

ИСТОРИЧЕСКИЕ НАУКИ

УДК 94(477-22)«192»(045)

Abrazumova O. M.

*Candidate of historical sciences,
Senior Lecturer, Department of Archeology
and Special Historical Disciplines,
Bohdan Khmelnytsky Cherkasy National University*

TRANSFORMATION OF THE POLITICAL CULTURE OF THE UKRAINIAN PEASANTRY IN THE 1920S

Абразумова Елена Николаевна

*кандидат исторических наук,
ст. преподаватель кафедры археологии
и специальных отраслей исторической науки
Черкасский национальный университета имени Богдана Хмельницкого*

ТРАНСФОРМАЦИЯ ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОЙ КУЛЬТУРЫ УКРАИНСКОГО КРЕСТЬЯНСТВА В 1920-Е ГГ.

Summary. The article analyzes the formation and transformation of the political culture of the Ukrainian peasantry during the first decade of the establishment of Soviet power. The complex of measures and technologies of the Bolsheviks, which were used to control the socio-political activity of the majority of the population, is considered. The political mood of the population ranged from armed methods of resistance to power in the early and late 1920s, to democratic attempts to cooperate by discussing a range of social issues and the formation of independent civic peasant organizations in the middle of the decade. However, ignoring the demands and neglecting the interests of the majority of the population led to a critical aggravation of relations between the state and the peasantry.

Аннотация. В статье проанализировано формирование и трансформацию политической культуры украинского крестьянства в течение первого десятилетия утверждения советской власти. Рассмотрен комплекс мероприятий и технологий большевиков, которые использовались для взятия под контроль общественно-политической активности основной массы населения. Политические настроения населения колебались от вооруженных методов сопротивления власти в начале и в конце 1920-х гг., к демократическим попыткам сотрудничества путем обсуждения комплекса социальных проблем и образования независимых общественных крестьянских организаций в середине десятилетия. Однако, игнорирование требований и пренебрежение интересами большинства населения привело к критическому обострению взаимоотношений государства и крестьянства.

Abstract. Introduction. Given the difficult current stage of development of the Ukrainian state, it is extremely important to find the origins of the existing political culture of Ukrainians. **The purpose** of the article is to analyze the formation and transformation of the political culture of the Ukrainian peasantry during the first decade of the establishment of Soviet power.

Results. The article considers a set of measures and technologies of the Bolsheviks, which were used to control the socio-political activity of the majority of the population. The policy of the new government led to an increase in social activity of the peasantry. Elimination of illiteracy, creation of a network of reading houses, libraries, dissemination of information through print media, gradual establishment of radio stations, constant propaganda talks and lectures, demonstration of propaganda films, involvement of peasants in non-partisan conferences, their involvement in various public goods of the rural population in numerous election campaigns, the involvement of peasants in the formation of local authorities have become quite a powerful impetus to the development of public activity of the rural population and, in particular, the formation of initiative groups and centers to strengthen the participation and role of the peasant topical issues of village life.

These measures, according to the plan of the authorities, were aimed at enhancing the attractiveness of Soviet ideals. At the same time, they had a certain educational value and objectively contributed to the realization of the peasants' own interests. As a result, peasant society, having argued for radical changes in consciousness, in the 1920s became an active subject in the socio-political sphere of post-revolutionary society.

The originality of the study lies in the fact that the Ukrainian peasantry, which made up the vast majority of the population of the republic at that time, was considered the main object of socio-political transformations of the Bolsheviks.

Conclusions. The political mood of the population ranged from armed methods of resistance to power in the early and late 1920s, to democratic attempts to cooperate by discussing a range of social issues and the formation of independent civic peasant organizations in the middle of the decade. However, ignoring the demands and neglecting the interests of the majority of the population led to a critical aggravation of relations between the state and the peasantry, which later resulted in the tragedy of repression and the Holodomor.

Key words: political culture, new economic policy, social and political activity, public moods, public organizations, peasant movement.

Ключевые слова: политическая культура, новая экономическая политика, общественно-политическая активность, общественные настроения, общественные организации, крестьянское движение.

Introduction. The young Ukrainian state has a rather complicated political history. In less than thirty years of independence, Ukrainians, having gained the right to manage their own lives, have repeatedly demonstrated quite contradictory and ambiguous political decisions. Failures and failures automatically fall on the shoulders of the previous government, and the Ukrainian people are ready to experiment again. Therefore, the search for the origins of the formed political culture of Ukrainians is extremely important at present.

Ukraine belongs to the post-totalitarian countries. During the Soviet period of its history, our country has fully experienced all the mechanisms of social transformation tested by the Bolsheviks, including the formation of a new political culture. Therefore, today the appeal to overcome the origins of the problem is not only scientific but also practical. In this context, the NEP period is of special interest, because at this time there was not only economic growth of the Ukrainian countryside, but also the growth of civic activity, amateur initiative, the formation of strong sprouts of political culture of the majority of Ukrainian society – the peasantry.

Recent researches and publications. The historiography of the phenomenon of political culture of totalitarian societies is extremely numerous. In fact, its study by Western researchers dates back to the establishment of these regimes and is relevant in the postwar period [1]. In domestic historiography, the understanding of political culture under totalitarianism has been gaining momentum since the late 1980s and early 1990s. The scientific paradigm and methodology of research of political culture as a socio-cultural system and process are proposed in the monograph of O. Rudakevich [3]. In the last decade, Ukrainian scholars, including K. Goloveshkina [3] and O. Posvistak [4], have actualized the study of the formation of mass political culture in the 1930s.

Originality. However, even today, researchers overlook the transformation of the political culture of the Ukrainian peasantry, despite the fact that it was the vast majority of the population and was actually the object of transformation of the Bolsheviks. This is due to the author's appeal to her study.

The purpose of the article is to study the transformation of the political culture of peasant society during the 1920s.

Results. The long period of military and political upheavals of 1917-1921 could not but affect the mass consciousness of the peasantry. Fierce armed confrontation and profound changes of socio-political and socio-economic nature led to a significant transformation of the basic principles of the peasant worldview. In these specific conditions, the bulk of the Ukrainian population – the peasantry – witnessed not only the breakdown of civilization, but also an active participant in these events.

The rejection of the radicalism of the war years stimulated the normalization of society. At the same time, peasant society, having been subjected to radical changes in consciousness, became an active subject of the socio-political sphere of post-revolutionary society in the 1920s.

To a large extent, the very policy of the new government led to an increase in the social activity of the peasantry. Elimination of illiteracy, creation of a network of reading houses, libraries, dissemination of information through print media, gradual establishment of radio stations, constant propaganda talks and lectures, demonstration of propaganda films, involvement of peasants in non-partisan conferences, their involvement in various public goods of the rural population in numerous election campaigns, the involvement of peasants in the formation of local authorities have become quite a powerful impetus to the development of public activity of the rural population and, in particular, the formation of initiative groups and centers to strengthen the participation and role of the peasant topical issues of village life.

These measures, according to the plan of the authorities, were aimed at enhancing the attractiveness of Soviet ideals. At the same time, they had a certain educational value and objectively contributed to the realization of the peasants' own interests.

During the NEP years, the socio-political life of the village became increasingly under the control of the Soviet authorities. In fact, the civil life of the Ukrainian village of the NEP era was characterized by two contradictory tendencies: the first was the desire for democratization, which was spontaneously formed in the minds of the peasant masses awakened by the revolution; the second is artificially imposed authoritarian authoritarianism.

The Soviet government, ostensibly declaring its devotion to the interests of the broad masses of the people and, consequently, «true» democracy, albeit with the frank stipulation that it operates under the dictatorship of the proletariat, contributed in every way to the creation of new public associations. According to the then understanding of the socialist (communist) perspective, they were to fill all spheres of life in Soviet society. The authorities declared the activities of public organizations as an integral, necessary part of building socialism. In view of this, their main task was to focus their efforts on the practical implementation of party and government directives.

Their organizational formation was the result of purposeful efforts of party organizations, which involved state, trade union and other Soviet structures in solving this problem. They also defined the mechanism of activity of public associations, filling it with the necessary content of the party. The Soviet system of public associations emerged with the priority of socio-economic issues in society. As you know, the state, not having the material means to solve them, was

forced to go to the proclamation of a new economic policy, in other words, to allow the economy a private, individual initiative. The public sphere is no exception. The authorities turned to non-governmental organizations for support not only to solve urgent practical problems of the country's socio-cultural development. First of all, it was a question of strengthening the state ideological and political influence on the apolitical masses of the traditionally self-sufficient Ukrainian people, the basis of which was the peasantry. It was no big secret that in the peasant environment, in contrast to the working class, the positions of the Bolsheviks, the Soviet government, were shaky. In an effort to influence this sphere, which is inaccessible to its political and organizational activities, the authorities came to understand the need to develop structures of indirect influence on the Ukrainian peasantry.

The activities of public associations in the 1920s were strictly regulated by law. The Bolsheviks made efforts to completely eliminate all pre-revolutionary civil societies and unions. However, even the quasi-social life of the Soviet type could not find itself in a complete vacuum. Therefore, objectively, there was a need to create a new network of «public infrastructure», a network of voluntary public organizations of the Soviet orientation, or at least coloring. They were to ensure the interaction of power with various social groups in order to solve certain problems in the state or to meet the urgent needs of the people.

Reflecting on the range of problems facing the ruling party, M. Bukharin stated that the colossal «bureaucracy» that emerged during the years of «military communism» has all the signs of party isolation, and a «void» has formed between the Bolshevik government and the people. He saw the opposition to this phenomenon in filling the vacuum with hundreds and thousands of small and large, quickly created on a voluntary basis societies, circles, associations, which were to ensure effective communication between the ruling party and the people. They were to promote decentralized initiative and create a chain mechanism through which the party could influence and listen to public opinion. In this way, the growth of public consciousness was to lead to the reproduction of social tissues torn apart by the war [5, p. 179].

In a relatively short time, freedom of association has been transformed from a citizen's right into one of the powers of a state body. In fact, it was the state that created non-state formations and managed them itself. For example, the state could regulate the species structure of public associations, their number, indicate the need to create or eliminate certain of them. For example, in the resolution of the Organizing Bureau of the Central Committee of the RCP (b) of February 1, 1925, special attention was paid to the problem of mass organizations in rural areas: to the peasantry. In the near future, it is considered possible for the party to actively promote in the village such organizations as «Down with illiteracy» and societies related to the country's defense» [6, p. 13].

In the eyes of the ruling party's leadership, the Ukrainian countryside was a special traditionally

conservative environment of «petty-bourgeois producers». With this in mind, the state set before all parts of the Soviet party-state apparatus an urgent task: to consolidate its power in the countryside by all means. First of all, it meant extending its influence to as many peasants as possible. Involvement of the rural population in active social and political life in any of its forms was to contribute to the accomplishment of this difficult task. To this end, in the 1920s the party launched an active campaign in the Ukrainian countryside, aimed at establishing the activities of numerous professional, national, youth, women's, cultural and educational, even scientific societies and organizations. Among other tasks, their diversity and mass character should indicate broad support for the rural population of the Soviet government.

Public organizations, working closely with government agencies and the ruling party, occupied one of the key places in the socio-political life of the country. In the second half of the 1920's, millions of peasants were involved in various public organizations: the Komsomol, trade unions, the Committees of poor peasants, peasant mutual aid societies, women's delegate meetings, workers of Selkoriv, Tsoaviahim, Bezbozhnyk, Friends of Children, Kultzmychka, «Down with illiteracy», «Anti-alcohol society», «Friends of the radio», «Society for the promotion of young Leninists», etc. In this way, the party penetrated the village, asserting its power.

The priority principle of organizing the work of these societies in the then «liberal period» of rural life was open centralism. Such a system was to gradually accustom the freedom-loving peasantry to accept the will of others imposed on them. A common shortcoming of Soviet-era civil society was the formalism in their activities and the low interest of the population in their existence. Deprived of local initiatives, members of organizations, especially in rural areas, often did not show business activity. There were cases when village centers existed only on paper.

At the same time, it cannot be ruled out that mass societies were endowed with independence and democracy in internal organization and functioning (relative freedom of speech of participants at meetings and conferences, election of governing bodies). This made it easier for mass voluntary societies to solve their statutory tasks, assist the Soviet state in implementing its socio-cultural policy (eliminate illiteracy, and combat child homelessness), and assist the ruling party in spreading its political and ideological attitudes.

In the late 1920s, the policy of the Soviet government towards public associations in the Ukrainian countryside underwent significant changes. The main trend has been to break the existing system of public organizations by liquidating them or by encouraging them to reorganize into a new type of association. As a result, there has been an overall reduction in the number of public associations. At the same time, in a number of cases, the then network was supplemented by new mass organizations. However, the dominant tendency for all of them was the rigid subordination of their activities to the total control of the party-state machine, their reorientation from solving mostly public to purely political and

ideological tasks. The party-state apparatus, having established virtually total control over all spheres of peasant life, secured a complete monopoly. In this way, the Ukrainian peasantry found itself in the grip of totalitarianism.

During the years of the new economic policy, despite the opposition of the strengthening totalitarian system, the active development of various, really active, original public organizations of the Ukrainian peasantry continued. Their creation and activities were not initiated by the authorities or remained little controlled by the state. They became an important factor in all spheres of life in the village of that time.

The Ukrainian peasantry in the 1920s was not an inert, conformist mass, incapable of active socio-political initiative. On the contrary, the ancient historical traditions of local self-government, along with the democratic conquests of the revolution of 1905–1907 and the national liberation struggles of 1917–1921, intensified the socio-political life of the village. Evidence of this is the fact that in the early 1920's in the countryside there was an extensive network of various economic, cultural, educational and social organizations.

The traditional democratic nature of the adoption and implementation of important cultural, educational, socio-economic decisions by mass peasant organizations became one of the determining factors in the dynamic development of the Ukrainian village in the 1920s. However, the active development of influential self-governing peasant organizations provoked growing opposition. The latter officially proclaimed the «dictatorship of the proletariat» the cornerstone of the new political system. The results of the activities of self-governing peasant organizations in the 1920s convincingly testify to good prospects under favorable, non-Bolshevik conditions and a significant unrealized potential for their further development.

The growth of socio-political activity of the Ukrainian peasantry often did not fit into the norms officially established by the Soviet authorities. In the 1920s, so-called informal (illegal) organizations functioned in the Ukrainian countryside. They were not legally registered, created spontaneously at the initiative of the «bottom», in accordance with the perceived common interests. Non-Bolshevik public associations (which were not involved in politics) usually operated without a clear program, on the principles of self-government.

During 1922–1924, all societies and unions were re-registered. To do this, they sent to the NKVD submissions, statutes, lists of members. The NKVD coordinated the issue of approving the statutes with the OGPU and with the relevant People's Commissariats, to which this or that organization was subordinated. As a result of such openly prohibitive actions by the authorities, by the second half of 1925, virtually no legal non-Soviet public organization remained throughout Ukraine. Only those public organizations remained in the village, in the cultural and educational activities of which the state was interested, but they were also under state and ideological control. Exercising a monopoly on power, the party constantly and systematically used anti-democratic methods and

techniques to combat social movements opposed to the government. To implement their ideas on the establishment of totalitarian

In order to realize its ideas of establishing totalitarian statehood, the party leadership planned to rely on a system of fully state-owned public organizations, unions, and various associations of a purely Soviet orientation. There was no place for an independent peasant public initiative in the new state of the «dictatorship of the proletariat».

Already in the first months of its establishment in Ukraine, the Bolshevik government took a clear course to ensure that all public organizations of Soviet society, without exception, formed a single system of mass non-partisan structures. They were to serve as a reliable guide to the policies of the ruling party in the masses. With their help, it would not only broadcast its will to the people, but could also adjust public policy if necessary, taking into account changes in the mood of the masses. The system was to be built and function, like the ruling party itself, on the principles of «democratic centralism». He ruled out the possibility of any real organizational autonomy and independence in decision-making.

Against the general background of numerous forms and directions of peasant public self-organization in the 1920s, the movement for the creation of peasant unions and other rural associations close to it in spirit and direction stood out. We believe that this was the most organized and widespread form of social activity, truly massive and progressive. Social movements have a mass character and are created for a specific purpose. However, in contrast to clearly structured public organizations, these are unorganized mass associations of citizens of different socio-political orientations, whose activities are usually temporary and often aimed at performing only certain, usually tactical tasks. After that, they either disintegrate or consolidate into new political parties or public structures. The creation of a peasant union (union) became the most popular and widespread slogan of the socio-political sentiments of the Ukrainian peasantry in the 1920s. Note that in the 1920s the sentiments about the creation of peasant unions were recorded in almost all republics of the Soviet Union. In terms of scale of distribution, Ukraine ranked second after the Central Black Earth of the RSFSR. Peasants in Zaporizhia, Kherson, Zinoviev and Dnipropetrovsk districts were especially active in this regard [7, p. 787].

In response, the Soviet authorities tried to explain the popularity of the idea of peasant unions by the presence in the countryside of a large number of leaders of local and regional branches of Ukrainian national parties, active participants in the agrarian movements of 1902–1917, and other «dark elements». Among the reasons for the great interest in the idea of creating their own union was also the preservation in the people's memory of the role of peasant unions in the insurgent movement during the Ukrainian National Revolution [7, p. 786].

Archival data and periodicals of the 1920s testify to the fact of extraordinary social activity of peasants. Their analysis occupied an important place in the then political technologies of the Soviet government.

Numerous special surveys, secret reports and reports of the period show that, despite the fact that in different regions of Ukraine there were some differences in the causes, currents, members of informal community centers, there was a common tendency to increase the peasant movement. It had a wide range of varieties. Thus, the opposition of the population ranged from armed methods of resistance to the authorities in the early and late 1920s, to democratic attempts to cooperate by discussing a range of social problems and the formation of independent public peasant organizations.

The direction and nature of the peasant movement were striking indicators of the reaction of the rural community to Soviet policy in the countryside. The emergence of such movements was complex in nature and was due to many factors. There were also purely subjective factors. Usually the movement occurred spontaneously and unsystematically, which is typical for transition periods. Ignoring the demands and neglecting the interests of the majority of the population led to a critical aggravation of relations between the state and the peasantry in the late 1920's.

These measures have every reason to be called a state counter-revolution against the peasant revolution. The dominant principles of the establishment of Soviet power in the Ukrainian countryside were as follows: division of the village on property grounds, granting artificial advantages to the proletarian strata, manipulation of the norms of representation in elections to councils, multilevel way of their construction, struggle against Socialist-Revolutionary parties. peasantry. Village councils were staffed solely on the basis of their obedience – from people completely loyal to the government. Opposition-minded peasants were not allowed to participate in the election process. The right to recall deputies did not exist, deputies were not accountable to voters, and executive committees were not accountable to councils, which were effectively cut off from the masses.

The ruling party, establishing a totalitarian society, created a holistic system of administrative, political and ideological influence and control over all segments and age groups. It supported only regime-loyal public organizations operating in rural areas.

Conclusions. During the 1920s, the socio-political thought of the peasants was the object of meticulous attention of the Bolsheviks. They used it in their technologies to establish the Bolshevik government. Numerous special surveys, secret reports and reports of the period show that, despite the fact that in different regions of Ukraine there were some differences in the causes, currents, members of informal community centers, there was a general trend of growing peasant movement, which had a wide range. Thus, the opposition of the population ranged from armed methods of resistance to the authorities in the early and late 1920s, to democratic attempts to cooperate by discussing a range of social problems and the formation of independent peasant organizations.

The direction and nature of the peasant movement were clear indicators of the reaction of the rural community to certain steps of the Soviet government. The emergence of such movements was complex in

nature and was due to many factors, including subjective ones. Ignoring the demands and neglecting the interests of the majority of the population led to a critical aggravation of relations between the state and the peasantry in the late 1920's. Authorities failed during the 1920's. To curb the peasantry, to suppress the peasant revolution. This was done in the early 1930's. The tools of extermination of the peasantry of Ukraine, the peasant revolution were tax policy, forced collectivization, the Holodomor of 1932-1933.

References (in language original)

1. Арендт Х. Джерела тоталітаризму / Х. Арендт ; пер. з англ. – К. : Дух і літера, 2005.
2. Рудакевич О. Політична культура національних спільнот: теорія та методологія дослідження : моногр. / О. Рудакевич. – Тернопіль : ТНЕУ, 2013.
3. Голоवेशкіна К. Феномен масової політичної культури в тоталітарних суспільствах / К. Голоवेशкіна // Сучасна українська політика. Політики і політологи про неї. – К., 2011. – Вип. 22. – С. 395–403.
4. Посвістак О. А. Формування масової політичної культури в радянському суспільстві 1930-х років / О. А. Посвістак // Наукові записки [Вінницького державного педагогічного університету імені Михайла Коцюбинського]. Серія : Історія. – 2014. – Вип. 22. – С. 209–212.
5. Коэн С. Бухарин. Политическая биография. 1888–1938: Пер. с англ./ Общ. ред., послесл. и коммент. И. Е. Горелова. – Москва : Прогресс, 1988.
6. Центральний державний архів громадських об'єднань України. – Ф. 1. – О. 20. – Спр. 1270.
7. Советская деревня глазами ВЧК–ОГПУ–НКВД. 1918–1939: Документы и материалы: В 4 т. Т. 1 : Советская деревня глазами ВЧК – ОГПУ. 1918–1922 / Редкол.: А. Берелович (отв. ред.) и др. – Москва : РОССПЭН, 1998.

References:

1. Arendt Kh. (2005). Sources of totalitarianism (Dzherela totalitaryzmu). Kyiv: Dukh i litera (in Ukr.).
2. Rudakevich O. (2013). Political culture of national communities: theory and research methodology (Politychna kultura natsionalnykh spilnot: teoriya ta metodolohiya doslidzhennya). Ternopil: TNEU (in Ukr.).
3. Holoveshkina K. (2011). The phenomenon of mass political culture in totalitarian societies (Fenomen masovoi politychnoi kultury v totalitarnykh suspilstvakh). Suchasna ukrainska polityka. Polityky i politolohy pro nei (Ukrainian policy is very modern. Politicians and politologists about her), 22, 395–403 (in Ukr.).
4. Posvistak O. A. (2014). Formation of mass political culture in Soviet society in the 1930s (Formuvannia masovoi politychnoi kultury v radianskomu suspilstvi 1930-kh rokiv). Naukovi zapysky [Vinnytskoho derzhavnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Mykhaila Kotsiubynskoho]. (Scientific notes [of the Vinnytsia sovereign

pedagogical university to the name of Mikhail Kotsyubinsky]). Seria : Istoriia, 22, 209–212 (in Ukr.).

5. Koen S. (1988). Bukharin. Political biography. 1888–1938 (Bukharyn. Politycheskaia byohrafiia). 1888–1938. Moskva: Prohress (in Russ.).

6. Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi arkhiv hromadskykh obiednan Ukrainy. – F. 1. – O. 20. – Spr. 1270 (in Ukr.).

7. Soviet village through the eyes of the Cheka-OGPU-NKVD. 1918–1939: Documents and materials:

In 4 vols. Vol. 1: Soviet village through the eyes of the Cheka – OGPU. 1918–1922 (Sovetskaia derevnia hlazamy VChK–OHPU–NKVD. 1918–1939: Dokumenty i materyaly: V 4 t. T. 1 : Sovetskaia derevnia hlazamy VChK – OHPU. 1918–1922). Redkol.: A. Berelovych. 1998. Moskva : ROSSPEN (in Russ.).

УДК 93

ГРНТИ 03.23.31

Babenko Oksana Vasil'evna

Candidate of Historical Sciences, Senior Researcher

Institute of Scientific Information for Social Sciences of the Russian Academy of Sciences

ID ORCID 0000-0003-2138-2848

MOSCOW ART INDUSTRY IN THE SIXTH AND EARLY XXTH CENTURIES: JEWELRY MAKING

Бабенко Оксана Васильевна

кандидат исторических наук, старший научный сотрудник

Институт научной информации по общественным наукам Российской академии наук

МОСКОВСКАЯ ХУДОЖЕСТВЕННАЯ ПРОМЫШЛЕННОСТЬ В XIX – НАЧАЛЕ XX В.: ЮВЕЛИРНОЕ ДЕЛО

Summary. The article discusses the development of jewelry in Moscow in the XIXth – early XXth century. It provides a history of jewelry making in Russia. The author analyzes the emergence of large enterprises in this field. Special attention is paid to the firms of P.F. Sazikov, P.A. Ovchinnikov and O.F. Kurlyukov. The achievements of Moscow factories at all-Russian and international exhibitions are noted. The conclusion is made about the great importance of jewelry in the art industry of Moscow.

Аннотация. В статье рассматривается развитие ювелирного дела в Москве XIX - начала XX вв. Приводится предыстория ювелирного дела в России. Автор анализирует появление крупных предприятий в данной сфере. Особое внимание уделяется фирмам П.Ф. Сазикова, П.А. Овчинникова и О.Ф. Курлюкова. Отмечаются достижения московских фабрик на всероссийских и международных выставках. Делается вывод о большом значении ювелирного дела в художественной промышленности Москвы.

Keywords: *art industry, Moscow, jewelry, gold-silver business, factory.*

Ключевые слова: *художественная промышленность, Москва, ювелирное дело, золотосеребряное дело, фабрика.*

Постановка проблемы. Вопросы развития художественного производства в Москве XIX – начала XX века до сих пор мало изучены. Взаимосвязь развития экономики и культуры России также недостаточно показана в отечественной историографии, но именно она находится в основе художественной промышленности. Москва же всегда была важнейшим центром русской художественной культуры, в котором развивались различные ремесла и промыслы. Как отмечает А.П. Лихачёва, именно Москва «превратилась в “мануфактурную столицу”, заложив базу на десятилетия вперед для развития особого вида промышленности, сочетавшей в себе как ремесло, так и подлинное искусство» [7, с. 140]. А XIX – начало XX века – это время расцвета художественной промышленности Москвы.

Следует также отметить, что термин «художественная промышленность» (нем. «Kunstgewerbe») начал использоваться в России только в XIX веке. Соответственно, употреблять его

корректно только применительно к эпохе капитализма и более позднему времени. Предприятия художественной промышленности выпускали предметы декоративно-прикладного искусства, дорогие ткани. Для XIX века они считались роскошью. Точного определения понятия «художественная промышленность» в научной литературе нет. Этот теоретический вопрос ждет своего вдумчивого исследователя. Однако нельзя приступать к изучению отдельных аспектов рассматриваемой проблемы, не дав ей собственного определения. Итак, под художественной промышленностью мы понимаем производство серийных и массовых художественных изделий, составляющих существенную часть бытовой материальной культуры общества. Исследовать развитие художественной промышленности очень сложно из-за широты данной проблематики. Поэтому мы сосредоточились на ювелирном деле – важнейшей отрасли художественной промышленности Москвы. Необходимо отметить, что ювелирное дело отчасти включает в себя