

*D. Danyliuk, BA student*  
*N. Shkoliar, PhD in Ped., As. Prof.*  
*Khmelnyskyi National University*

## **THE INFLUENCE OF POLITICAL IDEAS ON ARCHITECTURE**

Architectural forms represented the power of empires, the ideology of religious and national states. Even in democratic societies, buildings reflect values such as freedom, tradition, etc. «National styles» usually develop against the background of national ideation. These ideologies can be observed throughout historical centuries, from antiquity and the Middle Ages to modernism, totalitarianism, postmodernism: among illustrating examples there is the USSR, the Third Reich, France, the USA and colonial India, Africa, to name a few.

Ideological archetypes begin in Antiquity: Greek temples and Roman forums were used for democracy and empire politics. Temples (Gothic, Byzantine style) in the Middle Ages testify to the power of the church and feudal lords. They were more focused on religion or chieftaincy than on strictly modern «ideology» but even in them, architectural solutions emphasized and strengthened the power of the rulers. During the period of nation-states (18 – 19th century), there was a need for «national style» in Europe. L. Greenfield and others noted that the revolution of 1848 gave the idea of «nation» an ethno-cultural connotation and led to the study of national forms in architecture [5]. Architects borrowed mythologized versions of past eras and folk motifs. Thus, in Great Britain and the USA, neoclassicism, which borrowed from Athens and Rome, saved the battle for democracy, while in Eastern Europe and the Caucasus, national romanticism was in vogue. The latter turned to folk traditions such as facades with embroidered motifs, balconies, towers. Linda et al. (2022) note: «creating a national idea encourages the phenomenon of national style in architecture, which means that buildings represent a national idea». For example, in the 1918–30s, young states such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania adopted the «national style», invoking the «golden ages» or Grand Duke Culture.

Soviet ideology imposed clear, centralized control on architecture in the 20th century. The USSR, by decree of the Union of Architects, already in 1932 announced the only creative tool – socialist realism focused on classicism. This established a «total orientation to classicism» in design. During the Stalinist period, the authorities played with architecture as a form of power, wide avenues were opened through Moscow for military parades, and the residences of the government and party elite which were called «colonizers», were luxuriously built featuring main arches, porticoes, stucco. Ordinary residential quarters featured modest buildings. In this sense, monumental classicism almost sanctified the Stalinist system. For example, in 1955, the Central Committee of the CPSU, by its decision «On design and mass construction», actually ordered the revival of modernism in housing construction: the political will of «resurrected modernism anew» [2].

«Socialist modernism» soon established itself after its «thaw» (1950–60s): mass typical housing; brutalism of public facilities. As Osadchy (2016) explains, a gathering of socialist realists was established in Lviv and Ivano-Frankivsk in the post-war decades and modernist structures, in accordance with totalitarianism.

The very simplicity of the form and the neoclassical arches deliberately evoke the echoes of Ancient Rome (reinforcing the myth of the «greatness of Italians»). In the intervening years, fascism and neorealists moved to neoclassicism, especially in Italy and Germany. Hitler and Mussolini presented themselves as the heirs of Ancient Rome and Greece: they designed huge streets, palaces equipped with columns, mass buildings for display. the Roman Palazzo della Civiltà Italiana established «the connection of the Italian regime with the greatness of Ancient».

Architecture has consistently served as a powerful instrument for expressing and reinforcing political ideas across different historical periods. From Antiquity to modern times, architectural forms have reflected dominant ideologies, whether democratic, religious, national, or totalitarian, shaping not only physical spaces but also social perceptions and values.

The analysis demonstrates that political systems actively influence architectural styles, materials, and urban planning. In particular, totalitarian regimes, such as those of the USSR, Nazi Germany, and Fascist Italy, used architecture as a tool of control, propaganda, and symbolic representation of power. Monumentality, symmetry, and references to classical antiquity were deliberately employed to legitimize authority and create a sense of permanence and dominance.

At the same time, democratic and nation-building contexts also shaped architecture by promoting national identity and cultural heritage. The emergence of «national styles» in the 18th–20th centuries illustrates how architecture can embody collective memory, traditions, and ideological aspirations.

Thus, architecture should be viewed not merely as an artistic or functional practice but as a socio-political phenomenon closely connected with historical processes and ideological transformations. Understanding this relationship allows for a deeper interpretation of architectural heritage and its role in shaping both past and contemporary societies.

#### **REFERENCES**

1. Frankiv R. Ideological aspects of the architecture of national determined historicism / R. Frankiv // *Architectural Studies*. – 2021. – Vol. 7, No. 1. – P. 24–31.
2. Negay G., Bielinska M. Ideological content of architectural form / G. Negay, M. Bielinska // *Intellectual Archive*. – 2017. – Vol. 6, No. 3. – P. 19–22.
3. Quek R., Deane D., Butler S. *Nationalism and Architecture* / R. Quek, D. Deane, S. Butler. – London : Ashgate Publishing, 2013.
4. Vale L. J. *Architecture, Power and National Identity*. – New Haven : Yale University Press, 1992.
5. Deane D. *Nationalism and Architecture*. - Farnham : Ashgate, 2014.