

TRENDS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL IDENTITY IN
ARCHITECTURE*Olga SEMENYUK*

L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Department of Architecture, 010000, 5 K. Munaitpasov Str., Almaty district,
Astana, Kazakhstan
e-mail: semenyuk-1966@inbox.ru

Natalya Alekseevna CHERNYSH

L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Department of Architecture, 010000, 5 K. Munaitpasov Str., Almaty district,
Astana, Kazakhstan
e-mail: prakrity@mail.ru

Yelena Nikolaevna KHVAN

L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Department of Architecture, 010000, 5 K. Munaitpasov Str., Almaty district,
Astana, Kazakhstan
e-mail: Khvan-72@mail.ru

Rahima CHEKAEVA

L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Department of Architecture, 010000, 5 K. Munaitpasov Str., Almaty district,
Astana, Kazakhstan
e-mail: Rahima.chekaeva@mail.ru

Oxana Nikolaevna TKACH

RSE „Gosgradkadastr“, 010008, 19 Imanov Str., Astana, Kazakhstan
e-mail: ton-17@mil.ru

Botakoz KASSIMOVA

L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Department of Architecture, 010000, 5 K. Munaitpasov Str., Almaty district,
Astana, Kazakhstan
e-mail: Botagoz.rahmetollaevna@mail.ru

Zhazira Seralievna BISSENOVA

L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Department of Architecture, 010000, 5 K. Munaitpasov Str., Almaty district,
Astana, Kazakhstan
e-mail: Bisenova_1983@mail.ru

Abay Dildashevich OTARBAYEV

L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Department of Architecture, 010000, 5 K. Munaitpasov Str., Almaty district,
Astana, Kazakhstan
e-mail: abay87072104545@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The issue of national identity in architecture has two main aspects: retrospective (historical) and modern with a view to the further development of architectural and construction practices. Recent controversial years have shown that the further formation of national characteristics of architecture needs to be devoted to a fundamental shift from the external, formal features to their inner, meaningful essence. The history of architecture indicates that national elements in architecture may be developed regardless of the architectural style, i.e. they may be inherent in any style. This is due to the fact that the concept of “national character” has a deeper meaning than the external architectural forms or decor.

Keywords: national architecture, cultural identity, regionalism

I TREND NELLO SVILUPPO DELL'IDENTITÀ NAZIONALE IN ARCHITETTURA

SINTESI

La questione dell'identità nazionale in architettura ha due aspetti principali: quello retrospettivo (storico) e quello moderno con la prospettiva del futuro sviluppo di pratiche architettoniche e di costruzione. Le controversie degli anni recenti hanno dimostrato che l'accento nella formazione di caratteristiche architettoniche nazionali in futuro debba spostarsi dagli elementi formali esterni all'elemento interno, la sostanza. La storia dell'architettura indica che gli elementi nazionali si possono sviluppare indipendentemente dallo stile architettonico, ovvero, possono essere inerenti a qualsiasi stile. Questo perché il concetto di "carattere nazionale" ha un significato più profondo che trascende le forme architettoniche esterne o dell'arredamento.

Parole chiave: architettura nazionale, identità culturale, regionalismo

INTRODUCTION

The research of the peculiarities of form shaping in architecture, the content and imagery of the architectural form, which is still relevant for the understanding of the creative process, the correlation of national features in architecture have always been a matter of debate. A considerable amount of work is devoted to the consideration of these issues at every stage of architecture development.

In recent years, the world of architecture has been filled with new research works changing the professional ideas about the laws of creation and understanding of the image in architecture. For example, the semiotic approach to the formation of objects is observed in the works of D. Broadbent (1987), R. Venturi (1998), C. Jenks (1971), B. Zevi (1957), U. Eco and T. A. Sebeok (1984), K. Norberg-Schultz (2000), M. Tafuri (1989), R. Fusco (1984), E. Barbyshev (1991), A. Gutnov (1984), A. Ikonnikov (2002), B. Markuzon (1970), E. Rossinskaya (1992), Yu. Stepanov (1971), B. Uspenskiy (1971), I. Lezhava (2012), A. Fomenko (1999), S. Shubovich (2012), S. Shlipchenko (1976), I. Morozov (2012), O. Popova (2008), S. Petrovčič & V. Kilar (2017) etc. The basis for these publications was the solution to the problem of meaningfulness of the architectural image of buildings of various functional purpose, and the goal was the development of new approaches to the interaction of architecture with the adjacent subject areas –

philosophy, information theory, design – by introducing them to the methodology of architectural design.

Questions of architecture are on the agenda of many conferences, symposiums, where new techniques and concepts that could lead to the creation of ideal cities are discussed. Recently, urban environment and globalization have become the key concepts of social scientists, architects, and economic geographers observing (Eldemery, 2009).

As an art form, architecture reflects all aspects of community life: the political system, the level of culture, tastes in fashion and style. A large group of public buildings (for government and administrative management purposes, commercial and diplomatic missions, residence, etc.), having a clearly generated image, are an expression of the basic ideas of the epoch and society. Symbols and signs, which contain architectural objects, can reveal the principles upon which the society is based as well as its state and preferences, priority cultural and moral values (Grabovenko, 2010).

Engineering and technologies that have no national identity cannot solve complex problems in architecture today. In such a way, architecture has merged with the process of globalization, contributing to the development of national identity of individual regions.

The term 'globalization' was first used in the second half of the 20th century. However, this term and its concept were not popular until the second half of the 1980s (Holm, 2006). According to Adam (2008), globalization

is “a series of social, political and economic changes that affect everything from the operation of nations to everyday life” (Adam, 2008, 74-77). The tension between anti-global and pro-global forces that affect architecture has long existed. One force seeks to protect and develop indigenous architectural traditions, forms, decorative motifs and techniques. The other force contributes to the creation and dissemination of universal forms using new technologies and materials in response to changing functional needs and fashion trends. Global change is a new class of problems that “severely challenges our ability to achieve sustainable development” (Eldemery, 2009, 344).

Architects need to solve the problem of the expression and uniqueness of architecture as well as what is today called ‘cultural and national identity’, using new materials and technologies. That is why the search for ways to identify, acquire and preserve originality in the architecture of different countries and regions is becoming increasingly urgent. This was already felt at the sunset of the functional-planning dogma of architecture of the 1970s and 1980s. But the breakthrough in the “free flight” of charismatic postmodernism followed by the idea of a radical deconstruction of forms in architecture introduced more resonance in the architectural community. That is because the total disregard for style, the total indifference to cultural characteristics and traditions, and, as a consequence, indifference and arbitrariness in relation to new architectural structures, explain the painful tragedy that engulfed the civilization of megalopolis. The one which is doomed to “the homogeneous reproduction of the same thing in an endless process of identifying, in the universal cultural identity” (Baudrillard, 2005, 1).

In the process of searching for a modern style in architecture, it is necessary to solve the problem of an architectural form and national identity as a kind of a phenomenon which contributes to its formation and the reflection of the epoch in the form of an architectural object.

It is evident that in the modern world under strong globalization trends, regional identities did not disappear (Regional Architecture and Identity in the Age of Globalization, 2007). For example, the Gulf region in terms of the regional identity of architecture started to develop in the 1990s. Active construction was enhanced by oil revenues. It was the time of the gigantic rise of Arab Gulf cultures and architecture in a global context (Yasser, 2007, 6).

Relevance of the research question consists in the following issues:

- In the theory of architecture – the existing crisis in the style and imagery of modern architecture;
- The destruction of the system of direct communication between the object of architecture and the consumer;

- The loss of traditional signs-symbols in modern architecture that existed in the past and contributed to the definition of the image and the functional purpose of the object of architecture;
- In architectural practice – the lack of modern universal semantic principles of determining the image of architectural objects, the need to develop the foundations of architectural semantics in the context of the methodological foundations of the style of the XXI century.

The purpose of this research is to provide a theoretical rationale for a comprehensive study of the phenomena of national imagery in the architecture of residential and public buildings as an alternative and opportunity to overcome the impersonality of cities in particular regional and natural climatic conditions.

METHODS

The study used the following scientific methods:

- Analysis of literary sources for the study of urban planning typology and cultural identity of various regions;
- The analytical method for revealing the peculiarities of architectural means of forming modern and historic objects and the degree of influence of the elements of national culture on the formation of modern architecture;
- The system-structural method for assessing the existing urban environment of Kazakhstan and creating the ways to improve it by means of cultural and national identity;
- The method of a full-scale survey for identifying the peculiarities of forming the architecture of cities of Kazakhstan and its capital Astana.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The article revealed the connection between the architectural style and the elements of national identity as a phenomenon of the later order borrowing the imaginative possibilities of folk architecture. The authors proved the need to return to the national roots in the form shaping field in order to overcome the impersonality of modern cities, as a consequence of the loss of national identity and the rise of globalization.

The idea of style and its interpretation in architecture

An architectural composition binds the aesthetic needs of the society with its aesthetic ideal. This relationship is shown in the framework of a particular culture and reflects its intrinsic contradictory unity of the stable and variable, existing and emerging, general and special.

Style in architecture is a historically constituted rather stable entity of the means and methods of form shaping, and consequently, of the essential features of the architectural form, determined by the social nature of architectural creativity. In the architectural form, the style of architecture, on the one hand, establishes the achievements of the architectural process of cognition and transformation of the objective world, and on the other – unites these achievements with non-architectural processes of the nature and society, breaking these processes through the sensually perceived corporeal architectural form.

The style of the object is not only its outer form but first of all the nature of its material and spiritual functioning within a given culture; in other words, style reveals the functional features of an object or phenomenon. The traditional elements in architecture present only a stage of the evolutionary development and in their new manifestation they retain something of their former content (Ikonnikov, 1972, 213).

Since the aesthetic ideal does not have its particular form, style cannot be set as a role model. It is created spontaneously as a result of creative work of many people (style of the epoch, ethnicity style, corporate identity) or a single person (school, the community of people) for many years (master's style, style of the architecture school).

In the world history, as Hegel pointed out, “*due to of the actions of people, in addition to those results that people strive to achieve in their actions, different results are obtained*” (Hegel, 2010, 609). People seek to meet their needs and interests, but objectively something is also being accomplished that is hidden in their actions and is not understood by them. The interests of people clash with each other, and under the influence of many intersecting forces, a common result is manifested, of which none of the participants in this process, sometimes not directly related to each other, have ever thought (Ikonnikov, 2002).

Something similar happens with the formation of style. Architect seeks to objectify his aesthetic ideal, but his work overlaps with the work of other architects. As a result, along with the individual creative search, there is the process of social creativity, defined by the mutual influence and the social conditionality of creativity of each individual, as a member of a certain human community (Semenyuk et al., 2015).

The problem of national spirit in architecture and the concept of national architecture

Nationalism in architecture is the connection of the architectural creativity with the life of the masses, the reflection of their social and aesthetic ideals, service

to the people, the creation of optimal conditions for its material and spiritual development.

With the widespread proliferation of modernism, the efforts that had been made to highlight the regional and local issues, were left without sufficient support. The first regional seminar of the Aga Khan Award for Architecture in Kuala Lumpur was devoted to the issues related to identity in architecture. It was revealed that the geographic region determines many aspects of the society, both in the national, cultural and environmental terms (Proceedings of the Regional Seminar in the series Exploring Architecture in Islamic Cultures, 1985, 8).

Most discussions on the Greek architecture in Europe raise the following central issues in the field of architectural theory: what is cultural autonomy; how can identity be preserved in the environment? The question of the identity and uniqueness in architecture becomes global. How can we establish a clear dividing line between what is native and original, and what is borrowed (Kostas, 2014)?

With the emergence of social and political inequality (free – slaves, patricians – plebeians, lords – bonded peasants, the rich and the poor, etc.), the concept of nationalism began to be related to the interests and aspirations of the working masses, who constituted the majority of the people and the main productive force of the society. However, architecture was increasingly serving the ruling minority, and the concept of nationalism in architecture was becoming a revolutionizing slogan of the advanced architectural thought. In their amateur architectural works, the masses retained, multiplied and developed the ancient architectural traditions, which in the heyday of architecture were consistently applied in the advanced professional architectural idea. The architectural appearance of buildings was changing with the change of epochs, but along with the significant European styles, the national architecture of each country was developed. The identity of each city is formed over a long period because it undergoes historical changes, which leads to cultural diversity (Siniša et al., 2013).

Architectural styles representing the social order were changing along with epochs. As a reflection of the spiritual culture of citizens, architecture was formed under the influence of people's thinking style, national characteristics, natural environment, religious views and the government structure.

The growth of scientific and technological progress has provided more technical capabilities for expressing spiritual ideas. Each new technology was accompanied by the new appearance of buildings, churches, private houses. Sometimes a new style completely denied the heritage of the past with its old rules and methods and generated forms that never existed before. However, this development was mostly based on the old styles with the use of their individual characteristics.

National architecture is closely connected with the everyday life of ordinary people. Its shapes and lines



Figure 1: Flowing forms of oriental architecture (Frozen music, 2017)



Figure 2: European architecture (Frozen music, 2017)

reflect the peculiarities and character of each nation: flowing lines are inherent in the architecture of the desert inhabitants, sharp corners and clean lines – in the architecture of pragmatic Europeans, an imprint of increased religiosity of the people lies in the architectural structures of the inhabitants of China, Japan and India.

The “genes” of the national character of architecture smoothly move from the past to the present and are reflected in the architectural forms of the future. New contemporary designs with the distinct national character are thus being born. A standard product of globalization - skyscrapers - can be built in the original national style, showing to which country they belong at a glance. For example, a symbol of Ukraine is “*pysanka*” (painted eggs), so the Ukrainian architects A. Popov, D. Vasiliev and A. Khil’ko got the idea to build an office skyscraper in 44 floors, reminiscent of a huge Easter egg. It is planned to be built in Kiev on the Dnieper River (Popov, 2013).

The project “Pysanka” was not implemented because of economic reasons. But the ideas of the bold use of national traditions in modern architecture, which were laid in the project, were a valuable contribution to the further development of architectural design of cities in the CIS countries.

National traditions in the architecture of the Kazakh people

The main attraction of the Kazakh traditions in architecture and the national culture of Kazakhstan can be rightly considered a white yurt. This type of dwelling is one of the most unique artifacts of Eurasian nomads and traditions of Kazakhstan. White tents, carpeted inside and out, look amazing in green meadows and *jailow* (high mountain pastures).

The uniqueness of the yurt is that it is a mobile dwelling. At the same time, it is a completely functional house. This combination of reliability, fundamentality, mobility and lightness has been created for centuries. The yurt in the form of bales, loaded onto a camel, has always been an essential attribute of a nomadic people and Kazakh traditions. It is not surprising because living conditions suggested frequent changes of placements: wintering, spring grazing, autumn *kuzeu* (pastures). The very structure of the yurt implies strength and flexibility, at the same time, because it consists of willow rods and soft felt. This dwelling has become a real symbol of Kazakh cultural traditions of the entire group of peoples (Khait, 2003; Samuratova & Akhmetova, 2016).

In general, the structure of the yurt reflects the outlook of the Kazakhs, their traditions, and the principle of continuity with the nature, in particular. It transmits the majesty of the mountains, the freedom of the steppes and the tenderness of the meadows. It is a real fairytale world, which is supported through an unusually picturesque decoration. One can experience the spirit of this dwelling only by visiting it and spending a few days there immersed in the atmosphere of the very life of the nomadic people. The yurt is the focus of universal harmony in the eyes of the Kazakh, the traditions of Kazakhstan.

The desire to live in harmony with the nature and not to subordinate it was also expressed in the functionality of the yurt. It is no secret that very severe weather conditions prevailed in the steppes, where nomads lived. The yurt has always saved the Kazakhs from the scorching sun and the icy wind, from the torrential rains and the cold.

The frame of the yurt, as already mentioned, consists of willow rods – *kerege*. They are light and flexible, making the yurt construction mobile. The basis of this



Figure 3: The “Pysanka” complex in Kiev (draft) (Frozen music, 2017)



Figure 4: The interior of the “Pysanka” complex (draft) (Frozen music, 2017)

dwelling is a high quality felt, which saves the Kazakhs from all the vagaries of the weather. This material is carefully made from the wool of sheep of a special breed. They are shorn necessarily in the autumn – it is a mandatory attribute of the Kazakh traditions.

The design of the yurt reflects the harmonious attitude of the nomads towards the nature. The interior is also very important. After all, this is where people spend their time; this is where they should feel their unity to the world, to the universe. In the process of construction, all the nations turned to crafts and folk crafts. Thus, in the Kazakh traditions, the interior is replete with a variety of works of decorative art. Here you can find amazing items in the technique of carving, made of leather and metal. The Kazakh traditions also contain bright colors, and the carpets of felt and unsurpassed embroidery were adorned with fantastic ornaments.

The ornamental interior decoration generally prevails in the Kazakh tradition. In particular, one can often see *tekemets* – felt carpets, decorated with wonderful flowers and plants; *baskurs* – patterned ribbons, stretching along the entire tent and covered with unique and even mysterious drawings. Kazakh traditions present the entire worldview complex, which is a luxury furniture, created in the technique of carving and inlay. Looking at it, one can easily create a picture of the world of traditions of Kazakhstan and the Kazakhs’ world, which was based on paganism, with its agrarian cults, the worship of the nature and the heavenly bodies.

The central symbol of the Kazakh dwelling is a circle. This is one of the oldest symbols in the world culture and Kazakh traditions. The yurt is replete with circles and rings. The very construction of the yurt is a circle, and is encircled by *baskur* (a woven strip). All kinds of carpets, *tekemets* and mats are decorated with spirals and circles. The framework of cabinets, chests and beds have exquisitely carved circles, and dishes are covered

with similar ornaments. *Shanyrak* – a hole in the center of the dome, through which the smoke comes out – is the main circle of the yurt. It represents some sort of connection between the Kazakhs and their central deity, Tengri.

In addition to this sacred connection, *shanyrak* always incorporated a lot of meaning and reflected the entire system of the universe and traditions of Kazakhstan in the eyes of the nomad. It symbolized the universal harmony, the link between generations. This confirms the fact that since ancient times, *shanyrak* has been handed down from generation to generation, being a patron of the family and consisting not only of the living but also of the long-gone people.

The felt yurt is a real miracle of Kazakh traditions. People of the Middle Ages, one way or another getting into the territory of the nomads, travelers, merchants, scholars, ambassadors, were thrilled to see the Kazakh national home. In particular, highly emotional descriptions of the felt dwelling can be found in the works of such authors as N. Bichurin (1996), V. Rubruk (1984), A. Vambéry (Ergaliyeva, 2010).

Today we can say with full confidence that the yurt is not only an extremely mobile and sturdy dwelling but also a reflection of the nomadic worldview. It embodies the basic principles of life and traditions of the Kazakhs, the main of which is the desire to live in harmony with the nature, with the universe, with oneself. A white yurt simply amazes with its well thought-out functionality, beauty, and gorgeous decorations. Such a dwelling is one of the most mysterious and unique creations of human culture.

The yurt is the central image of the national culture of Kazakhstan. It is beautiful and interesting in all its varieties: *zhol uy* – trekking yurt, *ak uy* – snow-white ceremonial, *otau uy* – yurt for the newlyweds. It is a symbol of an entire people. Today yurt is the main tour-



Figure 5: Shopping and entertainment complex in the form of the Khan's tent (Frozen music, 2017)

ist asset, a symbol of Kazakh traditions and culture of Kazakhstan.

Currently, the reflection of nationalism in the architecture of Kazakhstan is manifested through a variety of aspects in a variety of ways. For example, in Astana, a shopping and entertainment complex was built in the form of the Khan's tent, which corresponds to the ethnic and national history. Its height is 150 meters, and there are several shopping and entertainment centers, a park with an artificial pond and a beach inside. The landscape corresponds to the landscape of the "native" nature.

Architecture reflects culture in close cooperation with structural, historical, political, economic and social characteristics of the society. In every country, people are trying to follow national cultural traditions and support their values in the creation of architecture. Changes in cultural and social relations in the community have an impact on styles in architecture. Art and architecture is one of the most important features and characteristics of each nation and each historical period, which affects the formation of the human environment (Ettehad et al., 2014).

Trends in the development of national identity in modern architecture

Doctor of Architecture, Professor of Petrozavodsk State University V. P. Orfinsky argues that the problem of national identity in architecture has two main promising approaches in the light of the question:

- retrospective with an analysis of the historical features of existing facilities;
- modern with an analysis of the prospects for the future development of architectural and building practices (Orfinskiy, 2011).

The architects' opinion that the revival of national architecture is the main way of the revival of the whole

building art once again confirm that the general direction of the necessary changes is generally known, there are some successful steps, but there is a need for a focused scientific, experimental and practical approach to this matter. Questions of national architecture, as an expression of a society's culture, must be developed organically and naturally rather than on the basis of administrative methods.

For any city in the modern world, it is important to be special and easily recognizable. This is an easier way to attract investors and tourists, and to be the best place to stay. The image of the city is a very important aspect of the city's presentation. This may be the result of the successfully developed strategy. In developing such a strategy, all the recognizable assets can and should be used. Among them, cultural and historical heritage, outstanding artists and other elements of intangible culture are of great importance. Rapid urbanization and technological advances have led to the standardization and uniformity of the architectural environment, thus depriving man of the cultural identity of the living environment and regional identity, in which the standardization trend has become an international disease, as far as the same methods, building materials and styles are used (Eldemery, 2009).

There is a need for an independent regional architecture based on the traditions of folk architecture, reflecting the specificity of geographical, social and ethnic living conditions. Based on the above, one can draw the conclusion to determine the ways of development of modern architecture: the national peculiarities of the new architecture in different regions can arise only in the design of buildings in the local context and under the influence of the other factors listed above (Frampton, 1985).

The history of architecture indicates that national traits in architecture may be developed regardless of the architectural style, i.e. they may be inherent in

any style. This is due to the fact that the concept of “national character” has a deeper meaning than the external architectural forms or decor. For example, Russian churches of the XII–XVII centuries or the Classical period have different architectural forms but one can always recognize the Russian church by its functional and spatial organization, dictated by the specific ideological content. Another example is two mosques that can be designed in completely different architectural forms: one – in the early Baroque, the other – in the eclectic forms of the end of the XIX century. Nevertheless, they have common national traits dictated by the functional and spatial organization, the presence of a minaret and other conditions (Khan-Magomedov et al., 1972).

Main problems of urban planning

The rapid growth rate of urban construction shows the financial rise and the relative economic stability of the region, which is a boon for the corresponding niches of social and economic spheres of the city. But, unfortunately, the high growth of construction does not always produce the same positive results in all spheres of life of urban entities, among which are political, cultural, aesthetic, educational, planning and others.

The question is the destructive power of individual components of the architectural and town-planning processes. The fact is that all the familiar and seemingly ordinary cities, including Astana, have the so-called “urban values”. According to Oriol Bohigas, “the protagonist of the reconstruction of Barcelona” and the author of “*Ten Theses on Urban Planning Methodology*” (Bohigas, 2006), these values include the elements of the city, forming a space for the “collective life of various urban communities”.

These elements comprise usual streets, parks, neighborhoods, monuments, and are more of the semantic nature than historical. They carry the symbolic information on the given city, and have a clear function, easily recognizable by different generations of residents. This usual everyday space is really unique and unrepeatable, as it forms the main scenario of the life of citizens. It cannot just be moved to another city because it would lose its meaning and become useless. It is not an accidental “by-product” (Bohigas, 2006) of the civilized city due to its certainty, a wholeness of the urban space, worked out for centuries. K. Lynch in his book “*The Image of the City*” refers to the importance of the symbolic environment in the life of the city and man in it (Lynch, 1982).

An artificial gross interference into these natural processes of urbanization can lead to a radical change in the content and way of life of individual communities that can turn out to be unfruitful or lead to the death of the city. The death of the city can be expressed both in the loss of it as a cultural value, and in the loss of its main material tangible senses.

The foregoing is not intended to call for a conservative attitude towards architecture and for the reproduction of patterns of bygone eras and their elements. It represents a modern interpretation of the existing city, the reasons for the emergence of new typological objects of multifunctional complexes and methods of their delicate implementation in the current urban order. The control of the territorial placement would help preserve the functional content of the city and get rid of junk sites, which are being formed both in the center of the city and on its outskirts.

One of the major problems of urbanization lies in the absence of such methods of control over the development of the city: “fabric” randomness of the environment. Another, no less urgent problem, typical of many cities, is the conditions of formation of the fabric of the modern city by volumetric architecture means. In this regard, O. Bohigas rightly said:

Across Europe, over the last thirty years, general layouts have caused the degeneration of cities, their lack of social and physical integrity, disintegration into separate ghettos, and paved the way for the criminal speculation of the undeveloped land (Bohigas, 2006, 54–56).

The author of this statement rightly suggested designing not general layouts but space structures of the city, “block by block”, combining them with each other. The detailed solid modeling at the initial design stages, as well as at the stages of the approval of general layouts makes it possible to demonstrate professionalism. Thus, the problem of architectural aesthetic quality is being solved, and not just its functional content and physical parameters.

As a result of these problems and the lack of efforts to address them, we have admittedly junk territories and aggressive architectural objects that are slated, at least, for renovation in the very process of construction, and at most – for demolition. The aggression of architecture is directed against the existing urban structure, as well as the individual, whose mentality was developed in accordance with his life in this city.

Among the reasons for such an attitude of society towards the modern city and its architecture are the following:

- Firstly, the commercialization of construction as an end in itself is backed by market research and business plans that do not take into account cultural and ethical factors and the moral durability of objects;
- Secondly, the development of the standard simplified and cost-effective type of building in practice is quite acceptable for the mentality of people raised on standard construction. The modern customer is not committed to the indi-

viduality of his object, and for him it is normal that his building is similar to that of his rival.

CONCLUSIONS

The problems of the modern city extend far beyond architecture. In this case, architect and town planner can solve many, but not all, problems associated with urbanization and architecture. With the current dynamism in the development of science, technology, engineering, a change of fashion and the way of thinking, architect cannot recommend or impose any known style techniques in form shaping, or convert the existing nets of streets and blocks into dogma. However, the objective characteristics, criteria for the evaluation of architectural creativity and modern urban facilities are still worth looking for.

Referring to the statements of theorists of different ages and cultures, one can find the following views on the formation of the city and its image. O. Bohigas offers the following methodological recommendations in the light of the problems of reconstruction of Barcelona: “[...] architecture should primarily take into account the shape of the city and the landscape and participate in the creation of a new configuration” (Bohigas, 2006, 54). A. I. Kaplun in his book *“Style and Architecture”* (1985) suggests seeking new opportunities for the realization of the fundamental concept of “style”, transforming the epochal characteristics of style in an individual artistic language that meets the requirements of time. In the modern interpretation, the basis for the formation of an individual artistic style should imply regional,

national and climatic factors that have an impact on form shaping.

K. Lynch suggests forming a symbolic environment that provides guidance, human security, emotional and semantic access to the city (Lynch, 1982). C. Sitte, who formulated the *“Artistic Foundations of Urban Development”* (Sitte, 1993), puts forward the establishment of the urban environment that meets the human scale as the basis of urban development. These points of view can be united by the fact that they express the interests of man in the urban space, which is intended to ensure the material and cultural safety of man.

In the period of high commercialization of architecture, it is virtually useless to focus on its cultural values, ethical and, especially, semantic characteristics. However, it is necessary to talk about new methods of design: a more productive participation of spatial architecture in urban development processes, a more strict subordination of spatial architecture to the so-called “urban values”, new evaluation criteria of architecture, responsible not only for its functional content, but also for its meaning. Spatial architecture at the early stages of arrangement of land acquisition will make it possible to design a holistic city, without scrappy areas unsuitable for human habitation. Subordination of spatial architecture to the existing development scenario of the city will save it from awkward shapes, mechanically borrowed from different cultures and eras. Scientifically formulated evaluation criteria will help avoid amateurish judgments and decisions in the field of architecture and urban planning.

TRENDI V RAZVOJU NACIONALNE IDENTITETE V ARHITEKTURI

Olga SEMENYUK

Evroazijska Nacionalna Univerza L. N.Gumilyov, Oddelek za arhitekturo, 010000, 5 K. Munaitpasov Str., Almaty district,
Astana, Kazahstan
e-mail: semenyuk-1966@inbox.ru

Natalya Alekseevna CHERNYSH

Evroazijska Nacionalna Univerza L. N.Gumilyov, Oddelek za arhitekturo, 010000, 5 K. Munaitpasov Str., Almaty district,
Astana, Kazahstan
e-mail: prakrity@mail.ru

Yelena Nikolaevna KHVAN

Evroazijska Nacionalna Univerza L. N.Gumilyov, Oddelek za arhitekturo, 010000, 5 K. Munaitpasov Str., Almaty district,
Astana, Kazahstan
e-mail: Khvan-72@mail.ru

Rahima CHEKAEVA

Evroazijska Nacionalna Univerza L. N.Gumilyov, Oddelek za arhitekturo, 010000, 5 K. Munaitpasov Str., Almaty district,
Astana, Kazahstan
e-mail: Rahima.chekaeva@mail.ru

Oxana Nikolaevna TKACH

RSE "Gosgradkadastr", 010008, 19 Imanov Str., Astana, Kazahstan
e-mail: ton-17@mil.ru

Botakoz KASSIMOVA

Evroazijska Nacionalna Univerza L. N.Gumilyov, Oddelek za arhitekturo, 010000, 5 K. Munaitpasov Str., Almaty district,
Astana, Kazahstan
e-mail: Botagoz.rahmetollaevna@mail.ru

Zhazira Seralievna BISSENOVA

Evroazijska Nacionalna Univerza L. N.Gumilyov, Oddelek za arhitekturo, 010000, 5 K. Munaitpasov Str., Almaty district,
Astana, Kazahstan
e-mail: Bisenova_1983@mail.ru

Abay Dildashevich OTARBAYEV

Evroazijska Nacionalna Univerza L. N.Gumilyov, Oddelek za arhitekturo, 010000, 5 K. Munaitpasov Str., Almaty district,
Astana, Kazahstan
e-mail: abay87072104545@gmail.com

POVZETEK

V zadnjih letih se v svetu arhitekture kopičijo nove raziskave, ki spreminjajo strokovne ideje o zakonih kreiranja in razumevanja podobe v arhitekturi. Kot umetniška oblika arhitektura namreč odseva vse aspekte družbenega življenja: politični sistem, kulturo, okuse v modi in stilu. Vprašanja nacionalne arhitekture, kot izraz družbene kulture, pa se morajo razviti organsko in naravno, ne pa na podlagi administrativnih metod. Eden temeljnih razlogov za zanimanje za kulturno identiteto različnih regij je želja po tem, da se reši osnovni problem brezosebности in pomanjkanja duhovnosti v arhitekturi, ter oblikujejo regionalne posebnosti v podobi mest na podlagi zmožnosti in izkušenj njihove kulture. Ta tendenca je še posebej značilna za mlade države kot je Kazahstan, ki si prizadevajo, da bi pridobili svoje vredno mesto, različno od drugih, na področju univerzalne kulture.

Ključne besede: nacionalna arhitektura, kulturna identiteta, regionalizem

SOURCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adam, R. (2008):** Globalisation and architecture: The challenges of globalisation are relentlessly shaping architecture's relationship with society and culture. *Architectural Review*, 223, 1332, 74–77.
- Barbyshev, E. N. (1991):** Communicative features of Russian architecture systems. In: Rossinsky, E. I. (ed.): *Semiotics and architecture, language*. Moscow, Institute of Theory of Architecture and Urbanism, 69–80.
- Baudrillard, J. (2005):** City and hatred. (Lecture delivered in Moscow at the French University College of M. V. Lomonosov Moscow State University). http://thule.primordial.org.ua/bodriar01.htm#_ftn1 (01.11.2017).
- Bichurin, M. (1996):** Chinese perceptions of Russia. In: Kurkchi, A. I. (ed.): "Arabesque" Stories, 2, 3-4: Russian spill. Moscow, DI-DIK, 262–266.
- Bohigas, O. (2006):** Ten theses on urban planning methodology. *PROJECT International*, 11, 54–56.
- Broadbent, D. E. (1987):** Perception and communication. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Eco, U. & T. A. Sebeok (eds.) (1983):** The sign of three: Dupin, Holmes, Peirce. Bloomington, Indiana University Press.
- Eldemery, I. M. (2009):** Globalization challenges in architecture. *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research*, 26, 4, 343–354.
- Ergaliyeva, R. (2010):** Yurt – home – Cosmos. *Journal of Academy of Arts of Uzbekistan "San'at"*, 2, 1421, 1.
- Ettehad, S., Reza, K., Azeri, A. & K. Ghazaleh (2014):** The role of culture in promoting architectural identity. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*, 3, 4, 410–418.
- Fomenko, A. T. (1999):** Antiquity in the Middle Ages. Greek and Bible History. USA, Lewiston, Queenston, Lampeter, The Edwin Mellen Press.
- Frampton, K. (1985):** Modern architecture: a critical history. London, Thames and Hudson.
- Frozen music (2017):** National architecture. <http://zodchestwo.info/post/366> (02.11.2017)
- Fusco, R. (1984):** Architecture of the 1400's. UTET, Turin.
- Grabovenko, A. Y. (2010):** Creative work of Robert Venturi and symbolic potential of the classical language in the architecture of 1970–1990. http://rus.neicon.ru:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/6030/8_10_03_33.pdf, 165–171 (01.06.2017).
- Gutnov, A. E. (1984):** The evolution of urban planning. Moscow, Stroyizdat.
- Hegel, G. W. F. (2010):** The science of logic. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Holm, I. (2006):** Ideas and beliefs in architecture and industrial design. Unpublished PhD thesis. Oslo, The Oslo School of Architecture and Design.
- Ikonnikov, A. V. (2002):** Architecture of the XX century. Utopia and reality, 2. Moscow, Progress-Tradition.
- Ikonnikov, A. V. (ed.) (1972):** Masters of architecture on architecture. Foreign architecture. The end of the XIX–XX century. Moscow, Iskusstvo.
- Jenks, C. (1971):** Orthodoxy and Innovation in the Law of Nations. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Kaplun, A. (1985):** Style and architecture. Institute of Theory and History of Architecture. Moscow, Stroyizdat.
- Khait, V. (2003):** On architecture, its history and problems. Moscow, Editorial.
- Khan-Magomedov, S. O., Maximov, P. N. & N. N. Savitsky (eds.) (1972):** The general history of architecture. Vol.10. The architecture of the XIX–early XX centuries. Moscow, Stroyizdat.
- Kostas, T. (2014):** An Identity Crisis of Architectural Critique. *Architectural Histories*, 2, 1, 1–8, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/ah.bi>.
- Lezhava, I. (2012):** On the Road to the new resettlement in Russia in the transition to an information society based on a combination of science and technology. Electronic journal "AMIT", 4.
- Lynch, K. (1982):** The Image of the City. Moscow, Stroyizdat.
- Markuzon, V. F. (1970):** Semiotics and the development of the language of architecture, architectural composition. Modern problems. Moscow, Stroyizdat.
- Morozov, I. (2012):** "National question" of architecture: urgency and problematics. *Architecture and Construction*, 4, 228, 22–41.
- Norberg-Schultz, K. (2000):** Architecture: Presence, Language, Place. Milan, Skira.
- Orfinskiy, V. P. (2011):** The problem of folk and national identity in architecture. Scientific-practical conference of Petrozavodsk State University, 5–11.
- Petrovčič, S. & V. Kilar (2017):** Seismic Vulnerability Assessment of Architectural Heritage Buildings in Slovenia. *Annales Series Historia et Sociologia*, 27, 2, 277–294.
- Popov, A. (2013):** "Pysanka" on the Dnieper. Tall Buildings Magazine. <http://tallbuildings.ru/ru/pisanka-na-dnepre> (01.11.2017).
- Popova, O. G. (2008):** Design theory: Textbook. Astana, Foliant.
- Proceedings of the Regional Seminar in the series Exploring Architecture in Islamic Cultures.** Sponsored by The Aga Khan Award for Architecture, Bangladesh University of Engineering and Technology and Institute of Architects, Bangladesh. Held in Dhaka, Bangladesh, December 17–22, 1985.
- Regional Architecture and Identity in the Age of Globalization the Center for the Study of Architecture in the Arab Region (CSAAR).** In Collaboration with Department of Architecture, National School of Architecture and Urbanism, Tunis, Tunisia 13–15 November, 2007
- Rossinskaya, E. (1992):** X-ray analysis in criminology and forensics. Kiev, Prospekt.
- Rubruk, V. (1984):** Traveling to the Great Khan of the Mongols. From Constantinople to Karakorum 1253–1255. Stuttgart, Edition Erdmann.

Samuratova, T. & G. Akhmetova (2016): The Symbolic Image of the Yurt in Kazakh Applied Arts. *Acta Histriae*, 24, 2, 427-450.

Semenyuk, O. N., Khvan, E. N. & A. A. Saurbayeva (2015): Social aspects of the design of the urban environment. Proceedings of the international scientific-practical conference "Space. Time. Architecture" dedicated to the 50th anniversary of the opening of the specialty "Architecture". S. Seifullin Kazakh Agro Technical University, Astana, 308–314.

Shlipchenko, Z. S. (1976): Pumps, compressors and fans. Kiev, "Tekhnika".

Shubovich, S. A. (2012): Mythopoetic phenomenon of architectural environment. Monograph. Kiev, KNAME.

Siniša, C. & G. Jasna (2013): Cultural and historical heritage: An asset for city branding. *Spatium*, 30, 23–27. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2298/SPAT1330023C>.

Sitte, C. (1993): Artistic basics of town planning. Moscow, Stroyizdat.

Stepanov, Yu. (1971): Semiotics. Moscow, Nauka.

Tafari, M. (1989): History of Italian Architecture, 1944–1985. Cambridge, MIT Press.

Uspenskiy, B. A. (1971): About semiotics icons. Works on Sign Systems. Vol. V. Scientists notes the University of Tartu. Vol. 28. Tartu, 178–223.

Venturi, R. (1998): Iconography and Electronics upon a Generic Architecture: A View from the Drafting Room. Cambridge, MIT Press.

Yasser, M. (2007): Architecture and the Expression of Cultural Identity in Kuwait. *The Journal of Architecture*, 12, 2, 165–182.

Zevi, B. (1957): Architecture as Space: How to Look at Architecture. New York, Horizon Press.