

UDC 94(477):316.32
DOI 10.33287/112004

Rybachok Volodymyr,
Postgraduate Student at the
Department of History of Ukraine
Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University
rybachok.v.2019@gmail.com

**“NEW KHARKIV” AND “GREAT ZAPORIZHZHIA”
PROJECTS
AS REPRESENTATION OF THE URBAN PLANNING
SEARCHES DURING THE PERIOD OF INDUSTRIALIZATION**

Abstract

In 1929 there was launched an all-Union public campaign to discuss the prospects for the development of Soviet urban planning, known as the Socialist Settlement Discussion, in the USSR. Its main participants were not only the leading architects and urban planners of the time, but also the highest party and state figures. Under the influence of the urban development ideas arose during the discussion on the problems of socialist displacement, Ukrainian constructive architects have developed master plans for the reconstruction and expansion of residential infrastructure of two industrial centers – Kharkiv and Zaporizhzhia. However, the construction projects of “Great Zaporizhzhia” and “New Kharkiv” by I. Malozemov, P. Khaustov and P. Alosyn were not fully realised as their planning decisions undercut the basic provisions of the existing urban planning policy of the Stalinist leadership.

There appeared the idea that the plans of “New Kharkiv” and “Great Zaporizhzhia” by Ukrainian architects were the implementation of author’s view of the ideal model of a socialist town. Based on the leading ideas of the Soviet avant-garde, the project authors proposed an original architectural and planning concept of development that had nothing to do with the urban planning experience of previous times. However, these architectural proposals were irrelevant in the USSR in the late 1920’s. In the context of Stalin’s industrialization, the party

apparatus attached secondary importance to housing. As a result, large-scale projects of "New Kharkiv" and "Great Zaporizhzhia" were declared "false".

Methodology. In the article we have used the historical and genetic method to determine the genesis of the concept of linear development, to find out the origin of the idea of a housing estate and to reveal the circumstances of the idea of unification of urban infrastructure, embodied by Ukrainian avant-gardists in architectural and planning decisions of "New Kharkiv" and "Great Zaporizhzhia" projects. The comparative method made it possible to determine the inconsistency of the content of the idealistic views of the Soviet constructors with the real essence of Stalin's urban policy. Thanks to the historical and systematic method, we have understood that the objects of urban infrastructure planned in the "New Kharkiv" and "Great Zaporizhzhia" projects had to enter into functional interaction, forming a single urban mechanism.

Summary. The beginning of the 20s of the XX century was marked by the emergence of interesting scientific, artistic, architectural projects both in the history of Ukraine and in the history of the whole Soviet Union. The euphoria of belief in creating a "new" world, building a "just" society for the representatives of all social strata characterized the general sentiment and inspired intellectuals and artists to seek creative work. However, the period of "flirting" of Soviet authorities with the elites was short. Its authoritarian nature, with its actualization to the militarization of the country, left no room for creative initiative and development of individuality. At the beginning of the first five-year schedule, the government decided to abandon the massive construction of comfortable housing for workers. All resources were planned to focus on the construction of heavy industry facilities. Therefore, futuristic projects of "New Kharkiv" and "Great Zaporizhzhia" were rejected because of their inconsistency with the true state urbanistic doctrine of the industrialization period.

Key words: *Avant-garde, discussion, industrialization, socialist settlement, master plan, constructivism, urban planning, social life.*

Introduction. In 1927–1929 a program of forced industrialization was finally approved in the USSR. In accordance with official party postulates, it was intended to turn a predominantly agricultural country

into one of the world leaders in industrial production. Industrial modernization was impossible without urbanization, that is the growth of the urban population of industrial centers, and therefore the Stalinist leadership was automatically asked to find the best options for the arrangement of their housing infrastructure. In these circumstances, the architecture and urban planning of Soviet Ukraine in the late 1920s became the sphere of intense generation of new approaches to the design and construction of industrial cities.

Nowadays, the architecture and urban development of the Stalinist era have been researched rather fragmentarily, and the interpretation of the main stages of their development is marked by one-sidedness and political commitment. Among existing researches we should mention the works of D. Hmelnytskyi (Hmelnytskyi, D., 2007) and M. Meierovych (Meierovych, M., 2008), which describe the process of formation of the Soviet urban planning in the late 1920s. V. Aloslyn (Aloslyn, V., 1985) addressed the topic of the Ukrainian city of the Stalin era directly. He analyzed the development of ideas about socialist settlement in the architecture of Soviet Ukraine in the 1920s - early 1930s. Urban everyday life of Ukrainian cities of this period is considered in the works of N. Hohokhiia (Hohokhiia, N., 2003). An analysis of Soviet urban planning experiments in Donbas is presented in the article by M. Ilchenko (Ilchenko, M., 2018) “Urban Development and Urban Planning Experiments”. The article was published as part of the collection “Work, Exhaustion and Success: Donbas Industrial Monomists” which examines a number of specific social and political and economic aspects of industrial development in the region. A wide range of issues on the problems of Ukrainian urbanism during the first five-year schedule are highlighted in the works of R. Liubavskiy (Liubavskiy, R., 2016), V. Khazanova (Khazanova, V., 1980), M. Borysenko (Borysenko, M., 2013).

The main objective of the proposed article is to analyze the projects of “New Kharkiv” and “Great Zaporizhzhia” as an attempt by Ukrainian avant-gardists to find a model of an “ideal” socialist city, devoid of “disadvantages” inherent in pre-revolutionary and capitalist development. The study analyzes the stylistics and architectural planning solutions presented in the plans of “New Kharkiv” and “Great Zaporizhzhia”. It examines the reasons for the government's refusal to

implement these projects and considers the ideological and political circumstances of concluding the discussion on socialist displacement.

In July 1929, as part of the preparation of the first five-year schedule plan, there was launched a campaign to publicly discuss the prospects for the development of Soviet urban planning in the USSR, which would later become known as the Socialist Settlement Discussion. Its nominee was L. Sabsovych, the leader of the department of Ferrous Metallurgy of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR National Economy. Besides, not only the leading architects of the time, such as O. Shchusiev, M. Miliutin, M. Hinzburh or the brothers Vesnin, but prominent party functionaries such as A. Lunacharskyi, M. Semashko, H. Krzhyzhaniivskyi and N. Krupska (Meierovych, 2011, p. 20) became its main participants. From the outset, the campaign has generated considerable public outcry and has gained a nationwide scale.

In the specialized literature the formal prerequisite for the emergence of discussion is usually considered to be the publication in 1929 of a mass circulation of the works of L. Sabsovych “The Soviet Union in 15 years” and “The cities of the future and organization of socialist life” (Khazanova, 1980, p. 47). The proposals on basic principles for the planning of the living environment of the future socialist cities presented in these editions appeared to be so prominent and relevant in connection with the beginning of the first industrial five-year schedule period, that they became the subject of attention of the State Planning Committee of the USSR and the Communist Academy of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks). These structures have given rise to public discussions with the participation of leading urban planners (Meierovych, 2011, p. 42). It should be noted that the ideas published on the pages of the aforementioned editions were not the result of L. Sabsovych's personal creativity, but only the author's interpretation of the settings formulated in the bowels of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the National Economy. Thus, the discussion on the problems of socialist displacement was inspired by the party apparatus and the economic control bodies under its control. L. Sabsovych was only a nominee. He was assigned the role of “herald” of party installations in the field of urban development.

The overall essence of the ideas presented by L. Sabsovych, as a whole, boiled down to the position that the key to the success of the

rapid industrialization of the country is the formation of a new Soviet man, devoid of worldviews and cultural stereotypes of past times. According to the functionary, the main tool for educating the consciousness of such an individual was to become his / her habitat (Sabsovych, 1930, p. 37). We should mention that by the time of the events described, representatives of the architectural avant-garde, who considered housing as a means of social engineering, were actively developing projects in the appropriate direction.

From the beginning of the discussion, its participants have divided into two trends - urbanists and desurbanists. The former, to which L. Sabsovych belonged, argued that the formation of a new, purely Soviet kind of a person, is possible only in the conditions of a large industrial city. The latter opposite trend headed by M. Okhitovych suggested resettlement of workers in the suburban area (Aloshyn, 1985, p.24).

However, both urbanists and desurbanists had solidarity with the idea that there would be no place for old social life in the future socialist cities. The panelists were for a complete revision of the existing way of life and, above all, called for the elimination of the traditional way of life. There were made a lot of calls to deprive a woman of the burden of “kitchen slavery”, which was declared anachronistic, unacceptable under the conditions of socialist life (Sabsovych, 1930, p. 44). There were made proposals to replace the customary individual urban household with a system of public service for basic household needs of workers as well. For example, the function of cooking, in this concept, relied on kitchen factories, which eliminated the need for home cooking. Other household tasks (washing, cleaning) had to be taken over by specialized household enterprises. In that way, private living space would only serve as a place to sleep and relax (Sabsovych, 1930, p. 45). Thus, a woman was relieved of her homework duties, she engaged in community service at a factory, plant or administrative office. As a result, at the expense of women, it was planned to double the number of workers employed in industrial production.

Under the influence of the discussion on socialist settlement in 1929–1930 Ukrainian avant-garde architects began to develop master plans for the reconstruction of Zaporizhzhia and Kharkiv. The proposed architectural designs became an exemplary embodiment of the Soviet urban planning utopias of the late 1920s.

There was a particularly noteworthy activity of the Ukrainian constructivists I. Malozemov and P. Khaustov, which is connected with the design of the city “Great Zaporizhzhia”, the construction of which was planned in connection with the beginning of the erection of the flagship of Stalin's industrialization - the Dnipro hydroelectric power station named after V. Lenin. There was anticipated to build a model socialist city on the banks of the Dnipro. Taking into account the ideological significance of the project, the architects formulated a number of conceptual provisions under which the master plan was to be developed.

First of all, the designers of “Great Zaporizhzhia” held the view that a city of a new, purely Soviet type, should become a kind of reflection of the emergence of a classless society in the USSR. Accordingly, the architects denied the expediency of hierarchically dividing the territory of the future city into the center and the surrounding area, which usually served as markers of socio-spatial segregation. In accordance with the views of I. Malozemov and P. Khaustov, it was possible to overcome this defect characteristic of pre-revolutionary and capitalist cities only by total unification and standardization of the urban space environment. Such a decision was entirely in line with the philosophy of the architectural avant-garde, which outlined not only the position of functionalism but also egalitarianism.

The planning structure of “Great Zaporizhzhia” was seen by the project authors as a system of 7 autonomous regions: Voznesenka; Kichkas; Pavlo-Kichkas; Khortytsia Islands; the third district of Dniprokombinat; reserve district Baburky and the old Oleksandrivsk. All of these regions were connected through communication, and together they formed a functionally integral urban body (Yefremov, 1934, p. 21). At the same time, it should be emphasized that the old Oleksandrivsk was considered not as a base but only as a constituent unit of the “Great Zaporizhzhia” complex. According to the project, all autonomous districts were supposed to have their own administrative bodies. It was also envisaged to decentralize cultural and community institutions. Thus, each of the 7 districts of the city had to have its own cinemas, kindergartens, hospitals, stadiums (Khaustov, 1930, p. 26). Thanks to

such planning decisions, the authors of the “Great Zaporizhzhia” project achieved the desired unification of urban infrastructure.

From the point of view of spatial and territorial organization, designing the “Great Zaporizhzhia” project was based on the scheme of linear development. When designing an urban environment, I. Malozemov and P. Khaustov planned to place the houses linearly at a distance from each other, thus creating an open space favorable for ventilation and insolation (inflow of sunlight) of living quarters (Khazanova, 1984, p. 145). The effect of urban transparency in the projected areas has also been enhanced by an extensive street-road network. According to the project, the width of the pedestrian streets reached 20 m, and the main roads and avenues 100–150 m. We can assume that such size parameters of the roadway width were set taking into account the prospects of total motorization of the country, which, in accordance with official party rhetoric and slogans, was one of the priorities of the program of forced industrialization.

It is worth mentioning that in the general plan of the “Great Zaporizhzhia” project the designers have developed not only an advanced network of terrestrial transport infrastructure, but also envisaged an airport, through which the city would gain the status not only of the Republican or All-Union, but also the world aviation center (Yefremov, 1934, p. 21)

The compositional decisions of the urbanized landscape of “Great Zaporizhzhia” were echoed by the popular during the period of discussion concept of a socialist settlement of the city-garden. In the projected city, more than 70% of the public space and 50% in the residential area are for green space. Khortytsia Island, designed by architects, should remain a veritable green oasis in the middle of an industrial city. In order to preserve the flora of the island, urban planners allowed the construction of only 6% of its territory, which was planned to erect 30-storey skyscrapers. In other parts of the city it was planned the appearance of not higher than 4–5-storied buildings (Khaustov, 1930, p. 25). That means that due to the growth of the surface, it was planned to reduce the construction area.

It is obvious that the main design decisions presented in the plan of “Great Zaporizhzhia” did not correspond to the realities of the Soviet social and political system. The projected division of the city into

autonomous districts and decentralization of the administrative apparatus directly contradicted the basic principles of functioning of the Soviet administrative and command system. However, under the influence of official party rhetoric, Ukrainian avant-gardists continued to create projects similar to the "Great Zaporizhzhia".

There was a notable, though much more modest in terms of planned construction, draft master plan of "New Kharkiv", which began in connection with starting construction in 1929 of Kharkiv Tractor Plant named after S. Ordzhonikidze. The project was carried out by a group of Ukrainian avant-gardists under the leadership of Kyiv academician of architecture P. Aloshyn. According to the plan of the author's team, the settlement of workers of the tractor plant – "New Kharkiv" was to become an exemplary embodiment of the advanced ideas of the Soviet constructivism: linear construction and flow-functional separation of the urban environment proposed by M. Miliutin (Aloshyn, 1985, p. 4).

P. Aloshyn, being a supporter of the ideological and aesthetic canons of neoclassicism, was able to accept the Soviet avant-garde. He believed that it was necessary to form a new, purely Ukrainian architectural tradition as well. Therefore, the aspiration of the Kyiv academician to give the building of a stylistic identity was felt in the artistic and compositional decisions of "New Kharkiv".

Similar to the authors of "Great Zaporizhzhia", P. Alyoshin's group sought to avoid uneven development of urban infrastructure in the form of division into "center" and "periphery". The main unit of planning structure of "New Kharkov" was the functional zone, that is the territorially limited part of the urban space, adapted to perform a certain amount of homogeneous functions (Khan-Mahomedov, 1996, p. 109). The zones were differentiated by purpose: residential, industrial, protective (strip of alienation), landscape gardening, etc. Separated from the industrial area by strip of green space of the park, the residential one allowed workers to live directly in front of their place of work, eliminating the need for private or public transport. The functional zones of "New Kharkiv" were designed in the form of clear parallel lanes, which were located along the axis of the main thoroughfare of the city, that is Moscow Avenue.

It was planned to carry out the construction of the residential and living space of “New Kharkov” in accordance with the provisions of the idea of social life. Thus, according to the plan of the designers, the city was divided into 36 residential complexes, each of which was a complex of 8-10 houses. Such a complex was designed for 2,548 people to live. The complex had all the facilities needed for its residents public services. The project suggested that the houses forming the housing complex would be interconnected at the level of the second floor by the closed bridging corridors (Khan-Mahomedov, 1996, p. 168). As a result, a resident was able to move from its premises to a public dining room, club or library without leaving the housing estate. In the summer, the flat roofs of residential complexes were transformed into tanning beds.

By embodying the idea of social life, the designers of “New Kharkiv” emphasized that the creation of a collective food system would help to create new social and household relationships among the residents. Therefore, there were no included individual kitchens in the planning of apartments of residential complexes (Liubavskiy, 2016, p. 32). The cooking function was entrusted to the kitchen factory system, and catering had to be taken place in public dining rooms. The centralized system of public catering provided for the complete standardization and unification of the menu of offered meals and drinks as well.

The Ukrainian avant-gardists did not miss the need to create a cultural center, which included, among others, the Palace of Culture, the Planetarium and the stadium. To hold cultural and educational events and public meetings there was equipped a separate hall in each housing complex (Borysenko, 2013, p. 108). It is obvious that the authors of the “New Kharkiv” project have taken into account the importance of social events in the general context of mass ideological work.

In the context of Ukrainian urban planning, formulated under the influence of the debate on the socialist displacement of artistic and compositional and planning decisions, architects and builders sought to bring to life the ideas not only in Zaporizhzhia and Kharkiv. They were also implemented in the cities of Donbas. During the work of the governmental commission for the construction of Donbas cities, there was worked out a general doctrine of urbanization of the region in 1929–1930. The territory was planned to divide into 13 industrial

districts, in the center of each there was planned a construction of a new city or a major reconstruction of the old one (Aloshyn, 1985, p.19). There was supposed to form the urban environment of the Donbas cities by the unification of the working settlements of several enterprises into a much larger one, while modernizing communication as well. Within the open competitions, there began the development of sketch projects of the socialist reconstruction of Horlivka, Kadiivka, Lysychansk and Yenakiievo, which, in the sum of stylistic and planning decisions, corresponded with “New Kharkiv” and “Great Zaporizhzhia”. However, all these ideas remained at the stage of project development.

The creative pursuits were significantly adjusted by the party apparatus, that was unexpected as for the Ukrainian, as for most Soviet urban planners. On May 29, 1930, a resolution of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) on "Work on the restructuring of everyday life" was promulgated, which in fact put a stop to the debate on socialist displacement, and most of the proposed ideas were criticized. The campaign to discuss the prospects of Soviet urban planning, launched by the party apparatus, was eventually suspended. In the party directive, the participants of the debate were accused of projecting and promoting the utopian idea of a solid socialization of life, which allegedly resulted from the emergence of false expectations about the prospects of overcoming the housing crisis in the population (Resolution of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) "On work on the restructuring of everyday life", 1930). Critical publications on proposed urban regeneration projects began to appear on Soviet newspapers.

Thus, according to party critics, the main drawback of the master plan of “Great Zaporizhzhia” was the extraordinarily large area of the building land. The project's weaknesses were identified by the extremely wide streets and low-rise buildings, which would seem to have led to unjustified costs for their improvement and public utilities. As a result, the master plan of “Great Zaporizhzhia” proposed by P. Khaustov and I. Malozemov was rejected by the Republican party apparatus.

As for “New Kharkiv”, its construction was started, however, in the same 1930, the decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the National Economy reduced the amount of investment in housing at the Kharkiv Tractor Plant named after S. Ordzhonikidze. The designers had to

abandon the construction of closed bridges-corridors, and of the 288 houses envisaged by the project by 1939, only 50 were built (Liubavskiy, 2016, p. 35). That is, by the end of the 1930s, most of the factory workers had not received separate housing.

The plans of “New Kharkiv” and “Great Zaporizhzhia”, developed under the influence of the leading ideas of the discussion, were almost identical in their aesthetic and ideological and compositional content. The projects differed mainly only from approaches to territorial organization of urban infrastructure. “New Kharkiv” was seen as a territorially monolithic urban complex formed by functional zones. While “Great Zaporizhzhia” appeared to its authors as a decentralized urban organism.

The lack of viability of the projects was driven by the specific social and political and economic transformations that took place at the turn of the 1920s and 1930s under the leadership of Y. Stalin. In the text of the Resolution “On work on restructuring of life” there was a direct indication in the form of lines about “... at the moment the need to maximize the focus of all resources on faster industrialization of the country, which will actually create real material prerequisites for a radical restructuring of life...” (Resolution of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) "On work on the restructuring of everyday life", 1930). This meant that financial, human and material resources would be directed, first of all, to industrial rather than residential construction by the Stalinist leadership. The reason for such a decision was not the scarcity of these very resources, but the recognition of the priority of the fastest possible activation of the production facilities of the heavy industry enterprises. As a result, in the satellite cities of the metallurgical and machine-building plants of the first five-year schedules, there would be "not enough resources" to build capital housing infrastructure.

Placing the priorities clearly indicates that, at the beginning of the first five-year schedule, the Stalinist leadership had made a conscious decision to abandon the mass construction of individual housing for workers. The move was motivated not only by the desire for faster construction of heavy industry facilities. An indispensable attribute of a separate urban dwelling was a family household, which traditionally relied on a woman. Therefore, there was a danger of an outflow of

working population (women and adolescents) from industrial production, in the event of the emergence and increase of individual housing. Therefore, mass workers' housing was envisaged only in the form of hostels, family and barracks (Meierovych, 2011, p. 135). Individual housing was recognized exclusively by the prerogative of the Soviet administrative bureaucracy, that is the nomenclature. Housing was considered as a means of encouraging functionaries for service and loyalty to the Stalinist regime. These principles were laid down and formed the basis of Stalin's urban planning policy. Under these circumstances, the avant-garde town planning doctrines proved “irrelevant” to the Soviet authorities.

In view of the above, the real and not officially declared motives for launching a debate on socialist displacement become clear. We can claim that the discussion of the prospects of Soviet urban planning and the popularization of the idea of social life initiated by the party apparatus were a kind of propaganda cover for the Stalinist plan to abandon the mass construction of individual housing. Thus, the entire discussion of socialist displacement may be regarded as a purely political campaign, which lasted exactly as long as it had successfully fulfilled the ideological veil of the real intentions of the party apparatus. The emergence of housing projects or kitchen factories was, in fact, the result of a specific interpretation by architects of the concept of social life, which had nothing to do with the utopian ideas of forming a new person in reality.

Thus, the architectural debate ended without achieving its primary purpose – to create a model of a “ideal socialist city”, devoid of the vices inherent in pre-revolutionary and capitalist urbanism. The avant-garde doctrines were incompatible with the party plans, which the Soviet functionaries criticized and rejected as vigorously as supported at the beginning of the discussion.

To sum up, we can argue that the refusal to implement these projects was a consequence of the inconsistency of their planning decisions with the basic provisions of a true Stalin's urban planning policy. Contrary to the official slogans of a “bright future of socialism”, the real party course did not aim to raise the living standards. The authorities considered the housing of working people as barracks and hostels, rather than futuristic apartment complexes. Therefore, the issues

related to the influence of Soviet social policy on the formation of state urban planning doctrine during the first industrial five-year schedule period need further studies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aloshyn, V. (1985). Urban planning searches in Ukraine in the 1920s – early 1930s. *Construction activity and architecture*, (10), 22–26.

Borysenko, M. (2013). *Housing and household activities of the Ukrainian urban population in the 20-30s. of the twentieth century*. K.: Stylos, 270 p.

Hohokhiia, N. (2003). Ukrainian "social city" in 1930s: dreams and reality. *Visnyk of Luhansk Pedagogical University named after Taras Shevchenko*, (6), 196–199.

Yefremov, N. (1934). *The layout of the Great Zaporizhzhia. Sorehor*, (1), 22.

Ichenko, M. (2018) Urban development and urban planning experiments. *Work, Exhaustion and Success: Donbas Industrial Monomists*. Lviv: Individual entrepreneur Shumylovych, 71-96.

Kazus, I. (2009). *Soviet architecture of the 1920s: the organization of construction*. M.: Progress-Traditsiya, 464 p.

Liubavskiy, R. (2016). *The daily life of Kharkiv workers in the 1920s – early 1930s*. Kharkiv: Raryety Ukrainy, 226 p.

Meierovych, M., Konysheva, E., Hmelnytskyi, D. (2011). *The cemetery of the social cities: urban planning policy in the USSR (1928-1932)*. M.: ROSSPEN, 270 p.

Sabsovych, L. (1930). *Socialist cities*. M.: Moskovskiyrabochiy, 124 p.

Khaustov, P. (1930). *Great Zaporizhzhia*. M.: Molodaya gvardiya, 25–27.

Khazanova, V. (1980). *Soviet architecture of the first five-year schedule plan: Problems of the city of the future*. M.: Nauka, 373 p.

Khan-Mahomedov, S. (1996). *The architecture of the Soviet avant-garde*. M.: Stroyizdat, 709 p.

Khmelnytskyi, D. (2007). *Stalin's architecture. Psychology and style*. M.: Progress-Traditsiya, 560 p.

Khmelnytskyi, D. (2007). *Architect Stalin*. M.: NLO, 312 p.

«About work on the restructuring of everyday life». Resolution of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) of May 16, 1930. http://ussr.totalarch.com/work_restructuring_life

**Рибачок Володимир. ПРОЕКТИ «НОВОГО ХАРКОВА» І
«ВЕЛИКОГО ЗАПОРІЖЖЯ» ЯК ВІДОБРАЖЕННЯ
МІСТОБУДІВНИХ ПОШУКІВ ПЕРІОДУ ІНДУСТРІАЛІЗАЦІЇ
Анотація**

У 1929 р. в СРСР розгорнулася всесоюзна публічна кампанія з обговорення перспектив розвитку радянського містобудування, відома як дискусія про соціалістичне розселення. Її основними учасниками стали не лише тогочасні провідні архітектори та містобудівники, а й вищі партійні і державні діячі. Під впливом утопічних містобудівних ідей, які виникли у ході дискусії щодо проблем соціалістичного розселення, українські архітектори-конструктивісти здійснили розробку генеральних планів реконструкції і розширення житлової інфраструктури двох промислових центрів – Харкова та Запоріжжя. Однак, конструктивістські проекти «Великого Запоріжжя» і «Нового Харкова» запропоновані І. Малоземовим, П. Хаустовим та П. Альошиним не були реалізовані у повному обсязі, оскільки характер їх планувальних рішень йшов врозрід із базовими положенням реальної містобудівної політики сталінського керівництва.

Висловлюється думка, що створені українськими зодчими плани «Нового Харкова» і «Великого Запоріжжя» були втіленням авторського бачення зразкової моделі соціалістичного міста. На основі провідних ідей радянського авангарду, автори проектів запропонували оригінальну архітектурно-планувальну концепцію забудови, яка не мала нічого спільного із містобудівним досвідом попередніх часів. Однак ці архітектурні пропозиції виявилися не актуальними в СРСР наприкінці 1920-х рр. В умовах сталінської індустріалізації партійний апарат надавав житловому будівництву другорядного значення. Як наслідок, масштабні проекти «Нового Харкова» та «Великого Запоріжжя» було визнано «помилковими».

Методологія: у статті було застосовано історико-генетичний метод для визначення генезису концепції лінійної забудови, з'ясування походження ідеї житлового комбінату та розкриття обставин виникнення задуму уніфікації міської інфраструктури, втілених українськими авангардистами у архітектурно-планувальних рішеннях проєктів «Нового Харкова» і «Великого Запоріжжя». Компаративний метод дозволив визначити невідповідність змісту ідеалістичних поглядів радянських конструктивістів реальній суті сталінської урбаністичної політики. Завдяки історико-системному методу вдалося дійти розуміння, що заплановані у проєктах «Нового Харкова» і «Великого Запоріжжя» об'єкти міської інфраструктури повинні були вступати у функціональну взаємодію, утворюючи єдиний урбаністичний механізм.

Висновки. Початок 20-х рр. ХХ ст. в історії радянської України, так і в цілому Радянського Союзу, позначився появою цікавих наукових, мистецьких, архітектурних проєктів. Ейфорія від віри у створення «нового» світу, побудови «справедливого» суспільства для представників всіх соціальних верств характеризувала загальні настрої та надихала інтелектуалів й митців на творчі пошуки. Проте, період «загравання» радянської влади з елітами був нетривалим. Її авторитарна сутність, з актуалізацією на мілітаризацію країни, не залишала простору для творчої ініціативи та розвитку індивідуальності. На початку першої п'ятирічки у владних кулуарах було прийнято рішення про відмову від масового спорудження комфортного житла для робітників. Усі ресурси планувалося зосередити на будівництві об'єктів важкої промисловості. Тому футуристичні проєкти «Нового Харкова» і «Великого Запоріжжя» були відхилені через їх невідповідність істинній державній урбаністичній доктрині періоду індустріалізації.

Ключові слова: авангард, дискусія, індустріалізація, соціалістичне розселення, генеральний план, конструктивізм, містобудування, усупільнений побут.

**Rybaczok Włodzimierz. PROJEKTY “NOWEGO CHARKOWA” I
“WIELKIEGO ZAPOROŻA” JAK WYŚWIETLENIE
WYSZUKIWAŃ URBANISTYCZNYCH W OKRESIE
INDUSTRIALIZACJI**

Streszczenie

W 1929 r. w ZSRR rozpoczęła się ogólnonarodowa kampania publiczna, mająca na celu omówienie perspektyw rozwoju radzieckiej urbanistyki, znana jako dyskusja na temat zasiedlenia socjalistycznego. Jego głównymi uczestnikami byli nie tylko prowadzący architekci i urbaniści tamtych czasów, ale także wyżsi partyjni i państwowi działacze. Pod wpływem utopijnych pomysłów urbanistycznych, które pojawiły się podczas dyskusji o problemach socjalistycznego zasiedlenia, ukraińscy architekci-konstruktywiści opracowali generalne plany przebudowy i rozbudowy infrastruktury mieszkaniowej dwóch ośrodków przemysłowych – Charkowa i Zaporozża. Jednak projekty konstruktywne “Wielkiego Zaporozża” i “Nowego Charkowa” zaproponowane przez I. Malozemowa, P. Haustowa i P. Aloszyna nie zostały w całości zrealizowane, ponieważ charakter ich planowych decyzji był sprzeczny z podstawowymi przepisami w zakresie faktycznego planowania miasta według Stalińskiego kierownictwa.

Istnieje taka opinia, że plany “Wielkiego Zaporozża” i “Nowego Charkowa”, stworzone przez ukraińskich architektów, były przejawem autorskiej wizji wzorowego modelu miasta socjalistycznego. W oparciu o wiodące idee radzieckiej awangardy autorzy projektów zaproponowali oryginalną koncepcję architektoniczno-planistycznej zabudowy, która nie miała nic wspólnego z doświadczeniem urbanistycznym z poprzednich czasów. Te propozycje architektoniczne nie były jednak aktualne w ZSRR pod koniec lat 20. XX w. W kontekście industrializacji Stalina aparat partyjny przywiązywał drugorzędne znaczenie do mieszkalnictwa. W rezultacie ogromne projekty “Wielkiego Zaporozża” i “Nowego Charkowa” okazały się “pomyłkowe”.

Metodologia. W artykule wykorzystano metodę historyczno-genetyczną, aby ustalić genezę koncepcji zabudowy liniowej, poznać genezę idei kompleksu mieszkalnego i ujawnić warunki pojawienia idei unifikacji infrastruktury miejskiej, zawarte ukraińskimi awangardzistami w ich decyzjach architektonicznych i planowych podczas projektów “Wielkiego Zaporozża” i “Nowego Charkowa”.

Metoda porównawcza pozwoliła ustalić rozbieżności treści idealistycznych poglądów radzieckich konstruktywistów z realną istotą polityki urbanistycznej Stalina. Dzięki metodzie historyczno-systematycznej udało się zrozumieć, że planowane obiekty projektów “Wielkiego Zaporozża” i “Nowego Charkowa”, należące do infrastruktury miejskiej, miały wchodzić w interakcję funkcjonalną, tworząc jedyny mechanizm miejski.

Wnioski. Początek lat 20. XX wieku. w historii radzieckiej Ukrainy i całego Związku Radzieckiego, odznaczał się pojawieniem interesujących projektów naukowych, artystycznych i architektonicznych. Euforia od wiary w stworzenie “nowego” świata, budowanie “sprawiedliwego” społeczeństwa dla przedstawicieli wszystkich warstw społecznych charakteryzowała ogólne nastroje i inspirowała intelektualistów i artystów do twórczych poszukiwań. Okres “flirtowania” władzy radzieckiej z elitą był jednak krótki. Jej autorytarny charakter, z aktualizacją do militaryzacji kraju, nie pozostawiał miejsca na kreatywną inicjatywę i rozwój osobisty. Na początku pierwszej “pięciolatki” za władczymi kulisami rząd postanowił porzucić masową budowę wygodnych mieszkań dla pracowników. Wszystkie zasoby zaplanowano skierować na budowę obiektów przemysłu ciężkiego. W rezultacie futurystyczne projekty “Wielkiego Zaporozża” i “Nowego Charkowa” zostały odrzucone z powodu ich niezgodności z prawdziwą państwową doktryną urbanistyczną okresu industrializacji.

Słowa kluczowe: awangarda, dyskusja, industrializacja, zasiedlenie socjalistyczne, plan generalny, konstruktywizm, urbanistyka, życie społeczne.

The article was received 09.21.2019
Article recommended for publishing 11.05.2019