

TOMSK. AN IMAGE OF THE TOWN BASED ON A HANDY SKETCHBOOK

Piotr Jakub Fereński

University of Wrocław, Poland
piotr.ferencki@uwr.edu.pl

Text concerns on visual dimension of urban space. It's based on analyses of historical and contemporary processes and phenomena shaping that space. The main topic is urban landscape of Tomsk (Russia). Nevertheless, the article contains a theoretical and methodological proposal that connects anthropological-semiotic approach with the idea of presenting various urban aesthetics of the city in context of relations between systems of values and political and economic disputes over the urban space. It's reflection on patterns of behaviour, norms, beliefs, expectations and needs of citizens. For author, city is not only a physical place structured by material objects but also as a human communicative environment – semiotically and axiologically marked space, which reflects the position of a human being as a cultural subject initiating the cultural activity. On example of wooden buildings, he shows relationship between the socio-cultural and architectural complexes. The author analysed architecture and architectural environment of the city as a text (semiotic construct), which manifests different types of lifestyle, aesthetic preferences, modernisation projects, ambitions of power, political strategies. He is particularly interested in the transformation of “reality” – the impact of urban texts on the perception of space and thinking about space (also in dimension of community and social differences).

Keywords: city, urban space, architecture, culture, cultural heritage, activities of residents, semiotics of urban space, urban studies, urban research, Tomsk, Siberia.

DOI 10.23951/2312-7899-2019-1-44-56

“Yasha, I know that you find this old architecture captivating, that you wish most of the wooden buildings were left standing. These houses are incredible. Look at it another way, though. Most of them are in terrible technical condition. Neglected, over the years they have fallen into ruin and disrepair, exposed to the harsh Siberian climate. As a member of the nation, the Russian community, I am ashamed and sorry that my compatriots live in such conditions.” This is a quote from an employee of one of Tomsk’s universities, who showed me around the city during my first visit to Siberia in September 2015. At the invitation

of professor Sergey Avanesov (the then Head of the Department of the Philosophical and Pedagogical Anthropology at the History and Philology Department of the Tomsk State Pedagogical University), together with Izolda Topp, PhD, my colleague from the Institute of Cultural Studies at the University of Wrocław, and a group of students (i.a. Agnieszka Smutek, Grzegorz Soboń, Joanna Panciuchin and Katarzyna Szymańska), through Berlin and Moscow I reached a place on the Tom River, completely unknown to me then. The programme of the joint research involved analyses of the visual dimension of urban space. Our main goal was to present historical and contemporary processes and phenomena shaping that space. The scope of our interest reached beyond the urban landscape's architectural dominants. We also saw importance in creative acts of residents who, through grassroots work – although sometimes inspired by local authorities – adapted their immediate surroundings to their needs (we examined courtyards and gardens arranged with extraordinary imagination, places of recreation, rest and celebration, drawings on old garages, graffiti on walls, etc.). According to the theoretical plan, the analyses were an attempt to synthesise Prof. Avanesov's concept, based on an anthropological-semiotic approach and focused on recognising the topographically-oriented signs that determined the identity of a place, with the idea of presenting various urban aesthetics and impressions of the city, which was proposed by our team. We were therefore interested in lifestyles of the inhabitants with regard to specific systems of values and horizons of meaning. The presumption was that patterns of behaviour, norms, beliefs, expectations and needs remain equally significant for the understanding of the city as the functional diversity of the urban space (as well as the objects it contains). We acknowledged that these were the elements that played the most important role in the process of shaping the identity of the place. On the one hand, we attempted to identify archetypical (i.e. possessing certain prototypes, patterns, primary presumptions) elements of the city's structure, while on the other hand, we tried to recognise and understand the attitude of inhabitants towards local urban planning and the surrounding architecture, such as temples, monuments, cemeteries, parks and rivers. We collected photographic and film documentation of the most important architectural objects, memorial sites, elements of space organisation and development, as well as manifestations of everyday life. We recorded the soundscape of the city, but most importantly, we registered conversations with the residents. They were supposed to help us reconstruct their experience, feelings, beliefs and desires. In 2015, as well as during subsequent visits to Tomsk in 2016 and 2018,

we collected a total of several dozen hours of audio recording. The interviews were conducted by a Polish-Russian team. The questions concerned, among other things, those elements of iconosphere that our interlocutors considered as valuable or important in terms of aesthetics, ethics, functionality, and those seen as negative, i.e. bothersome, impractical, aesthetically unpleasant, unnatural or disgraceful. We talked about Tomsk's central spaces, about old wooden settlements (from the 19th and the early 20th century) surrounding the main *prospekts*, as well as about the post-war large-panel prefabricated housing estates located a little further away, and about the dachas on the outskirts. As I have mentioned, we were interested in the structure of the city, its arteries, squares and promenades, as well as specific objects such as temples (Orthodox churches, Protestant church, synagogue), museums, alternative theatres (the founder of the most renowned one died tragically at the turn of January and February 2019), cultural centres, monuments, murals, public administration buildings, bleak housing projects, former prisons, shopping malls, cemeteries, etc.

Over the three years of collaboration, we developed methods of interpreting the city as a complex transphysical phenomenon of communicative semiotic nature. This means that we considered the city not only as a physical place structured by material objects but also as a human communicative environment – semiotically and axiologically marked space, which reflects the position of a human being as a cultural subject initiating the cultural activity. We identified the relationship between the socio-cultural and architectural complexes; analysed architecture and architectural environment of the city as a text (semiotic construct), which manifests different types of beliefs, lifestyle, biographical and political strategies, aesthetic preferences, modernisation projects, ambitions of power, the installation on the transformation of reality; determined the impact of urban texts on the perception of space and thinking about space, about community and social differences; studied architecture and architectural environment as a non-verbal text on the example of particular districts of Tomsk. Our theoretical position based on the semiotic communication model was therefore slightly different from that of e.g. Henri Lefebvre, who also explored the ways of “reading the city”. Recognising urban phenomena as “message”, in his concept of urban space Lefebvre linked mental, cultural, social and historical factors. Such an approach was to serve, among other things, the reconstruction of city organisation methods and strategies of creating a municipal landscape characteristic for different communities. At the same time, the French philosopher stressed that the relations,

connections or conflicts between the territorial, the urbanistic and architectural, can only be understood in terms of relations of “logic-dialectic” and “structure-conjuncture” [Lefebvre 2003]. For us, in turn, the physical phenomena were important mainly as carriers of meanings and as elements on which meanings and values are based. We indicated a wider spectrum of conditions than just material, production or power-related ones. Phenomena discovered in the space of Tomsk were teaching us a slightly different approach. As Caroline Humphrey, a British cultural researcher, rightly states in the introduction to her outstanding book *The Unmaking of Soviet Life: Everyday Economies after Socialism*:

(Cultural. – P. J. F.) anthropology’s strength is its rootedness in the everyday, in its familiarity with the practices that ethnographers are able to observe and question. Anthropologists are unlike economists who, whatever their approach, need to define an abstract category of *the economic* and make predictive statements on this basis. At least since Clifford Geertz and the abandonment of functionalism, structuralism, neo-Marxism and all those other -isms that propose or deduce self-existent social categories, anthropologists have tended to conceive their objects in terms of meaning, that is, requiring interpretation [Humphrey 2002, XVIII].

At the same time, Humphrey is correct to point out that cultural researchers have become aware of the meaning of power relations – and related dependencies – for people’s everyday lives. According to the anthropologist, the contemporary socio-economic systems are analysed mainly with the use of extremely broad, unclear categories, requiring further specification when reality escapes them (does not fit the accepted explication models). Today’s cultural anthropology and related disciplines allow us to choose a different starting point than an “-ism”, such as freely chosen (although specific) case, phenomenon practice. On the preliminary assumption that they have a certain “meaning in themselves”, they can be subsequently applied to a broader historical and cultural context (including religious and ideological), as well as to the existing power relations.

However, in the case of this article, should it reach readers from different parts of the world, it is necessary to begin by outlining the geographical conditions and historical background of the phenomena discussed here. Paradoxically, in the perspective of Tomsk’s development and its present landscape, what has been done appears to be equally important as what has not. Like the majority of the oldest Siberian settlements, Tomsk was founded for colonisation and defence purposes.

In the 17th century it became a place of exile. It constituted an “island” on the “inner” ocean made up of forests, floodplains and swamps. In winter everything was covered with snow and ice, in spring and summer the Siberian space was taken over by mosquitoes and sand flies. In 1804 the city became the capital of the *guberniya*, earning the status of an important political and trade centre. Further development of Tomsk was brought about by the discovery of gold (1830). The next chapter in the city’s history was connected with the establishment of Tomsk State University in 1880 and Tomsk Polytechnic University, founded 16 years later. The centre became known as the Siberian Athens: almost one in ten residents was involved in higher education. To this day, the city has 7 universities. However, another incident that took place in the late 19th century significantly affected the future history of Tomsk. According to the project of the Trans-Siberian Route, developed in the 1880s, a railway line was supposed to pass through the city on Tom River. Fearing noise, environmental pollution, the influx of poorer social groups, uncontrolled city development, decreasing safety levels, etc., the townspeople formed a committee opposing the construction of the railway. Ultimately, in 1893, Tsar Alexander III granted permission for the route to go through small Krivoshchekovskaya village (several years renamed Novonikolayevsk), situated 215 km south-west of Tomsk. The influx of people and goods led to its rapid development. By 1910 it was inhabited by over 50,000 people, and with the growth of industry and housing in the 1920s, this number rose to almost 150,000. In the next decade, the town was further developed in the style of social realism. Numerous public buildings were built: administrative facilities, theatres, banks, hospitals. In the mid-1930s the city, renamed Novosibirsk in 1926, outnumbered Tomsk in terms of population, gaining more important political and economic rank. The city on the Tom River had already been incorporated into Novosibirsk Oblast. Due to the relocation of over 300 production facilities from the European part of the USSR and mass deportations to Siberia during World War II, by the early 1950s, the number of citizens doubled. Today it is Russia’s third largest city (giving way only to Moscow and St. Petersburg).

While many factories, moved from the war zone were located in Tomsk too and the city’s expansion led to the restoration of its status as the region’s capital, it did not develop as dynamically as Novosibirsk (after 1945, over 50,000 people were resettled to the Tom River, it happened that one log house would be shared by as many as 10 people). The current image of the city has been influenced by other factors too. Unlike e.g. Kuźniecko, no significant coal reserves were discovered in

the area. In the 1920s and 1930s no mines were built there, and no large metallurgical or chemical plants were erected. Tomsk was not designed – as in the case of Novokuznetsk or Kemerovo – by a team of modernist architects under Ernst May's direction. Compared to the abovementioned cities, as well as to Novosibirsk, there are relatively few *prospekts* or even individual buildings in the socialist-realist style (the exception is Kirov Street). Another important decision for the destiny of the city was the objection of the authorities at Tomsk universities to Nikita Khrushchev's plans to establish Akademgorodok there. In the end, the academic town founded on the initiative of Mikhail Alekseyev Lavrentyev was located on the outskirts of Novosibirsk. The construction began in 1958. Only 12 months later, the first research institutes and residential buildings were put into use. Modernist buildings were located in a beautiful pine forest not far from Novosibirskoye Reservoir also called the "Ob Sea". Akademgorodok, a district of Novosibirsk, is currently inhabited by almost 140,000 people.

Several kilometres north of the centre of Tomsk you will find the so-called closed city. To this day you cannot access it without a special pass. Its construction began in 1949. The place was initially hidden under the name "Pyaty Pochtovy" (i.e. "Mailbox no. 5"), and later codenamed "Tomsk 7". From 1954, it was home to The Siberian Chemical Combine, which for decades remained of strategic importance to the development of the Soviet nuclear weapons programme. The plant produced plutonium and highly enriched uranium. In 1992, Tomsk 7 was renamed Seversk. A year later, on 6th April 1993, an explosion that took place at the site released a cloud of radioactive gas. The Western media ranked the explosion as one of the world's 10 worst nuclear disasters. Nowadays, the complex is one of the world's biggest disposal sites for low- and intermediate-level radioactive waste. In 2016, the construction of an experimental complex of the BREST-300 fast-neutron reactor was launched there. Another object under development is an installation for the processing of solid fuel based on uranium nitride.

But let's go back to Tomsk itself and its central districts. What is the main element of the experience of its space? Well, as Rudolf Arnheim observed in the introduction to the book *The Dynamics of Architectural Form*:

Most of us, when walking through the streets, are affected in one way or another by the look of the buildings we pass and their arrangement <...>. Moreover, it is hard to escape the impression that visually successful buildings are rarer today than they were in almost any other period of civilization. On

what sort of observation are such judgements based? We ask: Does a building display the visual unity that makes it understandable to the human eye? Does its appearance reflect the various functions, physical as well as psychological, for which it was designed? Does it transmit some of the best in human intelligence and imagination? It takes the occasional confrontation with a work of architecture that lives up to these requests to remind us that they are relevant and reasonable; and the elation offered us by such a sight is dampened only by the realization that too often the pleasure is due not to a builder of our own time but to someone long ago [Arnheim 1977, 1].

While the psychologism manifested in Arnheim's research on perception does not convince me, his remarks about the discomfort resulting from the encounters with contemporary architecture may provoke not only reflection on the ground-breaking achievements of the art of architecture and urban planning, but also on the cultural heritage, on the identity of places, on the issue of a sense of "ownership" (of space) by residents and the importance of taming and arranging the world around them. Unquestionably, one has to agree with the German-born visual theorist on one thing. Namely, that at the most basic existential level, space is experienced as a given and precedes objects existing in it. To put it differently, it is a sphere in which things find their place and establish a certain order. Without this simple assumption it is not possible to understand the essence of architecture as a system of buildings located in a particular place.

The thing that immediately caught our eye when we arrived there in 2015 were the picturesque wooden houses. First, we saw them near Krasnoarmieyskaya Street and Buff-Sad, then around Tatarskaya Street. Over time, we also got to know other areas with wooden architecture, especially the oldest part of the city, located on the hills between the winding Ushayka River and the Ozero Belye. Due to its history described above, Tomsk underwent the 20th-century modernisation processes to a relatively small extent. This does not necessarily imply that there are no Khrushchyovkas or housing estates from the Brezhnev period, but, apart from (relatively) few exceptions, the architecture dominating in the centre has little in common with avant-garde modernism or monumental socialist realism. In Lenin Prospekt and the surrounding squares you will find numerous brick buildings inspired by classical aesthetics, as well as many characteristic wooden houses, specific to the region. Over the last several years, in some places, e.g. near Igumen Park or Frunze Street, the old low-rise developments have been replaced by skyscrapers. Their architectural value is a matter of debate... "We have no contemporary architecture in Tomsk. If at all, we

can only speak of individual cases” – stressed one of our interlocutors. In his opinion, “historical lobby” groups or various more or less formal activist movements promote just the restoration of old buildings. This effectively bans the construction of new buildings in the city centre. The allowed height of a building is only 3 floors. With such restrictions, it is not profitable for private entrepreneurs to develop financially demanding contemporary architecture. There is a need for a change in the awareness of both investors and authorities. “Everyone here is an expert in architecture – the mayor, governor, deputy – but we don’t even have a chief architect of the city and the district.” At the same time, the author of these words points out that among the members of the association of architects in Tomsk there are few young people and as many as 60 % of them are pensioners. Just like across Russia, also here it is a popular idea to invite architects from abroad, but the question remains whether they are able to harmoniously integrate their style into the existing architecture behind the Urals. Our conversation partner claims that after the introduction of the ban on the high-rise buildings he decided to work in other parts of Tomsk. The implementation of a project in the city centre requires the permission of five or six commissions. During the interview, his main concern was the fact that “the whole central part of Tomsk is made up of wooden architecture.” In his view, the majority of these buildings are not architectural monuments and have little value in terms of art and craftsmanship. They serve rather as a picturesque background and remain in an uninhabitable state. Investors are not willing to accept high costs of their reconstruction while making relatively low profits.

Many of our interviewees stressed that historicism, which we found interesting and aesthetically appealing, is in fact rather troublesome. Referring to “modern patriotism”, they would explain that run-down houses had nothing to do with the 21st century. While appreciating the unique character of beautifully decorated windows of wooden structures – which play role of *iconostases* – they still argued that wooden architecture should not be regarded superior to brick. “Both are very important – it is like choosing between mother and father.” Our respondents were well aware that the colourful and richly ornamented houses strongly distinguish Tomsk or Irkutsk from other Siberian cities, where the number of such buildings is much lower and cannot be compared in terms of quality (craftsmanship). One example is Tyumen, founded in 1586 on the site of the Tartar city of Chingi-Tura. The first Russian city in Siberia, it used to be rich in wooden houses. Today they are practically non-existent.

It is about houses that have original balcony with a turret, finely decorated entrances, artistic carved details of the casing molding, scales of wood, beautiful corner baulks, picturesque front face, unique patterns, openwork elements, wooden laces (roof), the mythological bird Sirin, fairy owl, dragons, deer, and especially the motives of the sun. There is something extraordinary in all this, something oneiric, unreal in a way. According to the authors of the album *The Atmosphere of Tomsk*:

A town is not only a life environment, not simply four walls and a roof sheltering from the rain, cold and snow. It is an abode for human souls, those of yours peers and ancestors. <...> Over the years you experience something else. The same familiar sounds of your favorite alleyways fill your ears: a dog barking, a tram bell ringing, tweets of our unpretentious birds. But native voices and familiar laughter are missing. The smell of young sticky poplar leaves lingers – once poplar was the most common tree in the town of Tomsk. Yet the people who used to love these sounds and smells have left. The town becomes a treasurer of characters that were your dearest... [Avanesov et al. 2015, 101, 194].

However sentimental it may sound, some of these houses do indeed bring us to a standstill in contemplation. It's a matter of both aesthetics and the experience of being out of time. By no means do I have in mind only the grand wooden residences, such as for example the present premises of Tomsktunist. The Kryachkov's mansion (today – the Museum of Wooden Architecture), The merchant G. M. Golovanov's mansion ("The House with a Marquee", now – the Russian-German House) or The Head of Tomsk A. A. Gratsianov's mansion (currently – the Tomsk Region Reception House). Equally vivid in my memory are crumbling sheds drowning in roadside ditches and the reflections of their past existence, barely shining through the dense greenery. Wooden cottages shimmering with fabulous colours certainly cast a spell on us. On the other hand, however, we were fully aware of their fading beauty.

Another interlocutor, showing us around Cheremoshniki, considered as one of the most dangerous districts of the city, shared the story behind the creation of luxurious apartments in the historic centre of Tomsk. Their construction started in the 1990s, when Russian cities were still struggling with the plague of street crimes, thefts, kidnappings, murders, drug abuse, alcoholism and corruption. Of course, some of the buildings erected in the place where wooden houses used to stand, date back to the 1970s. The period after perestroika saw the return to the construction of now more luxurious blocks of flats. Kuznetsova Street and the neighbouring quarters long remained among the most expen-

sive in the city. Some time later investors started to take an interest in the already mentioned Krasnoarmieykaya Street and Tatarskaya Street. Wooden houses were being destroyed. Between 1995 and 2005, the very attractive Tartar district (between Lenin's prospectus and Tom river) was relatively often deliberately set on fire. As our guide explained: "Officials and businessmen began to claim the land and build new houses, often for themselves." Other interviewees pointed out that the "lobby of developers and administration" is still an important political force in Tomsk. Urban activists are frequently detained to discourage them from "interfering in real estate acquisitions". Some of them, due to the danger they were threatened with, were forced to leave the city (a well-known activist U. left for Ukraine). Nevertheless, many others continue to fight for the survival of historical buildings. Some of these battles have been successful. The activists loudly demanded the reconstruction of one of the demolished wooden houses. Relatively recently, they have been involved in saving an incredibly picturesque Bakunina Street, located in the heart of the oldest part of the city (starting at the foot of the Resurrection Hill, which in 1604 became the cradle of Tomsk). Huge capital was to be at stake then – due to the protests the new investment did not come to fruition. However, the activist we met in the autumn of 2015 emphasised that "activism has gone underground, for it is dangerous to say anything loudly. One person ended up in prison and the other was forbidden to leave the country for sharing materials criticizing the Orthodox Church on the Internet. In the past, pickets gathered up to 500 people. Between 2015–2016, there were far fewer of them. Bakunina Street was, however, recognised as an important part of the urban landscape, which resulted in the decision that it should be protected by law. Thus, it has become important for the city. Currently, the protection of such places is financed from the federal budget. "I believe that if such sites can be preserved in a decent condition, the number of tourists will increase. More and more funds are being allocated to this purpose, but the answers we receive are still predominantly negative, namely that there is no money. Tomsk is a wonderful, open city. There is no xenophobia or other negative social phenomena. I like this district, it's green, there are trees. There is also a kind of natural reserve, full of greenery," explains our guide to Cheremoshniki.

According to the respondents, the authentic, original architecture, both wooden and brick (pre-revolutionary empire), remains one of the main elements distinguishing Tomsk from other Siberian cities. However, as many of them stress, nowadays it is more necessary to invest

in infrastructure than to protect this heritage. And it is not only about roads, schools, hospitals, but also about an “innovative city”. Modernity is associated here with achievements in the field of science and technology, and with the implementation of new technological solutions. The topic of Smart City is also increasingly popular. Its development is expected to bring about a significant increase in the number of people coming from different parts of Russia. What are the chances for this? One of our speakers explains: “Tomsk is a provincial city, but it is not all mud. Unlike Novosibirsk or Kemerovo, Tomsk is multicultural, multi-ethnic, multinational. The last pogrom of Jews took place here in the early 20th century, then – until the revolution – there was even a military synagogue. I cannot estimate the number of right-wing radicals in Tomsk. They sometimes appear at lectures held at the university, but there are certainly fewer of them than in other Russian cities.”

However, a culturally inclusive Smart City is something we will have to wait for. A considerable part of the budget needs to be spent on ongoing road repairs. Like most Siberian cities, every spring Tomsk struggles with the problem of crumbling asphalt “melting away with snow”. There is even a special helpline for residents to call and report sites requiring the intervention of road construction workers. Yet there are also other, more comprehensive social programmes, whose aim is to change the attitudes of people towards their surroundings. The idea is to increase participation in the transformation of both private and public property. “People were not homeowners, now they are learning to own possessions. A major problem primarily concerns those buildings that have not been renovated for a long time. What happened is that with the increase in wages, the richer citizens moved to brick houses and the less well-off to blocks of flats. With the increase in wages, the richer citizens moved to brick houses and the less well-off from panels. The wooden houses are home to the marginalized”, explained one of the city officials. Another initiative was a 5-year programme “Our Tomsk”, based on “interactive” participation of the residents, who were able to submit their suggestions regarding e.g. urban greenery via a web portal. Moreover, the city provides artists with the possibility of making graffiti – typically on walls and in gates of residential buildings. There are also plans to build bike lanes, but the issue of profitability of this type of investment remains. Bicycles are a popular mode of transport in summer, but it is practically impossible to use them in the wintertime.

The changes in the ownership structure indicated above also impacted the problem of arson. Most of the previously state-owned flats have now been privatised, and the buyers were granted high discounts on

their purchase. If a wooden building was set on fire six times, it was obvious that someone was planning to acquire land for investment. At the same time, there were far fewer cases of arson of privately-owned objects than those that still belonged to the state. Some of our respondents also emphasised the important role of the legal regulations allowing for the privatisation of residential units, but not land, which presently remains the property of the city. This may be another reason why wealthy citizens of Tomsk prefer to live out of town. Of course, this is also due to such factors as more intimate atmosphere, isolation from the urban noise and a sense of privacy (the residences are hidden behind the walls and surrounded by greenery).

Perhaps the wooden houses called *terems* are not of interest to economic elites or the middle class, but, according to a writer we talked with, they remain the leitmotif of numerous local literary works (the term *terem* dates back to the times of Kievan Rus'). One can also find legends, e.g. about the underground Tomsk. Back when the engineering knowledge was not sufficient, houses would often collapse into the ground. Some say that there is virtually another city hidden below the earth's surface. "I myself have written about Tomsk, about its uniqueness. Clichés, of course," the aforementioned writer admits. "Some claim that the number of wooden houses might as well be reduced. Fifty federal terems is enough, the others may disappear. The only good thing about them is that they are very cramped, with no heating, uncomfortable to live in and people willingly move from them to flats of a higher standard. Well, I often travel around Russia and I can say that there are two cities where I could live – Tomsk and St. Petersburg."

Paweł Raczyński, an expert on Tomsk architecture, told us that the city was to be expanded on the basis of pre-made plans from St. Petersburg. According to another legend Peter I was buried there. As Raczyński explains, out of approximately 1500–1600 wooden houses there are 700 left. Most of them are to be placed under protection. Some are not so much monuments of architecture as of history and culture: "Stalin used to stay in one building, Kirov spent the night in another, etc.". In September 2004, the governor passed a law on the preservation of wooden architecture. The decision was to keep eight oases, i.e. historical zones. The first financial support was given to Kuzniecov Street and covered 12 sites. The reconstruction is carried out by the Architecture Department. At the time when we interviewed him, Raczyński worked at the Department of Culture and would participate in the discussions concerning the model and scope of the revitalisation merely in the role of an expert. While he recommended that the full

documentation of wooden architecture should be submitted to UNESCO, the answer was that such a step would entail too serious consequences.

REFERENCES

- Arnheim 1977 – Arnheim R. The Dynamics of Architectural Form. Berkeley, 1977.
- Avanesov et al. 2015 – The Atmosphere of Tomsk. Tomsk, 2015.
- Humphrey 2002 – Humphrey C. The Unmaking of Soviet Life: Everyday Economies after Socialism. Ithaca, 2002.
- Lefebvre 2003 – Lefebvre H. Key Writings. Transl. into English. London, New York, 2003.

Ματεριάλ πούστυπύλ β ρεδακτύου 28.02.2019