structures and coatings for industrial buildings. All this became part of the practice of erecting industrial buildings and structures. Such important areas of engineering science as soil mechanics and building physics were developed, which

made it possible to create a number of new foundations for various regions of the country and new lightweight types of enclosing structures. The tasks of improving the working conditions of workers were set and practically solved in the architecture of industrial buildings (creating a favorable microclimate, good illumination of workshops and workplaces, arranging household premises in accordance with hygiene requirements, canteens for workers, etc.).

In 1937, the I Congress of Architects of the USSR took place. The great pre-congress work of the organizing committee of the Union of Architects, free and broad discussions and discussions on the most important creative problems of Soviet architecture led to the fact that architects came to their congress as a close-knit team. The congress considered and adopted decisions on the direction of architectural creativity in all the most important branches of architecture and formulated a very important provision on the creative method of socialist realism. This provision was included in the first charter of the Union of Architects, adopted by the congress.

“Socialist realism,” the charter said, “is a method of Soviet architecture. In the field of architecture, socialist realism means a combination of the ideological and truthfulness of an artistic image with the most complete correspondence of a people's building to the technical, cultural and everyday requirements imposed on it, with the highest efficiency and technical perfection of construction. Soviet architecture should strive to create structures that are technically perfect, comfortable and beautiful, reflecting the joy of socialist life and the aspirations of our era. "

Various creative interpretations of the provisions on the method of socialist realism formulated at the congress took place in conditions of a struggle of opinions, but already within the framework of a single creative union. However, gradually from the beginning of the 30s. in practice, and then in theory, there is a reassessment of the direction in architecture. Remarkable in this respect are the results of the international competition for the project of the Palace of Soviets, which was supposed to be built in Moscow not far from the Kremlin. The Council for the Construction of the Palace of Soviets awarded three highest prizes to B. Iofan, I. Zholtovsky and the American architect. Hamilton, whose projects, although they were different in style, were united by the fact that they, in fact, sharply broke with the principles of architecture of the 1920s. If Zholtovsky proposed a kind of composition built on the classical principles of interpreting the ensemble, Iofan, with a functionally thought out spatial solution, gave an expressively tense monumental form, then Hamilton's project was developed in the forms of classic modernist style.

A number of projects were presented for the next round of the competition, borrowing art forms from various well-known examples of works of past architecture, such as Hadrian's Mausoleum, Doge's Palace, etc.

The given example is not an episode, it reflects a significant change in views on the nature of architecture, a reassessment of artistic values in architecture. The search for means of architectural expressiveness, conditioned by this or that tradition, became universal, and the leaders of the new architecture did not escape it. The reasons for this complex phenomenon have not yet been properly investigated. It cannot be explained solely by the dissatisfaction of the broad masses of the working people with the "new architecture", although in mass construction it was indeed far from perfect.

Firstly, in it back in the 20s. a kind of stereotype and even stylization appeared, which even then worried constructivist ideologists. Elements such as a horizontal strip window, flat roof, deep loggias or solid balconies, a spiral staircase, became mandatory signs of "style". At the same time, when the technical capabilities did not allow their implementation, these elements were imitated: flat roofs - by arranging brick parapets that surrounded a gable roof, a tape window - by painting the walls with black paint, etc.

Secondly, for the "new architecture" with its simple geometric volumes, smooth wall planes, high-quality building materials were required, varied in color and texture - mirror glass, metal bindings, as well as high quality construction work, which was practically absent in construction.

Probably, after all, the main reason was that in the modernized historical styles, the plastic architectural form more fully met the aesthetic ideals of man, due to the fact that it was associated with a number of analogies and historical associations, which caused an emotional reaction to the form, while the “new architecture "too decisively broke with tradition, with national ideas about beauty and therefore suffered from" an excess of information "that impedes direct emotional perception.

Modern researchers of the architecture of the Mausoleum of V.I. Lenin, an outstanding work of Soviet architecture, built according to the project of A. Shchusev, emphasize the connection between the architecture of the Mausoleum and the innovative essence of Soviet architecture of the 1920s. And there is a lot of truth in this. However, the reason for the strong emotional impact of the architecture of the Mausoleum on a person is, of course, also in the fact that the innovation of the ideological and artistic conception is combined in this work with continuity, with the creative assimilation of the classical tradition, if we understand by classics not formal signs of a particular classical style, but fusion of deep ideological content and plastic form, harmonious perfection of connections with the entire environment.

The architecture of the Mausoleum of V.I. Lenin is a vivid example of insight into the essence of Lenin's doctrine of socialist culture.

In the field of theory and history of architecture in 1935-1939. works on artistic composition based on the materials of classical and classicism monuments are being developed, measurements and measurements are published on individual outstanding works of architecture of the past, the laws of formation of famous architectural ensembles are studied. The revision of aesthetic values, the attraction of old plastic means of artistic expression inevitably entailed a revision of spatial architectural concepts. Of course, a number of urban planning provisions developed by the previous period of architecture development, such as the method of district planning, the construction of the city as a social organism that provides an equal level of culture and amenities for the entire population, the understanding of the quarter as a space of functionally organized life of a large team, continued to operate, however, compositional the concept of the city and its elements changed. Perimeter buildings, the classicist principles of building urban ensembles, the symmetry of the location of the masses, the dominance of symmetrical axes, often contrary to the interests of the convenience of urban transport and the scientific principles of improving the microclimate, were revived.

Functional conquests of the 1920s in the design of industrial buildings, the scientific foundations of typification, the formation of dwellings taking into account climatic features were retained in the

practice of architecture, but the artistic appearance of buildings changed, their plastic forms were based on the use of artistic elements of the past.

At the same time, from the beginning of the 30s. there were qualitative changes in the material base of construction. The XVI Congress of the CPSU (b) in its decisions demanded an acceleration of the pace of capital construction and the transition to industrial methods with the greatest use of mechanisms. As a result, the construction materials industry developed: the production of local materials (stone, brick, wood, cinder blocks, etc.), the production of cement, glass, and construction metal products increased; construction sites were equipped with mechanisms. The first factories for the production of ready-mixed concrete, various building elements and parts appeared.

The first five-year plan was completed in four years. In the second and third five-year plans, the volume of capital construction increased from year to year. In 1936, the decree of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) and the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR "On improving the construction business and on reducing the cost of construction" was published. It laid the foundations for the creation of the construction industry as an independent branch of the national economy. In these conditions, the compliance of architectural solutions with the principles of industrial construction became especially important. By 1940-1941. the well-known contradictions between the architectural orientation in its most stylized manifestations and the changes that took place in the construction technology began to be revealed.

# # #

The war interrupted the peaceful labor of the Soviet people. All the forces of the country, all the material and spiritual resources of the Soviet state were mobilized to defend the socialist fatherland, to defeat the enemy.

The war was a comprehensive test of the Soviet socialist system. The courage of the Soviet people, their patriotism, the unity of the peoples of the USSR rallied around the Communist Party and the Soviet government, the objective advantages of the socialist planned economy, the gigantic organizational work of the party turned out to be the main and only force that was able to lead the liberation war of the peoples against fascism and, taking on its shoulders all the main hardships of the war, save the world from fascist enslavement.

The threat of occupation by the Nazis of vast industrial regions of the center and south of Russia and Ukraine forced the evacuation of industrial enterprises to the east and southeast of the country. This circumstance required the rapid construction of new industrial buildings and the reconstruction of existing ones to ensure the prompt installation of equipment and the organization of production for defense needs.

Serious difficulties arose with the accommodation of the evacuees. It was necessary to mobilize all economic reserves to solve this problem. Soviet architects and engineers created a variety of economical types of dwellings, new structures from local building materials.

In the Academy of Architecture of the USSR and in other scientific institutions, research was undertaken, as a result of which it was possible to revive on a new technical basis a number of forgotten domed, arched and vaulted brick structures. It was at this time that the wooden factory

housing construction received a significant development, which, having turned into a developed branch of the Soviet construction industry, during the recovery of the national economy after the war, played a large role in providing temporary housing for the population.

Even during the war, work began on the restoration of cities and villages and industrial enterprises in the territories liberated from the enemy. In the face of complex and responsible tasks for the restoration of cities, towns and villages, back in 1943 under the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR, the State Committee for Architecture was created, which was entrusted with providing the upcoming grandiose work on the restoration of the national economy with projects, conducting urban planning and architectural policy in country.

The State Committee for Architecture has created a network of design organizations that began drawing up master plans for the restoration of Stalingrad, Sevastopol, Novorossiysk, Smolensk, Rostov-on-Don, Novgorod, Pskov, Velikiye Luki and many others.

In 1945, the war ended with the complete defeat of fascist Germany and imperialist Japan. The war caused enormous damage to the national economy of the USSR. More than 32 thousand industrial enterprises were turned into ruins, 1710 cities and more than 70 thousand villages were destroyed or deliberately burned, 25 million people lost their homes, about 65 thousand km of railways and 4 thousand railway stations were destroyed. Cities such as Stalingrad, Sevastopol were a heap of ruins, Minsk, Vitebsk, Velikiye Luki, Novorossiysk were destroyed by 70-80%, huge damage was inflicted on Leningrad, Stalino (now Donetsk), Rostov-on-Don and many other cities Soviet Union.

The Nazis sought to destroy the architectural relics of the Soviet people - the palace ensembles of the Leningrad suburbs were destroyed, the Church of the Savior Nereditsa with its amazing frescoes of the 12th-13th centuries was destroyed, the Resurrection Cathedral of the New Jerusalem Monastery near Moscow was blown up by the Germans during the retreat; the outstanding works of architects from Pskov, Novgorod, Chernigov, Riga, Vilnius, Kiev and other cities were turned into ruins.

The process of restoring the national economy, associated primarily with capital construction, required an enormous exertion of the forces of the people.

The objective advantages of the socialist system, the enthusiasm of the victorious Soviet people, and the organizational work of the party ensured the rapid restoration of the country's economy.

The builders and architects faced complex creative challenges. In 1946, the fourth five-year plan for the restoration and development of the national economy of the USSR was adopted. It required not only the rapid restoration of power units, railway transport, industrial enterprises, but also the modernization of the latter for a more advanced production technology. It was necessary to restore cities and villages, in a short time to liquidate dugouts and barracks in which people lived in the areas of the former occupation. It was necessary to build new schools, children's institutions, hospitals, sanatoriums, resorts and at the same time foresee the possibility of further development of the country's productive forces, and, consequently, cities and rural settlements.

The restoration of the cities and villages of our Motherland in such a short time (by 1950, the restoration was basically completed), undoubtedly, is an epoch-making phenomenon that has no analogues in the history of mankind. The complexity of the tasks that architects, engineers, and builders

had to solve was that it was not at all about a simple reproduction of what was destroyed. The restoration of populated areas simultaneously pursued their decisive reconstruction with the elimination of those shortcomings that arose in the old cities during the period of their capitalist development. The development of general plans for the restoration and reconstruction of destroyed cities became the central creative task of Soviet architects.

A striking example of the post-war stage of Soviet urban planning is the restoration of cities such as Stalingrad (now Volgograd), Minsk, Kiev, Sevastopol, Novgorod, Pskov, Rostov-on-Don, Donetsk, Orel, etc.

Many shortcomings of the spatial functional organization of cities were decisively corrected. The idea of separating transit and intracity transport was consistently pursued. Embankments of rivers and other reservoirs were cleared from chaotic buildings in order to introduce them into the structure of the city plan and landscape. A decisive enlargement of residential formations was carried out. It was at this time that the idea of a residential microdistrict was formed as the main structural unit of the city, which made it possible to solve the problem of rational and economical placement of all types of cultural and consumer services. Much attention was paid to the problem of improving the city by carrying out special works on watering and planting of greenery.

At that time, the interpretation of the center of a modern Soviet city became fundamentally new. This is no longer a single area, but a whole system of developed spatial compositions that seem to unite the planning structure of the city. The layout of the center of Volgograd, Rostov-on-Don, Minsk, and especially Kiev, where Khreshchatyk really became the spatial architectural dominant of the city, is an example of the implementation of large urban ensembles in practice.

Even in such a city of established classical ensembles as Leningrad, the restoration of areas affected by enemy shelling took place with a simultaneous adjustment of the general plan of the city. The designers put forward the idea of accessing the city to the sea through the consistent development of urban planning spaces in the direction of the seaside region, where a large ensemble was subsequently designed, the silhouette of which formed the “sea facade” of the city.

In 1947, a decision of great importance for urban planning was made to build high-rise buildings in Moscow, forming a new silhouette of the multi-storey capital.

In the development of master plans of cities and projects for their development during this period, for the first time, the question of the organic inclusion of architectural monuments into the structure of a modern city arose. Works on the general plans of Novgorod, Pskov and Kiev laid the foundations for the active introduction of valuable architectural monuments of the past into the city's architecture.

The revival of the masterpieces of Russian architecture began - the suburban palaces and parks of Petrodvorets, Pavlovsk, Pushkin. History does not know such an example, when, as a result of the enormous efforts of scientists, architects, master builders, artists, sculptors, wonderful architectural ensembles have re-emerged from the burnt ruins.

The fourth five-year plan was successfully completed. By 1950, “new 6200 large state industrial enterprises were built and destroyed during the war were restored” (Country of Soviets for 50 years.

Collection of statistical materials. M., 1967). 117 million m2 of living space was restored and rebuilt, including 47.6 million m2 in collective farms, but the demand for housing was still extremely high.

At the XIX Congress of the CPSU in 1952, Directives were approved for the fifth five-year plan for the development of the national economy of the USSR for 1951-1955, which provided for a sharp increase in the volume of industrial and civil construction.

The implementation of the fifth five-year plan was associated with the creation of various industrial complexes and engineering structures. The construction of the Transcaucasian Metallurgical Plant and the new city of Rustavi was nearing completion, the construction of the Cherepovets and Orsk-Khalilovsky Metallurgical Plants was in full swing, and in this connection the reconstruction of Cherepovets and Orsk. The construction of the country's energy base developed rapidly. There were grandiose construction projects of the Volga and Dnepropetrovsk cascades of power plants (Kuibyshevskaya, Volgograd, Kakhovskaya). The construction of the Tsimlyansk hydroelectric complex, the Volga-Don shipping channel was carried out. The development of the Angara water resources began.

The Party and the government took decisive measures to further develop the material and technical base of construction, to transfer all construction to the path of industrialization. Intensive searches of scientists and designers, in particular the work of the Academy of Architecture of the USSR, in the field of industrialization of construction have put forward fundamentally new design solutions in both industrial and civil construction, which made it possible to switch to the layout of buildings from large-sized elements of industrial production. It was a real technical revolution in construction. Labor costs in the construction of prefabricated buildings, in particular large-panel ones, including the manufacture of parts at factories, were more than halved. The construction time was sharply reduced, the own weight of the building was more than halved, which accordingly reduced transport costs.

In 1950, the first house-building factories appeared, the end product of which was completed multi-storey residential buildings.

The introduction of new industrial methods of housing construction from enlarged elements of industrial production required restructuring and standard design techniques. A system of modular coordination of space-planning parameters was developed, which made it possible to carry out a consistent unification of space-planning and structural parameters of buildings as an important condition for reducing the range of building elements and structures, factory production.

The contradictions that emerged before the war between the architectural form and the material and technical side of architecture in the face of a truly technical revolution in construction (typification and unification of all building elements, the transformation of the construction site into an assembly site, and the construction process into the assembly of ready-made factory elements) sharply escalated. Plastic forms of architecture (external cornices imitating old stone prototypes, platbands and pediments of doors and windows of complex classical profiles, imitation of masonry on plastered brick walls) contradicted the logic of the factory technology, slowed down and complicated the factory technological production processes.

In 1954, the All-Union Conference of Architects, Engineers and Builders was convened. The meeting recognized the need for the fastest transition of all construction to industrial factory construction methods, the progressive possibilities of which have already been proven in practice. At the same time, it was found that the artistic orientation of architecture, the presence of decorative archaic excesses in it hinder the development of progressive methods of construction.

In 1955, based on the analysis of the state of Soviet architecture, generalization of the materials of the All-Union Meeting of Builders and Designers, the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Council of Ministers of the USSR adopted a special resolution "On the elimination of excesses in design and construction", which was of great importance for the creative restructuring of the direction of Soviet architecture. Determining the nature of the creative tasks facing the architects, the decree indicated that Soviet architecture should be characterized by simplicity, severity of forms and economy of solutions. The resolution noted: "An attractive appearance of buildings and structures should be created not by using far-fetched expensive decorative ornaments, but by the organic connection of architectural forms with the purpose of buildings and structures, good proportions, as well as the correct use of materials, structures, details and high quality work." ...

In 1955, the II All-Union Congress of Soviet Architects was held, at which a comprehensive, professional, self-critical analysis of the creative practice of Soviet architecture made it possible to outline specific ways of creative restructuring of the work of Soviet architects towards the practical solution of the most important social, technical and ideological problems of architecture based on the comprehensive development of industrial methods of mass construction.

It is important to note that the decisions of the congress paid attention to the theory of Soviet architecture. The congress participants noted the backwardness of theoretical science, its one-sided development, the wrong interpretation by theoretical science of architectural form as a pictorial category in isolation from the functional and constructive essence of buildings, which, undoubtedly, was one of the reasons for the strengthening of stylization in architecture.

Thus, 1954-1955. can be considered the beginning of the modern stage in the development of Soviet architecture.

Period 1955-1970 associated with the powerful development of the country's productive forces in the context of the scientific and technological revolution.

The successes of the socialist economy of the USSR and the entire community of socialist nations, the historical mission of socialist society in the struggle for peace, freedom, equality and happiness of all peoples were reflected in the new Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, adopted at the XXII Congress of the CPSU and formulating the tasks of building the material and technical basis of communism and a rapid rise in the well-being of the entire population.

In the conditions of the scientific and technological revolution, which aggravates the competition between the socialist and capitalist systems, the maximum acceleration of scientific and technological progress has become the most important national task. The emergence of new industries, the discovery of oil, gas, rare metals, the industrial development of new regions required the rational placement of industry and associated settlements.

This circumstance served as the basis for the further development of regional planning, which now encompasses vast industrial areas, and the problem of rational settlement has received special development. The theory of group resettlement was developed in the form of the creation of interconnected industrial areas of populated areas grouped around the largest and largest cities.

In the field of urban planning after 1954, significant changes also took place. The planned nature of Soviet socialist society makes it possible to fairly accurately determine the prospects for the development of city-forming factors, and, consequently, of the city itself. However, in practice, there were cases when the population in the city for the settlement period in the process of real construction changed with all the ensuing consequences. This happened, as a rule, in those cases when the district planning was not developed in the proper volume as a scientific basis for settlement, based on an in-depth analysis of the industrial and agricultural development of a sufficiently large economic region.

Therefore, the regional planning, especially after the 23rd Congress of the CPSU, begins to develop primarily in the territories of new industrial development - the northeast, east and Central Asian republics. The estimated time frame for the development of the master plan of the city is increasing, and in addition, the State Committee for Civil Engineering and Architecture under the USSR State Construction Committee organizes the development of forecasts for the development of cities and all types of urban construction.

The very concept of the city also changed. The idea of a dynamically developing city, put forward back in the 1920s, is being specifically developed in a number of cities. Planning structures are being created, which for each stage of city construction provide for that measure of completeness of the composition, which allows the city to live a normal, full-fledged life in conditions of mass construction. An example of such a structure is, in particular, the master plan of Togliatti on the Volga.

The growth of road transport (personal and public) has brought forward with great urgency the problems of organizing urban traffic, creating a developed system of highways of continuous traffic, high-speed roads for off-street use of underground space in cities, and the need for various systems of traffic interchanges in the future.

Serious successes have been achieved in solving the problem of improving the city.

The city has its own climate, and its negative characteristics, superimposed on the unfavorable factors of the macroclimate, create conditions that are especially difficult for humans. In this regard, the work on the development of Baku, Tashkent (after the earthquake), Tbilisi, Yerevan, Kiev, on the creation of such new cities as Togliatti in the RSFSR, Navoi in Uzbekistan and Shevchenko in Kazakhstan, are convincing examples of the formation of a more favorable microclimatic environment by means of urban planning in conditions of uncomfortable climate factors in the area.

A major event in the field of urban planning in the post-war period is the approval of a new master plan for Moscow, developed by large teams of designers, sociologists, economists, engineers, and a number of special scientific institutions.

In the new general plan, in addition to solving purely functional, engineering problems using the most progressive technical achievements, great attention is paid to the architectural appearance of the city and, above all, to its center, which is a polygonal system of urban spaces. The concept of the center as a

system that unites all large areas of the city into a single whole is an innovative urban planning solution that allows to achieve unity and diversity in the structure of the city plan.

In the first years after the war, new construction in large cities developed mainly due to the development of vast new territories in the most favorable climatic and construction areas. Since 1960, work has been carried out in Moscow, Kiev, Baku, Perm, Kazan and in a number of other cities to reconstruct the old central districts with dilapidated housing stock. Particularly serious attention began to be paid to the planning of the suburban area, the allocation of green areas, reservoirs, the placement of places for tourism and recreation.

The new principles of the formation of large enterprises in the form of industrial hubs developed by scientific and design organizations began to be introduced into the practice of design and construction, ensuring the reduction of the necessary territories and communications, the enlargement of engineering and energy structures, the cooperation of warehouse and transport facilities. All this made it possible to reduce the cost of construction and operation of industrial enterprises.

The enlargement of units, the appearance of continuous automated lines of various kinds of machines and machine tools, the mobility of the technological processes themselves in time urgently required free production areas. This found expression in the enlargement of the grids of the bearing supports, in the appearance in the architecture of industrial buildings of various spatial coverings of large spans.

There has been a search for such architectural and planning compositions that make it possible to combine production of similar nature in a single large volume. The general development of the architecture of industrial buildings is characterized by the tendency to create free transforming spaces, increased attention to the architecture of the interiors of industrial workshops, in the creation of facilities for human work and rest. New industrial buildings in the South-West district of Moscow, Volzhskaya named after the XXII Congress of the CPSU hydroelectric station, Saratov and Bratsk hydroelectric power stations, Ladyzhenskaya and Ryazanskaya state district power stations, a watch factory in Minsk, a carpet factory in Brest, the Khromotron plant in Moscow, etc. Compliance with the functional requirements achieved a great expressiveness of the architectural form, they speak of the fruitful results of a new direction in the architecture of industrial buildings.

The CPSU program set the daunting task of providing each family with a separate comfortable apartment and the necessary types of cultural and social services. It is quite natural that at first the creation of new technological methods for the production of enlarged prefabricated elements was fraught with great difficulties and required the simplest solutions, therefore, despite the presence of a unified series of standard projects, factories practically produced 1-2 types of houses. With a large volume of construction being carried out throughout the country, this circumstance led to the emergence of monotonous, artistically impersonal residential areas.

New technology, new material possibilities of architecture, the construction of residential and public buildings in the form of large completed residential formations required new architectural and artistic means. The residential building lost its significance as a separate, unique element of the city. The result of machine production, it naturally became only a particle of a larger composition. The center of gravity in solving architectural and artistic problems has now shifted to the area of spatial urban

planning compositions. In this regard, the role of landscaping, landscaping, small forms, and reservoirs has greatly increased.

In 1969, the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Council of Ministers of the USSR adopted a decision "On measures to improve the quality of housing and civil construction", in which he noted the significant shortcomings of the architecture of mass construction, the dullness and standardness of the architectural appearance of new residential areas. This decision outlined the development and creation of new types of building and finishing materials, expanding the artistic possibilities of the architecture of industrial construction.

The improvement of urban planning and compositional skills of architects found its embodiment in large developed spatial compositions, in contrasting opposition of multifaceted inner spaces of micro-districts to the outer space of city-wide highways and squares.

The use of metric and rhythmic techniques for placing repetitive volumes, directing a person's movement to the final accents of spatial composition, the active inclusion of picturesque elements of nature in the artistic composition made it possible to outline ways to overcome the schematism and stereotypes of architectural solutions that were characteristic of the 50-60s.

At the same time, there were changes in construction technology. A technology for the manufacture of prefabricated elements was developed, allowing the expansion of their range. House-building factories began to gradually master the production of types of residential buildings of various storeys, lengths and configurations. The method of unified block sections began to be introduced into the standard design. The growth of the skill of architects, their mastery of the technique of industrial housing construction, gave interesting creative results. Districts Davydkovo, Belyaevo-Bogorodskoye, Zelenograd in Moscow, "Lesnye Polyany" and M. Torez in Leningrad, Chilanzar in Tashkent (after the earthquake), Rusanovka and Bereznyaki in Kiev, new residential areas of Vladivostok and Sverdlovsk, Zhirmunai microdistrict and especially Lazdinai in Vilnius , awarded the Lenin Prize, and others provide an example of the harmony of technology, economics and artistically expressive architectural solutions.

The steady increase in the cultural needs of the population, especially in connection with the increase in the free time of workers, required the development of various developed and economical systems of cultural and consumer services in the microdistrict (three-stage, two-stage), as well as the creation of new types of buildings.

Enlarged types of schools, united kindergartens, nurseries, primary consumer services, shopping and public centers, new types of health resorts, pioneer camps, Sports Palaces, air terminals and other buildings have appeared.

In the construction of the primary network of cultural and public services, the ideas of cooperative buildings were put forward, combining different, but similar functions and therefore allowing to increase the efficiency of the use of capital investments and reduce operating costs.

The formation of the architecture of these buildings at first was associated with individual creative failures. There were observed the mechanical application of some techniques as a kind of cliches of new architecture, enthusiasm for "glass breaking" regardless of the actual need for the functional

process of the building and its climatic environment, the loss of typological characteristics in the artistic image of the building; the use of organic elements such as sunscreens for purely decorative purposes, etc.

However, in such works of Soviet architecture as the Kremlin Palace of Congresses, the CMEA complex of buildings, the Palace of Pioneers in Moscow, the Lenin Memorial in Ulyanovsk, the Yubileiny Sports Palace and the Leningrad Hotel in Leningrad, the V.I. Lenin in Tashkent, a group of pioneer camps in Crimea, an exhibition building in Vilnius, a library in Ashgabat, the Lenin Palace of Culture in Almaty and many others, one can observe the fusion of all aspects of architecture: functional, technical and artistic, creating diverse, emotionally rich and socially meaningful images.

The Central Committee of the CPSU and the Soviet government at all stages of construction constantly paid special attention to the strengthening and development of agricultural socialist production, and, consequently, construction in the countryside.

Despite the fact that in the practice of building in the countryside in the pre-war period, certain successes were achieved in the planning of settlements, in the creation of new types of collective farm dwellings, and especially in the construction of cultural institutions (schools, clubs, children's institutions), nevertheless, in most cases, construction was carried out independently. without the participation of architects.

Meanwhile, the increase in the rate of development of agricultural production after the war put forward the task of securing permanent cadres in the countryside, the solution of which inevitably required an improvement in the quality of the architecture of the village.

In order to expand the cultivated areas for grain and industrial crops, the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Soviet government adopted in 1954 a decree on the development of virgin and fallow lands in the southeast of the RSFSR, Kazakhstan, and the Uzbek SSR.

The rise of virgin lands, naturally, was accompanied by massive construction in new state and collective farms. However, at first, there was no proper care for the architecture of the new construction.

The program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union set one of the greatest tasks of communist construction - the elimination of socio-economic, cultural and everyday differences between town and country.

The practical solution of this historical problem requires a fairly long time and is associated with overcoming great difficulties. On the one hand, the abundance of rural settlements (about 475 thousand), including extremely small ones with a population of no more than 80-100 people, on the other hand, the existing extensive development in large villages and stanitsas makes it practically impossible to increase the level of improvement of such settlements without decisive reconstruction and, in particular, the enlargement of settlements (increasing the per hectare and linear density of building).

An important stage was the development of district planning schemes that would make it possible to make adjustments to the location of settlements and industrial complexes, to outline the reconstruction

of transport links, to link the reconstruction of agriculture with the prospects for the development of industrial areas. In addition, the development of district schemes provided a more objective basis for drawing up master plans for the reconstruction of rural settlements. The organization of this important matter required the creation of appropriate state bodies, the expansion of design organizations, the development of research work, etc.

The complexity of solving architectural problems in the countryside is associated with a wide variety of both types of industrial buildings and complexes, the content of which is determined by the profile of agricultural production (modern mechanized livestock farms and poultry farms, granaries and warehouses of mineral and organic fertilizers, factories for the primary processing of agricultural products, etc.).), as well as residential and civil buildings, the variety of types of which is associated with the demography of the population and with different climatic conditions.

All this required the development of standard design for rural construction. The creation in 1963 of a special Ministry of Rural Construction of the USSR and republican ministries ensured the formation of a unified technical policy in the countryside and the gradual industrialization of construction in rural conditions.

In order to drastically improve the quality of construction and architecture in the countryside, to select the most economical, convenient and architecturally expressive solutions for residential and public buildings, experimental construction was undertaken.

The resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Council of Ministers of the USSR "On the regulation of construction in the countryside", issued in 1968, was of great importance for the further development of rural construction and the reconstruction of existing collective farm villages. This resolution emphasized that one of the most important tasks of rural construction is the gradual transformation of settlements into comfortable settlements that satisfy the increased demands of the population, with appropriate industries, where all conditions for highly productive labor of the rural population should be created and their employment should be ensured in a free from agricultural works time.

The transition to new, more progressive forms of organization of agricultural production, an increase in the material interest of collective farmers created the prerequisites for the economic strengthening of the collective farm economy, it became possible to allocate, in addition to state, collective farm funds for construction, which contributed to an increase in its volume. Where this process was well organized, where construction was carried out according to plans and projects with the involvement of architects, builders and economists, there have been achieved positive results.

Conducted in 1967-1970. Contests and contests to identify the most perfect in planning and architectural terms of collective and state farm settlements showed that the village is in the process of transforming villages and state farms into modern settlements equipped with all amenities and that the architectural appearance of many settlements has changed dramatically for the better. In many settlements, the old, spontaneously formed layout was eliminated, a clear zoning of the territory into production and residential zones was carried out, the volumetric-spatial solution of public centers in the planning structure of the settlements acts as a functionally and artistically organizing core of the entire

architectural composition, various types of houses were built taking into account the life of collective farmers, the settlements have been improved.

An essential feature of the post-war stage in the development of Soviet architecture is the appeal of architects to the synthesis of plastic arts in the architecture of the city and its individual ensembles, since the rise of the patriotic feelings of the people who defeated German fascism, the deep sorrow for the dead and pride in their immortal feat with the greatest completeness and impressive power could be reflected in synthetic images of monumental art.

The history of Soviet architecture knows major achievements in this area. Suffice it to mention the USSR pavilion at the 1937 International Exhibition in Paris. However, there were also creative failures in practice.

The reasons for individual failures are different, but the main one, as experience shows, is insufficient attention to urban planning requirements.

A distinctive feature of the new stage in the development of monumental art is the emergence of spatial architectural and sculptural compositions, which make it possible to more organically introduce the monumental image into the specific environment of the city. Such is the memorial ensemble at Treptower Park in Berlin, which provides an example of a narrative and at the same time symbolic image of great impressive power.

Leningrad architects and sculptors varied and expressively placed and assembled memorial monuments of the green belt of Glory around the city. The monument to the victims of the genocide and the memorial complex in honor of the Sardarabad battle in Yerevan have a great emotional impact. Outstanding achievements in the field of monumental art are the memorial complexes of Khatyn in Belarus and Salaspils in Latvia. All these works are characterized by an expressive detailed composition of the architectural space that organizes the movement of the viewer and contributes to the growth of emotional experience.

Monumental and decorative sculpture is also acquiring great importance in solving the problem of the national originality of Soviet architecture.

Soviet architecture was created in the conditions of the struggle for the consolidation of a socialist society, it develops in the conditions of the building of communism. On the way of its development, of course, there are both achievements and individual failures, which are inevitable in the course of solving fundamentally new social and artistic problems. It is this circumstance that makes it extremely important and necessary to historically illuminate the development of Soviet architecture, analyze its tendencies, identify the most fundamental achievements, and determine the causes of individual failures.

One of the most important features of Soviet architecture, which most fully reflects its significant difference from the architecture of capitalist society, is its socialist content, the basis of which is to create the most favorable material and spiritual environment for work, recreation, culture and life of the entire population.

With the development of the country, with the successes of its socialist economy, the scale of construction grew, its content expanded, and the theory of urban planning gradually took shape, which at all stages of the history of Soviet architecture provided and continues to assist architects in solving practical urban planning problems.

The theoretical foundations of Soviet urban planning, their practical verification in the course of grandiose urban planning works are of international importance. The formulation and solution of a number of practical problems in the field of district planning, the creation of scientific foundations for settlement, the construction of an economic hypothesis for the development of the city, the development of the idea of a large residential microdistrict and urban area, the stepwise construction of networks of its cultural and consumer services, the structure of the suburban area of the city, its health-improving value - all this still exerts a powerful influence on the state of the world theory and practice of urban planning. Soviet modern urban planning thought critically uses all the best and progressive that arises in advanced and foreign countries. At the same time, joint elaboration of urban planning problems and creative communication between the architects of the socialist countries are of great importance.

An important feature of Soviet architecture is its multinational character.

In contrast to bourgeois historical science, Soviet history of architecture proceeds from the Marxist proposition that every nation, no matter how small it may be, makes its own special individual contribution to the treasury of world culture, enriching world culture.

The Great October Socialist Revolution and the building of socialism in the USSR opened up tremendous opportunities for the development of the creativity of nations in all areas, including architecture. The creative achievements of Russians, Ukrainians, Belarusians, Georgians, Armenians, Azerbaijanis, Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians, Uzbeks, Turkmens, Tajiks, Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, Moldovans and other peoples of our country in the field of urban transformation, mass housing and cultural and household construction and architecture - irrefutable proof of this. All Soviet socialist republics have formed their own talented cadres of masters of architecture and scientists, whose work enriches the entire Soviet architecture with creative experience.

The formation of architecture, national in form and socialist in content, is a long and very complex process. It proceeded and is proceeding in the conditions of the struggle against the nationalist rudiments of culture, against the superficial stylization and canonization of the old, obsolete forms associated with the feudal past of peoples, through the selection of progressive democratic features of the art of each nation, on the basis of penetration into the development of the socialist content of the life of the people, its living developing aesthetic ideals, based on the mutual influence of the progressive achievements of other peoples.

In his report "On the fiftieth anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics," General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Comrade. L.I. Brezhnev said: “In the variety of national forms of Soviet socialist culture, common internationalist features are becoming more noticeable. The national is increasingly fertilized by the achievements of other fraternal peoples. This is a progressive process, it meets the spirit of socialism, the interests of the peoples of our country. "

New residential areas, ensembles of centers and the architecture of individual public buildings in cities such as Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Minsk, Tashkent, Alma-Ata, Frunze, Baku, Yerevan, Tbilisi, Ashgabat, Dushanbe, Riga, Vilnius, Tallinn, Chisinau, convincingly testify to the great successes of the multinational architecture of the USSR.

A peculiar feature of Soviet architecture is also the fact that the need to solve new complex social problems at all stages of history required the development of scientific methods for solving architectural problems.

Today, architectural science has developed such advanced disciplines as the theory of urban planning, architectural typology of industrial, residential and public buildings, architectural climatology, economics, theory of architectural composition, history of architecture, architectural problems.

In Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Minsk, Riga, Vilnius, Tallinn, Tbilisi, Yerevan, Baku, Tashkent, Alma-Ata, Gorky, Novosibirsk, Sverdlovsk, Vladivostok, Norilsk, Rostov-on-Don, Chisinau, Donetsk and other cities a developed network of state research and design institutes capable of solving complex state problems.

The division of the history of Soviet architecture into four stages adopted in this work - 1917-1932, 1932-1940, 1941-1954. and from 1954 to 1970 - to a certain extent conditionally. These stages are associated with certain moments of qualitative changes in the creative direction of Soviet architecture, but it would be wrong to understand these moments of change in direction as breaks in the history of architecture. In reality, things were more complicated. One thing is certain - the change in direction was not a pure negation of the previous period. All the most progressive things were kept. This circumstance ensured the general progressive course of the development of Soviet architecture.

All the features of Soviet architecture that we have noted make the history of its development, the analysis of its achievements and trends especially valuable for science and practice, if we consider the history of the subject not as a chronological sequence of events, but as the interpretation of these facts in their dialectical development, in the struggle of the new with the old, obsolete ...

Without such a history, it is impossible to outline with any reasonable grounds the prospects for the further development of architecture, for the determination of these prospects requires a scientific theory, that is, the history of architecture in its most general form.

Led by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, its Leninist Central Committee, the Soviet government, the Soviet people created a powerful socialist economy and achieved decisive successes in creating the material and technical basis of communism.

All this led to major successes in raising the material and cultural level of the people. Of particular importance was the successful implementation of the ninth five-year plan for the development of the national economy (1971-1975), adopted by the 24th Congress of the CPSU, the main focus of which was determined by the task of “significantly raising the material and cultural standard of living of the people, based on the high rates of development of socialist production, increasing its efficiency. , scientific and technological progress and accelerated growth of labor productivity ”.

All this posed a variety of complex, responsible, but also fascinating tasks for Soviet architects.

The history of Soviet architecture will be of great importance for the successful solution of the new tasks put forward by the needs of building communism in our country.