

Nadiia Antonenko*

orcid.org/0000-0001-9047-3669

Olga Deriabina**

orcid.org/0000-0002-3478-2544

Preservation of Monuments of Modern Architecture in Ukraine (1990–2010)

Ochrona zabytków architektury nowoczesnej na Ukrainie (1990–2010)

Keywords: monument protection activity, Ukrainian Modernism, the monument of modern architecture, Derzhprom, DOCOMOMO

Słowa kluczowe: działania konserwatorskie, modernizm ukraiński, zabytek architektury nowoczesnej, Derzhprom, DOCOMOMO

Introduction

The global experience of preserving the heritage of modern architecture dates back to the period between the 1940s and the 1970s, of the postwar rethinking of the value of cultural heritage, when systematic work for identification and documentation of monuments of modern architecture began in Western Europe and the United States against the background of the triumphant progress of the international style.¹ In Ukraine, the issue of the need to preserve modern architectural heritage was brought up much later. The first modern monuments began to be included in the State Register of Immovable Landmarks of Ukraine only in the 2000s. The process unfolded so slowly that the pieces of modern architecture still make up a small share of the register among other landmarks. The Ukrainian Branch of DOCOMOMO (International Committee for Documentation and Conservation of Buildings, Sites, and Neighborhoods of the Modern Movement) was established only in 2012, although the global organization was founded and has been operating effectively since 1988 in over 80 countries of the world.

Due to the significant stagnation of preservation processes, most of the pieces of Ukrainian modern architecture are in critical condition—thousands of unique modern buildings and structures are destroyed and disappear every year. In addition, the regional non-recognition of the value of the twentieth-century architecture significantly affected the status of the Ukrainian avant-garde and Modernism of the Soviet era in world rankings.

Meanwhile, it should be noted that during the years of independence, the growth of general interest in the future of Ukrainian modern architecture was still observed—both among scholars and ordinary citizens. From time to time, thematic conferences and workshops were held in the cities, interdisciplinary research was conducted, books were published, public organizations were established to take care of the preservation of individual landmarks, excursions, exhibitions, and non-academic educational events were organized. Up to this day, this kaleidoscope of events has not been studied, but it is important to identify a real social interest in the preservation of the architecture and the capability of the cultural field to provide it.

* Ph.D., Kyiv National University of Construction and Architecture

** Ph.D., Kharkiv National University of Civil Engineering and Architecture

* dr, Kijowski Narodowy Uniwersytet Budownictwa i Architektury

** dr, Charkowski Narodowy Uniwersytet Budownictwa i Architektury

This study aims to analyze the achievements of monument protection activities concerning the architectural heritage of the twentieth century in Ukraine during 1990–2010, the results of which may become the basis for further development of programs of measures to protect the heritage of modern architecture.

The study is based on the methods of historical and genetic research, which allows us to identify the historical sequence of events in the field of protection of the heritage of modern architecture and urban planning and to establish its periodization. The actual basis of the study is the chronicle of the organizational efforts of the professional community and the public, which were aimed at uniting advocates of the new architecture and the preservation of key architectural monuments of the twentieth century in Ukraine. The greatest cultural value is the architecture of the so-called Ukrainian avant-garde Modernism, the birthplace of which was Kharkiv.²

State of knowledge

In the modern research field, there are practically no works devoted to understanding the formation of the practice of preservation of Modernist architecture in Ukraine. Thus, one of the leading promoters of the Ukrainian avant-garde, Professor O. Bouryak³ analyses the current state and prospects of Ukrainian Constructivism. He believes that the preservation of the Ukrainian avant-garde is possible only within the framework of a large and long-term (and quite costly) cultural and information project, as the problem lies not so much in the field of monument protection, but in knowledge and theoretical field—there are issues of style attribution, confusion within the conceptual framework. S. Smolenska in her study⁴ highlighted the key issues of development of preservation efforts and analyzed the Register of Immovable Landmarks of Ukraine for monuments of Modern architecture; and also briefly described the period between 1990s and the 2010s as the final stage in the loss of authenticity of Ukrainian Modernism. P. Rychkov considers the outstanding objects of Kharkiv constructivism and emphasizes the need to preserve not individual monuments, but Kharkiv as the „capital of constructivism” as a whole.⁵ P. Vesel⁶ attempted to compare the processes of Ukrainian monument protection in the preservation of modern architecture with the European ones. In the context of the topic studied, the work of I. Kreiser⁷ is also relevant, who, unlike others, describes the development of interest in Ukrainian modern architecture, highlighting the most important turning points in Kharkiv in the 1990s–early 2000s. Important research works that allow the study of Ukrainian Modern architecture in general, despite the historical affiliation of Ukrainian lands with the territories of different states, are the works of O. Remeshilo-Rybchynska,⁸ O. Mykhailyshyn, S. Linda S.,⁹ M. Pszczółkowski,¹⁰ Yu. Bogdanova.¹¹ Works of theorists N. Kondel-Perminova¹²

and B. Yerofalov¹³ play a special part; they give a systematic idea of the role of monuments of architecture and urban planning in the context of the development of Ukrainian Modern monument protection activities.

Prerequisites for the Formation of the Concept of Ukrainian Modern Architecture as a Cultural Heritage Site (1970–1980)

The processes of forming concepts of the monuments of Modern architecture, which began in the USSR in the late 1960s and were completed in 1990 with the participation of a delegation of Soviet scientists at the constituent First International DOCOMOMO INT. Conference,¹⁴ were interrupted by Ukraine gaining independence. The preservation of Soviet heritage property seemed inappropriate amid exposing some tragic historical facts concealed by the Soviet government regarding Stalin’s terror, collectivization and artificial famines in the 1920s and 1930s, the fate of Ukrainians in the Second World War during 1939–1945 and the years after it, the persecution of Ukrainian dissidents in the 1960s and the Chernobyl disaster of 1986.

The process of forming Ukrainian national identity was just unfolding, and cultural meanings were mixed with political and historical contexts, as in Germany after the Second World War. Soviet architecture was perceived by Ukrainian society in a range of attitudes—from aggressive illustrative propaganda of the totalitarian regime to outdated architecture.¹⁵

In the 1990s, avant-garde architecture was of interest only to some local historians who were interested in the history of their native lands and collected photographic and factual materials. Most publications and articles were the result of search and collections as far back as Soviet times.¹⁶ Only at the end of the century the first suggestions for the renovation of an avant-garde building—the building of Derzhprom on Freedom Square in Kharkiv—were voiced in inner academic circles.

STAGES OF FORMATION OF THE PRACTICE OF PRESERVATION OF MODERN ARCHITECTURE MONUMENTS IN UKRAINE

Stage 1. Interest in the Kharkiv Derzhprom building: beginning of the discussion on preservation of the Ukrainian avant-garde (2000–2005)

In 2000 suggestions for restoration of the Derzhprom building (Fig. 1) were supported by the management of the then Kharkiv Regional State Administration. The Head of the Administration personally addressed the President of the Ukrainian Branch of ICOMOS L. Prybega with a request to establish an International Council to recognize the Derzhprom building as a monument of international importance, and in May



Fig. 1. Derzhprom Building, Kharkiv, 2016; photo by <http://ukraina-incognita.com/kharkivska-oblast/kharkiv/kharkiv-derzhprom-u-sviovii-spadshchyni-yunesko>.

2000 the regional expert commission for the technical support of the Derzhprom building with the support of ICOMOS began operating.

Restoration work on the building began under the supervision of architect V. Novgorodov in 2003. It consisted of the restoration of exterior trim of the walls—plaster, replacement of window blocks and stained-glass stairwells, fencing of parapets on roofs, and balconies.

Because the site was not included in the protection registers and did not have the status of a monument, and there was no experience in the restoration of modern buildings in Ukraine (in Soviet times, a few modern buildings were restored only in the Russian Federation—e.g., ZIL Palace of Culture designed by the Vesnin brothers), the restoration did not involve careful selection of measures to preserve the authenticity of the Derzhprom building. The selected plaster did not even have any visual resemblance to the original stucco, the new window systems had a simplified geometry of profiles and filling with modern double-glazed windows, and stained-glass systems were replaced by large single-glazed windows. A potential globally important monument was placed at risk. This catalyzed discussions on the need to give the building the legal status of a monument and introduce alternative restoration solutions to the current project.

In 2004, the first international research-to-practice conference „Constructivism in Ukraine” was held in Kharkiv, organized by the Ukrainian Branch of the ICOMOS together with the Kharkiv State Technical University of Construction and Architecture (KhDTUBA). Among the foreign guests, the conference was attended by Polish scientists, with whom Kharkiv scientists had established close working relations a few years before the event. The results of the conference were a resolution to present the Derzhprom building as a nomination for inclusion in the UNESCO World Heritage List and strong recommendations to the management of JSC „Derzhprom” and municipal bodies to revise the project. The requirements for the project were met only in a fragmented way—the authentic plaster was partially restored and the central stained glass windows on the main stairwells were replaced.

In December 2005, the restoration was abruptly suspended due to lack of funding and the building re-

mained in under-repaired condition with exposed concrete walls with no plaster. The indifference of the city authorities to the future of the Derzhprom building was criticized at the public hearings „Anniversary View of Kharkiv.” The hearings were attended by the Head of the Department of Architecture and Restoration of the Faculty of Architecture of the Gdańsk University of Technology R. Cielątkowska, who was upset by the inaction of the Kharkiv city authorities and the slowdown in the monument protection process.¹⁷ However, the activity of scientists did not lead to any practical changes—the movement for the preservation of the Derzhprom building and other modern monuments gradually stopped.

Stage 2. Ukrainian architecturalists joining the global discussion on the goals and prospects of protection of architectural heritage of the twentieth century (2005–2007)

During this period, higher educational institutions added studies of the history of Ukrainian avant-garde architecture to the state budget subjects of research programs and curriculums of vocation-oriented universities.¹⁸ Among the highlights of these years was the participation of Ukrainian scientists in international events—in France, Russia, and Poland. In December 2005, Professor O. Buryak took part in a workshop in Paris, organized by DOCOMOMO together with the Department of Architecture and Heritage of the Ministry of Culture and Communications of France and the Center for Advanced Studies, which was dedicated to the history and rehabilitation of European workmen’s clubs. It was there that Professor O. Bouryak met the then Head of DOCOMOMO M. Kashiato, who offered to establish a branch of her organization in Ukraine. Upon returning home, the Professor began working in that direction.

In 2006, the Ukrainian delegation took part in the International Scientific Conference „Heritage in Risk: Preservation of the 20th-Century Architecture and World Heritage” in Moscow, which was jointly organized by the ICOMOS, DOCOMOMO, and the World Monuments Fund. Over 170 specialists from 30 countries attended the conference. At the end of the event, the *Moscow Declaration on the Preservation of the 20th-Century Cultural Heritage* was drawn up, which recognized the outstanding contribution of the Soviet avant-garde of the 1920s and 1930s to global culture.¹⁹ It became a call to the leadership of the post-Soviet countries to launch state programs of international cooperation in the field of historical and architectural research, restoration and protection of architectural monuments of the twentieth century, including the creation of transnational projects with CIS countries to include prominent avant-garde monuments to the World Heritage List.

Since 2007, Ukrainian academics became regular participants of the International Conference in Gdynia —„Modernism in Europe—Modernism in Gdynia,”



Fig. 2. Old terminal of Kharkiv Airport after the restoration 6 2017; photo by O. Deriabina.

which later turned into one of the world's most authoritative platforms for discussing current issues and prospects for the preservation of Modern monuments.

Stage 3. Preparation for the Euro 2012 Football Cup as a catalyst for monument protection processes (2008–2011)

Works on restoration of the Derzhprom building facades were resumed in 2009 under public financing in preparation for the Euro 2012 Football Cup. The municipality initiated an architectural competition for the construction of a hotel within the complex of Freedom Square on the site of a small park.

Teachers and students of the Kharkiv State Technical University of Construction and Architecture were involved in the development of the program and participated in the competition. However, eventually, it turned out that the competition was simulated and the offer that was investment-attractive for the developer was chosen, which did not have any theoretical justification of the concept—it destroyed the integrity of the square's architectural complex with its scope in a pseudo-constructive way. The matter did not cause public resistance, and in 2010 the hotel was built.

At the same time, also within the framework of construction for Euro-2012, Kharkiv University took part in another project for the restoration of the old terminal of Kharkiv Airport (Fig. 2). Unlike the first one, it was completed, and the authenticity of the monument of Soviet architecture of the postwar period was preserved.

Stage 4. Establishment of the Ukrainian branch of DOCOMOMO and development of a program approach to the preservation of modern monuments (2011–2013)

Gradually, the history of individual pieces of Soviet architecture and its aesthetics began to attract local historians, non-academic researchers, public activists, and ordinary citizens. During 2006–2014, a rally to defend the Zhovten Cinema in Kyiv took place, initiated by the Cinema directorate and local public organizations (Fig.

3). The Cinema, as well as the Derzhprom building of the day, appeared to be exposed to a new developer that intended to demolish it since it had no protection status. In 2010, Zaporizhia artist Yu. Barannik started to hold exhibitions dedicated to Zaporizhia constructivism in his art space „LENIN” (later, „Barannik”). He brought together like-minded people who initiated themed tours, as well as managed to include prominent pieces of the Zaporizhia avant-garde to the local lists of immovable landmarks. At the same time, O. Burlaka launched the Local Modernisms Project, dedicated to facilities built in between the 1960s and the 1980s in post-Soviet countries, initiated by the Austrian Curator G. Schöllhammer, which was supported by the Visual Culture Research Center of the National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy.

A showcase event that demonstrated the degree of involvement of the general public in the process of preservation of modern monuments was the public discussion „Architectural Heritage of the Twentieth Century: from Preservation to Use,” organized by K. Dmytrenko sponsored by Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung, which took place in Kyiv Architect's House in May 2011 on the occasion of the opening of the exhibition „Constructivism and Postconstructivism in Kyiv: 1924–1941–1954.”²⁰ The discussion was devoted to the practical issues of using the monuments of the architectural heritage of the twentieth century in modern Kyiv. It was attended by theorists of architecture and culture researchers, historians, representatives of public organizations, enthusiasts.

In June 2011, at the initiative of scientists of KhDTUBA and the Lviv Polytechnic, an organizational meeting of the Ukrainian Branch of DOCOMOMO took place in Kharkiv after six years of preparation, which served to consolidate professionals and the public not indifferent to the preservation of Ukrainian monuments of Modern architecture and the intensification of protection processes in Ukraine. The first two conferences of the Ukrainian Branch of DOCOMOMO „Ukrainian Architectural Avant-Garde. Definition and Protection” and „Architecture of Ukraine. 1955–1975. Second Wave of Modernism” took place in 2012 and 2013 in Kharkiv. Due to the conferences, Ukrainian modernist architecture became known to the world scientific community—they were attended by scholars from France, Finland, Germany, the United States, the Netherlands, Russia, Spain, and other countries. The measures also had a positive impact at the community level. Roundtables with foreign experts, which were devoted to, among other issues, the future of the Derzhprom building, intensified the process of inclusion of the facility into the national register and the tentative UNESCO World Heritage List. The regional department of architecture started preparing documents for the inclusion of the Derzhprom building in the national register.

The invasion of the territory of Donetsk and Luhansk regions by Russian troops and the occupation of Crimea

in 2014 limited the possibility of holding mass events involving foreigners. DOCOMOMO Ukraine's activities were suspended until 2017.

Later, during the period from 2017 to 2019, three international conferences of DOCOMOMO Ukraine were held in Kharkiv, but they no longer had such wide international publicity. Meanwhile, higher education institutions continued to study the architecture of the twentieth century and cooperate in other international projects. Thus, during 2016–2019, the Kharkiv and Odesa National Universities of Construction and Architecture took part in the research and educational project „Unloved Heritage of the ‘Socialist City’? Strategies for Planning Sustainable Urban Development of Large Settlements from the 1960s and 1970s” with the support of Volkswagenstiftung, which aimed to study areas of large scale residential development in post-Soviet countries.²¹

Stage 5. Stagnation of monument protection processes through new socio-political conditions in Ukraine and inclusion in the processes of the Ukrainian community (2014–2015)

The events of 2014 affected the cohesion of civil society in the general and inspired establishment of public organizations, the activities of which were aimed at solving problems related to the development of Ukrainian cities. One of the focuses of such organizations was the preservation of Ukrainian architectural heritage, in particular the architecture of the twentieth century.

An additional incentive for activists was the adoption in 2015 of *Law On the Condemnation of the Communist and National Socialist (Nazi) Regimes, and Prohibition of Propaganda of Their Symbols*, which required public discussions with the involvement of general public to define the boundaries of the concept „communist symbols” when it came to the loss of 70 years' piece of Ukrainian culture.²² In parallel with the discussions, various educational initiatives aimed at raising awareness of the value of twentieth-century architecture began to develop among the population, such as themed tours, public lectures, organization of educational events (e.g., the educational program of Living History Studios *Soviet Past of Ukraine: Forget or Remember*, 2017).

In 2017, events took place that became another catalyst for protection processes aimed at preserving the Derzhprom building. The reason was the initiative of the Kharkiv municipality to hold a pseudo-tender and install a huge pseudo-classical column in the middle of the Modernist Freedom Square, in front of the Derzhprom building, which was immediately popularly called „scarecrow.” Non-governmental organizations NGO „City Reforms,” NGO „Kharkiv Anti-Corruption Center” and architect-activist B. Volynskiy held a campaign to protect Freedom Square, which included protests, the involvement of regional and national media, appeals to the Ministry of Culture of



Fig. 3. Zhovten Cinema in Kyiv after the restoration, 2015; photo by <https://uk.wikipedia.org/>.

Ukraine and the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, attracting the attention of international monument protection organizations, as well as legal proceedings.²³ In 2018, according to the court decision, the results of the „tender” were canceled, as well as the decision to start construction work; the claims of the municipal authorities were also not sustained. This action became an inspiring example of community victory over a corrupt state system. Due to the protest campaign, the process of the Derzhprom building's inscription onto the State Register of Immovable Monuments of Ukraine was accelerated, and in January 2018 the Derzhprom building became a monument of national importance, which allowed it to be included on the Tentative UNESCO World Heritage List. The process of the further promotion of the Derzhprom building to the World Heritage List in 2019 was again deadlocked due to systemic reasons by the operation of departments of the Ministry of Culture of Ukraine.

Another positive example of the victory of Ukrainian public activists was the preservation of the UkrISTEI building (the so-called „Dish”) (Fig. 4). In 2017, the #savekyivmodernism initiative group was formed in Kyiv, the members of which decided to unite to exercise public control over the condition of prominent buildings of Ukrainian Modernism of 1960–1985. During 2017–2019, they conducted a protection campaign, which involved the author of the project—architect F. Yur'yiv, and with the wide support of the Ukrainian architectural community as well as the international community, an alternative restoration project was developed for the building, the main purpose of which was to recreate the original appearance of the institute and preserve the concert hall with unique acoustics.

Projects with involvement of the community, dedicated to research and activities to preserve the architectural heritage of the twentieth century started to be developed in the territory of Ukraine. In 2018, Ukrainian artists and cultural researchers from Uzhhorod, Kharkiv, and Kyiv proposed nominating the central modernist quarter of Maly Galaliv in Uzhhorod to the World Heritage List. That same year, research of the Sixth Village (Socialist City) in Zaporizhia was started, aimed at the development of scientific and design doc-



Fig. 4. Visualization of the restored UkrINTEI building in Kyiv, 2019; project of #savekyivmodernism initiative group; photo by <https://pragmatika.media/news/v-otkrytom-dostupe-pojavilsja-projekt-rekonstrukcii-kievskoj-tarelki/>.

umentation for the inclusion of the Sixth Village in the tentative UNESCO World Heritage List.

Outside the framework of higher education establishments, in 2017, Zaporizhia hosted the International Conference „Universality of the Phenomena of Zaporizhia Modernism and the Bauhaus School. Issues of Modernist Heritage Preservation.” The conference was held as a part of the large-scale project „Bauhaus – Zaporizhzhia,” which included an exhibition at the „Barannik” Gallery, the project „My Socialist City” from the NGO „Garden City,” as well as a workshop on the revitalization of urban settlement (micro rayon) involving Ukrainian and German students. The project was organized by the Consulate General of Germany in Donetsk in partnership with the NGO „Urban Forms Center,” the „Barannik” Gallery, and Professor Thomas Flierl. The conference resulted in the opening of the Zaporizhzhya Constructivism Museum.

An important event in 2019 was the publication of a book by non-academic researchers O. Bykov and Ie. Gubkina *Soviet Modernism. Brutalism. Postmodernism. Buildings and Structures in Ukraine of 1955–1991*, the main purpose of which was the attempt to rethink the period in global historical and political contexts. The study was the first attempt to inventory the architecture of Ukrainian postwar Modernism.²⁴ In 2020, the authors are in the process of preparation of a large-scale exhibition dedicated to the history of Ukrainian architecture, where considerable attention will be paid to the architecture of the twentieth century.

Prospects for further development of the domestic system of inventory and preservation of Modern architectural heritage

Today the architectural heritage of the twentieth century in Ukraine requires special attention from the state and the community—thousands of potential monuments of modern architecture continue to be destroyed and lose their authenticity annually. „Their losses are irreparable, since cultural monuments are al-

ways unique, always associated with a certain era, with certain artists. Every monument is destroyed forever, wounded forever.”²⁵

B. Yerofalov considered the reason for the decline of monument protection in Ukraine was the rudimentary nature of the mechanisms inherited from Soviet times, where centralized management, budget (state) money was spent primarily on the registration of monuments (description, research, to a lesser extent, cataloging), and then on one-time repair (restoration). However, this only led to the decline of the industry, as the life of the monument could be maintained only when it was included in the financial and economic systems.²⁶ N. Kondel-Perminova developed these concepts about the systematic organization of monument protection, considering the monument of architecture and urban planning as an immovable antique, which involved interaction of three areas—culture, law, and finance. She proposed adaptation and implementation of American national programs to recreate the uniqueness of historical cities. Prospects for gradual and simultaneous deployment in four directions: design (improvement of the appearance of urban areas through the restoration of buildings and structures, construction of new buildings and landscaping); organization (reaching a consensus between all stakeholders); promotion (advertising of monuments to attract buyers, potential investors, business); economic restructuring (strengthening the economic base of the area, creating new opportunities).²⁷

Because of this, ensuring the preservation of the heritage of Ukrainian modern architecture is possible upon condition that, on the one hand, a normal architectural market with all functioning channels of reproduction of architectural professionalism is developed, and on the other hand, monument protection activities based on outdated principles of centralized management inherited from the Soviet system are restructured. Fulfillment of these requirements will ensure the sustainability of procedures for the identification, selection, and protection of architectural monuments, and the protection of monuments will be less dependent on current political, social, and economic processes. Among the key measures, the following should be mentioned:

- conducting historical, architectural and multidisciplinary studies of Ukrainian architecture of the twentieth century;
- the popularization of scientific knowledge about modern monuments in Ukraine and abroad, conducting PR campaigns, publishing topic-specific directories, manuals, books, organizing excursions, public lectures, discussions with the involvement of government officials and foreign experts;
- publication and regular updating of professional educational literature—textbooks for architectural and humanities universities; development of educational programs aimed at educating students—courses, summer schools, extracurricular activities;

- development of municipal development programs taking into account the potential of modern architectural monuments in strengthening the cultural attractiveness of the area;
- decentralization of inventory processes and creation of an authoritative consulting scientific institution based on existing ones (departments of specialized universities or DOCOMOMO Ukraine), which could control the quality of processes and provide methodological, technical and professional advice;
- development and deployment of inventory programs of various topics and scope (since there has been an increase in the role of non-professional structures in recent years, it will be appropriate to introduce methods similar to the inventory programs of the Netherlands, which involved a wide network of volunteers and third parties);
- documentation of monuments and their complexes following modern standards of international monument protection organizations;
- based on the accumulation of scientific knowledge and the results of inventories, the inclusion of the monuments of modern architecture and urban planning in the monument protection registers—local, state, UNESCO World Heritage List.

Conclusions

1. It was found that the inclusion of the concepts about the monuments of modern architecture in Ukraine was associated with the delay of some reforms in Ukraine that would have a positive impact on the functioning of the entire system of architectural and urban planning activities, including on

overcoming many archaic remnants in the organization of architectural research and training of architects – the inheritance of politically dependent Soviet mechanisms of selection of monuments and their inclusion in monument protection registers, with the slow general development of monument protection activities in the years of independence, the low general level of public responsibility, insufficient popularization of knowledge about the cultural significance of the architectural heritage of the nineteenth and the twentieth century, and a whole range of interrelated national economic, social, cultural and political issues.

2. Five stages of formation of monument protection practice aimed at preserving the modern architectural heritage in Ukraine have been identified, deployment of which depended on the interest of state bodies in the restoration of certain structures as image projects, local history and scientific research by individual scholars, enthusiasts, interest in the issue of public organizations, diverse interaction with foreign scientists and relevant international organizations.
3. It is proposed to further develop some tasks that would ensure the institutional effectiveness and systemic integrity of all work related to the study and protection of the entire national heritage of Modern architecture: deployment of a system of historical, architectural and multidisciplinary studies; formation of a decentralized inventory system for study and preservation of the monuments of Modern architecture; development of municipal development programs; initiation and development of pedagogical and educational programs.

References / Bibliografia

Source texts / Teksty źródłowe

- Antonenko Nadiia, *Monument of modern architecture in the context of architectural culture of the second half of the twentieth century*, Ph.D. Thesis, Kharkiv 2019, p. 240.
- Bouryak Alexander, Rusanova Mariia, *Why the magnificent architecture of early Ukrainian modernism is little known in the world and is not popular in Ukraine*, Architecture of the 20th century research and popularization in Gdynia and Europe, Modernizm w Europie – modernizm w Gdyni, Gdynia 2019.
- Cherkasova Ekaterina, *The public value of the architectural heritage of the Soviet avant-garde. Methods of preserving objects of architecture and urban planning*, „Problems Of Theory And History Of Architecture 2008”, No. 8, p. 128–135.
- Erofalov Boris, *Post-Soviet city*, Kyiv 2002, p. 112.
- Gubkina Yevgeniya, *Soviet modernism. Brutalism. Post-modernism. Buildings and structures in Ukraine 1955–1991*, Kyiv 2020, p. 258.
- Kondel-Perminova Nataliia, *Integration of monuments of architecture and urban planning in the modern socio-cultural context* „Modern Problems of Research, Restoration and Preservation of Cultural Heritage” 2008, No. 5, p. 94–111.
- Kondel-Perminova Nataliia, *Preservation of architectural and urban heritage of Ukraine in the context of urban development*, „Modern Problems of Research, Restoration and Preservation of Cultural Heritage” 2009, No. 6, p. 92–116.
- Kreiser Iryna, *The Fate of the State Industry in Our Hands*, Bulletin of the KhDAMG, 2008, No. 12, p. 82–86.
- Paper for the Proceedings of International Conference „Heritage at Risk. Preservation of 20th Century Architecture and World Heritage” Moscow, April 17–20 2006.
- Remeshylo-Rybchynska Olena, Baev Andriij, Rybchynsky Adrian, *On the problem of preserving the heritage of residential architecture of functionalism in Lviv*, „Bulletin of the National University Lviv Polytechnic” 2013, No. 757, p. 310–314.

Rychkov Pyotr, *Kharkov as a capital of Soviet-Ukrainian modernism*, „TEKA Komisji Architektury. Urbanistyki i Studiów Krajobrazowych” 2008, vol. IV A, p. 116–133.

Smolenskaya Svitlana, *Architecture of avant-garde modernism in Ukraine: genesis and heritage*, Kharkiv 2017, p. 477.

Smolenska Svitlana, *Ukraine: The Destruction of the Soviet Heritage*. Heritage at Risk, 2015, p. 133–135.

Vesel Pavlo, *Architectural heritage of Ukraine of the Soviet period, the criteria for recognizing its objects as „monuments” and the chances of state protection*, „Urban Planning and Spatial Planning” 2013, No. 64, p. 87–95.

Secondary sources / Opracowania

Chepkounova Iryna, *Some questions on the restoration of constructivist buildings, illustrated with the Tsentrosoyuz Building, Moscow (Le Corbusier, 1928–35)*, Paper for the Proceedings of First International DOCOMOMO Confer-

ence, Eindhoven, September 12–15, 1990, p. 33.

Cherkes Bogdan, *National identity in the architecture of the city*, Lviv 2008, p. 268.

Engel Barbara (ed.), *Mass Housing in the Socialist City. Heritage, Values, and Perspectives. Case Studies in Germany, Russia, and Ukraine*, Łódź 2019, p. 240.

Likhachev Ddimtriy, *Ecology of culture / The past to the future*, Moscow 1985, p. 50–62.

Lwów nowoczesny / Lviv and modernity, Kraków 2017, p. 357.

Mykhaylyshyn Olena, Linda Svitlana, *Kościoty rzymskokatolickie międzywojennego Wołynia: ich powstanie i zachowanie w kontekście pamięci/zapomnienia*, „Zarządzanie w kulturze” 2016, vol. 17 (3), p. 243–261.

Pszczółkowski Michał, *Kresy nowoczesne. Architektura na ziemiach wschodnich II Rzeczypospolitej 1921–1939*, Łódź 2016, p. 156.

Zvonitsky Eduard, Leibfreid Alexander, *Derzhprom*, Kharkiv 1992, p. 73.

¹ N.V. Antonenko, *Monument of modern architecture in the context of architectural culture of the second half of the twentieth century*, Ph.D. Thesis, Kharkiv 2019, p. 240.

² S.O. Smolenskaya, *Architecture of avant-garde modernism in Ukraine: genesis and heritage*, Sc.D. Thesis, Kharkiv 2017, p. 477.

³ A. Bouryak, M. Rusanova, *Why the magnificent architecture of early Ukrainian modernism is little known in the world and is not popular in Ukraine*, Architecture of the 20th century research and popularization in Gdynia and Europe. Modernizm w Europie – modernizm w Gdyni, Gdynia 2019.

⁴ S.O. Smolenskaya, op. cit.

⁵ P.A. Rychkov, *Kharkov as a capital of Soviet-Ukrainian modernism*. „TEKA Komisji Architektury, Urbanistyki i Studiów Krajobrazowych” 2008, vol. IV A, p. 116–133.

⁶ P. Vesel, *Architectural heritage of Ukraine of the Soviet period, the criteria for recognizing its objects as „monuments” and the chances of state protection*, „Urban Planning and Spatial Planning” 2013, No. 64, p. 87–95.

⁷ I.I. Kreiser, *The Fate of the State Industry in Our Hands*, „Bulletin of the KhDAMG” 2008, No. 12, p. 82–86.

⁸ O.I. Remeshylo-Rybchynska, A.A. Baev, A.A. Rybchynsky, *On the problem of preserving the heritage of residential architecture of functionalism in Lviv*, „Bulletin of the National University Lviv Polytechnic” 2013, No. 757, p. 310–314.

⁹ O. Mykhaylyshyn, S. Linda, *Kościoty rzymskokatolickie międzywojennego Wołynia: ich powstanie i zachowanie w kontekście pamięci/zapomnienia*, „Zarządzanie w Kulturze” 2016, vol. 17 (3), p. 243–261.

¹⁰ M. Pszczółkowski, *Kresy nowoczesne. Architektura na ziemiach wschodnich II Rzeczypospolitej 1921–1939*, Łódź 2016, p. 156.

¹¹ *Lwów nowoczesny / Lviv and modernity*, Kraków 2017, p. 357.

¹² N. Kondel-Perminova, *Preservation of architectural and*

urban heritage of Ukraine in the context of urban development, „Modern Problems of Research, Restoration and Preservation of Cultural Heritage” 2009, No. 6, p. 92–116.

¹³ B. Yerofalov, *Post-Soviet city*, Kyiv 2002, p. 112.

¹⁴ I. Chepkounova, *Some questions on restoration of constructivist buildings, illustrated with the Tsentrosoyuz Building in Moscow (Le Corbusier, 1928–35)*, Paper for the Proceedings of First International DOCOMOMO Conference (Eindhoven, September 12–15, 1990), p. 33.

¹⁵ B.S. Cherkes, *National identity in the architecture of the city*, Lviv 2008, p. 268.

¹⁶ E.M. Zvonitsky, A.Y. Leibfreid, *Derzhprom*, Kharkiv 1992, p. 73.

¹⁷ I.I. Kreiser, *The Fate of the State Industry in Our Hands*, Bulletin of the KhDAMG, 2008, No. 12, p. 82–86.

¹⁸ E.T. Cherkasova, *The public value of the architectural heritage of the Soviet avant-garde. Methods of preserving objects of architecture and urban planning*, „Problems Of Theory And History Of Architecture” 2008, No. 8, p. 128–135.

¹⁹ Paper for the Proceedings of International Conference „Heritage at Risk. Preservation of 20th Century Architecture and World Heritage”, Moscow, 17–20 April 2006.

²⁰ K. Dmitrenko, *Architectural heritage of the twentieth century: from preservation to use*, <https://ua.boell.org/uk/2011/02/05/architekturna-spadshchina-hh-stolitya-vid-zberezheniya-do-vikoristannya> (accessed: 26 VI 2020).

²¹ B. Engel (ed.), *Mass Housing in the Socialist City. Heritage, Values, and Perspectives. Case Studies in Germany, Russia, and Ukraine*, Berlin, p. 240.

²² S. Smolenska, *Ukraine: The Destruction of the Soviet Heritage*, „Heritage at Risk” 2015, p. 133–135.

²³ Y. Gubkina, O. Hatherley, *Modernist Kharkiv: behind the battle to protect avant-garde architecture in post-Maidan*

Ukraine, available at: <https://www.calvertjournal.com/articles/show/8568/modernist-kharkiv-battle-protect-avant-garde-architecture-maidan-ukraine>.

²⁴ Ye. Gubkina *Soviet modernism. Brutalism. Post-modernism. Buildings and structures in Ukraine 1955–1991*, Київ 2019, p. 258.

²⁵ D.S. Likhachev, *Ecology of culture / The past to the future*,

Moscow 1985, p. 50–62.

²⁶ B. Yerofalov, *Post-Soviet city*, Kyiv 2002, p. 112.

²⁷ N. Kondel-Perminova, *Integration of monuments of architecture and urban planning in the modern socio-cultural context*, „Modern Problems of Research, Restoration and Preservation of Cultural Heritage” 2008, No. 5, p. 94–111.

Abstract

This paper provides a historical and genetic analysis of organizational efforts of the professional community and the public, which were aimed at preserving the monuments of Ukrainian architecture of the twentieth century, and reconstruction of the process of formation of activities that unfolded during the period between the 1990s and the 2010s. The conditions of its development and the main reasons for the stagnation of the processes are clarified: delay in several reforms related to the general development of the system of architectural and urban planning. The determined driving forces of the process are public authorities interested in the implementation of image projects, the research community, public activists, relevant international organizations. The periodization has been worked out, five stages of formation of the practice have been singled out, which differed from each other in the following essential features: support from the authorities, degree of involvement of the public, research community and international organizations, the scale of extension and performance results. The promising areas of development of monument protection activity in Ukraine concerning the preservation of modern architecture are offered: conducting research, popularization of modern architecture, development of municipal programs, decentralization of processes, implementation of international standards, development of themed educational programs.

Streszczenie

Artykuł przedstawia historyczną analizę oraz genezę działań organizacyjnych społeczności zawodowych i społeczeństwa, których celem było zachowanie zabytków ukraińskiej architektury XX wieku oraz rekonstrukcja procesu formacji działań, a które miały miejsce w okresie pomiędzy latami dziewięćdziesiątymi XX wieku i drugą dekadą XXI wieku. Warunki ich rozwoju oraz główne przyczyny stagnacji tych procesów zostały wyjaśnione opóźnieniem wielu reform związanych z ogólnym rozwojem systemu planowania architektonicznego i urbanistycznego. Ustalono siły napędowe procesu to władze publiczne zainteresowane realizacją projektów o charakterze wizerunkowym, środowisko badawcze, aktywiści publiczni oraz odpowiednie organizacje międzynarodowe. Przedstawiono periodyzację obejmującą 5 etapów formowania się praktyki, które różnią się między sobą następującymi cechami: poparciem władz, stopniem zaangażowania społeczeństwa, społeczności badawczej oraz organizacji międzynarodowych, skalą zasięgu i efektywnością. Istnieją obiecujące obszary dla rozwoju działalności konserwatorskiej na Ukrainie odnośnie do ochrony nowoczesnej architektury: prowadzenie badań, popularyzacja nowoczesnej architektury, rozwój programów miejskich, decentralizacja procesów, wprowadzanie międzynarodowych standardów, rozwój tematycznych programów edukacyjnych.