Sociocultural bases of an era of modernity and their influence on postrevolutionary architecture of the USSR
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Abstract. Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917 applied for creation of the new world and first of all − the new person. This new person had to feel, wish, work and create in a new way. To formulate and implement the similar existential project, especially, so global, certain media language, imagination, art − a word, some obligatory means realizing political and subjective functions are required. Since ancient times such function was performed, in particular, in a special way by the organized subject and spatial environment finding the next expression in architecture. It is conventional that architecture − the major and strongest tool and the mechanism of impact on a subject. The architecture creates physical and symbolical borders, defining individual and collective life in a latent way. It is no wonder that the architecture of the first-ever socialist state was one of the most important construction tools of the new world.

1. Introduction
Article purpose − to track formation of the subject and spatial environment of a modernist style and to show what its sociocultural lines are inherited by architecture of the first postrevolutionary decades. In the beginning we will show how the social space of an era was created upon transition from the Middle Ages to a modernist style and we will specify meanings and the principles of the last as special cultural era, and then we will track the common and special features in postrevolutionary Russian architecture.

2. Materials and methods
The work is based on formational and civilizational methods of studying this problem, which allowed us to determine the influence of socio-cultural aspects on architecture in the USSR after 1917.

3. Results
The era of modernist style begins with one of the last revolutions made in relation to space. We are talking about the discovery of G Galilei. He formulates an alternative concept of motion, matter, and physical properties to Aristotle. He claims that Aristotle's physics with its doctrine of «natural places» is failing.

Let's remind that «natural places», according to Aristotle, are ontologically predetermined points somehow located concerning the center of Earth, so and the center of the Universe. Aristotle explained the movement so: everything moves to an ultimate goal of the existence. From here − the most imp-
important consequences of world outlook and sociocultural character. The world is structured. In the world there is a center. The center is more important, than the periphery. Each thing according to the center has the purpose. Scholasticism in the Middle Ages logically added this picture of the world with a concept of Divine providence. As a result accurately structured, reasonable picture of the Universe turned out.

Medieval world – qualitative space. At it there is an absolute top and a bottom, the absolute right and left. In modern science it is called anisotropic structure of space. It means that the directions the top and a bottom, left and right are quality characteristics. Top, sky – God. The earth, on the contrary, is the place mortal, it is dense. Below – flesh, above – spirit. But G Galilei says – no. Space not such is. The movement is relative, everywhere is identical. There are no «Natural places» just. The movement has the causal nature, but not teleologic. Everything moves because that faces something. The impulse generates the movement. Things in itself do not aspire anywhere. So other space, other world arises absolutely. Where right and left do not matter. Where everything is relative. It is the New world. And there is no Platon and Aristotle's world any more. «The original scandal made by G Galilei was not so much that it opened that Earth rotates around the Sun, how many that he constructed space infinite – and infinitely open; as a result it turned out that the place as it was understood in the Middle Ages, was kind of dissolved; the place of a thing was only a point in its movement now, is perfect the same as rest of a thing was only it indefinitely the slowed-down movement» [2, p 192].

Let's repeat: Galilei opens new space. Material bodies in it cope relationships of cause and effect. Things in itself do not aspire anywhere because there is no Telos. If they also aspire, then only for some reason, only «because». Instead of high-quality understanding of the movement the quantitative understanding appears. The philosophical principles which he found become fundamental to Modern times. Galilei's Universe – is the Universe with which the Modern times will deal. Earlier the picture of the world was other. Conditionally speaking, it was three-level: angels, people, demons. If the person fell (in religious sense), he fell under the earth. Souls of Saints, on the contrary, aspired up. The space dictated the different relation to rescue: from the average level it was possible to escape, on top rescue was not required any more, and at the lower level the rescue was impossible. But Galilei's space absolutely other, and it is necessary to philosophize on another. «What significant change was brought by Galilei in understanding of the communication uniting mathematics and the world? In the geometrical description of phenomena nothing new was obvious: already Greek mathematics described in geometrical terms of a trajectory of stars. Galilei thinks of the movement in geometrical terms. He reveals a mathematical invariant, independent of change of situation and speed, – acceleration. The Cartesian world extended – is the world which gains independence of substance which it is possible to think irrespective of everything that in it sends to concrete vital contact in which we with it keep. The ice world in which there is neither top, nor a bottom, nor the center, nor the periphery – anything that would do of it the world intended for the person appears at people of a modernist style. For the first time the world appears as capable to continue existence without a thing what makes its concreteness for us» [6, pp 171–172].

From now on in the world there is nothing that somehow dictated to the person of his purpose and meanings. There is no tradition, there is no authority and it dread to think – there is no God! The person remains in private with the world which suddenly lost familiar outlines. The described turn in judgment of space set new position of the person in the world. Before this person there were new tasks which need of the decision changed him. The person in a sense too became new. New, thus, was everything. It is no wonder that the new historical era which followed the above changes received the name of Modern times, or modernist style era. What is a modernist style what is a modernist style era? The highway of determination of value of a concept of a modernist style is paved by L Ionin. Having generalized numerous discussions about history of a concept of a modernist style, contexts of its use, about the relation of a modernist style and Education, L Ionin an apportionment three meanings of a modernist style which are clearing up the main maintenance of an era [5, pp 268–270]. The first meaning of a modernist style historical, he answers a question – when? Welling, the Russian researcher notes that historically the beginning of a modernist style contacts industrial revolution, emergence
of the bourgeois-democratic state, rise in natural sciences and formation of the new European science in general. The second meaning of a modernist style – social. It reveals in the concept «world breaking the spell». Since XVI–XVII of centuries the world becomes more and more clear, transparent for human mind. Breaking the spell is process of release from the authority of traditions, magics, superstitions; it is process of the increasing trust to scientific rationality and also to rationalization of life in general.

Thus, «breaking the spell» is a trend of the accruing intellectualization and rationalization in which the discussed era finds unity and sense. The equipment and calculation – here that becomes the main thing instead of the need of propitiation of spirits legitimating forces of tradition or belief in divine providence. At last, the third meaning of a modernist style – cultural, disclosing specifics of a way of existence of an era. The cultural meaning of a modernist style (with a support on M. Weber) is presented by Yu Habermas. This exarticulation three value spheres of science, morals and art and a support on them as the fundamental bases of social life. Thus, if to distract from conceptual subtleties and the bulky history of the term, one may say, that the modernist style is understood as a cultural era which beginning historically coincides with the European Modern times though it is hardly possible to place a modernist style in an exact chronological framework. It is characterized by a specific set of lines, such as industrial capitalist economy, democratic political organization, class social structures. All above-mentioned involves the certain way of life which is based on an industrialization of society, market economy, strengthening of social mobility, the increasing value of education, bureaucratization, increase in material well-being. As fundamental cultural characteristics of a modernist style it is necessary to mark out individualism and rationalism. If the individualism assumes free autonomous existence of the personality, then the rationalism assumes the aspiration of people and social groups to base the behavior only on the principles of reason. The basis and a condition of a possibility of modernist style per se is the reason.

Perhaps, one of the most successful images characterizing a modernist style and, in particular, the architectural and subject and practical environment of a modernist style is M. Foucault's Panoptikon [3, 8]. It is known that M. Foucault, by preparation of the book about evolution of a criminal system in Europe of Modern times used I. Bentam's plan, having received, thereby a fine metaphor of the subject and spatial environment of a modernist style generally and architecture in particular. In Foucault's work the communication between architecture, rationality and the power very clearly was found. Bentam managed to formalize the main general task of administrative practice of the time: to impart, spread discipline due to continuous threat of sanctions and also to reveal its general strategy which is in forcing wards to believe that not to disappear from a total eye of the managing instance for a minute. It meant: that it was made secretly, everything will become obvious and is subject to punishment. The similar situation is described in E. Zamyatin's anti-Utopias «We» (where people have walls of own houses transparent) and J. Orwell «1984» where everyone had own TV, but it is impossible to switch off it – therefore nobody knew at what moment watch it. So, thanking Panoptikona there was obvious a communication between the organization of space and opportunities of control and coercion. The modernist architecture continues the line set by rationalism of a modernist style [1, pp 72–81].

M. Foucault shows how the pan-optical model means of the organization of the subject and spatial environment played a key role upon transition from the local mechanisms of control provided with opportunities of human sight and hearing to total mechanisms of control in the state scale, the serious image surpassing natural opportunities of the person. Having incorporated the logician of social self-organization of Modern times, dictating expediency and functionality, the ideas and the principles of a modernist style formed the basis of formation of new architectural tradition. Under the influence of objective above-mentioned circumstances and also in connection with industrial revolution and social modernization the architecture and city planning were put in new conditions. At the same time architectural art was put before three calls. First, there was a new need for architectural registration. Secondly, new technical means and materials appeared. At last, all construction per se is from now on subordinated to new imperatives – first of all, economic and political [4, page 40–43].
Let's track briefly as sociocultural imperatives of a modernist style were implemented an imperative in postrevolutionary Russia. After the revolution the problematic relation to the called classical architectural forms is initially formed. The classical architecture, according to Hegel, resists to symbolical. The symbolical architecture has no utilitarian appointment and bears the purpose in itself; as a result, such architecture is not the embodiment of some concrete plan Her homeland – East; the mythological prototype can serve as the Tower of Babel, Ecbatana city in Midia. Classical architecture develops two appropriate forms: a house (as an architecturally conceived dwelling of a private person) and a temple. In Soviet Russia, churches are beginning to be dismantled or their functional purpose is unusual for them-they are being turned into warehouses, libraries, some utility rooms, etc. Houses are also being transferred to a new mode of operation: apartments are being «compacted", blocked off, estates are being turned into offices, museums or communal apartments. Naturally, this circumstance was not neutral in relation to the mode of existence and subject status: «the new architecture is destructive in relation to the traditional family, and it is quite consonant with the government's aspirations, which are aimed at reducing the family to the level of cohabitation-this is, in the words of Saltykov-Shchedrin, «two copies of useful male and female animals», and this cohabitation is considered only as a temporary deviation from collective existence» [1, p 127]. And one more fragment from the same source: «The attitude of new architecture towards family was curiously shown in own house of K Melnikov in Krivoarbatsky Alleyway. This house is intended for family – families of the architect, but at night this family turned into group of the sleeping people, and the dream of this collective has to proceed in one general specially issued room which is only slightly partitioned off by the narrow vertical planes. In this sense the group of family of K Melnikov does not differ from that collective from 600 people to which K. Melnikov addressed «Sleepy Sonata». It is interesting also that in the Government house in many apartments there are no kitchens – life of members of the government is destructive in relation to too to the family center» [1, p 128].

The individual beginning, thus, is suppressed, losing, in particular, space and property. In symbolical sense all events mean a gap with tradition and coming of other type of spirituality. At the same time, as M Ryklin notices, in the USSR on a new round there is a regression to forms of symbolical architecture. Intensive construction of palaces temples for the people begins. These constructions perform quasireligious function. They demonstrate unity of the people and party. Here it is possible to track important distinction with classics: if the last embodied some in advance given sense, then in our case the fundamental world outlook bases just should be created. It was necessary to create yet not existing identity – the Soviet person who should become the active subject of the social, economic and political relations subsequently. The social subject such is created by relevant sociocultural technologies and keeps the self-identity and personal identity until these technologies work [9, pp 139–152]. Such nearly first of all it is necessary to refer the subject and spatial environment to technologies generally and architecture in particular. And for this purpose most expressed subjective functions had to have the architectural forms symbolizing new, Soviet, not divine sacral. First of all it is necessary to carry the Lenin Mausoleum to such constructions. In 1924, an architectural structure appeared on Red Square, sacralizing the body of the leader of the world proletariat. This circumstance will completely be coordinated with a trend of conquest of the nature and in a limit – overcomes death.

Before architecture there is a task to build forever eternal buildings: «People will be born – generation behind generation, – to lead happy life, to grow old gradually, but familiar to them according to lovely books of children's years the Palace of Councils will stand just the same what and we will see it in the next years, centuries will not leave on it the marks, we will build it that it stood without growing old, is eternal» [1, p 42]. The idea of the mausoleum initially thought as temporary and functional: the mausoleum is necessary only in order that people, not in time to arrive in the capital by day of a funeral, could say goodbye to the leader after all. In the beginning mausoleum wooden; then it is replaced with more thorough (and too wooden). In 1930 the mausoleum already stone – it is calculated on eternity. It should be noted that the mummification of V. Lenin's body and the construction of the mausoleum for the purpose of its exaltation went in a kind of parallel to the revolutionary culture, which identified and positioned itself as the vanguard of all mankind, completely fitting into the logic of the
modernist style, the essential category of which is paradoxical. The paradox arises from incompatible contrasts. And in the modern era, the death of God turns into an idealization of man, and any innovation in a second turns into antiquity.

Only the paradoxical logic of a modernist style explains the answer to a question of what has to be the main architectural style in the country. As the collective identity of new historical community – the Soviet people – was formed over various national and mental spheres, «buildings were necessary to be both classical, and modern, and constructed in national style, and internally functional, and even «intimate»» [1, page 57]. It is no wonder that the Soviet culture and architecture in 1930–1940 feels as the successor of all traditions and styles. The culture of a modernist style, thus, can demand opposite things, remaining to be at the same time to right own logic. «It is possible to carry out all these contradictory orders in the atmosphere of terror when not yesterday's professionals, but leaders who are guided become true architects. faultless feeling ennobled (magically coinciding with the corresponding feeling of weight)» [8, p 57]. Buildings of original Soviet style have to be read easily as authentic. Each building has to be identified easily by collective perception as «ours». The Stalin architecture defiantly places itself in service of the person. She stands up for accounting of identity, fights against depersonalization and standardization. «Each marble bench in the subway is considered as one more manifestation of care of the person. This culture seeks to be art in everything and to tower over life which took great pain to improve avant-gardists of the first postrevolutionary decade. It we will gain fertility, any threat of potency is taken by it fall seriously. At all this she is capable to create mirages and phantasmagorias because to it is what to hide and to allow in the bosom. As a result, the pathetically created world of Good mirrors the repressed world of Evil. This is especially evident in the example of the metro and the Exhibition of Achievements of the National Economy complex in Moscow» [8, p 59].

4. Conclusion
Thus, the architecture of several postrevolutionary decades can be considered as attempt of implementation of the modernist project. It bears in itself all peculiar features of outlook of a modernist style. For creation of the new world and the new person it was necessary to get rid of ballast of all old, having entirely exempted from past language. The postrevolutionary architecture is innovative – it is focused on essentially new which is by default better old and regardless of how is actually. It is necessary to leave from last words, last thoughts, last images and images. New, the innovation is in relation to old in expressly critical position.

The postrevolutionary architecture is optimistic, it sings of progress. Progressism – utopian kernel of the modernist program. Everything will be good, however, not now. The tragedy of a modernist style – in this impossibility of compliance to an own image.

Paradox – next typical line of the Soviet architecture of the 1930th. The death of God is wrapped in idolization of the person. Any innovation in a second is wrapped in antiquity. It is symptomatic that disputes on the specific and Soviet architectural style did not find rational permission: buildings needed to be and classical, and in national style, both functional, and modern, for the big mass of citizens, but at the same time «personal». Partial regression to symbolical style confirms this thesis.
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