

G.M. Baigozhina^{*} , L.M. Dauletbayeva *Karaganda Buketov University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan*
(E-mail: gulnara_2007@inbox.ru, dauletbaeva@mail.ru)

History of Soviet Architecture in the Kazakh SSR

The article is dedicated to the Soviet architectural style in the Kazakh SSR. Architecture became one of the key areas in Soviet ideology, in which national elements in urban planning were designed and controlled by the party to form an international Soviet society. A brief overview of Soviet architecture's history reveals that it played a significant role in shaping the collective life of the Soviet people. Several stages and directions in the development of Soviet architecture in Kazakhstan were highlighted: 1st stage from the early 1920s to the early 1930s; 2nd stage from the mid-1930s to the mid-1950s; 3rd stage from the mid-1950s to the early 1990s. In turn, the party's urban planning decisions were divided into two directions: on the one hand, it was the standardization of construction; on the other hand, it was the erection of monumental buildings, which included elements of national culture. The brief history of architecture allows us to grasp the Soviet ideological transformation through the material organization of space. The results of the article allow us to conclude that the construction of buildings reflecting a unique national/ethnic style was aimed at «stabilizing» the emotional/psychic state of the indigenous population, creating the illusion of preserving their cultural and national identity despite the state policy of unification and construction of a new Soviet community.

Keywords: Soviet architecture, national architecture, urban development, culture, KazSSR, standard construction, national ornament, identity, buildings, architects.

Introduction

The Soviet national policy was considered within the framework of realizing the Party's ideological guidelines and the dominance of the class approach. According to Marxist materialism, the base determines the superstructure, and the task of Soviet construction was to erect the material foundation, which in turn was to form a new society. After the revolution, architecture became a key area in Soviet ideology. In the 1920s, it was believed that carefully designed residential buildings could eliminate the conditions for individualistic and petty-bourgeois lifestyles, and on this basis, a new type of person — the socialist man/socialist woman would be formed. Former social groups such as the patriarchal family, the private firm, or the peasant farm will pave a way to a new ideal, the labor collective [1; 39].

Soviet culture was created based on the all-union framework, and a Soviet international society was formed, where national identity had to yield to Soviet identity. The collective life of Soviet people was not a default state, but a construct of human activity. Architecture and collective life are subject to the idea that people use architecture to create collective life. This process is indirect: people make it by doing other things. We construct collective life by constructing our environment: a continuous and gradual process of building dwellings, gathering places, casual stops, intentionally or not, as an expression of power or as an act of resistance to power. If it is true to say that much of our environment is not constructed by architects, it is nevertheless in architecture that we understand and theorize it. In this way, architecture shapes collective life. Architecture is a constructed form of collective life; collective life is a social formation. [2]. The architectural forms embodied the spirit of the new Soviet era: an active emotional and volitional worldview of collectivism, a sense of strong camaraderie [3; 12]. Soviet architecture in Kazakhstan was built strictly in coordination with Moscow.

The relevance of the research topic. In some countries of the former Soviet Union there are different views on Soviet architectural objects — from the lust to destroy them as the embodiment of evil to aspiration. Almost all Kazakhstani cities were built during the Soviet period. In this case, Soviet architecture is a valuable source in some way, “reference point” for historians. Studying the history of architectural style spans the period from the 1920s to the early 1990s, allowing us to grasp not only the specific features and peculiarities of the Soviet construction but also the Soviet ideological transformation. By analyzing architectural design in the Soviet Kazakhstan, we can dig into people's everyday life and trace political, economic and social policy of the state.

^{*} Corresponding author's e-mail: gulnara_2007@inbox.ru

The purpose of the article is to examine the brief history of Soviet architecture in the Kazakh SSR.

We assume that the development of Soviet architecture in Kazakhstan can be divided into several stages: 1st stage from the early 1920s to the early 1930s; 2nd stage from the mid-1930s to the mid-1950s; 3rd stage from the mid-1950s to the early 1990s. In turn, the party's urban planning decisions can be divided into two directions: on the one hand, it is the standardization of construction; on the other hand, it is the erection of monumental buildings, the architectural style of which includes elements of national culture.

Materials and Methods

The methodological basis of this article builds on the scientific approaches indicated in Yu. L. Kosenkova's work [4]. The researcher highlights that for the first time, methodological problems in the study of Soviet architecture were seriously raised during the round table discussion in 1991. The main issue is what has changed today in the understanding of Soviet architecture and methods of studying it. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, researchers gained the opportunity to take a different research position, look at the phenomenon of Soviet architecture as if "from the outside". However, we agree with Yu. L. Kosenkova states that historians face a variety of problems today, such as accurate dating, and hence accurate chronology, and identification of the actual relationship between events and phenomena. One of the biggest problems is the periodization of the history of Soviet architecture, which is directly related to the accuracy of dating. Many researchers talk about the blurring of chronological boundaries. Therefore, we accept Yu. L. Kosenkova's opinion that there is no single, established periodization. Everything depends on the tasks set by the researcher and on the element of the general structure of the architectural and urban planning process that the researcher takes as a basis [4].

Following the approaches of Yu. L. Kosenkova along with a set of general scientific methods (content analysis, synthesis, induction, deduction, interpretation, and generalization), the following methods were used: historical-comparative, historical-systemic, historical-typological, historical-chronological, and reconstruction methods. Using the comparative-historical method, different periods of Soviet architecture in Kazakhstan were compared. Comparison of buildings and dwellings allowed to trace the differences in their forms, types, etc. The historical and chronological method allowed to identify periods, tracing changes in the architecture of a particular period. Historical-typological method and reconstruction method allowed for systematizing and identifying the types of architectural solutions in Soviet Kazakhstan.

The history of Soviet architecture is traditionally divided into three periods: the "avant-garde" (1917–1932), "socialist realism" or "Stalinism" (1932–1955) and late modernism (1955–1991). The clear boundaries between these periods are defined by two political interventions in architecture [5]. The first intervention was marked by the Decree of the Communist Party "On the Reconstruction of Literature and Artistic Organizations" (23 April 1932) [6]. This document marked the beginning of control in the cultural policy of the USSR. In architecture, this document became the normative basis for the transition from the avant-garde to Stalinist Empire style. The second intervention consists of Decrees "On Elimination of Excesses in Design and Construction" and the USSR Council of Ministers (4 November 1955) [7] and "On Development of Housing Construction in the USSR" (31 July 1957) [8]. These decrees established the starting point for new housing construction in the country. The construction of five-storey houses consisting of prefabricated structures went at a rapid pace and was put on the "conveyor belt". The construction of houses of this design continued from 1959 to 1985. The study and its results are based on the published works of foreign and Kazakhstani researchers.

Results

Architecture in the Soviet Union was one of the tools of the Bolsheviks' national policy. Architectural solutions were used to form an international Soviet society and shape the "Soviet man". In the introduction to the article, we conditionally divided urban planning in the Kazakh SSR into stages and directions. The first direction is the standardization of construction. Urban development projects were ruled strictly by Soviet standards; in particular, all large structures were erected after receiving approval from Moscow. The design of buildings took into account elements of national culture and a standardized approach. Architecture was politicized. Thus, the appearance of buildings invariably reflected socio-economic and political conditions [9; 75].

The first stage of the development of architecture in Soviet Kazakhstan can be attributed to the 1920s–1930s. The problem of introducing national culture into architectural solutions became relevant immediately after the Bolsheviks gained power in 1917. Russian researchers M. M. Iskandarov and A. Yu. Mikhailov be-

lieve that in the first period of the establishment of Soviet power there was no universally accepted approach to the problem of national features. Proletarian Constructivism appeared in parallel with the existence of “classicism” and stylization in the “national spirit” [10; 94].

In the 20s of the XX century, architects opposed stylizations slogan in the national style “architecture proletarian in content, national in color”, later in the 30s this slogan was transformed into the following formula: “architecture socialist in content and national in the form of the culture of the peoples of the USSR”. Here, researchers note that the change from “proletarian” to “socialist” gives a broader definition, including not only the culture of workers/proletarians, but also the culture of other social groups, in particular the culture of the peoples of the national peripheries [10; 95].

In 1926, an article by M. Ginzburg “National Architecture of the Peoples of the USSR” was published in the journal “Modern Architecture”. M. Ginzburg noted that “all prerequisites determining the modern face of the national Soviet republics should be taken into account” [11; 76]. One of the first buildings constructed in Alma-Ata was the Government House, built in 1929 by architects M. Ginzburg and F. Milinis. The building was constructed to take into account the urban landscape of Almaty, without deliberate archaization. In addition, the new government attempted to demonstrate a “better future” for Soviet residents through a strategy of building high-rise housing [12; 76]. Due to the economic situation, construction of the first apartment buildings in major cities began throughout the Soviet Union, including Kazakhstan.

After the adoption of the Decree “On the Reconstruction of Literature and Artistic Organizations” (23 April 1932), in the early 30s of the twentieth century, the architectural style began to change towards Stalinist Empire, also known as “Stalinist architecture”. Architects tried to find a balance between the national characteristics and international standards. The construction of monumental buildings representing a synthesis of classical Soviet and national styles began. The architectural creations of this period were characterized by grandiosity. Ye.V. Kostova notes that the greatness and grandiosity of the common cause of labor and struggle should lead to architectural monumentalism. The Soviet buildings symbolize the strength and power of the Soviet power [3; 14]. One of the brightest examples of construction in the spirit of the era was the construction of the Kazakh State Academic Opera and Ballet Theater named after Abai (1936–1941), designed by architect N.A. Krugly. The architectural style was Stalinist Empire, including national ornament. The construction of the grandiose, at that time, architectural ensemble of the Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh SSR (1948–1957) by architect A.V. Shchusev symbolized the greatness of human thought and the magnitude of the tasks facing science in Kazakhstan. The architecture used classical motifs combined with elements of national ornamentation [13]. The construction of the Theater and the Academy reflects a symbiosis of Soviet neoclassicism and elements of national ornament. The construction of residential buildings also underwent significant changes. The transition from constructivism to the construction of residential houses in the Stalinist style, featuring stucco, national patterns, arches, and other elements, occurred in major cities such as Almaty, Semipalatinsk, and Karaganda. “Stalinki” were characterized by high ceilings and large square footage. The ideological basis of Soviet architecture until the mid-1950s was not revised. Throughout the Stalinist period, two architectural and urban planning tendencies coexisted: “ensemble thinking” and monumental development of the central squares and thoroughfares of cities, designed to reflect the greatness of the achievements of the Soviet era [14; 9].

Kazakhstan researcher Ye.G. Malinovskaia notes that a new stage began for the architecture of Alma-Ata in the mid-1930s of the 20th century. Specifically, construction began to be carried out not by Moscow and Leningrad architects but by local design organizations. Municipal and Republican newspapers regularly reported on the rapid pace of construction, the selfless labor of workers, and completed objects. The Unified State Political Department (OGPU) supervised the construction of the largest projects. However, according to Ye. Malinovskaya, each large construction project was “a small concentration camp hidden from the city dwellers by a high fence”. Behind the cover of achievements was hidden the hard, forced labor of prisoners in camps and special settlers. People lived, worked and died of disease and hunger. There were constant arrests in the project organizations [15; 68-69]. The history of Stalin’s new buildings in Kazakhstan in the 1920s-1950s is a story of “extermination-labor camps”. All cities and settlements in large regions — Karaganda, Dzhezkazgan, Balkhash, Ridder, Achisai, etc. stand on the bones of hundreds of thousands of prisoners who built them [15; 115-116].

The end of Stalinist architecture is dated 1954-1955, after the All-Union Creative Meeting on Construction in 1954, the Second All-Union Congress of Soviet Architects in November-December 1955 [16; 13]. The 3rd stage of Soviet architecture in the USSR and, in particular, in Kazakhstan began with the complete rejection of the Stalinist architectural style and was the first indication of de-Stalinization and one of the first in a series of reforms initiated by the new leader of the state [14; 9]. To provide housing for the population of

the Union, the Party leadership decided to start mass standard construction in the second half of the twentieth century. In Kazakhstan, buildings began to be erected according to individual and standard designs. In the 50s of the twentieth century, the CPSU Central Committee issued resolutions “On Elimination of Excesses in Design and Construction” [7] and the Council of Ministers of the USSR “On the development of housing construction in the USSR” [8], according to which the style and ideas about the modern dwelling of a Soviet citizen were defined as development of Soviet architecture in Kazakhstan.

In 1961 The First Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, N.S. Khrushchyov, at the XXII party Congress indicated that “the needs of the Soviet people in comfortable homes will be met.” Large-scale construction of five-storey panel buildings has begun. New model neighborhoods have significantly changed the appearance of Soviet cities [17]. According to the program of the Communist Party, in the first decade the country would eliminate the housing shortage. Those families still living in overcrowded and poor housing would receive new apartments. After the second decade, every family, including newlywed families, will have a comfortable apartment that meets the requirements of hygiene and cultural life [17]. Tselinograd city was founded in 1961, which became the capital for the development of virgin and fallow lands [18]. This city became an example of a new urban concept and standardization of buildings under N.S. Khrushchyov. A new typology of residential buildings proposed as part of the virgin land development campaign, known as the Khrushchyovka, became widespread throughout the USSR. In the beginning of the 1950s, this new typology was used to provide housing for about 60 million people throughout the USSR for two decades. Even though these buildings were designed to have a limited lifespan, a significant portion of the population of the former USSR still lives in homes built during that era. The Khrushchyovkas contributed to the formation of socialist society and became an important part of the history of the USSR, as well as of collective memory [19; 59]. Workers from Ukraine, the RSFSR, Belarus, etc. came to build the city. For example, Resolution No. 241 of the Bureau of the Zakarpattia Regional Committee of the LCYL (LKSM) of Ukraine on sending young workers for construction in the areas of development of virgin lands of the Kazakh SSR indicated the necessity of selecting 100 best young people and sending them to the construction in the order of public conscription [20]. The construction of “Khrushchyovki,” in contrast to “Stalinki,” was cheap and uniform. The mass construction of such panel microdistricts leveled national and cultural differences. The problem of typical construction was also the ignoring of natural peculiarities. Thus, despite their modest layouts, the construction of Khrushchyov-era apartment buildings, which offered basic amenities, was perceived by Soviet citizens as a step forward. Of course, the construction of mass-produced standard housing introduced uniform standards — identical layouts, the same furniture in all flats, household items, etc.

In the late 1970s and 1980s, the construction of more comfortable multi-story panel and brick houses began. Continuing the practice of standard design, Soviet architects began to complicate the shapes of buildings, increase the number of floors, and develop new apartment designs. Panel construction technology was replaced by frame and monolithic construction technology [12; 43]. The kitchen area increased from 6 m² to 8-12 m². With the improvement of the economic component, storage spaces (cupboards, pantries) appeared in apartments. The bedroom area also increased from 8-10-12 m² to 10-12-14 m², and these changes led to an increase in the area of common rooms from 16-18 m² to 18-24 m² [21; 205-206].

The political and economic situation in the country in the late 1980s and early 1990s slowed down the pace of housing construction. In May 1990, the Republican Public Opinion Center of Kazakhstan conducted a quick survey in four regions of the republic (Alma-Ata, East Kazakhstan, Guryev, and Karaganda). The aim was to study public opinion on the activities of various socio-political structures and the socio-economic development of society. Approximately 2,000 people took part in the survey [22; 15]. The study sampled the most pressing issues affecting urban and rural populations. One of the issues raised in the express survey was the “housing problem.” Based on the data obtained, the following conclusion can be drawn: the “housing problem” ranked second in urban areas and fourth in rural areas, indicating an acute shortage of housing and, accordingly, low construction rates. During this period, national ornament in the construction of residential houses was practically absent, but in Almaty, Taraz, and Shymkent, one can see panel houses, the facades of which are decorated with traditional national ornament. Most of the buildings in Soviet Kazakhstan were constructed during the Soviet modernism period. Despite the standardization, the architectural structures demonstrated the national style. The second direction is the construction of monumental buildings, the architectural style of which included elements of national culture. The solution to this issue was a return to traditional motifs, particularly national ornamentation. The buildings were characterized by massive forms with futuristic elements and pronounced decoration. An example is the Palace of Marriage, built in 1971. In addition, Soviet architects tried to incorporate national features into the form of buildings. For example, the Arasan bath and health complex [23]. Among the monuments of Soviet architecture, it is necessary to single

out unique buildings — the Palace of the Republic (in the past Palace of Culture named after V.I. Lenin) built in 1970 and the Kazakhstan Hotel, the construction of which dates back to 1975–1977 in Alma-Ata. The construction of the Kazakhstan Hotel, a 25-story building in an earthquake-prone zone, was one of the most ambitious projects of Soviet architects. The style of the Palace of the Republic included a synthesis of features of Kazakh culture, which was expressed in the traditional tent theme [24]. In the 1980s, many cultural and educational buildings were constructed in Kazakhstan. Among the major architectural structures built in Kazakhstan during the late Soviet period, it is necessary to mention the Palace of Schoolchildren in Almaty (1983). The building was constructed in a modernist style with an oriental influence. The 25-meter dome and 40-meter observatory tower deserve special attention. The shape of the building resembles a snail, which makes the building a carrier of meanings characteristic of Kazakh culture [25]. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, construction of projects that had already begun was suspended due to a lack of funding. Let us assume that the erection of such buildings, reflecting their unique national/ethnic style, was aimed at “stabilizing” the emotional/psychic state of the indigenous population, creating the illusion of preserving their cultural and national identity, despite the state policy of unification and construction of a new Soviet community.

Discussion

The Soviet urban planning in Kazakhstan is still a little-studied issue *and remains largely descriptive*. In our opinion, there are currently no academic institutions in Kazakhstan that specialize exclusively in the history of Soviet architecture. Research in this area is mainly conducted at the Kazakh National Academy of Architecture and Civil Engineering (KazGASA) in Almaty. Existing research on the history of Soviet architecture is interdisciplinary and is studied within the framework of architectural studies, urban planning, cultural studies, and social history.

Discussions about the periodization of Soviet architecture continue to this day. Most researchers, including A. Vronskaya, propose a classical periodization based on ideological, political, and party-state changes. The proposed structure is divided into three stages: 1917–1932; 1932–1955; 1955–1990 [5]. Y.L. Kosenkova offers a slightly different periodization: 1920s–1930s; 1931–1937; early 1940s–mid-1950s, 1960s–1980s (the periodization was made by us, based on the researcher's works) [26–29]. We, in turn, share A. Vronskaya's logic of periodization, but we propose to start counting from 1920, since we believe that in the early years of Soviet power there was no centralized policy in the field of architecture. From the early 1920s, Higher Artistic and Technical Workshops were established, competitive projects became more active, associations appeared, etc. Thus, based on the proposed periodization, we identify three key stages: 1st stage from the early 1920s to the early 1930s; 2nd stage from the mid-1930s to the mid-1950s; 3rd stage from the mid-1950s to the early 1990s.

In the creation of national style in architecture, Russian researchers M.M. Iskandarov and A.Y. Mikhailov distinguish two main approaches: traditionalist and innovative. The first approach included the construction of buildings using the local traditional style of the past (Central Asia — the Timurid period; Middle Volga region — the Tatar Republic), etc. As a result, buildings in oriental style began to appear. The innovative approach “new architecture” implied the synthesis of national style with progressive style (Government House in Alma-Ata; workers' clubs in Baku) [5; 96]. C. Humphrey, in his work “Ideology in infrastructure: architecture and Soviet imagination”, states that ideology does not just exist in linguistic form; it also appears in material structures. The Soviet party-state believed architecture had a transformative effect and promoted communal dwellings to mould a new socialist way of life [1]. We agree with C. Humphrey's conclusions that ideology manifested itself in the material environment. In particular, in our view, architecture shaped ordinary people's perceptions of power. Large monumental buildings constructed during the Stalinist period had a certain psychological impact and seemed to create an image of strength, eternity, and stability. Kazakh researcher N. Sarzhanov and American researcher T. Schurch identify problems associated with the construction of high-rise buildings in the USSR, and in Kazakhstan in particular. Thus, in their opinion, mass standardized housing led to a decline in the quality of residential buildings. The researchers offer recommendations for the reconstruction of Soviet housing, which will improve the quality of life in the urban environment, in particular, to maximize the preservation of architectural and artistic details of houses built during that period [7; 42]. Indeed, mass construction in Kazakhstan has depersonalized cities, subjecting them to centralized requirements imposed by the authorities. However, despite this, as noted by Kazakh researchers, as G. Abdrassilova and Ye. Danibekova, the Soviet architecture in Kazakhstan met the contemporary requirements of its time: all settlements were developed according to approved master plans, design and construction were carried out by large state companies with powerful technical potential [4].

The monograph “Repressed Architecture” — Stalin’s New Buildings, Creativity and Fates of Architects” by the Kazakh researcher Ye. Malinovskaya is of considerable interest. The peculiarity of the monograph is that it is based not on the holdings of state archives, but on the memories of the witnesses of that era. The book presents materials about repressions in the field of architecture, analyzes the projects of model settlements for “settling nomads”, developed by the party nomenclature of the State Planning Committee of the KASSR in the late 1920s [15].

Conclusions

During the Soviet rule, architecture in Kazakhstan developed strictly within the framework of a centralized ideology. The study of Soviet architecture is an important branch of the humanities. The results of the article allow us to conclude that Soviet architecture served as one of the key instruments influencing the formation of cultural identity and ethnic integration in urban planning. Furthermore, by studying the history of Soviet architecture, we can trace how the national characteristics of people were either emphasized or, conversely, erased within the framework of a unified Soviet ideology.

We highlighted the periods and trends of Soviet architecture in Kazakhstan. In the construction of multi-storey housing, each stage is characterized by its distinctive style. Thus, during the first period from the early 1920s to the early 1930s, the constructivist style was widespread in Soviet architecture. The buildings were simple in form, practical, and without unnecessary frills. The second stage, from the mid-1930s to the mid-1950s, is characterized by the Stalinist Empire style in architecture. The erected buildings are distinguished by their monumentality, the use of decorative elements. This style of architecture symbolized the greatness of the Soviet Union and the embodiment of the ideas of Soviet society. By erecting monumental buildings, the party sought to demonstrate the greatness and power of Soviet power. However, at the same time, during the construction of monumental buildings, the cultural characteristics of the Kazakh people were taken into account. Particularly, one can see a combination of traditional Kazakh ornaments with elements of Soviet ideology.

After the exposure of the cult of personality and with the beginning of the “thaw” in the republic, large-scale construction of massive residential complexes of the same type began. During the construction and planning of residential buildings, standard projects were developed to provide all residents of the country with adequate housing. It should be noted that the houses being built did not always match quality standards and characteristics. The third stage, from the mid-1950s to the early 1990s, Soviet architects complicated the shapes of buildings, increased the number of floors, and developed new apartment layouts.

Acknowledgments

This research has been funded by the Science Committee of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Grant № BR28511965).

References

- 1 Humphrey C. Ideology in infrastructure: architecture and soviet imagination / C. Humphrey // Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute. — 2005. — № 11. — С. 39–58.
- 2 Holm L. Introduction: We Construct Collective Life by Constructing Our Environment / L. Holm, C. McEwan // Architecture and Culture. — 2020. — № 8(3-4). — С. 529–548.
- 3 Костова Е.В. Концептуальные основы советской архитектуры сталинского периода / Е.В. Костова // Вестник Томского государственного архитектурно-строительного университета. — 2021. — Т. 23. — № 4. — С. 9–18.
- 4 Kosenkova Yu. Study on the Formation of the Scientific Concept of the History of Architecture and Urban Planning of the Soviet Period / Yu. Kosenkova // Proceedings of the International Conference “Architecture: Heritage, Traditions and Innovations”. — 2019. — P. 389–394.
- 5 Vronskaya V. Soviet Architecture [Electronic resource] / V. Vronskaya. — Режим доступа: <https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/display/document/obo-9780190922467/obo-9780190922467-0060.xml>
- 6 Постановление Политбюро ЦК ВКП(б) «О перестройке литературно-художественных организаций» 23 апреля 1932 г. [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: <https://hist.msu.ru/ER/Etext/USSR/1932.htm>
- 7 Постановление Центрального комитета КПСС и Совета Министров СССР «Об устранении излишеств в проектировании и строительстве». — [Электронный ресурс]. — 1955. — Режим доступа: <https://docs.historyrussia.org/ru/nodes/257933-iz-postanovleniya-tsentralnogo-komiteta-kpss-i-soveta-ministrov-sssr-ob-ustraneni-izlishstv-v-proektirovanii-i-stroitelstve-4-noyabrya-1955-g>
- 8 Постановление о «О развитии жилищного строительства в СССР». — [Электронный ресурс]. — 1957. — Режим доступа: <https://docs.historyrussia.org/ru/nodes/355256>

- 9 Abdrassilova G. The transformation of modern architecture in Kazakhstan: from Soviet "Internationalism" to a post-Soviet understanding of the regional identity / G. Abdrassilova // *Spatium*. — 2021. — No 46. — P. 73–80.
- 10 Искандаров М.М. Национальная версия советского неоклассицизма в Казани: проблемы формирования национальной архитектуры в СССР в 1920-1950-е годы / М.М. Искандаров, А.Ю. Михайлов // *Культура и искусство*. — 2012. — № 6(12). — С. 94–101.
- 11 Калашников В. Грузинский постконструктивизм: национальное и колониальное в архитектуре 1932–1937 гг. / В. Калашников // *Новое искусствознание*. — 2021. — № 03. — С. 74–81.
- 12 Sarzhanov N. Rethinking Soviet Era mass housing in Kazakhstan / N. Sarzhanov, T. Schurch // *Spatium*. — 2023. — No 49. — P. 42–50.
- 13 Главный корпус Академии наук. — [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: <https://vernoye-almaty.kz/monum/academ.shtml>
- 14 Кузнецов С.О. Н.С. Хрущев и борьба с излишествами в советской архитектуре (1949–1954 годы) / С.О. Кузнецов // Академия. Архитектура и строительство. — 2019. — № 3. — С. 5–10.
- 15 Малиновская Е.Г. «Репрессированная архитектура» — сталинские новостройки творчество и судьбы архитекторов / Е.Г. Малиновская. — Алматы: ARK Gallery, 2018. — 488 с.
- 16 Хмельницкий Д. Архитектура Сталина. Психология и стиль / Д. Хмельницкий. — М.: Прогресс-Традиция, 2006. — 376 с.
- 17 Программа Коммунистической партии Советского Союза. — [Электронный ресурс]. — 1961. — Режим доступа: http://leftinmsu.narod.ru/polit_files/books/III_program_KPSS_files/062.html
- 18 Talamini G. Urbanizing the Virgin lands. At the frontier of Soviet socialist planning [Electronic resource] / G. Talamini. — Retrieved from <https://scholars.cityu.edu.hk/files/173286769/170118768.pdf>
- 19 Talamini G. The Plan for Tselinograd and the Khrushchiovka: The Programmatic Intentions and Legacy of the Virgin Lands Urbanization by Means of a New Typology / G. Talamini // 6th International Meeting Edinburgh College of Art. (pp. 59-60). Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh.
- 20 Из постановления Бюро Закарпатского обкома ЛКСМ Украины о направлении молодых рабочих на строительство в районы освоения целинных земель Казахской ССР от 2 сентября 1959 г. — [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: <https://docs.historyrussia.org/ru/nodes/451180>
- 21 Храмов А.Б. Тенденции развития массового строительства жилых зданий в 1980–1990-е годы. — [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа <https://rep.bntu.by/bitstream/handle/data/132792/204-206.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- 22 АП РК. — Ф. 7. — Оп. 1. — Д. 83. — Л. 13.
- 23 Архитектура Алматы: советский модернизм и национальный колорит. — [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: <https://www.98mag.kz/gorod/arhitektura-almaty-sovetskij-modernizm-i-naczionalnyj-kolorit/>
- 24 Дворец Республики. — [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: archcode.kz/objects/view?id=2
- 25 Архитектурный гид по 12 советским зданиям южной столицы Казахстана. — [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: <https://archcode.kz/journal/view?category=projects&sefname=arhitekturnyj-gid-po-12-sovetskim-zdaniyam-uznoj-stolicy-kazahstana>
- 26 Косенкова Ю.Л. Советское градостроительство 1920–1930-х годов: новые исследования и материалы / Ю.Л. Косенкова. — М.: Либроком, 2010. — 384 с.
- 27 Косенкова Ю.Л. Опыт централизованного управления советским градостроительством. 1931–1937 [Электронный ресурс] / Ю.Л. Косенкова. — Режим доступа: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348246181_Centralized_management_of_Soviet_town_planning_1931-1937/fullTextFileContent
- 28 Косенкова Ю.Л. Советский город 1940-х — первой половины 1950-х годов: От творческих поисков к практике строительства [Электронный ресурс] / Ю.Л. Косенкова. — Режим доступа: <https://www.disscat.com/content/sovetskii-gorod-1940-kh-pervoi-pолоviny-1950-kh-godov-ot-tvorcheskikh-poiskov-k-praktike-str>
- 29 Косенкова Ю.Л. Наследие и советский город 1980-х [Электронный ресурс] / Ю.Л. Косенкова. — Режим доступа: <https://golos-nauki.ru/library/researches/10092>

Г.М. Байгожина, Л.М. Даулетбаева

Қазақ КСР-дағы кеңестік архитектура тарихы

Мақала Қазақ КСР-дағы кеңестік сәулет стилінің тарихына арналған. Ол кезіндегі кеңестік идеологияда сәулет өнері басты бағыттардың бірі болды. Кеңестік сәулеттегі ұлттық элементтерді партия жобалап, бақылап отырды. Архитектуралық шешімдер интернационалдық кеңестік қоғамды қалыптастыру және «кеңес адамын» тәрбиелеу мақсатында пайдаланылды. Мақала авторлары Қазақстандағы кеңестік сәулет өнерінің бірнеше кезеңін бөліп көрсетеді: 1 кезең — 1920 жылдың басынан 1930 жылдың басына дейін; 2 кезең — 1930 жылдың ортасынан 1950 жылдың ортасына дейін; 3 кезең — 1950 жылдың ортасынан 1990 жылдың басына дейін. Сонымен қатар, партияның қала құрылысына қатысты шешімдері екі бағытта жүргізілді: біріншісі, құрылыс жұмыстарын стандарттаумен, екіншісі — ұлттық мәдениеттің элементтерін қамтитын монументалды ғимараттар

салумен байланысты. Архитектураның қысқаша тарихы кеңестіктің материалдық ұйымдастырылуы арқылы кеңестік идеологиялық трансформацияны түсінуге мүмкіндік береді. Авторлардың пайымдауынша, ұлттық немесе этникалық стильді бейнелейтін ғимараттарды салу — жергілікті халықтың эмоционалдық және психологиялық тұрақтылығын қамтамасыз етуге бағытталған. Бұл саясат тұрғындарға өздерінің мәдени және ұлттық болмысын сақтап қалғандай әсер қалдырып, шын мәнінде, мемлекеттің біртұтас кеңестік қауымдастық қалыптастыру саясатын бүркемеледі.

Кілт сөздер: кеңестік сәулет, қала құрылысы, мәдениет, Қазақ КСР, типтік құрылыс, ұлттық ою-өрнек, қолтаңба, ғимараттар, архитекторлар.

Г.М. Байгожина, Л.М. Даулетбаева

История советской архитектуры в Казахской ССР

Статья посвящена казахскому архитектурному стилю в Казахской ССР. Архитектура стала одним из ключевых направлений в советской идеологии. Национальные элементы в советской архитектуре конструировались и контролировались партией. Архитектурные решения использовались для формирования интернационального советского общества и формирования «советского человека». Авторами были выделены несколько этапов и направлений в развитии советской архитектуры в Казахстане: 1 этап — с начала 1920-х гг. и до начала 1930-х гг.; 2 этап — с середины 1930-х гг. до середины 1950-х гг.; 3 этап — с середины 1950-х гг. до начала 1990-х гг. В свою очередь, градостроительные решения партии были разделены на два направления: с одной стороны, это стандартизация строительства, с другой стороны, это возведение монументальных зданий, архитектурный стиль которых включал в себя элементы национальной культуры. Краткая история архитектуры позволяет нам понять советскую идеологическую трансформацию через материальную организацию пространства. Авторы данной статьи приходят к выводу, что строительство зданий, отражающих свой уникальный национальный/этнический стиль, преследовало цель «стабилизации» эмоционального/психического состояния коренного населения, создавая иллюзию сохранения своей культурной и национальной идентичности, несмотря на государственную политику унификации и конструирования новой советской общности.

Ключевые слова: советская архитектура, национальная архитектура, градостроительство, культура, КазССР, типовое строительство, национальный орнамент, самобытность, здания, архитекторы.

References

- 1 Humphrey, C. (2005). Ideology in infrastructure: architecture and soviet imagination. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 11, 39–58.
- 2 Holm, L., & McEwan, C. (2020). Introduction: We Construct Collective Life by Constructing Our Environment. *Architecture and Culture*, 8(3–4), 529–548.
- 3 Kostova, E.V. (2021). Kontseptualnye osnovy sovetsoi arkhitektury stalinskogo perioda [Conceptual foundations of Soviet architecture of the Stalin period]. *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo arkhitekturno-stroitel'nogo universiteta — Bulletin of the Tomsk State University of Architecture and Civil Engineering*, 23, 4, 9–18 [in Russian].
- 4 Kosenkova, Yu. (2019). Study on the Formation of the Scientific Concept of the History of Architecture and Urban Planning of the Soviet Period. *Proceedings of the International Conference «Architecture: Heritage, Traditions and Innovations»*, 389–394.
- 5 Vronskaya, V. Soviet Architecture. *oxfordbibliographies.com*. Retrieved from <https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/display/document/obo-9780190922467/obo-9780190922467-0060.xml>.
- 6 Postanovlenie Politburo Tsentralnogo Komiteta VKP(b) «O perestroike literaturno-khudozhestvennykh organizatsii» 23.04.1932 [Resolution of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks (VKP(b)) “On the restructuring of literary and artistic organizations”]. *hist.msu.ru*. Retrieved from <https://hist.msu.ru/ER/Etext/USSR/1932.htm> [in Russian].
- 7 Postanovlenie Tsentralnogo Komiteta KPSS i Soveta Ministrov SSSR «Ob ustraneni izlishstv v proektirovanii i stroitelstve (1955)» [Resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Council of Ministers of the USSR “On the elimination of excesses in design and construction”]. *docs.historyrussia.org*. Retrieved from <https://docs.historyrussia.org/ru/nodes/257933-iz-postanovleniya-tsentralnogo-komiteta-kpss-i-soveta-ministrov-sssr-ob-ustraneni-izlishstv-v-proektirovanii-i-stroitelstve-4-noyabrya-1955-g> [in Russian].
- 8 (1957). Postanovlenie o «O razvitii zhilishchnogo stroitelstva v SSSR» [Resolution on The development of housing construction in the USSR]. *docs.historyrussia.org*. Retrieved from <https://docs.historyrussia.org/ru/nodes/355256> [in Russian].
- 9 Abdrasilova, G., & Danibekova, E. (2021). The transformation of modern architecture in Kazakhstan: from Soviet “Internationalism” to a post-Soviet understanding of the regional identity. *Spatium*, 46, 73–80.
- 10 Iskandarov, M.M., & Mikhailov A.Y. (2012). Natsionalnaia versiiia sovetского neoklassitsizma v Kazani: problemy formulirovaniia natsionalnoi arkhitektury v SSSR v 1920–1950-e gody [The National version of Soviet Neoclassicism in Kazan: problems of formulating National Architecture in the USSR in the 1920s and 1950s]. *Kultura i iskusstvo — Culture and art*, 6(12), 94–101 [in Russian].

- 11 Kalashnikov, V. B. (2021). Gruzinskii postkonstruktivizm: natsionalnoe i kolonialnoe v arkhitekture 1932–1937 gg. [Georgian Post-Constructivism: National and Colonial in Architecture 1932–1937.]. *Novoe iskusstvovedenie — New Art Studies*, 03, 74–81 [in Russian].
- 12 Sarzhanov, N., & Schurch, T. (2023). Rethinking Soviet Era mass housing in Kazakhstan. *Spatium*, 49, 42–50.
- 13 Glavnyi korpus akademii nauk [Main building of the academy of sciences]. *vernoye-almaty.kz*. Retrieved from <https://vernoye-almaty.kz/monum/academ.shtml> [in Russian].
- 14 Kuznetsov, S.O. (2019). N.S. Khrushchev i borba s izlischestvami v sovetskoi arkhitekture (1949–1954 gody) [N.S. Khrushcheyov and the fight against excesses in Soviet architecture (1949–1954)]. *Akademia. Arkhitektura i stroitelstvo — Academy. Architecture and Constrution*, 3, 5–10 [in Russian].
- 15 Malinovskaia, Ye.G. (2018) «Repressirovannaia arkhitektura» — stalinskie novostroiki tvorchestvo i sudby arkhitektorov [“Repressed architecture” — Stalinist new buildings creativity and fates of architects]. Almaty: ARK Gallery [in Russian].
- 16 Chmel'nizki, D. (2006). *Arkhitektura Stalina. Psikhologiia i stil* [The Architecture of Stalin. Psychology and style]. Moscow: Progress-Traditsiia [in Russian].
- 17 (1961). Programma Kommunisticheskoi Partii Sovetskogo Soiuzu [The program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union]. *leftinmsu.narod.ru*. Retrieved from http://leftinmsu.narod.ru/polit_files/books/III_program_KPSS_files/062.htm [in Russian].
- 18 Talamini, G. (2023). Urbanizing the Virgin lands. At the frontier of Soviet socialist planning. *scholars.cityu.edu.hk*. Retrieved from <https://scholars.cityu.edu.hk/files/173286769/170118768.pdf>
- 19 Talamini, G. (2021). The Plan for Tselinograd and the Khrushchiovka: The Programmatic Intentions and Legacy of the Virgin Lands Urbanization by Means of a New Typology. *6th International Meeting Edinburgh College of Art*. (pp. 59-60). Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh
- 20 Iz postanovleniia Biuro Zakarpatskogo obkoma LKSM Ukrainy o napravlenii molodykh rabochikh na stroitelstvo v raiony osvoeniia tselinnykh zemel Kazakhskoi SSR. 2 sentiabria 1959 g. [From the resolution of the Bureau of the Zakarpattia Regional Committee of the LKSM of Ukraine on sending young workers for construction in the areas of development of virgin lands in the Kazakh SSR. September 2, 1959.]. *docs.historyrussia.org*. Retrieved from <https://docs.historyrussia.org/ru/nodes/451180> [in Russian]
- 21 Chramcov, A. Tendentsii razvitiia massovogo stroitelstva zhilykh zdaniy v 1980–1990-e gody [Trends in the development of mass residential construction in the 1980s and 1990s]. *rep.bntu.by*. Retrieved from <https://rep.bntu.by/bitstream/handle/data/132792/204-206.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y> [in Russian].
- 22 AP RK [Archive of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. — F. 7. — Op. 1. — D. 83. — L. 13 [in Russian].
- 23 Arkhitektura Almaty: sovetskii modernizm i natsionalnyi kolorit [Architecture of Almaty: Soviet modernism and national flavor]. *98mag.kz*. Retrieved from <https://www.98mag.kz/gorod/arhitektura-almaty-sovetskij-modernizm-i-natsionalnyi-kolorit/> [in Russian].
- 24 Dvoretz Respubliki [Palace of the Republic]. *Archcode.kz*. Retrieved from [Archcode.kz/objects/view?id=2](https://archcode.kz/objects/view?id=2) [in Russian].
- 25 Arkhitekturnyi gid po 12 sovetskim zdaniyam yuzhnoi stolitsy Kazakhstana [Architectural guide to 12 Soviet buildings in Kazakhstan's southern capital]. *archcode.kz*. Retrieved from <https://archcode.kz/journal/view?category=projects&sefname=arhitekturnyj-gid-po-12-sovetskim-zdaniyam-uznoj-stolitsy-kazahstana> [in Russian].
- 26 Kosenkova, Yu. (2010). *Sovetskoe gradostroitelstvo 1920–1930-kh godov: novye issledovaniia i materialy* [Soviet urban planning in the 1920s and 1930s: new research and materials]. Moscow: Librokom [in Russian].
- 27 Kosenkova, Yu. Opyt tsentralizovannogo upravleniia sovetskim gradostroitelstvom. 1931–1937 [Centralized management of Soviet town planning. 1931–1937]. *researchgate.net*. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348246181_Centralized_management_of_Soviet_town_planning_1931-1937#fullTextFileContent [in Russian].
- 28 Kosenkova, Yu. Sovetskii gorod 1940-kh — pervoi poloviny 1950-kh godov: ot tvorcheskikh poiskov k praktike stroitelstva [Soviet cities in the 1940s and early 1950s: From creative exploration to practical construction]. *dissercat.com*. Retrieved from <https://www.dissercat.com/content/sovetskii-gorod-1940-kh-pervoi-poloviny-1950-kh-godov-ot-tvorcheskikh-poiskov-k-praktike-str> [in Russian].
- 29 Kosenkova, Yu. Nasledie i sovetskii gorod 1980-kh [Heritage and the Soviet city in the 1980s]. *golos-nauki.ru*. Retrieved from <https://golos-nauki.ru/library/researches/10092> [in Russian].

Information about the authors

Baigozhina Gulnar — PhD, Karaganda Buketov University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7779-9509>

Dauletbayeva Lyazzat — Master, Karaganda Buketov University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-7406-9890>