



CODEN [USA]: IAJ PBB

ISSN: 2349-7750

**INDO AMERICAN JOURNAL OF
PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES**<http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2648229>Available online at: <http://www.iajps.com>

Research Article

**THE ROLE OF URBANIZATION IN DEVELOPMENT OF
PARTY-STATE SYSTEM OF THE USSR.**Tamara Bulygina¹, Inna Kravchenko², Evgeny Tufanov².¹North Caucasus Federal University, Pushkin street, 1, Stavropol 355007, Russia, ²Stavropol State Agrarian University, Zootekhnicheskiiy lane 12, Stavropol 355017, Russia.**Abstract:**

The article reveals the main historical provisions of urbanization processes and the specifics of urban development on selected examples of the North Caucasus region. The authors attempted to identify the main advantages and disadvantages of urbanization in the framework of the Caucasian city. The article presents the effects of the modernization process on the example of urban growth and the expansion of their influence on all aspects of society, which is traditionally considered among scientists to be phenomenal, one of the most significant phenomena in the 20th century. Based on historical research, the process of urban growth, the gradual formation of their networks and systems, and the spread of urban lifestyles are related to the urbanization process. Traditionally, to characterize urbanization take only its first component, showing the proportion of urban population. But it is important to take into account the total urban population, that is, to use not only relative, but also absolute data, thus showing the level and extent of urbanization. On the basis of archival materials put into scientific circulation and periodicals of the period under study, the authors study the synthesis of theoretical and practical stages associated with the modernization, industrialization, urbanization and sociocultural development of the North Caucasus in the second half of the 20th century. Based on the research of historical experience, a deep methodological analysis of the problems has been conducted. In the present article, the authors attempted to identify the main advantages and disadvantages of urbanization within the framework of the Caucasian city. On the basis of archival materials introduced into scientific circulation and periodicals of the period under study, the authors study the implementation of general trends and reveal the specifics of the North Caucasian history of this period. Researchers conclude that urbanization was a factor in the development of Soviet cities in the Caucasus.

Keywords: industrialization, urbanization, modernization, polyethnicity, demography, resettlement, national trends, regional elites, economy, party-state management, city, USSR.

Corresponding author:**Tamara Bulygina,**North Caucasus Federal University,
Pushkin street, 1, Stavropol 355007, Russia.

QR code



Please cite this article in press Tamara Bulygina et al., *The Role Of Urbanization In Development Of Party-State System Of The Ussr.*, Indo Am. J. P. Sci, 2019; 06(04).

INTRODUCTION:

Despite the fact that the problems of urbanization in the USSR and abroad are attracting more and more attention of specialists in various fields, many issues of urbanization have not been adequately reflected, especially in terms of its socio-economic characteristics.

Today, there are definitions of urbanization as a process of “increasing the role of cities in the life of a country, region”, “growth of large cities and concentration of people’s activities in relatively small areas of the territory”, “predominant growth of large cities and large urban agglomerations based on them”, etc.

In the socio-human sciences, there are two main approaches to the category of "urbanization". It should be said that the former is characterized by a broad understanding of its phenomenon as the development of cities, regardless of the specifics of civilizations, social systems, historical time, etc. In the context of this, even archeologists study urbanization. The second understanding is historically (and chronologically) narrower and is connected with radical social changes, the beginning of which was laid by the manufactory stage of production and the subsequent industrial revolution. It was changes in the production sphere that gave rise to a fundamentally new phenomenon, which can be designated as a transition from rural to urban society.

Referring to the problem of defining the concept of “urbanization”, I would like to note that in the period of the 60s-80s, urbanization was understood as a specific process of transformation of the entire population or individual elements of the non-urban environment under the influence of urban development and city-forming processes [1] The transformation of the rural environment into the urban one can be done in two ways: both by teaching the urban norms and their distribution to the rural environment, and by transferring the rural elements of the environment to the cities, primarily through migration population in the city.

Proceeding from the above, we come to the conclusion that not only the number of cities, but also the number and proportion of the urban population can be an indicator of urbanization. The change in the share of the urban population over a certain period acts as a measure of the pace of urbanization. So, in the USSR the proportion of the urban population to the beginning of the 60s. accounted for 50%. Using these theoretical approaches, we will try to determine the specificity of urbanization in our society in the

last Soviet twentieth anniversary. The study can be divided into three main components of the Soviet urbanization: urban forms of production and settlement, urban living conditions and urban lifestyle, which will be the object of studying this problem.

MATERIALS AND METHODS:

An analysis of historical sources shows that urbanization in the USSR resembles the type of development characteristic of developing countries, and suggests that it bore a quasi-process trait: retained the outward signs of the dynamics of urbanization, but in many ways it did not show the prevailing ideas about the image and level life of the population and standards of urban environment [2].

Methodology for the study of urbanization in Soviet science of the 60s-80s reflected the general underestimation of man in social development, characteristic of Soviet science. Urbanization was determined, first of all, by the growth of cities, types of settlement and other external (albeit important) forms of urban development, leaving the person himself in the background. It is this interpretation of the process of urbanization that prevailed in our 60s-80s. years, reflected not only the state (subjective) attitude towards him, isolation from world science, the rejection of many of its achievements, but also the objective nature of the development of Soviet urbanization as a largely quasi-process [3]. Its essence convincingly showed A.S. Akhiezer, stressing that the cities were formed not only as administrative centers, but also as a necessary appendage of production, some “packaging” for the accommodation of personnel.

Recently, in domestic historical science, the emphasis in studying urbanization processes has shifted towards considering the city as a community of people with a specific way of life, towards studying the socio-psychological state of people during the transition from rural life to city status [4].

Within the framework of the anthropocultural paradigm, one can single out the specifics of the evolution of Soviet urbanization. If in the developed countries of the West to the second half of the XIX century. such stages as the relocation of the majority of the population to the cities, the change of their occupations, the concentration of the population in large cities, the approval of the urban way of life as a phenomenon of culture and modern civilization, have been completed for a long time, then in the USSR the processes of adaptation of rural residents to the urban lifestyle, mastering them urban culture, its value

system, norms of behavior and other characteristics of the second stage, in the 60s-80s were far from being completed [5].

Considering the problems of the Soviet urbanization of the 60s-80s, it should be noted that in most of the Soviet Union republics the status of urban settlements was determined depending on the number of residents, their occupation and the importance of settlements. In the RSFSR, in the period under review, the cities included settlements with the smallest population of 12 thousand people, with the number of workers, employees and members of their families at least 85%.

The systematic process of creation and growth of Soviet cities in the 60s-80s gradually covered all areas of the country. Soviet cities, established in the system, the core of which usually became a major center, influenced the economic and social life of the 60s-80s much stronger than single cities, affecting each separately, indicating an intensification of the urbanization process [6].

The process of Soviet urbanization in the 60s-80s caused the acceleration of the process of socialization, not only in production, but also in the service sector. The process of urbanization developed, the number of cities grew, the population increased. This process increasingly conditioned the spread of urban "type" of activity, which, in its turn, caused an increase in the need for educational, cultural, and everyday institutions to improve the quality of their work. For the period from the 60s to the 80s. the proportion of the urban population increased by 30% and was at the beginning of the 80s. 63%. Accordingly, the level of education of the population has also increased, since the urban population generally had a higher level of education during the study period [7].

A characteristic feature of urbanization in the USSR in the period was also the fact that it took place under the conditions of the scientific and technological revolution and promoted large-scale and integrated socio-economic development. These conditions not only intensified the process of urbanization, but also exposed its main essential features. The impact of the urbanization process on the location of production and its organization, on the resettlement of the population and changing its social structure has become obvious. At the final stage of Soviet history, relative proportionality was observed (in meaning) in the whole of the processes of socio-economic development and urbanization. At the same time, the pace of urbanization, the trends of its development in

certain areas did not always correspond to the deep laws of the development of society. First of all, the attention is drawn not to the existing settlement system (city, village) to the process of socio-economic development of society [8].

The discrepancy between individual manifestations of urbanization and the tasks of the socio-economic development of Soviet society in the 1960s-1980s. it was also found that the reduction in the number of the rural population was proceeding at a faster rate than $\pi\tau\sigma$ was justified by the results of scientific and technological progress. As a result, in some periods, the differences between town and country deepened, although, in general, socialist urbanization led to their smoothing [9].

On the process of urbanization 60s-80s. It was also influenced by the fact that urban planning and architecture in the USSR were subject to centralized regulation and management. Construction rested on the uniform canons of functionalism, and housing construction was oriented towards the social tasks of "socializing socialist life". From the sphere of private and economic life and interrelations of numerous subjects on the ground, they moved into a fully centrally regulated area, turned into one of the elements of the mechanism for exercising state power and solving the tasks put forward by the party [10]. As a result, cities turned into settlements at enterprises, and town planning completely turned out to be subordinate to production controlled from the center. The construction customer in almost all cases was the state represented by the ministries that owned enterprises. [11] Through the ministries, funding was allocated for industrial construction of "social and cultural", including housing, while the city itself did not actually have the finances and material and technical resources for its own development.

The Soviet practice of free-of-charge (for ministries, not for society) of resources generated a number of negative consequences. The ministries that did not pay local authorities until 1989 for land, water, workers, did everything possible to preserve, expand, place new production facilities in cities. Their main interest consisted in minimizing social expenditures and in guaranteeing the production of labor, which was most fully provided by large cities, while the restraining economic levers in the form of taxes to cities were not involved [12].

As a result, in the USSR until the early 1990s. continued rampant extensive urban growth, and the situation was in line with the trends of developing countries, while in a number of developed Western

countries, centrifugal trends replaced concentration of population, capital investment, production. With all this, it should be noted that the diversity of urbanization as a historical process does not fit into the framework of conjuncture patterns of studying Soviet history [14]. As the urban population grew, the cultural and technical level not only of the entire population, but also of labor resources, changed. The growth of the cultural and technical level of labor resources took place on the basis of the growth of the level of education and, as a result, caused an increase in the needs for social infrastructure.

In the period under review, the process of urbanization in the USSR led to the tendency of partial socialization of such a function as the reproduction of the population and labor resources. As a result, the urban population of the country in the study period was reproduced only mainly due to migration.

Intensive development of urbanization in the 60s-80s. will be not only in the growth of cities, but, above all, in their further qualitative transformation. As a result of the territorial division of social labor, during the course of its development, each city acquired new functions, as its economy grew more complex, its engineering devices were retooled, its engineering devices were technically re-equipped, the degree of improvement was improved, and the social infrastructure developed.

It should not be forgotten that an important direction in the intensification of the urbanization process in the USSR was the gradual transformation of sections of the network of cities into urban settlement systems. This process became possible only when the number of cities became very significant and, therefore, geographically they became closer to each other. Urbanization in the 60s-80s. It has a beneficial effect on the improvement of the service sphere of the urban population, on its living conditions. Excluding the above, for the residents of the city there was an improvement in the air and water basins, the expansion of green areas and recreation areas.

The most famous controversy of the Soviet urbanization of the 60s-80s. there was a large gap between its quantitative and qualitative parameters, since the rapid growth in the number of citizens did not keep pace with their adaptation to the urban way of life and the assimilation of urban culture, was not supported by economic opportunities and social interests of the state. This largely predetermined both the type of Soviet urban development as extensive, and many characteristic features of Soviet

urbanization. By the beginning of the 80s, the number of city dwellers in the USSR increased 3 times, the number of cities and urban-type settlements increased almost 2.5 times. A modern urban network has emerged, as well as the type of the Soviet city itself, with its originality of buildings, planning, architectural appearance, quality of urban environment and the main characteristics of the citizen himself.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

The direct result of the formation of urbanization as a by-product of industrialization, disregard for human needs in the city, the social sphere and in general for solving specific urban problems for decades has been the incomplete, flawed, one-sided development of the urbanization process itself. Not all the urban population was included in the urban lifestyle by the nature of employment, level of service, variety of leisure, etc. In the general growth of the urban population of the country, approximately 70% were yesterday's villagers.

Excessive migration from a village to a city in a number of districts was aggravated by often ill-considered administrative transformations of rural to urban areas. This has had negative consequences not only for the city, but also for the countryside. The number of rural settlements in Russia decreased between the 1959 and 1989 censuses. almost doubled (from 294 to 153 thousand), mainly due to small villages with up to 500 inhabitants, and the rural population from 55.0 to 39.1 million people.

New cities and towns at large industrial enterprises grew rapidly, in spurts, without having the finances and time for cultural maturation, creating a normal urban environment with its inherent variety of activities, leisure, urban planning decisions, etc. That is why, paradoxically *это* sounds, in the country there are many cities and urban areas, devoid of the urban environment in its modern sense.

The consequence of totalitarian (military-industrial) urbanization, which is characterized by the abundance of cities in one industry with a weak development of central functions (relations with the surrounding territory), cultural potential, urban environment, etc. became the deformation of the functional structure of cities, the prevalence of single-specialized highly specialized centers. Hence, the township character of even large cities, which often still remain exceptionally huge settlements at giant enterprises.

The development of the urbanization process in the

20th century, in particular in the 60s-80s, on the one hand, demonstrates the processes of rapid growth of the urban population, increasing the diversity of life activity and updating the life of citizens, and on the other hand, special, catastrophic events in Russian history, which hindered the natural course of natural changes and sharply aggravated the already difficult problems of urban modernization. It is this modernization that is primarily associated with large quantitative shifts — large-scale migration of the rural population to the cities. True, Russia has missed its “demographic explosion” - if there were no huge losses from wars, repressions and famine, the population of the country, according to the Center for Demography and Human Ecology of the Institute of Economic Forecasting of the Russian Academy of Sciences, could be 50-60 million more than the urban population is 40-45 million, and, consequently, the urban network would look much more extensive in both the west and the east of the country.

At the same time, qualitative changes associated with the organization and functioning of urban systems and man in the city. But these changes dramatically lagged behind the quantitative changes in the urban structure of Russia in the 60s-80s. XX century. Such a gap is explained by the peculiarities of the historical, socio-economic and anthropo-cultural evolution of the country, which did not lead to the creation of a single urban space even in its relatively developed territory.

CONCLUSION:

Urban changes were massive, but remained half, incomplete. Tens of millions of villagers began to move, they were wary of the traditional norms and values that governed their life in the countryside. The new “rules of the game”, which corresponded to new historical opportunities in the urban environment, were perceived by yesterday’s rural residents much more slowly, determining in many ways the peculiarity of the Soviet city, especially the insufficiency (with the exception of capitals and few major centers) of its social and cultural potential. The emergence of a cultural vacuum in such important areas of human existence could not pass without a trace. It is worth noting that it greatly strengthened the transitional character of Soviet society, its sociocultural disintegration, and political totalitarianism.

In the framework of the global approach, the urban track, by which the life of the population of the RSFSR, as well as the entire USSR, was “normal” was only by Soviet standards, but in many respects it wasn’t good for world standards. If we speak more

strictly, then in the Soviet period Russia was dominated by the migration of the rural population to the cities (prerequisites of urbanization) over urbanization in its modern interpretation with its characteristic high quality and standard of living of citizens, a variety of urban culture, environment, etc. This is due to the shift of real priorities in Soviet society from person to production, from the interests of the individual to the interests of the state. Excluding the above, the prevalence in the Russian mentality of the historically established striving for the primary abolition of vast new territories, but not their capital arrangement, and many other features reflecting the social coloring of the era of “real socialism” also influenced.

At the same time, with all the negative aspects of the Soviet model of urbanization, it was within its framework that a historic breakthrough was made - the transition of Russia from the rural to the urban society. In Soviet urbanization were such components, which were generated not only by the system, but also by the general trends of the development of modern civilization, as well as the fundamental features of the country and the level of its development.

Based on all the above, we conclude that urbanization in the USSR in the 60s-80s. on the whole, it “fit” in the general logic of industrial development, inherent in technogenic civilization, to the global urbanization process, albeit with its “systemic” features.

REFERENCES:

1. Tufanov E.V. Kravchenko I.N. Party education, as an element of the formation of the national party-state nomenclature in the 1920-1930. (on the materials of the North Caucasus). Scientific thought of the Caucasus, 2018; #1:134.
2. Tufanov E.V., Zolotarev S.P., Gulyak I.I., Kravchenko I.N., Guzyin N.G. For The Formation Of The Soviet Political System. Research Journal of Pharmaceutical, Biological and Chemical Sciences, 2018; 9(3): 997-1002.
3. GARF, F.-17.Op.1. D.212, L.3.
4. GARF, F.-5451. Op.26. D.2717, L.15.
5. Industry of the Stavropol Territory in archival documents (1945-1991). 2007. Stavropol, Russia.
6. GARF, F.-5451. Op.26. D.2768, L.73.
7. Aliyev V.F. 2007. Demographic processes in modern Dagestan. Moscow, Russia.
8. RGASPI, F.-17. Op.102. D.1016, L.10.
9. RGASPI, F.-17. Op.103. D.1156, L.25.
10. RGASPI, F.-17. Op.105. D.329, L.38.

11. Arutyunov S.A. 2009. Peoples and cultures: development and interaction. Moscow, Russia.
12. Magramov E.M. 2007. The current geopolitical situation in the North Caucasus: problems of Russia's regional geostrategy. Rostov-on-Don, Russia.
13. RGASPI, F.-556. Op.19 D.198, L.54.
14. RGAE, F.-1562.Op.337. D.4455, L.62.
15. Astivtsaturova M.A. 2007. Diaspora: Problems of Theoretical and Methodological Comprehension. Current State and Development Paths of the South of Russia. Rostov-on-Don, Russia.
16. North Ossetia during the years of Soviet power (1920–1975). 1977. Ordzhonikidze, Russia.