



Историјски институт Београд
Institute of History, Belgrade



Државни универзитет за архитектуру
и грађевину
(ННГАСУ) Нижињи Новгород
«Нижегородский государственный
архитектурно-строительный университет»

URBANIZATION IN EASTERN AND SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE

**Collection of Articles of the II International
Scientific Conference**



“Nizhny Novgorod State University of Architecture and Civil Engineering”
Institute of History, Belgrade

URBANIZATION IN EASTERN
AND SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE
Collection of Articles of the II International
Scientific Conference

Nizhny Novgorod
NNGASU
2021

УДК 364.122 (4-11)

Published in author's version

Collection of Articles of the II International Conference “Urbanization in Eastern and South-Eastern Europe” / Nizhny Novgorod State University of Architecture and Civil Engineering; edited by: A. A. Gordin, A. Rastović – N. Novgorod: NNGASU; Belgrade: Institute of History, 2021. – 125 p.

The collection of articles is based on the materials of the II International Scientific and Training Conference “Urbanization in Eastern and South-Eastern Europe” held by the Nizhny Novgorod State University of Architecture and Civil Engineering and the Institute of History in Belgrade on September 26, 2019.

The collection includes articles by Russian and Serbian historians, philosophers devoted to various aspects of urbanization. The works are distinguished by their diversity and have a multifaceted character. The collection is intended for teachers of universities and schools, graduate students, students and all interested in history.

Editorial Board:

A. A. Gordin,
A. Rastović

ISBN 978-5-528-000501-0

© NNGASU, 2021

Table of Contents

CVIJANOVIĆ I. R. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE EARLY MEDIEVAL EUROPEAN URBAN CENTRES ACCORDING TO THE ARABIC SOURCES	5
PETROVIĆ V. M. SPATIAL STRUCTURE OF SERBIAN MEDIEVAL CITIES (XII-XV CENTURIES)	11
AMEDOSKI D. SPATIAL ORGANIZATION OF THE OTTOMAN TOWN IN THE 16 th CENTURY – EXAMPLE OF KRUŠEVAC AND PASHA SANDJAKS	19
VULETIĆ A. B. THE GROWTH OF URBAN POPULATION IN SERBIA 1835–1910. CHARACTERISTICS AND TENDENCIES	23
MILJKOVIĆ KATIĆ B. M. INFLUENCE OF METROPOLITAN FUNCTIONS ON THE URBAN DEVELOPMENT OF THE CITY: KRAGUJEVAC IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE 19 th CENTURY	28
DELIĆ N. TOWNS AND TOWNSHIP IN SERB-INHABITED AREAS OF THE HAPSBURG EMPIRE DURING THE SECOND HALF OF THE 19 th CENTURY – CHANGE OF STATUS LAW AND LEGAL DEFINITION	31
POPOVIĆ R. J. IMPACT OF MILITARY CONSTRUCTION ON THE URBANIZATION OF VAROŠES IN THE PRINCIPALITY OF SERBIA IN THE MIDDLE OF THE XIX CENTURY	35
VUKSANOVIĆ-MACURA Z. GARDEN CITY IN INTERWAR SERBIA: FROM ENGLAND <i>VIA</i> RUSSIA.....	40
KOCHETKOV I. I. OLD RUSSIAN CITIES IN THE CONTEXT OF ECONOMIC HISTORY (HISTORIOGRAPHICAL ASPECT).....	46
VARAKIN S. A. LEAGUE OF MILITANT ATHEISTS IN NIZHNY NOVGOROD IN THE EARLY 1930S ..	51
SEREBRYANSKAYA G. V. PECULIARITIES OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC DEVELOPMENT OF CITIES IN THE VOLGA-VYATKA REGION OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION BEFORE AND DURING THE GREAT PATRIOTIC WAR.....	56
ABRAKOVA T. A. SOCIAL SECURITY OF FRONT-LINE SOLDIERS AND THEIR FAMILIES IN 1945-1946 (ON MATERIALS OF GORKY).....	62

GREBENYUK A. V. ARCHITECTURAL ENSEMBLE OF THE NIZHNY NOVGOROD ANNUNCIATION MONASTERY AS AN ARCHITECTURAL DOMINANT	70
BELOUS T. I. PECULIARITIES OF THE TRADITIONAL RUSSIAN WEDDING IN THE URBAN ENVIRONMENT.....	74
LAPSHINA V. S. ANTHROPOLOGICAL DETERMINATION OF URBANIZATION.....	80
PROKHOROV M. M. MARXIST PHILOSOPHY AND CONCEPT OF NOOSPHERE BY V. I. VERNADSKY	85
GORDINA E. D. PRODUCTION OF CONSUMER GOODS AT THE ENTERPRISES OF THE GORKY REGION AFTER THE GREAT PATRIOTIC WAR: SOCIO-ECONOMIC ASPECT (ON THE MATERIALS OF THE STATE PUBLIC INSTITUTION “STATE SOCIO-POLITICAL ARCHIVE OF THE NIZHNY NOVGOROD REGION”).....	97
GORDIN A. A. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOVIET CITY IN 1985-1991 (ON THE MATERIALS OF GORKY).....	106

CVIJANOVIĆ I. R.

The Institute of History, Belgrade, Serbia

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE EARLY MEDIEVAL EUROPEAN URBAN CENTRES ACCORDING TO THE ARABIC SOURCES

Relevant information about European lands and cities often comes from the accounts of contemporary Arab traders and travellers. Intense trade relations were maintained between Arabs and Western world between the 9th and 12th centuries, at the time of the Abbasid (or Baghdad) Caliphate (750-1258). Arabic merchants brought exotic, oriental goods, and left numerous hoards of Islamic silver coins, dirhams, all around Europe [14, p. 229-238]. After the journeys many travelogues were written, that contained interesting data about geography and history of the European Medieval lands and new urban centers.

Today's Europe developed on the basis of Medieval cities. Term city is sometimes identified with term civilisation, because the city is main driving force of progress, and main characteristic of the European culture [6, p. 15-48]. New city emerged in Europe from the ruins of the Roman Empire and was transformed out of all recognition by the coming of manufacturing industries [16, p. 267-269]. The Medieval city owned to the classical cities of Greece and Rome, but it belonged to a type that was peculiarly its own. Before the city emerged, people lived in smaller settlements, and cultivated the soil. Then small agricultural settlements developed to large communities in which craft industries, the exchange of goods, and possession of certain economic functions had important role. An increase in population and the need for protection joint together rural settlements to create new urban pattern in the Early Middle Ages.

In the 7th century besides the Byzantine Empire appears the Arabic halifat, and those two different worlds stayed main civilised and urbanized areas for centuries. Byzantine capital Constantinople, was built on the Antique tradition, while the Arabs founded great extensive cities-oasis, Bagdad, Damasc, Kordoba and palermo with Perisan irrigation system and developed agriculture. Western cities were more poor, and divided, and for that reason disappeared economic and administrative conditions for survival of big cities.

However, that undeveloped and divided areas made conditions for developing a new model of the European city between 7th and 10th century, and helped them to go out from the frame of the Mediterranean world. The territories that were already urbanized adapted inherited old buildings, and life near ruins of the Antique world became the constant of the European civilization [12, p. 1-21]. From the 11th century cities, on the different ways got autonomy. That autonomy, and taking responsibility are main characteristics of the European cities that enabled them to exist in the future. New cities were smaller than former ancient or eastern metropolis.

Process of decadence of the urban spaces in the Roman areas and beginning of the urbanization of the areas out of the former borders, is followed by gradual transition from the Mediterranean to the north seas. This process enabled to come to the surface many regional and local differences, and political organizations have weak

influence on them. German people settled in the northern valleys near old borders of the Empire, or our of them, and in that areas founded military and trade fortresses, taht enlarged urbanized space of the continent. These are trade centers along Rhine river and Norther sea, Scandinavian houses, Saxson and Frankish castles between Rhine and Elba rivers, than fortified trade settlements in Moravska, Bohemia, as well as English burg founded by Anglo-saxon kings.

Arabic conquest of Spain started in the year 718., and continued in the area out of the borders, up to the Rhine river, German limes, and Danube, where distant Roman cities became island in the rural surrounding, or in the more distant, unlimited, in which was founded a new system of separated fortified places. New characteristic of the Europe became unity made of differences, as a constant feature in the continent. Germans changed old names of the cities by adding word burg, what means castle. Early Christian churces were built on the perrifery of the old cities. Religious centers were built in the separate quarters. Sometimes new city was built in one Antique building, such as Diocletian's palace.

In the new settlements, founded independently of the Antique matrix, buildings were shaped according to the new demands, trade and defense, and they did not adept to the inherited forms of the ancient world, or they are used only to enlarge dignity of the religious and city centers. On the other side of the city gates were forests, swamps, ninhabited fields and mountains. All kinds of towns became unsecured shelters in the endless space, in which territorial organization do not exist, and new one has to be formed.

That new life style is important for the future, which apeared in the first centuries of the Middle Ages, among the ruins of the dissapeared world. City centers of the barbarian kings in Ravenna, Verona, Pavia, Bordeaux, Toulouse, Ahen and Vorms, became actually courts that took as a model Antique places, sometimes included in the new geographic system, opened to the spaces on the North, and thus giving a chance for creating qualitative changes in the next centuries.

The most important Arabic sources about the Early Meieval European cities from 9th to 12th century are books written by Ibn Khurdādbih, Ibn Rusta, Ibn Jubayr, Al-Idrīsī, and Al-Bakrī, who preserved description of the Slavic lands written by Ibrāhīm ibn Ya'qūb.

Ibn Khurdādbih (820-912) came from the province Horasan in Persia, but he wrote in Arabic. Ibn Khurdādbih worked in the post as a Postmaster General and intelligence officer. The position of the Postmaster General had more of a political significance and united the function of a political agent and a chief of police who contated viziers and caliphs. As a Chief of Police he had a list of clerks and correspondents who filed regular reports from their regions, and this position enabled him to write about all trade routes and main urban centers. Ibn Khurdādbih paid particular attention to description of Constantinople and Rome.

Ibn Rusta (9th/10th century, died in 903/913) was a Persian geographer who wrote in Arabic. Ibn Rusta wrote that there are precisely 21,600 cities on the Earth. Ibn Rusta preserved a particularly beautiful description of Constantinople written by Harun

ibn Jahja. Some Arabic authors wrote about things that they heard, and others on the basis of their own experience. Harun's report is important because he described Constantinople where he was captured, as well as the Great Church, the Emperor's ceremony, and his trip through the Land of Slavs to Thessalonica, Split and Venice [13, p. 31-31-43]. Here is a list of the cities mentioned in Ibn Rusta's book:

- 1) Constantinople
- 2) Rome
- 3) Narbona (France), Narbonian Bay
- 4) Thessaloniki (Salonika)
- 5) Split (Balatis, Palatis-Spalato)
- 6) Venice (Bandakis)
- 7) Vatib/Vabit – The Slavs
- 8) Djervab – The Slavs (lives svjatbalk)

Ibrāhīm ibn Ya'qūb (10th century), is Arabic traveler from Spain, merchant and chronicler who traveled across West and Central Europe in the 10th century. **Al-Bakrī** wrote memories and comments from this trip in his book "Roads and Kingdoms". Ibrāhīm ibn Ya'qūb gave reliable description of the Land of Slavs, Poland, Bohemia, trade centers Krakow and Prague, as well as the Land of Franks. Cities in the Land of Franks are mostly placed in today's Germany, but in this chapter, are two Slavic cities among them: **Soest** and **Paderborn**. It is well known from the Arabic sources that the Slavs were scattered all around Europe in the Early Middle Ages, obviously sometimes surrounded by Franks. Western Slavs were Germanized.

- 1) Prague in Bohemia
- 2) Krakow – Mieszko fortress is the largest city
- 3) Al-Djavfa – in Nakur (in the far west)

The Russians and Slavs come from Krakow to Prague to trade. Also Muslims, Jews and Turks come from the land of Turks. Merchants bring Avar coins.

Land of Franks:

1. Bordeaux
2. Noirmoutier
3. San Maolo
4. Ruan
5. Utrecht - (The Netherlands)
6. Eks (Aix)
7. Mainz – dirhams coined in Samarkand in 914. and oriental goods from India
8. Fulda
9. Soest – in (near) Land of Slavs (North-western Germany)
10. Paderborn – in Land of Slavs (Western Germany)
11. Schleswig
12. Augsburg

13. Kortona
14. Trapani

Ibn Ġubayr (middle of the 12th century, 1145-127), was born in Valencia. Ibn Ġubayr became a secretarial scribe to the Almohad, the Governor of Granada. Between 1183 and 1185 he has undertaken his first series of travels. He took two other trips around the Mediterranean world, first one between 1189 and 1191, and the second in 1217. Ibn Ġubayr gave description of the five main urban centers in Sicily as Al-Idrīsī.

Sicily:

- 1) Palermo (Al-Madinah)
- 2) Messina
- 3) Cefalu
- 4) Termini (Thirmah)
- 5) Trapani

Al-Idrīsī (middle of the 12th century, 1099/1100-1164/5/6) was born in Ceuta, of Spanish-Arabic parents. Al-Idrīsī is the best known Arabic geographer. During Crusades Idrīsī wrote his geography at the court of Norman king Roger II in Sicily, and he had included main European routes and cities. Descriptions of cities in today's Poland, Bulgaria, mentioned in Idrīsī's book are already published, and I chose a few chapters from his work, related to the Land of Slavs, Balkans, Eastern coast of the Adriatic and Sicily. Idrīsī often mentioned population of the cities, and it gives us ethnic picture of Europe in the 12th century.

Таблица 1. The most important Medieval cities in Al-Idrisi's geography:

Country today	Medieval cities in the 12 th Century
Albania	Drac.
Austria	Vienna.
Belgium	Bruges, Courtray, Ghent.
Bulgaria	Great Preslav, Ihtiman, Silistra, Varna, Widdin.
Croatia	Bakar, Biograd, Bribir, Dubrovnik, Karlobag, Konavlje, Lovran, Materada, Medulin, Nin, Novigrad, Old Trogir, Porec, Pula, Rovinj, Senj, Split, Stari Grad, Ston, Umag, Vranjak, Zadar, Zaton.
Cyprus	Limassol, Nicosia.
Czech Republic	Prague.

France	Agen, Angers, Arras, Bayeux, Bayonne, Besancon, Bordeaux, Bourges, Carcassonne, Chartres, Dijon, Langres, Les Sables-d'Olonne, Limoges, Lyon, Macon, Marseille, Nantes, Nevers, Orleans, Paris, Pontoise, Reims, Rennes, Rouen, Saint-Malo, Toulouse, Tours, Troyes, Vannes.
Germany	Augsburg, Ehingen, Mainz, Regensburg, Ulm.
Greece	Almyros, Argos, Corinth, Kastoria, Lacedaemon, Larissa, Mnemvasia, Platamonas, Pylos, Serres, Thebes, Thessaloniki.
Hungary	Pécs, Szentes.
Italy	Amalfi, Ancona, Aquileia, Bari, Bologna, Brindisi, Capri, Crotone, Gallipoli, Lesina, Leuca, Matera, Milano, Naples, Otranto, Pavia, Pisa, Potenza, Ravenna, Rimini, Rome, Sorrento, Tavianò, Venice, Venosa; Sardinia: Oristano; Sicily: Agrigente, Cefalu, Corleone, Marsala, Messina, Palermo, Ragusa, Syracuse, Termini, Trapani.
Montenegro	Kotor, Old Bar, Ulcinj.
Netherlands	Utrecht.
North Macedonia	Bitolj, Kratovo, Ohrid, Polog, Skoplje, Stip.
Poland	Gniezno, Cracow.
Portugal	Lisbon, Santarém.
Serbia	Belgrade, Branicevo, Carlowitz, Cuprija, Kovin, Malesevo, Nisu, Ostrovo, Pancevo, Petrovaradin, Pirot, Sremska Mitrovica, Titel.
Slovakia	Nitra.
Slovenia	Kopar, Piran.
Spain	Algeciras, Barcelona, Burgos, Cádiz, Córdoba, Granada, Guadalajara, Ibiza, León, Málaga, Murcie, Segovia, Segura, Seville, Soria, Toledo, Tortosa, Tudela, Valencia, Zaragoza.
Switzerland	Basel, Geneva, Lausanne.
Turkey	Adrianople, Amasra, Constantinople, Heraclea, Nice in Bithynia, Rodosto, Sinop, Trebizond.

Ukraine	Kiev, Beryslav.
United Kingdom	Cornwallia, Dover, Durham, Hastings, Lincoln, London, Shoreham by Sea, Wallingford, Wareham, Winchester.

We can conclude from all this that Arabic historians, geographers, travelers and merchants preserved many interesting data about European lands and cities. Intensive trade between East and West enabled the Arabs to bring exotic, oriental goods, but also to study and explore. Arabic travelers wrote about all known cities, trade routes, as well as about ethnic picture of Europe.

References

1. Ibn Khurdābih, Kitāb al-masālik wa –l-mamālik, *in: BGA VI*, ed. De Goeje, Lugduni-Batavorum (Leiden) 1967.
2. Ibn Rusta, Kitāb al-a'lāq al-nafisa, *in: BGA VII*, ed. De Goeje, Lugduni-Batavorum (Leiden) 1892.
3. Al-Bakrī, Al-Masālik wa-l-Mamālik, Beirut 2003; Al-Bakrī preserved description of the Slavic lands written by Ibrāhīm ibn Ya'qūb.
4. Ibn Jubayr; Wright, William (editor), 1852, 323-335; de Goeje, M.J. (revised by; in Arabic), The Travels of Ibn Jubayr, (preface in English, manuscript in Arabic), Brill, Leiden, 1907.
5. Al-Idrīsī, Kitāb nuzhat al-mushtāq fī ikhtirāq al-āfāq, Beirut 1989.
6. Benevolo, L. Grad u istroiji Evrope / Beograd : Clio - 2004. – xxx str.
7. Lewicki, T. Polska i kraje sąsiednie w świetle, Księgi Rogera, geografa arabskiego z XII w. al-Idrīsī'ego, Warszawa 1954.
8. С. Кендерова, Б. Бешевлиев, Балканският полуостров изобразен в картите на Ал-Идриси, палеографско и историко-географско изследване, част I, София 1990.
9. Zaimova, R. Арабски извори за българите, София 1999.
10. Luis, B. Muslimansko otkriće Evrope / Beograd : Avangarda 2004.
11. Norič, Dž.Dž. Veliki gradovi kroz istoriju / Beograd : Laguna 2019.
12. Pounds, N. The Medieval City / Wetsport, Connecticut, London : Greenwood Press 2005.
13. Цвијановић, И. Путопис Харун ибн Јахје // Историјски часопис No. LV – 2007 – с. 31-31-43.
14. Цвијановић, И. Арапски писани извори о трговачким путевима и градовима у словенским земљама од IX до XII века // Архаика No. 2 – 2008 – с. 229-238.
15. Cvijanović, I. The Typology of Slavic Settlements in Bohemia, Poland and Russia in: The World of the Slavs: Studies on the East, West and South Slavs: Civitas, Oppidas, Villas and Archeological Evidence (7th do 11th Centuries AD), ed. Rudić, S., The Institute of History, Belgrade : The Institute of History 2013.

16. Cvijanović, I. Development of Medieval Cities in the Balkan Peninsula until the end of the 13th century in: *Eastern Europe in the antiquity and the Middle Ages. Early stages of Urbanization*, Moscow : Institute of World History 2019 – p. 267-269.

PETROVIĆ V. M.

Institute of History, Belgrade, Serbia

SPATIAL STRUCTURE OF SERBIAN MEDIEVAL CITIES (XII-XV CENTURIES)

Each city consists of a material structure and a social sphere, which are transposed within it. Cities are the clearest trace of the society living in it. Since it is undeniable that a city does not exist in itself, but it is inextricably linked to a particular society, it is clear that understanding the social context of a city is impossible outside the historical context. Proceeding from the fact that the social patterns and material form can recognize the cultural values to which the city belonged, it follows that the city as an object of research should be considered through the prism of several scientific disciplines. Namely, history, archeology, geography, and sociology of the city [23, p. 107]. Therefore, if there are written sources and observations during the field research, it is necessary to use the results of the mentioned scientific disciplines, their analysis and comparison in order to get the clearest idea about the degree of urbanization of the Serbian medieval state and about the specifics of its separate urbanized areas.

The nature of urban space, its structure and its functions are the result of socio-spatial aspects in political, economic and cultural terms. Perceived in this way space and time can be interpreted only in the social context, an integral part of which they are. [3, p. 281].

Taking into account natural and geographical conditions, the most important settlements in the territory of the medieval Serbian state can be divided into three groups. The first group includes ancient urbanized centers in the fertile valleys of the Moravian-Vardar Hollow, Kosovo and Metohija, through which the most important transport routes in the peninsula passed. The second group consists of the settlements originated in the immediate vicinity of large mining basins and roads leading to them. The third group is represented by cities and towns on and adjacent to the Adriatic coast.

The processes of urbanization of the Serbian medieval state reached their highest peak in the first half of the 15th century. At that time, different types of cities and towns were clearly distinguished in the territory and existed simultaneously: capitals, mining settlements, fortifications with suburbs, old Byzantine towns and unfortified trade settlements.

Taking into account the specificity of the development of Serbian medieval cities, the borders were not set too rigidly when classifying cities and defining the individual types of urban settlements. Each city was a separate complex with its own economic, social and political processes. They were reflected in the construction and municipal improvement of urbanized spatial and physical structures. This was influenced by the constant problem of the degree of study of their material culture, as well as by

the fact that cities are living organisms which have their own personality.¹

It should be borne in mind that in addition to constant interaction with the surrounding countryside and with the feudal elite, cities form an interconnected complex of settlements in certain territories. The numerous remains of fortifications in the area covered by the Serbian medieval state indicate the possibility of a relatively dense network of urban settlements. This is confirmed by the increase in the number of archaeological finds, belonging not only to the Late Antiquity and Early Byzantine period, but also to the Medieval period. So far, the focus of archaeological research on the ancient and early Byzantine city in the Central Balkan region and on the citadels, as the most visible and visually representative traces of previous eras, makes it difficult to understand the significance of individual urban remains and, therefore, of the whole complex of urban settlements. Out of sight remains the entire medieval urban space, which, in addition to the feudal or administrative center – embodied in the fortress walls – also comprised: the suburbs with their neighborhoods, markets, and craft shops. And in the mining towns there were also foundries and mines themselves. In this presentation we will confine ourselves to the continental space, without taking into account the seaside towns, which were separate complexes.

Depending on the political and geographical preconditions, the main function of the city is determined. Consequently, there are also social groups that play a leading role in urban life: the ruler and main authorities in metropolitan cities, local authorities and employees in local administrative centers, merchants in trade urban settlements, and mining entrepreneurs and merchants in mining towns.

The surrounding area in the immediate vicinity of the city was subordinated to the city authorities and was called *urban land* or *urban metochion*. The term *metochion*, of Greek origin, mostly referred to church estates, although it was also used to define the territories of small or large urban settlements, as well as villages. Data on urban metochion was recorded for Rudnik, Štip, Novo Brdo, and Prizren. Within the urban metochion, the land was well cultivated. There were usually numerous vineyards, vegetable gardens and orchards, while cropland was scarce. Presumably, most of it was located on the periphery of the urban metochion. In this area, the population of the town and the town churches had their estates and houses. It is interesting to note that the urban settlements had incentives for the sale of the agricultural products of the metochions. Larger metochions possessed villages, as can be seen from the examples of the Štip, Rudnik and Novo Brdo metochions, as well as the districts of seaside towns [20].

During the Nemanjić dynasty we cannot speak of a capital in the classical sense

¹ We have tried to present in the description the different types of urban settlements in Serbia during the late Middle Ages. Namely, to describe how the social stratification of society was carried out, and how it was placed by territory; quantitative (statistical) and qualitative (functional and sociological) criteria (such as the administrative role of the city settlement, in relation to a particular territory, which could not be fully respected when creating the typology of the Serbian medieval city); the historical status of the city; the lower limit of the size of the settlement; the organization of some form of urban administration; the structure of the activities of the population, where the connection between agricultural and other activities is relevant. But, if we try to use such broad criteria for the typology of the late Middle Ages, we will see that this statistical analysis is impossible, because there is no documented data on the size of medieval settlements. With regard to the administrative role of urban settlements, the situation is not clear.

of the word. In those times, the rulers were not tied to one particular locality, but were stationed in their palaces located in the most important cities. It should be noted that during certain periods of Serbian medieval history, some of these cities were the central localities. Thus, after the transfer of the center of the Serbian state to Raška, the town of Ras became the central locality. Up to the great territorial expansions which took place at the end of the 13th century, the center of the state remained the region of Ras [19]. During the time of King Milutin his palaces in Pauni, Nerodimlja (Porodimlja), Svrčin and Štimlja are mentioned, as well as palaces in Prizren and Ribnik and a residence near Skadar (Shkodër) [25]. After capturing vast areas in the south, the center of the state became Skopje, where Dušan was crowned king in 1346 and adopted the Law Code in 1349. After the collapse of the Serbian Kingdom, the regional rulers remained in the most important cities in their territories. At that time Kruševac becomes the throne city of Prince Lazar and Moravian Serbia, and Lazar's heirs become attached to the cities. Stefan Lazarević rebuilds Belgrade [13], which becomes his capital, and despot Đurađ Branković erects Smederevo [28]. The specifics of the Serbian state in the 15th century in relation to the earlier period of Serbian history are the throne cities of Belgrade² and Smederevo³. These two urban settlements combined three main functions: throne, administrative and urban. The irony of the historical process is that the Christian idea of the Heavenly Jerusalem as a paradigm for the eternal Christian capital found its full expression in medieval Serbia at the dawn of its historical independent development.

Out of the medieval Serbian capitals, Belgrade is still the best archaeologically researched. Its location near two river beds was used, on the one hand, for defense purposes and, on the other hand, for the construction of a harbor and the development of river navigation. The appearance and spatial structure of Belgrade is described in several extant written records [6, p. 286-288; 12, p. 509-532]. The city was divided into several parts. The most important and the most fortified part was the Inner City – Castle, a fortified complex of the governor's palace. According to the spatial and functional division, it had all the factors of independent defense. The Inner City was surrounded by three specially protected fortifications. The most important among them was the fortification of the Upper Town. It housed both the military unit and the houses, in which lived the nobility and aristocracy. The fortifications of the Lower Town functioned as a fortified settlement or suburb. There was a Church of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary and a Roman Catholic church in the very center of the settlement (most likely in the place where a Franciscan monastery was later erected). The western suburb was connected to the Inner City, providing a direct link to the fortified harbor on the Sava river. The second residence of the Serbian despot was located in this suburb

²The Hungarian King Ladislaus IV gave Belgrade to the Serbian King Dragutin in 1284. The Hungarians regained possession of this significant city in 1319 in fierce battles between King Milutin and Charles Robert. At least twice during the 14th century, the Serbs tried to take it back. After the battle of Angora, the despot Stefan Lazarević entered into vassal relations with the Hungarian King Sigismund. In return he received Belgrade. The despot made Belgrade the capital of his country and the economic and political center. After despot Stefan died, Belgrade was returned to the Hungarians [16, p. 31-43]. For more details about the history of medieval Belgrade see [13].

³It was first mentioned in 1020 as a settlement in the territory of the Braničevo diocese. In the late 14th and early 15th centuries it was mentioned in sources as a trade settlement. It is believed that the fort was built by despot Đurađ Branković. After losing Belgrade in 1427 despot Đurađ Branković built a new capital here [16, p. 264-272].

[22, p. 117-130].

The architects of Belgrade and the subsequent capital, Smederevo, took maximum advantage of the location of the settlement-along the river banks. According to the basic concept, Smederevo was divided into two parts, usually called the Small Town and the Big Town. In the Small Town, at the place where the Jezava river flows into the Danube, there was a palace. On the north and east sides it was defended by the waters of the Danube and the Jezava, while its third side was protected by a dug trench filled with water. The main tower, the donjon, was located in the Small Town, at the highest point where the Jezava river flows into the Danube. Near the tower and the Danube fortress wall was a multi-story palace. Both Big Town and Small Town were protected from all sides by water [28, p. 59-70]. There were also several sacral objects in the Big Town [28, p. 83-100].

As Kruševac, Belgrade and Smederevo became capitals, the political center shifted to the north, while in the south the Serbian state gradually lost old urban-type settlements. These are the ancient Byzantine towns, which continued to exist after the arrival of the Slavs. These towns were incorporated into the Serbian state after the conquests of Stefan Nemanja. They all had their fortifications (*acropolis*, tower) in which the military unit was located. The residence of the governor (*kephale*, voivod) and military governor (*kephale* of the castle, voivod of the castle) was also located in the fortress. On the basis of fragmentary documentary sources we can conclude that in this part there were arsenals, storehouses and dungeons. The sources name a civilian settlement situated near the fortress as *amboria* from the Greek word *emporion* or suburb [26, p. 270-273].

The oldest Serbian fortifications followed the traditions of Byzantine military architecture.⁴ The oldest Serbian fortified towns in the beginning were probably military fortresses of a purely defensive nature, with no civilian settlement. As construction activity intensified in the mid-14th century, the formation of the medieval city also began to change significantly. Civilians now also took part in the defense that led to the emergence of fortified settlements, which became part of the fortification, forming with it a single complex. There were many fortifications throughout Serbia belonging to this group of localities, such as Zvečan [16, p. 112-115], Stalać [16, p. 284-286], Koznik [2], Prokuplje [16, p. 229-231]. These towns were characterized by a clear division of the fortified space in the functional sense. The most defensible space was the inner city – citadel, which could contain the palace of the governor or the courtier and the house of the fortress' chief.

These objects fulfilled an important function in the urban complex, both in their scale, location of premises, and the method of construction. They were imposing buildings designed for living as well as for public activities of rulers, secular and

⁴ Aleksandar Deroko divides fortifications into five groups: fortifications built at strategic points on the border and main communications (Zvečan, Maglić, Ram, Golubac); fortifications protecting mining settlements (Brskovo, Novo Brdo, Ostrovica, Milyt); fortifications protecting settlements, capitals (Belgrade, Smederevo, Prizren, Ohrid, Skopje, Prilep, Kruševac); fortifications protecting monasteries (Resava, Manasija, Ravanica) [4, p. 39].

Ivan Zdravković notes that the ability to defend oneself was crucial in the construction of each fortification. Their fortification depended on what they needed to defend: the capital, a mining or trade settlement, a court, a monastery or something else [5, p. 12].

ecclesiastical authorities. Near the palaces were the outbuildings necessary for their daily functioning. Nearby were also the court churches. As the most important residential buildings, the palaces were mostly built in the inner fortifications (Golubac, Stalać, Koznik, Smederevo) and near the donjon (Maglič, Stalać). Very rarely, they are found as freestanding structures, such as the palace in Stalać. As ancillary structures, chapels or churches, water storages or wells, kitchens, storerooms, and other outbuildings were necessarily present near the palace. These buildings were located along the fortress walls, and together with the palace formed a single whole. Depending on the territorial possibility and configuration of the building area, the construction and erection of a single large building or, in another case, a complex consisting of several separate buildings could be arranged. When this happens inside a building, then the public premises (hall – large hall), private spaces (rooms – living spaces) and ancillary rooms (kitchen, storerooms) are combined. The building is simple in size, rectangular in shape and has a basement and first floor. The first floor usually has a large hall and ancillary rooms, while the upstairs has rooms, or the first floor has kitchens and storerooms, and the upstairs has halls and rooms [24, p. 96; 17, p. 184].

The defense of the inner city was stronger, so there were more towers on the fortress walls. Around these fortifications the suburbs gradually developed as centers of trade and crafts activities. Numerous fortifications and urban settlements became the bearers of the system of public administration. The administration belonged to the local authorities through which the central government collected revenues and regulated trade, crafts and life in the whole city.

Already in the first half of the 13th century a new type of town was developing in Serbia. Those were mining settlements formed thanks to the development of the mining and metallurgy. This development initiated the arrival of Saxon miners, who opened new and restored old mines [27, p. 21-26]. The oldest settlement with which the Saxons are associated is Brskovo [21, p. 80-82]. Except for Brskovo, the towns of Rudnik [16, p. 245-247], Novo Brdo [11] and Srebrenica [15], which were centers of rich mining regions, are also important.

Novo Brdo gradually became a big city, not only the center of mining and metallurgical activity, but also an administrative, trade and crafts center. Novo Brdo had its own territory – metochion. It included an urban-type central settlement and a mine zone with small mining villages [20, p. 142-143]. The Novo Brdo city had its own fortification consisting of the Upper and Lower Town. At the Lower Town, parallel to the western wall, there was a trench intended for the first defense against an attack. To the east of the fortress was an urban settlement, which was not fortified by fortress walls, but rather by wooden paling. Numerous traces of stone walls of buildings and old communications can be seen in this territory. The city center was situated east of the fortress, in the place of the remains of the Cathedral Church. In addition to the Cathedral Church, there were several other small churches in the city. The remains of these small churches were located at a considerable distance from the fortress and the central square, which indicates the presence of parts of the settlement (attached) to the central part of Novo Brdo [11, p. 98-124]. Around the city there was a mining basin which included functioning mines around the cities of Novo Brdo and Janjevo where

lead, silver and alloy of gold and silver were mined. The Novo Brdo complex also included the remains of former mines located in the immediate vicinity of the city, as well as a number of small mining towns scattered around [20, p. 142-143].

Near the mining towns which were formed from the beginning of the 13th century, then in the late 14th and early 15th centuries, another wave of urbanization began conditioned by the development of local trade. "Suburbs" which are most commonly found in Bosnia, developed near castles and fortifications: Podvisoki, Podsoko, Podborać, Podblagaj, Podkukan [14, p. 261-265]. In Serbia this type of settlements was not connected with castles and fortresses, but with markets and fairs. These new small settlements appeared at the foot of fortresses, at crossroads, near caravan stops and periodic fairs (*panajur*). They can be classified as settlements, which in terms of their spatial and demographic characteristics are between villages and fortified towns. Non-agricultural population, craftsmen and traders lived in them. These small settlements most often originated near roads. Some of them did not reach a high level of urbanization, and they differed from nearby rural settlements only in the fact that their population was slightly larger. On the other hand, settlements at the most important crossroads, caravan stops or near mining areas developed into real urban settlements [26, p. 269-270]. This type of urban settlements includes: Prijepolje [16, p. 223-224], Hoča [16, p. 311-312], Trgovište [16, p. 298-299], Valjevo [16, p. 67], Paraćin [16, p. 209-210]... The spatial structure of the medieval Serbian open type settlement is seen by the example of Trgovište. This settlement was erected near the junction of the two rivers of Sebečevo and Raška, at the junction of the roads to Sopočani and Gluhavica. It was built at the end of the second half of the 14th century, and its life continued until the 18th century. Archaeological research revealed 64 houses belonging to different residential (archaeological) layers. The older layer includes about thirty wooden houses and a few stone objects (14th–15th centuries). And the younger layer (15th–18th centuries) includes stone houses. The houses are correctly arranged in two or three rows (levels) along the main road. In terms of internal organization and house size, the following types were distinguished in the older layer: one-story houses (practically square, 14-25 m² in area, with an entrance on the road); two-bedroom houses (square and rectangular, 21-34 m² in area); houses with three or more rooms (about 30-33 m² in area). These types of housing space organization indicate the location of the stove or hearth in the center of the house and the planning of rooms around them. There were areas in front of apartment houses which probably represented entrances. The passages between the houses were rather narrow. Several grouped objects were observed in the spatial organization of the settlements. It was assumed that the owners of these houses belonged to the same family. The first floor was made of broken and partly pressed stone. The floors could be wooden or made of stone combined with wood. The roofs were covered with tiles. The first floor of the house was commercial in nature, while the area of the second floor was intended for living. Quadrangular niches and shelters were found in some of the buildings [18, p. 94-96, 98; 17, p. 87, 174-175, 177-180]. Four churches with necropolis were found and archaeologically researched in the settlement [9].

During the last decades before the disappearance of the Serbian medieval state, the number of urbanized complexes of various sizes and purposes reached a maximum. Some of them disappeared under the raids of the Ottoman invaders. Those that were in strategically important locations, and which represented important economic and administrative centers, continued their life in altered circumstances. In the following centuries, the old Serbian urban settlements became integrated into the political and economic environment of the Ottoman Empire. Changing their urban spatial environment and structure, these cities became part of a new network of Eastern cities on the Balkan Peninsula. The conquered cities continued to live under the Ottomans, gradually adapting to the civilization of the Levant. Somewhere this adaptation was more intense, somewhere – less pronounced. In any case, the introduction of the new Ottoman administration can be characterized as a continuity rather than a rupture of some medieval institutions. Immediately after the conquest, the introduction of the symbols of faith and ideology of the new rulers into an entirely Christian environment began. In the Ottoman view, the city was bound to have a large mosque providing an opportunity to gather and pray on Fridays.

This was the next step in the process of Ottomanization of medieval settlements. Near the cathedral mosque, large cities immediately developed neighborhoods with an extensive commercial infrastructure, with large and small stores and craft workshops. In smaller towns, bazaars and caravanserais were organized near mosques.

Housing districts (mahals) were formed around a new urban core. Usually they were formed near places of worship and were connected by several routes to places of trade. This is a later stage in the development of the Ottoman concept of the city. The population of a single mahal was usually socially connected in some way by confessional affiliation, ethnicity, family ties, or profession. Most mahals were religious and ethnically homogeneous, but there were also mixed mahals. [1, p. 236-240].

References

1. Амедоски, Д. Градска насеља Крушевачког санџака : (XV-XVI век) / Д. Амедоски, В. Петровић. – Београд : Историјски институт, 2018. – 325 с. – (Посебна издања ; 71).
2. Амедоски, Д. Тврђава Козник – од првог помена до краја 16. века / Д. Амедоски, В. Петровић // Војно-историјски гласник. – (2011). – № 2. – С. 127–137.
3. Buser, M, The production of space in metropolitan regions: A Lefebvrian analysis of governance and spatial change / M. Buser // Planning Theory. – (2012). – № 11/3. – С. 279-298.
4. Дероко, А, Старе наше тврђаве, / А. Дероко // Уметнички преглед. – (1937) – № 2. – С. 39-41.
5. Здравковић, И, Средњовековни градови у Србији / И. Здравковић. – Београд : Туристичка штампа, 1970. – 151 с.
6. Јагић, В, Живот Стефана Лазаревића деспота српскога / В. Јагић // Гласник СУД. – (1875) . – № 42. – С. 223-328.

7. Лиречек, К, Историја Срба II / К. Лиречек. – Београд : Просвета, 1988. – 565 с.
8. Jireček, C, Staat und Gesellschaft im Mitelalterischen Serbien : Studien zur Kulturgeschichte des 13.-15. Jahrhunderts. Teil 2 /C. Jireček . – Wien : Hölder, 1912. – 74 с.
9. Јовановић, В. Некрополе средњовековног Трговишта / В. Јовановић, Д. Минић, С. Ерцеговић-Павловић // Новопазарски зборник. – (1990). – № 14. – С. 19-44.
- 10.
11. Јовановић, В, Ново Брдо / В. Јовановић, С. Ћирковић, Е. Зечевић, В. Иванишевић, В. Радић. – Београд: Републички завод за заштиту споменика културе, 2004. – 258 с.
12. Калић, Ј. Европа и Срби : средњи век / Ј. Калић. – Београд : Историјски институт, 2006. – 711 с.
13. Калић-Мијушковић, Ј. Београд у средњем веку / Ј. Калић-Мијушковић. – Београд : Српска књижевна задруга, 1967. – 503 с.
14. Ковачевић-Којић, Д. Градска насеља средњовјековне босанске државе / Д. Ковачевић-Којић. – Сарајево : "Веселин Маслеша", 1978. – 421 с.
15. Ковачевић-Којић, Д. Средњовјековна Сребреница : XIV-XV вијек / Д. Ковачевић - Којић. – Београд : САНУ, 2010. – 312 с.
16. Лексикон градова и тргова средњовековних српских земаља : према писаним изворима. ур. Синиша Мишић. – Београд : Завод за уџбенике, 2010. – 362 с.
17. Милошевић, Г, Становање у средњовековној Србији / Г. Милошевић. – Београд : Археолошки институт, 1997. – 276 с.
18. Минић, С, Нека запажања о градњи кућа у средњовековном Трговишту , / С. Минић // Гласник Српског археолошког друштва. – (1989) . – № 5. – С. 94-100.
19. Мркобрад, Д. Рас-Постење: фазе развоја утврђења / Д. Мркобрад // Зборник радова Византолошког института. – (1997) . – № 36. – С. 203-217.
20. Петровић, В. Градски метох / В. Петровић // Споменица академика Милоша Благојевића (1930–2012) / ур. Синиша Мишић. – Београд : Филозофски факултет, Центар за историјску географију и демографију. 2015. – 139–150 с.
21. Петровић, В. Друштвено раслојавање у српским средњовековним рударским градовима / В. Петровић // Наша прошлост. – (2011). – № 12. – С. 9–17.
22. Popović, M. Beogradska tvrđava / M. Popović. – Beograd: JP "Beogradska tvrđava" : Arheološki institut : Zavod za zaštitu spomenika kulture grada Beograda, 2006. – 334 с.
23. Pušić, Lj. Grad, društvo, prostor: sociologija grada. – Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, 1997. – 447 s.
24. Симић, Г, Палата Голубачког града, / Г. Симић // Саопштења. – (1990-1991). – № 22-23. – С. 77-101.
25. Ћирковић, С. Владарски двори око језера на Косову / С. Ћирковић // Зборник за Ликовне уметности Матице српске. – (1984). – № 20. С. 67-83.

26. Ћирковић, С. Работници, војници, духовници : друштва средњовековног Балкана / С. Ћирковић. – Београд : Equilibrium, 1997. – 516 с.
27. Ћирковић, С. Старо српско рударство / С. Ћирковић, Д. Ковачевић-којић, Р. Ћук. – Београд – Нови Сад : Вукова задужбина и Прометеј, 2002. – 262 с.
28. Цуњак, М. Смедеревска тврђава : новија истраживања / М. Цуњак. – Смедерево : Историјски архив : Висока школа – Академије Српске православне цркве за уметност и конзервацију : Newpress, 2011. – 352 с.

AMEDOSKI D.

The Institute of History, Belgrade, Serbia

SPATIAL ORGANIZATION OF THE OTTOMAN TOWN IN THE 16TH CENTURY – EXAMPLE OF KRUŠEVAC AND PASHA SANDJAKS

The Ottoman conquest of the Balkans brought about far-reaching changes in the position, nature and role of medieval Christian settlements. Towns were the main backbone of the state, particularly in the areas where the Christians made up the majority of the population. The Ottomans carried out a long-term urbanization policy, establishing new spatial and social markers, whose aim was to show changing of the hierarchy in the conquest area and domination of the Ottoman Empire and Islam, as well as the continuity of the ruling dynasty. Thus, Balkan towns entered the sphere of Levantine civilization. [12, p. 95-96, 113; 3, p. 12]. The Ottomans did not change the existing urban concept of the settlement; public and private edifices maintained their place and purpose, while as traffic and water supply networks were still in use.

The way of raising new settlements or reshaping the inherited ones was not static. That was a complex system depending on a lot of factors, previous cultural and historical background and geographical conditions. There are Ottoman towns in Anatolia, Balkans and Middle East, accordingly. [15, p. 1-16].

The spatial organization and transformation of the Balkan settlements into an oriental-urban centers were introduced by preparatory activity of religious foundations – *vaqfs*. The same pattern of transformation was evident in different towns of the Balkan Peninsula.

The construction of the first important buildings of Islamic architecture occurred during the first Ottoman administration in the town. For example, the first sign of the Ottoman supremacy in Pirot, one of the towns in Pasha Sandjak, which was conquered in 1385 was the construction of Sufi lodge. Its construction shifted the focus of urban life of the town. By extending the architectural presence to the periphery, the boundaries of the new Ottoman town were designated. [2, p. 291]. Along the Sufi lodge, in the Ottoman perception of the towns, there had to be a large congregational mosque (*‘Ulû Câmi’*) for gathering and prayer on Friday. [9, p. 161-173]. The mosque was the next step in the process of ottomanization of the medieval town. The main town church was, very often transformed into the congregational mosque, enabling Muslims to gather in the place of worship and express the triumph of Islam at the same time. [5, p. 302-303]. The presumption is that the first Ottoman conqueror of Pirot, Sultan Murad I, founded

the first mosque immediately after the conquest. [2, p. 291].

The construction of the first important building of Islamic architecture in Kruševac, seat of the Sandjak of Alacahisar, occurred during the first Ottoman administration in town. It was the mosque founded by Sultan Murad in the period from 1427-1444 together with *hammâm*. [1, p. 161]. Since Kruševac was chosen to be a seat of the eponymous sandjak, the first civilian administrative buildings were built immediately after the conquest, courthouse and utility buildings. Another two important structures were erected in Kruševac in the early period of the Ottoman rule. Ali-beg Mihaloglu, a famous borderland beg, and *akıncı* commander founded the *zâviye*, while Firuzaga, former commander of Kruševac, established the *mescid*.

The earliest indicator of the Ottoman supremacy in Bitolj, also one of the bigger settlements in Pasha Sandjak, which was conquered in 1385 [15, p. 14]. was the mosque of Sungur Çavuş Bey built in 1435, an example of the Selcuk/Bursa style. [13, p. 67]. In 1430 the first library of Islamic literature was established and subsequently in 1491 town got its first Nakshibendi *tekke*. [10, p. 310].

These were the very first steps made by Ottomans in establishing Ottoman settlements in the Balkans. Erecting of the congregational mosque and bazaar implied conclusion of the first phase in the process of materialization the new commercial core in the reshaped urban center. [5, p. 302-303]. Around newly formed urban core residence quarters (*mahalle*) aroused. [5, p. 323-326]. This is a later stage in the development of the Ottoman concept of a town. [5, p. 23].

Besides the religious center, each transformed Ottoman town had another ambient unit, which complemented the urban image of the town. This was the second phase of urban development which occurred in the first decades of the 16th century. In Pirot it was the Halil-bey's complex. Halil-bey was one of the greatest endowers of Pirot in the latest decade of the 15th century who was aware of the needs of the town that was one of the stops on the Imperial road. Halil-bey recognized the opportunities provided by the proximity of the Constantinople road and the ways in which opportunities could be exploited. Through planned construction of sacred and lucrative buildings, as well as communal infrastructure facilities, he enriched the urban content of the town and thus attracted travelers. In this way the conditions were created for achieving significant revenues from the passengers who were visiting Pirot. By the 1530's he built a mosque, a *hammâm*, caravanserai and bridge. [2, p. 291-292].

In this phase one of the most important vaqfs was founded in Kruševac by a person known by the name of Hacı Mehmed. He founded *mescid* and *mekteb*. Until the fall of Belgrade in 1521, still, the construction of civil facilities and foundations were relatively rare in Kruševac as it was primarily military stronghold. After the transfer of military campaigns into the southern parts of the Hungarian Kingdom, foundations and endowments, presenting an urban development of Kruševac, entered a full development mode. [1, p. 164, 166].

In the beginning of the 16th century Bitolj was on the higher level of urban development in comparison with Pirot and Kruševac. It was more advanced Ottoman city, which was reflected in the numerous mosques and diverse facilities of Islamic architecture. Hence Bitolj was the center of the Islamic school of jurisprudence, one of the

muderrises teaching at that school, named Isa Fakih built a mosque and *medrese* in 1505/506. [4, p. 99-100]. His son Ishak Çelebi was a founder of the largest main mosque in Bitolj built in 1508. The whole mosque complex was ideally situated between the government buildings and the covered market which were connected by the Big Bridge to the other side of the river. [7, p. 79]. The complex consisted of one monumental Friday mosque, a *medrese* with ten rooms, two guesthouses (*musâfirhâne*), a printing workshop, an *imâret* and kitchen, a horse stable and public toilets, the *zâviye* and *mekteb* with a library of 275 volumes and three Qurans. Due to maladministration by the trustees over the centuries, the whole property vanished, except for the mosque building, which is very well preserved. [4, p.102]. After some time Bitolj became richer for one more mosque – Mosque of Hacı Mahmud Bey. The mosque was built in the year 1521-22. In the oldest parts of the *Çarşı* (market), next to the river, he erected his pious mosque with its picturesque complex which comprised a mosque, a *medrese* with religious college, a *mekteb*, library, an inn with its commercial warehouses and a drinking fountain. [4, p. 107]. A few years later Bitolj became richer for one more mosque – Mosque of Hoca Kadı built in 1529. [8, p. 28].

By the end of the 16th-century urban structure of all mentioned towns was formed to a great extent. In that period in Pirot appeared person called Iskender Bey b. Ibrahim who greatly contributed to the improvement of the Ottoman Pirot and influenced the distribution of its population. Namely, after the foundation of his vaqf the town expanded to the south side of the Nišava River. The first building he endowed was a mosque, erected before 1570. In the period until 1585 two more *mescids* were erected within the vaqf, for the sustenance for which he provided funds. He dedicated a part of the land to the Muslims who lived in its vicinity so that they could build their houses there. This initiative probably inspired some of the town's residents to convert to Islam and in that way to get free land. The other part of the land was endowed for a Muslim cemetery. [2, p. 292-293].

In the second half of the 16th century urban space of Kruševac was fulfilled with another two mosques, Hacı Ibrahim's and Mahmud-beg's mosque, three more *mescids* and one *mekteb*. [1, p. 167-168].

One of the crucial facilities for further growth of Bitolj was covered bazaar (*bedesten*) founded in 1541 by grand vezir Daut pasha. [6, p. 62]. It surely gave better working conditions to traders and artisans which were numerous in the town. After a certain period of time two monumental mosques were erected – Mosque of Kadi Mahmud efendi (Yeni Cami) in 1553 and the Mosque of Gazi Haydar Kadi in 1565. They reflect the architectural tendencies of the transitional phases of the Early Ottoman style from Edirne, with strong influences of the Classical Ottoman style, inspired by the school of Hayreddin and Mimar Sinan. [14, p. 157-158]. Mosques of Bitolj and their complexes were built in the same urban and architectural pattern followed throughout the Ottoman Empire. In the front there was usually a fountain for abdest. A small cemetery surrounded the building, reminding rich and poor believers about the after-life. [13, p. 352]. The richness of the facilities in Bitolj, their quality, and various architectural styles noticed in the buildings indicates that Ottoman state policy found it very important settlement.

The transformation of the spatial organization of the urban settlements in the Balkan Peninsula was gradual and carried out through several phases. Waqfs were the pillar of this process. The period from second half of 15th until the end of the sixteenth century was the golden era of urban development of these towns. In the 17th century the process of urbanization was impeded due to frequent wars and armed conflicts. The vicinity of the important roads such as Constantinople Road and Via Egnatia, whose routes were crossing the territories of Sandjaks Pasha and Kruševac was also essential for further development of these urban settlements. They influenced the buildings that were built in the town, the professional orientation of the inhabitants and their transformation from small medieval settlement into an important Ottoman town.

References

1. Амедоски, Д. Оријенталне грађевине Крушевца од османског освајања до краја 16. века / Д. Амедоски // Историјски часопис – (2007) – књ. LV – p. 157–169.
2. Amedoski, D. XVI. Yüzyıl Şehirköy (Pirot) Vakıflarına Genel Bir Bakış / D. Amedoski // Uluslararası Balkan Tarihi ve Kültürü Sempozyumu 6-8 Ekim 2016, Çanakkale. Bildiriler, ed. Aşkın Koyuncu – (2016) – vol. 1 – p. 289–294.
3. Амедоски, Д. Градска насеља Крушевачког санџака : (XV-XVI век) / Д. Амедоски, В. Петровић. – Београд : Историјски институт, 2018. – 325 с. – (Посебна издања ; 71).
4. Ayverdi, E. H. Avrupada Osmanli mimârî eserleri, cild III: Yugoslaviya / E. H. Ayverdi. – Istanbul : İstanbul Fetih Cemiyeti, 1981. – 388 p.
5. Boykov, G. Politics of Religion: Spatial Modification and Transformation of Religious Infrastructures of the Southeastern European Cities in the Late Middle Ages and Early Modern Period / G. Boykov // Städte im lateinischen Westen und im griechischen Osten zwischen Spätantike und Früher Neuzeit, Topographie – Recht – Religion, Herausgegeben von Elisabeth Gruber, Mihailo Popović, Martin Scheutz, Herwig Weigl – Wien : Böhlau, 2016. – p. 299–312.
6. Cezar, M. Typical commercial buildings of the Ottoman Classical period and the Ottoman construction system / M. Cezar. – Istanbul : Türkiye İş Bankası, 1983. – p. 321.
7. Edward Lear in the Levant: Travels in Albania, Greece and Turkey in Europe, 1848-49 / ed. S. Hyman. – London : Murray, 1988. – p. 168.
8. Eyice S, Haydar Kadi Camii / S. Eyice. // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. – (1998). – Cilt 17 – p. 28-29.
9. Faroqi, S. A map of anatolian Friday mosques (1520–535) / S. Faroqi // Osmanlı Araştırmaları. – (1984). – No. 4 – p. 161–173.
10. Kiel, M. Studies on the Ottoman Architecture of the Balkans / M. Kiel. – Aldershot : Brookfield USA, – 1990. – p. 284.
11. Kuban, D. Mahalleler: Osmanlı Dönemi, Dünden Bugüne / D. Kuban // İstanbul Ansiklopedisi. – (1994). – Cilt 5. – p. 242–247.

12. Lowry, H. W. *The Nature of the Early Ottoman State* /H.W. Lowry. – Albany : SUNY Press, – 2003. – p. 210
13. Mihajlovski, R. *The sixteenth century mosques of Bitola/Toli Manastir* / R. Mihajlovski // *Patrimonium. MK.* –No.7 (8) – p. 351–366 .
14. Necipoğlu, G. *The Age of Sinan, architectural culture in the Ottoman Empire* / G. Necipoğlu. – London: Reaktikon Books, – 2005. – p. 157-158
15. Stojanovski, A. *Gradovite na Makedonija od krajot na XIV do XVII vek* / A. Stojanovski. – Skopje : Zavod za unapreduvanje na stopanstvoto vo SRM "Samoupravna praktika", – 1981. –p. 174.
16. *The Ottoman City Between East and West, Aleppo, Izmir and Istanbul* /eds. Edhem Eldem-Daniel Goffman-Bruce Masters// Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, – 1999. – p. 264.
17. Yel, M.A. *Mahalle* / M.A. Yel, M.S. Küçükaşçı // *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*– (2003). – Cilt 27 – p. 323–326.

VULETIĆ A. B.

Institute of History, Belgrade, Serbia

**THE GROWTH OF URBAN POPULATION IN SERBIA 1835–1910.
CHARACTERISTICS AND TENDENCIES**

During the Ottoman rule in Serbia, the Serbian population was largely excluded from the urban life and economy. At the beginning of the 19th century the Serbs lived predominantly in rural areas and dealt with agriculture, while urban areas were inhabited by the Turks/Muslims and members of other ethnic groups – the Greeks, Cincars, Jews etc., who engaged in activities typical of the urban economy – trade and artisanship. The uprisings against the Ottoman Empire (1804–1815) and the political struggle for autonomy (1815–1833) brought about major demographic changes in urban environments: instead of the Turks/Muslims as the hitherto majority population in Serbia's urban settlements, new inhabitants came, mainly the Serbs (along with the members of other ethnic groups such the Greeks, Cincars and Jews, who had already lived in those settlements during the Ottoman rule).

At the time when Serbia gained autonomy, the urban population was scarce. According to the 1835 census, the largest urban settlements were those in the north of the country, on the border or close to the border with the Habsburg Empire – Belgrade (7,033 inhabitants), Šabac (3,018), Smederevo (2,450) and Požarevac (2,303). [3, p. 233; 21, p. 41, 64, 69, 110;] Kragujevac, the capital of Serbia at that time, had only 2,235 inhabitants. Kragujevac was chosen as the capital in 1818, at the start of the struggle for political autonomy, for strategic reasons: it was located in the interior of the country, far from main transportation lines and Turkish military garrisons. After Serbia gained autonomy, the capital was transferred to Belgrade (1841), the largest urban centre. Owing to its geostrategic position – it bordered the Habsburg Monarchy, Belgrade was particularly important for the Serbian state – it was through Belgrade that the bulk of trade with the neighbouring Monarchy took place, and European cultural

influences spread through Belgrade to the rest of Serbia.

The above-mentioned data on the number of inhabitants do not include the remaining Turkish/Muslim population in Serbia. Once dominant in urban settlements, since the early 19th century the number of the Turks/Muslims was decreasing, and as of 1833 they could live only in six fortified towns. The major portion of the Turkish population was concentrated in Belgrade. According to unofficial estimates of the Serbian authorities, in 1836 around 3,500 Turkish inhabitants lived in Belgrade, twice less than the Serbian and other non-Muslim population. The number of Turkish residents gradually dwindled and in 1867 the last subjects of the Ottoman sultan had to leave Serbian towns. [6, p. 337; 11, p. 672]

Up until the second half of the 19th century, there were no clear criteria for the classification of urban and rural settlements in Serbia. In 1866, urban settlements were legally defined and divided into two categories – *varoš* (town) and *varošica* (small town). At the time, 38 places got the status of urban settlements (18 *varošes* and 20 *varošicas*), accounting for 9.5% of the population of Serbia. [13, p. 103] The status of *town* was given only to the county seats. Only criterion for defining the towns was the administrative function of the settlement, while the number of inhabitants and their economic activity were not taken into account. [9, p. 36] The status of *small towns* was mainly determined by the dominant activity of their inhabitants; those were settlements with developed trade and artisanship, and played a mediating role between villages and towns. The number of inhabitants of urban settlements was highly uneven. In 1874, Belgrade, as the largest urban centre, had 27,605 inhabitants, while Gornji Milanovac was the smallest settlement with the town status with only 1,092 people. As many as 13 settlements with the status of *small towns* had more inhabitants than Gornji Milanovac; the largest among them – Paraćin (4,836 inhabitants) and Svilajnac (4,099) had as much as four times more people. [14, p. 142–145]. While Gornji Milanovac was a new settlement, especially constructed as the county seat in the mid-19th century, the said *small towns* were located on the most important communication lines in the country, which was conducive to the development of trade and artisanship, and thus their demographic development as well.

In 1878, four counties in the south, hitherto belonging to the Ottoman Empire, became part of the Principality of Serbia. The share of the urban population in these counties was higher than in the remainder of the country. The larger presence of the urban population suggests that the urban economy was more developed in the counties hitherto under the Ottoman rule, compared to the counties which had been for almost half a century within the autonomous Serbian state. At the time of its incorporation in the Principality of Serbia, the town of Niš with 12,800 inhabitants became the second largest urban settlement in the country. The relocation from one state to another did not reflect significantly on the rise in the number of urban inhabitants – in 1910 Niš was still the second largest urban centre in Serbia. [2, p. 137–38; 15, p. 54–55; 16, p. 111]

Until 1910, the number of urban settlements rose to 85 and the share of urban in total population of Serbia went up to 13.1%. The analysis of urban population growth in the 19th century shows that the economic functions of settlements played a more important role than administrative functions. For instance, in the first half of the 19th

century, the strongest population growth took place in urban communities in the north of the country, where trade with neighbouring Austria was developed. In the second half of the 19th century, Kragujevac – a town in the middle of the country, recorded higher population growth than those communities, owing to its industrial development. The population of Kragujevac increased much faster during the period when it was the industrial centre of Serbia than in the prior period when it served as the country's political and administrative centre. [4, p. 99–105; 16, p. 110]

The Belgrade population rose at the fastest pace – it went up 13 times compared to 1834. With 91,000 inhabitants in 1910, Belgrade was the most populous settlement in Serbia, with four times more people than Niš, the second largest urban centre. [16, p. 110–111] However, the impression about its size did not surpass Serbia's borders. In European terms, at the start of the 20th century, judging by the number of inhabitants, Belgrade was among the smallest European capitals. Leaving aside the capitals of developed European countries, in 1910 the following capitals of the Southeast European countries had more inhabitants than Belgrade: Sofia (103,000), Athens (167,000) and Bucharest (341,000). [10, p. 76–78]

After giving a general overview of Serbia's urban development in the 19th century, we shall consider urban population growth within the scheme of "urban transition". The concept of urban transition implies two phases of development. The first phase consists of rural-urban migrations. In this phase, the mortality rates in urban milieus are higher than in rural, the natural population increase is negative and the population rises primarily owing to migrations. In the second phase, mortality rates decline below those in rural environments and the natural population increase turns from negative to positive values. As a result, urban settlements become capable of autonomous demographic development although migrations are still important for the increase in their population. [1, c. 53–60] A specificity of urban migrations in Serbia is that they unfolded from two directions. At the time of gaining autonomy, the largest number of urban immigrants originated from urban settings in the neighbouring empires – the Ottoman and Habsburg. These immigrants (mostly merchants, artisans and clerks) were looking for a chance for business success in the new milieu. In the mid-19th century, the number of them began to decline and the number of immigrants from rural areas of Serbia was on the rise. In 1874, only 8.7% of urban inhabitants were born outside Serbia. Most of them lived in the newly established mining centre Majdanpek (36.5%), followed by Belgrade (28.3%). [9, c. 38–39; 14, c. 142–145] Migrations from rural areas continued in the coming period, at varying intensity. In regard to the second phase of urban demographic transition – the reduction in mortality and a switch from a negative to positive natural population increase, the first available data originate from 1862–1887 and concern Belgrade. During the 1860s, mortality rates in Belgrade were by 12‰ higher compared to entire Serbia. They entered a decline in the '70s (falling at a stronger pace than in rural environments), but kept values above the Serbia average in the '80s when mortality was declining both in urban and rural areas. [3, c. 210–211, 215; 8, c. 1–65; 12, 58–69; 18, c. XXI, XLIII, LXIV] Data about the natural population increase for the 1890–1905 period are classified by urban and rural areas. In this period, the mortality rate in urban areas was by 2‰ higher on average than in rural areas.

Overall, the natural population increase was positive in urban settlements, but was smaller than in villages due to birth rates lower by 12.5%. In Belgrade, the largest and most developed urban centre, the natural population increase was negative throughout the whole period, although the mortality rate was on a gradual decline. In Niš and Kragujevac, other two second largest urban centres, the natural population increase was negative in the majority of the years observed, which means that demographic development in larger urban settlements still relied primarily on migratory movements. [19, c. 184–190; 20, c. 204–209; 21, c. 224–227]

Apart from short-term effects, such as the increase in the number of inhabitants, migrations to urban settlements bring about long-term effects as well – changes in the age and gender structure of the urban population. Adult male population of active working and biologically reproductive age participate in migrations in the first place. The difference in the age structure of the urban and rural population in Serbia was observed already in the mid-19th century. The most numerous category of inhabitants in urban area constituted those of younger, active working age – from 16 to 30 years, while young, non-working age individuals accounted for the majority in rural areas. [5, c. 59–72; 7, c. 249–265] The difference in the age structure was noted as well in 1890: the working-age population accounted for 61% in urban vs. 52% in rural areas. The consequence of migratory movements in the 19th century was also a higher share of men not only in the urban, but in total population of Serbia as well. The predominance of male population was the most evident just after the country gained autonomy, but it declined in time. The largest proportional share of men was recorded in Belgrade, followed by Kragujevac as the industrial centre of the country. (In 1834, men accounted for 60% of the Belgrade population. In 1910, the share of men dropped to 57%, including soldiers and convicts, or 54% excluding these two categories). The largest disproportion between men and women was noted in the category of active working population – aged from 16 to 45, who were the most active participants in migrations. [5, c. 59–72; 16, c. 110; 22, c. 64]

Based on the above data, it may be concluded that in the late 19th and early 20th century, at the time when urban transition was completed in the majority of developed European countries, the second phase of this process was still ongoing in Serbia. The characteristics of urban transition came to the fore most notably in larger urban centres, while being less pronounced in smaller settlements, whose structure more resembled rural than large urban settlements.

References

1. Vries, Jan de. Problems in the Measurement, Description, and Analysis of Historical Urbanization / AD van der Woude, A. Hazami, J. de Vries // *Urbanization in History, A Process of Dynamic Interactions* – Clarendon Press Oxford, 1995. – С. 43–60.
2. Вулетић. А. Демографске карактеристике становништва нових округа у време присаједињења Кнежевине Србији / А. Вулетић // *Од турске касабе до модерног града преко Берлина и Версаја*. Пирот : Историјски архив у Пироту, 2018. – С. 129–140.

3. Вулетић, А. Демографски капацитети / В. Јовановић, А. Вулетић, М. Самарцић // Наличја модернизације. Српска држава и друштво у време стицања независности. Београд : Историјски институт, 2018. – С. 141–286.
4. Вулетић, А. Живети у Крагујевцу / Р. Ј. Поповић, А. Вулетић, П. Илић // Престони Крагујевац. Крагујевац : Друштво историчара Шумадије, 2019. – С. 97–175.
5. Вулетић, А. Старосна структура становништва Србије у 19. веку / А. Вулетић // Зборник Матице српске за историју. – 2016. – № 94. – С. 59–72.
6. Vuletić A., Delić N. Population of Belgrade as a Focus of Political and Administrative Interest in the Mid-19th Century / S. Rudić, S. Aslantas, D. Amedoski // Belgrade 1521–1867 – The Institute of History. Yunus Emre Enstitüsü, Turkish Cultural Centre, 2018. – С. 327–346.
7. Јакшић В. Число и покрет људства у Београду / В. Јакшић // Гласник Друштва српске словесности. –1855. – № VII. – С. 249–265.
8. Кретање људства у Србији од 1874. до 1879. године // Државопис Србије XV – Београд 1889. – С. 1–65.
9. Миљковић-Катић Б. Структура градског становништва Србије средином XIX века / Б. Миљковић-Катић – Београд : Историјски институт, 2002. – С. 223.
10. Mitchell, V. R. European Historical Statistics 1750-1970 / V. R. Mitchell – London : Macmillan Press, 1975. – С. 827.
11. Перуничкић, Б. Београдски суд 1819–1839 / Б. Перуничкић – Београд : Историјски архив Београда, 1964. – С. 835.
12. Покрет људства Србије кроз дванаест година, од 1862 до 1873 // Државопис Србије VIII – Београд 1874. – С. 43–121.
13. Попис људства Србије у години 1866. // Државопис Србије III. – Београд, 1869. – С. 1 – 123.
14. Попис људства Србије у години 1874-ој // Државопис Србије IX. – Београд, 1879. – С. 1–153.
15. Попис људства у ослобођеним крајевима // Државопис Србије XI – Београд, 1882. – С. 1–57.
16. Претходни резултати пописа становништва и домаће стоке у Краљевини Србији 31. децембра 1910. године – Београд : Управа Државне статистике, 1911., 113 с.
17. Статистика Краљевине Србије I/5 – Београд : Управа Државне статистике, 1893. XXII, LIII.
18. Статистика рођења, венчања и умирања у Краљевини Србији од 1880. до 1887. године // Државопис Србије XVII – Београд 1893. – С. 1–681.
19. Статистички годишњак Краљевине Србије IV – Београд : Управа Државне статистике, 1902. – С. 778.
20. Статистички годишњак Краљевине Србије VI – Београд : Управа Државне статистике, 1904. – С. 746.
21. Статистички годишњак Краљевине Србије X – Београд : Управа Државне статистике, 1907. – С. 842.

22. Цвијетић, Л. Попис становништва и имовине у Србији 1834. године / Л. Цвијетић // Мешовита грађа – Miscellanea. – 1984. – № 13. – С. 1–118.

MILJKOVIĆ KATIĆ B. M.

Institute of History, Belgrade, Serbia

INFLUENCE OF METROPOLITAN FUNCTIONS ON THE URBAN DEVELOPMENT OF THE CITY: KRAGUJEVAC IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE 19TH CENTURY

Kragujevac which became the capital in 1918 when Prince Miloš Obrenović moved there from the village of Crnuče with his family and officials of the “permanent chancellery”, is a vivid example of the influence of metropolitan functions on the urban development of a city [11, p. 22]. The capital was created gradually even in the case of the permanent residence of the princely family, the transfer of state institutions and the formation of the court [17, p. 17, 21]. However, in terms of urbanism the influence of metropolitan functions was immediately obvious and remained strong, not only when Kragujevac was the capital, but also later.

Kragujevac suffered considerable damage to its urban structure during the uprisings of 1804–1815. It was burned in both the First and Second Serbian Uprisings. During the time of full Turkish domination, it was the center of the nation, a linear-type town, with one main street, which was at the same time the trade center, the *čaršija* (bazaar) [18, p. 122, 127, 138–139; 1, p. 289; 9, p. 38, 67–68]. The bazaar started higher than the so-called “Cross” and stretched to the ditch with a rampart (*šanac*) and around it to the banks of the Lepenica [5, p. 46, 49; 16, p. 45]. With the transfer of the capital to Kragujevac in 1818–1819, radical changes took place in the urban structure of the town – it became bicentric. By building palaces (so called *konak*) and forming a palace complex, two separate urban zones were formed in the urban core around which Kragujevac developed: a residential zone around the palaces and a trade zone at the place of the former *čaršija*. These two zones differed not only functionally, but also architecturally.

The *čaršija*, as in other Turkish towns (*palanka*), was small. The houses were located along a winding street; on the side of the street there were usually stores, and behind the houses there were home grounds [16, p. 44; 18, p. 147]. The houses were built of poor material, covered with straw, low, many of them with only one room, and most of the plots were fenced with high fences. The houses of the more wealthy inhabitants were more solidly built and fenced with a brick wall [15, p. 180–182; 19, p. 67; 4, p. XI; 5, p. 48; 18, p. 146, 148].

The palace complex was built on the private land of Prince Miloš Obrenović [17, p. 19], on an undeveloped space, on the left bank of the Lepenica, near the bridge, the former *šanac* and mosque, far from the *čaršija*, separated by a wide space, called “around the Cross” [12, p. 28; 21, 299]. The complex consisted of several palaces-konaks (Princely Konak/Men’s Konak, Konak of Princess Ljubica/Women’s Konak/of different colors, Amidža Konak) built in the so-called Balkan style in 1817–1820. The

palaces were enclosed by palisades [17, p. 19–21; 18, p. 147]. The prince and his family lived in these palaces, which housed state institutions and their employees, as well as servants and artisans working for the prince and the state needs [11, p. 267, 491–492, 494; 2, p. 171]. Although the palaces were randomly scattered (even one was on the other side of the river [5, p. 50]), they represented one complex – a princely court. As in the palaces in Belgrade and Požarevac there were military units attached to them, that enhanced the ceremonial and state character of the complex [7, p. 305; 12, p. 29; 14, p. 134; 17, p. 18–22]. Some small and large outbuildings (dairy, stables, barn, watermill, bread oven, corral) were erected around the palaces [11, p. 40–41, 204–205, 429; 17, p. 20, 28, 34].

The urbanistic concept of the palace complex in Kragujevac basically corresponded to the traditional concept of a rural manor of wealthy landlords, with the main house, houses for living (so-called *vajat*), outbuildings and a fence separating the manor from arable land of the estate [8, p. 131]. The prince in Kragujevac had a similar manor with arable land. Not far from the palace complex there was a pasture for horses; elsewhere in Kragujevac he had vegetable gardens, orchards, meadows, fields, a corral for deer and fallow deer [7, p. 306; 11, p. 257, 447, 474; 17, p. 19]. And other inhabitants of the city had farmsteads and arable lands, and thus in the middle of the 1820s Kragujevac gave the impression that it “did not differ from the village in anything” [15, p. 148, 156].

The location of the palace complex in an area (remote from the existing commercial center) encouraged private construction in its vicinity. Prince Miloš also contributed to this by ordering officials to buy plots and build houses near the residence complex, and to some of them, he himself sold or donated plots [18, p. 148, 153]. Representatives of the local and central administration (city prince Dana, court administrator Sima Milosavljević Paštrmac and others) built houses here [11, p. 64; 13, p. 15]. In this way new streets and a new city appeared around the palace complex, often referred to in the literature as “Kragujevac of Prince Miloš” [13, p. 11]. Already in the thirties the first urbanistic steps outside the palace complex were taken – the street line was drawn so that the objects went to the regulation line [18, p. 191; 21, p. 304–305]. Then they established the directions of streets which exist up to date [6, p. 203]. In this way in urbanistic terms the city corresponded to modern European urban planning and design, and its contemporaries stressed that it was “beautiful and well-appointed” [20; p. 78].

The creation of the palace complex also prompted the construction of public buildings close to it, first of all the church (1818–1819), and later the buildings of other institutions [13, p. 29; 21, p. 300, 303; 17, p. 19, 36; 6, p. 203–204]. The public buildings were built not in the business center – *čaršija*, as it was usual in other Serbian cities [9, p. 63], but near the courtyard, the complex of which differed in size and quality of objects. There were military facilities close to and across the river [17, p. 36, 64–65], and from the 1850s onwards also industrial ones. In the middle of the 19th century these buildings were built in the European style and contributed to the modification of the prevailing Ottoman-Balkan architectural model [7, p. 301–302, 305; 21, p. 301, 303; 10, p. 195]. However, the European architectural models did not mean also the

adoption of the European urbanistic models, that is proper structuring of the urbanistic elements. These buildings, and later erected industrial objects, were arranged according to the layout close to the “Balkan tradition”, although they were not supposed to fit into the existing urban structure. They formed not a square, but an urban core around a very wide elliptical space (with barely visible forms of a square), later called “Miloš wreath” [21, p. 300; 1, p. 290–300; 7, p. 307–308]. Because of this urbanistic concept the city was not integrated until the First World War, so that it remained polycentric even in the first half of the 20th century [1, p. 290; 21, p. 305; 9, p. 38–39, 68].

So, the predominant activity of people form settlements. Metropolitan functions influenced the demographic and economic development of Kragujevac [3, p. 102–103], but the faster development of *čaršija* based on additional business circumstances was not enough that trade and craft affairs contributed to the integration of urban structures, not only in the middle of the 19th century. The example of Kragujevac shows that the formation, economic and urban development of cities in Serbia was dominated by their administrative functions, and in relation to Kragujevac – by metropolitan functions.

References

1. Андрејић, Ж. Историјске градске целине као урбана језгра Крагујевца XIX века // Крагујевац у другој половини деветнаестог века, научни скуп, књ. 2, Шумадијски анали, посебна издања, зборник радова са научног скупа одржаног 2. децембра 2008. године у Крагујевцу / ред.: Б. Радовановић, П. Илић. – Крагујевац : Историјски архив Шумадије – Крагујевац, 2010. – С. 287–296.
2. Вујић, Ј. Путешествије по Србији, књ. I / Београд : Српска књижевна задруга, књ. 66. – 1901. – 226 с.
3. Вулетић, А. Живети у Крагујевцу / Престони Крагујевац / Р. Ј. Поповић, А. Вулетић, П. Илић. – Крагујевац : Друштво историчара Шумадије, 2019. – С. 97–175.
4. Давидовић, Д. Дѣла Димитрія Давидовића, књ. I / История народа србскогъ (печатана у Виѣни године 1821.) / ред.: I. Хацић-Светић / Београд : Григорие Возаровић, 1846. – 160 с.
5. Дробњаковић, Б. М. Крагујевац // Гласник Српског географског друштва. – 1926. – № 12. – С. 44–64.
6. Илић, П. Стварати у Крагујевцу / Престони Крагујевац / Р. Ј. Поповић, А. Вулетић, П. Илић. – Крагујевац : Друштво историчара Шумадије, 2019. – С. 177–263.
7. Каниц, Ф. Србија, земља и становништво од римског доба до краја XIX века, књ. I / Београд : Српска књижевна задруга, 1991⁵. – 720 с.
8. Којић, Ђ. Б. Стара градска и сеоска архитектура у Србији / Београд : Просвета, 1949. – 188 с.
9. Macura, V. Čaršija i gradski centar. Razvoj središta varoši i grada Srbije XIX i XX veka / Niš : „Gradina“, Kragujevac : „Svetlost“, 1984. – 275 с.
10. Макуљевић, Н. Османско-српски Београд: визуелност и креирање градског идентитета (1815–1878) / Београд : Тору, 2014. – 251 с.

11. Марковић, Р. Крагујевачка нахија 1815–1839, св. I, 1815–1827. / Књажевска канцеларија, књ. II, Грађа, књ. V, св. 1 / ред.: Р. Марковић. – Београд : Државна архива НР Србије, 1954. – 625 с.
12. Марковић, Р. П. Питање престонице у Србији кнеза Милоша / Београд : Задужбина Луке Теловића Требињца, 1938. – 134 с.
13. Марковић, Р. П. Црква кнеза Милоша у Крагујевцу / Крагујевац : Управа Крагујевачке црквене општине, 1955. – 84 с.
14. Митровић, К. Топчидер, двор кнеза Милоша Обреновића / Београд : Историјски музеј Србије, 2008. – 212 с.
15. Нинковић, Н. Жизниописанија моја (1807–1842) / ред.: Т. Поповић / s.a.s.l. [Нови Сад : Матица српска, 1972]. – 431 с.
16. Поповић, М. Д. Крагујевац и његово привредно подручје – прилог привредној и социјалној географији града и околине / Београд : Српска академија наука, посебна издања, књ. ССXLVI : Географски институт књ. 8. – 1956. – 411 с.
17. Поповић, Р. Ј. Владати у Крагујевцу / Престони Крагујевац / Р. Ј. Поповић, А. Вулетић, П. Илић. – Крагујевац : Друштво историчара Шумадије, 2019. С. 11–95 .
18. Радовановић, Б. Историја Крагујевца од најстаријих времена до 1944. године / Крагујевац : Б. Радовановић, 2017. – 819 с.
19. Рихтер, В. Прилике у Србији под кнезом Милошем до његове абдикације 1839. године, приказ најновијих догађаја, карактеристика српског народа и топографска скица Кнежевине / Крагујевац: Светлост, 1984. – 128 с.
20. Тирол, Д. П. Политическо землђописание за употребленіе србске младежи / Београд : Књажескко-Србска књигопечатња, 1832. – 175 с.
21. Трифуновић, В. Промена градитељских образаца у Крагујевцу у XIX веку / Крагујевац у другој половини деветнаестог века, научни скуп, књ. 2, Шумадијски анали, посебна издања, зборник радова са научног скупа одржаног 2. децембра 2008. године у Крагујевцу / ред.: Б. Радовановић, П. Илић / Крагујевац : Историјски архив Шумадије. – 2010, С. 297–315.

DELIC N.

Историјски институт Београд, Србија

FROM DIVERSITY TO UNIFORMITY.

TOWNS AND TOWNSHIP IN SERB-INHABITED AREAS OF THE HAPSBURG EMPIRE DURING THE SECOND HALF OF THE 19TH CENTURY – CHANGE OF STATUS LAW AND LEGAL DEFINITION

Before the Revolution of 1848/49 the Serbian population of the Hapsburg Empire inhabited areas which belonged to 7 different political entities. Those entities were to a certain degree autonomous regions with semi-independent legislature, government and political system. The status of towns and township differed from region to region. In the Kingdom of Hungary (with Croatia and Slavonia) important towns acquired the

privilege of “free royal cities” since the middle ages. The privileges, issued by the ruler alone, promoted the towns into separate political entities, with demarcated territory and administratively independent from the surrounding Counties. Actually, a “royal free city” had almost the same status in the Hungarian political system as a County. Self-governance, self-regulation of internal matters and fixed representation in the supreme legislative body of the Kingdom were granted. Immigration caused significant population increase in the towns, but the privilege to become a town-citizen in full legal capacity could only be approved by the city’s self-government bodies. Since the rights given by the ruler were not unified, every “royal free city” had its own and unique system of self-regulation and a specific relationship with the central administration. This caused every single “royal free city” developing its own and specific “city lifestyle” and individual identity. [10, c. 131–142; 7, c. 96–97; 4, c. 2–200] The cities in the Kingdoms of Slavonia and Croatia (as parts of the Hungarian crown) were organized in a similar way, being under control of the King but the Banal administration in Zagreb as well. [1, c. 212–223]

In the Military Frontier the “free military communities” were analogue to the “royal free cities” in Hungary proper. On the other hand, the communities were neither free nor independent at all. They could be established and abolished due to the wishes of the military. Self-government was rather of symbolic and consultative character. The real political power and decision-making capacity remained in the hands of the military which appointed all of the city’s mayors (commanding officers) and was in full control over all aspects of “everyday city life”. The Statutes, regulating the internal life of the communities, were not privileges issued by the ruler for eternity, but just ordinary decrees of the Supreme military command of the Military Frontier. The main purpose of the communities, according to the plans of the Viennese central command, was to supply the mostly rural Military Frontier with special and imported goods, craft products and services necessary for normal everyday life of the “frontiersman”. All other, typically urban institutions such as theatres, libraries, restaurants, hotels, newspapers and print shops were not on the list of priorities. Until the mid-19th century huge differences in urban structure between the communities could be identified. Most of them were not more than “big villages”, lacking typically urban architecture, institutions, economy and social life patterns. Serbs comprised the majority of the population in the larger and far more advanced communities in the east (Pančevo, Zemun etc). [1, c. 233–234, 235, 237–246; 2, c. 183–184, 187–188, 197; 5, c. 120–121; 3, c. 145, 149; 8, c. 295, 302–304] Serbs lived in the Kingdom of Dalmatia too, but they were significant only in the southern urban settlements (Kotor, Herceg Novi and Budva). Bosnia and Herzegovina, with a strong Serbian urban population, was occupied by Austria-Hungary in 1878 but became officially part of the Empire in 1908. The Revolution in 1848/49 and the restoration of the “old regime” afterwards changed the political system in the whole Empire. During the era of “Bach’s absolutism” (1851–1859) centralization was the main policy of the Viennese government.

The Empire was officially reorganized, the Counties in Hungary lost their political power and the “royal free cities” were strongly supervised by government officials. After the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867, centralization remained the ultimate

policy in Hungary, but now carried out by Budapest and not Vienna. The Law of 1870 established a supervisor appointed by the government to each city with self-government rights, with full authority to change all decisions made by the city's representative bodies. "Royal free cities" were actually renamed "cities with municipal rights", but the old and prestige designation could still be used. The law introduced the "cities with established Magistrate" as a form of less important towns, with limited self-government and directly subordinated to the Counties. In 1876 the system was reorganized and 28 former "royal free cities" together with 19 "cities with municipal rights" were degraded to "cities with established Magistrate". This meant that 28 formerly separate political entities, with a long standing tradition of self-government, own territory and unique regulations of internal life became nothing more than ordinary administrative units, controlled and instructed by the central government. The number of "cities with municipal rights" was restricted to 25 by Law in 1886. [4, c. 105–201; 12, c. 178–205; 13, c. 118–153; 14, c. 285–287]

The development of cities in the Kingdoms of Croatia and Slavonia followed almost the same pattern as in Hungary proper. During the 1850's and 1860's the central government in Zagreb took over most of the judicial and administrative prerogatives of the towns, sometimes giving them back to them in sense of "temporary transfer of rights". In 1874 the "royal free cities" lost all of their judicial privileges, and finally in 1895 all cities were transformed in "urban communes". The cities have become subordinated to the Counties and the Banal government in Zagreb, which could easily overrule all decisions made by the city's political bodies, install new and non-elected representatives, mayors etc. The central government was responsible for all more important issues (the city's property, main infrastructure etc.). [1, c. 264–266, 274, 294–295; 11, c. 219–254] In the Military Frontier first preparations for its dissolution were made during the era of "Bach's absolutism". Prior to that, the "military communities" were transformed into "urban communes" in 1862 and finally into regular towns/cities in 1871. Until 1881 the territories of the Military Frontier were incorporated step by step into the Kingdoms of Croatia, Slavonia and Hungary proper, and the cities lost all of the judicial privileges and became part of the already existing and consolidated systems. [2, c. 184–190, 197; 5, c. 121; 9, c. 123–129] The development of the cities in the second half of the 19th century shows a clear pattern. Instead of a lot of different systems, unique internal life, separate identity and moderate political power on whole-country level, the urban areas were degraded into simple administrative units. Prior to the Revolution of 1848/49 the "royal free cities" were separate territories, with privileges issued by the ruler alone. Legally, they were more or less responsible only to the King and not to the Diets of the Counties or the Kingdoms. On the other hand, still part of the Empire, they had the privilege to send representatives to the Diets, and influence the political life of the country.

After the reforms, and specially the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867, the term "royal free city" had no real meaning anymore. It prevailed as a designation of prestige and honour, but legally the cities were neither free nor "royal" any more. The legal status of urban settlements was now fully incorporated into the constitutional system of the Kingdom of Hungary. Instead of the King, the cities were responsible and

subordinated to the governments in Budapest and Zagreb. The Diets, the central government, the Counties and even some Districts were now in charge to prescribe the main development plans of the cities and to issue direct orders to resolve urban problems. There was no need for an immigrant to obtain special “town citizenship” to get full political and economic rights any longer. This had implications on immigration policies and change in population structure and political orientation of the cities. Centralization led automatically to more uniformity. Laws regulating the political system in urban settlements and the handling of communal problems were binding for all cities. Old privileges, such as judicial prerogatives, tax or conscription exemptions, specific economic rights etc. were abolished. Certain differences remained, but in general, all cities were now part of a universal and uniform system which led them to function and even visually look the same. It should be mentioned that the centralization policy of the government obviously had the intention to create a “homogenous” country in every sense. Some Hungarian politicians even considered the cities as the most effective “tools” in the desired and supported process of assimilation of wider areas. [6, c. 207–260; 4, c. 222.] Thus self-governance and the “individuality” of the cities were treated as “obstacles” for the process of integration and unification of the country.

References

1. Beuc I. Povijest institucija državne vlasti Kraljevine Hrvatske, Slavonije i Dalmacije: Pravnopovijesne studije / Ivan Beuc – Zagreb : Pravni fakultet, Centar za stručna usavršavanja i suradnju s udruženim radom, 1985. – 403 c.
2. Bergmayr F. Verfassung der kaiserlich-königlichen Militär-Gränze und Oesterreichischen Kriegs-Marine / Franz Bergmayr – Wien : самиздат, 1845. – 330 c.
3. Buczynski A. Gradovi Vojne krajine 1 / Alexander Buczynski – Zagreb : Hrvatski institut za povijest, 1997. – 356 c.
4. Deák E. Das Städtewesen der Länder der ungarischen Krone (1780–1918), Pt. 1: Allgemeine Bestimmung der Städte und der städtischen Siedlungen. In Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Wirtschafts-, Sozial und Stadtgeschichte, No. 3. / Ernő Deák – Wien : Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1979. – 227 c.
5. Делић Н. Инструкција за полицијске службенике војних комунитета из 1833. године / Нино Делић // *Miscellanea – Мешовита грађа*. – 2015. – № 36. – С. 119–139.
6. Делић Н. Брошура „Мађаризација и помађаривање, са посебним освртом на наше градове” Густава Бекшича / Нино Делић // *Споменица Историјског архива „Срем”* – 2011. – № 10. – С. 207–260.
7. Delić N. Slobodné kráľovské mesto Nový Sad 1748-1918. Od hraničiarске usadlosti k modernému ekonomickému, kultúrному a politickému centru / Nino Delić // *Stredoeurópske mesto ako politické, hospodárske a kultúrne centrum / Acta Facultatis Philosophicae Universitatis Šafarikianae. Studia Historica 72 / Pavol Kacvinský, Nikoleta Dzurikaninová (eds.) – Košice : Univerzita Pavla Jozefa Šafárika v Košiciach, 2015. – С. 94–105.*

8. Hietzinger C. B. Statistik der Militärgränze des österreichischen Kaiserthums, III Buch / Carl B. Hietzinger – Wien : Carl Gerold Verlag, 1823. – c. 668.
9. Hostinek J. Die K. K. Militär-Grenze, ihre Organisation und Verfassung, Buch I / Josef Hostinek – Wien : Kaiserlich-königliche Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1861. – 441 c.
10. Steeger J. von, Darstellung der Rechte und rechtlichen Gewohnheiten der königlichen freyen Städte in Ungarn, Teil 1 / Johann von Steeger – Wien : Bauer und Dirnböck, 1834. – 259 c.
11. Zakon ob ustroju gradskih obćinah u kraljevinah Hrvatskoj i Slavoniji, Broj 34 / Sbornik zakonah i naredabah valjanih za Kraljevine Hrvatsku i Slavoniju, Godina 1895 (Komad I–XXI. Broj 1–90) – Zagreb : Narodne novine, 1895. – C. 219–254.
12. XLII. Gesetzartikel vom Jahre 1870 über die Regelung der Munizipien (Jurisdictionen) / Landesgesetz-Sammlung: für das Jahr 1870 – Pest : 1871. – C. 178–205.
13. XVIII. Gesetzartikel vom Jahre 1871 über die Regelung der Gemeinden / Landesgesetz-Sammlung: für das Jahr 1871 – Pest : 1872. – C. 118–153.
14. XX. Gesetz-Artikel vom Jahre 1876 über die Aufhebung einiger städtischer Municipien / Landesgesetz-Sammlung: für das Jahr 1876 – Pest 1876. – C. 285–287.

POPOVIĆ R. J.

Institute of History, Belgrade, Serbia

IMPACT OF MILITARY CONSTRUCTION ON THE URBANIZATION OF VAROŠES IN THE PRINCIPALITY OF SERBIA IN THE MIDDLE OF THE XIX CENTURY

The process of liberation of the Serbian people from centuries-old Ottoman domination, initiated with the First Uprising in 1804, had a significant impact on the transformation of the ethno-national, social and spatial structure of urban settlements in Serbia. At the beginning of the XIX century, there were three types of settlements in the territory of the Pashalik of Belgrade, which is the beginning of modern Serbia: cities (grads), varošes (towns) and villages. The term “grad” refers to large settlements surrounded by fortified walls. Varošes, in turn, had no fortifications, but were administrative and commercial centers. Cities and varošes were mainly populated by Muslims, villages – by Christians, i.e., Serbian population [1, p. 134–137]. Because of the hostilities during the Serbian Revolution, Muslims began to leave, and the Order of Sultan as of 1830 forbade them to remain in varošes and in areas outside the fortified cities. Despite this, the Muslim population remained in Belgrade, Šabac, Užice and Sokol until the sixties of the XIX century [7, p. 8].

In 1830 the Principality of Serbia became an autonomous part of the Ottoman Empire. In 1863 there were 1,108,668 people living on an area of 37,740 km², of which 91.19% were rural and 8.81% were urban [12, p. 53]. A distinctive feature of that time was the parallel existence of the Serbian and Ottoman power which lasted until 1867. The mentioned historical circumstances influenced the determination of two periods in the urbanization process of Serbia: the first period in 1831–1861 when new varošes

were created (Donji Milanovac, Lesnica, Gornji Milanovac, Bajina Bašta, etc.); and the second period in 1861–1914 when old cities and varošes were reconstructed and received European forms and features instead of oriental ones [8, p. 14]. Accordingly, the presence of Ottoman troops in the fortified cities of Serbia, living of Muslim population, vassal position of the state and economic circumstances were important factors hindering the regulation of the territorial development of varošes in Serbia in the middle of the XIX century. On the other hand, rural-urban migration flows, influence of transit roads, trade and crafts, and, starting from the second half of the XIX century, industrial production, mining and railroads also acted as urbanization factors [8, p. 7–17]. However, the influence of military construction on the development of localities in Serbia can be considered “one of the main driving forces of urbanistic development” [5, p. 23].

Until the 80’s of the XIX century, the Serbian military system was characterized by the parallel functioning of the people’s militia (*militia*) and permanent units. The first such units were established as early as in 1825, during the first reign of Prince Miloš Obrenović (1815–1839). In his autocratic system of power the army was assigned, among other functions, to be the armed guardian of the regime [10, p. 144].

Due to the parallel existence of the Serbian and Ottoman power in the territory of the Pashalik of Belgrade from the end of 1815 and the actual division of the population into Muslim and Christian, namely Turkish and Serbian, at that time territories of Ottoman power and territories of Serbian power were gradually formed [9, p. 19–56, 155–172]. Prince Miloš built a manor in Kragujevac in the territory of his own estate from 1817 to 1821, along with the existing čaršija from the period of Ottoman domination. The process of moving the capital from the settlement of Gornja Crnuća, where Prince Miloš had hitherto predominantly lived, to Kragujevac lasted about two years. Kragujevac was located in the center of the country, at a safe distance from Belgrade, where the Ottoman authorities and army were located. For the aforementioned reasons this small town was chosen as the Serbian capital. When, in 1825, Prince Miloš established permanent units, military facilities were erected near the manor on the right bank of the Lepenica. Thus these two objects, the manor and barracks, fenced in with a high fence and located close to each other, became the center of Serbian Kragujevac and the center of Prince Miloš’s ruling power. The permanent troops in Kragujevac expanded over time. The first unit was founded in 1825 and consisted of 150 soldiers. Already in 1830 a foot guard of 140 guardsmen was formed, and in 1832 – an equestrian guard of more than a hundred guardsmen. Then in 1836 the first artillery battery and the second cavalry squadron were established. Two-story barrack building was constructed in 1832. It consisted of 66 rooms. It was enough to accommodate all soldiers in Kragujevac. At the same place in 1838 two-story building of military hospital was erected [12, p. 169]. In 1836 a stable and a pergola were built. Near the barracks there were also a smithy and a guardhouse. In 1838 in the territory of čaršija in Kragujevac a bakery was built for the army, and nearby on the Metin hill a food warehouse was constructed. The presence of the army in Kragujevac contributed to the development of crafts and the rise of industrialization. In the fourth decade of the XIX century about 18 cannons were made in an ordnance plant, so-called “Amidžina topolivnica”.

A leather processing facility (tannery) was built near the Lepenica in 1834. Military construction influenced the development of military education in Serbia, since in 1838–1839 in Kragujevac, Požarevac and Belgrade the first military school was founded [12, p. 170; 17, p. 58–59].

A similar situation was developed in Požarevac, which from 1825 became the second, unofficial capital of Serbia. Near Prince Miloš's estate in this varoš, military facilities were also erected. First of all, Prince Miloš built a church in 1819 and a manor in 1825. In the immediate vicinity of the church and the manor, a Serbian čaršija was built, called the New or Church čaršija. The manor grounds included the residence of Prince Miloš (1825), the residence of the Young Princes (1826), the residence of Princess Ljubica (1829), as well as auxiliary buildings. This area housed the first barracks in Požarevac which, according to one contemporary who lived in 1826, could accommodate 200 soldiers. As the number of soldiers increased and new units (guards, cavalry, and artillery) were founded, a two-story spacious barrack was erected in Požarevac in 1834. The new barrack was located outside the estate, on the road to it, in the southern part of the settlement. On the fenced area of the new barrack, a powder depot, stables, carriage house, kitchen, rick yard and barn were located. The military hospital built in 1836 was situated here [12, p. 54–57; 73–74; 95–96].

The Muslim population lived in Belgrade and the Ottoman army garrison was located in Kalemegdan. The residence of the Ottoman governor of the Pashalik of Belgrade was also located here [9, p. 19–65; 91–153]. Since in the twenties of the XIX century the state status of Serbia was not yet determined, Prince Miloš created several strategic sites outside the Belgrade's varoš, from which he spread Serbian influence: Rakovica monastery, Topčider and Tašmajdan. After 1830, the latter two sites also became military strongholds of the Serbian power. Particularly in those years, Serbia, with the diplomatic support of Russia, acquired an autonomous state status. The construction of the Topčider complex was performed from 1831 to 1836. The residence (1831) and the Church of Saints Peter and Paul (1834) were erected in its territory as the main buildings [9, p. 172–178]. In the immediate vicinity there was a barrack for cavalymen, near which a military complex was formed that existed until the end of the twenties of the XX century [12, p. 172; 15, p. 119, 122].

Realizing the plan of creating a new, Serbian Belgrade in the Savamala suburb, Prince Miloš arranged large-scale construction works in the mid-thirties. Just then the buildings of the Manor (1835–1837), the Council (1835) and the Great Barrack were erected in the style of classicism [16, p. 76–84]. In Palilula, another suburb of Belgrade, in 1837–1838 a barrack was also built. Thus, three barracks already existed in Belgrade, strategically the most important city in Serbia, by the end of the thirties [12, p. 173]. The road between the two military centers, Savamala and Topčider, became the basic route along which a new rectangular matrix of this area of the city was formed, which continued to develop during the next decades [5, p. 225].

Along with the military buildings in Kragujevac, Požarevac and Belgrade, a two-story barrack for cavalry was also built in Ćuprija in the mid-thirties of the XIX century [12, p. 171, 174].

Meanwhile, as a result of dynastic and political reprisals, Prince Miloš's regular

army was dissolved in 1839. According to the provisions of the 1838 Constitution, the organization of new regular units began in the same year. The administration of the army was transferred from the ruler to the Minister of Internal Affairs [16, p. 33]. Notwithstanding acute political and dynastic conflicts, the existing military contingents were preserved and expanded during the rule of the Defenders of the Constitution (1842–1858), that favored further urbanization, especially of Kragujevac and Belgrade, where regular units were accommodated. Požarevac ceased to be a military center at that time, while a small cavalry garrison was stationed in Čuprija. The territory around the military facilities in Belgrade, both in the wide area of Savamala and in West Vračar and Palilula, was divided into regular blocks, as evidenced by one of the Austrian maps of 1854 [13, p. 78]. In these districts of the city developed according to modern urban planning standards, plots were allocated for the construction of houses for, among others, officials and officers. A new military hospital was also built in Palilula in 1848 [3, p. 473], and in 1850 the building of the Military Academy formed as a result of the shortage in Serbia of qualified officers and armament identified during the 1848–1849 Revolution in the neighboring Austrian Empire, was erected next to the Great Barrack [19, p. 1–5]. This part of the city was also connected by infrastructure with the rest of “Serbian Belgrade”. The construction of the road from Terazije to Topčider, five and a half kilometers long, started in 1841, was completed in 1858 [15, p. 129]. The streets near the Great Barrack, the Military Hospital and the Military Academy were paved in 1855.

Even more significant was the transformation of Kragujevac, where in 1850 the “Topolivnica” ordnance plant was founded, the first military industrial enterprise in Serbia. The plant for the production of artillery weapons and equipment was located near the existing military facilities, in the former workshop for the repair of infantry weapons, so-called “Arsenal”. Since 1851, in the territory of the “Topolivnica” plant the construction of new facilities began: a foundry and a plant for manufacturing gun carriages. The construction of “Topolivnica” stimulated the arrival of foreign specialists, as well as the influx of local workers who were trained for factory labor. At one time there was an industrial school. The “Topolivnica” plant, later the Military and Technical Plant, represented a stronghold of Serbian industrial development in the XIX and XX centuries and one of the most important factors in the further urbanization of Kragujevac [1, p. 155–157; 20, p. 121].

With the return of the Obrenović dynasty to the Serbian throne in 1858, the army acquired a new organization based on universal conscription. According to the 1861 Law, the main military force was the “people’s army”, that is, all male citizens of Serbia of twenty to fifty years old, divided into two classes, one of which was permanently in full combat readiness, while the other one was in reserve. A small number of permanent army units continued to be stationed in Belgrade, Kragujevac and, from 1859, again in Požarevac. The state territory was divided into five large military directorates (one directorate included several districts), which were located in Šabac, Kraljevo, Zaječar, Požarevac and Kragujevac. There were battalion formations in each district [4, p. 25–27; 16, p. 36–37]. Požarevac, as a stronghold of the Obrenović dynasty after its return to the throne, became again an important military center of Serbia. In particular, the

garrison and military hospital in Požarevac were dissolved in 1841, and the army left this city for the whole 18 years [10, p. 95–96]. Firstly, at the end of 1858, the state stud farm from Ćuprija was moved to the emptied barracks. In 1860, Prince Miloš donated to the state his large estate “Morava” where in 1860–1861 the stud farm “Ljubičevo” was built. This stud farm, which bred first-class horses for the army, played an important role in the development of horse breeding in Serbia in the second half of the XIX century and the first half of the XX century [11, p. 98–99].

However, in the sixties of the XIX century, the two most important military centers in Serbia remained Belgrade and Kragujevac. In Belgrade, until 1867, when the Ottoman troops finally abandoned the fortress, facilities and military premises, the Serbian army was stationed in the outskirts of the city. After the withdrawal of the Ottoman troops, the building, where the pasha had recently been located, housed the General Staff of the Serbian army and the district military office [9, p. 220–221]. In Kragujevac, where there was no Ottoman army, the military facilities and other institutions of the Serbian power were accommodated in the new (Serbian) center, opposite the Ottoman rule era *čaršija* survived despite the changed circumstances. The territorial location of the military facilities in Belgrade, Kragujevac and partly in Požarevac, built on the periphery and later becoming part of the urban center, reflects the urbanistic development and transformation of these cities in the middle of the XIX century [5, p. 121]. The influence of military construction on this process is obvious.

References

1. Вучо, Н. Развој индустрије у Србији у XIX веку / Београд : Српска академија наука, посебна издања, књ. DXXXIII : Одељење друштвених наука књ. 7 – 1981. – 450 с.
2. Двор и породица књаза Милоша у Пожаревцу 1825–1839, Пожаревац : Историјски архив Пожаревац, Зборници докумената, зборник 1, приређивач Др Мирољуб Манојловић – 2011. – 223 с.
3. Ђорђевић, В. Историја српског војног санитета, књига прва, 1835–1875 / Београд : Министарство војно. – 1879. – 816 + XXXIV
4. Ђорђевић, Ж. Српска народна војска. Студија о уређењу народне војске у Србији 1861–1864 / Београд : Народна књига. – 1984. – 273 с.
5. Ђурић, Р. Развој насеља са аспекта војних потреба у Србији XIX и почетком XX века, необјављена докторска дисертација одбрањена на Архитектонском факултету у Београду 27. јун 1987 (рукопис).
6. Караџић, В. С. Географско–Статистическо описаније Србије / Даница 1826–1829; 1834. / Сабрана дела Вука Стефановића Караџића VIII, Београд : Просвета. – 1969. – С. 127–177.
7. Љушић, Р. Кнежевина Србија (1830–1839) / Београд : САНУ, Посебна издања, књига DLXX, Одељење историјских наука, књига 12. – 1986. – 508 с.
8. Максимовић, Б. Идејни развој српског урбанизма – период реконструкције градова до 1914. године // Споменик САНУ CXXI, Одељење друштвених наука, нова серија 23- – 1978. – 221 с.

9. Макуљевић, Н. Османско–српски Београд: визуелност и креирање градског идентитета (1815–1878) / Београд : Тору. – 2014. – 251 с.
10. Манојловић, М. Пожаревац од турске касабе до српске вароши 1804–1858 / Пожаревац : Народни музеј. – 2005. – 196 с.
11. Манојловић, М. Пожаревац окружна варош 1858–1918 / Пожаревац : Историјски архив Пожаревац / Посебна издања књ. 5. – 2011. – 424 с.
12. Марковић, Р. Војска и наоружање Србије кнеза Милоша / Београд : Српска академија наука, Посебна издања, књ. ССХСV : Одељење друштвених наука књ. 25. – 1957. – 326 с.
13. Macura, V. Čaršija i gradski centar / Niš–Kragujevac : IRO Gradina, NRIО „Svetlost“. – 1984. 274 с.
14. Миљковић–Катић, Б. Структура градског становништва Србије средином XIX века / Београд : Историјски институт. Посебна издања књ. 36. – 2002. – 223 с.
15. Митровић, К. Топчидер, двор кнеза Милоша Обреновића / Београд : Историјски музеј Србије. – 2008. – 212 с.
16. Несторовић, Б. Архитектура Србије у XIX веку / Београд : Art press. – 2014². – 536 с.
17. Поповић, Р. Ј. Владати из Крагујевца / Р. Ј. Поповић, А. Вулетић, П. Илић. Престони Крагујевац – Крагујевац : Друштво историчара Шумадије. – 2019. – 304 с.
18. Ратковић–Костић, С. Српска војска у XIX веку. Преглед развоја од Првог устанка до Берлинског конгреса // Војно-историјски гласник – 1926. № 1–2. – С. 25–45.
19. Споменица педестогодишњице Војне академије : 1850–1900. – Београд : Војна штампарија. – 1900. – 158 + VII с.
20. Стаматовић, А. Војни производни погони: Прва савремена индустрија у Србији (1804–1878) // ПИНУС Записи – 1997. – № 7. С. 1–192.

VUKSANOVIĆ-MACURA Z.

Geographical Institute “Jovan Cvijić” of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts,
Belgrade, Serbia

GARDEN CITY IN INTERWAR SERBIA: FROM ENGLAND *VIA* RUSSIA

The conclusion of the First World War was the turning point in the urbanization process in Serbia, which became part of the newly formed Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, after 1929 named as the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. Uncontrolled population growth led to a pronounced housing crisis in all major cities. During the two interwar decades, the population of the capital, Belgrade, tripled. The housing shortage resulted in an uncontrolled urban sprawl [15]. It led to the illegal construction of impoverished housing with dreadful sanitary conditions in many parts of the city from the centre to the peripheries [14]. One of the solutions that were discussed to overcome the complicated situation was the garden city concept that linked the spatial and social

organization of the community [11]. However, in the reality of Serbian cities, the idea was only sporadically implemented.

As Lewis Mumford wrote in his essay, the garden city promised “a better dwelling-place on earth for man” [6, p. 29]. The idea developed in the late 19th century by Ebenezer Howard (1850–1928), an English stenographer and philanthropist, was quickly transformed into a “diversified tradition” around the globe [17, p. 249]. In Serbia, intellectuals of different professions have promoted and advocated the garden city idea, and researchers have thoroughly studied their activities [4, 11]. Jan Dubovi (Jan Dubový, 1892–1969), a Czech architect then employed in the Technical Office of the Belgrade Municipality delivered lectures on theoretical and practical aspects of the garden city concept. Urban planner and architect Branko Maksimović (1900–1988) publicly presented and analysed examples from England and Germany and discussed the possibility of their application in Serbia. Physician Vojislav Kujundžić emphasized hygienic aspects, while publicist Slobodan Ž. Vidaković (1905–1983) stressed the social dimension of the garden city concept. Based on plans and urban designs of an architect, urban planner and later professor at the University, Mihailo Radovanović (1899–1980), several garden suburbs were built in different Serbian cities. However, the contribution of the architects and engineers of Russian origin who lived and worked in Serbia during the interwar period has been rarely studied.

This article examines the role and importance of the authors of Russian origin in applying the concept of a garden city in interwar Serbia. In order to explain their contribution, the examples of planned and realized garden-city-type neighbourhoods in two cities, Belgrade, the capital, and Kragujevac in central Serbia, are analysed. Original and unpublished documents and urban plans have been used in the description and analysis. In particular, George Pavlovich Kovalevsky’s book *Big city and garden-cities* (Большой город и города-сады), published in 1916 in Kyiv [7], is analysed and interpreted in this paper.

After the Revolution in 1917, some 45,000 people immigrated to the Kingdom of Yugoslavia from Russia. Russian immigrants had a considerably higher education level than the local population, due to which many of them played an important creative role in the life of their adopted homeland [8]. Around 1,200 engineers of various kinds, some 250 of whom were architects and civil engineers, got actively involved in design and construction work in Serbia and very quickly became leaders in designing the most important state buildings. Their monumental designs for various ministerial buildings, state archives, army headquarters, the patriarchy and numerous others reflected the strength and magnitude of the newly-formed Kingdom Yugoslavia [13]. Some architects and civil engineers played a significant role in urban planning practice, e.g. George Pavlovich Kovalevsky and Nikolai Aleksandrovich Zhitkevich, who were involved in the development and implementation of garden-city-type settlements in Belgrade and Kragujevac, respectively.

George Pavlovich Kovalevsky (Георгий Павлович Ковалевский, 1888–1957) was born in Yelisavetgrad (today Kropyvnytskyi). He studied civil engineering in Kiev and later was a professor at the Kiev Polytechnic Institute. He came to Belgrade in 1920, together with his family and the first wave of Russian refugees. His practical

experience and knowledge were quickly recognized, making him the most important urban planner in Belgrade during the interwar period [13]. He developed regulatory plans for entire city areas, as well as numerous urban designs for public squares, city parks, promenades, lookouts, streets, etc. Kovalevsky was a leading author of the 1923–1924 Belgrade General Plan, the most significant planning document from the interwar period. The Kovalevsky family stayed in Belgrade until 1944, when they moved to Munich and subsequently to the USA. Kovalevsky was buried at the cemetery in the Holy Trinity Monastery, Jordanville, New York [13].

In his above-mentioned book, *Big city and garden-cities*, Kovalevsky presented the findings from his study visit to garden city ‘places of pilgrimage’ in England and Germany [7]. Kovalevsky underlined diverse aspects of Howard’s initial idea, such as the settlement form, the communal financing system and social principles. He elaborated and documented various spatial forms that embodied the concept of garden city in practice – from self-contained garden cities, through new garden suburbs, to garden quarters, rather small residential neighbourhoods with modest houses. Kovalevsky believed that the idea of a garden city could help in addressing the “painful issues of contemporary cities [...] the spontaneous and unregulated growth of the surrounding areas of cities, contributing to their sanitary and hygienic improvement” [7, p. 6]. According to him, garden suburbs were the perfect form of suburbs in modern cities, which should be built for ordinary citizens, as well as workers, when located near factories. He emphasized that the vitality of garden suburbs lied in their spatial characteristics and the opportunity to use cultural, traffic, commercial, and other resources of the neighbouring city. Kovalevsky concluded: “garden suburbs will be the long-lasting and the most widely used form of Howard’s idea” [7, p. 19].

The 1923–1924 Belgrade General Plan proposed new neighbourhoods built in the spirit of garden suburbs [13]. In this regard, garden suburbs were at the same time a suitable solution for housing shortage and a way to ensure the rational expansion of the city and suburban growth. During two interwar decades about 20 new garden suburbs and garden quarters, known as “cottages” or “colonies”, were established in Belgrade. They were low-density residential development characterized by an attractive design and their layout is easily recognizable even on the present-day city map. Those garden suburbs were established by private companies or co-operatives which parcelled out the land and leased at a price affordable to the residents of middle income. Two prominent garden suburbs were built by the Construction Company *Neimar*, the first was named *Kotež Neimar* and constructed in the 1920s and the next was *Novi Neimar* initiated in the 1930s [12]. Several profession-based cooperatives were created as well. They planned and organized new garden suburbs and offered credit to assist home purchase contributing to the construction of some of the most successful residential development in interwar Belgrade, such as Professors’ Colony and Railway Clerks’ Colony.

In addition, on the northeast outskirts of the city, the General Plan envisaged the construction of one utterly new “workers’ settlement”, located near the Danube River, the industrial area and large brickyards. It was to have a harmonious composition of streets and green spaces with about 100 residential buildings, an elementary school,

playgrounds, and a centrally located market square [11]. The entire complex and its structures were referred to as “public buildings and facilities”, which emphasized their specificity with respect to other residential areas within the General Plan. The urban matrix of the planned workers’ settlement reveals striking similarities to the urban design of Hampstead, the garden suburb in London, which Kovalevsky considered “the best-realized example of a garden suburb, in terms of space organization, beauty of the streets, etc.” [7, p. 77]. Unlike Hampstead, the Belgrade workers’ settlement was never built.

Another Kovalevsky’s urban design that followed Howard’s idea was the Clerks’ Colony (*Činovnička kolonija*) a garden quarter built in the southern edge of Belgrade [13]. Building in Clerks’ Colony started in 1929 and was almost completed by 1940. The street layout, arrangement of open spaces and division of lots were realized according to the Kovalevsky’s idea quite closely. Modest detached houses with small gardens, public green squares, an elementary school and centrally locate an open market with public fountain and children's playground characterised the spatial structure of the neighbourhood. The Clerks’ Colony consisted of 10 large housing blocks with a total of 300 houses, covering an area of about 20 hectares. The design of houses was confined to fewest renowned Belgrade’s architects who produced several types of single-story houses. The residents were of similar social backgrounds and diverse professions, such as engineers, professors, civil servants and small merchants. Even today the Clerks’ Colony is recognized as an attractive place to live in Belgrade.

The garden city idea found its place in other Serbian cities, as well. The Workers’ Colony (*Radnička kolonija*), a suburb designed in the spirit of garden city, was built in Kragujevac, in central Serbia. Kragujevac was a smaller city than Belgrade, in both population and size, but at the time, it was an important industrial center, with advanced military production that employed almost one-eighth of the city’s population. Like Howard’s initial concept, municipality-owned land in Workers’ Colony in Kragujevac was transferred to the benefit of the community. At the same time, built structures were leased to inhabitants for residential, commercial or other use. Raised by joint efforts of the local authority, military factory, state bodies and workers association [1], the Workers’ Colony in Kragujevac was distinguished as “a unique complex of workers’ flats in that part of Europe” [10].

The Colony was built based on the design of Professor Nikolay Aleksandrovich Zhitkevich (Николай Александрович Житкевич, 1868–?) an engineer of Russian origin, who was born in Kiev. Before the Russian Revolution in 1917, Zhitkevich worked as a professor at the St. Petersburg Military Engineering-Technical University (Nikolaevsky). He was an expert on industrial buildings and was widely known, both at home and abroad, as one of the pioneers in the introduction of reinforced concrete in construction. Nevertheless, the life and work of Nikolay Zhitkevich in Serbia are not researched yet. After emigrating from Russia to Yugoslavia in 1920, he first came to Kragujevac and later moved to Belgrade [5]. He shortly worked as an engineer in the Engineering-Technical Department of the Ministry of the Army and Navy where he resigned in 1922 [9]. Later he became a professor at the Belgrade University whit an

expertise in building and industrial structures, and occasionally was engaged as supervising engineer for the military factory in Kragujevac. [16]. Zhitkevich was very active in the Association of Russian engineers in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, becoming their president in early 1930s [2].

The Workers' Colony in Kragujevac was erected on the western periphery of the city in 1928–1929. The construction was financed from several state and local sources, such as State Mortgage Bank, Ministry of Social Welfare and Public Health, Ministry of Army and Navy, State Fund for Aid to Unemployed Workers, and local Fund for Workers of Military-Technical Factory. The Municipality of Kragujevac donated 25 ha of land for construction, and built a public bath, laundry and healthcare facilities [1]. The Military Technical Factory constructed the infrastructure, water and sewerage, paved the streets and sidewalks, provided electricity from their sources, arranged public park and squares, and built a kindergarten and an elementary school for both children of factory workers and from the surrounding area.

The dwellings were single-story multi-family buildings, mainly wooden cabins obtained from Germany as war reparation, and each apartment had a small yard for farming [3]. The orthogonal layout of the Colony ensured a rational spatial organization. Public open spaces and community facilities such as a park, squares, a music pavilion, a hotel, retails, shops, an infirmary, a pharmacy, a kindergarten, an elementary school, an administration building and fire barracks with a bell tower were arranged along a centrally positioned wide street. The Colony was fenced and was accessed through an accentuated entrance gate. It was a model example of semi-autonomous settlements.

The examples presented in this paper demonstrate the contribution of architects and engineers of Russian origin in applying the concept of a garden city concept in response to rapid urbanization and uncontrolled urban growth in Serbian between two World Wars. George Pavlovich Kovalevsky, an engineer and urban planner, who had a direct personal experience of English and German garden cities, was focused on both physical and social aspects of Howard's vision. He advocated for the implementation of garden suburbs, which were the dominant settlement forms proposed in the 1923–1924 Belgrade General Plan. The work of Nikolay Aleksandrovich Zhitkevich, an engineer and University professor, contributed not only to the construction of Workers' Colony in Kragujevac, one of the most successful garden suburb in Serbia and the Kingdom of Yugoslavia but was also fundamentally crucial for introducing the modern building technics in the construction of industrial facilities in Serbia.

More generally, the experience of authors of Russian origin significantly contributed to the realization of garden suburbs and garden quarters in Serbian cities such as Niš, Novi Sad, Jagodina, Šabac, etc., thus contributing to implementation of garden city idea into the urban discourse of interwar Serbia, as well as subsequently in the decades of the socialist period. The examples presented in this article have shown the diversity of influences on planning and implementation of garden-city-type settlements in interwar Serbia. Furthermore, this paper sets new directions for critical research on the knowledge transfer in urban planning theory and practice between Russia and Serbia.

References

1. Archives of Yugoslavia, F 39 AU 8/23Z
2. Association of Russian engineers in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia // *Pravda*. – 1933. – 13 June. – p. 14.
3. Brašić, M. Na nekada pustom Stanovljanskom Polju izgradjena je i uredjena najlepša radnička kolonija u državi / Miloš Barasić // *Vreme*. – 1929. – 10 Sept. – P. 8.
4. Ćorović, D. Vrtni grad u Beogradu. – Beograd : Zadužbina Andrejević, 2009. – 118 p.
5. Historical Archives of Belgrade, F 1 Residents records
6. Howard, E. *Garden Cities of To-Morrow*. – reprint. – London : Faber and Faber LTD, 1970. – 168 p.
7. Ковалевский Г. П. Большой город и города-сады. – Киев, 1916. – 168 с.
8. Milenković, T. *Ruski inženjeri u Jugoslaviji 1919-1941*. – Beograd : Savez inženjeri i tehničara Srbije, 1997. – 217 p.
9. *Official Military Gazette*. – 1922. – 19 May. – P. 881-882.
10. Trifunović, V. *Urbanizam Kragujevca 20. veka*. – Kragujevac : Direkcija za urbanizam i izgradnju, 2004. – 359 p.
11. Vuksanović-Macura, Z. *Život na ivici: stanovanje sirotinje u Beogradu 1919–1941*. – Beograd : Orion art, 2012. – 296 p.
12. Vuksanović-Macura, Z. Emil Hoppe and Otto Schönthal's Project for Kotež Neimar / Z. Vuksanović-Macura, // *Nasledje*. – 2012. – № 13. – P. 79-91.
13. Vuksanović-Macura, Z. *Generalni plan Beograda 1923: komparacija planiranog i ostvarenog : Doktorska disertacija 16.09.2014 / Vuksanović-Macura Zlata; Arhitektonski fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu*. – Beograd, 2014. – 358 p.
14. Vuksanović-Macura, Z. The right to housing: squatter settlement in interwar Belgrade – defence and demolition of Jatagan-mala / Z. Vuksanović-Macura, V. Macura // *Journal of Urban History*. – 2018. – Vol. 44. – № 4. – P. 755-774.
15. Vuksanović-Macura, Z. Land cover changes of the Belgrade area over the past three centuries / Z. Vuksanović-Macura, S. Radulović, V. Macura // *Spatium*. – 2018. – № 40. – P. 42-50.
16. Žitkević, N. A. *Tipovi i konstrukcije građevina i odvojenih zaklona za zaštitu od napada iz vazduha*. – Beograd : Štamparska radionica Ministarstva vojske Jugoslavije, 1937, – 60 p.
17. Ward, S. V. *The garden city tradition re-examined // Planning Perspective*. – 1990. Vol. 5. – № 3. –P. 249-256.

KOCHETKOV I. I.
NNGASU, Nizhny Novgorod, Russian Federation
OLD RUSSIAN CITIES IN THE CONTEXT OF ECONOMIC HISTORY
(HISTORIOGRAPHICAL ASPECT)

The study of the problems of Old Russian cities, and, in particular, their economic history, in the Russian historiography has traditionally been given much attention. At the same time, the change in methodological approaches had a strong influence on historians' evaluation of the role and nature of the impact of economic factors on the development of cities.

The main stages in the study of the economic history of Old Russian cities and the peculiarities of the methodology, which largely determined the problems of research in this sphere, are considered in this work.

Up to the middle of the XIX century in the works of Russian historians (V. N. Tatishchev, N. M. Karamzin, S. M. Soloviev, etc.) only some aspects of the history of Old Russian cities (in particular, problems of *veche* governance) were touched upon.

The keen interest in political and legal aspects of the development of Old Russian cities also remained during the second half of the XIX century – beginning of the XX century when the first special studies appeared (A. P. Shchapov, P. N. Milyukov, N. A. Rozhkov, etc.). In them, as a rule, the main attention was paid to political and legal issues of the history of Old Russian cities, and the artificial, secondary character of their development was recognized.

A. P. Prigara, for example, came to the conclusion that Old Russian cities before the tsars of Moscow were no more than fenced villages. Another author N. Khlebnikov believed that before the XV century cities had primarily only military significance and were not trade and industrial centers.

N. A. Rozhkov took up the same position, noting that in the almost complete absence of trade and city industry the population of cities did not differ much from the rural population, was mostly engaged in farming and numerically insignificant.

P. N. Milyukov persistently proved the thesis of artificiality of Russian cities. He wrote that the Russian city was not a natural product of the internal economic development of the country, and with few exceptions, it arose not from the accumulation in one place of population engaged in trade and crafts, but was, above all, a government and military center [12, p. 5–7].

This kind of statement was largely determined by the methodology of positivism, the representatives of which were P. N. Milyukov and N. A. Rozhkov. In the late XIX and early XX centuries, there were many approaches in Russian historiography, and there was no leading theoretical and methodological line. In addition to the positivist methodology, historians also adhered to the ideas of Marxist, Neo-Kantian and a number of other theories.

The conclusion about the insignificant economic role of Old Russian cities and the artificial nature of their development derived from the thesis about the fundamental differences in the historical development of Russia and Western Europe. Such a point of view was later shared by many foreign researchers. Thus, M. Weber considered the

Russian city as an eastern city, and defined it as a symbol of immobility and stagnation [1].

A special place in the historiography of this period occupied the concept of V. O. Klyuchevsky which substantiated the determining role of foreign trade in the emergence and development of Old Russian cities. He wrote: “These cities emerged as gathering places of Russian trade, points of storage and dispatch of Russian export... the cities that emerged on the main trade routes, along large rivers, grew into large bazaars, which concentrated the turnovers of surrounding urban markets” [6, p. 140–141].

This formulation of the question drew attention to the importance of economic aspects in the development of Old Russian cities.

The study of the economic history of medieval Russian cities advanced considerably in Soviet historiography. A fundamental feature of research in the initial Soviet period was the use of Marxist methodology which was characterized by the recognition of the dominant role of economic factors and class struggle in the development of medieval Russian cities (S. V. Bakhrushin, P. P. Smirnov, etc.). The final affirmation of the Marxist understanding of the problems of economic history of Ancient Rus’ is connected with the works of B. D. Grekov, S. V. Yushkov, V. V. Mavrodin, N. N. Voronin, B. A. Rybakov and other scientists [12, p. 8–9].

Among the works of the Soviet period, N. M. Tikhomirov’s monograph “Old Russian Cities” stood out, which for many years determined the main directions of research on this topic, and still has not lost its scientific value. Based on the analysis of a large volume of written sources, M. N. Tikhomirov strongly argued against the view of the economic underdevelopment of Old Russian cities and clearly defined the historical background of the emergence and development of cities in Russia: “The real force that brought Russian cities to life was the development of agriculture and crafts in the field of economy, the development of feudalism in the field of social relations” [14, p. 36–37].

This point of view on the nature of the Old Russian city became dominant in Soviet historical science. The notion of “Old Russian city” and “center of crafts and trade development” became almost synonymous which was criticized by some historians.

For example, P. I. Lyashchenko insisted that “if cities in Western Europe begin to stand out as independent industrial centers, then in feudal Russia the city plays a more subordinate role, and crafts do not become in it specifically urban industrial occupations” [7, p. 201].

Some researchers continued to express the view that “the Russian city... lagged behind in development and had no organic connection with the general economic and political growth of Russia” [13, p. 76–77].

Due to the widespread archaeological research of Old Russian cities in the Soviet period, a huge volume of material was accumulated, the analysis of which revealed a number of significant problems. In particular, long-term archaeological excavations in various places showed that the probability of finding an impressive number of production (handicraft) complexes is extremely low. The narrowness of the approach to the Old Russian town only as a center of developed crafts and trade began to be noted in

the historical literature [4, p. 44–45].

Some scientists proposed to use a functional approach in the study of Old Russian cities. Thus, M. G. Rabinovich, defining a city as a local center with broad administrative and economic functions, singled out a set of features which, one way or another, are inherent in all cities regardless of their local specifics: a complex ethno-social structure of the population, mutual exchange of traditional and cultural value norms, social and economic functions, partly – administrative and managerial powers and protective fortifications. At the same time, it was noted that a settlement did not have to combine all functions in order to acquire the features of a city [10, p. 19–24].

By the end of the Soviet period most researchers began to adhere to the polyfunctional approach to the study of problems of Old Russian city, presenting it as a complex socio-political and economic organism that performed a number of important functions in the system of the feudal state, such as economic, military, administrative, political and cultural functions [4, p. 51]. The use of the polyfunctional approach implied the analysis of the entire set of functions of the Old Russian city, and the identification of the nature of their interaction allowed to determine the specifics of their development in a particular historical period.

In the 90's, alternative theories that criticized the Marxist approach to the study of Old Russian cities began to evolve. For example, V. P. Darkevich, substantiating the special importance of cultural and spiritual factors in the formation and development of cities of Ancient Rus', concluded that "not so much economic factors as the society's desire to avoid ruinous collapse, the search for previously unknown forms of solidarity and cooperation forced human collectives to unite under the protection of city walls" [3, p. 53].

The representatives of Russian historiography also began to express the point of view about the impossibility of a scientific definition of the concept of Old Russian city. The same V. P. Darkevich wrote about the futility of attempts to rigid definitions of the concept of "city" by means of a fixed set of features. He noted that "any definition implies a certain limitation, therefore, leads to the impoverishment of historical reality. The essence of such a complex socio-cultural phenomenon, as a medieval city, changes depending on the place and time" [3, p. 56].

The overly critical attitude of V. P. Darkevich to the previous concepts (first of all, to the Marxist ones), and the representation of a medieval city only as a socio-cultural phenomenon, in our opinion, is one-sided that leads to an obvious underestimation of the role of economic factors. Besides, when studying different aspects of cities, identification of the concept is required which makes it possible to identify objective criteria and determine the boundaries of further research, which is impossible without the formulation of general definitions.

The followers of the modern "contextual approach" defining the city as "a particular expression of larger systems (civilizations, states, societies, modes of production)", in fact, offer to use a systematic method in the study, including a functional analysis. Within the framework of this approach the city is presented by them as a complex object (or subsystem) in the unity of its diverse (economic, administrative and political, military and strategic, organizational and other) functions and simultaneously

as an element of its integrity, as a spatial embodiment of its social relations and cultural specifics [29, p. 25–26].

In general, domestic historiography in recent decades has returned to the use of a comprehensive approach which allows to overcome the shortcomings of scientific developments of the Soviet period, when the history of cities acted only as an integral part of research on political, socio-economic or cultural history. This approach reduced the history of individual cities to the level of illustrations to the theoretical statements about “objective regularities” of socio-economic development of society, and their economic, historical and cultural specifics remained out of sight of researchers.

The results of studies by Russian medievalists devoted to the study of the history of Western European cities are noteworthy. As A. L. Svanidze rightly writes, scientists “still manage to formulate only a detailed definition of the city, i.e. to offer its descriptive characteristic where its properties, manifestations, functions and elements are formed and summarized”. In his multivolume work “City in the Medieval Civilization of Western Europe” an attempt is made to define the city which is suitable for all civilizations: “It is a specific settlement with a special topography, with a significant dense, heterogeneous (ethnically, socially and professionally) population; it concentrates the exchange of goods and commodity production, mostly crafts, institutions of power, cult and culture” [2, p. 9].

Despite the peculiarities of the development of medieval Western European cities, the civilizational approach to their study, presented in the multivolume book, in our opinion, can be successfully used in the study of individual problems of the history of Old Russian cities.

In this regard, the use of the modernization approach by foreign economic historians, and, in particular, the authors of the two-volume edition “The Cambridge Economic History of Modern Europe”, is of undoubted interest. Linking urbanization processes with problems of economic growth, the researchers identify three distinct phases in the long-term dynamics of European urbanization: growth during the High Middle Ages (900–1300), a period of relative stability in 1300–1800, and modern growth since 1800 [14, p. 371–372].

In the national literature modernization approach is successfully used by historians in the study of problems of social history of Russia [8]. B. N. Mironov, studying the issues of urban history of the 18th – early 20th centuries, rightly connected them with the most important economic aspects of urban development, considering them in inseparable unity with the problems of the preceding period. In particular, he proposed a periodization of the history of Russian urbanization, distinguishing two main periods: the Old Russian period of the 10th – 17th centuries and the second period from the beginning of the 18th century up to the present, drawing attention to the characteristic common features [9].

Thus, in the study of problems of the economic history of Old Russian cities in the national historiography we can conditionally distinguish three main stages, the content of which was largely determined by the peculiarities of the used research methodology. The first, pre-revolutionary period, was characterized by the use of numerous methodological approaches, and, in particular, positivistic one, which implied the

recognition of the artificial nature of Old Russian cities and underestimation of the level of their economic development.

The Soviet period was characterized by the domination of the Marxist methodology, with its inherent economic determinism, and the recognition of the determining role of economic factors. By the end of this period in historical literature the most recognized was a polyfunctional approach, which recognized the importance of considering the totality of factors that influenced the development of Old Russian cities.

The modern stage of the Russian historiography is characterized by methodological “pluralism”, which led to the use of multiple approaches to the study of Old Russian cities. In the historical literature there are many different assessments of the role of economic factors – from their underestimation associated with criticism of the Marxist methodology (liberal approach) to the recognition of the significant influence on all aspects of life of the medieval city (formation, civilization and modernization approaches). The latter, in our opinion, avoids the extremes of neo-Marxist and liberal historiography to a large extent.

The presence of different concepts implies the complexity and multidimensionality of the problems of the history of Old Russian cities, which requires further development of the methodological aspects of their study.

References

1. Weber, M. *Economy History. The City* / Translation from German; edited by I. Grevs; comments by N. Sarkitov, G. Kuchkov / M. Weber. – Moscow: CANON–press–C: Kuchkovo Pole, 2010. – 576 p.
2. *City in the Medieval Civilization of Western Europe. Vol. 1. The Phenomenon of Medieval Urbanism* / Ed. by A. A. Svanidze. – Moscow: Nauka, 1999. – 390 p.
3. Darkevich, V. P. The Origin and Development of Cities of Ancient Rus’ (X–XIII centuries) / V. P. Darkevich // *Voprosy Istorii*. – 1994. – No. 10. – P. 53–56.
4. *Ancient Rus’. City. Castle. Village* / Ed. by B. A. Kolchin. – Moscow: Nauka, 1985. – 430 p. (*Archaeology of the USSR from Ancient Times to the Middle Ages in 20 Volumes*).
5. *The Cambridge Economic History of Modern Europe Volume 1: 1700–1870* / Translation from English by Yu. Kapturevsky; edited by T. Drobyshevskaya. – Moscow: Gaidar Institute Publishing House, 2013. – 464 p.
6. Klyuchevsky, V. O. *Works: In 9 vol. Volume 1.* / V. O. Klyuchevsky. – Moscow: Mysl, 1987. – 430 p.
7. Lyashchenko, P. I. *History of the National Economy of the USSR Volume 1.* / P. I. Lyashchenko. – Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1949. – 663 p.
8. Mironov, B. N. *The Russian City in the 1740–1860s.* / B. N. Mironov – Leningrad: Nauka: Leningrad branch, 1990. – 271 p., Mironov, B. N. *Social History of the Russian Empire (XVIII – early XX century)* In 2 volumes / B. N. Mironov. – 3rd ed., revised and suppl. – Saint Petersburg: Dmitry Bulanin, 2003, Mironov B. N. *The Russian Empire: from Tradition to Modernity* In 3 volumes / B. N. Mironov – Saint Petersburg: Dmitry Bulanov (DB), 2014–2015.

9. Mironov, B. Town out of Village: Four Hundred Years of Russian Urbanization / B. Mironov // *Otechestvennye zapiski*. – 2012. – No. 3 – P. 259–276.
10. Rabinovich, M. G. To the Definition of the Concept “City” (for ethnographic study) / M. G. Rabinovich // *Sovetskaya etnografiya*. – 1983. – No. 3. – P. 19–24
11. Repina, L. P. “New Historical Science” and Social History / L. P. Repina. – Moscow: LKI Publishing House, 2009. – 320 p.
12. Sakharov, A. M. Cities of North-Eastern Russia in the XIV–XV centuries. / M. A. Sakharov. – Moscow: Moscow University Publishing House, 1959. – 236 p.
13. Smirnov, P. P. Posadsky People and Their Class Struggle to the Middle of the XVII Century Volume 1. / P. P. Smirnov – Moscow; Leningrad: Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1947. – 490 p.
14. Tikhomirov, M. N. Old Russian Cities / M. N. Tikhomirov – Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1956. – 477 p.

VARAKIN S. A.

NNGASU, Nizhny Novgorod, Russian Federation
LEAGUE OF MILITANT ATHEISTS
IN NIZHNY NOVGOROD IN THE EARLY 1930S

The antireligious movement in Nizhny Novgorod began in 1924, when offices of the Society of Friends of the “Bezbozhnik” (“Godless” or “The Atheist”) Newspaper were organized in the city. P. A. Malakhov, one of the first newspaper correspondents, was directly involved. Later this society was renamed as the Union of the Godless (1925) and later (1929) the League of Militant Atheists of the USSR (SVB). The irreplaceable leader of the organization was Em. M. Yaroslavsky.

In 1925 organizations of the Union of the Godless began to appear all over the country. Nizhny Novgorod region was no exception. The regional organization of the SVB had 28 thousand members by the end of the 1920s, and by the beginning of the 1930s – already 85 thousand (district organizations represented the following number: Sverdlovsky district – 12 thousand people, Kanavinsky district – 4.5 thousand, Sormovsky district – 5 thousand) [11, p. 979].

N. Novgorod was the center of all atheistic work in the region. Already in 1925 the city council of SVB began to work here.

The structure of the city council was the following: plenum consisted of 3 persons, presidium consisted of 11 persons, audit commission – 3 persons, chairman – 1 person, executive secretary – 1 person [4, s. 15].

The Council consisted of two departments: of organization work among the public and AMO. They, in turn, were divided into a number of sectors: sectors for work in the residential cooperation, for work in the industrial cooperation, military, transport, production, research and higher education sectors. In addition, the city council had commissions of national minorities, youth and women. The paid apparatus consisted of three people: executive secretary, instructor and clerical assistant [4, s. 15].

Such a structure contributed to the quality management of the work of district

councils, offices and citywide events [4, s. 15].

By the beginning of the 1930s, the municipal SVB organization had 62 offices with more than 3,000 people in number. The city had 50 antireligious circles (interest groups) with 1 thousand attendees [8, p. 5]. The largest Kanavinsky district SVB council included 45 production and 12 school SVB offices with 3,000 members. The anti-religious university established in the district educated 38 people [7, p. 5; 8, p. 53]. The Sormovsky district organization had 66 SVB offices consisted of 1,624 members, most of whom 1,045 were workers [8, p. 53]. Already in the early 1930s in Nizhny Novgorod there were 85 godless shock brigades and 2 completely godless shock workshops [8, p. 60].

As of January 1, 1932, there were 402 offices in the city, uniting 41,600 members of the SVB. In Nizhny Novgorod there were 4 district councils controlling the work of the offices: Kanavinsky, Sormovsky, Sverdlovsky, and Avtozavodsky, each with 2 paid employees, except for the Sverdlovsky one [4, s. 15].

Collectivization and industrialization in the early 1930s had a positive effect on the development of the Nizhny Novgorod organization of SVB. With the sharp growth of the urban population, when industrialization required a huge number of workers, the policy of collectivization caused a mass exodus of people from the village to the cities, where it was still quieter in a social sense and where it was relatively easier to subsist [10, p. 281].

The Nizhny Novgorod region was one of the largest proletarian regions of the country. In the early 1930s there was a huge construction in the region. In the third year of the five-year plan out of 518 new plants and factories 25 enterprises were built in the Nizhny Novgorod region [13, p. 3]. In Nizhny Novgorod in 1932 the Avtozavod, the largest automobile plant in the USSR, was put into operation.

Seasonal workers and recent peasants who came to build regional enterprises brought with them a rural worldview consisted of, among others, religious beliefs. This led to an increase in cases of absenteeism during church holidays. The godless strove to change their worldview to a socialist one, where labor, free of religion, was regarded as of paramount importance.

The antireligious activity of the city SVB organization included several directions.

The first direction was represented by the performance of mass antireligious campaigns focused on the most different layers of the population: collective farmers, workers, intellectuals. The godless urban population carried out anti-Christmas and anti-Easter campaigns and mass celebrations. They were aimed at popularizing atheism and disclosing the reactionary essence of religion.

Thus, in 1930, an anti-Christmas campaign was conducted at Avtostroy. The campaign plan and materials were posted in wall newspapers. The city council of the SVB prepared instructive and methodological reports for teachers, pioneer leaders, pioneer activists, and young godless activists on its conduct in groups, schools, children's clubs, playgrounds, and housing cooperative associations. These organizations created control, record and other brigades [5, p. 6].

At the general meetings of the SVB offices, as well as at the meetings of workers

and employees, they presented reports, gave lectures and held conversations revealing the reactionary essence of religion and its holidays. Antireligious literature was distributed among the SVB members and workers [5, p. 6].

During the “holidays”, antireligious events were held with lectures, plays, concerts, readings of artistic antireligious works, and question-and-answer evenings. The anti-Christmas campaign was aimed at popularizing the ideas of the SVB, as well as at disclosing the anti-Soviet nature of the work of religious organizations which should have contributed to the transition of the worker to the path of materialistic worldview [5, p. 6].

The second direction in the work of the Nizhny Novgorod branch of the SVB, closely related to the first one, was agitation and propaganda work of atheists, which was carried out through antireligious posters, movies, the activities of atheistic theater, as well as through the press. The propaganda of the atheistic worldview by means of art of declamation was the most effective means of influence, since it was oriented on human perception of the images broadcast in the press, movies, theater and club scenes. Thus the atheists were focused on the accessibility of perception for the wide audience.

In conducting antireligious work and popularizing atheism, the atheists widely used posters. They were one of the mass forms of atheist propaganda in the USSR in the 1920s-1930s. The Soviet antireligious propagandists used the works of Soviet graphic artists as an effective ideological instrument [9, p. 11]. Famous poster artists were D. S. Moor, V. N. Deni and M. M. Cheremnykh.

An important place in the art of antireligious poster is occupied by the works of M. M. Cheremnykh. They feature a conscious simplification of images, schematization of drawing, composition, color, single-plane, roughly grotesque characteristics of negative characters, while the posters are realistic, created on a historically and socially specific basis [9, p. 36].

The main work of M. M. Cheremnykh is “Antireligious Alphabet” (1930), 28 multi-colored lithographed sheets, on each of which is presented an antireligious couplet to one of the letters of the alphabet and a picture illustrating it [9, p. 39-40].

Antireligious films were very popular among Nizhny Novgorod residents. The film “The Feast of St. Jorgen” deserves a special mention. The film is set in a Catholic country where on the eve of the holiday of St. Jorgen, they choose his bride receiving a significant money prize, while the candidates are relatives of priests. Two thieves who recently escaped from prison find out it, and in a cunning deception, they get both the money and the bride.

I. Kireev (Avtozavod) described the significance of this film as follows: “The film reveals all the impudence of deception and the blurring of people’s minds by the church; it shows the mercantile role of the church, which in pursuit of profit, for receiving the last money from the population is capable of any nasty thing” [6, p. 4].

Another direction in the work of the city organization of the SVB was the participation in the closure of churches. Believers had an extremely negative attitude toward the closure of churches. Thus, according to the materials of the Unified State Political Department, the closure of the Pokrovskaya Church in Molitovka (1929) caused protest sentiments among the population. On June 20, 1930, a crowd of almost

500 people (mostly women) actively opposed the inventory of the property of the church closed by order of the Regional Executive Committee [2, p. 382].

A township workers' conference was scheduled for June 23, 1930, to discuss the closure of the church, but the workers of the "Krasny Oktyabr" factory refused to elect their delegates. The conference scheduled for June 24, 1930, did not take place due to the absence of the workers. On the same day a group of religiously minded female workers of the "Krasny Oktyabr" factory organized the collection of signatures under a statement protesting against the closure of the church. The statement was signed by 218 people (mostly women). In protest against the withdrawal of the statement by the secretary of the shop cell, 25 female workers of the workshop gave up work and carried out anti-Soviet agitation in the shop. The outreach efforts resulted in some change in the sentiments of the workers [2, p. 382].

On August 23, 1930, a crowd of up to 400 people (mostly women) organized by an "anti-Soviet element" resisted the seizure of church property from a closed church in the township of Molitovka. To the shouting of the crowd: "Robbers, bandits, blasphemers, you will soon be finished", the crowd threw stones at the people who were seizing the church property. The crowd was driven off by a detachment of mounted police [2, p. 483].

Despite the discontent of ordinary citizens, the closure of churches resumed.

Thus, in 1930 five churches were closed: the Church of Metropolitan Alexis and the Annunciation Cathedral on Blagoveshchenskaya Square (to free up the space for military parades and political demonstrations), the Nikolaevskaya Odigitrievskaya Church on Grebeshok (the community could not pay taxes), the Sretenskaya or Tikhonovskaya Church on Tikhonovskaya street ("at the request" of students and workers of "Nizhpolygon" the building was given for the needs of the education department of the Nizhny Novgorod State University), the Trekhsvyatitelskaya Church (the community could not pay taxes for the use of the building) [1, p. 16].

In 1931 the Church of the Myrrh-bearing Women (or Znamenskaya) on Dobrolyubova street was closed at the "request of the working population of the city" (the extramural branch of the Moscow Higher Engineering School was housed in the building of the church). In 1932 six churches were closed: The Church of the Assumption on Krutoy lane, the St. George's Church was blown up and dismantled to free up the space for a hotel, the Vladimirskaya Church in Gordeevka – to be re-equipped "for an educational institution", the Church of the Resurrection on 3rd Yamskaya street was given to the Lenin Radiotelephone Plant for a cinema, the Nikolaevskaya Verkhneposadskaya Church on Bolshaya Pokrovskaya street was subject to demolition to free up the space for the construction of a hotel, the Church of the Assumption in Pechersky monastery was given to the archive bureau [1, p. 16].

In 1933 the St. Elijah's Church on Ilyinskaya hill was closed [1, p. 16].

As a result of the active work of Nizhny Novgorod (Gorky) atheists, most of the churches were closed.

The international cooperation of Nizhny Novgorod and German atheists is worth mentioning separately. In 1931 they concluded an agreement on revolutionary compe-

tition. Up until the Nazis came to power in Germany, the godless and the Rhenish free-thinkers carried on a correspondence. From this correspondence German atheists learned about the success of socialist construction and antireligious work in the USSR [14, p. 3].

The international education of the masses was an important task of the SVB. Showing the commonness of interests of workers of all nationalities, the godless exposed great power chauvinism as the main danger and simultaneously fought against manifestations of nationalism [14, p. 3].

The Nizhny Novgorod region in the 1930s was a major industrial center where large-scale construction of new industrial giants (Avtostroy, Stankostroy, etc.) was performed. This process was accompanied by an increase in the population of N. Novgorod, caused, among other things, by collectivization taking place in the country. Under these conditions it was necessary to reconstruct the worldview of the recent peasants performed within the framework of modernization and secularization of mind.

In this case, a great role was played by the antireligious activities of the League of Militant Atheists. It was multifaceted and embraced wide layers of the population. It is possible to distinguish several directions in the work of the League, starting with holding mass events and ending with the international work of the Nizhny Novgorod atheists.

References

1. Abrosimova, L. V. History of Orthodox Parishes and Old Believers' Communities of Nizhny Novgorod (Gorky) in the Period from 1917 to 1991 / L. V. Abrosimova // *Nizhegorodskaya starina*. – 2011. – No. 27–28. – P. 11–21.
2. Bystrova, N. E. "Top Secret": Lubyanka's Reports to Stalin on the Situation in the Country (1922-1934) Vol. 8. Part 1 / Compiled by N. E. Bystrova, V. N. Zemskov, L. P. Kolodnikova [et al]; Institute of Russian History of the Russian Academy of Sciences. – Moscow: Institute of Russian History of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2008. – 863 p.
3. State Archive of the Russian Federation. Fund P-5407. List 2. File 386. Sheet 1.
4. State Public Institution "State Socio-Political Archive of the Nizhny Novgorod Region". Fund 30. List 1. File 127. Sheet 15.
5. Kalashnikov. Attention to the Anti-Christmas Campaign // *Avtogigant*. – 1930. – No. 6. – P. 2.
6. Kireev I. "The Feast of St. Jorgen" // *Avtogigant*. – 1935. – No. 165. – P. 4.
7. Lebedev. Kanavinsky District Residents, Don't Fall Behind! // *Bezbozhnik*. – 1929. – No. 50. – P. 5.
8. Malinovkin, S. N. From Religion to Atheism: from the History of the Atheist Movement in the Gorky Region / S. N. Malinovkin. – Corky: Volga-Vyatka Publishing House, 1987. – 95 p.
9. Mikhnovsky, D. V. Satire against Religion / D. V. Mikhnovsky. – Leningrad: Khudozhnik RSFSR, 1963. – 78 p.

10. Mosolov, V. G. "From all sides of..." (what Soviet people said to their agitators) / V. G. Mosolov // *Sotsialnaya istoriya. Yearbook.* – Moscow, 2004. – P. 285-294.
11. Rozanov, P. A. *Antireligious Policy and Activities of Authorities // Society and Power. Russian Province.* In 6 volumes. Vol. 2. 1930 – June 1941 / Compiled by A. A. Kulakov, V. V. Smirnov, L. P. Kolodnikova; Institute of Russian History of the Russian Academy of Sciences. – Moscow, 2005 – 1152 p.
12. S. N. M. *Trade Unions Aside // Bezbozhnik.* – 1929. – No. 50. – P. 5.
13. Uzkov. *To Expand the Work in New Construction (to the regional congress of the League of Militant Atheists) // Bezbozhnik.* – 1931. – No. 27. – P. 3.
14. *To Strengthen the International Relations // Bezbozhnik.* – 1931. – No. 68. – P. 3.

SEREBRYANSKAYA G. V.

NNGASU, Nizhny Novgorod, Russian Federation

PECULIARITIES OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC DEVELOPMENT OF CITIES IN THE VOLGA-VYATKA REGION OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION BEFORE AND DURING THE GREAT PATRIOTIC WAR

Before talking about the peculiarities of urban development, it is necessary to know the geography and history of their location; region, oblast, district. These factors determine the peculiarities of their development.

The subject of our attention is the cities of the Volga-Vyatka region located for the most part in the Volga and Central parts of Russia. So what is this Volga-Vyatka region and what is the history of its origin?

The roots of the formation of the territory, economy, culture, social life of the peoples of the Volga-Vyatka zone go back centuries of history of the formation and development of the Russian state, when different peoples inhabited the Volga region. Since ancient times they were connected not only by territory, geography of settlement, natural conditions, economy, everyday life, but also by neighborly and friendly relations that had been forming for thousands of years, despite the differences in language, economy, way of life, religious and everyday habits, customs and traditions.

It is known that in the second half of the XIX and early XX centuries an important economic hub of Russia was the vast Nizhny Novgorod province covering the Volga-Vyatka zone.

The XX century brought intensive development of this territory. With the formation of the first republic of Soviets – RSFSR (Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic), there were complex, contradictory processes of national-state, administrative-territorial, economic and cultural construction which had a great impact on the formation of economic areas and zones of the Russian republic. By the beginning of the 30's of XX century the oldest Nizhny Novgorod province became the largest administrative-territorial and economic part of the single economy of the RSFSR and the whole Soviet Union. During the first years of industrialization, on July 15, 1929 the All-Russian Central Executive Committee of the RSFSR by its decree formed the

Nizhny Novgorod region with the center in Nizhny Novgorod. It comprised: the former Nizhny Novgorod and Vyatka provinces, the Mari and Votyak (Udmurt) autonomous regions, the Chuvash ASSR, the Murom district of the Vladimir province, and part of the Unzha woodland of the Kostroma province. The inclusion of the Chuvash autonomous region, the Mari and Votyak (Udmurt) autonomous regions in the Nizhny Novgorod region corresponded to the national policy of the state in those years and was aimed at eliminating the economic and cultural backwardness of their peoples [4, p. 7].

The Nizhny Novgorod region also had a favorable geographical location (tributaries of the Volga connected all its constituent territories of neighboring regions and autonomies), significant natural resources (the area of forests alone was about 13 million hectares) in combination with its material and human resources created an opportunity for rapid industrial development of this part of Russia. Significant volume of agricultural and small handicraft industry, formation of large-scale industry determined the main trends in the development of the Nizhny Novgorod region renamed in October 1932 as Gorky region.

As an independent juridical union the region existed in the above-mentioned composition for a short time, until 1936. It should be noted that in the first half of the 1930s there were important administrative-territorial changes in the region. So on January 7, 1934 the Kirov region was singled out from the Gorky region; in that time the Kirov region included the Votyak (Udmurt) autonomous region, which was subsequently absorbed by the Ural region. On December 20, 1934 the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party and the Presidium of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee considered the question "On transformation of the Mordovian autonomous region into the Mordovian autonomous republic". The XVI All-Russian Congress of Soviets (January 15-23, 1935) approved this decision. Prior to that, since May 14, 1928, Mordovia was part of the Middle Volga region, and the Saransk district was formed there. On December 5, 1936, the Mari and Chuvash autonomous regions were also transformed into autonomous republics. The Mordovian population constituted a high percentage in the Arzamas, Lukoyanov, and Sergach districts of the Gorky region. This was one of the reasons for the inclusion of Mordovia in the Volga-Vyatka region [4, p. 8]. Although since 1936 the Gorky krai ceased to exist as an independent territorial and administrative unit, the Gorky region was formed, but the trend of economic and cultural development continued in subsequent years. At the end of the 30's the territory of the former Nizhny Novgorod-Gorky region began to turn into an industrial and agricultural region of the Volga region, which allowed it to become during the Great Patriotic War, one of the largest military-industrial bases of the country. In 1941-1945, the regions and republics of the Volga-Vyatka zone were part of the vast Central industrial region of the RSFSR.

The territory of the Volga-Vyatka region is located in the basins of the navigable rivers Volga, Oka, Vyatka and stretches from southwest to northeast for 1000 km and is located in different natural zones: the northern part in the forest taiga and the southern part in the forest-steppe. The area shares borders with the Central, Volga, Ural and Northern regions.

The intra-regional cooperation, formed in the 30's – first half of the 40's in the

territory of Volga-Vyatka region became the basis for further economic, especially industrial development of this part of central Russia.

On the eve of the war (1939) in the Volga-Vyatka region lived 8,898,149 people, 20% of the urban and 80% of the rural population. Of them 1 million 156 thousand workers and employees were employed in the national economy (previously the figure of 1 million 42 thousand was indicated, because the Arzamas region was not taken into account), including 667 thousand in the Gorky region, Kirov region – 243 thousand, Mari ASSR – 60 thousand, Mordovian ASSR – 95 thousand, and Chuvash ASSR – 91 thousand. This figure represented 5.6% of their employment in Russia as a whole [3, p. 20-21]. As we can see, in the pre-war years the number of the urban population was inferior to the rural population, but it should be noted that the same trend was observed in the Russian Federation as a whole.

Naturally, the centers of industrial development became large urban and district cities of the Gorky, Kirov regions, Mari, Mordovian and Chuvash autonomous republics which were part of the Volga-Vyatka region. At the end of the 1930s in the Gorky region these were the regional center – city of Gorky, large district centers, primarily the cities of Dzerzhinsk, Vyksa, Balakhna, Arzamas, Pavlovo, Bogorodsk, Bor, etc. In the Kirov Region these were the cities of Kirov, Kotelnich, Omutninsk, Slobodskoy, Vyatskiye Polyany. In the Chuvash autonomous republic these were the cities of Cheboksary, Alatyry, Kanash, Shumerlya, Yadrin; in the Mari autonomous republic – Yoshkar-Ola, Volzhsk, Kozmodemyansk; in Mordovia – Saransk, Ruzayevka, Pervomaysk.

Population dynamics in the cities of the Volga-Vyatka economic region (in thousands of people)

Region, autonomy, city	1897	1926 (1931)*	1939	1959
Gorky region: Gorky (Nizhny Novgorod)	90.1	221.5	643.7	942.0
Arzamas	10.3	21.0	25.8	41.5
Balakhna	5.1	7.8	25.6	29.8
Bogorodsk	12.3	14.9	30.0	36.5
Bor	1.8	11.8	25.1	42.9
Vyksa	-	15.5	26.5	40.3
Gorodets	6.3	11.2	16.1	27.0
Dzerzhinsk	-	8.4	103.4	164.3
Kstovo	-	-	2.0	27.0
Kulebaki	-	21.1	32.8	44.7
Lyskovo	8.5	6.9	11.2	16.2
Pavlovo	12.4	20.6	32.4	47.9
Kirov region: Kirov	25.0	61.2	142.0	252.4
Vyatskiye Polyany	-	-	10.6	25.7

Kotelnich	4.2	10.7	18.5	27.7
Omutninsk	-	6.4	17.4	24.8
Mari ASSR Yoshkar-Ola	1.7	4.3	27.2	88.7
Volzhsk	-	-	19.5	33.4
Kozmodemyansk	5.3	7.7	10.7	2.6
Mordovian ASSR Saransk	14.6	15.7	41.1	91.0
Ruzayevka	-	-	17.1	24.9
Chuvash ASSR Cheboksary	4.7	9	31.0	104.4
Kanash	-	2.2	18.8	33.6
Shumerlya	-	15.2	15.2	30.2

Compiled by: List of cities of the Volga-Vyatka economic region – <http://wiki-org.ru/wiki/>

As can be seen from the table, most of the cities were located in the most industrially developed part of the Volga-Vyatka region – the Gorky region. In the very regional center, Gorky, where was concentrated the majority of the population of the oblast and the whole region, and large plants of metallurgical, machine building and metal processing, shipbuilding and other branches of heavy industry were located. These are such large enterprises as the oldest shipbuilding plant “Krasnoye Sormovo”, diesel plant “Dvigatel Revolutsii”, “Krasnaya Etna”, plant for milling machines (GZFS n.a. M. Frunze), machine building plant No. 92, Gorky Automobile Plant (n.a. Molotov), aircraft plant No. 21 n.a. S. Ordzhonikidze (GAZISO). Since World War I, the city of Gorky worked for the defense of the country. Here in the 20’s at the “Krasnoye Sormovo” Plant was produced the first Soviet tank “Freedom Fighter Comrade Lenin”.

In the Gorky region during the first five-year plans grew Dzerzhinsk, the center of chemical industry, not only in the Volga-Vyatka region, but in Russia and the Soviet Union as a whole. In terms of population before the war it was the third in the Volga-Vyatka region after the regional centers of the Gorky and Kirov regions. All other district cities of the Gorky region had a population of about 20,000, or even less, except for Vyksa, Kulebaki – centers of the metallurgical industry in pre-Soviet Russia. And also Pavlovo, the center of metal processing (see Table No. 1). The city of Bogorodsk was famous for leather processing. All Russia knew the town of Balakhna, where in the first five-year plan was built the State Power Station of the Gorky region, which supplied electricity to many cities of the Volga region and Central region of RSFSR. Towns of the region with more than 10 thousand inhabitants were mostly engaged in small artisan industry and handicrafts: Gorodets, Lyskovo, Semenov, etc.

The cities of Vyatka and the autonomous republics were significantly behind the Gorky region in terms of population. The only thing in common was that the majority of the urban population lived in the regional and republican centers of the Volga-Vyatka region.

In the city of Kirov (Vyatka), the regional city of the Kirov region, the center of the leather and timber industry, the population amounted to 142.0 thousand people. The “Iskoz” factory was a large enterprise at that time. In Omutninsk also functioned the oldest among the metallurgical plants of the country, Omutninsk Metallurgical Plant. In the Mari, Mordovian and Chuvash autonomous republics of the region in 1939 the population of republican centers did not reach even 50 thousand people; Yoshkar-Ola had 27.2 thousand people, Saransk – 41.1 thousand people, Cheboksary – 31.1 thousand people, although it grew by 3-3.5 times respectively compared to the 1920s (see Table No. 1). A role in the development of industrial production was also played here by such cities as Volzhsk, Kozmodemyansk – Mari El; Ruzayevka – Mordovia; Alaty, Kanash – Chuvashia. However, in the rest of the cities, small commodity production still prevailed.

During the period of industrialization the population of almost all cities of the Volga-Vyatka region increased twofold, and sometimes even more. The region in question was transforming from agrarian and industrial to industrial and agrarian.

Availability of raw materials and food resources, convenient and effective transport highways, solid power base of the Gorky region, own metallurgical production of the Nizhny Novgorod and Vyatka industrial hubs, some factories of Chuvashia; aircraft building, artillery, ammunition production, production of submarines, armored cars, various chemical compounds, individual and collective means of protection for population, other types of weapons and equipment; human and scientific potential of the region – in other words, everything was in place to further develop military production in the event of war, and to become a forge of weapons for the front.

The Great Patriotic War gave a powerful impulse to the development of the Volga-Vyatka region and its transformation into a defense industrial base of the rear area. The rural population mobilized to work in industry, citizens evacuated along with the factories, students of vocational schools significantly replenished the ranks of the city population. Unfortunately, the author does not have complete statistics of the urban population of the Volga-Vyatka region by the war years. But the facts and individual figures, as well as post-war statistics eloquently speak for the powerful development of the former cities and the emergence of new ones. An important source of replenishment of citizens was the evacuated population. During the first months of the war 1 million and 88 thousand evacuated citizens came to the Volga-Vyatka region. In 1943 in its territory lived only 554 thousand evacuees. On January 20, 1943 in the Gorky region 186.2 thousand people were accommodated, of which 66.6 thousand in cities [1, s. 152]. The population of the Gorky city increased from 643,689 people in 1939 during the war years to 700 thousand or more [2, p. 62]. Citizens who arrived with evacuated enterprises joined the industrial production of the regional cities. Over 100 enterprises were evacuated to the Gorky region, including 13 of them of Soviet importance, i.e. large ones. To the Kirov region 20 enterprises of the Union significance

arrived, as of January 20, 1943, 198.6 thousand evacuated people were placed there, 48.8 thousand of them were accommodated in cities. The Chuvash ASSR had 28 enterprises and housed 70.4 thousand people, including 17.6 thousand in cities; Mordovia had 17 enterprises and housed 69.7 thousand people, including 7.1 thousand in cities; the Mari republic – 27 enterprises and 28.7 thousand people, including 8.3 thousand people in cities [5, p. 87], respectively. In total, 178.7 thousand evacuated citizens lived in the cities of the Volga-Vyatka region at that time according to the calculations of the author of the article [1, p. 152].

Generally all the evacuated enterprises were placed on the premises of already existing plants in the region, or new ones were built. Workers and their families were accommodated in the vicinity of the plants. For example, the city of Gorky housed Leningrad enterprises: ammunition plant No. 259, part of the equipment of the “Russky diesel”, “Promet” plants. M. V. Sedykh from Leningrad, who worked during the war as a senior technologist in the engine building of the Gorky Automobile Plant, recalled: “We, workers and engineers from the “Promet” plant, arrived in Gorky in July 1941. Our trains were delivered to “Krasnaya Etna” directly to the production building. Quickly, day and night we unloaded the wagons... and in 15 days the production of motorcycles began. In September, by order of the People’s Commissar, a group of engineers from the motorcycle plant was transferred to the automobile plant...” [4, p. 130]. So the Gorky Motorcycle Plant appeared, the only producer of army motorcycles during the war. A little later it received equipment from the Kharkov Motorcycle Plant.

The employees of the Kirov Liquor and Vodka Plant quickly vacated the premises to accommodate the Leningrad “Krasny instrumentalshchik” Plant (KRIN). The plant was located on an area of 4,800 square meters. On October 9, 1941 the State Defense Committee decided to evacuate to Kirov some equipment of Kolomna locomotive plant No. 38 and 15 thousand workers. The equipment was placed in the territory of the Plant n.a. May 1, which belonged to the People’s Commissariat of Railways. In December 1941 to the Kirov region also arrived 400 people and with them machine tools from Vladykinsky engineering and Moscow body plants, as well as equipment from Yaroslavl tire and cable plants. Workers and employees of the Kaganovich Plant from Dnepropetrovsk were settled in the buildings of the Kirov meat processing plant and puppet theater [4, p. 130-131]. During the first year and a half of the war the number of urban population in the Kirov region increased by almost 150 thousand people. In general, by the beginning of 1945 in the cities of Vyatka lived more than 466 thousand people [5, p. 11]. Every fourth inhabitant of the Kirov region became a citizen.

On October 21, 1941 the main train with the equipment of the Moscow Searchlight Plant arrived in Yoshkar-Ola, Mari ASSR, and in early December it already provided products for the front. The Kiev “13 let Oktyabrya” plant, Odessa factory of cinema equipment (KINAP), Sevsk fruit factory, Osipenkovsky pasta factory and other enterprises were also transferred there. In Mordovia, the premises of the “Teplopribor” plant under construction housed the All-Union Institute of Electrical Industry (VIEP). Here 14,240 residents of Moscow citizens were accommodated. The cottonin factory buildings were given to Plant No. 583 of the People’s Commissariat of ammunition. In addition, the Gomel brick plant, the Kremenchug shoe factory, twine and rope factories,

six hemp twine factories, two timber factories, a clothing factory and other enterprises came to the republic. To Chuvashia were evacuated 477 workers and engineers, part of the main and auxiliary shops of the Kharkov Electromechanical Plant. Thanks to the arrived specialists, in a short period of time the equipment was installed in unsuitable buildings. In December 1941 the new Cheboksary Electromechanical Plant released its first trial production by merging with the Leningrad “Elektrik” plant. Over 30 thousand residents of Leningrad were accommodated in the cities and villages of Chuvashia. And this is far from being a complete picture and only part of the examples of how the evacuated citizens became residents of the cities of the Volga-Vyatka region [4, p. 131-132].

This article does not consider the everyday problems of urban residents of the Volga-Vyatka region. They are investigated in an earlier work to which the author refers in this work as well.

Whatever the harsh life of the city people, they devoted all their strength to the Fatherland. Together with all the Soviet people they forged the victory in the cities of the rear and gave the front more than 20% of the armament: more than a third of tanks, artillery guns, armored vehicles, more than a quarter of submarines, a quarter of fighter planes, more than half of radios, most of all shells, millions of grenades, as well as railway carriages, huge amounts of equipment and uniforms, food and much, much more.

References

1. State Archive of the Russian Federation – GARF. Fund P-327. List 2. File 18.
2. Gordin, A. A., Serebryanskaya, G. V., Sakovich, N. V. The Gorky Region in the Years of the Great Patriotic War // *Voprosy Istorii*. – 2015. – No. 5. – P. 61-72.
3. Results of the All-Union Population Census of the USSR in 1959: Cumulated volume. – Moscow, 1962. P. 20-21.
4. Serebryanskaya, G. V. Industry and Personnel of the Volga-Vyatka Region of the Russian Federation in the Late 30’s – First Half of the 40’s of the XX Century: monograph / G. V. Serebryanskaya. – Nizhny Novgorod: Nizhny Novgorod State University of Architecture and Civil Engineering, – 2003. – 476 p.
5. Chernysheva, N. V. The Population of the Kirov Region in the Years of the Great Patriotic War: monograph / N. V. Chernysheva. – Kirov: – Publishing house of VyatTGU, – 2012. – 217 p.

ABRAKOVA T. A.

NNGASU, Nizhny Novgorod, Russian Federation

SOCIAL SECURITY OF FRONT-LINE SOLDIERS AND THEIR FAMILIES IN 1945-1946 (ON MATERIALS OF GORKY)

The home front workers in 1941-1945 provided soldiers of the Red Army with everything they needed for combat operations. The Soviet state formed a system of measures aimed at securing families who were left without material support in the first

days of the war. This assistance was defined by normative legal acts adopted shortly thereafter. So, on the basis of the Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR as of June 26, 1941 “On Procedure for Appointment and Payment of Benefits to the Families of Soldiers, Common Soldiers and Junior Officers in War-Time” [15], the families of those mobilized to the front were assigned by the commissions at the City (Village) Executive Committee of the Council of Deputies with monthly allowances for the relatives of those who were fighting at the front. The Resolution as of June 28, 1941 of the Council of People’s Commissars of the USSR “On Provision of Volunteers Joined the Troops of the Active Red Army” [13] had similar objectives.

Legislation, legal documents on assistance to the families of the front-line soldiers and dead servicemen during the Great Patriotic War were constantly supplemented. The circle of citizens who under appropriate conditions were entitled to state monthly payments and financial assistance, was expanded. These were family members of servicemen: wives, husbands, children, brothers, sisters under 18 years old, disabled parents over 60 and 55 years old, grandmothers, grandfathers, if they had no other relatives who could take care of them [16]. In addition, the next of kin of Red Army soldiers who had been killed or missing in action or who had died as a result of wounds were assigned a survivor’s pension. Lump-sum benefits were provided for additional support to families in dire need. Demobilized servicemen and disabled war veterans were also entitled to various types of state assistance.

Front-line soldiers received state monetary payments during 1941-1945, the amount of which was determined by their peacetime wages. Many soldiers drew up so-called “money certificates” in the name of their closest relatives, on the basis of which they could receive certain money payments. This support, of course, was very important to the families of soldiers during the difficult years of the war.

Life on the home front was held in the most difficult social and living conditions for all kinds of people. Many citizens had to apply to the authorities for various kinds of assistance and support. Party authorities took upon themselves the whole burden of responsibility and care for the population, and accurately controlled the provision of targeted assistance. An important part of the documents characterizing this type of activity of the Gorky City Party Committee during the war is stored in the State Socio-Political Archive of the Nizhny Novgorod region [1]. All types of possible social assistance were thoughtfully assigned and applied that during the war period helped most Soviet citizens to survive.

The purpose of the present study is to perform an analysis of workers’ appeals to the Gorky City Party Committee in 1945-1946, which allows to identify the main aspects of state assistance to the families of front-line soldiers, including in the transitional period of the end of hostilities and the return of the USSR to peaceful life. The object of the study is the social policy of the Soviet state on the example of the actions of the administrative structures of Gorky (now Nizhny Novgorod). The subject of the study is peculiarities of providing various types of social support to families of war veterans.

In the harsh conditions of 1941–1945, everyday life on the home front was very

difficult. Therefore, the regional and city party committees received a significant number of appeals from citizens concerning their material provision necessary for survival in war-time reality. The closest relatives of the front-line soldiers were in great part in need.

The City Party Committee paid great attention to the request letters of Red Army soldier families. The procedure for work with each appeal was clearly worked out. The letter went to the military department of the City Committee, and then, depending on the subject, was sent to the relevant department, which had to carefully study and check the facts specified and make a reasonable decision on it. Thus, if the family needed additional material assistance, the state security department was in charge of it. The housing department considered the necessity to support the front-line soldier relatives with manufactured goods or public catering products, and the necessity to provide them with living space. Assistance in repairing an apartment, a room was provided through the department of construction and public utilities. Upon that, the appeals should be considered as soon as possible, as there was a corresponding resolution of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party as of January 22, 1943 “On Measures to Improve the Work of the Soviet and Local Party Organizations to Help the Families of Front-Line Soldiers” [17]. Coordination of rendering assistance to needy citizens was carried out by similar departments at the executive committee of the Gorky City Council.

Often the letter from the city committee was redirected to the state security department at the district party committee in accordance with the place of residence of the applicant. After a decision was made, a report on execution was sent by the respective organizations to the military department of the city committee. It provided monthly information reports to the leadership of the city party committee on the review of complaints, applications and letters of servicemen and members of their families in Gorky [2]. Then a report on the measures taken on the appeal of the family was sent to the soldier at the address of field post office.

The system of interaction between local authorities and various institutions in the process of providing various kinds of social assistance to needy citizens showed effectiveness during the entire period of the Great Patriotic War and continued to be used in the first post-war years.

K. A. Nasonov provides a list of the main benefits that the Soviet state provided to the family members of soldiers and dead Red Army servicemen, demobilized and disabled war veterans. They concerned the provision of housing, medical and social services, material and household support, payment of pensions and benefits [14]. Citizens, being informed about the privileges provided for on the legislative basis, actively applied to local authorities for their provision.

The military department of the Gorky city party committee, in a report on the handling of appeals received, identified a group of problems that touched almost every family: “In total for 1945 there were 266 complaints and applications, including those on material assistance – 138, provision of living space – 51, on various issues – 52, fuel issues – 25” [3]. The quoted document also indicated that most of the letters received by the City Committee were sent for consideration to the military department.

Based on this statement, the author conducted a thematic analysis of the workers' letters, received in the departments of the City Party Committee in 1945 and stored in the document collection to date [4]. The final, more accurate quantitative data obtained by the author is systematized and presented in the form of a table. It not only confirms and supplements the statistic data, which in that time was collected by the military department, but contains, taking into account all the documents studied, the correlation of quantitative indicators by certain types of appeals.

Appeals of citizens	Number of appeals
Improvement of living conditions for family members of demobilized soldiers, dead servicemen, disabled war veterans	61
On social security and material support for family members of demobilized soldiers, dead servicemen, disabled war veterans	54
Employment, dismissal, transfer to another job of demobilized soldiers and disabled war veterans	23
Shortcomings in the work of enterprises and institutions	8
Search for relatives who were evacuated or undergoing medical treatment in Gorky	7
Education issues	4
Problems of urban improvement	3
Abuse of office by managers	3
Communist's improper behavior in everyday life	3
On the change of the place of residence of citizens	2
On wages accounting	2
Miscellaneous	6
Total appeals of citizens for 1945	176

The author's analysis of all available documents showed that the predominant reasons for citizens to appeal to the Party authorities in 1945 were requests for improved housing conditions, material support, and employment assistance (see table). The possibilities of assistance to citizens were not so great and were strictly differentiated.

As follows from the data analyzed by the author, the largest number of requests came from service families. A rapid verification of the facts stated was performed in advance, which was then considered by the relevant commission. Based on a decision made by the commission, those in need could also receive assistance with manufactured goods: coats, clothes, underwear, cloth strips, shoes, kerosene; food (potatoes, millet, etc.); sowing material for an individual gardening plot; firewood, peat for home heating in winter. In addition, monetary allowance was often given in a single payment or assigned as a permanent allowance.

Relatives of the killed Red Army soldiers were supported by the state in a similar way and at the same time they had the right for additional benefits: medical care and medical treatment at home, possibility to get from the front the wearable things of the

killed for their further use in civilian life.

If the author of the letter was a demobilized person, then his primary domestic needs were met. The yesterday's front-line soldier was given warm clothes, footwear, additional lump-sum food ration; if necessary, this person was provided with treatment – hospitalization or a sanatorium-resort voucher. Similar comprehensive support was given to disabled veterans. Let us note that citizens, applying to the City Party Committee for one type of assistance, often received not only it, but also accompanying additional assistance. For example, in the responses to the letters about the warrant for firewood, there were indications of allocation to the applicants of manufactured goods, children's felt boots, monetary allowance in various amounts, etc.

At the same time, the military department, having carefully studied the application, the facts concerning the applicant's living conditions, could also reject the request. The motivation for the refusal was different. For example, the commission, when examining the circumstances of life, rendered a verdict: "there is no acute need for material assistance". The employed relatives of the serviceman, if there was any request, received assistance at their place of work.

Special attention was paid to the children of servicemen. Depending on their age, they were entitled to benefits for the admission to nurseries, kindergartens, school tuition, free vouchers to pioneer camps or sanatoriums, assignment of supplementary food. As additional social assistance, the large plants and factories of the Gorky city arranged matinees with gifts and lunches for the children of front-line soldiers of the enterprise.

The most common type of assistance to the families of front-line soldiers was allowances. The basis was the above mentioned Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR dated as of June 26, 1941. Depending on the number of disabled children the serviceman's family was given monthly state allowances of 100 to 200 rubles, and there were also some single payments. Quite often, the answers of the military department contained the following resolution: "to render monetary assistance in the amount of 100 rubles" or "to pay 200 rubles as a lump sum". Special purpose payments were also assigned, for example, the wife of a dead Red Army soldier, applying for assistance, could receive money to buy winter coats for her children [5].

As follows from the studied archival materials, the housing issue was the second most important for the residents of Gorky. There was a shortage of housing due to the enemy bombing of the city and the presence of several thousand evacuees from other cities. The Soviet legislation ordered that the servicemen families had to be provided with housing first. It was also pointed out the necessity of obligatory return of the living space which was occupied by the demobilized during the pre-war period. This provoked complicated conflict situations between, for example, the family of a serviceman who arrived in the process of evacuation and moved into an apartment, and the former tenant, a soldier who had returned from the front. Requests related to such problems were considered by the City Party Committee with the involvement of other local government structures.

An example of such proceedings is the case of the disabled war veteran K. A. K-v [6]. In September 1945, he was evicted from the room where he was temporarily

living with his family, as the former owner, a demobilized soldier, returned. The disabled war veteran was left homeless: The Kuybyshevsky district (now the Sovetsky district of Nizhny Novgorod) did not have an opportunity to provide other living space. The problem had not been solved for a long time, although K. A. K-v applied to the district committee, the regional party committee, and the district executive committee. In search of support, he even sent a telegram to I. V. Stalin: “For three months I have been trying to get a place to live. I am met with the most inhuman attitude from the local authorities. I am now evicted from my room with my small children. I have been happily defending my Motherland, and I am patiently enduring a severe wound, but it is hard for me to be outside with my children in winter. I earnestly ask you to help me” [7].

This telegram, as follows from the notes available on it, was forwarded to a special sector of the City Committee, where the situation was taken under control, but the problem was not solved. In December 1945 the applicant personally appealed to the Secretary of the regional party committee M. I. Rodionov: “My sufferings have been going on for 4 months. What could be worse: they have thrown the disabled war veteran and his children outside in winter. I earnestly ask to call to order those who do not know the trenches at the front, who have no idea of the smell of gunpowder, who have not experienced the hardships of the war and post-war period, and also who have no human attitude towards man. There is a limit to patience. I ask, I earnestly ask to give me a deadline for the heads of the Kuybyshevsky district to provide me with living space: not in days, but in hours, otherwise nothing has any effect on them.

I spent the days of celebrating the October Revolution in anguish, the new year is coming, there is no joy either. Do these bureaucrats have the right to take away a person’s joy and replace it with anguish? I wrote everything sincerely and frankly” [8]. Only after this appeal, with the attention of the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the City Council, the problem of living space for the disabled war veteran K. A. K-v was solved: he was settled and registered in his old room.

However, such conflicts were not always resolved positively. Often, such letters from citizens were marked with a resolution of the employees of the military department, which stressed the need to follow the law: “eviction from the living space is legal”, “the disabled war veteran’s apartment must be vacated, the family must be provided with a cubic meter of firewood and a sum of 250 rubles”.

Citizens considered these decisions made by the local authorities as heartless and bureaucratic, so they wrote to what they considered to be more effective authorities, such as the “Pravda” and “Krasnaya Zvezda” newspapers. Their main ground was: “Where can we find justice and how?” Obviously, the housing problem in the post-war years was one of the most acute for all cities, towns, and settlements that survived the barbaric bombing. Local authorities, of course, had enormous difficulties in solving this difficult problem, applying variants of densification of residents in the preserved living space, using for housing little suitable premises, including basements, and semi-basements, barracks were built as temporary objects for living, etc.

Analyzing the studied post-war applications of citizens to the City Party Com-

mittee, it should be noted that the needy families on housing issues were always assisted taking into account the available opportunities and living conditions of the applicant. Along with the inclusion in the list of those in need or claiming to improve their housing conditions, it was practiced to allocate plots of land for individual construction to those demobilized from the army and invalids of war. Requests for help in maintenance of living premises: repair of roofs, stoves, pipes, sanitary installations, insulation, repairs, whitewashing of dwellings, etc. were positively solved. However, due to the limited material resources of the city economy and according to the analysis of the living conditions of the applicant the latter could receive a reasoned refusal: “Urgent measures for assistance are not required, the apartment is in satisfactory condition”; “Due to the difficult situation with housing in the city of Gorky, it is not possible to provide another dwelling instead of the emergency one”.

The veterans had the right to priority employment and reinstatement in their former place of work, so appeals on such issues were also received by the military department. At the same time, among them there are letters indirectly touching upon one of the wartime problems – lack of professional staff at the enterprises. Thus, when considering a letter about the reasons for the refusal to dismiss from the “Serp i Molot” Plant, the applicant received the following answer: “The management of the plant assures that after an appropriate employee for the position occupied by Mr. K. will be found, he will be released to his family” [9]. A similar situation occurred in the law enforcement agencies. For example, N. F. B-v appealed in connection with the refusal to dismiss him from the police and transfer him to another job. Soon the military department of the Gorky City Committee gave the following answer: “Due to understaff in the police bodies, I consider Mr. B-v’s request for his dismissal from the police to be denied” [10].

Another important topic directly related to the post-war activities of the authorities, which occupies a certain place in the appeals, required painstaking work – requests to establish the whereabouts of relatives, Red Army soldiers who were treated in hospitals in Gorky. The evacuation of civilians in the initial period of the war was carried out in extreme conditions. As a result, the military department received a significant number of appeals about the whereabouts of relatives who had arrived in the territory of Gorky and the region. Often citizens thanked in writing for the work and assistance provided. From a letter of a schoolboy of Gorky A. F. sent to an employee of the military department: “Thousands of times I thank you for your concern and attention to me. You are the only person who has helped me to find my father. How glad I was when I received his address from you. I hope that I will not remain owing to you” [11].

In addition to the above-mentioned problems concerning a variety of support for the families of front-line soldiers, the Party and Soviet city authorities had to deal with other equally important social issues: child homelessness, orphanhood, improvement of the city, quality of public utilities, transport, etc.

In 1946 material provision for the needy became more regular. Families continued to receive regular monetary payments in the form of allowances, constant assistance with manufactured goods. People with disabilities were granted state pensions

and ration cards. They could receive necessary treatment in specialized hospitals in the city and sanatoria. Later all these processes became more systematic.

E. Yu. Zubkova identified some features characterizing the mood of citizens in the first post-war years. First of all, it is trust in the Soviet system, war weariness, longing for peace, desire for a better life, but at the same time – constant confrontations with difficult to solve problems of everyday life [12]. At the same time there was a reasonable and fair belief of the front-line soldiers and their families that the state should show the utmost care about their well-being. Note that the Gorky City Party Committee, relying on the available rather limited opportunities and material resources of the war and the hardest post-war time, tried to provide the families of servicemen, demobilized soldiers, evacuees maximum social support, which certainly helped them to survive in a difficult period of Soviet history.

References

1. State Public Institution “State Socio-Political Archive of the Nizhny Novgorod Region”. Fund 30. List 1.
2. State Public Institution “State Socio-Political Archive of the Nizhny Novgorod Region”. Fund 30. List 1. File 3074.
3. State Public Institution “State Socio-Political Archive of the Nizhny Novgorod Region”. Fund 30. List 1. File 3114. Sheet 3.
4. State Public Institution “State Socio-Political Archive of the Nizhny Novgorod Region”. Fund 3. List 1. File 2995, 2997, 2999, 3000, 3124, 3125, 3127, 3128–3130, 3174, 3199, 3236.
5. State Public Institution “State Socio-Political Archive of the Nizhny Novgorod Region”. Fund 3. List 1. File 2999. Sheet 220.
6. State Public Institution “State Socio-Political Archive of the Nizhny Novgorod Region”. Fund 3. List 1. File 3124. Sheet 46–65.
7. State Public Institution “State Socio-Political Archive of the Nizhny Novgorod Region”. Fund 3. List 1. File 3124. Sheet 64.
8. State Public Institution “State Socio-Political Archive of the Nizhny Novgorod Region”. Fund 3. List 1. File 3124. Sheet 58–59.
9. State Public Institution “State Socio-Political Archive of the Nizhny Novgorod Region”. Fund 3. List 1. File 3000. Sheet 240–241.
10. State Public Institution “State Socio-Political Archive of the Nizhny Novgorod Region”. Fund 3. List 1. File 2995. Sheet 146–147.
11. State Public Institution “State Socio-Political Archive of the Nizhny Novgorod Region”. Fund 3. List 1. File 3000. Sheet 317.
12. Zubkova, E. Yu. *Post-War Soviet Society: Politics and Everyday Life. 1946 – 1953.* / E. Yu. Zubkova. – Moscow: ROSSPEN, 1999. – P. 111 – 119.
13. Lyubetsky, A. E. *The State and Families of Servicemen during the Second World War: USSR, Germany, Great Britain. Comparative analysis* / A. E. Lyubetsky // *Problems of history, philosophy, culture.* – 2016 – No. 3. – P. 211 – 218.
14. Nasonov, K. A. *Social Security of the Red Army Soldiers during the Great Patriotic*

War: Essence, Content and Contemporary Significance / K. A. Nasonov // Army and Society. – 2010. – No. 3. – P. 1 – 11.

15. World-war.ru [Electronic resource] (date of reference: 15/02/2021).

16. Ibid.

17. Ibid.

GREBENYUK A. V.

NNGASU, Nizhny Novgorod, Russian Federation

ARCHITECTURAL ENSEMBLE OF THE NIZHNY NOVGOROD ANNUNCIATION MONASTERY AS AN ARCHITECTURAL DOMINANT

The Nizhny Novgorod Annunciation Monastery is one of the oldest city monasteries of the Nizhny Novgorod diocese. Fragmentary information about it appears since the second half of XIV century. The history of the monastery up to that time has a legendary character [6; 10].

The significance of the monastery as an architectural dominant changed together with transformations in the planning structure of Nizhny Novgorod, the historical situation and the circumstances of the monastery's development.

The basic elements of the structure of the monastery complex were formed in the XVII century. They are, first of all, five-domed Annunciation Cathedral (1649) and the Church of the Assumption with two-steeped construction and a bell tower at the refectory [9, p. 199]. The first mention of this temple refers to 1652. There is a hypothesis that it stands on the place of the ancient Annunciation Cathedral of XIV century [3, p. 66]. The old temples of the monastery also include Alekseevskaya (nowadays Sergievskaya) church built at the end of XVII – beginning of XVIII centuries.

The structural element of the architectural ensemble of the monastery is the Annunciation Cathedral. [1]. In it there was a rich sacristy and monastery library. In the temple the Korsun Icon of the Mother of God was kept, according to legend, painted at the end of X century by Simeon the Greek and presented to the monastery by Metropolitan Alexius in the XIV century. (Withdrawn among the church valuables in 1928. Location is unknown) [3, p. 20, 21, 51]. In the library of the monastery there are also Kondar of the XI century and the Gospel of 1575 [3, p. 21, 57].

The planning structure of Nizhny Novgorod until the end of the XVII century gave a significant place to monasteries located on the city borders, giving them the importance of defensive outposts. This function was carried out in ancient times by the Annunciation Monastery situated on the western extremity of Nizhny Novgorod [7, p. 25, 26; 4, p. 69].

At the same time the Annunciation Monastery played a role of a nodal element in the composition of the Nizhny Novgorod settlement – “equal part of the city” on a par with the Kremlin [1]. Its most important component was the “white” Blagoveshchenskaya suburb. Administratively it belonged to the Annunciation monastery and was “the largest white suburb in the territory of the Nizhny Novgorod district” [8, p. 12]. Acting as a “self-sufficient urban formation” [1], the suburb even fought with the

local Zemstvo authority for the feudal tenants owing obligation in labor and in kind, Nizhny Novgorod residents [8, p. 12].

As part of its city-forming function, the suburb was a link between “the city fortress and the Annunciation Monastery”. Here, a street (the future Rozhdestvenskaya) stretched from the Ivanovskaya Tower, determined one of the directions of urban development.

Thus, the city-forming link “the Kremlin – the Annunciation Monastery” in ancient Nizhny Novgorod acted as one of the main lines in the urban compositional structure, and as an architectural dominant, the Annunciation Monastery designed the “spatial-compositional and view frame” of the territory of the Blagoveshchenskaya suburb [1].

The stone cathedrals of the monastery were included in the panorama of the city. They were “vertical dominants and the most important architectural accents...” in the planning “fractional” structure of Nizhny Novgorod. [12, p. 11].

The eighteenth century brought significant changes in the position of the monastery in the urban planning structure, somewhat reducing its importance in shaping the cultural landscape of the city. This was facilitated by a number of circumstances and events of urban life that happened at a given time.

With the end of the XVII century, the monastery lost control over the Blagoveshchenskaya suburb. In the future, the policy of secularization pursued by Catherine II further undermined the income of the monastery, depriving it of all possessions and funds for its development [2, p. 42].

The fires of 1715, 1722, 1767 caused significant damage to the architectural ensemble of the monastery, in which not only the property and documentation of the monastery burned down, but also its temple buildings were badly damaged. The main temple – the Annunciation Cathedral, being the compositional center of the monastery complex, burned out so much that from 1767 to 1782 there was no worship service at all.

At this time, the official status of the monastery in the structure of spiritual institutions significantly decreased. After the reform of church establishment in 1764, the monastery was transferred from a stavropegiat patriarchal, and then a synodal one, to the number of “third-class” with a staff of 12 monks [3].

In the 1770s the planning structure of the city begins to change, acquiring a regular character. Already in terms of the urban development plan of A. V. Kvasov “... almost all the towers of the Kremlin, and not religious buildings, began to serve as visual landmarks for newly laid streets” [12, p. 12]. The monastery begins to lose its importance as a city-forming planning “node”, gradually falling into a dilapidated state.

A new stage in the life of the monastery began after the transfer of Makaryev fair to Nizhny Novgorod, the consequence of which was the strengthening of the “urban development significance” of the monastery [1]. The transfer of the fair stimulated the development of the city [12, p. 14]. The completion of the first phase of its construction by the mid 1820s led to the need for a new urban development plan (architect V. I. Geste) [12, p. 12].

In the new planning structure, the fair turned out to be “the main place of attraction for all the life of the city” [12, p. 14]. The location of the monastery, which was directly opposite the fair ensemble, gave it the status of the city’s front gates. In this situation, the improvement of the monastery turned out to be a city-wide task [9, p. 206; 12, p. 15; 11, p. 61].

In the XIX century the Annunciation Monastery is significantly transformed in the “spirit of classicism”. In 1823 according to the project of architect V. N. Voronov the monastery walls with corner towers were erected on the eastern side of the monastery. New Saint Gates with Andreevskaya Church (1836) were built in the west [4, p. 70; 11, p. 61].

The building for monks and archimandrite chambers [2, p. 43] were reconstructed and one of the most “rich” [3] churches in Nizhny Novgorod – Alekseevsky church (1822-1834) – was built. In 1846 the Alekseevskaya chapel in the eastern part of the monastery territory was built anew according to the project of G. I. Kiesewetter. In the 1870s architect L. V. Dal conducted restoration works of the Annunciation Cathedral during which the original gables instead of the pitched roof set in the 1820s were restored [2, p. 43; 9, p. 199]. The construction was facilitated by benefactors, among whom, first of all, we should specify the names of merchants I. M. and M. M. Rukavishnikov, M. I. Kostromin and others [3, p. 73, 74]. Significant funds came from the memorial contributions of merchants who wished to be buried within the walls of the monastery [3, p. 72, 91], as well as from renting monastic premises for lodging and storage of goods of the merchants who came to Nizhny Novgorod Fair [2, p. 43, 9, p. 199].

The monastery gained importance also as a city necropolis, where were buried as ordinary merchants and burghers, as well as local bishops.

The orientation to the Nizhny Novgorod Fair determined the development of the opposite bank of the Oka in the XIX century, in which the Annunciation Monastery began to play a strategic role [12, p. 14]. This was facilitated by its location almost at the junction of Rozhdestvenskaya street and Chernigovskaya embankment, the development of which by the end of the XIX century was “... united with the ensemble of the monastery in a single compositional whole” [1]. The appearance of the Nizhny Novgorod Fair on the opposite bank of the monastery established interesting “view-points” of the monastery, making it one of the most picturesque architectural landmarks of the city (its new city-forming status is depicted in lithographs by André Durand (1839), photographs by M. P. Dmitriev (late XIX century), etc.).

By the beginning of the XX century the third-class Annunciation Monastery had 4 stone churches and 5 residential buildings [5, p. 143; 3, p. 55].

In the Soviet period, the role of the monastery as an architectural dominant is significantly reduced. This is due to the liquidation of the monastic community, as well as the appearance of new vertical dominants on the crest of the slope on the south side of the monastery.

Since 1918, the monastery was no longer active. For some time there was a church community at the gate church of St. Andrew. But soon it was closed. Premises of the monastery were rented to various organizations. In the Annunciation Cathedral

there was a repository. In the sub-church there was a vegetable storehouse.

The Alekseevskaya chapel was dismantled, as having no historical and architectural value, as well as the monastery fence with corner towers. After the Great Patriotic War the Planetarium was placed in the Alekseevsky church and stayed there from 1948 till 2005.

During the Soviet period the interior of the churches suffered a lot. As a result of withdrawal of church valuables in the 1920s the monastery lost all its relics and valuable utensils.

Only in 1960 the Annunciation Cathedral was included among the monuments protected by the state [2, p. 46]. Nevertheless, the monastery complex continued to deteriorate.

The restoration of the monastery's architectural ensemble began after the devastating tornado that swept through the upper part of the city on July 3, 1974, and severely damaged the buildings of the monastery's churches. First of all, the Annunciation Cathedral needed restoration, because the shrinkage of the walls caused a considerable slope of the drums of its domes. Most of the restoration work was completed by 1987 [2, p. 46].

In 2005, the Alekseevsky church was transferred to the diocese, and in 2006-2007 it was restored at the expense of its benefactors. In 2008 the church was transferred to the Nizhny Novgorod Seminary located near the monastery. The Alekseevskaya chapel was reconstructed in wood.

Modern researchers of this issue note "... high historical and memorial significance..." and good preservation of the existing Nizhny Novgorod Annunciation Monastery [11, p. 56].

Today the monastery is an object of cultural heritage and a valuable monument of architecture and urban development. It looks beautiful on the green background of the slope, and the territory of the monastery fits harmoniously into the cultural landscape of Nizhny Novgorod, corresponding to the developing structure of our city.

References

1. Agafonova, I. S. On the Methodology of Urban Planning and Architectural Design in the Territories with a Special Regime of Land Use (on the example of the concept of renovation and regeneration of the territory of the place of interest "Blagoveshchenskaya suburb" in Nizhny Novgorod) / I. S. Agafonova // opentextnn.ru/space/nn/agafonova-i-s-k-voprosu-o-metodike-gradostroitel'nogo-i-arhitekturnogo-proektirovaniya-na-territorijah-s-osobym-rezhimom-ispolzovaniya-zemel-na-primere-koncepcii-renovatsii-i-regeneratsii-territorii-dos/
2. Davydov, A. I. History of Construction of the Annunciation Cathedral of the Nizhny Novgorod Annunciation Monastery / A. I. Davydov // Uvarovskiye chteniya – III. A Russian Orthodox Monastery as the Phenomenon of Culture: History and Modernity. Materials of the scientific conference devoted to the 900th anniversary of the Murom Spaso-Preobrazhensky Monastery, April 17-19, 1996. – Murom, 2001. – P. 41-47.

3. Degteva, O. V. Alekseevskaya Church of the Nizhny Novgorod Annunciation Monastery / O. V. Degteva. – N. Novgorod, 2009. – 224 p.
4. Dobrovolsky, M. A Brief Description of Nizhny Novgorod Churches, Monasteries and Chapels / M. Dobrovolsky. – N. Novgorod, 1895. – 80 p.
5. Dranitsyn, N. N. Reference Book of the Nizhny Novgorod Diocese / N. N. Dranitsyn. – N. Novgorod, 1904. – 308 p.
6. Kuznetsov, A. A. Foundation and Early History of Nizhny Novgorod / A. A. Kuznetsov // Bulletin of the Nizhny Novgorod University n.a. N. I. Lobachevsky. – 2014. – No. 5. – P. 9 - 17.
7. Lavrov, V. A. Development of the Planning Structure of Historically Established Cities / V. A. Lavrov. – Moscow, 1977. – 176 p.
8. Filatov N. F. Cities and Suburbs of the Nizhny Novgorod Volga Region in the XVII Century (For the Problem of Trade and Industrial Development of Russia and the Formation of Russian Market) / N. F. Filatov. – Synopsis of Thesis of Doctor of Historical Sciences – Moscow, 1988. – 36 p.
9. Filatov, N. F. The Domes that Look at the Sky: Nizhny Novgorod Temple Architecture of the XVII – XX Centuries / N. F. Filatov. – N. Novgorod, 1996. – 154 p.
10. Chechenkov, P. V. History of the Nizhny Novgorod Region: New Editions, Old Problems / P. V. Chechenkov // Historical expertise. – 2017. – No. 1. – P. 151-162.
11. Shumilkin, M. S. Nizhny Novgorod Monastic Architecture. Monograph / M. S. Shumilkin, S. M. Shumilkin, T. V. Shumilkina. – N. Novgorod, 2018. – 195 p.
12. Shumilkin, A. S. Evolution of Architectural and Planning Structure of Nizhny Novgorod at the End of XVIII – Beginning of XX Centuries / A. S. Shumilkin. – Synopsis of Thesis of Candidate of Architecture. – N. Novgorod, 2010. – 24 p.

BELOUS T. I.

NNGASU, Nizhny Novgorod, Russian Federation

PECULIARITIES OF THE TRADITIONAL RUSSIAN WEDDING IN THE URBAN ENVIRONMENT

A traditional wedding is one of the most complex, multi-component and extended in time rites of the Russian people. It is a kind of historical and ethnographic document that provides material on the history of everyday life and traditions of the Russian population. The largest number of descriptions of Russian wedding refers to the end of XIX – beginning of XX centuries, herewith the majority of the material covers the wedding traditions of the Russian peasantry, although it also contains some information about marriages and weddings of urban population. There is still no comprehensive work on the traditional Russian wedding that examines its entire complex; most works are devoted to the wedding rites of a particular region or examine individual elements of the wedding ritual [2; 3; 4]. Although the first attempts of generalization on the Russian wedding ceremony were made in the 80's of the XIX century [11]. The study of the urban wedding begins in the XX century. At once we should mention that this work will focus on the traditional wedding ceremony of the late XIX – early

XX centuries in the cities of European Russia, mostly medium-sized in population, where the traditions have been preserved longer.

Ethnographers consider traditional a wedding of peasants who have preserved the rite until the 20's, and in some places until the 40's of the XX century; and in cities, peasants who influenced the development of urban wedding rituals and settled more often in the outskirts of cities, sometimes amounted to more than 30% [9]. The heterogeneity of the urban population, where the majority was the bourgeoisie (about 50%) [9], determined the main feature of the urban wedding: its multi-variant nature, due to the cultural and domestic traditions of different strata of the city population. In addition to the mentioned bourgeoisie, as well as the peasantry, gradually involved in other social strata, it is necessary to name merchants, nobility, clergy, intellectuals and others. But, despite the differences in the wedding of different social strata (and the bourgeoisie, and merchants, and even the nobility) to a greater or lesser extent it preserved the traditional basis of the wedding ritual. In order to identify the peculiarities of urban weddings, let us compare the wedding customs of traditional peasant wedding ceremonies and weddings in the city.

The structure of traditional Russian wedding consists of three stages: pre-wedding activities, wedding itself and post-wedding ceremonies. The first stage includes the following elements: choice of a couple, marriage proposal, bride-show, promise of marriage, drinking at the conclusion of match-making, wedding eve ceremonies, including bachelorette party. The wedding itself consists of ceremonies on the morning of the wedding day (gathering of the bride and the wedding train of the fiance, bride purchasing, departure for the wedding), church wedding, wedding feast in the fiance's house, second and third days of the wedding. Post-wedding ceremonies constituted "otgostki" (reciprocal visits) and many special ceremonies, timed, as a rule, to certain dates of the annual cycle (e.g., Cheese Fare Week customs, "vyunishniki" (rites associated with congratulating the young marrieds during the year)).

The average age of marriages in cities was 21–25 years for men and 19–25 years for women [12, p. 235], in villages the girl could be younger, but the age difference up to 10 years and more was typical for city wealthy strata, especially for merchants. The choice of the bride in the cities, as in the countryside, was made by the parents. Due to the greater isolation in the cities, the bride and fiance did not know each other more often, in the countryside this was less common. In the urban environment there were events for introductions within their social group: family-dance evenings and balls, while in groups of poorer citizens – "parties" and "conversations" similar to rural ones, where at certain days of the year fortunetelling about the coming marriage was accepted, just as in the villages. At the same time, individual fortunetelling was more common in the city, in contrast to the collective fortunetelling (e.g., with dishes), which was common among the peasants. The largest number of fortunetelling events fell, as in the village, during the Christmas.

The city's pre-wedding rites began, just as in the traditional wedding, with marriage proposal. But if in the villages, matchmakers were usually the fiance's female relatives, then in the cities match-making was typically executed with the help of professional matchmakers, who not only performed the marriage proposal for a fee, but

also selected the object, finding out everything about the dowry, appearance and character of the bride. The match-making for the poorer social strata (poor bourgeoisie, petty merchants, and craftsmen) was traditional. The available materials indicate that in the cities the tradition of observing a number of actions related to the belief in the ancient omens for successful match-making was preserved. The initial wording of the matchmakers also remained traditional: “You have a bride, we have a fiance”, “You’ve got a customer, you’ve got a business”, etc. At the match-making, the date of bride-show was agreed upon.

The bride-show was held differently by the citizens in different social and class environments, differing in the composition of the participants and the features of the procedure itself. On the outskirts of the cities and in the suburbs the more traditional form of the ceremony was preserved, in particular with the preservation of the custom of testing the bride. At the bride-show the dowry and gifts were negotiated. In the wealthy environment of petty bourgeoisie and merchants (and also nobility) an inventory of the dowry was made in writing, in the families of craftsmen, workers, petty traders, day laborers, as well as in villages, the dowry was agreed upon verbally. On that day, a date was set for the promise of marriage.

The promise of marriage, as in a traditional peasant wedding, was probably the most important moment of the pre-wedding cycle in the city, and by the late XIX – early XX centuries it was already called an engagement. The procedure of promise of marriage depended on the social status of the family, but after the promise of marriage, regardless of social status, as in a traditional wedding, the girl was considered finally betrothed (promised), after the engagement neither party could refuse the marriage. The arrangement of the dowry and gifts was often finalized at the engagement, the parties shook hands and determine the date of wedding. The timing of city weddings was not much different from the traditional peasant rite. More often it was the autumn (August 15 – November 14, O.S.) and winter (December 25, O.S. till Cheese Fare Week) periods, in summer from “Low Sunday” (the first Sunday after Easter) to Trinity and from Peter’s day (June 29, O.S.) to Honey Feast of the Savior (August 1, O.S.). The autumn weddings of rural population differed only in the time of their beginning which began a little later: from Pokrov (October 1, O.S.) [3, p. 131]. In the city, a church proclamation held after the promise of marriage was of great importance [10, p. 28-29]. And the traditional drinking, which took place between the promise of wedding and the wedding eve, by this time was little recorded in the cities.

On the eve of the wedding in the urban environment during this period a number of ritual elements of the traditional wedding were reduced or dropped out of the ritual, such as the ritual bath. Even the bachelorette party during this period was not obligatory for all social and class groups of the population; it was most typical for residents of the urban outskirts and for former villagers. During bachelorette parties there was often a traditional parting with girl’s “beauty” represented by various symbols (herringbone, embroidered towel, etc.) [5, p. 52]. Wedding ritual songs and especially lamentations were practically not performed here at the end of the XIX century. They sang to the harmonica, there were also games (“flower flirt”, “slips”, etc.), that is, in the cities the traditional ritual scheme of the bachelorette party noticeably simplified and came

closer to the usual festive fun of urban youth. On the day of the bachelorette party, most often the bed and dowry were transported to the fiance's house, and different groups of the urban population had their own specific customs which differed in the composition of the participants. The only exception was the nobility, whose dowry was not a public event.

On the eve of a wedding in the Russian ritual tradition, very ancient customs and rituals of baking wedding bread were performed, these were round loaf or kurnik; in the urban environment such a custom was preserved by certain social groups: craftsmen, small-scale pedlars, shopkeepers and those who retained ties with their rural relatives. At weddings of nobility, merchants, wealthy bourgeoisie the table was served with "wedding figurative spice cakes", but the actions with them were similar to those played by peasants around loaf and kurnik [8, p. 33]. Bread in the specified social environment was used, but only at the moment of blessing at the meeting of the young marrieds from the church.

The wedding itself in cities began in the morning of a wedding day in the bride's house with the ceremony of dressing her for the wedding. The use of amulets and protective actions in this case was characteristic both in peasant and urban environments, only the object embodiments of amulets could differ. In general, traces of dual faith were noted in both peasant and city weddings. In the fiance's house on the morning of the wedding there were preparations of the fiance, sending his gifts to the bride, collecting and decorating the wedding train, whose participants performed certain functions, and the chief master was "druzhka" (in cities this term is often replaced by the word "bridesman"). The departure of the train for the bride was accompanied by ceremonial protective actions. In peasant weddings, numerous artificial barriers on the way of the fiance's train to the bride's house played a great role, as did even more numerous rites of bride purchasing. In the city they were less pronounced. After the purchasing already in the bride's house and the blessing of her parents, the wedding train went to church, and the actions of apotropaic magic were applied again. Upon the tradition the bride said goodbye to everyone by crying and wailing until the departure from home, in the city this custom was practically absent during the period under review. The bride and fiance went to church separately.

The church wedding in the city was the focal point, while in the traditional rural wedding of the late XIX – early XX centuries the main ceremony remained the "unveiling" ceremony (braiding a girl's plait into two plaits and putting on a woman's headdress) on the first day of the wedding, i.e. for the tradition of a church wedding (without a "wedding feast" and "unveiling") often it was not enough that the peasant community sanctioned the marriage. After the church wedding, the young couple went together to the fiance's house or to the house where there would be a "ball", this term, borrowed from the life of the nobility, gradually replaced the traditional name "wedding (princely) feast". When the young couple arrived from church, they were greeted by the fiance's parents with an icon and bread and salt. There were no more traditions with inverted fur coat, of showering the young marrieds with grain and hops in the cities, but rather showering them with small money. Newlyweds arriving from the church wedding at the fiance's house in all social strata passed around the table three

times [5, p. 53], which is most likely a reduced form of archaic custom of passing around the hearth to join young wife to husband's house [6, p. 252].

On the first day of both traditional and urban weddings there was the custom of congratulating and gifting the young marrieds. Some elements of the traditional wedding feast were gradually disappearing by this time, first of all the rite of "unveiling", as well as, for example, sitting a young boy on the knees, although the custom of feeding the young with chicken was preserved by most social strata. The customs of parting the young to the marriage bed, which played a significant role in peasant weddings, as well as showing the bride's innocence in the morning, were not characteristic of citizens. The ritual wedding folklore (glorifying songs, other wedding songs, ritual folklore elements) was also poorly represented in urban weddings, it was preserved mainly among urban peasants; the most popular were dance songs, in the wealthy environment often heard both urban songs and "cruel romances" [7, p. 248], that is, the musical accompaniment of weddings in the city was already significantly different from the traditional wedding in the countryside.

The second day of the wedding in the city was seriously different from the traditional wedding, where they continued to feast, went to the house of the young marrieds, where they looked for, for example, "yarochnka" (i.e. the bride), "stole" certain items, etc. Widespread customs of dressing up after the first day of the wedding were absent in the cities, but preserved in the outskirts.

A traditional wedding in the countryside at the end of the XIX – beginning of the XX centuries was held more often for three days. The third day was absent in the urban environment, but instead of "otgostki" (the young couple walking together with their close relatives to visit their new kin) there was the so-called "visiting week" when the relatives of the young, starting with their godparents, came in turns to the newlyweds for tea with sweets. At the end of kinship visits, in the nobility and high-ranking environment courtesy visits to influential people began [1, p. 210].

The post-wedding stage of the traditional wedding included numerous customs on certain dates during the year associated with honoring the young, their trials (often playing), etc. These rites gradually incorporated the young into the social and everyday life of the peasant community throughout the calendar cycle, and only after that (or after the birth of a child before the end of the year) they were recognized as a full married couple. In the cities, these customs were mostly absent; here the post-wedding activities had a secular character and fulfilled a different social function.

Summing up, we can say that we cannot speak about a special urban wedding ceremony of the late XIX – early XX centuries, sharply different from the traditional rural one, since they are variants of a single Russian folk wedding ceremony. It varies in different socio-professional groups of citizens. At the same time, the urban ritual reveals features that allow us to talk about its originality, first of all, in different social strata. Transformations of the wedding in the city are associated with the displacement and disappearance of some ritual elements (but also with the appearance of innovations), with the simplification of the wedding cycle, with changes in the connections between wedding actions, rites and their functions, and with a partial change in terminology. At the same time, the urban population continues to have traditional forms of

wedding ceremonies, as well as there are certain traditional elements of the wedding of all social and class groups in the city. Russian socio-cultural heterogeneity of the city population had a great impact on the urban wedding, preserving traditional ethnic basis of the Russian folk wedding.

References

1. Aleksandrovsky, B. N. Features of the Moscow Way of Life at the Beginning of XX century / B. N. Aleksandrovsky // *Voprosy Istorii*. – 1975. – No. 7. – P. 209-212.
2. Belous, T. I. Russian Folk Wedding of the Nizhny Novgorod Region: Wedding Ceremony of the Southern Districts in the Interfluvium of Tyosha and Alatyr / T. I. Belous. – N. Novgorod: MP “Prosveshcheniye”, 1993.
3. Busygin, E. P. Social and Family Way of Life of the Russian Population in the Middle Volga Region / E. P. Busygin, N. V. Zorin, E. V. Mikhaylichenko. – Kazan, 1973.
4. Gura, A. V. Marriage and Wedding in the Slavic Folk Culture / A. V. Gura. – Moscow: Indrik, 2012.
5. Zhirnova, G. V. Russian Urban Wedding Ceremony of the End of XIX – the beginning of XX centuries / G. V. Zhirnova // *Sovetskaya Etnografiya*. – 1969. – No. 1. – P. 48 – 58.
6. Kagarov, E. G. On the Classification of Folk Rites / E. G. Kagarov. – L., 1928.
7. Kolpakova, N. P. Lyrics of the Russian Wedding / N. P. Kolpakova. – L., 1973.
8. Ostroumov, N. I. Wedding Customs and Ceremonies of Ancient Rus’: Historical and Ethnographic Essay / N. I. Ostroumov. – Tula, 1905.
9. First General Census of Population of the Russian Empire. Saint Petersburg, 1901. Vol. 15, part 2. – P. 2-3; Saint Petersburg, 1904. Vol. 29. – P. 2-3; Saint Petersburg, 1904. Vol. 44. – P. 2-3.
10. Saveliev, A. A. Legal Relations between Spouses according to the Laws and Customs of the Great Russian People / A. A. Saveliev. – N. Novgorod, 1881.
11. Sumtsov, N. F. About Wedding Ceremonies, Mostly Russian / N. F. Sumtsov. – Kharkov, 1881.
12. Yanson, Yu. E. Comparative Statistical Essays: Russian Data on Marriages / Yu. E. Yanson. – Saint Petersburg, 1873. Vol. 13, No. 7-8. P. 227-243.

LAPSHINA V. S.

NNGASU, Nizhny Novgorod, Russian Federation

ANTHROPOLOGICAL DETERMINATION OF URBANIZATION

The study of the dynamics of urbanization in the transition to a post-industrial society allows us to reveal the contradictions in the social life of the urban population and to outline the boundaries of modification of human worldview meanings, values and goals.

The modern post-non-classical period is characterized by axiological relativism. Relativism removes the distinction of value opposites, the so-called enantiodromia of culture takes place (values change places with their antipodes: “good” turns into “evil”, “beautiful” – into “ugly”, etc.) [7]. Such relativism can be observed in urbanism.

Modern society is characterized as a consumer society (J. Baudrillard), an information and network society (“liquid modernity” by Z. Bauman), a risk society (U. Beck). Contemporary British sociologist Zygmunt Bauman notes that in urban space there are meaningful spaces, “devouring” spaces, empty spaces and “non-spaces”. The purpose of the latter is to make us pass through them and leave them as soon as possible. Bauman believes that never before in world history “non-spaces” have occupied so much space (for example, airports, hotel rooms, highways, public transport, etc.) [4, p. 112-113]. These territories do not require possession of the complex art of politeness, because they reduce the behavior of people in public places to simple and clear instructions. The sociologist then writes of “empty spaces” which escape not only the gaze of architects and urban planners, but also the attention of people: “The emptiness of space is in the eye of the observer and in the feet or car wheels of the person moving through the city. Empty spaces are those spaces where one does not enter and where one can feel lost and vulnerable, surprised, stunned and a little frightened by the sight of the people one meets”. [4, p. 114]. For example, favelas in Brazilian cities, the Khlong Toei neighborhood in Bangkok, the City of the Dead in Cairo, and other backyards of the world. The intensive development of cities forces today to include “non-spaces” and empty spaces in the “map of the city”, integrating them into the urban collage. In recent years, a new hobby has even emerged, a new kind of tourism (slum tourism) – traveling through various slums.

Urbanization is associated with progress, but we should also be aware of the sad and irreversible consequences it leads to. The result of urban sprawl, the increase in urban population, the development of urban infrastructure and transportation is urbanism which implies a weakening of social control and social cohesion, anonymity of communication, predominance of formal-role communication, and rationality of behavior. These contradictions cause the relevance of studying the anthropological determination of urbanization.

The stated topic of the study requires some explication.

“Are cities engines of innovation, models of economic and social progress, as optimists consider them, or zones of pronounced inequality and class stratification, as pessimists claim?” – as one of the most famous theorists of modern urbanism Richard Florida in his book “The New Urban Crisis” asks [15, p. 4]. In his opinion, urbanism

is paradoxical and contradictory. To understand today's urban crisis it is necessary to carefully examine the arguments of both pessimists and optimists.

To be clear it is necessary to remember the distinction between "urbanization" and "urbanism".

Urbanization is the process of people moving from rural to urban areas, as well as the process of urban expansion and absorption of new areas by cities. Demographic criteria are quite suitable for describing these processes. Urbanism – is the socio-cultural consequences of living in an urban environment: changes in the system of values, habits, customs, patterns of human behavior. Urbanization and urbanism do not always go hand in hand. In developing countries you can see areas with a high degree of population concentration, i.e. urbanized ones, but with a low level of urbanism [6].

The German sociologist and philosopher Max Weber in "The City" writes that a city is "a settlement, hence a settlement in closely contiguous houses, which is so large that there is no personal acquaintance with one another specific to the society of neighbors" [5, p. 9]. Another German philosopher and sociologist Georg Simmel points to this last point as a key feature of the city (in sociocultural terms). Examining everyday human existence in his book "The Metropolis and Mental Life", Simmel notes that "the spiritual relation of the inhabitants of a big city to each other can be formally called a closedness" [9, p. 90]. We often "do not even know the faces of our neighbors, with whom we have lived in the same house for years". The inner side of this external isolation is indifference, mutual alienation, rejection, unspoken desire to avoid contact [9, p. 92-93].

N. P. Antsiferov, a Soviet cultural specialist and local historian, was a proponent of a comprehensive approach to the study of the city as a cultural phenomenon and separated "anatomy", "physiology", and "psychology", i.e., the soul of the city. N. P. Antsiferov referred to the "anatomy" of the city as the place, plan, core, growth, and elements of the city; to the "physiology" – the functions of the city as a social organism and the social composition of the population; to the "psychology" or "soul" — the urban landscape, historical destinies, repository of memories, character of population and expression of artistic tastes. N. P. Antsiferov referred architectural space to the "psychological" – spiritual and value-conscious sphere of the urban way of life, which determines the further development of any city. In the work "The Soul of St. Petersburg" N. P. Antsiferov revealed the cultural image of St. Petersburg through an analysis of fiction and poetry [2].

E. Yu. Ageeva considers the city as a cultural subject of development. In the study "City as a socio-cultural formation: functional-typological analysis" E. Yu. Ageeva notes that "the city is a certain cultural idea, notably frame, constituting everything else" [1, p. 13]. The city is analyzed and presented as a special cultural form, formed historically, along with other social institutions of society. Among the best urban projects of the world the first place belongs to ArtCity – Kunststad in Amsterdam. The conception "the city as a cultural idea" became a reality here. One of the most important art-clusters in the Netherlands has more than 200 art, architecture and design studios, 12 theater halls and several galleries. The author of the overview of the best urban

projects in the world, Yuri Manukyan, notes that “a successful city is something like a cool party: people stay there because it feels good” [13].

E. Yu. Ageeva draws attention to the fact that the city not only reflects the features and nature of the development of civilization, it also “shapes”, forms a special type of human [1, p. 14]. Urban space, architecture, geography of the city, rhythm of the city influence on thinking, feelings, experiences and inner world of a person. Let us consider an example of the influence of city architecture on a person during the Middle Ages. Gothic cathedrals, such as the Roman Catholic Cologne Cathedral and the Catholic Church Notre Dame de Paris, are not just symbols of the Middle Ages, they represent the spirit of the time, the religious-idealistic consciousness, the worldview of the Middle Ages. And the use by architects of sculptures of chimeras, demons, statues of gargoyles, dragons and monsters only strengthened the aesthetic experience and the experience proved and lived by person of that time.

Philosophically, the city and a human can be seen as dialectically interdependent subjects of interaction. A human “speaks” to the city through his activities, and the city to a human — through the language of symbols, the influence of the community and the peculiarities of public and private spaces [3].

E. V. Danilova, D. V. Bakshutova in their study “Models of Urban Description in the Context of Historical Evolution” note that “the speed of changes in spatial organization is identical to the speed of urbanization – radical changes in urban structures follow and continue to follow the waves of urbanization” [8]. The authors of the study give a whole classification of possible variants of models of the city from a simplified image – a “diagram” – to a full representation – a “picture”. Urban models covered four main aspects: communication, structure, monuments and society. In the XX century a lot of author’s concepts emerged, which were born from different interpretations of these original images (*the city as a collection of blocks*, the city as an artifact of history and memory, the city as a collage, the city as psychosocial space, the city as a set of macro-spaces, etc.).

The procedure of analysis of descriptive models of the city allows us to conclude that the professional project of the city went beyond the framework of architectural and urban planning activities and became an urbanistic project. This conclusion, on the one hand, allows us to talk about interdisciplinarity in the study of the city and urban space, and on the other hand, contributes to the unification of different approaches and new points of view. In addition to urban planners and architects, sociologists, historians, psychologists, and politicians take part in urban studies.

Modern researchers of the urban structure of Russia and its spatial differentiation distinguish territories of demographic growth and decline on the national scale. The authors note that there are two large zones with decreasing urban population (European and Asian) and six zones of smaller scale in which the urban population has increased (South-Western, Central, North-Western, Volga-Ural, Siberian and Yakutia) [14]. This is due to the unbalanced development of the economic sphere in the regions, and the cessation of the functioning of entire industries. The authors emphasize that the spatial differentiation of urbanization becomes the cause of depression not only in the econ-

omy and demography of individual regions, but also in the social sphere. Such transformation of the urbanized environment of Russia can lead to “depopulation” and “desolation” of entire regions of the country.

The disadvantages of urban growth include pollution, overcrowding in cities, emergence of “poor neighborhoods” in mega-cities, and increased crime. Urbanization results in fundamental changes in the employment structure of the population, in the lifestyle of a modern person, and in the nature of social relations. All this, in turn, affects the value world of a person, his comprehension of social, cultural, economic processes occurring all around. According to the results of studies on the evolution of value orientations of the population of Russia, it became obvious that the most significant shifts in value orientations can be observed in the donor regions (four subjects of the Federation: Moscow, Tyumen region, Khanty-Mansi and Yamalo-Nenets Autonomous Districts), while subsidized regions (they account for 44.3% and include 35 subjects of the Federation) showed as their leading values and standards the strategy of survival or quite archaic in its essence system of traditional Russian cultural values which is very far from the liberal values that are being strongly promoted [12].

According to R. Florida, a decisive condition for the prosperity of the city is the attraction and retention of talented professionals (creative class): people of intellectual labor and technical specialties, as well as representatives of creative professions [15, p. 27].

Today, every resident of the city can become a participant of the city research and express his/her idea of the future of his/her native city.

For example, in 2020 the Financial University under the Government of the Russian Federation conducted the final study of the quality of life in Russian cities with a population of more than 250 thousand people. When assessing the quality of life in Russian cities the focus was on the following aspects: the state of roads and road facilities, including the state of the roadway; interest in cultural values – theaters, exhibitions, museums, books, as well as the desire to get a good education for themselves and their children; work of the housing and public utilities to maintain housing in good condition, issues on the improvement of the city, etc. The city of Nizhny Novgorod scored 74 points out of 100 and took 13th place (out of 75 cities). According to the results in 2020, the cities with the highest quality of life are Moscow, St. Petersburg, Grozny, Kaluga and Kazan.

Modern citizens can be involved in projects related to the study of the city, urban space, and improvement. There are public organizations which study cities (“Nash Dom”, “Smart Cities”), teach new urban professions (Center for Applied Urbanism), engage in educational activities, teach to take care of themselves, others and nature (Open Laboratory of Ecourbanism), designed to improve the urban environment with the help of modern urbanism data (Urban Projects) [11]. For example, the creation of a public park (Superkilen, Copenhagen) located in the multi-ethnic neighborhood of Nørrebro was preceded by a survey of the residents of the neighborhood (how they imagine the future park). In total, more than 60 nationalities living in Nørrebro were represented in the park. “Water pipes from Israel, rainbow bicycle racks from Finland, sidewalk bollards from Ghana, palm trees from China, neon signs from Qatar, benches from

Brazil, a Japanese rock garden, a Moroccan fountain, manhole covers from Zanzibar,” – these and many other things, according to Yu. Manukyan, represent a brilliant solution to level out intercultural conflicts (and the area was famous for such conflicts) and create an organic and attractive environment for migrants, and just for the residents and guests of the Danish capital.

“The active involvement of citizens and experts in the process of creating projects for the development of territories is an important aspect in the integrated development of the urban environment and a prerequisite for the program #Sreda800”, states the director of the Institute of Urban Environment Development of the Nizhny Novgorod region, Daria Shorina [10]. The concepts for the development of district squares, boulevards, embankments of Nizhny Novgorod arose out of the discussion, dialogue between representatives of architectural firms and residents of Nizhny Novgorod. In order to make the public spaces demanded and precisely meeting the needs of citizens, online questionnaires were created to collect proposals using Google Forms, where citizens could evaluate the proposed solutions. Comments and questions from online broadcasts and social media posts were also collected and processed. The role of natural oases in urban space, places of recreation and cultural leisure is increasing.

Humanity and inhumanity of urbanization (in fact, its anthropological determination), this growing and becoming more and more evident duality is both a cause and a consequence of increasing involvement of every (almost) citizen in the city development, when an ordinary citizen acts as a co-author of architectural projects and concepts of urban areas development.

References

1. Ageeva E. Yu. The City as Sociocultural Formation: Functional and Typological Analysis: Synopsis of Thesis of Doctor of Philosophy: 24.00.01 / E. Yu. Ageeva; Nizhny Novgorod State University of Architecture and Civil Engineering. - Nizhny Novgorod, 2005. - 48 p.
2. Antsiferov N. P. The Soul of St. Petersburg. [Electronic resource] URL: <https://www.litmir.me/br/?b=104728&p=1> (date of reference: 18/02/2021).
3. Balyushina Yu. L. A Man and Small Town: Specificity of Interaction (philosophical aspect) // Manuscript. 2016. No. 7-2 (69). P. 16-18.
4. Bauman Z. Liquid Modernity / Translation from English. Edited by Yu. V. Asochakov. – St. Petersburg: Piter, 2008. – 240 p.
5. Weber M. The City / Translation from German; 2nd ed. – Moscow: Strelka Press, 2018. - 252 p.
6. Vershinina, I. A. Sociology of the City: Origins and Main Directions of Research // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 18. Social Studies and Political Science. 2012. No. 1. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/sotsiologiya-goroda-istoki-i-osnovnye-napravleniya-issledovaniy> (date of reference: 18/02/2021).
7. Vyzhletsov G. P. Axiology of Culture at the Turn of the Century // International Journal of Cultural Studies. 2016. No. 2 (23). URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/aksiologiya-kultury-na-rubezhah-vekov> (date of reference: 10/02/2021).

8. Danilova, E. V., Bakshutova, D. V. Models for Describing a City in the Context of Historical Evolution [Electronic resource] / E. V. Danilova, D. V. Bakshutova // Architecton: Proceedings of Higher Education. – 2017. – No. 4 (60). – URL: http://archvuz.ru/2017_4/1 (date of reference: 18/02/2021).
9. Simmel, G. The Metropolis and Mental Life / Translation from German. Moscow: Strelka Press, 2018. – 112 p.
10. Institute of Urban Environment Development of the Nizhny Novgorod region. Nizhny 800. [Electronic resource] URL: <https://sreda800.ru/> (date of reference: 23/02/2021).
11. Information from the website: All Russian Urbanism [Electronic resource] URL: <https://urban.2g0.ru/> (date of reference: 23/02/2021).
12. Lyakhovets, A. S. Evolution of Value Consciousness of Citizens in Modern Russia // Bulletin of MGUKI. 2011. No. 2. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/evolyutsiya-tsennostnogo-soznaniya-gorozhan-v-sovremennoy-rossii> (date of reference: 23/02/2021).
13. Manukyan, Yu. Best Urban Projects in the World: Part One [Electronic resource] URL: <https://www.prostranstvo.media/luchshie-urbanisticheskie-proekty-mira-chast-pervaja/> (date of reference: 18/02/2021).
14. Sokolov, A. A., Rudneva, O.S. Modern Urban Structure of Russia and its Spatial Differentiation // Narodonaselenie. 2018. No. 3. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/sovremennaya-urbanisticheskaya-struktura-rossii-i-ee-prostranstvennaya-differentsiatsiya> (date of reference: 10/02/2021).
15. Florida, R. The New Urban Crisis: How Our Cities Are Increasing Inequality, Deepening Segregation, and Failing the Middle Class and What We Can Do about It / Richard Florida: Translation from English. – Moscow: “Tochka” Publishing Group, 2018. – 368 p.

PROKHOROV M. M.

NNGASU, Nizhny Novgorod, Russian Federation

MARXIST PHILOSOPHY AND CONCEPT OF NOOSPHERE

BY V. I. VERNADSKY

The “Theses on Feuerbach” by K. Marx, in which the opposition between the philosophy of activism and the contemplative philosophy is established, is considered to be the beginning of Marxism [1, 25-29]. Such an approach cannot be considered satisfactory today. In the Russian tradition, there is the philosophy of Russian cosmism [16], which has as its basis the opposition between the activist (which ensures the domination of man over the world) and contemplative (which adapts man to the world) attitude of man to the world. Indeed, it developed and defended the “philosophy of activism”. Marxist philosophy offers a different type of worldview relation of man, different from the activist one.

To prove this, let us conduct a comparative analysis of Marxism and the concept of noosphere by V. I. Vernadsky which belongs to the philosophy of Russian cosmism. Their “similarity” is that they proposed a transition from the first “axial time” to the

second one. According to K. Jaspers, the “axial time” in Modern time has turned into a “catastrophic impoverishment” of humanity, “impoverishment of all spiritual life” in Europe; only achievements in the field of science and engineering are the essence of the greatness of this time. But, as K. Jaspers conceded, it is possible for mankind to enter a second axial time, when true human and humane essence is realized, realized in a “universal and all-encompassing” way. The question, according to K. Jaspers, is “whether the coming development will retain its openness and culminate... in the creation of a real man, although the way in which this will happen we cannot yet imagine at all” [24]. Marxism, Russian cosmism and the concept of noosphere proposed various options for the implementation of this project.

According to literary sources under the definition of philosophy of Russian cosmism “fall heterogeneous approaches of philosophy”, scientific-philosophical and religious-philosophical ones, on which crossroads there is “common cause philosophy” by N. F. Fedorov. A distinctive feature of its representatives is their attention to the analysis of man’s relations with the world and the cosmos. It fixes different types of world-relations: contemplative (A. L. Chizhevsky), activist (N. F. Fedorov), less frequently, coevolutionary (N. N. Moiseev) [21]. For instance, A. L. Chizhevsky is famous for developing the doctrine of the direct influence of solar activity and energy processes in the Galaxy on individual and social activity of humans (theory of heliotaxia). However, the leading type in the philosophy of Russian cosmism is the activist-transformation type of man’s attitude to the world.

In an effort to avoid ambiguity in the definition of Russian cosmism due to its unjustified and immeasurable expansion, S. G. Semenova believes that it is necessary to fix “a fundamentally new quality of worldview”, which is a defining “genetic feature” of this philosophical approach. Such she recognizes as “the idea of active evolution”, i.e. the necessity of “a new conscious stage in the development of the world, when humanity directs it in the direction dictated by its reason and moral sense, takes the steering wheel of evolution in its own hands, so to speak”. It is logical to define this approach “not only as cosmic, but as active-evolutionary”. Man is a conscious-creative being, called to transform not only the outer world, but also his own nature, including the overcoming of disease and death. The question of spiritualization of the world and man, even of management of the spirit of matter, is also covered [19, p. 4].

Difficulty in defining the philosophy of Russian cosmism and the concept of noosphere, from our point of view, is due to two circumstances. Firstly, the “complexity” of different types of worldview, in the clash of which the concept of activist worldview makes its way as a leading one. Secondly, the “complexity” and hence the clash of different positions (paradigms) in the course of the solution of the main question of philosophy, each of which is capable of penetrating the “territory” of the justification of the worldview concept. This determines the polemics within Russian cosmism. For example, the doctrines of N. F. Fedorov and S. N. Bulgakov are expressions of an activist type of world-relationship. This allows us to list them “comma separated” as being of the same type. On the other hand, S. N. Bulgakov criticizes the doctrine of N. F. Fedorov, in whom he sees a representative of the pantheistic position, from a more consistent religious and idealistic conception. It is pertinent to remember that S. N.

Bulgakov passed a difficult way of spiritual evolution: from fascination with Marxism he turned “to idealism”, sought to substantiate economic, cultural activity of man from the religious point of view, to bring it into the Christian concept of the development of the world, in which he sees not only moral preaching, but also activity, creativity, in which its “world-building” sense is manifested.

Discussing “economy and theurgy” and pointing out the pantheism of N. F. Fedorov’s concept, S. N. Bulgakov writes that he “transforms economy into theurgy, or rather, merges the two till indistinguishable, as for him the raising of the dead stops being theurgy, but becomes economy-magic entirely” [4, p. 310]. As a consequence, the question “what is life and what is death” becomes unclear, thus introducing “a sad ambiguity and uncertainty in the whole doctrine”. It turns out a peculiar combination of materialism and spiritualism, which corresponds to a purely mechanical understanding of both death and resurrection: “The possibility is excluded that the soul, having passed through the gate of death, cannot return at all to the body, which is outlived and destroyed by death, and bring it back to life”. So, “it is not the body alone that has lost the power of life”. S. N. Bulgakov argues: “Resurrection, like birth, is a creative act of God’s omnipotence by which the soul of the deceased receives back its life-giving power”; it is “a theurgic act”. Fedorov’s “project” of economic and labor, magical resurrection “sins with an improper mixture of economic and theurgic spheres”, is “a fall into magism”, which puts a man in dependence on the “economy” [4, p. 311]. Therefore S. N. Bulgakov stands for “abolition of matter” (as the beginning – M. P.), “source of death and mortality”, denying the view of N. F. Fedorov, who “goes in the direction of Mechnikov, since he seeks scientific immortality, taking as it the absence of death, or uncertain duration of life”. N. F. Fedorov thinks rather about corpse revival, but not about resurrection of “spiritual body, glorified and transformed” [4, p. 312].

In this criticism, S. N. Bulgakov demonstrates a self-growing to excess notion of the opposition between spirit and matter, man and nature, soul and body, leading to the recognition of the primacy of the spirit at the cost of “nothingness” of matter. Pointing to it, F. Engels wrote that such an opposition “spread in Europe since the decline of classical antiquity and received the highest development in Christianity” [23, p. 495-496]. It was formed in the course of formulating and solving the basic question of philosophy. Speaking against the idea of such an increase of alternativity of spirit and matter, man and nature, soul and body, which was fixed in the medieval tradition, F. Engels pointed, on the contrary, to the increasing awareness of people of “their unity with nature” and noted the contribution of natural science to it. Therefore, he objected to man’s attitude of domination over nature presenting “as someone outside nature”. On the contrary, we belong to nature and are within nature, we must learn to regulate natural processes. But to overcome this “contradiction”, simple cognition is not enough; we need a revolution in the very mode of our production, to free it from the blind play of uncontrollable forces. In this, F. Engels follows the ideas of the joint work with K. Marx “The German Ideology” [13], immediately adjacent to Marx’s “Theses on Feuerbach”, imbued with the humanism of coevolution.

The opposite to S. N. Bulgakov approach is demonstrated by V. I. Vernadsky, proposing the concept of noosphere from the position of a “naturalist” and remaining

in the mainstream of the activist paradigm. V. I. Vernadsky's notions of contemplation and activism are present in the ideas of the opposition of the nonliving matter to life, he argues that the evolutionary process is inherent only in living matter, in the nonliving matter of our planet there is no manifestation of it, except nonliving natural bodies, always associated with living matter, to which they are subordinate [5, p. 306]. Instead of the concept of life the scientist introduces the concept of "living substance", a set of "living organisms" as a scientific, empirical generalization of countless, empirically indisputable facts, known and easily and accurately observed by all. Humanity as a living substance is inextricably linked to the biosphere, it cannot be physically independent of it for a single moment, although "in communion" we usually speak of man as an individual living and moving freely on our planet, who freely builds his history. Historians, humanists and even biologists consciously do not consider the laws of biosphere nature, where only life can exist, while spontaneously man is inseparable from the biosphere [5, p. 304-305].

In contrast to Marxism, the social philosophy of which appears as the ultimate general theory of the historical process, V. I. Vernadsky believes that the concept of life leads beyond the history of people in the broader field of a single large earthly geological process, covering both the nonliving and living nature from the same point of view. The biosphere is a planetary phenomenon of a cosmic nature, implying activism: V. I. Vernadsky writes that according to Huygens, "life is a cosmic phenomenon..., sharply different from the nonliving matter" [5, p. 305]. The history of living matter is expressed in the change of forms of life, forms of living organisms from generation to generation, without interruption, emphasized in the doctrine of the evolution of species, plants and animals. It is important that the evolution of living matter goes in a certain direction, called by D. Dan cephalization, the growth of the nervous system (brain). Geologically, it leads to the human kingdom, according to I. P. Pavlov, to the anthropogenic era: man becomes a mighty geological force, all growing. As a result, man's position on our planet has changed. Humanity has become one. All this is the result of the cephalization by Dan, the growth of the human brain and its guided labor. The power of man is not related to his matter, but to the brain, mind and labor directed by this mind.

V. I. Vernadsky is a follower of abstract humanism, on the basis of which he writes that in the "geological history of the biosphere a great future opens up before man, if the man understands this and does not use his mind and labor for self-destruction". He takes into account the possibility of the destruction of values due to the barbaric invasion of "the Germans (fascists – M. P.) and their allies"; this circumstance cannot be ignored, remaining on empirical positions. "The geological evolutionary process corresponds to the biological unity and equality of all men... It is a law of nature. All races interbreed with each other and produce fertile offspring". In modern war (with fascists – M. P.) the one who follows this law will win since "one cannot go against the principle of the unity of all people as a law of nature with impunity" [6, p. 308]. Human history embedded in the natural geological process "changes... and the interests of the masses of the people – all and everyone – and the free thought of the individual determine the life of mankind, are the measure of its ideas of justice. Humanity, taken as a

whole, becomes a powerful geological force. And before it, before its thought and labor raises the question of restructuring the biosphere in the interests of freethinking humanity as a whole. This new state of the biosphere... is just “noosphere”, modern stage, geologically experienced biosphere, where man for the first time becomes the largest geological force [6, p. 308-309]. Vernadsky’s reasoning does not go beyond this abstract humanism.

V. I. Vernadsky also points out the “incomprehensibility” or “mystery” of this process. Here is how he describes them: “Thought is not a form of energy. How can it change material processes? This question is still scientifically unresolved” [6, p. 309]. V. I. Vernadsky finds himself in the grip of raising the question of excessive opposition between spirit and matter, man and nature, soul and body. This problem is characterized by F. Engels in the second chapter of his work “Ludwig Feuerbach...” as “the great fundamental question of all, especially, modern philosophy” “concerning the relation of thinking to being”, being rooted in the period of wildness, and which was posed “with all sharpness” after the Christian Middle Ages. V. I. Vernadsky poses this question as a naturalist, falling in the grip of the opposition between contemplation and activism. He writes: “The noosphere is the last of many states of the biosphere’s evolution in geological history – the state of our days” [6, p. 310]. He separated life from nonliving matter, excluding its “spontaneous generation” from non-life matter, i.e. excessively contrasting the living as a carrier of mentality, consciousness and thought, to the nonliving. Thus, human thought, consciousness could not be understood as the highest form of the property of reflection inherent in all matter. “Autotrophy” of man is only another name for the excessive opposition between spirit and matter, man and nature, soul and body, denying the material unity of the world: “In the biosphere there is a great geological force, perhaps cosmic, a force whose planetary action is not usually taken into account in ideas about the cosmos... This force, apparently, is not a manifestation of energy or a new special form of it... This force is the mind of man... Manifestation of this force in environment has appeared after a myriad of centuries as an expression of unity of a set of organisms – monolith of life – “living substance”, a part of which is mankind... It becomes more and more independent of other forms of life and evolves to a new vital manifestation” [5, p. 288]. This approach is justified by V. I. Vernadsky as an “empirical generalization” of the existence in the Earth’s crust of “a single whole of life” and not as the material unity of the world. He sees this as “the deepest cosmic mystery”, a “riddle” before which “the thought of the great Greeks” (remember Anaxagoras – M. P.) “stopped”. “This riddle has remained for us... as unsolved as it was for them” [5, p. 289]. V. I. Vernadsky refers to the statement of F. Redi (1626-1698): “every living organism comes from another living organism”. He raises it to the “Redi principle”, “the idea of eternity of life, the denial of its beginning, the idea of the enigmatic – in the aspect of the known physical and chemical phenomena – difference which exists between the nonliving and living matter” [5, p. 289-290]. He does not recognize that “the direct synthesis of the organism from its material elements should be a necessary completion of the development of science”, that “there was a moment when the organism originated in the Earth’s crust by virtue of spontaneous change of nonliving matter”.

At the same time, V. I. Vernadsky excludes the possibility of a philosophical justification of the origin of life, based on the consideration of the general properties of moving matter or material motion, although “they cannot be considered scientifically rejected”. V. I. Vernadsky writes that “nothing points to their probability”, he refers the “problem of spontaneous generation” to problems like “squaring of the circle”, “trisection of the angle”, “perpetuum mobile”, “philosopher’s stone”. “If spontaneous generation is not a fiction created by our minds, it can only take place outside the realm of known physical and chemical phenomena”, since empirically “no trace of spontaneous generation of life has been found”, “there is no organism... whose genesis would not conform to the Redi principle”, living matter is “sharply separated from nonliving matter. Man is inextricably linked as a whole to the life of all living beings that exist or have ever existed” [5, p. 290-291]. V. I. Vernadsky reminds that the German physiologist W. Pfeffer (1845-1920) called autotrophic the organisms that do not depend on other organisms for their nutrition [5, p. 293], and expresses the hope that humanity also will become free from dependence on other living matter, turning from a socially heterotrophic being to autotrophic one, using activism and primacy of thought. For a “naturalist” this would be “not an action of the free will (whim – M. P.) of man, but a manifestation of a natural process” [5, p. 302].

V. I. Vernadsky suggests that the priority of thought, which S. N. Bulgakov tried to substantiate from religious positions, should be substantiated from the “naturalist’s” position. It turns out that thought cannot be considered from the point of view of the material unity of the world on which Marxism insists, from the point of view of the mutual dependence of matter and motion as inseparable moments of reality in which motion is the universal mode of existence of matter, material substance, an attribute inherent in it which “embraces all the occurring... changes and processes starting from the simple movement and finishing with thinking” [22, p. 391]. V. I. Vernadsky argues “vice versa”, from thinking as the most complex to the simplest, the expression of such an approach is his “noosphere” that turns into the first notion, the reference system for thinking. Thereby he removes the question of the possibility of the humanity’s entry into the second axial time, when a true human and humane essence is realized, which was only allowed by K. Jaspers, wondering “whether the coming development will keep its openness and whether it will result in the creation of a real man”. V. I. Vernadsky removes the question of K. Jaspers as to whether this will happen, because, according to K. Jaspers, how this will happen, “we cannot yet imagine at all”. V. I. Vernadsky proceeded from the reality of the noosphere, which he found in the past, present and future, without reasoning about the transition in the categories of possibility and reality.

Ontologically, matter is the universal basis, the general content of all states of change, gnoseologically, it is objective reality reflected in the sensations, perceptions and concepts of the subject of cognition. Consequently, motion is absolute since the world as a whole is moving matter or material motion, whose individual states are the result of motion of matter or material motion. At the same time, motion is relative since the absolute nature of matter motion does not appear directly, but is realized always and only in concrete, qualitatively and quantitatively defined, locally and historically limited, dependent on concrete conditions, transient and in this sense relative forms of

motion. “Nothing is eternal except eternally changing, eternally moving matter, laws of its motion and change”. Any state of matter must be looked upon as a state of its motion and must always be expected to change and move into a different state of motion. According to dialectics, changes are generated by contradictions, the contradictory nature of motion appears in the form of the unity of stability and variability: any change of state is accompanied by preservation, stability, rest of the basis of this change; the very movement, change, development implies relative stability of what is changing; without stability of objects of change, change itself as such is impossible. Movement, change, development are connected with stability, preservation, and do not exist without it; on the contrary, all rest, stability is only an expression of the state of movement and development. Movement and development are sustainable, and sustainability is the stability of movement and development itself. “The world consists not of finished objects, but is the whole of processes, in which objects, seemingly unchangeable, as well as their mental screenshots and concepts are in the uninterrupted process of change” [8, p. 363, 391, 554], and “a philosophical theory of any manifestations of matter must always rest on an adequate reflection of the general properties of motion” [18, p. 5].

On the basis of the alternative nature of the activist type of worldview to the contemplative one, A. V. Sukhovo-Kobylin, one of the first representatives of the Russian cosmism philosophy, also gave the main role to consciousness, “... work of spirit, which abolishes the natural form, i.e. nature”, he stated that nature comes into spirit, that “spiritualization of nature is the creation of man”, that “man himself is this coming of nature into spirit, since man, like Janus, has two faces”. Although, in doing so he refers to the Bible: “You are Gods, it is said in the Scripture” [20, p. 63].

The contemplative organization of the human mind adapts man to the surrounding world and its laws, seeing in them the foundation of human activity. It can agree with dialectics: changing the world, creating new things, man interprets changes as a movement of the “very” world. Man sees himself as a being who acts “on behalf of” the substance of the universe and its regular change. The world is absolute, man is relative, a bearer of the fundamental parameters of the world itself. That is why he cannot be ascribed the traits of a subject, a self-sufficient creator, but must be seen as the life of “substance” which reveals itself in everything. This life also manifests itself in the image of man while his consciousness provides man with the knowledge of the laws of the universe according to which he acts, unlike all other unconscious things and processes. This is how the philosophy of Heraclitus, who reflected on the cosmos and man, presents man’s position in the cosmos and the contemplative organization of the human mind.

Classical natural science can remain committed to a contemplative position insofar as it portrays man as a being who emerges in the process of natural evolution, at its “end”, being the “elite” of natural evolution. So man remains a natural conscious being who could not have been the creator of the nature that preceded him. The contemplative position may also be shared by the objective idealist. Hegel, for example, insisted on the rationality of reconciliation with reality, justifying the need to eliminate the “insubordination of the individual” in relation to the whole, such as the historical

epoch, of which it acts as a son, being “within” it. No one is able, writes Hegel, to “jump over his epoch” [7, p. 16, 59].

However, such a position of man in the world carries a great danger for him. Russian cosmologist V. F. Odoevsky, in particular, pointed to it, referring to the characteristics of possible “natural disasters”, natural catastrophes, often dooming man to death. For example, he refers to the case when a comet can destroy the Earth [17, p. 38-48]. In order not to perish, a human being has to proceed to active actions transforming the natural course of events, abandoning “contemplation”. Only in this way the “situation of mortality” can be overcome. Man finds himself faced with the need to control the “world process” by himself, to emerge from subordination to the world process, to demonstrate a new form of organization of the human mind and attitude toward the world. In doing so, man is able to rely on the religious dream of conquering all things. In other words, religion acted as the first prerequisite of “activism” that man discovered in culture. It carries within it the doctrine of creation and the creator, which man accepts as a new pattern of his behavior, as a being created in the image and likeness of God. Religion seems to have technological roots, less rooted in the process of knowing “what is”. This “gluing” of religion and technology is demonstrated in different ways by the philosophical doctrines of A. V. Sukhovo-Kobylin, N. F. Fedorov, S. N. Bulgakov, etc.

From our point of view the activism of religion of the Middle Ages became a prerequisite for the Renaissance and New Age concept of human creativity, making possible the transition from feudalism to capitalism, which widely deployed in the natural space “production” that emerged “from the hiding place” of the world, nurtured a new type of human attitude to the surrounding world and the form of organization of the human mind. Thus, historically and logically, the world became dependent on man. This was expressed by the philosophy of Russian cosmism, which, in the person of its representatives, deifies the technocratic attitude of man to the world, combining science and technology, as they say nowadays, in “technoscience”. N. F. Fedorov, the founder of the philosophy of Russian cosmism, rethinks the concept of “cosmism”, stating that its essence is not the domination of cosmos over man, as with Heraclitus, but the domination of humanity over cosmos, implementing its “common cause” in it. He criticizes science, which deals with knowledge, only contemplating the world, whereas its work consists in its transformation by man; even I. Kant’s position, regarded as the embodiment of contemplation, is criticized. N. F. Fedorov writes that the fantasy of such a transition is “only apparent; the necessity of such a transition is doubtless for a realistic, direct view of the subject for those who will want to take into account all difficulties to create a fully moral society, to correct all vices and evils...”, while to refuse to solve this problem means “to refuse to be human” [17, p. 71-72]. The transition, according to N. F. Fedorov, will either be made by man himself, or it will be executed by God.

As J. Ortega y Gasset showed, an important factor in the expansion of activism was, after religion, idealist philosophy: Leibniz called man a small god, I. Kant proclaimed “I” as the supreme legislator of Nature, and I. Fichte, prone to extremes, declared that “I am everything” [14, p. 81]. In fact, J. Ortega confirms F. Engels’ idea that

the rationale of activism on an idealistic basis is the self-growing opposition between spirit and matter, man and nature, soul and body, leading to the idea of the primacy of the spirit. He characterizes contemplation and activism as two great metaphors. They are eponymous with the concepts of contemplation and activism that are at the base of the organization of the human mind in the two greatest historical eras, the Ancient World and the Modern Age, starting already with the Renaissance [14, p. 76]. For ancient man “to be” meant to be among the multitude of other things clustered in the universe. The subject itself is one of the multitude of objects forming the “sea of being” in which the Subject or “I” does not play a major role, since at that time it was taught to live “in harmony with nature” [14, p. 82]. J. Ortega refers to the famous image of “tabula rasa”, the “seal metaphor”, well known in the theory of cognition, which determined the development of philosophy for many centuries [14, p. 78]. The Renaissance [14, p. 79] inverted this relationship between subject and object, while the Modern Age unequivocally gave priority to human creativity. J. Ortega reveals the logic of activism, subjectivity, “passing” contemplation, the emergence literally from nothing and the self-growth of activism, its detachment from contemplation and transformation into a certain independent beginning of thought.

L. Feuerbach demonstrated the alternativeness of these types of organization of human consciousness, as well as the opposite types of worldview, by defending contemplation from “subjectivity”, “creativity” (in the religion of the ancient Jews). This choice corresponds well to his recognition of the primordality, the substantiality of Nature. His certain solution of the main question of philosophy penetrated “into the territory” of the substantiation of the concept of the worldview proposed by L. Feuerbach. In contrast to Marxism he did not rise to materialism in the field of philosophy of history, to the consideration that human consciousness and his bodily organization are formed under the influence of historically developing labor activity. Therefore, L. Feuerbach viewed sensuality as contemplation. Man remained in his philosophy an extra-historical being, an abstract, contemplative world theorist, not thinking of changing the world, although millions of workers are still not satisfied with the conditions of their lives, their labor activity [12, p. 41]. The workers remain in this condition even now. From this arises the task of revolutionizing the world, of changing this state, and it still retains its relevance. On the contrary, L. Shestov defends the activist type of worldview, in the development of which his idealism played a notable role. N. A. Berdyaev correctly pointed out this “connection” of the worldview concept with a certain solution of the main question of philosophy when he stated: “The cosmos of antiquity and the Middle Ages... disappeared, man found compensation and a standing point, shifting the center of gravity inside man... The idealistic philosophy of the new age is this compensation for the loss of the cosmos, in which man... felt surrounded by higher forces... The power of technology continues the cause of revealing the infinity of spaces and worlds...” [3, p. 154].

In the transition to the activist paradigm, being is removed in the activity, development is transformed into activity, which differs from spontaneous development by goal-setting nature: the goal, means and methods of its implementation are introduced inside it, which turns it into a process fully managed and controlled by man in his own

interests. Moreover, the goal is achieved faster than the result in the process of development made by trial and error. The universalization of activity means that the world becomes secondary to the human “cause” which was once generated and determined by the world. According to N. A. Berdyaev, at the beginning of his history man was a slave of nature; and “he began the struggle for his liberation. He created culture, states, nationalities, classes, but became their slave. Then he entered a new period – for mastering irrational social forces: he creates an organized society, advanced technology, but this makes man the instrument of the organization of life and the final mastery of nature. He, man, becomes a slave of organized society and technology, a machine into which society has been transformed and man himself imperceptibly transforms [3, 162]. N. A. Berdyaev saw opponents of the contemplative worldview in the Bolshevik revolution as well, extending to them the philosophy of activism [2, p. 228].

The disclosure of the idea of co-development, coevolution of the development of being and man as applied to history is given by K. Marx in the first volume of “Capital”. Exploring the historical genesis of capitalist accumulation, K. Marx firstly points to the destruction of private property based on one’s own labor, to the “dwarf property” of “many” people, which turns into the giant property of a few exploiters in the course of expropriation of the masses of their means of life and tools of labor. He points to the ruthless vandalism, the filthy, petty, rabid passions with which the followers of the new form, capitalist private property, acted. Individual private property was obtained by the labor of the proprietor, it was based on the fusion of the individual independent worker with his instruments and means of production. Capitalist private property, by contrast, rests on the exploitation of another’s labor force, albeit formally free. As a result, the former “workers” become “proletarians”, and the conditions of their labor become capital. In free competition one capitalist beats many capitalists, there is a centralization of capital.

Under the conditions of the developed capitalist mode of production, the capitalist himself, who exploits many workers, is already subject to expropriation. The expropriation of the expropriators is accomplished by the play of the immanent (objective – M. P.) laws of capitalist production itself: it, as a natural process, generates its own negation, restores “individual property on the basis of the achievements of the capitalist era”, that is, on the basis of cooperation and common ownership of land and means of production produced by labor itself. Thus, capitalism, at the highest stage of its development, creates the material means for its own destruction: in its depths “the forces and passions which feel constrained by this mode of production begin to move. It must be destroyed, and it is being destroyed” [10, p. 771-773]. In the “Manifesto of the Communist Party”, the founders of Marxism pointed to the proletariat as that subject which represents all humanity, to whose interests these changes correspond, and which is the opponent of the bourgeois class. “The bourgeoisie itself produces its gravedigger, the revolutionary proletariat, its destruction and the victory of the proletariat are equally, in their opinion, inevitable” [12, p. 434-435]. This is how the idea of co-development, coevolution of social being and humanity, their correspondence to each other, is created.

So, a comparative analysis of the philosophical foundations of Russian cosmism,

including the concept of noosphere, with the main content of Marxism shows the inadequacy of the interpretation of the Marxist philosophy by contrasting it with the contemplative concept. Marxism is a philosophy of co-development, of coevolution of being and man: possessing the ability to develop and create something new, the material world gives birth to homo sapiens, whose practical activity prolongs being and its development so that their joint development and coevolution of being and man takes place. The consideration of this circumstance leads to more adequate ideas and assessments of Marxism, Russian cosmism and the concept of noosphere of V. I. Vernadsky, which should be taken into account both in scientific research and in the teaching of philosophy.

References

1. Alekseev P. V., Panin A. V. Karl Marx. Philosophy of Activism and Contemplative Philosophy // Alekseev P. V., Panin A. V. Philosophy Reading Book. Textbook. 2nd Edition, revised and supplemented. – Moscow: “Prospekt”, 1997. – P. 25-29.
2. Berdyaev N. A. Self-knowledge (Experience of philosophical autobiography). – Moscow: “Kniga”, 1991. – 446 p.
3. Berdyaev N. A. Man and Machine // Voprosy Filosofii. No. 2, 1989. – P. 142-162.
4. Bulgakov S. N. Svet nevezherny: Contemplations and Speculations. – Moscow: Respublika, 1994. – 415 p.
5. Vernadsky V. I. Humanity Autotrophism // Russian Cosmism: Anthology of Philosophical Thought. – Moscow: Pedagogika-Press, 1993. P. 288-303.
6. Vernadsky V. I. Some Words about the Noosphere // Russian Cosmism: Anthology of Philosophical Thought. – Moscow: Pedagogika-Press, 1993. P. 303-311.
7. Hegel G. W. F. The Philosophy of Right // Hegel. Works. Vol. VII. – Moscow: State Socio-Economic Publishing House, 1934. – P. 16, 59.
8. Gutov E. V. “Russian Cosmism” // Contemporary Dictionary of Philosophy. / Under the general editorship of V. E. Kemerov. – 2nd ed., corr. and suppl. – London, Frankfurt am Main, Paris, Luxembourg, Moscow, Minsk. / PANPRINT, 1998. – P. 752-756.
9. Zinoviev A. A. Our Youth Flight // Zinoviev A. A. Bright Future. – Moscow: Astrel, 2008. – P. 257-446.
10. Marx K. Capital. A Critique of Political Economy. Vol. 1. – Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1968. – 908 p.
11. Marx K. Capital. A Critique of Political Economy. Vol. 3. Book III // Marx K., Engels F. Selected Works. In 9 volumes. Vol. 9, part 2. – Moscow: Politizdat, 1998. – P. 348.
12. Marx K., Engels F. Manifesto of the Communist Party // Marx K., Engels F. Works. 2nd ed. Vol. 4 – P. 434-435.
13. Marx K., Engels F. The German Ideology // Marx K., Engels F. Works. 2nd ed. Vol. 3, Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1955. – 827 p.
14. Ortega y Gasset J. Two Great Metaphors // Theory of Metaphor: Collection: Translation from English, French, German, Spanish, Polish. / Introduction and text prepared by N. D. Arutyunova; under the general editorship of N. D. Arutyunova and M. A. Zhurinskaya. – Moscow: Progress, 1990. – 512 p.
15. Ortega y Gasset J. What is Philosophy? – Moscow: Nauka, 1991. – 140 p.
16. Prokhorov M. M. Genesis, Humanism and the Second Axial Time. – Moscow: Russian Humanist Society, 2008. – P. 154-184.
17. Russian Cosmism: Anthology of Philosophical Thought. – Moscow: Pedagogika-Press, 1993. – 368 p.
18. Svidersky V. I. Some Questions of the Dialectics of Change and Development. Moscow: “Mysl”, 1965. P. 5.

19. Semenova S. G. Russian Cosmism // Russian Cosmism: Anthology of Philosophical Thought. – Moscow: Pedagogika-Press, 1993. – P. 3-33.
20. Sukhovo-Kobylin A. F. A Philosophy of Spirit or Sociology (A Doctrine of the Universe) // Russian Cosmism: Anthology of Philosophical Thought. – Moscow: Pedagogika-Press, 1993. – 120 p.
21. Khabibullina Z. N. Philosophical Paradigm of Russian Cosmism: Social and Philosophical Analysis. Thesis for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. – Ufa, Bashkir State University Publishing House: 2012. – 32 p.
22. Engels F. Basic Forms of Motion // Marx K. and Engels F. Works: second edition. Moscow: “Gospolitizdat”, 1961. P. 391.
23. Engels F. The Part Played by Labor in the Transition from Ape to Man // Marx K. and Engels F. Works. Vol. 20, 2nd ed. – Moscow: Politizdat, 1961. – P. 495-496.
24. Jaspers K. The Origin and Goal of History. 2nd ed. – Moscow: “Respublika”, 1994. – 527 p.

GORDINA E. D.

Nizhny Novgorod State Technical University n.a. R. E. Alekseev, Nizhny Novgorod,
Russian Federation

**PRODUCTION OF CONSUMER GOODS AT THE ENTERPRISES OF THE
GORKY REGION AFTER THE GREAT PATRIOTIC WAR: SOCIO-
ECONOMIC ASPECT (ON THE MATERIALS OF THE STATE PUBLIC
INSTITUTION “STATE SOCIO-POLITICAL ARCHIVE OF THE NIZHNY
NOVGOROD REGION”)**

The question of the organization of production of consumer goods at Gorky enterprises after the Great Patriotic War (1941-1945) has not been the subject of special study by historians and archivists, despite the existence of several major works on the development of the Gorky industrial sector. The focus of scientists’ attention remained predominantly on heavy and defense industry, the intensive development of which was dictated by the strategic tasks of the country’s development and security. Undoubtedly, at the same time, the end of the war put the government before the need to restore normal peaceful life, supplying the population with essential goods. The source base for this article is the documents of the State Socio-Political Archive of the Nizhny Novgorod region, first of all – materials of inspections of enterprises, certificates on their product sales in the post-war period.

The Resolution of the Council of People’s Commissars of the USSR as of 23/10/1945 ordered all Gorky enterprises to switch over to the production of consumer goods after the end of the Great Patriotic War. The range of products to be produced was quite wide [1, s. 10]: wearing apparel, hosiery, leather and felt shoes, leather goods, saddlery, dishes, furniture, gardening equipment, bedding, household appliances, bicycles and much more. Plants of the Pavlovsky, Vachsky and Sosnovsky districts made knives, cutlery, fitting and assembly, woodworking, shoemaking tools, razors, scissors,

and saws. The “Krasnaya Etna” Plant sold enameled plates, beds, electric irons, the Vyksa Metallurgical Plant sold beds, forks, shovels, rakes, the Balakhna Furniture Factory sold dining tables, chairs, mattresses, the “Zarya” and Sverdlov Plants sold enameled mugs, bowls, pots, kerosene lamps, plastic buckets and plates [1, s. 19-19]. The product range of the Gorky Glassworks included mirrors, cigarette cases, combs, lamp glasses [1, s. 55], plant No. 397 (Dzerzhinsk) produced enamelware [1, s. 55]. At the “Krasnoye Sormovo” Plant (No. 112), the consumer goods workshop produced spoons, dishes, and beds. The consumer goods at the Stalin Plant were made in workshops No. 38 and 25, partially – in other 13 workshops of the plant [1, s. 58]. The main products were axes and cleavers, tools for the citric gardens of Abkhazia, produced under a special order of the USSR Government. At the Molotov Automobile Plant in shop No. 4 shoes were produced (galoshes, boots, rubber boots, textovinite soles), in the armature and coating shop – enameled and aluminum ware for the needs of canteens, children’s institutions and hospitals of the district. The main consumer goods workshop produced three-wheeled bicycles, barrack beds, cast iron, window and door handles and hinges [1, s. 53].

During the transition to mass production of consumer goods the enterprises had a number of problems, the consequences of which were the failure to realize the plan and the low quality of products. For example, the Stalin Plant produced for five months only 33% of the annual norm of products, of which the fitting and assembly tools – 27.5%, scissors – 13.8%, etc. The folding knives factory produced 12.6% of folding knives and 18.6% of garden knives during the same period. The “Luch” Plant produced 12.6% of table knives and forks [1, s. 13]. This is how the reporting documents describe the organization of production of consumer goods at the Molotov Automobile Plant: “The plant management and the party organization of the plant pay little attention to this shop. The shop (of consumer goods – E. G.) is 5 km away from the plant, in the forest. The road to the shop is in poor condition, and there is no transport. The management of the plant did not understand the reasons for the poor work of the shop and replaced the management of the shop without eliminating the shortcomings of the work”. The plan of production of consumer goods is not realized [1, s. 54].

The local industry of the Gorky region included in 1946 74 district industrial complexes, 1 repair-mechanical plant, 2 enterprises of regional subordination, weight-repair shop [1, s. 61]. The work of light industry enterprises in the region was subjected to sharp criticism in reporting, control and inspection documents, it was stated the emergency condition of the premises of many enterprises, deterioration of equipment, low quality of products, overspending of raw materials, under-performance of production targets by workers. In particular, the Certificate on the work of enterprises of the regional light industry in the first half of 1946 shows that “... in recent time the light industry has worsened its work (...) The felt industry realized the plan of gross output by 79.8%, including the Arzamas factory – by 85.7%, VSF No. 3 – by 69%, VSF No. 2 – only by 17%. VSF No. 2 (...) was reduced to a nearly destroyed condition. Steam-power and production equipment was not repaired in time and was working at full wear and tear. The premises were in an emergency condition. Out of 5 machines 2 were running, out of 4 horses 3 fell down. The Arzamas factory works just as badly (...)

Planned preventive repair of equipment is not conducted, equipment downtime is the reason for failure to realize the plan. The quality of felts is low. The supply of low-quality felts resulted in complaints for 141.2 thousand rubles (instead of 15.2 for 1945). The norms of the raw material consumption were not complied with. The overspending of the raw materials amounted to 20.9 tons for five months of 1946. (...) The output per worker was 81.8 with reference to plan, the wage fund was overspent by 16% (...)” [1, s. 26-27].

As a way out of the difficult situation it is supposed to re-equip enterprises with the equipment necessary to arrange the production of consumer goods, but even this, despite government subsidies, has proved difficult. “The increase in production capacity for the manufacture of consumer goods is performed extremely slowly (...) The assignments for certain nomenclature of metal consumer goods are not being executed. In 1946, the regional Industrial Cooperation Department and plants of local industry received 5 million rubles and 10 million rubles respectively from the government for those purposes. Actually 1,206 thousand rubles were spent by the plants during the first six months of the year, and only 652 thousand rubles – by the regional Industrial Cooperation Department (...) Out of the 940 thousand rubles, allocated for the re-equipment of the Textile factory (should supply yarn to all the artels of Textile Union), only 382 thousand rubles, or 40.6%, were actually spent as of 1.07.1946, which created a clear threat to start-up the factory on due date. Only 28 out of 64 machines transferred by the union-republican plants to the Regional Administration of Local Industry in the first half of 1946 were put into operation. For 5 years 7 out of 9 automatic machines for tooth brush production have been out of order at the bristle-brush factory of the Regional Administration of Light Industry because of the lack of production facilities, while the question of transferring the factory to the unused premises of the Kalinin Leather Factory could not be solved for more than a year. The production and power equipment that has failed is being restored slowly, and the equipment in operation is not used to its full capacity...” [1, s. 28].

One of the most acute problems of the post-war period was the shortage of labor force, especially qualified workers. We read in the reports on the results of inspections of enterprises: “Enterprises with a large shortage of qualified workers are poorly engaged in training personnel and creating material and living conditions for workers. The “Luch” Plant, with a labor shortage of up to 48%, realized its training plan in the first half of the year (...) only by 13.7%. At the Stalin Plant there is a big staff turnover. For five months of 1946 132 people were hired, 129 people were dismissed for the same period” [1, s. 12]. At the Molotov Automobile Plant, the consumer goods shop was staffed by prisoners (out of 229 people, 100 prisoners). “The personnel department of the plant is not interested in this category of workers, while their behavior degrades the rest of the workers and reduces workforce productivity. Certain workers from among prisoners have terrorized the shop recorders, forcing them to show higher output than they actually produced. The personnel department could have used these workers more effectively in other work outside the shop, and staffed the consumer goods shop with more stable personnel” [1, s. 54]. “The City Committees do not help the enterprises well in the return from the collective farms of the districts of the labor force

previously worked at these enterprises. From the list submitted by the “Trud” Plant none of the 77 people returned to the plant. Only 7 people out of 58 were returned to the “Luch” Plant” [1, s. 14]. The product range of the Gorky Glassworks (...) is not maintained, as out of 40 people only 19 people (47,5%) work in the shop according to the plan. Because of the lack of workers, the plant does not produce lamp glasses, glasses, and cigarette cases. The plant is not looking for a source of labor force for this shop. The plant’s vocational school does not train personnel for the shop. The workshop is provided with engineers (5 people, 1 engineer, 4 trainees). Worker’s salary is up to 20 rubles per day, engineer’s salary is from 1,000 to 2,000 rubles per month. The shop is not comfortable, requires repair. The roof leaks. The workers are often taken off for other work. On July 2, for example, to load glass. The work of whole workshop was stopped. The quality of products is low” [1, s. 55].

Even with a relatively good overall staffing picture, the problem of low labor productivity remained actual. So, at large enterprises, such as the “Krasnoye Sormovo” Plant and the Ordzhonikidze Plant, the total number of workers in the shops of consumer goods and their qualifications are generally satisfactory, but it did not help to solve the problem of effective organization of production of consumer goods. The reason for this was, according to reports, unsatisfactory staffing policy – high “staff turnover”, constant transfer of workers from the consumer goods workshop to other workshops and additional work, which hindered the professional specialization of the consumer goods workshop workers, the perception of consumer goods by the enterprise management and the workers themselves as second-rate and not prestigious goods. Concrete expression of this was, in particular, the lack of a system of training and professional development of workers of the consumer goods workshops, low (in comparison with the “main” shops of plants) wages, unsatisfactory labor discipline. The consequence of such a staffing situation was constant under-fulfillment of plan indicators, high percentage of defects, and low quality of products manufactured by the consumer goods shops. At the “Krasnoye Sormovo” Plant (No. 112) in 1946 the “qualitative structure of workers is low – up to 85% are workers of 3rd category, though many of them work in the shop for more than 4 years. In the shop there is a very high staff turnover (in 1945 – up to 53%). The main reason is that the plant management underestimates the role of the shop. Often workers were transferred to other shops. Only during the first half of 1946 20% of workers were transferred to other shops, and they were replaced by the less qualified specialists, who were not familiar with production of consumer goods. Now only 70% of the workers are working in the shop, because 20% of the qualified workers were sent to peat provision, fishing, etc. They are not engaged at all in the development of personnel involved in the production of consumer goods. There is not even a training plan. Nor are they interested in labor and wages issues. There is no incentive system to pay workers and engineering staff in the shop. There were 45.9% of Stakhanovites and 97% of competitiveness in the shop, but the plan was not realized. For the first half of 1946 the plan was realized by 79%, but the available labor force was 90%. Labor discipline is at a low level. The party committee of the plant does not address the question of staffing in the shop of consumer goods, for example, on February 14, 1946, they decided to increase the number of consumer

goods to 22 items. But so far only 13 are produced, as before the decision was made” [1, s. 56-57]. At Ordzhonikidze Plant 21 the workshop is fully staffed with workers and engineering personnel, the best engineers and qualified workers were sent to the shop. 94% of the workers of the shop have been working for more than 3 years, have qualifications of grade 4-5, but the shop works poorly. “The 1st quarter plan was realized by 65%, the 2nd quarter plan – by 69%. Poor labor organization. Downtime of workers in the first half of the year amounted to 11% of the time worked, 15% of workers have not fulfilled production standards. As a result, the qualified workers of the consumer goods workshop earn not more than 500 rubles, i.e. much less than in other shops of the plant. The staff turnover in the workshop is high, reaching up to 21%, mainly due to the constant transfer of workers to the main shops of the plant. Despite the failure to meet production standards, the management did not organize industrial and technical training and professional development of workers in the consumer goods workshop. Poor labor and production discipline. The party committee of the plant absolutely does not pay attention to the issue of human resources in the consumer goods workshop” [1, s. 58]. At the Stalin Plant “there is no accurate accounting of personnel engaged in the production of consumer goods. Workshop No. 38 systematically fails to meet the targets. Out of 10,000 axes per month, only 4,000 are made according to plan. Not staffed with labor force. There is a lack of qualified personnel (...) 11 people do not realize the standards (...) The heads of other workshops also pay little attention to the staff involved in the production of consumer goods. In workshop No. 25, 81 people are employed in the production of tools, but no one has dealt with them for two years in technical training. The party committee has never discussed the issue of personnel for the consumer goods production [1, s. 59]. In the report materials on the results of the inspection of the regional enterprises, it is stated: “Work with human resources is inappropriate. Workers are used to work outside the enterprise, are released from production (for example, to load grain, build a culture center, etc.). The Lindovsky industrial complex is closed during the haymaking season. In Semenov and other districts, workers are sent to work at collective farms. The staff situation at the enterprises of the City Department of Local Industry is bad: 1,899 out of 3,065 workers are employed according to the plan, 1,166 workers are missing, but the management takes no action. From 27,096 of the workers employed in the system of regional industrial cooperation, up to 90% (24,000) of them are engaged in consumer goods production. The actual need for personnel reaches 3,000 people. Most of the workers are non-graduates, uneducated, requiring serious training. Engineering staff also consists of specialists with primary education, only 20 people have higher education. In 1945, 5,595 people were trained [1, s. 62], but there is little training of the leading professions involved in the production of consumer goods. There was a high turnover of working personnel” [1, s. 63].

Thus, it is obvious that staff problems, caused primarily by the consequences of the Great Patriotic War, took place at many enterprises of the Gorky region. A noticeable role is played by the lack of a clear and systematic personnel policy at the enterprises, irrational use of available human resources, insufficient attention of enterprise managers to the problem of organizing the work of shops of consumer goods and in general to the task of organizing the production of consumer goods.

Under the conditions of the planned economy, enterprises paid close attention to the production of precisely that range of products which were most in demand by citizens, even if these types of products were more labor-intensive than others, as well as to the intended use of raw materials and raw waste, reducing production costs and balancing the plan and actual indicators of production costs. “In the pursuit of realizing the plan for gross output, certain heads of enterprises have clearly taken the wrong path, allowing the use of high-grade raw materials for products unnecessary to the population. The tawery manufactured from bridle instead of agricultural stitching more expensive ski straps which were sold outside the region in the absence of demand (...) The Gorky Industrial Cooperation Department realized its plan of production of cotton pillows by 306.6% in June which are not used by consumers for their intended purpose and are sewn on other more necessary things. The garment factories of the City Department of Light Industry neglect the production of children’s clothes as unprofitable for the fulfillment of the gross plan. Garment factories No. 1 and 2 produced children’s cotton coats instead of 42,000 pieces in the first half of the year, only 27,700 pieces. Garment factory No. 4 manufactured instead of 8 thousand children’s dresses and 10 thousand shirts for girls only 3,347 dresses and 3,817 shirts” [1, s. 28]. “The heads of enterprises are poorly engaged in mastering new consumer goods and introducing them into production. The regional Industrial Cooperation Department had to introduce in 1945-46 33 items of consumer goods, but so far nothing has been done on the taken samples. In order to ensure uninterrupted supply of furniture artels with quality carpenter glue, the head of the Regional Administration of Industrial Cooperation, Mr. Smirnov ordered the Regional Industry Union and Regional Leather Union to organize glue production in the first quarter of 1946. After the issue had been illustrated in a feuilleton by Mr. Polonsky in the “Gorkovskaya Kommuna” newspaper, the Administration of Industrial Cooperation not only did not show persistence in organizing the production of glue, but completely stopped planning it (...) The cost of the same products produced by the local industry in some industrial complexes has a very significant difference. The cost of a pair of felt boots produced by the Urensky Industrial Complex is 56.20 rubles, that of the Vorotynsky Industrial Complex – 81.63 rubles, that of the Chernukhinsky Industrial Complex – 101.56 rubles. One liter of pottery at the Semenovskiy Industrial Complex has a cost of 70 kopecks, that of the Zalesny Industrial Complex – 2.10 rubles (...)” [1, s. 44-46]. “The cost of production for four months against the plan increased to 18.6% at the tawery, and at the Kalinin Leather Factory to 11.3%” [1, s. 29].

The actual cost of products in most cases significantly exceeded the planned one, as can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. Cost of consumer goods at the Molotov Automobile Plant according to the cost-information report in May 1946

<i>Product name</i>	<i>Planned cost of production</i>	<i>Actual cost</i>
Three-wheeled bicycle	151.42	201.60
Infant bed	122.17	159.04
Adult bed	74.14	84.78
Three-liter cast iron	7.73	15.60
Five-liter cast iron	8.44	20.28
Rake	2.42	1.98
Window handles	1.20	1.03
Door handles	1.83	1.24

It should be noted that the difference between the planned and actual cost was compounded at the stage of selling the goods by the values of selling prices which differ drastically from the actual costs. The example of the indicators given below (Table 2) clearly demonstrates that the difference is very large, and in some cases (highlighted in red) the cost price is twice as high as the price of the goods.

Table 2. Information about consumer goods, the selling prices of which are set by the City Commercial Department lower than their cost price [1, s. 74]

<i>Organization</i>	<i>Product name</i>	<i>Approved selling price of the City Commercial Department</i>	<i>Cost of production</i>
Plant No. 21	Cupboard	1,300	2,162
	Extending table	300	433
	Infant bed	210	334
	Chair	127	182
	Case	6.50	8.69
Plant No. 469	Kerosene stove	116	151.59
“Krasnaya Etna” Plant	Nickel-plated bed	800	1,089
	Electric cooker	65	141.48
	Electric iron	75	175
	Plastic hanger	20	26
	Infant bed	55	64
	Enameled plate	6	8.35
Molotov Automobile Plant	Children’s three-wheeled bicycle	253	334
	Children’s two-wheeled bicycle	-	-
	Children’s two-wheeled bicycle	300	450
		-	-

	Adult bed	78	83.60
	Infant nickel-plated bed	-	-
	Infant bed	140	165.50
		-	-
		40	157
Motorcycle Plant	Children's bicycle	162	321
Enterprises of City Industrial Cooperation Department	School ruler	0.36	0.56
	Clothespin	0.30	0.42
	Glass sphere	-	-
		1.35	2.65

Undoubtedly, a very acute problem in 1945-46 was the low quality of consumer goods. Production was hastily mastered, organized and supplied with the necessary resources on a residual basis. The documents contain many facts about the manufacturing of low-quality products at Gorky enterprises (Table 3).

Table 3. Information about the enterprises producing low-quality consumer goods [1, s. 76]

<i>Organization</i>	<i>Goods</i>
Gorky Artel Union, "Metalloposuda" Artel	Tin-plated metal spoon with badly cut edges
Gorky City Department of Local Industry, Chemical Plant	Low-quality oil varnish, badly dried, unstable
Koverninsky Inspection Union	Khokhloma painted earthenware not accepted by trading companies due to low quality
Knyagininskaya Artel "Plamya Sotsializma"	Cap of low quality
Pavlovskaya Artel "Metallist"	Table, children's and teaspoons of low quality, overstock
"XX Years of the Workers' and Peasants' Red Army" Artel, Gorky	Quilted blankets and pillows stuffed with cotton waste
Sverdlovsky District Industrial Complex of Gorky	Kerosene lamps with bad painting and threads on the burner
"Proletarsky Put" Artel, Bogorodsk district	Saddlery goods are produced incomplete, collar without traces and hame strap
Zalesny Spoon Union	Spoons with defects, of low quality
Dryukovskaya and Pikinskaya Furniture Artels of the Regional Timber Industry Union system	Furniture is made of raw lumber, it soon shrivels up and falls apart
Voskresensky Timber Industry Union	Produces a snow shovel made of pine instead of aspen

A number of other documentary fragments cited in the text of the article illustrate a similar state of affairs at the enterprises. The directors of the enterprises “waved off” the production of consumer goods primarily because of the acute shortage of necessary raw materials and personnel – they were sent to the “main” workshops, where they also had to meet the planned targets. The director of plant No. 178 Borovikov wrote in the summer of 1946 to the Head of the Gorky Region Commercial Department: “During the post-war restructuring, the plant found itself in an extremely difficult staffing situation, since the plan did not decrease due to the transition to an 8-hour working day, but it even increased. In metallurgical production, increasing workforce productivity by 50% without serious investment proved to be an insurmountable task. It took additional (compared to war time) quantity of workers in the main workshops, which could happen only due to transferring the workers from auxiliary workshops, because the army demobilization of two lines had not given anything to the plant, except for few soldiers, who returned to the plant. (...) The plant mostly works on local fuel (firewood and peat) which is procured by the plant itself (...) Physically healthy people had to be concentrated in the main metallurgical workshops, those more or less able to work should be sent to the fuel procurement and only very young and disabled people should be left in a very limited number in the auxiliary workshops (...) Under such conditions it is of course difficult to talk about production of consumer goods, whatever range of products is offered to the plant. It is clear and understandable to everyone the importance of consumer goods, especially in the post-war period. Nevertheless, the plant is not able to develop the production of consumer goods until the end of the fuel-production period, and we should not expect to receive them from the plant in the near future (...) Buckets and plates require roofing iron which is an extremely scarce type of rolled metal, which we receive from outside in absolutely insufficient quantity even to meet our current needs. As for the rest of the nomenclature, it is within our capabilities, but only starting in September in an amount approximately equal to 30% of specified by you (...)” [1, s. 78].

The process of restoration of “peaceful” functions of the economy in the post-war period was difficult in the Gorky region. It was expressed in “chronic” underfulfillment of the plan of production of consumer goods, disruption of terms of reorientation from military to peaceful range of products, acute shortage of raw materials and human resources. Attempts to solve these problems quickly and by purely administrative methods yielded no results. The average figures for mastering new types of production fluctuated in 1946 in the range of 8-30% of the desired volume. The personnel problem could not be solved in the short term, since time was required to form new qualified workers by developing the institute of mentoring and vocational training of youth. The production problems were complemented by the presence of difficulties of social character connected, first of all, with the organization of the catering of the workers and the solution of the housing problem. There was a catastrophic shortage of available housing. Strict obligations to provide workers with housing dictated to the heads of enterprises the need to allocate funds for the construction of dormitories, renting private apartments. “The Stalin Plant used only 11.6% (317 thousand) according to the

plan of capital works.

The construction of a forge and press shop, an eight-apartment house, a dormitory for 100 people, repair of the plant's clubhouse and other facilities was not started at all. The "Trud" Plant utilized only 307.2 thousand rubles, or 9.3% of the investment plan for six months. No work has begun on the restoration of the grinding shop, repair of the dormitory for the vocational school of second line and completion of the plant clubhouse (...) The Pavlovo City Committee has not solved the issue of providing dormitories for workers of the construction office, as a result of which the construction office is forced to rent apartments of private individuals and overpay in this case a lot of money" [1, s. 14]. One of the most important tasks was to reduce the cost of production, targeted use of consumables, and to strictly adhere to the production of nomenclature of goods.

Obviously, the study of the problem of production of consumer goods in the Gorky region in the second half of the 1940s – early 50s will help to significantly complement the picture of socio-economic development of the region in the post-war decades.

References

1. State Socio-Political Archive of the Nizhny Novgorod Region. Fund 3. List 1. File 5613. Sheet 10.

GORDIN A. A.

NNGASU, Nizhny Novgorod, Russian Federation

SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOVIET CITY IN 1985-1991 (ON THE MATERIALS OF GORKY)

The perestroika (reconstruction) period (1985–1991) is one of the least studied pages of the Russian history. The reason for this is both the proximity of the events and the insufficient study of the documentary heritage of perestroika. Despite the significant number of works by researchers, historians in the scientific study and comprehension of the "perestroika period" are still making their first steps.

The macro approach is characteristic of scientific studies devoted to the perestroika problematic. Specialists focus on issues related to the causes of perestroika, the process of change that occurred in different spheres of social life in the Soviet Union, and the results and consequences of reforms [15; 8; 16; 6; 12; 13; 17]. Historians are trying to comprehend the phenomenon of the "sunset of the USSR", to give scientific answers to socially significant questions – what "perestroika" actually is, what were the goals of its "foremen", what internal and external factors led to the death of the Soviet Union, what were the objective and subjective reasons for the changes taking place in the country. Looking for an answer to the essential question: what happened "in reality" – the collapse or disintegration of the USSR?

Of particular interest for understanding the phenomenon of “perestroika” are the works published under the aegis of the “Gorbachev Foundation”, which reveal the position of the last leader of the USSR and his entourage [9; 7; 18]. The impressive boom in the publication activity of the Gorbachev Foundation, which publishes literature of various genres – collections of works by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, memoirs, scientific monographs, collections of documents – is nothing other than M. S. Gorbachev’s struggle for history. This is an opportunity to defend his historical truth, to create a concrete historical memory about himself and his time. That is why these works are valuable for researchers.

At the same time, the regional aspect, including the way of life of the Soviet people within local systems: a particular city, district, factory, etc., is poorly represented in the historiography [11].

The purpose of the present article is to reveal at the micro-historical level the peculiarities of socio-economic development (including the essential changes of the Soviet way of life in the years of perestroika). The object of the study is the city of Gorky (Nizhny Novgorod). During the period of “perestroika” Gorky (in 1990 the city was returned to its historical name) was one of the largest centers of the Soviet Union in the field of high-tech industry, played an important role in the military-industrial complex and scientific and technological development of the country. By virtue of its specificity the city of Gorky had a special status – from 1959 to 1991 it was closed for foreigners. In 1988 the number of Gorky inhabitants was 1,438 thousand people. It was one of the largest cities of the Soviet Union.

In the second half of the 1970s and early 1980s there was a decline in the growth rate of economic and social development of the USSR. The dynamics of industrial production growth in the periods from 1971 to 1975 was 7.4%; from 1976 to 1980 – 4.4%; from 1981 to 1985 – 3.7%. The growth rate of gross agricultural output showed the following dynamics: from 1971 to 1975 – 2.5%; from 1976 to 1980 – 1.7%; from 1981 to 1985 – 1.1%. The pattern of growth in real per capita income was as follows: from 1971 to 1975 – 4.4%; from 1976 to 1980 – 3.4%; from 1981 to 1985 – 2.1%. The growth rate of retail turnover also decreased: from 1971 to 1975 – 6.3%; from 1976 to 1980 – 4.4%; from 1981 to 1985 – 3.1% [13, p. 6].

In our opinion, the decline in growth rates compared to the maximum indicators of the Eighth Five-Year Plan was not critical, and after the powerful socio-economic growth, which occurred in the period of the second half of the 1940s-1960s, followed a cycle of decline.

Oil export played an important role in the state budget. High oil prices in the 1970s and early 1980s allowed the import of grain and consumer goods for foreign currency [17, p. 54].

But already in 1985-1986 there was a catastrophic (more than twofold) drop in oil prices, which led to a reduction of the inflow of funds into the budget. Revenues from the anti-alcohol campaign carried out in these years decreased significantly. From 1985 to 1986, the budget deficit tripled. Large expenditures were associated with investments in mechanical engineering [13, p. 11].

Forced “arms race”, a huge military load on the national economy led to imbalances in the economic sphere of the USSR. At the same time, it is obvious that under the conditions of the Cold War and the tough confrontation with the USA, the developed MIC was a guarantor of the country’s security. The difficult international situation had a great impact on the socio-economic state in the country, especially after the entry of a limited contingent of Soviet troops into the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. The military presence required significant financial resources.

Rapid growth of prosperity of Soviet society throughout 1950-1970s, outstripping income growth and suppressed prices led to imbalance in social consumption: the growth of money incomes was not fully provided with goods and services. Throughout the 1970-1980s the forced savings of Soviet citizens accumulated. In 1970 the forced savings of the USSR population amounted to 17.5 billion rubles (11.3% of retail turnover in the given year), in 1985 – 60.9 billion rubles (18.8%) and in 1990 – 238.0 billion rubles (50.8%) [17, p. 54].

At the April Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee in 1985, General Secretary of the CPSU M. S. Gorbachev set a course for reforming the country approved by the XXVII Congress of the CPSU (1986). The need for a policy of restructuring and acceleration of socio-economic development was declared.

The new leadership of the USSR set objectives to increase the growth rate of the national income up to 20-22% and that of the industrial output up to 21-24%. It was planned to catch up with the USA by the level of industrial production by the year 2000. The acceleration was supposed to be ensured, first of all, by transferring the management methods of the military-industrial complex to civilian sectors and social sphere [13, p. 10].

In general, the first “perestroika years” (1985-1986) were quite stable.

At the same time, state budget revenues significantly decreased due to the anti-alcohol campaign carried out in these years. From 1985 to 1986, the budget deficit grew 3 times. Large expenditures were associated with investments in mechanical engineering [13, p. 11].

Throughout 1985-1987, the economic development of the city of Gorky and the region was stable. Note that the economic growth of the 1950s and the first half of the 1980s was the peak for the entire Soviet period of regional history. In the first perestroika years it was possible to ensure the predominance of the growth rate of production over the rate of fixed assets. The growth rate of production in the Gorky region for the period 1986-1987 was 108.2% [14, p. 239].

The adoption of the Law “On Individual Labor Activity” on November 9, 1986 (enacted in 1987) was a turning point in the first perestroika years. In accordance with this document, private activity was allowed in 30 kinds of production. On January 1, 1987, most of the ministries and departments, as well as large enterprises received the right to conduct export-import operations directly. On June 30, 1987, the Law “On State-Owned Enterprise (Association)” was adopted (enacted for all enterprises on January 1, 1988). The adoption of the document was preceded by its discussion, which took place in March – June 1987. The new law expanded the independence of enterprises and reduced the role of centralized planning bodies. Enterprises were transferred

to the principles of self-sufficiency and self-financing. The state monopoly of foreign trade was actually abolished. The law allowed the factory directors to have foreign currency accounts, to form the enterprises' structures which operated on the principles of self-sufficiency. The products manufactured in excess of the state order could be sold at a free price. It was an incredible freedom for the Soviet economy. Developing the principles of democracy and glasnost (disclosure), the management of enterprises was to be elected by the general meeting or conference of the labor collective. This freed managers from direct dependence on the Soviet and party apparatus [13, p. 13-14; 14, p. 238, 240, 274-275].

The increase of economic and social efficiency of perestroika was put in direct dependence "on the nature, degree and intensity of workers' involvement in the processes of managing the affairs of labor collectives, on the extent and form in which the worker manifests himself as a master of production and a subject of managerial activity" [5, p. 482].

In 1987 more than 2,000 managers of different levels were elected in the Gorky region. In Gorky 1,474 managers of all ranks of labor collectives, 155 heads of shops and departments, 1,240 team heads and foremen were elected. Councils of labor collectives were being created. As of November 1, 1988, 438 of them were created [14, p. 238, 240, 274-275].

In 1988, 38 Councils of Labor Collectives were formed in the Avtozavodsky district of the city (which consisted of about 1.5 thousand people). At them, 14 first directors were elected, passed through a competition, or confirmed their authorities. All in all, by December 1988, 360 district managers had been elected "democratically". Reports of communist leaders began to be heard regularly in the primary party organizations [5, p. 467].

The Law "On State-Owned Enterprise (Association)" became a turning point that changed the essence of the planned economy – the Soviet economic model that had been in effect since the late 1920s. Although formally the plan indicators were still retained, the key points, primarily the role of the state in economic life, were changing. The state, within the framework of the Soviet system, was transferring powers to private initiative. The essential elements of the Soviet economy were undermined. Elections of enterprise managers turned out to be more of a "game of democracy". The vast majority of factory managers in the Gorky region safely passed the "democratic election" procedure and retained their positions, but with another powers.

The next step in the economic transformation and winding down of the Soviet planned economy was the adoption of the Law "On Cooperation" (1988), which allowed cooperatives to engage in any not prohibited activities. Legalized in 1986, private entrepreneurial initiative was given even more freedom. Cooperatives were seen as one of the most democratic forms of social organization of production and labor. They were supposed to bring the producer as close as possible to the means of production. Cooperatives were supposed to deal directly with the provision of the population with various goods and services.

There were 914 cooperatives registered in Gorky as of July 1, 1989. The number of employees in them reached 17 thousand people. And although the main activities of

cooperatives were related to consumer services, production of consumer goods and construction, still the cooperative movement did not make a tangible contribution to the solution of social problems. In their activities the cooperatives tended to focus more on cooperation with state-owned enterprises, since the enterprises “did not limit themselves to the payment of non-cash funds which the cooperators withdrew from the bank in the form of cash”. For example, a whole network of cooperatives was created under Gorkovglavsnab (Main Administration of Material and Technical Supply of Gorky). Many employees of the organization worked in the cooperative on a part-time basis. Some of the cooperatives were engaged in the banal purchase of goods (primarily food products) in the public sector and their subsequent resale to the population “at speculative prices”. Thus, there was an outflow of money from the public sector into private sector. The profit went to the private enterprise (the cooperative under the organization), while the losses were borne by the state-owned enterprise. The main income of cooperatives went not for the development of production, but for salaries. Only in 1989 cooperatives in the Gorky region were paid salaries in the amount of 77% of the received income. The average salary in 1989 in cooperatives reached 326.7 rubles and was higher than in industry (in 1987 it amounted to 222 rubles). The salaries of cooperative chairmen were especially high. For example, the chairman of the “Temp” cooperative of the Nizhegorodsky district received 12-18 thousand rubles per month, “Module” of the Kanavinsky district – 3,5 thousand rubles. At the same time, the cooperatives deliberately understated production development funds and evaded the payment of insurance premiums. The attitude of Gorky residents to cooperation is indicative. In 1989 in answer to the question “What is your attitude to cooperatives” 52% of the respondents gave the answer “disapprove”, 17% – “approve”, 13% – “indifferent”, 18% – “no answer”. As for enterprises owned by private persons, 45% of the respondents had “disapproving” attitude, 12% – “approving”, 6% – “indifferent”, the question caused difficulty for 37% of respondents [5, p. 467; 14, p. 295-298; 1, p. 63; 13, p. 15].

From the memoirs of I. P. Buslaev (General Director of the G. M. Petrovsky Plant): “Gorbachev was still in power, and no one thought that in three years the Soviet Union would not be. We were engaged in reconstruction, building something in our subsidiary holding, and we needed cement. And it suddenly disappeared. Nowhere! Soon it appeared, but at three times the previous price. The same cement that we had bought a couple of weeks before, it wasn’t going anywhere, it was just being sold through cooperatives, which were then allowed to be set up at the enterprises. And the cement became three times more expensive! The cooperatives at the factories were created in order to divide the national good among their own and ours” [1, p. 63].

Another evidence of the era. N. S. Zharkov, General Director of the “Krasnoye Sormovo” Plant, notes: “When Gorbachev allowed enterprises to transfer non-cash money into cash, it became the basis of robbery in the country, from this theft developed. Many people were ruined by this time, there is no trace of many factories today. But thanks to the incredible efforts of the Sormovsky district residents, their dedication to the plant and engagement, we managed to keep production going. We did not create any subsidiaries and firms which many people were fond of at that time in order to quietly steal from the state plant into the private initiative. We did not have it because

I understood that once we put it into action, theft would flourish and would not be contained. I must say that there were plenty of propositions from all sorts of cunning people” [1, p. 63-64].

At the same time, cooperative banks began to be created. Their number rapidly increased. Enterprises were able to transfer their money into their accounts. Large factories and departments created their own banking structures. Cooperatives through the legal withdrawal of funds from the public sector rapidly increased their potential, accumulating initial capital [13, p. 64].

In 1990, having analyzed the activities of cooperatives in Nizhny Novgorod, the city authorities came to the conclusion that “cooperatives in general are inefficient and wages in cooperatives are artificially high (...) The price level in cooperatives for the production of consumer goods is 70-80% higher than in state industry (...). The share of the salary budget in the production volume is 59% (in state enterprises – 27%), the output in state enterprises is 20% higher, and the wages are 30% lower than in cooperatives (...) Cooperatives do not spend money on the development of production and social sphere, but direct the money to wages (...). Cooperatives have less overheads since they use the services of the enterprises for which they perform works without compensation” (from the “Note on Social and Economic Policy of the Nizhny Novgorod City Committee of the Communist Party of the RSFSR “On Social Protection of the City Population in 1991” (1990)) [11, p. 383-384].

In the first half of 1991 – in the midst of a powerful socio-economic crisis – there was a serious decline in the activities of cooperatives in Nizhny Novgorod. The number of cooperatives decreased (from 833 to 771), the number of employed fell (from 27.4 thousand to 23.3 thousand), and revenues decreased. The average monthly salary decreased from 604 rubles to 385 rubles (which corresponded to the level of salary in state enterprises). This was a consequence of the decline in the living standard of the population [11, p. 395].

In 1987-1988, according to researcher R. G. Pikhoya, “the socialist economy entered the point of no return” and was essentially destroyed [13, p. 16].

In 1989-1990, the total output in the Gorky region decreased by 1.7%; and in the defense industry – by 2.9%. Production decreased especially sharply in the aviation industry, by 11.4%; in the radio industry – by 6.9%. Only the electronic industry increased production by 8.7%. At the same time, the output of consumer goods increased: tape recorders, washing machines, vacuum cleaners, furniture. But this did not allow to sharply reduce the commodity shortage [14, p. 243].

In the Note on Social and Economic Policy of the Nizhny Novgorod City Committee of the Communist Party of the RSFSR “On Social Protection of the City Population in 1991” (1990) it was noted: “Material production in the main industries due to a mess of supply, systemless conversion, and absence of a well-considered system, is falling, and its efficiency has declined. The volume of industrial production in 1990 decreased by 1%, profits in industry fell by 6% (...), 41% of enterprises reduced production volumes (...) At the same time the salary budget in industry grew by 8.1% (...) At 60% of enterprises the salary budget grew faster than production volume, and more than half of them increased payments while production volume fell” [11, p. 383].

As a result of the policy pursued during the years of “perestroika” by the leadership of the country there was a powerful crisis in the social sphere.

Throughout the first half of the 1980s, there was a steady increase in the consumption of basic food products in the USSR. Although it was lower and less balanced compared to the developed Western countries [17, p. 55-56]. At the same time, the shortage of goods was relative. It was possible to buy a fairly wide range of goods in the operating markets. But the prices there were higher than in the state stores.

Throughout 1985-1987, the state of the population’s livelihood was fairly stable. In 1987, food consumption per capita in Gorky was almost up to the recommended standard for key indicators (meat, milk, eggs, confectionery), exceeded the standard for potatoes, but was significantly lower for fruits and berries (Table 1) [11, p. 324].

Food consumption per capita in Gorky (kg)

Products	Recommended standard of consumption	1987
Meat and meat products	78	69
Milk and dairy products	390	362
Eggs (pcs.)	291	348
Potatoes	117	123
Vegetables and gourds	139	73
Confectionery	18	16.9
Fruit and berries	71	12

In 1989 there was a noticeable deterioration in the situation in the sphere of life support of the population. The volume of food sales in the Gorky region in 1989 decreased compared to 1988 [11, p. 376-377].

The report “On the results of socio-economic development of the Gorky region for January-June 1989” noted: “the analysis of reports on the sale of goods by the city fund indicates a decrease compared to the half of last year in the sale of many types of goods. These are TV sets and soft drinks, tea and confectionery, canned fish and meat, sausages, etc.”. For the majority of the population, the problem of “shortage” became a vicious circle. The everyday goal of the Soviet inhabitant was to “get” something (not “buy”, but “get”). From T. P. Kusova’s speech at the plenum of the Avtozavodsky district committee (1989): “Go to district stores after 3 p.m. – at best you can buy a bottle of milk. Where did the confectionery disappear to? There are three confectionery factories in the city, but there is no sweets in the city” [3, s. 113-114]. Soviet people were perplexed – “enterprises, including food ones (producing products – A. G.), work in the former capacity, and if we judge by the stores – all the factories and enterprises have closed! Even in the first years of Soviet power there was no such situation” [5, p.

465-466].

At the same time, there was an alternative trade network represented by cooperative stores and markets, with a full variety of goods. But this trade segment was out of reach for the vast majority of the population. Prices in cooperative stores and markets were several times higher than in the state trade. For instance, in the first half of 1989 the price of potatoes in the Gorky city amounted to 30 kopecks per kg at the state stores and 60 kopecks at the cooperative stores, 70 kopecks at the collective-farm markets; 1 kg of beef at the state stores – 2 rubles, at the cooperative stores – 4 rubles 80 kopecks, at the market – 6 rubles 62 kopecks; 1 kg of pork in the state stores – 2 rubles 10 kopecks, at the cooperative stores – 4 rubles, at the market – 5 rubles 50 kopecks. For other categories of goods the same dynamics was observed [5, p. 466].

It is indicative that the majority of the population was satisfied with the situation, which guaranteed the possibility to purchase, although limited, but at a steadily low price, goods allowing to satisfy the minimum essential needs. According to a sociological survey conducted among the workers of the Gorky region in October 1989, 80% of respondents were in favor of preserving state regulation of prices for goods, and only 4% of respondents were against this measure. At the same time, 60% considered it possible to introduce a card system for consumer goods, and only 27% were in favor of raising prices, so that the goods “were available in the stores” [5, p. 466].

A sharp deterioration in the supply situation occurred in 1990-1991.

As specified in the Note on Social and Economic Policy of the Nizhny Novgorod City Committee of the Communist Party of the RSFSR “On Social Protection of the City Population in 1991”: “1990 was a year of transition from stagnation in life support of the population to crisis (...) The acute food crisis began, which especially intensified by the end of the year. Sales of basic foods (...) declined significantly. A coupon system was introduced, and goods for which coupons were not introduced practically disappeared in the stores. Sales of butter fell by 20% (...), meat by 23% (...) during 1990. In the food industry, production fell by 4.6% [11, p. 382].

The head of Department of the Committee for State Security of the Avtozavodsky district S. stated (1990): “More than two weeks ago we celebrated the 73rd anniversary of the Great October Revolution. This October, to be honest, was no fun for the majority of Soviet families... There were no holiday pies at family feasts. The consumer market in the city and region was marked by a new step toward total collapse. Prices in the markets increased [11, p. 466].

“No one can explain why such a sharp deterioration has taken place”, stated in the information summary. Examples of “purposeful sabotage” aimed at worsening the supply situation were spreading in the public consciousness. In 1990, at the Election Party Conference of the Avtozavodsky district, I. P. Lisov noted: “Crime is growing among the workers of trade, warehouses, and bases. We know examples of this: they take food products to the dump at nights, so lacking nowadays sausage, beef carcasses, chicken, sweets, condensed milk” [11, p. 466].

In the first half of 1991, sales declined even further. In January-February 1991 the consumption of meat was only 40% of the 1990 level, sausage products – 90%, butter – 46%, tea – 49%, fish – 30%. There were difficulties in changing coupons to

eggs, cereals, tea [11, p. 385].

In the first half of 1991, the living standard of Nizhny Novgorod residents decreased significantly. The volume of sales of basic food products fell sharply compared to the first half of 1990, although in 1990 it was also below the level of 1989 [11, p. 392].

Table [11, p. 392-393]

Sales volume of basic food products in Nizhny Novgorod in the first half of 1990 and the first half of 1991

Products	First half of 1990	First half of 1991
Meat and poultry (tons)	19,806	8,403
Sausage products (tons)	7,945	7,670
Fish (tons)	5,407	3,930
Butter (tons)	5,673	2,824
Cheese (tons)	2,193	1,224
Sugar (tons)	13,993	10,044
Vodka and liqueurs (thousand decaliters)	943	949
Beer (thousand decaliters)	1,376	1,513
Fruit, juice (million jars)	9.47	6.10

In Nizhny Novgorod in the first half of 1991, distribution limits were reduced, redemption of coupons was poor, the city's food industry enterprises worked unsatisfactorily [11, p. 392].

In 1990, the shortage of industrial goods was largely artificial and stimulated by excessive incomes of the population and the expected rise in prices. Many industrial goods in 1985 could be bought quite freely, but in 1990 they were sold on special lists, coupons or great favors [11, p. 386].

If in 1985 the citizens bought 42.1 thousand TV sets, 22.1 thousand radios, 10.6 thousand refrigerators, 1,347 tons of laundry soap, clothes and underwear in the amount of 109.6 million rubles, fabric in the amount of 18.3 million rubles, then in 1990 – 52.5 thousand TV sets, 28.5 thousand radios, 10.1 thousand refrigerators, laundry soap – 1,863 tons, clothes and underwear – 153.8 million rubles, fabric – 21.3 million rubles [11, p. 386].

Huge incomes of cooperators, unreasonable growth of wages of the population with limited commodity turnover dramatically worsened the situation. The mechanism

of salary budget regulation (“Abalkinsky tax”) turned out to be ineffective due to inefficient arrangement. Monetary incomes of the population were growing rapidly. Under these conditions, the population lost confidence in the ruble, money was outflowing from savings banks. Whereas in 1989 the State Bank of Gorky received cash in the amount of 99 mln rubles from savings banks, in 1990 the cash flow went in the opposite direction: The State Bank had to give 14 mln rubles to the savings banks to back them up. The scale of the emission became enormous. Much damage was caused by the indecisive and contradictory policy of the Soviet leadership in the field of price regulation. In 1990 the Soviet government, having declared a price increase, for populist reasons did not take this step. But the reaction of the population was immediate. In the city of Gorky, a rapid (one might say, provoked) increase in prices in the private market began. For example, if in 1980 beef was 5 rubles 70 kopecks (kg) and potatoes 70 kopecks (kg), then in December 1990 it was already 15 rubles and 1 rubles 30 kopecks respectively [11, p. 384]. To stabilize the socio-economic situation, in January 1991 the USSR Prime Minister V. S. Pavlov conducted a monetary reform, which could not fundamentally change the situation. In 1991 in Nizhny Novgorod the growth of prices significantly outstripped the growth of wages. Solvent demand of the city’s population declined. Rising prices and falling consumption were the main points characterizing the situation in the field of living standard of the city population.

The management of the city’s enterprises was looking for ways to reduce the shortage of goods. In these difficult conditions, the General Director of the Gorky Automobile Plant B. P. Vidyayev made every effort to improve the situation of workers and employees of the plant, and the entire population of the district as a whole. During these years, “Chinese stores” (as they were called among the people) were opened, where workers of the plant were offered consumer goods, mostly of Chinese origin, for coupons (clothes, dishes, food (Chinese stewed meat, tea, etc.)). On the outskirts of the Avtozavodsky district the population began to plant potatoes and other vegetable crops. Workers got their own gardens and orchards. On weekends and during vacations, thousands of the Avtozavodsky district workers went to their summer houses, which helped them to significantly diversify and, what is important, reduce the cost of their home menu [5, p. 465-466].

One of the most important socio-economic projects of perestroika was a sharp increase in housing construction. In 1986, a slogan was put forward: “A separate apartment for every Soviet family by the year 2000”. To solve the housing problem, special programs were developed: the development of housing and utility services for 1989-1990 and housing construction for the period up to 2000 [11, p. 324].

For the rapidly increasing urban population, the housing problem became one of the most important. Thus, in the letters of the residents of the Avtozavodsky district of Gorky addressed to various authorities, the housing problem was in the first place. Out of 394 letters received by the Avtozavodsky district Party Committee in 1986, 98 were related to the improvement of housing conditions, in 1987 90 out of 352 letters were about this issue. As of January 1, 1989, the Avtozavodsky district Executive Committee had 2,964 people on 15 waiting lists to improve their housing conditions [4, s. 28].

The construction of 3.5 million square meters of housing was planned in Gorky

for the XII five-year plan (1986-1991). The increase in housing was primarily due to large industrial enterprises – GAZ (Gorky Automobile Plant) and “Krasnoye Sormovo” Plant. So in the Avtozavodsky district as early as the late 1970s and early 1980s, the housing problem began to affect the personnel policy of the enterprise and, eventually, the quality of products. N. A. Pugin, General Director of the Gorky Automobile Plant, recalls: “We were building 70 thousand square meters of housing per year at that time. Is it a lot? – Very little. The waiting list for apartments amounted to 20 thousand people (...) To somehow compensate for the lack of human resources we had to invite temporary workers... The quality of our trucks and “Volga” cars was declining, people were leaving in search of a better life, more and more “temporary workers” had to be employed – I could literally see the “personnel crisis” that could soon embrace the Gorky Automobile Plant”. In the end, thanks to the efforts of N. A. Pugin, a “quota” for the annual construction of 200 thousand square meters of living space for the Automobile Plant was obtained in Moscow. In 1985, the government issued a special decree “On Technical Re-Equipment of the Production Base and Social Development of the Gorky Automobile Plant”. This program for 1985-1990 envisaged allocation of significant financial resources, including for social sphere of the Avtozavodsky district. The program was successfully implemented under the next General Director of GAZ, B. P. Vidyayev [5, p. 464; 11, p. 324].

In 1989 the housing stock of the Avtozavodsky district was 5.135 mln square meters, average housing per resident was 15.1 sq. m. During the perestroika period the panel-built houses built in the 1930s, disappeared from the map of the Avtozavodsky district. Their residents received comfortable apartments. A new form of housing construction was actively used in the district – MZhK (youth residential complexes) [5, p. 464].

At other enterprises of the city was carried out intensive construction. For example, in 1988 the “Krasny Yakor” Plant began the construction of two 83-apartment houses on Aerodromnaya Street [10, p. 74].

In general, in Gorky in the twelfth five-year plan (1986-1990) it was not possible to reach the planned rate of construction. A total of 2,716 thousand sq. m. of housing (1.9 sq. m. per 1 resident) were built. For comparison: during the tenth five-year plan (1976-1980) 3,086 thousand sq. m. were built in Gorky (2.26 sq. m. per 1 resident), during the eleventh five-year plan (1981-1985) – 2,834 thousand sq. m. (2 sq. m. per 1 resident). In 1990 the city of Gorky was the 65th in the republic by the number of housing put into operation per capita. Commissioning of housing in 1990 in the city of Nizhny Novgorod was disrupted, which led to the aggravation of the situation in the housing sphere [2, p. 382].

The analysis of materials from the period of “perestroika” shows that in the socio-economic development of the city of Gorky can be distinguished two periods: the first one – 1985-1988, when the reforms resulted in radical changes in the economic sphere, and the second one – a large-scale socio-economic crisis of 1989-1991. By 1991, there was a sharp decline in the living standard of the city residents. The reforms led to a change in the Soviet economic model, and traditional economic ties were bro-

ken. The social structure of the city also changed: a new category of citizens with significant financial resources rapidly emerged. Under the influence of the crisis, the way of life of the city population was transformed.

References

1. Association with History. To the 30th anniversary of the Nizhny Novgorod Association of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs. Nizhny Novgorod, 2019. 304 p.
2. Belous V. I. Problems of the Social Sphere of the Gorky region. 1986-1991 of the XX century // Society and Power. Russian Province. Vol. 6. 1986 – 1991 / Compiled by A. A. Kulakov, V. V. Smirnov, L. P. Kolodnikova. Moscow: Institute of Russian History of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2010. 976 p.
3. State Public Institution “State Socio-Political Archive of the Nizhny Novgorod Region”. Fund 37. List 47. File 23. Sheet 113-114.
4. State Public Institution “State Socio-Political Archive of the Nizhny Novgorod Region”. Fund 37. List 47. File 19. Sheet 28.
5. Gordin A. A. City Workers: Labor, Social Life and Sentiments // Society and Power. Russian Province. Vol. 6. 1986 – 1991 / Compiled by A. A. Kulakov, V. V. Smirnov, L. P. Kolodnikova. Moscow: Institute of Russian History of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2010. P. 482.
6. Gordina E. D. Perestroika 20 Years Later: Social and Political Debate in Modern Russian Publicism // Philosophical Paradigm in Philosophy: Being, its Genealogy and Renewal: Monograph / edited by prof. M. M. Prokhorov. Nizhny Novgorod: VGIPU Publishing House, 2007. P. 273-284
7. Two Coups and Collapse of the USSR / Head of the author’s group A. S. Chernyaev. Gorbachev Readings. Ed. 9. Moscow: Gorbachev Foundation, 2011. 146 p.
8. Medvedev R. A. Why did the Soviet Union collapse // Otechestvennaya istoriya. 2003. No. 4, 5
9. Mikhail Gorbachev and German Issue: Collection of Documents. 1986-1991 / Text, introduction and notes compiled by A. A. Galkin, A. S. Chernyaev / Gorbachev Foundation. – Moscow: Ves mir, 2006. 670 p.
10. Our “Krasny Yakor”. N. Novgorod: “Nizhpolygon” GIPP, 1998. 86 p.
11. Society and Power. Russian Province. Vol. 6. 1986 – 1991 / Compiled by A. A. Kulakov, V. V. Smirnov, L. P. Kolodnikova. Moscow: Institute of Russian History of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2010. 976 p.
12. Pikhoya R. G. Moscow. Kremlin. Power. Two Stories of One Country. Russia at the Turn of the Millennium. 1985-2005. Moscow, 2007. 554 p.
13. Pikhoya R. G. On the Periodization of the Systemic Crisis of the Soviet Union // Russian History. 2019. P. 3-29
14. Serebryanskaya G. V., Goreva A. M. Regional Economy in the Conditions of Reforms // Society and Power. Russian Province. Vol. 6. 1986 – 1991 / Compiled by A. A. Kulakov, V. V. Smirnov, L. P. Kolodnikova. Moscow: Institute of Russian History of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2010. P. 239.
15. Sogrin V. V. Political History of Modern Russia. 1985-2001. From Gorbachev to Putin. Moscow: “Ves mir”, 2001. 976 p.
16. Sogrin V. V. 1985-2005: Three Transformations of Modern Russia // Otechestvennaya istoriya. 2005. No. 3. P. 3-24
17. Khlevnyuk O. V. Day of New Prices. Supply Crisis and Russian Society at the Turn

of the 1980-1990s // Rossiyskaya istoriya. 2019. No. 2. P. 52-70

18. 1989 in Russian and World History. Analytical Report; First Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR: 20 Years Later. Materials of panel discussion / Ed. by O. M. Zdravomyslova // Gorbachev Readings. Ed. 7. – Moscow: Gorbachev Foundation, 2010. 234 p.

URBANIZATION IN EASTERN AND SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE

Collection of Articles

Computer-aided makeup

A. A. Gordin,

A. Rastović

Federal State Budgetary Educational Institution of Higher Education
“Nizhny Novgorod State University of Architecture and Civil Engineering”
65, Ilyinskaya, Nizhny Novgorod, 603950