

THE IMPACT OF PERESTROIKA ON SOVIET LAW

edited by

ALBERT J. SCHMIDT



MARTINUS NIJHOFF PUBLISHERS

DORDRECHT / BOSTON / LONDON

LAW IN EASTERN EUROPE

*A series of publications
issued by the
Documentation Office for East European Law
University of Leyden*

General Editor

F.J.M. FELDBRUGGE

No. 41

SOVIET LEGISLATION FOR PROTECTION OF ARCHITECTURAL MONUMENTS: BACKGROUND¹

ALBERT J. SCHMIDT

Although all-union legislation on monuments did not appear until 1976, reflecting, as Professor Feldbrugge has observed, "the lowly place of monuments on the list of legislative priorities",² there had been periodic union-republic legislation since the Bolshevik Revolution, especially since the 1960s.³ A decree in 1966 "On the State and the Measures of Improvement of the Protection of Monuments of History and Culture in the RSFSR"⁴ was clearly linked to establishing a year earlier the All-Russian Volunteer Society for the Preservation and Use of Cultural and Historic Monuments, or the Russian acronym VOPIK (VOPIIK).⁵ VOPIK became a model for similar socie-

1. The author gratefully acknowledges grants from the American Philosophical Society and the University of Bridgeport School of Law and the assistance of the staffs of the University of Bridgeport Law Library and the Documentation Office for East European Law of the University of Leyden.

2. F.J.M. Feldbrugge, "Monuments in Soviet Law", in *Soviet Administrative Law: Theory and Policy*, (G. Ginsburgs et al.) No.40 *Law in Eastern Europe*, (F.J.M. Feldbrugge, ed.), Dordrecht 1989. Hereinafter cited as "Monuments".

For more on monuments' law see Albert J. Schmidt, "Monuments", *Encyclopedia of Soviet Law*, 2nd ed., (F.J.M. Feldbrugge, G.P. Van den Berg, W.B. Simons, eds.), Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 1985, 521-22 and H.J. Drengenberg for comments on Art.68 of the 1977 Constitution in *Handbuch der Sowjetverfassung*, (M. Fincke, ed.), 2 vols. Berlin 1983, 2: 679-683.

3. For surveys of legislation on monuments see M.M. Boguslavskii, *Mezhdunarodnaia okhrana kul'turnykh tsennostei*, Moscow 1979 and *Okhrana pamiatnikov istorii i kul'tury; sbornik dokumentov*, (G.G. Anisimov, ed.), Moscow 1973.

The Estonians enacted legislation as early as 1961 to be followed by the Lithuanians (1967), Uzbeks (1968), Armenians, Moldavians, and Belorussians (1969), and the Kazakhs (1971).

4. CM RSFSR 24 May 1966; *Okhrana pamiatnikov*, *op.cit.* note 3, 150-154.

5. The decision to establish VOPIK occurred 23 July 1965 (*SP RSFSR* 1965 No.17 item 101; *Okhrana pamiatnikov*, *op.cit.* note 3, 144). The Society's charter was confirmed by CM RSFSR 6 July 1966, No.589 "Ob utverzhdenii Ustava Vserossiiskogo obshchestva okhrany pamiatnikov istorii i kul'tury", *SP RSFSR* 1966 No.19 item 105.

For establishment of VOPIK see 17 *CDSP* 1965 No.30, 32-33 as abstracted from *Izvestia* 30 July 1965, 4. V.I. Kochemasov, Vice-Chairman of the Russian Republic Council of Ministers, was named chairman of the organizational committee. For abstracts of public statements by Kochemasov, who eventually was also named Chairman of the Presidium of the

ties in other union republics.⁶ These together with republic monuments legislation set the stage for the all-union legislation of 1976.

That statute "On the Protection and Use of Monuments of History and Culture",⁷ which served as a basis for incorporating the monuments theme (art.68) in the USSR Constitution in 1977, produced a spate of union republic laws and generated numerous scholarly commentaries and news articles.⁸ By 1982 new federal legislation enlarged on what had appeared in 1976;⁹ naturally, subsequent republic legislation followed suit. Although there has been no addi-

Central Council of VOPIK, see 17 *CDSP* 1965 No.48, 28; 19 *CDSP* 1967 No.49, 13-15; 31 *CDSP* 1979 No.20, 17-18; 32 *CDSP* 1980 No.19, 8-9.

The most recent version of the VOPIK charter was confirmed in 1973. (CM RSFSR 23 Feb. 1973 and *SP RSFSR* 1973 No.8, item 29.)

6. The limits of VOPIK's autonomy remains in doubt; unquestionably, it acquired a popular aspect that both furthered the cause of proposed monuments' legislation and stroked nationalistic sentiment.

Feldbrugge, "Monuments", in analyzing variations among the Union Republic societies and Union Republic legislation, concludes that VOPIK fares much better than the other Union Republic societies. It has "been granted the status of a semi-official body, which acts in tandem with the corresponding state agency, *in casu* the RSFSR Ministry of Culture. Politically, this is of considerable interest, because the republican monument protection associations are one of the few legitimate outlets for national aspirations in the union republics, and the fact that the Russian association has been granted a unique status can hardly be regarded as a coincidence". (p.204) This statement is, of course, dated in light of various new modes of expressing nationalist sentiment during 1988-1989.

7. The USSR Supreme Soviet, 29 Oct. 1976. *Ved. SSSR* 1976 No.44, item 628. For English translations see *The Soviet Legal System: Selected Legislation and Documents*, (William Butler, ed.), Dobbs Ferry, N.Y. 1978, 539-546 and 28 *CDSP* 1976 No.45, 15-19.

The Draft Law is printed in 28 *CDSP* 1976 No.25. For discussion of the Draft Law in the Supreme Soviet see *Zasedaniia verkhovnogo soveta SSSR*, 9th convocation, 5th session (27-29 Oct. 1976), 304-332; English transl. in 28 *CDSP* 1976, Nos.38, 39, 45.

8. Union republic legislation after the 1976 Law replaced that enacted in the 1960s, which in turn had been based on the 1948 legislation. The Union Republics adopted their own versions of the 1976 within the next two years. See Boguslavskii, *op.cit.* note 3, 126-137.

A resolution in the CM RSFSR (*Izvestiia* 9 Feb. 1980) reiterated support for the statute but expressed reservations about the manner of its implementation. See 32 *CDSP* 1980 No.6, 18.

For Russian Union-Republic legislation in the 1970s see *SP RSFSR* No.1 item 1; *Ibid.*, 1976 No.17 item 134; *Ibid.*, 1976 No.21 items 156 and 158; *Ibid.*, 1978 No.15 item 100; *Ibid.*, 1979 No.21 item 155.

See note below for a bibliography of principal commentaries; the most useful source for the many news articles written between 1976-1984 about architectural monuments' preservation and protection is *Letopis' gazetnykh statei*.

9. *SP SSSR* 1982 No.26 item 133; Min. Kul'tury SSSR 1982 No.604.

The most far-ranging legislation of the present decade for the Russian Union Republic appears to have been that of 1980, an enlargement of that of the 1970s, setting priorities and determining the means of restoring specific projects for the remainder of the decade. *SP RSFSR* 1980 No.7 item 53, 118-39. See also *SP RSFSR* 1981 No.9 item 55; *Ibid.*, No.29 item 180; *Ibid.*, 1982 No.2 item 6.

tional all-union legislation and a diminution of commentaries since 1982, the draft legislation for a Culture Fund, drawn in mid-1986 and subsequently approved, reiterated monuments preservation.¹⁰ That it did confirms its role in cultural *perestroika*.¹¹

10. During the peak years (1976-1984) of monuments legislation and discussion forty-one relevant articles were listed in *Gosudarstvo i pravo: bibliograficheskii ukazatel' / novaia sovetskaia literatura po obshchestvennym naukam* (Moscow: Akademiia nauk SSSR, Institut nauchnoi informatsii po obshchestvennym naukam, published monthly). The following, listed chronologically, are among the most important:

Zakonodavstvo pro pam'iatniki istorii ta kul'turi: zbirnik normativnikh aktiv, (O.N. Iakimenka, ed.), Kiev 1970.

Okhrana prirody i pamiatnikov Latviiskoi SSR: Sbornik zakonov, (L.F. Linkaitis, Ia.Ia. Rits, eds.), Riga 1972.

Sovetskoe zakonodatel'stvo o pamiatnikakh istorii i kul'tury: sbornik dokumentov i materialov 1917-72 gg., (F.V. Borisevich, ed.), Minsk 1972.

Okhrana pamiatnikov istorii i kul'tury: sbornik dokumentov, (G.G. Anisimov, ed.), Moscow 1973.

L.A. Steshenko, *Pravovaia okhrana pamiatnikov kul'tury v SSSR*, Moscow 1974.

L.A. Steshenko, "Okhrana pamiatnikov kul'tury v SSSR", *SGiP* 1975 No.11, 42-49.

F.V. Borisevich, *Razvitie sovetskogo zakonodatel'stva ob okhrane pamiatnikov istorii i kul'tury*, Minsk 1976, 1-19.

M. Grishin, "Pamiatniki pod okhronoi zakona", *Sots.Zak.* 1977 No.1, 36-39; also in 16 *SLG*, Fall 1977 No.3, 105-110.

A. Tkach, "Kul'turni tsinnosti — pid okhoronu zakonu", *Radians'ke pravo* 1977 No.2, 12-16.

V. Strelkov, "Pamiat' narodnaia", *Sov.Iust.* 1977 No.5, 16-17.

V. Novikov, A. Trofimov, "Dostoianie naroda", *Khoziaistvo i pravo* 1977 No.4, 78-84.

S. Semanov, "Zakon okhraniaet kul'turnoe nasledie", *Sots.Zak.* 1977 No.11, 29-33.

L.A. Steshenko, "Pravovye voprosy okhrany i ispol'zovaniia pamiatnikov istorii i kul'tury", *SGiP* 1977 No.6, 31-39.

L.A. Steshenko, V.D. Tepferov, "O pamiatnikakh istorii i kul'tury", *Novoe v sovetskom zakonodatel'stve* 1977, 1-80.

R.M. Kolomtseva, "Pamiatniki otechestvennoi istorii: istochnik dukhovnoi zhizni", *Istoriia SSSR* 1978 No.3, 206-219.

M.M. Boguslavskii, *Mezhdunarodnaia okhrana kul'turnykh tsennostei*, Moscow 1979.

O. Steshenko, "Okhorona pam'iatok istorii ta kul'turi — konstitutsiini obov'iazok", *Radians'ke pravo* 1979 No.1, 3-7.

I.V. Gus'kova, "Zakonodatel'stvo ob okhrane istoricheskikh i kul'turnykh tsennostei", *Problemy sovershenstvovaniia sovetskogo zakonodatel'stva* 1979 No.14, 74-83.

Iu. Kostanov, "Pravovye mery okhrany pamiatnikov istorii i kul'tury", *Sots.Zak.* 1980 No.9, 52-53.

V. Nastiuk, "Administrativno-pravovi pitannia okoroni pam'iatok istorii ta kul'turi", *Radians'ke pravo* 1980 No.4, 62-65.

Iu. Belonozhko, A. Berenzon, "Pravovoe polozhenie dokumental'nykh pamiatnikov istorii i kul'tury", *Sots.Zak.* 1981 No.4, 43-44.

G. Popov, "Okhrana pamiatnikov istorii i kul'tury", *Sovety narodnykh deputatov* 1983 No.11, 99-104.

The 1976 and 1982 statutes differed more in length than spirit.¹² The earlier law included under the caption "General Provisions" articles on definition, ownership, and types of monuments, state administration of and control over their protection, and the participation of social organizations in the same. Part II of the legislation had to do with registration of all monuments for the State record. The third section enumerated the procedure and conditions for the use of monuments to insure their preservation. A fourth placed responsibility for violations of the law, and, finally, a single article (art.33) spoke to international treaties and agreements. The 1982 law's 80 articles added a section on "Use of Monuments of History and Culture" essentially for educational purposes, and greatly enlarged those on "The State Record", "Ensuring Protection", and "Restoration, Conservation, and Repair".¹³

This flurry of legislation and the inclusion of Article 68 in the 1977 Constitution suggests that in recent years Soviet authorities, despite notable lapses, have been serious about protecting the nation's historical treasures. Present planning encompasses the decade 1981-1990 during which expenditures will be measured in hundreds of millions of rubles with subsequent annual costs in tens of millions.¹⁴ No other state spends so much for such purposes. This scheme, the many organizations involved, and projects to be undertaken warrant a review of Soviet monuments policy. The Soviet record for protecting and

A.P. Sergeev, "Grazhdansko-pravovaia okhrana kul'turnykh tsennosti", *Pravovedenie* 1983 No.4, 37-46.

A.P. Sergeev, "Grazhdansko-pravovye mery bor'by s beskhoziaistvennym soderzhaniiem kul'turnykh tsennosti", *SGiP* 1984 No.8, 131-35.

V.Ia. Nastiuk, "Rol' mer administrativnogo vozeistviia v obespechenii okhrany pamiatnikov istorii i kul'tury v SSSR", 13 *Problemy sotsialisticheskoi zakonnosti* 1984, 113-116.

N.A. Riabova, "Situatsionnyi analiz primeneniia zakonodatel'stva ob okhrane i ispol'zovaniia pamiatnikov istorii i kul'tury", *SGiP* 1986 No.11, 140-43.

N.D. Boboedova, "Osobennosti upravleniia v oblasti okhrany i ispol'zovaniia pamiatnikov istorii i kul'tury", *Problemy sovershenstvovaniia sovetskogo zakonodatel'stva* 1986 No.34, 69-80. This article contains a useful bibliography beyond the above.

K.N. Smirnov, "Sotsial'nye i pravovye problemy okhrany pamiatnikov", *SGiP* 1987 No.9, 12-16.

M. Vasil'eva, "Pamiatnikam istorii i kul'tury - rachel'nogo khoziaina", *Sov.Iust.* 1988 No.2, 19-21.

11. *Perestroika* is generally translated in the English-speaking press as Restructuring. It seems to this author that the Soviets have in mind a more forceful term, Rebuilding, which is also an acceptable translation.
12. The author is saved the necessity of an extensive analysis of this legislation as that task was undertaken by Professor Feldbrugge, *op.cit.* note 2.
13. *SP SSSR* 1982 No.26 item 133.
14. This projection, as extracted from the eleventh Five Year Plan and divided in the XXVI Party Congress, was the object of discussion in the Plenary Session of VOOPIK in Moscow, 10 February 1984. For a full account see V.A. Peterburzhitsev, "Ocherednoi plenum obshchestva okhrany pamiatnikov", *Pamiatniki otechestva* 1984 No.1 (9), 166-17.

restoring monuments, particularly those of architecture, is best understood in terms of 1) the structure of the preservation apparatus, 2) a chronology of past practices, and 3) a comparison with Imperial Russian monuments preservation.

Structure of the Preservation Apparatus

The organizations involved have been numerous and inevitably intertwined with the state planning apparatus. Those most important for consideration are 1) the All-Russian Volunteer Society for the Preservation of Historical and Cultural Monuments (VOOPIK) and its local affiliates; 2) the Shchusev Museum for the History of Architecture under the directorship of Victor Baldin; 3) the All-Union Specialized Restorative Production Combine (*Soiuzrestavratsiia*) of the Ministry of Culture at Novospasskii Monastery with various workshops elsewhere; 4) architectural preservation programs in various schools of architecture; 5) the Culture Fund; 6) the Ministry of Culture; and, finally 7) various "informal groups" which have made monuments a vehicle for nationalism. Such groups as the Writers and Artists Unions and clubs¹⁵ of various types have had more than a passing interest in monuments protection, but they will not be considered here.

VOOPIK, a unique organization because of its popular origins,¹⁶ descended from the Rodina (Homeland) Club and may have originated as a Great Russian nationalist reaction to the destruction of architectural monuments during the Khrushchev epoch.¹⁷ To its credit, VOOPIK has sponsored a variety of activities which have successfully publicized Russia's endangered architectural heritage.¹⁸ Although it still retains a core of committed preservationists, the

15. See 37 *CDSF* 1985 No.24, 12-13 from *Pravda* 16 June 1985, 1-2.

16. The All-Union Scientific and Methodological Center, established in 1978 and operating under the Ministry of Culture, and the newly established Culture Fund both encourage amateur cultural activities, some of which have to do with monuments' preservation. See Vera Tolz, "Creation of Soviet Cultural Foundation", *Radio Liberty Research*, RL 138/86, 26 March 1986.

17. John B. Dunlop, *The Faces of Contemporary Russian Nationalism*, Princeton, N.J. 1983, 63-92. Dunlop's lengthy discussion of the linkage between monuments preservation and Great Russian nationalism is excellent. See Marshall Winokur's thoughtful review of Dunlop in 29 *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 1985, 357-360 and repeated in 12 *Soviet Union/Union Sovietique* 1985 No.3, 346-347. *

18. VOOPIK was probably responsible for one of the great cultural events of 1984, the first extravagant Soviet exhibition on historical preservation. "Restoration of Museum Treasures in the USSR", held in the Central House of Artists, apparently generated the kind of excitement that is usually reserved for daring works of literature, music, or cinema. This emotional in-

society almost from the beginning faced co-optation by the authorities, a fate which protesting preservationists have only partially avoided.¹⁹ That it is presently an official (though non-governmental) body probably has also had a stultifying effect on it. Recently the Party Central Committee criticized VOPIK for its "administrative-bureaucratic inertia". It called it inept in the promotion and preservation of historical and cultural monuments "under conditions of the democratization of our entire life and people's growing interest in the history of our homeland".²⁰ This Central Committee resolution, noting that new grassroots (*samodeiatel'nye*) cultural organizations had taken advantage of the VOPIK's passive administration, clearly constituted a reprimand for allowing the society to become a refuge for Great Russian nationalists and other "informal groups" to seize the monuments idea to enhance their nationalist agenda.

Both VOPIK's effectiveness as a lobbying group and the legislation by which it registers grievances against monuments violators were further called into question in a recent dialogue between the *Izvestiia* commentator Iu. Feofanov and two associates of the All-Union Research Institute on Soviet Legislation.²¹ Admitting that VOPIK "plays a role, but it is a public organization, after all — one with no real rights" — they recommended additional legislation to correct the inadequate grievance procedure and create "a competent arbiter with authority". Finally, criticism of VOPIK has come from the Orthodox Church authorities abroad, who in light of the ill-treatment of an-

volvement by the exhibition's viewers is described by William C. Brumfield, "Russia's Glorious Churches", *Historic Preservation* Jan./Feb. 1985, 43.

Typically, too, the Society has recently co-sponsored with Moscow's Shchusev Museum of Architecture an extended lecture series (1985-1987) on the "History of Russian Architecture". Less ambitious undertakings by VOPIK are those directed to students, workers, and military personnel and the publicizing of the monuments preservation on television, radio, and through cinema clubs and tourism. VOPIK's publication, *Pamiatniki otechestva*, is discussed below.

VOPIK solicits membership from anyone fourteen or older. Legislative authority rests in the All-Russian Conference, which must meet at least once in five years and the Central Council, which functions when the Conference is not in session. The Presidium, elected from the Council, constitutes the executive; its creature, the Bureau, under a director, runs the daily operation. Local conferences in turn meet at least every two or three years to elect their respective councils and presidiums. (Dunlop, *op.cit.* note 17, 71.)

Viacheslav Kochemasov, vice chairman of the Council of Ministers of the RSFSR in 1966 assumed chairmanship of the Bureau, a post which he held until at least until 1977. The *de facto* chairman has been the Bureau's vice chairman, Vladimir N. Ivanov.

19. *Ibid.*, 69.

20. *Pravda* 13 May 1988, 4 as abstracted in 40 *CDSP* 1988 No.19, 22.

21. "In Safekeeping but Unprotected", 40 *CDSP* 1988 No.8, 27-28. See also, "Central Committee Faults Historical Preservation Society for 'Passivity, Formalism'", 40 *CDSP* 1988 No.19, 22.

cient Russian churches, tend to discount whatever successes VOPIK has had.²²

Another organization which has fostered architectural preservation and collaborates from time to time with VOPIK is the Shchusev Museum of Architecture located on the lower end of the Kalinin Prospekt in Moscow. This institution was for a long time under the directorship of Victor Baldin, a notable restorer in his own right.²³ Baldin was also responsible for the superbly organized architectural photo archive in Donskoi Monastery.²⁴ The Museum has recently sponsored in conjunction with VOPIK an extended lecture program on Russian architectural history and held in its own right an architectural exhibit commemorating the 200th anniversary of the birth of Osip Ivanovich Bove, principal restorer of Moscow after the great fire in 1812.²⁵

The All-Union Specialized Restorative Production Combine (*Soivzirestravratsiia*) with its main offices and workshops in the Novospasskii Monastery in Moscow is a key establishment in the preservation and restoration enterprise. The ancient monastery itself is evidence of both the successes and failures of preservation. More than a quarter of a century ago this author wandered about a nearly deserted Novospasskii which was then in shambles.²⁶ That situation has changed considerably now, albeit at rather a slow pace. The walls, main gate and tower, and buildings within the walls have been repaired and washed in various pastels and white. The exquisite Znamenskaia Church, apparently the work of the architect Elizvoi Nazarov at the end of the eighteenth century, has had only exterior restoration; but it has fared better than the adjoining seventeenth century sobor where even the scaffolding is rotting.²⁷

22. Despite the efforts of VOPIK destruction of churches has continued. See Andrew Pospelovskii, "The Destruction of Ancient Churches Continues", *Radio Liberty Research*, RL 308/86, 19 Aug. 1986, 5; Jane Ellis, *The Russian Orthodox Church: A Contemporary History*, Bloomington, Ind. 1986, 29-31.

23. Baldin was responsible for the restoration of Trinity-Sergei Monastery in Zagorsk.

24. Besides having an extraordinarily efficient operation at Donskoi, Baldin had a courteous staff, ever willing to make copies of archival photographs, and readily grants permission for use in publications abroad. Baldin, recently retired, has been replaced by A. Shehusev.

25. Details of history series. See also the exhibition catalogue Z.V. Zolotnitskaia, *Arkhitektorskiĭ Osip Ivanovich Bove k 200 -letiiu so dnia rozhdeniia (1784-1834)*, Moscow 1986.

26. The only activity occurred in a small workshop where busts of Lenin were made.

27. Heaps of stones and materials are more in evidence than workmen; inside the seventeenth century church scaffolding suggested that the restoration of wallpaintings is in progress, but the author saw no evidence of recent work. The Znamenskaia Church appeared to be a workplace for architects; other buildings served as offices. One section was outfitted with looms where fabrics are made for restoration projects far beyond the reaches of Moscow. This workshop is described in detail in Lee H. Nelson, "Restoration Workshops and Architectural Mu-

Soiuzrestavratsiia is the principal official body presently having responsibility for restoration of monuments in the USSR.²⁸ It originated in the immediate post-World War II period with the establishment of the Central Project-Restorative Workshop (TsPRM) and later (1948) termed the Central Scientific-Restorative Workshop (TsNRM). Some of its work was also taken over by the Experimental-Construction branch of the USSR Academy of Architecture.

TsPRM's initial task was one of restoration of buildings damaged during the war or buildings or ensembles crucially in need for repair. Restoration of Moscow's Spasso-Andronikov Monastery in 1960-1961 under TsNRM was an example of the latter. Although the staff of both these organizations was initially small and its undertakings consequently limited, it earmarked projects for restoration, publicized the issue, trained restorers, and developed both a theory and methodology for restoration.

Early in the 1960s TsNRM's planning and production functions were shifted to the Ministry of Culture, which directed them to two new departments — the Scientific-Research Planning Studio and the All-Union Specialized Restoration Production Shop. These, in turn, merged in 1968 to form the All-Union Production Scientific Restorative Combine (VPNRK) of the Ministry of Culture. In the dozen or more years of its existence VPNRK greatly enlarged the number of restoration projects²⁹ and encouraged new restoration methodology in its physics-chemistry laboratory and in its engineering section.

In 1981 VPNRK was reorganized within the Ministry of Culture as *Soiuzrestavratsiia*, as noted above. The present organization employs approximately

seums", *A Report of the US Historic Preservation Team of the US-USSR Joint Working Group on the Enhancement of the Urban Environment*, Washington, D.C. 1975. (Hereinafter cited as: *A Report by the US Historic Preservation Team.*) See in particular the introduction and Lee H. Nelson, "Restoration Workshops and Architectural Museums", *Ibid.*, 35-36.

28. For the history and structure of *Soiuzrestavratsiia* see V.I. Sherebega, A.G. Grigor'eva *et al.*, *Pamiatniki istorii i kul'tury - narodu: deiatel'nost' vsesoiuznogo proizvodstvennogo ob'edineniia "Soiuzrestavratsiia" Ministerstva Kul'tury SSSR*, Moscow 1986. (Hereafter cited as *Soiuzrestavratsiia.*)

29. Before 1970 planning began in VPNRK on outdoor architectural or ethnographic museums such as those in Kizhi, Malaia Karelia near Arkhangel'sk, Irkutsk, Komi and the restoration of such magnificent ensembles as those at Kirillo-Belozerskii and Solovetskii Monasteries, and numerous kremlins and country estate houses. *Soiuzrestavratsiia*, 8-9.

In 1972 VPNRK was charged with restoration of the Moscow Kremlin ensemble, a task which doubtless imposed considerable strain on its small staff. By the time Kremlin restoration was completed at the end of the decade VPNRK had begun planning and initiating work on other Moscow ensembles — Novospasskii and Novodevichii Monasteries, St. Basil's in Red Square, various Moscow churches, and such suburban villas as Arkhangel'skoe, Kuskovo, Nikolskoe-Uriupino, and Bratsevo. VPNRK also worked on painting restoration in Novgorod, Iaroslavl', Rostov the Great, and Riazan and even sent its specialists to such distant points as Samarkand for the restoration of the mausoleum of Gur-Emir and to Riga for work on the Cathedral of Peter. *Ibid.*, 13-14.

2,000 staff and workers, and at the time of the reorganization was engaged in some 80 projects and had another 150 on the drawingboards. *Soiuzrestavratiia* has a much more complex structure than its predecessors. For example, its Scientific-Planning Workshop (NIPM) attends not only to the actual planning of restoration projects but to such related matters as drafting the legislation for monuments protection, cataloging monuments, determining protective zones for projects, and providing support for restoration projects by eliciting the historic and architectural essentials from the plans of old cities. NIPM also engages problems of restoration methodology and technology.

NIPM (Planning). In order to accomplish the above tasks NIPM breaks down into four Architectural-Planning Workshops (APM), the Department of Engineering Services, the Department of Restoration-Technology Development (OPTP), and the Budget [Estimate-Standards] and Technical Department (*Smetno-Normativnyi i Tekhnicheskii Otdel*) (SNO).

APM-1 has focused on restoration planning of Russian kremlins, *i.e.*, in Novgorod, Tula, Astrakhan, Riazan, that of Priludskii Monastery outside Vologda, and Novospasskii, Danilov, and Novodevichii in Moscow.³⁰ APM-2's research and planning domain has been that of architectural ensembles and open-air architectural museums. These have included the Kirillo-Belozerskii and Solovetskii Monastery ensembles, the architectural-ethnographic museum in Komi ASSR, and the wooden architecture museums in Irkutsk, Ivanov, and Vologodsk. Recently APM-2 has undertaken planning and research for the restoration of the eighteenth century gem Pashkov House, opposite the Kremlin and now a part of the Lenin Library.

The third APM unit has been assigned the task of preparing support for designated restoration projects. This includes the planning of protective zones, publicizing architectural monuments and the RSFSR Code for their protection, and the registering of monuments.³¹ This department has become a repository for such essentials as rosters of architectural craftsmen, archival material, bibliographical references, and treatises by contemporary specialists. APM-3 reviews all legislation pertaining to monuments within and without the USSR.

The restoration of interiors – varying from light fixtures, fabrics, and furniture to parquet floors and wall moldings – has become the specialty of APM-4. The staff in this section has among other places worked on the Kremlin cathedrals and Kuskovo Palace.

30. ATM-1 has also engaged in planning restoration for the Kuskovo and Marfino palaces outside Moscow as well as the home of Chaliapin and the Moscow Art Theater in the city itself. *Ibid.*, 20.

31. See Kenneth C. Tapman, "Legal Aspects of Historic Preservation", and William J. Murtagh, Anatole Senkevitch, Jr., "Identification and Registration of Cultural Monuments", *A Report by the US Historic Preservation Team*, 26-32 and 16-25, respectively.

The Engineering Department's task has been essentially one of modernizing monumental edifices – electrification, heating, and sanitation. A new undertaking of this department has been the establishment of photogrammetry (photographic survey) laboratories. Photogrammetric work has proved invaluable to restorers of ancient monuments. These photo laboratories and the scientific-technical archives of NIPM are under the authority of the production personnel of NIPM.

The Department of Restoration-Technological Development's (OPTP) staff of architects has reputedly applied the latest scientific knowledge and technique as exemplified in its study of ancient building materials and the causes of their deterioration and new restoration substances (sealants for white stone, hydraulic insulation, anti-corrosive protection of metals). Its methodological innovations have included injected reinforcement of masonry and uses of silication and water-proofing for strengthening foundations on archeological sites and for open-air museums. The Estimate-Standards and Technical Department (SNTO) confines itself to the financing of restoration, estimating costs, setting up norms, interpreting data based on labor-time studies. The technical section presently oversees standards and contract compliance. CNRPM (Production). Responsibility for *Soiuzrestavratsiia's* production has been delegated to three Special Scientific-Restoration Production Offices (CNRPM), which undertake the specific restoration work whether in sculpture, the decorative arts, painting, or architecture.³² Some 75 master-professionals, supervising the other restorers, carry out on-site production. The workmen of CNRPM-1 and -3, strikingly similar to the Experimental-Construction restoration shop that operated out of the Academy of Architecture after World War II, work at masonry, plastering, tile setting, restoring the decor and painting facades, forging and joining, and laying metal roofs.

CNRPM-2, called the fastest-growing section of *Soiuzrestavratsiia*, engages in the restoration of paintings, sculptures, and the decorative arts. Its task has been one of restoring luxuriant interiors, furniture, and occasionally museum pieces. CNRPM-2's personnel are artist-restorers of gold leaf, frescoes, and tempera and oil paintings; weavers³³ who since 1948 have been recreating the rich fabrics (by old methods) to adorn the walls and furniture of Russian palaces; craftsmen who restore and reproduce lighting fixtures, hardware, and non-ferrous objects of metal, crystal, and ceramic objects for palatial exteriors

32. See *Metodika restavratsii pamiatnikov arkhitektury*, (E. V. Mikhailovski, ed.), Moscow 1977. See also Henry A. Judd, "Techniques and Administration of Restoration", *A Report by the US Historic Preservation Team*, 39-43.

33. This author, the guest of Kul'chinskii, spent several hours early in 1987 in the weaving section of CNRPM-2 in the Novospasskii Monastery inspecting and comparing fabric originals and reproductions. This is described by Lee H. Nelson, "Restoration Workshops and Architectural Museums", *A Report by the US Historic Preservation Team*, 35-36.

and interiors. Those CNRPM workers who engage in woodwork – furniture-making, carving, restoring marquetry and wooden iconostasis, and joinery construction – have had a major role in the restoration of the Kremlin, the Arkhangel'skoe and Kuskovo palaces and various churches.³⁴

Finally, *Soiuzrestavratsiia* has within its structure a Department of Scientific-Technological Information and a Standards-Research Station for maintaining quality and cost control of restoration and conservation undertakings.

The restoration bureaucracy has changed frequently, and it has become exceedingly complex. One can but wonder whether this complexity, like so much of the administrative apparatus in the USSR, does not as often impede as facilitate the tasks at hand. Moreover, in this restoration endeavor as in so many the charge of corruption has surfaced. People's Control in 1979 charged that VPNRK had flawed reports which left tens of thousands of rubles unaccounted for in fourteen of its restoration projects.³⁵

The preservation programs in schools of architecture have been described elsewhere and require no repetition here.³⁶ By the mid-1970s only two schools, the Moscow Architectural Institute and the Leningrad Engineering and Building Institute, had initiated curricula in architectural preservation. Moscow's was a fully-developed one; Leningrad's had only begun accepting diploma projects.

The Culture Fund, as organized in the draft legislation in 1986, has also taken up the monuments issue and in so doing relates it to current cultural policy.³⁷ Perceived by some as a vehicle for a broad rejuvenation of Soviet culture, the self-governing Culture Fund vests authority in its Constituent Conference – or Constituent Council when the Conference is not in session – consisting of prominent artists, composers, museum heads, and the like. A board of directors will serve as the executive, organizing the Fund's activities while an Audit-

34. There have been instances of on-site workshops such as that in Pushkin for restoring the Great Palace in the post-War years. See *Ibid.*, 33-35.

35. 31 *CDSP* 1979 No.42 from *Pravda* 20 Oct. 1979, 3.

36. See Anatole Senkevitch, Jr., "Preservation Programs in Schools of Architecture", *A Report by the US Historic Preservation Team*, 44-55.

37. The draft statute for the Culture Fund appears in *Sovetskaia kul'tura* 4 Sept. 1986, 3. See also Vera Tolz, "Creation of Soviet Cultural Foundation", *Radio Liberty Research*, RL 138/86, 26 March 1987; *idem*, "Cultural Foundation Holds Inaugural Conference", *Ibid.*, RL 442/86, 24 Nov. 1986; *Izvestiia* 5 Sept. 1986, 5 with English transl. in 38 *CDSP* 1986 No.36, 23; *Sovetskaia kul'tura* 13 Nov. 1986, 1-2 with English transl. in 38 *CDSP* 1986 No.46, 12-14. An appraisal of the first year of the Culture Fund and the establishment of a Russian Culture Fund are in 39 *CDSP* 1987 No.26, 23. The Culture Fund's first benefit evening is described in 39 *CDSP* 1987 No.38, 28-29. The first issue of its journal *Nashe nasledie* appeared in 1988. See Vera Tolz, "Nashe nasledie – The Journal of the Soviet Cultural Foundation", 1 *Report on the USSR* 20 Jan. 1989 No.3, 11-13.

ing Commission will oversee finances. Like VOPIK the Fund will have branches in major centers throughout the USSR and representatives in local and remote areas. The respected Academician Dmitrii Likhachev, one who has had his share of troubles with the authorities in the past, has been elected chairman of the presidium of the board of directors and Iurii Korolev, director of the Tret'iakov Gallery, chairman of the Council. The Fund expects to be self-supporting, obtaining like VOPIK funding through contributions.³⁸

The Fund's charge is much broader than VOPIK's, but in encouraging amateur cultural activities, especially those preserving the village and urban heritage, the Fund will also give priority to protecting architectural monuments. It recently joined the chorus to return pre-Soviet names to various cities.³⁹ To achieve its monuments goal it will educate, encourage volunteer work, and solicit monies.

While the Ministry of Culture is the agency under which the others named operate, its position on monuments is ambivalent. Cultural policy — education broadly construed to buttress official ideology — is the Ministry's business. To the degree that monuments protection facilitates official ideology, it is a good thing; any ideological challenge, however, is viewed with the utmost seriousness.⁴⁰ Agitation for protection of historic monuments, to the degree, for example, that it represents Russian nationalist aspirations is disturbing even to a Soviet leadership that is more tolerant of Russian nationalism today than at the time of the Revolution when it was, as Dunlop as noted, one of the "legitimizing props of the old order".⁴¹

38. For more on private funding see Russell V. Keune, "The Private Sector in Historic Preservation", *A Report by the US Historic Preservation Team*, 56-63. Mikhail Gorbachev recently contributed 50,000 rubles from royalties to the Fund and requested that it be used for a monument in Smolensk. 39 *CDSP* 1987 No.26, 23.

39. "Cultural Fund Advocates Returning Old Names to Cities", *Radio Liberty*, RL 311/88, 15 July 1988, 3 and "Historical Names are also Cultural Monuments", 40 *CDSP* 1988 No.32, 21. See also James Critchlow, "Uzbeks Demand Elimination of Non-Native Place Names", 1 *Report on the USSR* 20 Jan. 1989 No.3.

40. See Darrell P. Hammer, "Inside the Ministry of Culture: Cultural Policy in the Soviet Union", in *Public Policy and Administration in the Soviet Union* (Gordon B. Smith, ed.), New York 1980, 53-78. Recent Soviet cultural policy is discussed in Julia Wishnevsky, "Manifestations of a 'Thaw' in Soviet Cultural Policy", *Radio Liberty Research*, RL 266/86, 15 July 1986; Julia Wishnevsky, "Aleksander Yakovlev and the Cultural Thaw", *Ibid.*, RL 51/87, 5 Feb. 1987. See also *Radio Liberty Research*, 18 June 1986, 20 June 1986, and 11 Sept. 1986 for more on the same topic. The role of the fine arts and monuments preservation in Communist upbringing is the subject of the lead article in 38 *CDSP* 1986 No.37.

41. Dunlop, *op.cit.* note 17, 3. Dunlop has also shown how recent efforts to preserve the Russian

Recently the monuments preservation issue, perhaps fueled in part by *glasnost*, has become a highly-charged and divisive one because of its seizure by several "informal groups". The most prominent, or even notorious, of these are *Pamiat*' (Memory) and *Otechestvo* (Fatherland) – some members of which have brashly reasserted the historic clichés of Great Russian nationalism with associated xenophobia.⁴² No doubt *Pamiat*'s argument that national values could combat alcoholism and hooliganism among juveniles is a tempting proposition, but for today's reformers support for *perestroika* from such quarters is both embarrassing and risky.⁴³

village and the environment are all of the same cloth as monuments in expressing nationalist sentiment. *Ibid.*, 87ff.

See also Dunlop, "The Many Faces of Contemporary Russian Nationalism", 24 *Survey* 1979 No.3, 18-35. This particular issue of *Survey* is devoted to nationalism and nationalities in the USSR.

For Gorbachev's attitude toward Great Russian nationalism see Ann Sheehy, "Gorbachev's New Propaganda Chief a Critic of Russian Nationalists", *Radio Liberty Research*, RL 357/85, 31 Oct. 1985; Vera Tolz, "The 'Russian Theme' in the Soviet Media", *Radio Liberty Research*, RL 33/87, 26 Jan. 1987; and Roman Solchanyk, "Russian History, Russian Nationalism, and Soviet Politics", *Ibid.*, RL 327/86, 25 Aug. 1986. See also Esther B. Fein, "Soviet Conservatives Try to Turn Back the Clock on Gorbachev's Policies", *New York Times* 27 Feb. 1989 and "Russian National Sentiments Surface", 39 *CDSP* 1987 No.13, 1-3 from *Pravda* 28 Mar. 1987, 3.

42. Members of both groups have expressed anti-Zionist (and anti-Semitic) and anti-masonic sentiments. The literature about these informal groups greatly proliferated during 1987-1988. See Felicity Barringer, "Russian Nationalists Test Gorbachev", *New York Times* 24 May 1987, 10; Julia Wishnevsky, "El'tsin Meets with Members of Pamyat'" *Radio Liberty Research*, RL 191/87; Vera Tolz, "'Informal Groups' in the USSR", *Ibid.*, RL 220/87 (11 June 1987); Julia Wishnevsky, "*Glasnost*' on Anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union", *Ibid.*, RL 254/87 (6 July 1987); Julia Wishnevsky, "The Emergence of 'Pamyat' and 'Otechestvo'" *Ibid.*, RL 342/87 (26 Aug. 1987); Vera Tolz, "'Informal Groups' Hold First Officially Sanctioned Conference", *Ibid.*, RL 380/87 (23 Sept. 1987); Julia Wishnevsky, "Theater Attacked by 'Otechestvo' Receives State Prize", *Ibid.*, RL 457/87 (12 Nov. 1987); Julia Wishnevsky, "A Second 'Pamyat' Emerges", *Ibid.*, RL 463/87 (16 Nov. 1987); Vera Tolz, "Independent Journals Proliferate in the USSR", *Ibid.*, RL 35/88 (27 Jan. 1988).

See also 39 *CDSP* 1987 No.21, 1-7; "Anti-Semitic Group in Shadow of Kremlin", *New York Times Week in Review* (26 July 1987), 6; "Pamyat' Draws Defense, New Attacks", 40 *CDSP* 1988 No.12 and *Radio Liberty*, RL 55/88; "Crackdown on 'Pamyat' Nationalists Urged", 40 *CDSP* 1988 No.33, 7-8. Further reaction to *Pamiat*' may be seen in the warning issued by the poet Aleksandr Mezhirov in *Ogonek*, the attack on *Pamiat*' in *Sovetskaia kul'tura* on 2 Feb. 1988, and Valentin Rasputin's denunciation of *Pamiat*' critics in the first 1988 issue of *Nash sovremennik*. The best summary to date is Vladislav Krasnov, "Pamyat: A Force for Change?" Paper read at the AAASS meeting in Honolulu, 19 Nov. 1988.

43. The question whether *glasnost*' encourages nationalism appears very much a present concern of Soviet authorities. See 39 *CDSP* 1987 No.27, 1-6, 24. The unprecedented expression during 1988 in Armenia, the Baltic Republics, and, more recently in the Ukraine, White Russia, and in Central Asia, indicates the risks inherent in *glasnost*' after years of repression.

Chronology

The Soviet record for protection and preservation of Russia's artistic, particularly architectural monuments, falls into the following periods: 1) 1918-1928, when protective and restoration efforts met with reasonable success; 2) 1928-1934, when significant architectural monuments were demolished; 3) the mid- and late 1930s, when reconstruction of Moscow shattered the historic city center; 4) 1941-1945, the war years, when many great architectural monuments were destroyed in Novgorod, Pskov, the Leningrad suburbs, and elsewhere; 5) 1959-1964, the Khrushchev years, a highly destructive period especially for church architecture and for old Moscow with the building of the Kalinin Prospekt through the Arbat; 6) 1965 to the present, a period of change in monuments policy characterized by the founding of VOOPK, the promulgation of all-union legislation, the inclusion of restoration projects in the eleventh Five Year Plan, and, finally, the establishment of the Culture Fund in late 1986.

In the aftermath of the Bolshevik Revolution, the prospects for preserving the best of old Russian monuments appeared reasonably good. Destruction from the uprising had been minimal in both Petrograd and Moscow; the principal abuses resulted from burning and vandalizing of manor houses in the countryside. A. V. Lunacharsky, the first Commissar of Education, played a positive role in protecting monuments and persuading Lenin to take action. A government appeal early in 1918 calling for preservation of the nation's artistic heritage urged citizens not to "touch one stone, protect the monuments, the old buildings, articles, documents — all this is your history, your pride".⁴⁴ This promising mood of 1918 continued for the next decade.

One of the great figures in the protection of Russian monuments was Igor Emmanuelovich Grabar', painter and art historian. As a scholar and publicist for old Russian architecture Grabar' is particularly remembered for his monumental *Istoriia russkogo iskusstva* (1909-1915) and his even larger edition of the same work, entirely rewritten by multiple authorship after World War II. Not only did he assume an important role in preservation matters during the NEP period, but he performed similarly after World War II.⁴⁵ Such is possible when one lives a long life.

In 1918 Grabar' organized the Collegium for Museum Affairs under Nar-

44. As quoted in S. T. Palmer, "The Restoration of Ancient Monuments in the USSR", *Survey* 1970 Nos. 74/75, 166 and Kathleen Berton, *Moscow: An Architectural History*, New York 1977, 199. This early legislation is reproduced in *Okhrana pamiatnikov*, *op.cit.* note 3.

45. Cf. Grabar', *Voprosy restavratsii*. Sbornik tsentralnykh Gosudarstvennykh restavratsionnykh masterskikh, 2 vols., Moscow 1926 and 1928. After World War II he wrote *Pamiatniki iskusstva razrushennye nemetskimi zakhvatchikami v SSSR*, Moscow & Leningrad 1948. Cf. also Grabar', V. E. Lazarev, V. V. Kostochkin, *Pamiatniki kul'tury: issledovanie i restavratsii*, Moscow 1959-1963.

kompros, the People's Commissariat for Enlightenment; later in the same year the organization changed its name to suit its principal orientation, the Department on Museums and Preservation of Ancient and Artistic Monuments.⁴⁶ Grabar' established in Moscow a central restoration workshop, facilitated bringing thousands of monuments under state protection, and engaged in the restoration of many others.

This heyday of protection came to an end after the death of Lenin in 1924 and Stalin's massive push for industrialization and reconstruction, neither of which allowed for preserving old architecture.⁴⁷ Frequently state protection of monuments was either withdrawn or shifted to local authorities; Grabar's State Restoration Workshop was closed in 1930. Protectionists like Grabar' and the architect Shchusev, using the journal *Stroitel'stvo Moskvy* as their platform, protested to no avail.

The list of great architectural monuments destroyed in the name of progress between 1928-1934 is a long one.⁴⁸ Moscow, in particular, was hard hit, losing some 400 ancient edifices.⁴⁹ The old city, silhouetted by a forest of cupolas,

46. For more on *Narkompros* see F.I. Sharonov, M.D. Pecherskii, "Obzor dokumentov tsestral'nogo gosudarstvennogo arkhiva RSFSR po istorii okhrany pamiatnikov istorii i kul'tury v RSFSR", *Pamiatniki otechestva* 1983 No.1(7), 148-152.

47. Even before Lenin's death one of the great architectural monuments of the Russian North, the Solovetskii Monastery, became the main concentration camp of the GPU with an inmate population numbering in the tens of thousands. A significant portion of the prisoners in this camp were Orthodox clergy. David J. Dallin, Boris I. Nicolaevsky, *Forced Labor in Soviet Russia*, New Haven, CT 1947, 173-175. For a Soviet version of Solovetskii as a prison camp, see "Film Recalls White-Sea Island Prison Camp", 40 *CDSP* 1988 No.46, 10, 24. See also "Years and Fates: Russian Leonardo", 41 *CDSP* 1989 No.4, 22-23 on Pavel Florensky, a prominent preservationist until his arrest in 1933.

48. The following identify many destroyed monuments: M.Iu. Braichevskii, "Sokhranit' pamiatniki istorii", *Istoriia SSSR* 1966 No.2. 205-226; Palmer, *op.cit.* note 44; and Berton, *op.cit.* note 44.

Les églises de Moscou/Moskva zlatoglavaia, Paris 1979; *Architecture of Russia from Old to Modern*, 2 vols., Russian and English, New York 1973; and *Razrushennye i oskvernennye khramy*, Frankfurt/Main 1980, which focus extensively on destruction of ecclesiastical buildings, are discussed in that context below.

For Moscow before these alterations the reader is referred to *Baedeker's Handbook for Travellers: Russia*, New York 1970. A recent article describing the destruction of old Bucharest in the name of progress and the style of replacement buildings recalls this earlier transformation of old Moscow (Romain Valence, "Wreckers get to work in Old Bucharest", *Manchester Guardian Weekly* 6 Dec. 1987).

49. Vladimir Soloukhin, after enumerating some of Moscow's greatest architectural losses, eloquently reveals the tragedy of these years:

It would be very tiresome for the reader if I started detailed enumeration of complete destruction. . . . It is also a pity that the Sukharev Tower, built in the seventeenth century, was destroyed. It was blocking the automobile traffic. . . . What a pity that the Red Gates and the Triumphal Gates were also demolished. . . . And would you know that

was shorn of many of its churches.⁵⁰ Perhaps the most dramatic loss was that incurred by the razing of the Cathedral of Christ the Redeemer, a monument of the last century commemorating the Russian victory over Napoleon and presently the site of a huge outdoor swimming pool.⁵¹ Among secular buildings the greatest losses were the Golitsyn Place, the Sukharev Tower, large portions of the remainder of the Kitai Gorod wall, Prince Ukhtomskii's Krasnye Gates, and Osip Bove's Triumfalnye Gates before Kazan Station. As it turned out Bove's monument of the last century was only dismantled and subsequently has been reassembled on the Kutuzovskii Prospekt.⁵²

Pushkin Square was adorned with the old Passion [*Strastnoi*] Monastery? They pulled it down and now a black-gray dismal courtyard is facing the street. Is this supposed to be the imposing appearance, the sights of Moscow we should be proud of? . . . Nobody would be admiring either the square or the cinema "Rossiia" that replaced the Passion Monastery.

It took forty years to build the Cathedral of the Redeemer. This immense architectural structure was financed entirely by a popular subscription in commemoration of the famous Moscow conflagration and the unconquerable Muscovites defeating Napoleon. . . . A famous Russian artist, Vasiliï Surikov, painted the walls and arches of the Cathedral, which was the tallest and most magnificent building in Moscow. One could see it from any side of the city. It was not an ancient building, but it constituted with the Kremlin ensemble the architectural center of our capital. They pulled it down. . . . A swimming pool was installed there instead. . . . They were blowing up Simonov Monastery. At the Monastery was the family burial place of Aksakovs. . . . The sacred memorial to the wonderful Russian people and especially to the writer Aksakov had not stopped the detonaters. . . . A sad fate overtook the magnificent Sadovyi [Garden] Ring. . . .

In place of a unique even a little bit archaic, typically Russian, unmatched city of Moscow, they have built an average European city not notable for anything special. It is just a city. One can even say it is a nice city but not more than that. *Pis'ma iz Russkogo Muzeia*, Moscow 1967, 14-19.

50. Academician Dmitrii Likhachev, present head of the Culture Fund, has related how as a young man he arrived in Moscow for the first time and came upon the Church of the Assumption (1696-1699) on the Pokrovka and was astounded by its beauty. "But", he notes, "the church was torn down. This was in the early 1930s". *Pravda* 10 Nov. 1979, 6; English transl. in 31 *CDSF* 1979 No.45, 9-10.
51. Palmer, *op.cit.* note 44, 162 lists among the most prominent losses Kazan Cathedral (1630s) opposite GUM on 25 October Street (Nikol'skaia), the Church of the Nativity in Stoleshnikakh behind the Bolshoi Theater, the Vozdvizhenka Church (1709-1728) on the Kalinin Prospekt, and one from the sixteenth century near the site of the Arbat Metro entrance. Berton, *op.cit.* note 44, 201-201 records the Church of Spas na Boru (Savior in the Wood), dating from 1330, the Chudov (Miracle) Monastery, and the Voznesensky Convent within the Kremlin and the Simonov Monastery (from the fifteenth century) and the Assumption Church on the Pokrovka (1690s), noted above.
52. Since 1980 or so there has been increased pressure to rebuild the Sukharev Tower. In 1983 the architects P.M. Ragulin and P.M. Miagkov suggested that it could be done opposite the Sklifosovskii Institute, the former Sheremetev Hospital and Poor House, in Kolkhoznaia

Apart from simply a piecemeal destruction of Moscow's architectural monuments, many were swept away during the reconstruction of the city. The prime movers behind replanning Moscow in the 1930s were Lazar Kaganovich and his aid Nikita Khrushchev. Their 1935 plan, intended to impose a socialist look on a city built by capitalism, altered the city's center by reverting to aspects of age-old models of Russian classicism. Even St. Basil's in Red Square was scheduled to be blown up in order to allow for bigger and better military parades in the tradition of the 1812 aftermath.⁵³ This meant accentuating Moscow's arterial highways, concentric boulevards, and squares, often by placing imposing public buildings upon them. It also necessitated the demolition of many old structures which obstructed this grand design. The Garden Ring, Moscow's ancient boundary enclosing the Zemlianoi Gorod, lost its lovely lime trees; the once magnificent Tverskaia, now translated Gorkii Street, lost many of its noble homes.⁵⁴ After the war reconstruction occurred where the Kalinin Prospekt cut through the ancient Arbat; naturally a large portion of this sector was razed.

This destruction of architectural monuments in Moscow during the late 1920s and 1930s has emerged as an issue with the present leadership.⁵⁵ At the XXVII Party Congress Ie. K. Ligachev praised preservation efforts and supported "those who are raising their voices in alarm over the architectural appearance of our glorious ancient cities". Boris El'tsin, the former Moscow Party boss and Politbureau candidate member, also raised the monuments issue when he noted that "the question of the loss of Moscow's architectural distinctiveness, especially in the central part of the city, has moved into the category of political questions".⁵⁶

Square, where it had formerly stood. Nothing has been done in the interim as Oleg Volkov has noted in "Eshche raz o sud'be Sukharevoi bashni", *Literaturnaia gazeta* 4 Feb. 1987. There is even some talk of rebuilding the Cathedral of Christ the Redeemer, fantastic as that seems (discussion with Professor Svetlana Polenina).

53. Only when the defiant protectionist Petr Baranovsky chained himself to the edifice did Stalin withdraw the order. See Ruth Daniloff, "Restoring a Russian heritage turns out to be a Byzantine task", *Smithsonian*, March 1983, 66.
54. "Reconstruction" in a destructive sense was limited almost wholly to Moscow in the 1930s. Leningrad kept its city-center intact. Work in Novgorod and Pskov at this time did not alter their historic look.
55. Yet only a few years ago the writers O. Volkov, S. Zalygin, V. Rasputin, Professor A. Losev, and Academician D. Likhachev voiced concern for the structure of Pashkov House because of construction in the nearby Borovitskaia Metro Station. 35 *CDSP* 1983 No.21, 23 from *Pravda* 22 May 1983, 3.
56. 39 *CDSP* 1987 No.13, 3-7 from *Moskva* Nov. 1986 No.11, 183-198. The same article retells A.E. Grabar's anecdote of Lenin's voicing anger upon seeing a broken window in the Church of Constantine and Helena (1470) on the Kremlin grounds. After Lenin's death it and others near it, some that had been restored between 1918-1920, were razed.

The wartime destruction in Soviet cities and in the countryside resulted in the loss, according to the Ministry of Culture, of some 3,000 architectural monuments, including the Cathedrals of Kiev, Chernigov, and Vitebsk.⁵⁷ The greatest destruction in and around Leningrad were the great suburban palaces — at Peterhof (Petrodvorets), Rastrelli's Great Palace at Tsarskoe Selo (Pushkin), Charles Cameron's Catherine Palace in Pavlovsk (1782-1786), and Rinaldi's Palace for the Emperor Paul in Gatchina. All of these were shattered and have required years of restoration: work on the Peterhof and Great Tsarskoe Selo Palace interiors (*i.e.*, the personal rooms of Catherine II by Charles Cameron) has been impressive and oft noted, but the fact is that many items of the Peterhof interior were irretrievably lost and the Tsarskoe Selo restoration has been largely that of facade restoration with much of the interior still untouched. In Moscow the lovely Empire-style Gagarin House (Architect O.I. Bove, 1817) on the Novinskii Boulevard was destroyed by bombing. Such cities as Novgorod and Pskov, heavily damaged during the War, have been rather successfully restored.⁵⁸ In all, the Soviet record of selective restoration of monuments damaged during the War has been impressive, despite the huge losses incurred.

A Western perception of the Khrushchev era as "liberal", particularly in terms of de-Stalinization and law reform, must be altered when one considers his religious policy. The closing and destruction of many churches were its notable features. The number of Orthodox Churches in Imperial Russia in 1914 (excluding chapels but including churches in Finland and Poland) numbered 54,147; the number reputedly was some 20,000 in 1961 when the Russian Church entered the World Council of Churches; Khrushchev's anti-religious campaign between 1959-1964 may have reduced that number to 10,000 or fewer. In the process many important monuments of church architecture were either destroyed or converted to non-religious use.⁵⁹

57. Daniloff, *op.cit.* note 53, 66. See also Boguslavskii, *op.cit.* note 3, 93-95 and R.M. Kopomtseva, "Pamiatniki otechestvennoi istorii", *Istoriia SSSR* 1978 No.3, 206-219.

58. The 12th century Church of the Savior on the Nereditsa River outside Novgorod was destroyed but has been restored.

59. Ellis, *op.cit.* note 22, 14. Cf. the discussion on church numbers on pp.14ff. Ellis notes that the restoration of the twelfth century Cathedral of the Dormition in Vladimir as recently in 1974 prompted speculation and fears on the part of the congregation that it would be converted into a museum, "an architectural monument belonging to the country as a whole, not just to the believers". (p.20) When the Cathedral did, indeed, revert to the Church, the Church paid the 500,000 ruble cost of restoration. (p.20)

On the matter of using church buildings for purposes other than worship in order to preserve the best architectural monuments, see Iu. Gerasimov, V. Rabinovich, "New Life for Ancient Churches", in *Nauka i religia* Nov. 1984 No.11; English transl. 37 *CDSP* 1985 No.6, 11-12.

The destructiveness of Khrushchev's policy no doubt contributed to the reaction evident after his ouster in 1964. The establishment of VOPIK and the all-union and union republic legislation of the 1970s and 1980s, already discussed, were the result. It remains to consider the state of architecture, particularly that in the RSFSR during these years and into the present time.

Church architecture continues in a precarious state despite occasional protectionist support from those in high places. A current worry has been care for the Kolomenskoe ensemble on the banks of the Moscow River beyond the Moscow center.⁶⁰ El'tsin recently (11 April 1986) joined the chorus of those lamenting the "sorry state" of Moscow's architectural monuments, criticizing in particular the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification's use of the Church of the Ascension, between Herzen and Aleksei Tolstoi Streets, as its Moscow office.⁶¹

The state's return of Moscow's Danilov Monastery, the Monastery of the Caves in Kiev, the Optina Pustyn' Monastery in the Kaluga area, and a smaller one in Yaroslavl' suggest a dramatic change in policy. The Danilov Monastery and its churches were recently restored in order to commemorate the 1000th anniversary (summer of 1988) of Russian Christianity; moreover, the monastery will henceforth serve as the administrative center of the Moscow Patriarchate.⁶² There has also been discussion of the need for new legislation to

On closing of churches and the destruction of church art and architecture or conversion of church buildings to other uses during the period 1959-1964 see Michael Bourdeaux, *Patriarch and Prophets: Persecution of the Russian Orthodox Church Today*, New York 1970, 124-140.

For graphic accounts on destruction of monuments of church architecture, as noted above, see V.Z. Sorokin, "Obezglavlennaiia Moskva", *Russkoe vrozozhdenie* 1981 (II) No.14, 155-176; and, as noted above, *Razrushennnye i oskvernennnye khramy; Architecture of Russia from Old to Modern*, vol.I: *Churches and Monasteries*; vol. II: *Palaces, Manors, and Churches*; and *Moskva Zlatoglavaia/Les eglises de Moscou*. See especially Marshall Winokur's judicious review of these last three in *26 St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 1982 No.1, 49-59.

60. See 30 *CDSP* 1978 No.33, 13 and 19 from *Literaturnaia Rossiia* 11 Aug. 1978 No.32, 14.

Similar concerns have been expressed for the neglect of Optina Pustyn' Monastery, which has had an important role in Russian literature. Neglect and World War II left the place in shambles. Despite much talk over the years and some small appropriations, the monastery is still largely unrestored. See 30 *CDSP* 1978 No.3, 14-15 from *Literaturnaia Rossiia* 20 Jan. 1978, 8-9 and note 62 below.

61. He noted the loss of more than 2,000 major monuments in Moscow since 1935. As cited from *Le Monde* 16 July 1986 by Andrew Pospelovsky, "The Destruction of Ancient Churches Continues", *Radio Liberty Research*, RL 308/86, 19 Aug. 1986.

62. Oxana Antic, "The Activities of the Russian Orthodox Church 1983-85", *Radio Liberty Research*, RL 71/86, 13 Feb. 1986, 3; Oxana Antic, "The Fate of Some Orthodox Monasteries after the Revolution", *Radio Liberty Research*, RL 481/84, 20 Dec. 1984; and *Izvestiia* 28 Dec. 1986, 6 with English transl. in 38 *CDSP* 1986 No.52, 18-19. Besides the restoration of the Monastery, a five-story hotel with a conference hall for 400 will be erected — all to be financed by the Moscow Patriarchate. *Ibid.*, 19.

protect church property. Blaming the clergy for necessitating such changes in the law is indicative of the dissatisfaction with the treatment of church property.⁶³ Years of neglect, abuse, misuse, and even "restoration" have taken a heavy toll.⁶⁴ The Ministry of Power's occupancy of a church has by no means been an aberration. Other churches and great houses have been left vacant or used as factories, warehouses, and housing – to the detriment of the building itself.⁶⁵

Wooden and masonry architecture in the Russian North have suffered greatly from all of these as well as natural disasters.⁶⁶ While the principal cities in Novgorod and Pskov provinces have fared well in restoration, less has been accomplished in, say, Karelia, Arkhangel'sk and Vologda provinces. Nearly a decade ago the Presidium of the Central Council of VOPIK conferred about these Northern monuments.⁶⁷ Although the specialists attending concurred on the need to protect the Solovetskii Monastery, Valaam, Kizhi, and the unique

Under Gorbachev state religious policy appears to have softened. In part this has been influenced by the celebration of the millenium of the Russian Orthodox Church in 1988. Besides restoring Danilov to the Patriarchate, the state has returned the Optina Pustyn' Monastery in Kaluga Oblast and the Tolgskoi Bozhiei Materi Monastery in Iaroslavl'. Now there is talk of establishing an open-air museum of Old Believer culture near Moscow (Oxana Antic, "Government Policy towards the Official Churches in the USSR in 1987", *Radio Liberty Research*, RL 54/88, 8 Feb. 1988). Elizabeth Fuller, "Ligachev Intervenes to Save Medieval Georgian Monastery", *Ibid.*, RL 285/87, 20 July 1987 provides additional evidence of a recent change in state policy. See also "The Architecture of our Forebears Calls for Joint Efforts", 40 *CDSF* 1988 No.1, 22.

63. See Vera Tolz, "New legislation on the Protection of Church Property in the Offing?" *Radio Liberty Research*, RL 62/86, 4 Feb. 1986.

64. See 30 *CDSF* 1978 No.30, 13, 19. See also "Kriticheskie zametki o faktakh bezotvestvennogo otosheniia k delu okhrany pamiatnikov", *Pamiatniki otechestva* 1980 No.1(1), 162-65.

Brumfield, *op.cit.* note 18, 44-46 discusses this "fundamental contradiction" of Soviet preservation policy, that of restoring "palaces and churches, the relics of two groups dispossessed by the Revolution". (p. 44)

65. In 1962 one of Matvei Kazakov's best churches, that of Philip the Metropolitan (1777-1778), was used as a carpentry shop; now it is simply locked. As recently as 1982 A.A. Menelas' (Menelaws') Razumovskii House (1801-1803), later the Institute of Physical Culture, lay in shambles. See 30 *CDSF* 1978 No.45, 15 and 20 from *Literaturnaia gazeta* 13 Sept. 1978, 12. There are times, no doubt, when churches used for storing grain are treated with more care than were they merely classified as a monument. See Brumfield, *op.cit.* note 18, 46.

66. As early as 1975 legislation designated monuments in Arkhangel'sk oblast for restoration. Cf. *SP RSFSR* 1975 No.1 item 1; see also legislation for Valaam *SP RSFSR* 1979 No.21 item 155.

For more on the architectural richness of the North see B. Fedorov, *Architecture of the Russian North 12th-19th Centuries*, Leningrad 1976 and Alexander Opolovnikov, *The Wooded Architecture of Russia*, New York 1989: Cracraft in *The Petrine Revolution in Russian Architecture*, 39-44 questions the aesthetic merit of Russian wooden architecture.

67. 30 *CDSF* 1978 No.39, 14 and 20 from *Sovetskaia Rossia* 15 Sept. 1978, 3; 33 *CDSF*, 1981 No.43, 15-16 from *Sovetskaia Rossia* 29 Aug. 1981, 3; 29 *CDSF* 1977 No.45, 18-19 from *Pravda* 11 Nov. 1977, 3; 38 *CDSF* 1986 No.24, 25-26 from *Pravda* 14 June 1986, 3.

edifices of Solvychevodsk, Velikii Iustiug, Kargopol, Ky Island in Lake Onega and Arkhangel'sk, and many lesser known — the accomplishments have been meager. The problems on the other hand are numerous. Many of the structures, especially churches, have deteriorated. The abandonment of villages (about 1,000 in Arkhangel'sk province alone) in order to consolidate the rural population has accelerated architectural ruin. Buildings — especially, the old wooden ones — often burn down as a result of carelessness or natural causes. Vandalism and severe climate also contribute to their decay. Recently, there has been a great debate because of the lack of lightning rods on old wooden churches in the North.⁶⁸

One way devised to protect wooden architecture is that of moving it to protected areas, for often the distances between monuments inhibits their care.⁶⁹ Many important works from Karelian villages have been collected at Kizhi and another museum of wooden architecture has been created in Arkhangel'sk.⁷⁰ Better known still are similar open-air museums of wooden architecture, the Vitoslavlitsy outside Novgorod and the Museum of Wooden Architecture in restored Suzdal.⁷¹ The creation of open-air museums has made a virtue of necessity in that such museums are perceived for their tourist potential no less than for conservation. Certainly this is true of Suzdal and Novgorod. Similarly, there is a well-planned ethnographical museum outside Riga. Heavy investment, however, will have to occur before Kargopol, Mezen, or the Solovki Islands become havens of tourism.⁷²

68. See 29 CDSP 1977 No.7, 17 from *Literaturnaia gazeta* 2 Feb. 1977, 12; 29 CDSP 1977 No.17, 19 from *Literaturnaia gazeta* 30 March 1977, 13; and 29 CDSP 1977 No.30, 14 from *Literaturnaia gazeta* 29 June 1977, 13.

69. These open-air museums also protect isolated structures against vandalism. On the other hand, major works like those on the Valaam Archipelago in northern Lake Ladoga have suffered such abuse and neglect. See 24 CDSP 1972 No.13, 14-15 from *Ogonek* No.8, Feb. 1972, 23-24. For a criticism of these outdoor museums see 32 CDSP 1980 No.11, 19 from *Pravda* 15 March 1980, 3 and Opolovnikov, *op.cit.* note 66, 10.

70. See 29 CDSP 1977 No.1, 19 from *Pravda* 6 Jan. 1977, 6 notes the establishment of an architectural and ethnographic museum of wooden architecture near the Novoierusalimskii Monastery; however, this author has heard nothing more of it. *Pravda* reported in 1977 that Solovetskii Monastery had been formally established as a historical, architectural and nature museum-preserve in 1974. [cf. 29 CDSP 1977 No.45, 18-19].

Professor Svetlana Polenina has reported that restoration of the magnificent Church of the Transfiguration in Kizhi has resulted in serious damage to the building's interior.

71. For more on the Vitoslavlitsy Museum see Liudmila Filipova, *Vitoslavlitsy: Muzey derevianogo zodchestva*, Leningrad 1979.

See also William Brumfield, *Gold in Azure: One Thousand Years of Russian Architecture*, Boston 1983 for excellent photographs of wooden architecture from the Vitoslavlitsy Museum and the Museum of Wooden Architecture, Suzdal.

72. Presently, it is possible to arrange a trip to Kizhi, some 250 miles from Leningrad. The nearest Intourist hotel is in Petrozavodsk. As recently as August 1987 this author was informed that

Soviet authorities have learned that tastefully restored ancient cities can attract both foreign and domestic visitors. *Intourist* exploits to the fullest the architecture of Novgorod and Pskov and the cities of the Golden Ring – Zargorsk, Rostov, Iaroslavl', Vladimir, and Suzdal.⁷³ Similar considerations have gone into the restoration of war-ravaged palaces in the Leningrad suburbs.

Despite the riches in art and the currency of historic preservation in the USSR, the Soviets have failed to tap the fullness of their potential. In the Russian North, which holds much for tourism, doubtless there is some correlation between tourist facilities' lag and the deterioration of the monuments. The question of will was especially evident in the recent scheme to divert Russian and Siberian Rivers.⁷⁴ This enterprise, which if realized would have been disastrous to many architectural monuments, marked the persistence of that nagging dichotomy, development or preservation, for that region. Thus, even at a time when monuments protection has become vogueish, there undoubtedly persists in the USSR as in non-Socialist countries a broad base of "development" sentiment, which on a daily basis erodes protectionist efforts.⁷⁵

Although urban planning and reconstruction have had disastrous conse-

no provisions exist for Intourist tours from Petrozavodsk to the Solovetskii Monastery Preserve. There may be good reason for this: *Pravda* (11 Nov. 1977) quotes one V. Rastopchin from Moscow who wrote that "I recently visited the Solovetskii Islands. I was delighted with the remarkable architectural ensemble and the monuments built several centuries ago. But not everything delighted me. Both the territory and the structures are totally uncared for, as though the place has no proprietor". As reprinted in 29 *CDSP* 1977 No.45, 18-19.

While tourism offers some prospect for rehabilitating this impoverished and remote region, the costs for facilities would be high. See 34 *CDSP* 1982 No.52, 13 from *Trud* 7 Dec. 1982, 3; 30 *CDSP* 1978 No.36, 6 from *Pravda* 10 Sept. 1978, 3; and 34 *CDSP* 1982 No.52, 13 from *Ogonek* No.46, 13 Nov. 1982, 25. Cf. also *Ogonek* No.8 1982 with English transl. in 34 *CDSP* 1982 No.13, 14-15.

73. Tourism, of course, is written into the Monuments legislation and has from the very beginning been a factor in funding preservation work. See 18 *CDSP* 1966 No.29, 10 from *Literaturnaia gazeta* 9 July 1966, 2; 30 *CDSP* 1978 No.36, 6-7 from *Pravda* 10 Sept. 1978, 3; 21 *CDSP* 1969 No.24, 29 from *Izvestiia* 12 June 1969; 21 *CDSP* 1969 No.26, 14-15 from *Pravda* 26 June 1969, 1; 27 *CDSP* 1975 No.47, 4 & 14 from *Literaturnaia gazeta* 10 Sept. 1975. Tourism has had its negative aspects as well. See 33 *CDSP* 1981 No.45, 13 from *Literaturnaia gazeta* 23 Sept. 1981, 13.
74. The scheme of diverting the flow of northern rivers prompted concern for the Kirillov-Belozersk Monastery, which is already in great disrepair. 34 *CDSP* 1982 No.36, 14 from *Ogonek* (July 1982), 26-27. For more on river diversion see *CDSP* 34 (1982) No.10; 35 *CDSP* 1983 No.18; and Sergei Voronitsyn, "Renewed Debate over Cancelled River Diversion Project", *Radio Liberty Research*, RL 205/87, 27 May 1987.
75. A recurring opposition to monuments preservation has come principally from those who resent the costs and its perceived detraction from development – a view well expressed by a writer who nearly two decades ago sought to promote tourism by "showing what our Russia has achieved in 50 years of Soviet power" rather than display "excessive enthusiasm for gold cupolas". 21 *CDSP* 1969 No.19, 12-13 from *Sovetskaia Rossiia* 6 May 1969, 2.

quences for historic monuments in the USSR, they are not perceived as inevitable. Indeed, Soviet planners recently have gone to unusual lengths to preserve the appearance of old cities, utilizing monuments for aesthetic, recreational, and even tourist purposes.⁷⁶ Parks of Culture and Rest and parks generally have utilized not only natural settings but monuments as well.⁷⁷ The great palace of Ostankino with its lovely gardens has served such a purpose. The repaired palaces and gardens outside Leningrad and Kuskovo and Arkhangel'skoe outside Moscow are favorites for holiday outings. Beautifully restored buildings such as the Il'ia Propok Church in Iaroslavl' or ancient kremlins and monasteries have remained focal points in Soviet as they had been in Imperial town planning. Now even a pedestrian mall in the Moscow's Arbat has repaired some of the damage done to the area two decades ago.⁷⁸

Certain aspects of protection and preservation of monuments in the USSR should be noted although time does not permit their discussion in this paper. These are 1) the popular aspects of the issue as evidenced to a degree by VOOPIK, various club, and some *subbotnik* and other volunteer endeavors; the enthusiasm with which certain exhibitions have been received; and the intensity of recent demonstrations protesting monuments abuse. All of these suggest a consciousness-raising about historic preservation, its intellectual and even political implications no less than aesthetic;⁷⁹ 2) the linking of monuments preservation to protection of nature, which has received much more attention

76. Meshing the old and new is the theme in 32 *CDSP* 1980 No.11, 19 from *Pravda* 15 Mar. 1980, 3.

See Jack A. Underhill, "Reflections of the Planning of Old and New Cities in the USSR", Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies, Occasional paper No.80, 19 Dec. 1979 and *idem*, *Soviet New Towns*, Washington, D.C. 1976, 63-64.

Preserving the appearance of old or parts of old cities is a recurring theme in preservation articles, *i.e.*, 29 *CDSP* 1977 No.14, 23 from *Izvestiia* 8 Apr. 1977, 2; 31 *CDSP* 1979 No.13, 15-16; 28 *CDSP* 1976 No.42, 26; 34 *CDSP* 1982 No.12, 21-22; 19 *CDSP* 1967 No.33, 21-22; 31 *CDSP* 1979 No.27, 22-23; 32 *CDSP* 1980 No.32, 17-18; 32 *CDSP* 1981 No.49, 22-23.

77. See Denis J.B. Shaw, "Recreation and the Soviet City", in *The Socialist City*, (R.A. French, F.E. Ian Hamilton, eds.), New York 1979, 119-143.

78. What remains of the old Arbat has become a protected zone and pedestrian mall. See 31 *CDSP* 1979 No.24, 22 from *Pravda* 15 June 1979, 6.

That city planning and monuments' preservation are not necessarily incompatible is evidenced in several recent works on Soviet cities. See *The Socialist City*, *op.cit.* note 77, and James H. Bater, *The Soviet City: Ideal and Reality*, London 1980. See also Underhill, "Reflections of the Planning of Old and New Cities in the USSR", *op.cit.* note 76.

79. Kathleen Berton-Murrell discusses in "The Fight to Save Old Moscow", *Washington Post* 29 March 1987, C5, the large numbers of *subbotniki*, volunteers from ages seven to seventy, who turn out each weekend to haul rubble and engage in other kinds of non-technical restoration work and over tea and biscuits after a hard day's work often listen to lectures and debate the fate which has befallen old Moscow.

than the former, and beyond that to recreation (*i.e.*, national parks) and even tourism;⁸⁰ 3) the appearance of numerous publications on monuments protection;⁸¹ 4) the galvanizing of an able, well-organized and diversely-placed leadership;⁸² and, finally, 5) the numerous restoration projects that have been suc-

She noted that other instances of popular reaction to the issue were revealed in a recent television documentary which showed a wrecking ball devastating an old building while weeping by-standers watched. Then, too, last summer an architecture student collected signatures on a petition in the busy Kuznetskii Most to save the arches of a recently excavated eighteenth century bridge. As it turned out the Moscow City Council relented.

The activities by the group called "Pamiat'" are discussed elsewhere.

80. The All-Russian Nature Conservation Society, described as a "voluntary mass social organization" is analogous to VOPIK. See "Statute on the All-Russian Nature Conservation Society", *SSD*, Fall 1972, 33.

See L.P. Astanin, K.N. Blagosklonov, *Conservation of Nature*, English transl., Moscow 1983, 131-138 on the tension between environmental protection and tourism, a recurring theme applicable to monuments as well.

Great Russian Nationalist predilection for both the architectural heritage and the village represents another linkage between monuments and nature. See Dunlop, *op.cit.* note 17, 87-92 and 110-113 and *passim*, 30 *CDSF* 1978 No.42, and Alexander Opolovnikov, *Restravratsiia pamiatnikov narodnogo zodchestva*, Moscow 1974.

81. The monuments issue is often found in articles in *Pravda*, *Izvestiia*, *Sovetskaia kul'tura*, and *Liternaturnaia gazeta*. *Letopis' gazetnykh statei*, especially from 1975-1985, contains many references.

Occasionally, larger works list projects and contain up-dated bibliographies on the subject. Such is E.V. Mikhailovskii *et al.*, *Metodika restavratsii pamiatnikov arkhitektury*, Moscow 1977.

Periodical literature specifically devoted to restoration and protection of monuments has grown impressively over the past several decades. *Arkhitektura SSSR* and *Stroitel'naia gazeta* occasionally have relevant articles. Building and city planning undertakings in the 1950s and 1960s probably spurred the excellent journal *Arkhitekturnoe nasledstvo* (1951-). As the protectionist movement accelerated VOPIK sponsored a number of hardcover anthologies, published irregularly during the 1970s and entitled *Pamiatniki otechestva*. Beginning in 1980 a new *Pamiatniki otechestva* made its appearance. Attractively designed, it appeals to a well-informed readership and contains features and news on restoration and protectionist activities. "Soiuzrestavratsiia" in the Novospasskii Monastery publishes a newsletter, *Kul'tura i iskusstvo v SSSR* to inform about that agency's activities. As noted elsewhere, the Culture Fund has now (1988) begun publishing its journal, *Nashe nasledie*. As independent journals proliferate, one devoted to monuments has appeared: *Vesnik soveta ekologi i kul'tury*, edited by Mikhail Talalai. Talalai first called preservationists' attention to cemeteries, which the official press has since begun to discuss. See Vera Tolz, "Independent Journals Proliferate in the USSR", *Radio Liberty Research*, RL 35/88, 27 Jan. 1988.

82. Mention has been made of Igor Grabar and Victor Baldin. Among others are the painter Ilya Glazunov, the architectural restorer Petr Barannovskii, the writer Iurii Bondarev, the Culture Fund's new chairman and scholar in old Russian literature, Dmitrii Likhachev, Dmitrii N. Kul'chinskii of "Soiuzrestavratsii", Vladimir V. Kostochkin, head of the Department of Architectural Restoration of the Moscow Architectural Institute, the late Vladimir I. Piliavskii of the Leningrad Engineering and Building Institute, and the many who author articles in *Pamiatniki otechestva*.

cessfully undertaken, completed, and new restoration methodologies employed.⁸³ That monuments protection has acquired a broad base of support as well as legal and official recognition invites a comparison of Soviet with Imperial Russian policies and accomplishments.

Imperial Russia's Record

In this comparison we are confronted with the charge that the old Russian architectural heritage, preserved by the Tsarist regime, has been savaged by its successor. Several points need be considered. Because Russian cities burned with frightful regularity in old Russia, architectural losses through the centuries have been considerable. Because Imperial Russian cities, like Soviet ones, were frequently the object of planning and rebuilding, many ancient monuments were razed in the process. Industrialization in late Imperial Russia frequently encroached on historic zones, nearly destroying them. Preservationist groups in late Imperial Russia were markedly similar to Soviet ones and even had continuity through activists like Igor Grabar'.⁸⁴

Old Russia suffered substantial losses of her historical monuments through fire: Moscow's conflagration in 1812 was but the last and certainly the worst of many which cost the city dearly.⁸⁵ The destruction of Tver (Kalinin) by fire in 1763 may be said to have launched an extensive replanning of Russian cities in the classical motif.

The massive rebuilding of Russian cities in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries was hardly less destructive to ancient monuments than Soviet reconstruction in the 1930s and 1960s in Moscow. This extensive rebuilding of Russian cities during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was really a

Writers, of course, have long been in the vanguard of monuments preservation. This is especially true of Valentin Rasputin (see his "Irkutsk s nami" in *Pamiatniki otechestva* 1980 No.1(1), 65-73; Iurii Nagibin; and Vladimir Soloukhin, a founder of both VOPIK and the Culture Fund whose *Pis'ma iz russkogo muzeia* was one of the earliest critiques of the destruction of old Moscow. His *Vremia sobirat' kamni*, Moscow 1980 touches on efforts to save the Sergei Aksakov estate and the Optina Pustyn' Monastery.

For more on Soloukhin see Sergei Yurenen, "Vladimir Soloukhin: Rehabilitation with an Award for Literary Achievement", *Radio Liberty Research*, RL 478/84, 20 Dec. 1984, 1-8; and 33 *CDSP* 1981 No.34, 4-6.

83. See Mikhailovskii *et al.*, *op. cit.* note 81.

84. For more on architectural continuity that impinges on protection of monuments see S. Frederick Starr, "Writings from the 1960s on the Modern Movement in Russia", 30 *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 1971 No.2, 170-178.

85. See Albert J. Schmidt, "The Restoration of Moscow after 1812", 40 *Slavic Review* 1981, 38-48. This theme is further discussed in Albert J. Schmidt, *The Architecture and Planning of Classical Moscow*, Philadelphia, Pa. 1989.

testimony of the low regard for old Russian architecture held by Enlightened monarchs and classical architects.⁸⁶ When the architect Vasiliĭ Bazhenov designed a classical Kremlin for Catherine II, it required razing the entire complex and beginning anew; demolition had actually begun but stopped when the Empress lost interest. Bazhenov's successor in Kremlin matters, Matvei Kazakov, gave his name to an epoch of classical building in Moscow, but as one charged with revamping the Kremlin he destroyed many old structures there. The Scottish architect William Hastie's plan for rebuilding Moscow after 1812 included a plan for the Tverskaia (Gorkii Street) which was quite as destructive as Stalin's nearly a century and a quarter later. In the decades after this restoration and into the twentieth century Moscow's appearance was governed more by economic and population growth than aesthetic considerations.⁸⁷

Although classical planning and masonry construction spared St. Petersburg much of the agony of Old Moscow, the city center was confronted with extinction by a new threat early in this century. As one author has noted "Conditions in the capital were typical of cities throughout the Empire as long-standing zoning and architectural restrictions collapsed in the face of unprecedented in-

86. See James Cracraft, *The Petrine Revolution in Russian Architecture*: "It appears that any serious interest in the architectural heritage especially of pre-Petrine Russia, and consequently any serious effort to promote its values or to preserve its monuments, are scarcely a century old; and thus postdate by as much as a hundred years the beginnings of the related movement in Europe" (p.10). Old Russian art as a field of study is discussed by R. Milner-Gulland in "Art and Architecture of Old Russia", in *An Introduction to Russian Art and Architects*, (R. Auty, D. Obolensky, eds.), Cambridge 1980. For more on Russian city-building see Albert J. Schmidt, *The Architecture and Planning of Classical Moscow*, Philadelphia 1989; *idem*, "Architecture in Nineteenth-Century Russia: The Enduring Classic", *Art and Culture in Nineteenth-Century Russia*, (Theofanis George Stavrou, ed.), Bloomington, Ind. 1983, 172-193 and "William Hastie: Scottish Planner of Russian Cities", 114 *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 1970 No.3, 226-243. See also Hans Blumenfeld, "Russian City Planning of the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries", 4 *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 1944, 22-33.

V. Shkvarikov, *Ocherk istorii planirovki i zastroiki russkikh gorodov*, Moscow 1954; P.V. Sytin, *Istoriia planirovki i zastroiki Moskvy*, 2 vols., Moscow 1950 and 1954; A.M. Tverskoi, *Russkoe gradostroitel'stvo do kontsa XVII veka*, Moscow 1953; E. Beletskaiia, N. Krashenini-kova, L. Chernozubova, I. Ern, "Obraztsovye" proekty v zhiloi zastroike russkikh gorodov XVIII-XIX vv., Moscow 1961; A.V. Bunin, *Istoriia gradostroitel'nogo iskusstva*, Moscow 1953. Especially valuable for planning at the beginning of the last century is V.I. Piliavskii, "Gradostroitel'nye meropriiatiia i obraztsovye proekty v Rossii v nachale XIX veka", *Arkhitekturnaia praktika i istoriia arkhitektury* 1958 No.21, 75-112.

87. Nineteenth century building in Moscow is summarized in E. Kirichenko, "Gradostroitel'stvo Moskvy v kontekste razvitiia russkoi arkhitektury XIX - nachala XX vv", *Arkhitektura SSSR* 1982 No.5, 42-46. See also Joseph Bradley, *Muzhik and Muscovite: Urbanization in Late Imperial Russia*, Berkeley, Calif. 1985, 41-69 and *passim* and *The City in Late Imperial Russia*, (Michael F. Hamm, ed.), Bloomington, Ind. 1986.

dustrialization".⁸⁸ In 1916 Alexander Benois took before the Duma a proposal "On the Question of Planned Development of the Construction of Petrograd and Its Surroundings".⁸⁹ Intended to save the city's center, it eventually embodied the entire metropolitan area. Although approved, little came of it because of the War. This plan did represent, nonetheless, a return to classical planning, this time for preservation, of a city and its architectural monuments.

Late Imperial Russian culture was as vibrant any in Europe. Then as presently in the USSR, artists and intellectuals voiced concern for artifacts of the Russian past. The founding of the Society for the Defence and Preservation in Russia of Monuments of Art and Ancient Times, the publication of *Starye Gody*, a journal on the Russian architectural heritage, and the appearance of Grabar's multi-volume *Istoriia russkogo iskusstva* — all before Russia's entry into the War — exemplified this concern.⁹⁰

Finally, Soviet nihilism as a factor in the destruction of monuments of Russian architecture finds no parallel in Imperial Russia. The wanton destruction of both secular and religious buildings at various times in the Soviet past remains the most serious charge with which the Soviets have to contend, not only from Great Russian nationalists but from patriotic citizens as well.⁹¹

Conclusion

Soviet legislation on monuments, the publicizing of the issue, the extensive restoration enterprises, the encouragement given to organizations and clubs to engage in restoration endeavors, and the funding of such efforts — all these reflect official support for monuments protection and restoration. Still the

88. James H. Bater, *The Soviet City*, London 1980, 89-91. Bater observes that "The task facing the Soviet town planner was much complicated by the fact that few cities had a rational distribution of industry at the time of the revolution" (p. 91). Also see *idem*, *St. Petersburg: Industrialization and Change*, Montreal 1976, 308-411, *passim*.

89. See S. Frederick Starr, "The Revival of Urban Planning in Twentieth-Century Russia", in *The City in Russian History*, (Michael F. Hamm, ed.), Lexington, Ky. 1976, 225-230. Also see Boguslavskii, *op.cit.* note 3, 124.

90. See A.P. Bannikov, "Problema okhrany pamiatnikov kul'tury no stranitsakh zhurnala 'Starye gody'", *Pamiatniki otechestva* 1983 No.2(8), 148-153 and V.I. Sakharov, "Zhurnal sobiratei'stva i okhrany pamiatnikov 'Sofia'", *Pamiatniki otechestva* 1983 No.1(7), 152-155.

91. This patriotic sentiment was evidenced recently at the site of an incomparable archaeological discovery in Red Square: "As he [Sergei Z. Chernov, chief of the Moscow archaeological expedition working at the site] stood, on the site one recent afternoon, Mr. Chernov was congratulated by people who had come to see the excavation and to thank him. 'It is our sacred duty to touch our ancestors' soil', said Vladimir Kuznetsov, a retired engineer, who asked Mr. Chernov for his autograph. 'All of Moscow thanks you'." See Esther B. Fein, "Moscow Digs Up Its Past and Then Covers It Over", *New York Times* 11 Sept. 1988.

nagging question persists whether the issue is really taken all that seriously, especially when one continues to hear reports of callous disregard for and even destruction of notable buildings. Surely, the issue can be perceived as one of justice delayed: the destruction of old Russia and her monuments must be righted, especially in this period of *glasnost*' when criminal acts of the past are frequently admitted.

However much the monuments theme feeds the purely cultural side of *perestroika*,⁹² recent events have shown that it is not innocuous and does precipitate problems. That hundreds of young people recently gathered to protest the demolition of the Leningrad hotel where the poet Esenin committed suicide is a case in point. This demonstration – demonstrations are always disconcerting to Soviet authorities – met with a mixed reaction: censure of the uncaring bureaucrats who failed to listen to the demonstrators and criticism of “trouble-makers” who exploited the situation.⁹³

The worry over monuments has also been perceived as a spiritual crisis – a reaction to sterile and soulless socialism in one instance and a youthful fascination with materialistic Western culture on the other. Conservative writers like Iurii Bondarev, Vladimir Soloukhin, and Valentin Rasputin have led this protest.⁹⁴ Bondarev warned at the Writers' Congress of a cultural crisis caused by a mindless bureaucracy's destruction of a nation's environment and historical and artistic heritage, really, of its spirit.⁹⁵ Vladimir Soloukhin had

92. Cf. 38 CDSP 1986 No.37, 1-5 from *Pravda* and *Izvestiia* 11 Sept. 1986, 1-2. The CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers adopted a resolution “On Measures for the Further Development of the Fine Arts and Increase in their Role in the Communist Upbringing of the Working People”. The resolution stated the need for restoring those “architectural monuments of great importance for the patriotic upbringing of Soviet people, especially the younger generation” (p.3). See also Nancy Condee, Vladimir Padunov, “The Frontiers of Soviet Culture: Reaching the Limits?”, *The Harriman Institute Forum*, Vol. 1, 1988 No. 5, and Ben Eklov, *Soviet Briefing: Gorbachev and the Reform Period*, Boulder, Col. 1988, 42-65.

93. 39 CDSP 1987 No.14, 7-9 from *Literaturnaia gazeta* 25 March 1987, 10; *Izvestiia* 27 March 1987, 6. This latter article generated many readers' responses and still other articles in *Izvestiia* Nos.86 & 99. A follow-up has appeared in the 39 CDSP 1987 No.17, 18-19 from *Izvestiia* 25 April 1987, 3. *Lit.gaz.* has been an excellent source for monuments.

A current campaign by a group to scholars to preserve historic street names may be perceived as still another dimension of the preservationist mood. See *Radio Liberty Research*, RL 63/88, 12 Feb. 1988. Related to this is a recent resolution adopted by the Vilnius City Soviet Executive Committee to restore historic names to the streets in the city center (*The Soviet Observer*, 1-15 Feb. 1988, 3). See also “Historical Names are Also Cultural Monuments”, 40 CDSP 1988 No.32, 21.

94. As part of the Village Prose School, they lament decline of the village no less than architectural monuments. See Kathleen Parthé, “Time, Backward! Memory and the Past in Soviet Russian Village Prose”, Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies Occasional Paper No.224 (Washington, D.C. 1987). Cf. Opolovnikov, *op.cit.* note 66, *passim*.

95. 38 CDSP 1986 No.32, 8-10 from *Literaturnaia gazeta* 2 July 1986, 4. See above, note 31.

Martin Walker, “The Old Storey”, *Manchester Guardian Weekly* (24. Jan. 1988) muses on

said much of the same two decades ago when he criticized the destruction of Moscow's monuments.⁹⁶ Rasputin at the Fifth Congress of VOPIK in Gorkii in July 1987 lamented the loss of historical memory in Russia and condemned "mass culture" and such Western "diseases" as heavy rock, break dancing, and hippies.⁹⁷ "Unlucky" *Pamiat'*, on the other hand, won his pity.

Although the legislation protecting monuments was in place before Mr. Gorbachev became General Secretary, it has frequently not been effectively enforced. That it has not has provided nationalist groups with a convenient pretext to use the issue, as they have the environment, for political purposes. It remains to be seen whether *perestroika* with its emphasis on reform through law will allow such lackadaisical enforcement of a toothless law to continue.⁹⁸

history and houses: "This kind of history through architecture is one of the great pursuits of the modern Russian intelligentsia as they try to rediscover their national history and culture after so much of it was dragooned into Soviet shape. As a city of palaces, Moscow is also a city of memories". (p. 24.) Katerina Clark, "New Trends in Literature", *The Soviet Union Today*, (Jas. Cracraft, ed.), Chicago 1983, 264.

For more on collective memory see Albert J. Schmidt, "Collective Memory, Architectural Monuments, and the Crisis of Soviet Culture", read at the American Sociological Association meeting in Atlanta, Ga., 28 August 1988. See also David Lowenthal, *The Past is a Foreign Country*, Cambridge 1985, 185-362, *passim*; Edward Shils, *Tradition*, Chicago 1981, 63-161, *passim*; Barry Schwartz, "The Social Context of Commemoration: A Study of Collective Memory", 62 *Social Forces* 1982 No.2, 374-402 and *Material Culture Studies in America*, (Thomas J. Schlereth, ed.), Nashville, Tenn. 1982.

96. He observed

that by destroying antiquity one always tears the roots. A tree is provided with roots and every little piece of root counts, but especially important are those rhizomes that penetrate deep water-bearing layers. Who knows, perhaps at the time of some great drought those seemingly moribund rhizomes would supply the leaves on top with the life-giving moisture. (*Pis'ma iz russkogo museia*, *op.cit.* note 49, 17)

97. "Pamyat Draws Defense, New Attacks", 40 *CDSP* 1988 No.12, 12-15, 31.

98. See Esther B. Fein, "Moscow Digs Up Its Past and then Covers it Over", *New York Times*, September 11 1988. The author notes that

archeologists and historians were stunned late in July, when workers repairing the [Red] square's main entry passage unearthered the remains of several wooden houses that had been standing a hundred years before Danil became the first prince of Moscow in the 13th century. They were also surprised, and hardly pleasantly, when the Soviet Council of Ministers decided that the passageway between the History Museum and the Central Lenin Museum was too essential to Red Square's traffic. . . and that the site would have to be closed after only five weeks of excavation and examination.

See also "In Safekeeping but Unprotected", 40 *CDSP* 1988 No.8, 27-28.

Postscript

Since the above article was written, preservation-minded Soviets have achieved some success in strengthening existing monuments legislation. The efforts of the jurists S. Yani and V. Syrykh to increase penalties for vandalism and destruction of monuments and to formulate effective procedures for appealing and staying harmful administrative decisions regarding monuments may have led to action by the Party's Central Committee. In May 1988 it approved "On Measures to Improve Further the Activity of the All-Russian Society for the Protection of Historical and Cultural Monuments". By this resolution the Ministry of Justice, USSR Ministry of Culture, and republican societies of VOPIK were directed to study the current law and propose changes in it.⁹⁹

99. "V Tsentralnom Komitete KPSS", *Pravda* 14 May 1988; see TASS, "Izuchat i khranit: vse-soiuznoe soveshchanie po problemam sokhraneniya, restavratsii i ispolzovaniya pamiatnikov istorii i kul'tury", *Pravda* 17 May 1988.

For a recent summary of legislation on monuments see M.M. Boguslavskii, "Iz istorii sovetskogo zakonodatel'stva ob okhrane pamiatnikov", *Pravovedenie* Sept.-Oct. 1987. I am indebted to Frances Foster-Simons, "Towards a More Perfect Union? The 'Restructuring' of Soviet Legislation", 25 *Stanford Journal of International Law* (1989), 338-339 for the above citations.



Manchester Guardian 3 April 1988; first published in *Le Monde* 26 March 1988.

Permission to reprint granted by PLANTU.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The Impact of perestroika on Soviet law / edited by Albert J. Schmidt.
p. cm. -- (Law in Eastern Europe ; no. 41)

ISBN 0-7923-0621-X

1. Law--Soviet Union--Congresses. 2. Law reform--Soviet Union--
Congresses. 3. Perestroika--Congresses. I. Schmidt, Albert J.
II. Series.

KJC510.A15L39 no. 41

349.47 s--dc20

[349.47]

[344.7 s]

[344.7]

89-70938

ISBN 0-7923-0621-X

Published by Martinus Nijhoff Publishers,
P.O. Box 163, 3300 AD Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

Sold and distributed in the U.S.A. and Canada
by Kluwer Academic Publishers,
101 Philip Drive, Norwell, MA 02061, U.S.A.

In all other countries, sold and distributed
by Kluwer Academic Publishers Group,
P.O. Box 322, 3300 AH Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

Printed on acid-free paper

All Rights Reserved
© 1990 by Kluwer Academic Publishers
Kluwer Academic Publishers incorporates the publishing programmes of
Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

No part of the material protected by this copyright notice may be reproduced or
utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical,
including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and
retrieval system, without written permission from the copyright owner.

Printed in the Netherlands