

RESTORATION, REVITALIZATION OR LIQUIDATION: STRATEGIES OF ATTITUDE TO CULTURAL HERITAGE

Andrii MARKOVSKIY^{1*}, Olga LAGUTENKO²

¹ National Academy of Arts of Ukraine, Scientific Secretary of the Department of Plastic Arts Synthesis, 20, st. Boulvarno-Kudryavska, Kyiv, Ukraine.

² National Academy of Fine Arts and Architecture, Professor of department of Theory and History of Arts, 20, st. Voznesens'kyi uzviz, Kyiv, Ukraine.

Abstract

The article focuses on the main problems and socio-cultural and political challenges related to the attitude of the professional community, state bodies and society as a whole to cultural and artistic monuments. The issues of restoration/revitalization/reconstruction or elimination of cultural heritage were largely actualized as a result of the direct military invasion of the Russian invaders on the territory of Ukraine in order to destroy the country, Ukrainian self-identification and us as a separate, independent nation. The paper provides examples of complex discussion aspects in relation to artefacts of architecture and art of different political eras, different ideological orientation, practical significance, material value and the degree of destruction / preservation in the context of the transformation of society's attitude to them and the prospects for future post-war reconstruction.

Keywords: Restoration; Reconstruction; Reassignment of symbols; Architectural monument; Art monument; Avant-garde art; Monumental sculpture; Post-war restoration

Introduction

The large-scale Russian invasion presented Ukraine with several dramatic challenges, including the preservation of cultural monuments, the restoration of war-destroyed structures, districts and entire cities. In the conditions of severe limitation of resources and time, the question of a well-thought-out and consistent strategy of actions becomes more relevant than ever. However, despite the seemingly simple utilitarian nature of the task – "returning to the authentic state" of architectural and art monuments and building modern functional objects instead of destroyed typical buildings – a detailed analysis shows the complex multifacetedness and ambiguity of the issue.

The concept of "architectural monument" in modern perception began to crystallize in the European-North American cultural area after the unprecedented terrible destruction of the World War I, when, combined with the growing interest in one's own cultural identity against the background of the struggle for independence (or, conversely, an attempt to keep nations within the Empire by imposing titular narratives) [1], the possibility of losing material monuments of one's own history as a result of conflicts and cataclysms became obvious. The World War II, with its genocide (including the demolition of key cultural structures and the

* Corresponding author: andrii_markovskiy@ukr.net

destruction of artifacts of ideologically unacceptable art), massive bombing, tank storming of cities and mining, brought the loss of monuments to a new level, finally fixing in the mass consciousness the need to preserve the latter.

Numerous charters and resolutions of both professional congresses and political platforms during the second half of the 20th century promoted in the legal field and mass consciousness theses of the inadmissibility of the destruction of monuments of art and architecture. Meanwhile, actual military conflicts indicate the lack of real mechanisms for protecting cultural heritage, declarative, manipulative, and, sometimes, outright inaction and bias of organizations that were assigned the mission of preserving cultural and artistic heritage. Returning to the Russian invasion of Ukraine: the exact number of destroyed objects and lost art artifacts can only be determined after the end of the war, because their number is increasing every day. However, the catastrophic number of losses, commensurate only with the events of World War II, is already obvious. Therefore, the issue of preservation and restoration is critically relevant for the national present.

Results and discussion

Meanwhile, turning to this issue more specifically, we are faced with a dualistic paradox of relation to the very concept of "preservation/restoration of monuments", which differs for architecture and fine arts as such. Regarding fine arts, in particular works of sculpture and painting (to which, in the context of the specific topic of the article, it would be appropriate to add monuments of archeology and decorative and applied arts), there are elaborate and effective methods of conservation, restoration and museification, which, in fact, are aimed at returning monuments the most authentic, in our case, "pre-war" condition. «The restoration industry is quite conservative; it adheres to the criteria for defining a work of art and the basics of preserving and reproducing a work of art that developed during the 20th and 21st centuries, in which restoration includes painting, murals, sculpture, carving, iconostasis, furniture, fabrics» [2].

In relation to architecture, it is the question of returning to the previous appearance (and, most importantly, functionality) that is very ambiguous and definitely not universal due to its very nature. Architecture cannot exist as a "thing-in-itself", "l'Art pour l'Art", requiring constant material support for its state, which is impossible without functioning.

Researchers *M. Orlenko* and *Yu. Ivashko* [2], based on the works of A. Marder, note: «Despite architecture and art have consolidating common features, the above-mentioned differences are in their final objective works of art are aimed at the creation of the aesthetic values, while architecture is aimed at the making of the material and practical values of utilitarian purpose; the aesthetic values in architecture is the by-product and addition to its functional goal».

Architecture, devoid of visitors or residents, is itself rapidly falling into ruins. Its objects are mostly too large to be transferred to museums and too expensive to be left as just artistic artifacts. Because of this, at all times, architectural objects were not "museumified" in the literal sense, but were restored and revitalized, filled with new functions: former castles were turned into museums or hotels; palaces for exhibition halls; stables and workshops for parking lots, restaurants or even loft housing etc.

As for the historically formed urban development, there are even more questions: "classic" urban plans are not designed for modern traffic, zonal distribution and, often, sanitary

and hygienic requirements (starting from insulation, ending with heating networks, water supply, sewerage, garbage collection sites etc.).

In other words, when restoring an object destroyed by war, we face a dilemma of the relationship between authenticity and revitalization. The question is not new at all, but it is so complex that there are still no formulas generally accepted by society and specialists, so for each specific situation the proportion is determined individually (which, again, often causes suspicions of incompetence or dishonesty, broad discussions, manipulation of public opinion etc.).

The degree of damage and loss for each of the objects should be determined individually. If for a typical development, the elimination of a damaged structure and its future reproduction or replacement is a purely pragmatic issue, other categorical criteria of aesthetics and value that directly correlate with authenticity are applied to monuments. Meanwhile, even a typical development can acquire a certain symbolic value in connection with related events. In this case, in case of damage, it cannot simply be liquidated (without losing this added symbolic value). As an example, we can cite a series of works by the famous street artist Banksy, created by him in the fall of 2022 on the ruins in several Ukrainian cities affected by the occupation.

Banksy's action gave rise to a debate about the fate of the murals: whether it would be appropriate to leave them at the place of creation (and, accordingly, not to restore the typical residential development, preserving it in a state of destruction); whether to move them to museums with the loss of the context of the environment; or, perhaps, to restore the buildings by integrating the murals into the restored structures (which, however, will not allow replacing the outdated building with a fundamentally modern one and, at the same time, leaving the authentic place of the work of art, will deprive it of an atmospheric contextual environment). Similar disputes have occurred before: a well-known example of the Kaiser Wilhelm Memorial Church in Berlin, which, under public pressure, was decided not to reconstruct, but left mothballed in a state of destruction after World War II as a symbolic object [3].

Restoration is an extremely expensive and lengthy process, but the reconstruction of a damaged object often, due to technical aspects, costs several times more than its restoration. Given the need to quickly restore a large amount of housing stock, infrastructure, and preserve partially damaged monuments that have minor losses; the discussion about the possible elimination of severely damaged objects with their future reproduction instead of restoration, unfortunately, sometimes seems justified. Which only reinforces the tragic consequences of the war.

In the case of architectural and sculptural monuments, the issue often goes beyond the specific object, affecting the overall ensemble of the surrounding development. As an example, we can cite the Transfiguration Cathedral destroyed by the Russian invaders in Odesa: on the one hand, the building itself is not authentic, but only a reconstruction of the monument of the classicism era, destroyed by the Bolsheviks in 1936. On the other hand, the architect-restorer S. Yurchenko in several interviews expertly noted that the reconstruction of the cathedral played an important role in preserving the integral urban planning ensemble of the historical center of Odesa, listed as a UNESCO World Heritage Site [4].

In particular our, Ukrainian, realities, the issue of returning to the "pre - war state" also often comes into confrontation with another important factor - the issue of decommunization or, more broadly, cultural de-occupation, which often concerns monuments of architecture and art and related objects. There is a dispute between authenticity and once-hostile imperial narratives, which occurs in a fairly short period of time since the beginning of the era of Independence. Taking as an alternative the need to eliminate the occupation identity and propaganda symbols,

we must decide every time for each object what exactly should not be restored, or restored with other symbols, or carry out renaming / reassignment. If it is a survivor, then what exactly should be dismantled; destroy the removed parts after dismantling or transfer them to special museums and storage facilities etc.

Naturally, the implementation of the decommunization program has exacerbated many socio-political, cultural and artistic problems. The movement of decommunization gradually spread from the era of Perestroika in the USSR and further from the beginning of the era of independence of Ukraine. One of the still unresolved issues, painful and at the same time paradoxical, is how to relate to the art of the classical avant-garde in Ukraine, which during the era of strict ideological censorship in the USSR was destroyed or, at best, was hidden in remote special preservation funds, away from exhibitions and permanent museum expositions. The creative methods of artists of the 1910s-1930s were mostly recognized by Soviet ideology as a formalism harmful to the culture of socialist society.

The era of Perestroika and the era of Independence lifted the ban on the exhibition and study of modernist art. This, in fact, has started the process of restoring the integrity of the picture of the development of Ukrainian Art in the first third of the twentieth century. This process can be compared to the restoration of a canvas of the history of art, which has undergone superficial recording of individual parts, rough painting of others, distortion of the connections of elements in the composition.

Over the past thirty years, the efforts of scientists and researchers have returned to the integral history of Ukrainian Art in the first third of the twentieth century the names of artists who were previously deleted by Soviet censorship, little-known works, even entire stylistic trends such as Cubo-Futurism, expressionism [5], schools – as the school of *G. Narbut* and *V. Krichevsky* [6], *M. Boychuk* [7], expanded the context of the analysis of the work of individual creators of avant-garde art [8]. At the same time, works from museum vaults were often reproduced for the first time, and before getting into the expositions, they passed through the caring hands of restorers.

Since the early 1990s, the exhibition of avant-garde art in museums of Ukraine and abroad has become widespread: "Avant-garde & Ukraine" (Villa Stuck Munchen, 1993) [9], "Ukrainian Modernism. 1910-1930» (Chicago, Ukrainian Institute - New York, Ukrainian Museum, 2006) [10]. In April 2007, an outstanding international conference was held at Harvard University called "Ukrainian Modernism in Context: 1910 to 1930" [11], which for the first time brought together the most famous researchers from Ukraine, the USA, Canada, France, and the Czech Republic; in 2019, the 36th edition of Harvard Ukrainian Studies was published under the general title "Ukrainian Modernism". During the war in 2022-2023, the exhibitions "in the epicenter of the storm: Modernism in Ukraine. 1900-1930s " (National Museum of Thyssen-Bornemisss, Madrid) and "Modernism in Ukraine of the 1900s and 1930s" (Ludwig Museum, Cologne), "Kaleidoscope of stories. Ukrainian Art 1912-2023" (Albertinum of State Art Collections, Dresden).

But the question remains whether to exhibit and publish the works of avant-garde masters that were created under the influence of the ideology of the Soviet state. If they are withdrawn, the newly "restored" picture of the development of Fine Art of this era will be incomplete. The problem of exhibiting and studying the art of modernism today is also a small number of original works that have come down to our time, most of them were destroyed by wars or because of the repression of them by the ruling ideology during the Soviet era.

Among the few surviving monuments of the masters who best represent the art of the avant-garde, there are also those associated with revolutionary realities and symbols. For

example, the famous constructivist Vasyl Yermilov has a memorial plaque "January 21, 1924. 6.50 pm" (Ludwig Museum, Cologne). This work shows the exact date of V.I. Lenin's death, although it can be visually perceived as a perfect composition, where figures are cut out of a red plywood background, upholstered along the contour with shiny nails laid in a measured and expressive way. His memorial plaque "Horky. 18.50. 21.01.1924" (Fond Fine Art Ltd., London), representing a composition of two squares, at their intersection the metal numbers "18.50" have frozen has the same dedication.

For Vasyl Yermilov, as for many of his contemporaries, the name Lenin was perceived as a symbol of the Revolutionary era, the creators of avant-garde art were close to the idea of transforming the world. In general, reality was perceived by the master's as if through certain lenses, which were created by official reports in newspapers, speeches on the radio, where facts were passed through a selected ideological "mesh". Thus, works belonging to the art of the avant-garde are not devoid of the component that brings them under the requirements of decommunization.

If in relation to works of Fine Art the issue can be resolved to a certain extent either by creating special exhibitions in museums, or, in the worst case, by transferring part of the works to funds, that is, "postponing the issue for the future", then in relation to architecture and monumental sculpture, the discussion becomes much more acute.

On the one hand, these objects in most cases represent a significant artistic value, because the best resources were provided to their creation and the most talented masters were involved. The Bolshevik-Communist Party skillfully managed the possibilities of presenting information in the right frame and accent. Plastic art was given an outstanding mission in the social project. So, the decree of April 12, 1918 "On the removal of monuments erected in honor of tsars and their servants, and the development of projects of monuments of the Russian socialist revolution", better known as the "Plan of Monumental Propaganda", was adopted and gained force literally in the first months of the arrival of the new government, and then its influence covered seven decades of the development of monumental plastic in the cities and villages of the USSR.

On the other hand, the relevant objects, precisely because of their political and propaganda mission, should be removed from the public space in our time as a matter of priority. Unfortunately, for more than 30 years of Independence, the authorities, through various political manipulations and external influences, have not listened to the demands of the professional community and the active public, demanding the creation of special Skansen museums for monuments of the totalitarian occupation regime, such as those that were implemented in other countries that were undergoing the process of decommunization.

In Ukraine today, there are examples of ironic reassignment and new "use" of monumental statues. So, a unique application for sculpture of the era of totalitarianism and socialism was found by the private owner of the Frumushika Nova ethnic estate near Odessa. He arranged monumental sculptures of chieftains in a circle, like the menhirs at Stonehenge. It turned out to be such a vicious circle of idols. The monument to Lenin in Odessa underwent an ironic transformation, receiving a new image – the main antihero of one of the most famous movie franchises - The Dark Lord Darth Vader. Which, in our opinion, is also a philosophical reinterpretation through satire.

A symbol of social confrontation was the monument to Lenin in Kiev at the intersection of the central streets – Khreshchatyk and Taras Shevchenko Boulevard. First, in June 2009, activists of the Svoboda Party damaged the main parts of the statue – the leader's face and arm. In the same year, the monument was officially stripped of its status as a monument of national

significance. But thanks to the efforts of the Communist Party of Ukraine (now banned), it was restored and preserved. In the end, the lack of response of the authorities to a social request for dismantling led to a social riot, the symbol of which was the overthrow of the monument: during Euromaidan in late November 2013, the monument was doused with red and bloody paint, and on December 8 it was overthrown. By the force of the protesting crowd, it was smashed to pieces with sledgehammers as a sign of the symbolic destruction of Leninism in Ukraine.

The designated monument, unlike numerous standard copies, was unique: according to the project of Architects O. Vlasov and V. Yelizarov, designed in the summer of 1944, was to install a sculpture created by the Moscow sculptor S. Merkurov in 1938 for the USSR Pavilion at the world's fair in New York. The figure of the leader was made of red polished granite, had a height of 3.45 meters, it was placed on a cylindrical pedestal with a height of 6.8 meters. The opening took place on December 5, 1946. Accordingly, the lack of a timely response of the authorities during the days of Independence to the society's request for dismantling in a legal way, led to the irreversible loss of the artifact, which should have been removed from the public space, but could be museumified as an exhibit and as a symbol of totalitarian art.

Free from the image of Lenin, the pedestal became the site of temporary installations that were supposed to re-designate the abandoned fragment. Already in February 2014, the "Golden Toilet" appeared here as a symbol of corruption, which was sought to be destroyed together with the then-ruling government of V. Yanukovich; then in the same month, the installation "100 golden mannequins" by T. Voytovych was created as an image of the young generation transforming the country. In 2016, the platform of cultural initiatives "IZOLYATSIA" (Insulation) proposed a temporary art project "Social Agreement", within the framework of which art installations were to be placed on the Lenin monument for a certain short period of time. Thus, since 2017, the works of Mexican artists S. Gutierrez ("Inhabiting the Shadows") and I. Carrillo ("The Ritual of Nature"), Iranian artist M. Baksha ("Endless Celebration"), Ukrainians O. Zolotaryov ("Confrontation") and P. Gronsky ("Reflection"), Romanian sculptor B. Rácz ("Middle Way") have appeared on the site of the dismantled monument.

On Khreshchatyk in October 1977, another monument to Lenin was erected, the opening of which was dedicated to the 60th anniversary of the October Revolution. The authors were sculptors V. Borodai, I. Znoba, V. Znoba, architects O. Malinovsky and M. Skivitsky. The full name of the monument is written on a granite pedestal in bronze letters – "in honor of the Great October Socialist Revolution". It became the dominant feature of the central square of the city. Wide terraces-stairs led to bronze sculptural images of a worker, a worker, a soldier and a sailor (the height of each figure is 5.25 meters), and behind them against the background of the banner-pylon (18.4 meters high) the figure of Lenin (8.9 meters high) rose, made, like the pylon, of Red Granite. After the declaration of independence in 1991, the decision of the Kyiv City Council to dismantle the monument was made, which was implemented on September 12 of the same year. Heavy granite parts were transported to the territory of the Museum of Kyiv.

In 2001, a monument was erected on the same site in honor of the tenth anniversary of Ukraine's Independence. The triumphal column (52 meters high) rises above the architectural form, stylized as the image of a church in the Ukrainian baroque style. The prototype of the church was the Zaborovsky gate of the 18th century – the main entrance to the territory of St. Sophia Cathedral, the main shrine of Kyivan Rus. The column is crowned with a 9-meter bronze statue of Berehynya-Oranta (The Lady Guardian), made by sculptor A. Kushch. Berehynya in national dress holds a branch of viburnum above her in her hands like a rainbow,

the wide sleeves of her shirt turn into wings spread in the sky. The total height of the monument reaches 62 meters, the female image of the Goddess Berehynya is always high in the sky, a viburnum branch (a symbol of the native land, a symbol of Ukraine) sparkles with gold, as do the folk national ornaments on the costume.

However, in the case of Monumental Propaganda in architecture, museumification with transportation to a special Skansen is often technically impossible. Numerous structures, especially administrative buildings in the centers of Ukrainian cities, contain coats of arms, flags, emblems and other political and propaganda symbols. In some cases, as with the building of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, built in 1936 by architect Y. Langbard as the House of the Central Committee of the CP(B)U, the Soviet coat of arms was covered from above with a shield with a Trident. In other cases, as with ceramic ornaments on residential buildings on Khreshchatyk Street, such coverings are not very possible. This, accordingly, gives rise to numerous professional and non-professional discussions, significantly induced by the hybrid war with Russia.

Even in the case of some sculptures, moving is difficult to implement, expensive, and can significantly affect artistic value. An example of such a "problem" is the monument to the Soviet political figure Artem (F. Sergeyev) in Svyatogorsk, created by I. Kavaleridze in 1927. It has a special value, because it belongs to the monuments created according to the "Plan of Monumental Propaganda" of the post-revolutionary era, there are almost no such authentic objects left in Ukraine.

The sculpture, made in the late 1910s-early 1920s, was mostly temporary in nature, often created from plywood, boards, gypsum, and sometimes cement. The monuments destroyed during further military operations were not restored. Their avant-garde plastic solutions in the style of Cubism, Futurism or Constructivism from the early 1930s did not meet the requirements of the customer, the time of compromise solutions of cooperation between party and state authorities with avant-garde artists came to naught and ended with the transition to directive requirements for the introduction of a single method of socialist realism. The first monument to Artem by Kavaleridze, erected in 1924 in Bakhmut, was destroyed and not restored after the Second World War.

In Svyatohirsk, the monumental monument to Artem (made of reinforced concrete) is installed on a separate hill, the highest in the landscape, a pyramid-shaped pedestal creates a solid foundation on which a fifteen-meter figure rises. This is a real Colossus, depressing a person with its scale. Next to him, you feel like a bug, and this impression is enhanced by the fact that the decisive protrusion of the knee rises above you, the fist rises higher, and already somewhere in the sky – the strict outline of the head. Artem seems to rise above the huge crowd, making a speech-appeal, clenching his fists. The quote written on the pedestal is eloquent: "Nothing annoys me as much as the sight of an unorganized mass."

Given the personality of Artem, the monument in Svyatohirsk is already under threat of liquidation. Since the late 1990s, it has been actively opposed by monks of the Holy Dormition Svyatohirsk Lavra, which is located on the neighboring hills of the Siversky Donets River Coast. The monastery settlement has existed on this site since ancient times, since the XIII century. Perhaps it contrasted with the monastery where the monument was erected in 1927. In our time, the monks call him a pagan idol that rises above the Lavra, so he must be overthrown.

Further, the idea of eliminating the monument was joined by numerous voices in the company of decommunization in the 2010s and decolonization in the 2020s, because a huge monument in honor of the Communist-Bolshevik, the leader of the revolutionary events in Ukraine, the Russian politician F. Sergeev has no right to continue to exist. A large and lengthy

discussion unfolded: how to perceive this monument - to take into account its political content in the first place or as a work of art, an example of Cubo-Futuristic sculpture, as the largest work of this stylistic direction not only in Ukraine, but also in the world.

As a result of the Russian invasion of Ukraine, during a large-scale war in the fall of 2022, the invaders targeted the churches of the Holy Dormition Svyatohirsk Lavra, and the monument to Artem served as a target for them. The head in the monument received the greatest damage. After the liberation of the city of Svyatohirsk, thanks to private efforts and funding, the monument to Artem was restored. What will be its future fate – the question remains open.

Similarly, the issue of restoring the buildings of the Holy Dormition Svyatohirsk Lavra, as well as other numerous churches destroyed or partially damaged by invaders in the war zone, is problematic. In the context of a hybrid war with Russia, at key points in the historical landscape, the dispute is actualized not only between Soviet ideological "secular" and pre-revolutionary "religious" art and architecture, but also within the imagery of the most sacred monuments. Now not only the professional community, but also the general public is increasingly paying attention to systematic examples of deliberately inaccurate restoration or even processing of surviving authentic sacred objects of the Mazepa Baroque era in the style of "Russian" classicism with the replacement of the characteristic pear-shaped forms of baths and crosses (of various shapes), respectively, with domes – "poppies" and eight-pointed crosses, characteristic of Russian, and not Ukrainian cult architecture. In the case of reconstruction, discussions often arise about which form (or rather, in which of the stages) to restore a particular sacred object.

Decommunization and decolonization through monumental art continues in Ukraine and in Kyiv, including during martial law. An example of the reassignment and transformation of an existing monumental sculpture is taking place literally today. The celebration of Independence Day in the conditions of the war with the Russian invaders is timed to remove the Coat of Arms of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic from the shield on the "Motherland" monument and install the Trident in its place in this monumental sculptural image, which has been renamed "Ukraine-Mother".

The monument was opened on May 9, 1981, for the anniversary of the victory, the memorial complex was called "Ukrainian State Museum of the history of the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945". The authors are sculptor V. Borodai, architects V. Yelizarov, G. Kyslyi, M. Feshchenko. In 2015, the museum was renamed – "National Museum of the history of Ukraine in World War II", and the monument remained unchanged from the state symbols. The sculptural image is designed in the tradition of Soviet monumental plastic art, installed on a high hill above the Dnipro. The pedestal in the form of a cut cone has a height of 40 meters, the sculpture is 62 meters, so the total height is 102 meters.

The monument is unique in many ways: grandiosity of size – the highest sculpture in Europe and in the top four highest sculptures in the world; complexity of structures located inside the mold, designed for stability under various natural tests; unique technology of metal alloy – steel with the addition of titanium; technology of execution – a solid welded steel mold of 27 multi-ton blocks, for the connection of which about 30 km of welding seams are laid.

The sculpture very succinctly represents the image of a woman in full height, the heroine holds a shield and a sword in her raised hands. The monument was not initially perceived positively by the people of Kyiv, it violated the gentle line of the Dnipro Hills, argued with the images of ancient churches [12], represented the art of socialist realism and the state pressure of the Soviet government. Only in 2022-2023, this image caused close public attention to detail. It

turned out that the figure is dressed in an antique chiton, which resembles the statue of Pallas Athena by the ancient Greek sculptor Phidias; the face has a majestic calm, a Ukrainian artist posed as a model. The pose of a woman, her raised hands lead associations to the Goddess-Berehynya, to the image of Oranta in the Cathedral of St. Sophia of Kiev. But the most important thing is the inverted statue of the warrior in the direction of the East, to Moscow. Therefore, during the offensive on Kyiv by the Russian invaders at the beginning of a large-scale war, in all subsequent days and nights of shelling of the capital, this image acquired a new definition-irresistible steadfastness and heavenly patronage.

A broad discussion and subsequent replacement of the coat of arms of the Ukrainian SSR with a Trident completed the reassignment of the monumental sculptural image. The sculpture got rid of the symbol of the Soviet republic and immortalized the symbol of Ukrainian statehood. The monument became a symbol of the struggle against the invaders, the independence of Ukraine, so decommunization, decolonization and de-occupation were combined in this act and acquired a visualized perpetuation.

Conclusions

Ukrainian architecture and art are now in a multi-variant and multi-vector socio-cultural environment without a holistic concept of development and restoration. The study, comprehension and reassessment of previous experience are particularly relevant in times of crisis and military aggression.

A sign of wartime was the great activity of society in relation to all the challenges and issues raised by tragic events. Discussions that unfold on social networks on the internet find echoes in newspaper analytical articles, in the presentation of political and cultural news, and eventually lead to some official decisions of the state authorities. This process of involving the broad masses in the consideration of pressing socio-cultural problems requires significant competent expert support.

The prospect of post-war reconstruction generates numerous discussions, raises and will continue to raise many practical and ideological questions. One thing is clear – these challenges should be addressed. Consistently, as far as possible, but to solve here and now, without delaying it, as has often been done since 1991, which, in the end, has become one of the main reasons for the dramatic events that Ukraine is going through now.

References

- [1] A. Markovskiy, **From Modern to Modernism: Three Stages of Kyiv Architecture**, The Modern Art Research Institute of the National Academy of Arts of Ukraine, Kyiv, 2020, p. 320.
- [2] M. Orlenko, Y. Ivashko, *The concept of art and works of art in the theory of art and in the restoration industry*, **Art Inquiry. Recherches sur les arts**, XXI, 2019, pp.171-190. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26485/AI/2019/21/12>.
- [3] M. Falser, *Trauerarbeit an Ruinen – Kategorien des Wiederaufbaus nach 1945*, In: M. Braum and U. Baus (Eds.), **Rekonstruktion in Deutschland: Positionen zu einem umstrittenen Thema**, Birkhäuser, Basel 2009, p. 112. ISBN 978-3-0346-0067-5.
- [4] * * *, UNESCO - World Heritage Centre, *The Historic Centre of Odesa*, <https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1703>
- [5] D. Horbachev (Ed.), **Ukrainian Avant-Garde 1910-1930**, Mustetstvo, Kyiv, 1996, p. 400.

- [6] O. Lagutenko, **Ukrainian Graphics of the First Third of the 20th Century** (Original name: **Ukrayinska grafika pershoyi tretyny` XX stolittya**), Grani-T, Kyiv, 2006, p. 240.
- [7] L. Sokolyuk, **Mykhailo Boychuk and his School**, Savchuk O., Kharkiv, 2014, p. 386.
- [8] O. Lagutenko, *Vasyl Iermilov in the Context of Ukrainian and European Art of the First Third of the Twentieth Century*, **Harvard Ukrainian Studies** 36(3-4), pp. 351-387.
- [9] Jo-A.B. Danzker, I. Yassenjawsy, J. Kiblitky M.V. Stuck (Eds.), **Avantgarde and Ukraine**, Klinkhardt and Biermann, Munhen, 1993, p. 198.
- [10] A. Melnik, **Ukrainian Modernism, 1910-1930** (english edition), 2006, p. 288.
- [11] H. Hryn (Ed.), **Harvard Ukrainian Studies**, 36(3-4), 2019. p. 522.
- [12] A. Markovskiy, V. Tovbych, O. Lagutenko, *The role of the river, active landscape and greenery in the formation of urban development in Kyiv*, **Landscape Architecture and Art**, 19(19), 2021. pp. 43-51. DOI: 10.22616/j.landarchart.2021.19.04
-

Received: November 20, 2023

Accepted: February 10, 2024

© 2024. This work is published under <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>(the “License”). Notwithstanding the ProQuest Terms and Conditions, you may use this content in accordance with the terms of the License.