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Soviet Totalitarianism and Teaching the History of Architecture in Modern Russia

The teaching of architectural history in present-day Russia is still linked to the Soviet past and its totalitarian approach toward education, which is based on centralization and application of the same standards countrywide. Although the links among the architectural schools in the former Soviet republics were dissolved in 1991, the curriculum continues to follow the Soviet model. Currently, however, there is greater emphasis on national artistic traditions in the Commonwealth of Independent States—an issue that was largely neglected in the Soviet Union.

In Russia, the number of architecture schools and departments in polytechnic schools doubled during the last decade, reaching a total of thirty-nine. The majority of architecture departments in provincial institutions were transformed into faculties of architecture, and several departments of architecture in the schools of construction became independent architectural schools (most under the title of “Academy”). They may display varying strengths in responding to technological changes, but there is no diversity in the courses on architectural history. This situation was legally confirmed by the Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation in 2001, with the stipulation that the standards prepared by the Moscow Institute for Architecture (MARHI) be met by all institutions.1 The legal proclamations made no serious change, as MARHI had been responsible for devising programs for other schools since 1934. Nevertheless, there are, and there have always been, differences in the teaching of architectural history in Russia, stemming from the personalities of the professors, not the programs. Even when the schools adopt alternative pedagogical approaches, they mostly use textbooks and other teaching materials from Moscow.2

The teaching of architectural theory flourished in Russia during the 1920s—the time of the Russian avant-garde. In the early 1930s, after the introduction of the obligatory Soviet neoclassicism, theory and history were combined so that views of Vitruvius or Leon Battista Alberti, for example, were discussed in reference to the buildings of their respective eras. Theories of the twentieth-century masters were taught either very superficially or not at all. A decade after the fall of the Communist regime in 1991, there are still no courses that do justice to the richness of the historical and contemporary architectural theory of different cultural traditions.

The teaching of architecture in Russia preserves many features from the first half of the twentieth century and, in some cases, even earlier periods. It is important not to reject such conservatism outright, but to understand its origins, as well as the benefits it provides for the future. In the Soviet epoch, architectural history was a “frontier” subject: it balanced on the edge of the official ideology, to which political and economic history belonged. But at the same time, architecture was considered a technical subject, escaping from the strict ideological control of the Communist Party. Architectural history thus became a unique branch of the humanities, where it was possible, to some extent, to preserve prerevolutionary traditions and ideas. Now, after the disintegration of the U.S.S.R., as Russia tries to restore the valuable elements of its culture that were lost during the Soviet period, the conservatism of architectural history is proving to be useful.

An Outline of Architectural Education and Architectural History in Russia

Architectural education based on European models was introduced into Russia at the beginning of the eighteenth century, during the reforms of Peter the Great. It started to take a stable form in the early 1720s, at the end of his reign. Initially, the training of a new type of builder and architect was intertwined with the foundation of St. Petersburg. Russian assistants were put under foreign architects in the service of the tzar, who ordered that they should be taught the principles of new architecture and construction techniques.3 During the same time, several young men were sent to study in Italy and Holland.4 This manner of educating Russian architects—abroad or in the workshops of foreign masters at home—survived until the creation of the Imperial Academy of Arts in 1757.5 The academy had to fulfill the functions of a ministry of arts, as well as serving
as the center of artistic education in the Russian empire. Jean-Baptiste-Michel-Vallin de la Mothe, a student of Jacques-François Blondel, was its first professor of architecture. He brought to St. Petersburg Parisian methods of teaching painters, sculptors, and architects together. Classical drawing played an essential part in their training, and remains part of the curriculum in modern Russian architectural schools. Even the same antique statues employed at the end of the eighteenth century are used as models today. At MARHI and at the State Art Institute of Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture (formerly the Imperial Academy of Arts) in St. Petersburg, the classic architectural system is studied in the context of a design course separate from architectural history.

The Imperial Academy of Arts was the most important center of architectural education in Russia until the revolution of 1917. Before 1830, neoclassicism, combined with studies of classic monuments, was the dominant mode. In the nineteenth century, the institution’s attitude toward the history of art changed with the development of new architectural styles. By midcentury, the pedagogical system was expanded to include Byzantine and Russian medieval art and architecture. Constantine Ton, then one of the leading professors at the academy, introduced the Russo-Byzantine style, which would be used for official imperial buildings—among them the Great Palace of the Kremlin and the Cathedral of Christ the Savior in Moscow. Although teaching this style helped broaden the repertoire of historical models, the academy has not relinquished its attachment to neoclassicism. Even today, in the State Art Institute of Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture, classic tendencies remain the strongest in design teaching, and history courses concentrate on neoclassicism and its variants.

In St. Petersburg, a different kind of architectural education was established in 1832, when the School of Civil Engineers was opened to train more practically inclined builders than those educated at the academy. In 1882, the school was enlarged and transformed into the Institute of Civil Engineers. During the Soviet era, under the name of Leningrad Institute of Engineering and Construction, it became the center of architectural training in the northern capital of Russia. The graduates of the academy received, and still receive, the “Architect-Artist” diploma, whereas those of the Institute of Civil Engineers are awarded the degree of “Architect-Engineer.” The titles reflect the differences in the two programs, which place unequal emphasis on the history of art, architecture, and construction techniques.

In Moscow, the history of architectural education was connected to transformations in the planning and image of the great old city. During the eighteenth century, designs for new houses and the radical refurbishing of ancient buildings had to be approved by special state institutions. The imperial power insisted on the introduction of architectural models chosen by authorities, not by the owners or builders. Moscow was to become regular in its plan, with European styles informing its architecture. At first, the police implemented the restrictions; later the Senate took on this responsibility, and eventually during the reign of Catherine the Great, from 1762 to 1796, the Commission to Rebuild St. Petersburg and Moscow assumed the job. Simultaneously, several bodies looked after the imperial residences and, above all, the Kremlin. Each had a team of architects, whom it trained.

In Russia, the first architecture school was founded in 1749 by Dmitry Uhtomsky, the leading Baroque architect of Moscow. At the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries, another influential school was organized by Matvei Kazakov, the most productive neoclassical master. Judging from copies of drawings made by the students, both schools primarily used French treatises from the late seventeenth to the mid-eighteenth centuries. The first formal architectural educational institution, the Palace School of Architecture, was opened within a larger institution—the Moscow School of Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture—which would become the equivalent in Moscow of the Imperial Academy of Arts, but without its administrative functions. Initially it followed the example of the École des Beaux-Arts in Paris, and at the end of the nineteenth century it embraced the Arts and Crafts movement. It was in the Moscow school that the art and architecture of the Russian Middle Ages were examined from the point of view of their folk origins.

After the revolution of 1917, Free State Art Workshops were created on the model of the Moscow School of Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture. In 1920, they developed into the famous All-Russia Artistic and Technical Workshops (VHUTEMAS). VHUTEMAS soon became the Russian equivalent of the Bauhaus, with which it had extensive contacts. The other architecture programs in Moscow were, as in St. Petersburg, within engineering schools: the Moscow Institute of Civil Engineers and the architecture department of the Moscow Technical High School. In 1930, the two institutions were merged to form MARHI. The integration of their programs continues to determine the character of architectural education in modern Russia and to account for the majority of its problems.

During the nineteenth century, the history of architecture was not taught as an independent subject in Russian schools, but was closely linked to design. Certainly, there were lectures on classical orders, historical ornamentation,
and important buildings of the past, but the most promising young architects were sent abroad to further their knowledge by working on reconstructions and measurements of the buildings of Greco-Roman antiquity. Only during the early years of the twentieth century, on the eve of World War I, were true history courses introduced in St. Petersburg and Moscow architecture schools. Exercises analyzing ancient monuments were implemented; despite being based on minimal research, they displayed a high level of artistic quality, which is maintained to the present day.

After 1917, the Russian avant-garde preferred theory to history, and several groups of radical artists and architects in VHUTEMAS proposed alternative theories. The brilliant Stanislav Noakovky taught a course there entitled “Architectural History of the World,” in which he impressed his students with the magnificent drawings he made on the blackboard of all the buildings he examined. The current practice of asking students to draw sketches of the most important historic monuments during exams in modern Russian architectural schools dates from this period. The investigation of the qualities of architectural space and experimentation with abstract spatial arrangements that were so important for VHUTEMAS could not help but lead to an appreciation of historic architecture.14 While Soviet authorities abolished the new trends in art in the early 1930s, architectural historians maintained their interest in the analysis of spatial compositions.

Despite the earlier countervailing influences, the teaching of historical subjects to architects in Russia is strongly informed by Soviet neoclassicism of the 1930s to 1950s. Between 1932 and 1934, different architectural groups were brought together to form the Union of Soviet Architects. The responsibility for creating a policy of construction and architecture was assigned to the newly established Academy of Architecture of the U.S.S.R., which founded a special institution to pursue research on the history of world architecture and the building traditions of the different peoples of the Soviet Union. The Moscow Architectural Institute was ordered to prepare a national curriculum, and a Department of the History of Architecture and Town Planning was established. Its professors were the same scholars who conducted research at the Academy of Architecture. They devised a structure for teaching historical subjects and developed methods that influence contemporary practice.

Current Traditions and Their Formation

MARHI has preserved its original methods of teaching classical architecture in design and art training. They include drawing copies of ancient statues, and rendering in pencil and Chinese ink wash the Greek and Roman orders and elevations and perspectives of historic buildings. MARHI values the coexistence or synthesis of arts. This explains the broad artistic training (in drawing, painting, and sculpture)
and the importance of the history of art in the curriculum. Since the 1930s, the survey titled “General History of Art” has been the first course future architects take. As developed by Alexander Gabritchevsky, a well-known theoretician of the Russian avant-garde, it treated the fine and decorative arts, as well as major architectural styles, in a synthetic manner. When Gabritchevsky was replaced by faculty holding more traditional views, the course was changed to conform to official university policy: from the 1930s to the 1990s, the Russian Middle Ages were not discussed in depth because of official Soviet atheism, and the Russian avant-garde and twentieth-century Western art were excluded altogether. During the period of comparative liberalization of the Soviet ideology in the early 1960s, Kirill Afanasiev, who had studied at VHUTEMAS, brought a breath of fresh air to the teaching of art history for architects, following Gabritchevsky’s concept of the unity of visual arts in architectural creation.

The three-semester course called “General History of Architecture” was designed in the 1930s by Nikolai Brunov. Two semesters were devoted to the architectural history of the world and one to Russian architectural history. Brunov was educated in the art history department of Moscow University, which was then strongly influenced by the German pedagogical system. Brunov’s teaching centered on the classic monuments of antiquity and the Renaissance and consisted of formal analyses of composition and style. In the Soviet climate, he was forced to include social aspects that served the “Bolshevik taste,” although he himself never harbored Communist ideas. In comparison with his skillful analyses of architectural forms, his coverage of political and economic history in the Soviet manner seemed perfunctory. This uncomfortable coexistence still lingers in the teaching of architectural history in Russia.

Soviet neoclassicism led to a veritable worship of the architectural ensemble. Between 1930 and 1950, Soviet theoreticians considered the city as a unique architectural organism, subject to the laws of classical composition and style. Andrei Bounin, a primary promoter of this idea, initiated a course at MARHI on the history of town planning that covered the building of new towns in all countries and epochs, from ancient Greece and China to modern St. Petersburg. Following Karl Brinkmann, he investigated the evolutionary principles of cities. The course was to crown the architect’s training in history by providing him with an understanding of the artistic value of complex urban spaces.

In the 1940s and 1950s, the promoters of Soviet ideology began their struggle with cosmopolitanism: everything Soviet or Russian was valued over everything foreign. Many specialists in Western art and architectural history suffered from this political campaign, but ultimately “General History of Architecture” and the field itself survived. The course became more focused because “History of Russian Architecture” was turned into a specialized academic discipline and extended to two semesters (like “General History of Architecture”). While Russian architectural history became a more popular research and publication topic, its separation from foreign trends was a serious shortcoming. A chronology limited to the Soviet view of Russian political history provided the only framework for an understanding of the development of Russian architecture. Russian scholars are currently trying to overcome the artificial and long-standing isolation of the national heritage from the European heritage in order to correct the distorted impressions it gives.

On the whole, by the end of the 1960s the teaching of architectural history was uniform throughout the U.S.S.R. During the first year, “General History of Art” (including architectural styles) was taught parallel to the drawing and
study of classical orders in the design studio. The second year continued with “General History of Architecture”; the third concentrated on “History of Russian Architecture”; and the fourth was dedicated to “General History of Town Planning” (including Russia). Each involved seventy-two hours of lectures (over two semesters), two final exams, and an analytical assignment. Every year students were expected to conduct a short original research project, usually on a single monument; the presentations were not necessarily textual and more often took graphic form. The exercise examined the origin of the edifice and its relationship to buildings of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. To prepare their projects, students worked in direct contact with professors or their assistants in tutorials and seminars. The understanding was that the student would investigate the subject in terms of its proportions, composition, the role of the orders or decorative elements, and the hierarchy of viewpoints one experienced while “walking” around it. Often models of historic buildings, sometimes of rather high quality, were produced. Students could also choose a comparative exercise focusing on structures of the same or different epochs, styles, and types. It was popular to make models of unrealized designs or variants of well-known ones. Sometimes the students would draw chronological tables for a certain building type.

From the 1960s to the 1980s, such research was more rigorously conducted in “General History of Architecture” and “General History of Town Planning.” In the context of the latter, the tasks were normally more difficult and demanded a great deal of work. The most graphically skillful projects found their way into textbooks or monographs written by the professors. In “History of Russian Architecture,” primary attention was given to the dimensions of prominent monuments, underlining their proportions and metrological characteristics. Another popular exercise documented with photographs and drawings obscure historic buildings, which were and still are abundant in Russia. It was common for several students each year to get deeply involved in their original topics and to continue to study them in-depth for four years; many pursued the same subject in their Ph.D. theses. Among the current history faculty at MARHI and other Russian architectural schools are many scholars who followed this path.

The partial liberalization of Soviet ideology in the 1980s led to a new focus on history in architecture schools throughout the country. Two taboos were discarded: it became possible to discuss the Russian avant-garde and modern architecture in the West. New courses, such as “History of Soviet Architecture” and “History of Modern Foreign Architecture,” were introduced. They were taught differently from ones they replaced, which were already considered “traditional,” and concentrated more on visual information and classroom discussion. Analysis was not popular and soon disappeared altogether. While students were not enthusiastic about the new courses in Soviet architecture, which they saw as the “decadent” and irrelevant expression of the Communist regime, they were eager to learn what went on beyond the Soviet borders. We knew very little about the outside world; in the mid-1980s, it was difficult to find foreign architectural magazines in Moscow, let alone in the towns of far-flung Soviet architectural schools.

The government’s abolition of neoclassicism at the end of the 1950s and the introduction of industrial prefabricated construction led to the abandonment of Soviet historical styles in architecture. However, teaching changed much more slowly than practice, and historical subjects contin-
The Current System

Today architectural education in Russia is divided into three stages, each ending with a degree: bachelor (four years), specialist (two additional years), and magister (one more year). The Ph.D. (called “candidate of architecture” in Russia) program takes three more years and is devoted to individual research and the preparation of a lengthy dissertation.

The required history courses for the bachelor’s degree include “General History of Art” (which covers the history of Russian art and of modern art), “General History of Architecture,” “History of Russian Architecture,” and “General History of Town Planning.” Students have to pass twelve exams and prepare six analytical exercises, at least three of which are presented in graphic form. In the program for the degree of specialist, “History of Modern Russian Architecture” and “History of Modern Foreign Architecture” are also mandatory. Each of these one-semester courses has thirty-six lecture hours. For the small number of students in the magister’s program, MARHI offers seminars entitled “Contemporary Problems of the History and Theory of Architecture” and “Major Trends in Contemporary Art.”

As we have seen, this elaborate system was formed over a period of more than sixty years, modulated by the shifting attitudes toward architecture in the former Soviet Union and modern Russia. The consistent emphasis on the role of historical topics in architectural training is unusual, and the system may seem only remotely linked to the preparation of architects for practice. Formally and legally, this approach may be explained by the Ministry of Education’s policy of imposing a uniform structure and curriculum on all architectural schools in Russia. But the more significant reason is the belief that architects should have the widest professional culture possible, and this notion still permeates the pedagogy of Russian architectural schools. In Russia, architecture is considered closely connected to the humanities, and not to science or technology. It is regarded not only as a part of civilization, but of culture as well. History courses are designed to help the students understand the cultural aspects of the built environment. Yet, this creates a contradiction with the desire to teach architectural practice more effectively.

It is possible that too many courses are offered in Russian schools of architecture. Technical courses form an enormous percentage and include mathematics, descriptive geometry, different areas of the physics of construction, many branches of engineering, and building equipment. This situation has also been determined historically, going back to the 1930s, when the programs to train architects

ued to be taught. In the 1980s, Tatiana Savarenskaya modified the course on the evolution of town planning into a general history of urban culture.18

The fall of communism freed up a great deal of teaching time in Russian universities. After 1991, “scientific communism” and other ideological subjects were dropped from the curriculum and replaced in part by history; a required course on the political history of Russia was initiated, which counterbalanced the curious Soviet interpretation of history. At MARHI we decided to dedicate more time to art history, extending it from two to four semesters. The expansion allowed us to examine the religious aspects of medieval Russian art and to conclude with a comparison of the development of fine arts in the West and in Russia during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Figure 4 Student works for “General History of Architecture,”
Moscow Architectural Institute, 2001
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and construction engineers were consolidated. Although half a century has passed since their separation into two professional fields, future architects still have to study irrelevant technical subjects at the expense of history and design. There is even a new proposal to reduce the number of history courses in favor of engineering subjects. This would be a mistake. In order to establish a closer relationship between design and architectural practice, the content of history courses should be refocused on contemporary conditions in the architectural profession.

**Perspectives**

In Russia, architecture schools educate not only architects, but also industrial and computer designers and those who specialize in graphics, visual advertising, set design, and so on. In Moscow, St. Petersburg, and other large cities, young architects often receive commissions to redesign or renovate old Soviet apartments into more comfortable and prestigious housing. Aesthetic sensibility is as important as technological skill, calling for professionals with further training in art and historical styles. Hence, it is important to offer “General History of Art” in the beginning of the curriculum. Still having to convince students that architecture is, above all, art, at MARHI we direct their attention to modern and contemporary art to give them some exposure to the present-day artistic landscape and its origins.

“General History of Architecture” remains a central course in Russian schools despite its pronounced conservative bent. While the importance of acquiring a conventional body of knowledge is unquestioned, attempts are being made to expand the focus beyond the evolution of styles. It is especially interesting to introduce the students to different historical types of space and to discuss their underlying meanings. The problem of anthropogenic, man-made space is crucial for an approach that aims to construct vital links with political history, the history of ideas, and social anthropology.

The course on the history of Russian architecture has changed dramatically. The main goal of those who currently teach it is to cast some light on how Russian architecture reacted to Western influences during its thousand-year evolution. We do not ignore relations with the East, but we acknowledge that they were never as strong as the Western ones. We hope to show the students that many monuments of Russian architecture belong to a common European heritage. This requires a change in the presentation of Russian architectural history to include new information on foreign architects who practiced in Russia. Another vital task is to connect the history of Russian architecture with preservation issues, and to communicate the importance of designing in a way that is compatible with historical contexts. Today, when Russian cities and landscapes are being transformed so rapidly, this is our primary responsibility.

“General History of Town Planning” is now more broadly defined, covering the history of man-made landscapes. Ecological aspects, the influences of different communities on the environment, and the role of the architect in the resolution of such problems constitute its “front-line”
issues. Discussions of historic towns have to incorporate
garden history, the history of landscape, and paleogeogra-
phy, among other topics.

Dealing with the history of twentieth-century archi-
tecture in the U.S.S.R. and abroad, we still have to contest
Soviet and other dogmas. We are eager to depict as broad a
picture of architectural trends as possible, to speak not only
about the monuments of the Russian avant-garde and the
International Style, but also national variants of neoclassi-
cism, regionalism, and vernacular architecture. Our goal is
to enable the students to appreciate the complexity of the
origins of contemporary architecture.

Training the Restoration Specialists
The late 1960s and early 1970s saw a renewed interest in
history in the Soviet Union, as a result of weakening ideo-
logical control on the one hand, and a shared despair for
Bolshevik values on the other. This phenomenon led to a
greater appreciation of the monuments of the past. At the
same time, universal standards of preservation were
brought to the U.S.S.R. with the help of the International
Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), which
called much attention to issues of restoration. It should be
remembered that during World War II a great number of
historic buildings were destroyed, and from the 1920s to
the 1960s Soviet authorities ruined more churches and
palaces than the Nazi soldiers. The enormous need for
trained restorers was not met, as architecture schools did
not have appropriate programs. In the early 1970s,
MARHI inaugurated a special program, Architectural
Restoration and Reconstruction of Historic Towns, open to
students who had completed their third year.¹⁹ All design
teaching in the program was devoted to restoration, and
specialized training in restoration technology was initiated.
Sergei Podiapolsky prepared a course that examined the
history and modern practice of architectural restoration in
Russia and abroad.²⁰ His students engaged in intensive
research on historic buildings, using archival material, as
well as conducting fieldwork. The most devoted young his-
torians of architecture were trained in this program. The
lectures and seminars on the development and reconstruc-
tion of historic towns were organized as an independent
subject by Lev Andreev and Uliy Raninsky in the late 1980s
and the early 1990s. Unfortunately, the later economic dif-
ficulties and the crisis of the centralized cultural adminis-
tration significantly impeded the restoration efforts. The
program became less popular and turned its attention to
the adaptation of old buildings to new functions. Plans to
consolidate the departments of history of architecture,
town planning, and restoration to create a prominent cen-
ter for architectural history were not realized.

Training the Professional Architectural Historian
At the end of the 1970s, an experiment at MARHI aspired
to train architects to work instead as professional architec-
tural scholars from the beginning of their career (some stu-
dents did go on to practice architecture as well). A special
two-year program, which is still active today, was organized
by Oleg Shvidkovsky.²¹ Fourth-year students were admit-
ted on the basis of an examination that involved writing a
critical essay on a modern building, followed by a discus-
sion with professors on issues in architectural history. Each
year, a group of ten to fifteen students was accepted. In the
curriculum requirements, architectural design was replaced
by graphic architectural analysis accompanied by an
explanatory text. First-year students took lecture courses
and seminars entitled “Methodology of Architectural
Research,” “Architectural Criticism,” “Publishing and Edi-
tag,” and “Current Problems of Art History,” as well as an
additional foreign language. The second year was devoted
to production of the final work, which had to be presented
as a large graphic panel and a lengthy text.

The students worked in groups of two or three to a
professor. They chose their fields of research themselves
and the first-year exercises prepared them for the next year’s
more complex projects. The topics of both first- and sec-
ond-year projects have always been very diverse. They
could be linked to the history and theory of architecture, or
design issues. As a student of this program, I researched the
role played by the British architect Charles Cameron in the
creation of imperial gardens to the south of St. Petersburg,
while others analyzed, for instance, the viability of particu-
lar existing structures to be transformed into entertainment
centers for teenagers (Vera Son), and the evolution of
boulevards in Moscow (Alexei Tarhanov). Later, as a
teacher, I engaged the students in research topics such as
theatrical painting and the origin of landscape gardens
(Eugenia Mikulina) and neoclassicism in the residential
architecture of Moscow around 1910 (Tatiana Gne-
dovskaya).

Originally, graduates of the program found jobs in the
numerous research departments of design institutions and
in the preservation of historic monuments. After the disin-
tegration of the U.S.S.R. and the emergence of the new
economic order, such departments folded. Being a teacher
of architectural history ceased to be prestigious because of
the low university salaries. The program to educate histo-
rians and theoreticians of architecture still exists in MARHI,
but the students prefer to pursue other avenues. According to a recent survey, about 70 percent of the graduates practice architecture, 20 percent are employed at interior design, furniture, and architecture magazines (there is a remarkably high number of such publications in Russia, with more than sixty in Moscow alone), and only 10 percent are professional researchers and teachers of the history of architecture.

Present-day Faculty
Architects outnumber art historians as teachers of architectural history in contemporary Russia, particularly in schools and departments of architecture at the construction institutes in the provincial capitals of the Russian Federation. In the older educational centers of Moscow, St. Petersburg, and Ekaterinburg, art historians trained in university history departments play an important role. At MARHI we are trying to bring together specialists with different educational backgrounds, including architects, restorers, and art historians. The teaching staff of the previous generation was mostly male, whereas now, not only in Moscow but nationwide, women are more numerous and more active, especially in promoting new methods. Across Russia, professors of architectural history with backgrounds in architecture commonly work in design and construction, and their teaching situates concrete professional problems in a historical perspective. Art historians teaching architectural history tend to be more productive researchers and publish more, in professional or semiprofessional magazines as well as scholarly journals and books. It is crucial for students to be exposed to professors with differing professional experiences, points of view, artistic tastes, and attitudes to architecture and its history. As we would like to make students aware of their professional choices, we encourage collaboration between teachers of design, history, theory, and practice. This goal is not easily attained. Indeed, we are currently witnessing an increasing separation between the teaching of history and design, which leads to disastrous interpretations of historical styles in practice.

Russian architecture is at a crossroads. Some architects follow neomodernist trends from abroad and face difficulties in realizing their projects because of their lack of technological experience. Others attempt to adapt classical decorative elements to comparatively modern constructions in a kind of neoclassicism. In Moscow and St. Petersburg, a real struggle is taking place between neo-modernism and historicism, stemming from the demands of new Russian clients for whom historical forms signify prestige. The appeal of historical styles is also determined by a widespread distaste for the prefabricated structures of the late Soviet period. The intensive historical training in the Russian architectural schools further influences the aesthetic preferences of contemporary architects. Today architectural historians are more and more involved in developing aesthetic criteria for new buildings. The history and theory of architecture thus call for a rapprochement, and it cannot be achieved without devising new frameworks. In Russia, the most vital issue is the creation of a contemporary version of our national architectural heritage by comparing and analyzing its ties to the West. This is why a solid understanding of our distant and recent past is so essential.

Translated by Dr. Ekaterina Chorban

Appendix
The following is a list of registered architecture schools and faculties in Russia offering full programs in architectural history:

Faculty of Architecture, Altaysky State Technical University (Fakultet Arhitekturny, Altaysky Gosudarstvenny Téchnichesky Universitet), Barnaul
Faculty of Architecture, Belgorodsky State Technological Academy of Building Materials (Fakultet Arhitekturny, Belgorodsky Gosudarstvennaya Tekhnologicheskaya Akademiya Stroitelnih Materialov), Belgorod
Faculty of Architecture, Dalnevestochny Politechnic Institute (Fakultet Arhitekturny, Dalnevestochny Politekhnichesky Institut), Vladivostok
Faculty of Architecture, Groznensky Oil Institute (Fakultet Arhitekturny, Groznensky Neftianoy Institut), Grozny, Chechnya (not currently in operation)
Faculty of Architecture, Haravorsky State Technical University (Fakultet Arhitekturny, Haravorsky Gosudarstvenn Téchnichesky Universitet), Haravorsk
Faculty of Architecture, Irkutsky State Technical University (Fakultet Arhitekturny, Irkutsky Gosudarstvenn Téchnichesky Universitet), Irkutsk
Faculty of Architecture, Ivanovsky Academy of Architecture and Construction (Fakultet Arhitekturny, Ivanovskaya Akademiya Arhitektury i Stroitelsva), Ivanovo
Faculty of Architecture, Kazanskaya State Academy of Architecture and Construction (Fakultet Arhitekturny, Kazanskaya Akademiya Arhitektury i Stroitelsva), Kazan
Faculty of Architecture, Kostromskaya Academy of Agriculture (Fakultet Arhitekturny, Kostromskaya Akademiya Selskogo Hoziaystva), Kostroma
Faculty of Architecture, Krasnoyarskaya State Academy of Architecture and Construction (Fakultet Arhitekturny, Krasnoyarskaya Akademiya Arhitektury i Stroitelsva), Krasnoyarsk
Faculty of Architecture, Kubansky State University (Fakultet Arhitekturny, Kubansky Gosudarstvenn Universitet), Krasnodar
Faculty of Architecture, Magnitogorsky State Technical University (Fakultet Arhitekturny, Magnitogorsky Gosudarstvenn Téchnichesky Universitet), Magnitogorsk
Moscow Architectural Institute (Moskovskiy Arhitekturniy Institut), Moscow
Notes
1. State standards for the teaching of architecture were published by the Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation, Moscow, for the teaching program degree in the history of architecture and town planning in 1995, and the bachelor and specialist degrees in architecture in 2001.
2. A striking exception is the architecture department founded in 2001 at the venerable Sourikov Art School, whose program departs from MARHI standards (through special permission from the Ministry of Education) by emphasizing drawing and painting over the so-called building sciences.
4. Ibid., 119.
5. Vladimir Lisovskiy, Akademiya Hudogestv (Academy of Arts) (St. Peters-
8. See Leningradskaia istoriia-stroitel’noe izdeliia (Leningrad Institute of Engineering and Construction) (Leningrad, 1982).
12. Boris Anastasiya, Evgeniya Kiritchenko, et al., “Architekturnoe otde-
leniya Uchilisha givopisi, vajania i zodchestva i drugih utchebnych zave-
deny (Departments of architecture at the Moscow School of Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture, and other institutions),” in Ivanova-Vein, 250
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