

Victor Sydorenko
Prof., PhD (Art)

UKRAINIAN NONCONFORMISM IN POLITICAL CONTEXT

After implementation of socialist realism in Ukraine, extermination of all art organizations started, accompanied with repressions against intelligentsia, moral and psychological pressure on them, even physical elimination. All of that caused significant losses to Ukrainian art, threw it into isolation and stagnation zone for years. However, high level of artists' professional skill have been preserved to present new sides on a further phase of art evolution. In the time of the Khrushchev Thaw of the late 1950s and early 1960s one may notice some parallels with the 1920s, when Ukrainian culture and art developed dynamically.

The Khrushchev Thaw period, that caused a phenomenon, later called the Sixtiers movement, was marked with a string of cardinal political changes. Stalin's death provoked significant destabilization within the Soviet Union party leaders. Khrushchev's speech at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (February, 1956) marked denouncing of Stalin's personality cult and became a turning point in history. Despite all the efforts of regime that went along with persecutions and physical extermination of numerous cultural and art figures, the power of national renaissance was incredibly strong. Ukrainian art managed to perform an outstanding progress, that could hardly be overestimated from that day's point of view.

National movement has been initiated by cultural and scientific activists who represented the new generation of intelligentsia that emerged underground and hardened during the repression years. Their enthusiasm displayed features of irrepressible, rapid growth; their achievements were truly influential. Unprecedented breakthrough happened in Ukrainian literature. The young ones came out bravely: poets Lina Kostenko, Vasyl Symonenko, Ivan Drach, Mykola Vingranovsky, Dmytro Pavlychko; writers Oles Honchar, Valeriy Shevchuk, Volodymyr Drozd, Yevhen Hutsalo. Actively positioned themselves literary critics: Ivan Dziuba, Yevhen Sverstyuk, Ivan Svitlychny etc. That was a time, when daring thoughts and uncompromising views of Ukrainian nonconformist artists actively formed.

Changes in development of culture and art were determined by the resolution *On Elimination of Excesses in Designing and Building*, issued by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the USSR Council of Ministers in 1955. Despite the fact, that formally this document applied only to architecture and construction, in fact it initiated a string of imminent significant processes. For instance, the main means and new principles of architectural-space environment were reviewed, academicism and eclecticism priorities were vigorously rejected, as well as imitation of the classical styles. Variety of decorative art genres developed swiftly. In the panel painting changes manifested themselves through emergence of a "strict style", that in Ukraine turned to "coarse realism", as one of its ideologist called it, speaking of Ukrainian artists.

Noteworthy that it was Kyiv where the art life revived in the second half of the 1950s. The city soon became a center of the main events, however, the sources and causes of the "thaw" period should be searched not in Ukraine, but in the depth of the Soviet system generally. The system had no other choice though: after announcing horrific effects of Stalin regime (notably in Ukraine), the pressing need to admit the past mistakes, even partially, rose high, as well as the need to demonstratively condemn the ones, who strayed from the "right" and straight Soviet path. The "iron curtain" had to be lifted, demonstrating new and democratized variant of socialistic society to the world. In literature it happened this way.

On December 20, 1954 the *Slovo* Association of Ukrainian Writers sent a telegram to the Second Soviet Writers' Congress in Moscow that stated,

"Ukrainian writers in political exile greet the high congress and express condolences to the writers of all dependant nations of the USSR. In 1930 there were 259 Ukrainian writers published. After 1938 only 36 of them were published. Please inquire of the Ministry of State Security, where and why 223 writers disappeared from Ukrainian literature."

The facts about Ukrainian writers are utterly tragic. Yuriy Lavrinenko, the author of *The Executed Renaissance* anthology, counted, that among the 223 Ukrainian writers, who disappeared in the USSR, 17 were executed; 8 committed suicide; 175 arrested, exiled in remote labor camps or otherwise eliminated out of literature (executed or died in the camps); 16 missing; 7 died of natural causes. The timid exoneration of some of them has started in 1956 and covered only few names.

The number of repressed artists was probably as equal: they died in labor camps or just died in oblivion, deprived of the ability to create.

The Club of Creative Youth arose in Kyiv in the late 1959 and early 1960. Its founders were drama school and conservatory students and artists. Les Tanyuk was elected head of it, however the true mover of it always was Alla Horska. The Club gathered in the October Palace (now the International Center of Culture and Arts), or more often — at the Liudmyla Semykina's studio or at home of Victor Zaretsky and Alla Horska. The club produced the commission that pledged to reveal the Bykivnia mass burials and expose executions of Stalin era. Physical evidences and eyewitnesses were searched for. The authorities' reaction was fast: repressions of everyone participating started shortly after, and in 1964 the Club was officially closed.

The Sixtiers movement was not local, Ukrainian only phenomenon. Loosening of the "iron curtain" regime contributed to the effective and supremely important, though brief, revival of cultural contacts with the outside world. This breakthrough highlighted the contrast between ephemeral ideals of internationalism and collectivism and completely different values — priority of self-respect and personal recognition. The protest of the new generation of Ukrainians sounded like a violent reaction on a prolonged suppression and manifested itself not just in the national self-awareness, but also in the desire to actively contact the world and foreign peers. In this sense a passion for jazz a pop music was naturally determined, as well as liking of the popular western fashions and hippie movement. However, all the knowledge of the western way of life came through illegally, as the 1950s and 1960s were the culmination period of the Cold War between USSR and USA. Since the "iron curtain" was still there, free communication and information exchange, obviously, were not possible, therefore Soviet art developed outside the global context and its agenda was completely different. To underline the polarity of two worlds it is necessary to give a brief review of the Western art situation.

Paris, being a center of the newest art trends of the time, from the mid-20th century gave this place to New York. American Pop art and Expressionism became dominant styles. They were "official" and marked a triumph of American culture as a culture, supported by the world leading state. In the mid-1950s Jackson Pollock's abstract expressionism won acclaim on the global art scene. On my opinion, it is characteristic, that his work according to the *LIFE* magazine poll (1949) was considered iconic symbol of advanced art. In 1958 *ARTnews* magazine featured Jasper Johns' *Target with Four Faces* on its cover.

Meanwhile in Europe new movements arose, among which Informalism should be noted (from the French Informel, literary "abstract", "nonfigurative"). The artists of this trend sought new ways of creating an image, not using cognitive forms of Cubism and Expressionism. Through improvising they tried to reveal new art language (the exhibition of French painter and sculptor, founder of the Outsider art Jean Dubuffet in 1945). Generally, existential aesthetics, typical to the Cold War art period, may be seen in works by Alberto Giacometti, Jean Dubuffet, Francis Bacon, Willem de Kooning and others.

In photographic art of the mid-1950s the New York School of Photography rose and developed; the landmark events for it were *Observations* series by Richard Avedon and *The Americans* by Robert Frank. Contemporary art museums, large and originally shaped, were constructed. For instance, in 1977 Walter De Maria created the *Lightning Field* in the uninhabited area of New Mexico. *Lightning Field* is a series of 400 stainless steel poles, average of about 20 feet height. The truly universal building of the time was the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao, vast space of which is perfectly suited for large-scale exhibitions.

In the world practice painting transformations continued: Roy Lichtenstein and Andy Warhol turned to cartoons and advertising as sources for paintings, followed by James Rosenquist, Ed Ruscha, and others. American artist George Maciunas organized a series of international exhibitions in Wiesbaden (West Germany at the time), that stimulated formation of the Fluxus movement, one of the most jocular, absurd and at the same time serious post-modernist trends. This movement aimed to present everyday events and objects in artistic and aesthetic environment to change and expand their perception.

In Vienna a group of artists, including Günter Brus, Otto Muehl and Hermann Nitsch, formed the Viennese Actionism movement. In 1975 Laura Mulvey published the groundbreaking essay *Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema*, that urged feminist-minded women, as Judy Chicago and Mary Kelly, to develop different positions on the representation of women in art. At the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York the *King Tut*, iconic blockbuster exhibition took place, proving important changes in the institutional structure of global art.

Back to the USSR, it should be mentioned, that positive changes, as far as they were possible in the situation of the isolation from the outside world, has happened since appointing Petro Shelest the First Secretary of the Communist party in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic in 1963. His views were somewhat consonant to the revolutionary romanticism of the communists, who carried out the Ukrainization policy back in the 1920s. However, Shelest's position could not change general course of events. It just hampered unavoidable negative changes. Recalling his famous Moscow Manege exhibition and his conflict with Khrushchev, artist Ernst Neizvestny said it all was a provocation, planned by art ideologists against intelligentsia, liberalization, and eventually against the party leader. After the event the sculptor was forcefully urged to write a letter of excuse. He, on the contrary, submitted a brief note, expressing his philosophic and aesthetic views. Incidentally, Neizvestny is a creator of Khrushchev's tomb sculpture and evaluates him in such a way: Khrushchev's weapon was his unpredictability, his strong will, his power, that he used willingly; this way he could prolong the fear system tradition within the Soviet society, because fear has been nourished by his spontaneous actions, that indeed were his rational choice.

It should be noted, that officially recognized Ukrainian artists felt the changes, and it affected their work. One should mention creative experiments of Tetyana Yablonska, Victor Zaretsky, Volodymyr Mykyta etc, that happened in the 1960s and 1970s. These artists, though being top-USSR awards winning, manage to preserve a right for free creative expression. In different years fondness of folk art, philosophical and metaphysical sentiments could be sensed in their works.

Through the 1960s to the 1980s conceptual art trend shaped, gaining recognition both in the Western and Soviet art. Its adherents produced and manifested texts by all means, especially artistic. American Joseph Kosuth considered conceptual artists' main objective in fundamental reconsideration of the way, in what art functions. Two biggest museums of the world presented exhibitions of European and American art (1968). Two major museums—the Stedelijk Van Abbemuseum in Eindhoven and the Städtisches Museum Abteiberg in Mönchengladbach—exhibited the work of Bernd and Hilla Becher, placing them at the forefront of an interest in Conceptual art and photography. Conceptual art manifested itself in publications by Sol LeWitt, Dan Graham, and Lawrence Weiner.

Soviet-style Conceptual art contained concerns of the era, and the desire to hold on was strengthened with art actions and performances. *The Collective Actions* art group, founded in Moscow in

1976, kept a detailed record and commented its out-of-town actions. Therefore the result of the group activity were not the trips out of town (during one of the trips, for instance, the group hung the red fabric between trees in the forest, stating, "I do not complain about anything and I do really like everything despite that I have never been here and know nothing about these areas"), but commentaries to them. Unlike the *Collective Actions*, the *Medhermeneutics* art group (among its members were Odessa-born artists, who later moved to Moscow, including the *AptArt* group ideologist Sergey Anufriev), used traditional drawing and graphic forms as well. They were inspired by *Schizoanalysis* of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, that automatically generated comical effect and brought it closer to Sots Art.

Some scholars consider minimalism, that formed in Western art in the 1960s and 1970s, to be the predecessor of Conceptual art. Minimalists tended to visual laconism, used play of the simplest forms and their combinations. Artists rejected the active suggestion of Abstract Expressionism, the partly advertizing-like straightforwardness of Pop art and even canvas itself, limiting themselves to spatial objects. Particular transparency of the message, sometimes with the author's dedication, is typical to these works. For example, American artist Dan Flavin dedicated his light installations to Henri Matisse (1964), Piet Mondrian (1966), Donald Judd, Vladimir Mayakovsky (1987) and to his wife, fellow artist Tracey Harris (1992). Minimalists worked with other materials: wood, thick felt, metal. Within the Soviet Minimalism practitioners Kazimir Malevich, first of all, should be mentioned; then go Constructivists, who created metal constructions: Konstantin Medunetsky and Vladimir Stenberg.

After Petro Stelst had been ousted from his position of the First Secretary of the Communist party in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic in 1972, a large-scale ideological attack on Ukrainian language, culture and art began and new wave of total internationalization began.

In 1972–1986 the dissident movement emerged and flourished as a form of active political protest against the ruling regime. In Ukraine this movement made itself known on November 9, 1976, when, alike the Moscow organization, the Ukrainian Helsinki Group was founded. Its members were writers Mykola Rudenko (head of the group), Oles Berdnyk, Petro Hryhorenko, Ivan Kandyba, Levko Lukyanenko, Oksana Meshko, Oleksa Tykhyi, Nina Strokata (wife of Sviatoslav Karavansky), Mykola Matusevych, Myroslav Marynovych, Mykhailo Horyn (officially joined already being imprisoned) etc. This organization became a mouthpiece of the Ukrainian national interests. Its objective was, acting within the law and international agreements, to familiarize Ukrainian society with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to collect evidences of human rights violation, of the ethnocide and linguicide policy. Besides that, Ukrainian Helsinki Group promoted Ukraine worldwide, assisted in obtaining accreditation for the foreign media in Ukraine, in spreading and exchange of information and ideas. The very fact of the group's existence was of great importance to moral and psychological support of the Ukrainian Nonconformist artists, the best of which could be rightfully considered dissidents in art field.

In this period important role of the earlier Sixtiers movement shaped boldly. Set against such selfless activity, the socialist realism ideology finally started to lose authority and looked plainly anemic. Socialist realism, imposed as a flag of new culture, started becoming a thing of the past, despite the unsuccessful attempts of its revival under the "new realism", "poetic realism" or even "boundless realism" terms.

Though the Soviet power continued implementing its long-term plans of ideological art events, their formal nature became more and more obvious. Pompous vernisages and exhibits, traditionally timed to yet another party congresses or anniversaries, happened periodically with large numbers of participants. However, these events only revealed and proved the idea, that socialist realism method was not designed for art progress.

An alternative art environment formed everywhere, generating a live stream of interesting ideas. For instance, Kharkiv produced such names, as Stepan Sapeliak, Eduard Limonov, Vagrigh Bakhchanyan, Boris Chichibabin. They practiced deliberately shocking behavior, fearlessly ruined tradi-

tional forms and figurative devices. I remember the atmosphere in the city in the late 1960s and early 1970s. From the one hand, there were high spirits and enthusiasm after *The White Bird Marked with Black* film by Yuriy Ilyenko. (By the way, the film, that entered the 7th Moscow International Film Festival and won the golden prize along with the viewers' sympathy, later was banned in Ukraine...) Then went fondness of the *Internationalism or Russification?* work by Ivan Dziuba, of Vasyl Symonenko's poetry. Then I made friends with Vasyl Lashko, an artist, who supported the idea of national self-identification. From the other hand, authorities reacted fiercely on such reckless rebelliousness. From the contemporary point of view, the times were strange: when even such seemingly neutral thing as artistic form, should be nevertheless subjected to ideology; even a painting manner could be condemned. Many artists could not bear that: they immigrated or (more often), withdrew from reality into seclusion and simply died.

In the early 1980s society entered the special, final phase, showing signs of stagnation. The Stagnation era began, when general degradation and apathy reached the highest point and became almost overwhelming. Induced lack of information from abroad continued, contacts with the outside world were still limited and ideologically screened.

In the situation of such pressure the occurrence of active outright or latent forms of protests were quite logical. Expressing such protest, that assumed artist's radical rejection of the imposed ideological guidelines, goes under the common name of Nonconformism (meaning "incongruous", "un-alike", "dissenting"). The Nonconformism term is interim one between *conformism* and *dissidence*.

Some researchers use different terms at times. For instance, some Russian authors, speaking of Soviet Nonconformism, covering its nature and asserting it as a local cultural phenomenon, label it "the other art" (*drugoe iskusstvo*) and note, that suppression of creative personality provoked flourishing of the "other art", "diversity of the ways, deviating from official demands". The "other art" has been actual till the end of 20th century. Dramatic lives of young artists confirm the thought, that contemporary art history in Ukraine was in fact the history of Nonconformism.

The "Nonconformism" term, that emerged back in the 15th–17th centuries, is noticeable in the philosophical conceptions of the late 19th and mid 20th centuries, such as Intuitionism, Freud's theory, Existentialism, Lebensphilosophie, and as an alternative to Rationalism and Positivism in the literary, musical and art experiments on the edge of the 19th and 20th centuries. The term acquired a special sense in USSR in 1956–1986, being applied to the emergence of alternative culture, to the Sixtiers movement and underground. The term consists of two parts. First originated from the Latin "non", meaning "no-", second derives from English "conformism", meaning "complying with the rules". In translation into Ukrainian they form a term, that most properly could be rendered as "disagreement". Therefore, Nonconformism could be interpreted as an expression of fundamental opposition, as a creative personality's protest against the imposed system of artistic values. At the time student revolutions actively stormed US and Western Europe, based on the theoretic works of American scholars (Charles Wright Mills, David Riesman, Paul Goodman), of the Frankfurt school of sociology (Herbert Marcuse, Jürgen Habermas, Max Horkheimer), Neo-Freudians (Erich Fromm) and Existentialists (Jean-Paul Sartre, Albert Camus).

Thus, analyzing Soviet Nonconformist and creative achievements of its artists, one should consider the fact, that they were a product of certain cause-and-effect process, expressing both personal and social tragedies. Inside society a great number of creative personalities were spiritual immigrants, as the conformist attitude to art, pleasing the ruling elite was considered highly artistic accomplishment.

I cannot avoid mentioning one almost comical incident. One renowned artist once mentioned, that he was working on a painting, titled *Gamarnik's Arrival to Romny* (the artist was born in that Ukrainian town). And went on telling about this highly important, on his opinion, historical event. However, social situation constantly changed, and new discrediting materials about party leaders of the time appeared in the press, including Yan Gamarnik. The artists changes the image in a hurry, and voilà! — the painting is about another party leader Stanislav Kosior. Shortly after the painting

was presented for the selection committee of the exhibition, timed to the next party congress. Official guests observe the painting silently, nobody particularly impressed. Pause lasts for too long. Then the artists rushes to the painting, tears away a hat from Kosior (it was not painted, but attached) and asks, "Is it better now?" Seeing the sparkling bald spot on the party leader's head, everybody eagerly nodded. After a time the artists fulfilled another creative project, this time partisan-themed.

Such situation was typical, and though everyone in fact understood the doubtful value and message of these works, no one dared to oppose established dogmas. It seemed, that artist himself started to believe, that by tearing away a hat, painting a miner's helmet or changing machine guns to wind instruments he thereby changes composition of the artwork, enriches it with "unique" images, offers original theme. The special hierarchy of genres and plots existed in art, therefore the ones who covered the "right" theme, were rewarded in that stifling atmosphere.

However, as it was said before, a number of artists did not resign to the system and preserved their true Self. That was the way unofficial art developed, art of resistance, that we are now examining in a context of overall cultural process. At the time, when global contemporary practice concentrated mostly on the search for form-representation, when different forms of depicting reality were polished up and perfected, on the local grounds emerged art, that more or less applied to political and national issues. That inevitably narrowed nature and development of this art.

Nonconformism as a notable phenomenon in the history of Ukrainian art of the second half of 20th century manifests itself fully from 1960s to 1980s. These decades for a long time will attract attention of many researchers: art historians, culture researchers, sociologists. Features of Ukrainian Nonconformisms were romanticism, search for truth, opposition, national renaissance and desire to get a worldwide acclaim. Artists, united by yearning for express the newest trends with stylistics that best complied to understanding of free creativity, were Galina Neledva, Valeriy Laskarzhevsky, Victor Ryzhykh, Zoya Lerman, Valentin Reunov, Ivan Marchuk, Roman and Margit Selsky, Karlo Zvirynsky, Oleg Sokolov, Valentin Khrushch, Volodymyr Makarenko, Vladimir Strelnikov, Alexander Anufriev, Vagrish Bakhchanyan, Alla Horska, Liudmyla Semykina, Irina Makarova-Vysheslavskya, Oleksandr Pavlov, Boris Lobanovskyi, Anatoliy Summar, Valeriy Lamakh, Fedir Tetianych, Ernest Kotkov, Victor Khamkov, Oleksandr Shuldizhenko, Yuriy Lutskevych, Hryhorii Havrylenko, Opanas Zalyvakha, Alexander Aksinin, Nadiya Ponomarenko, Pyotr Belenok, Serhiy Paradzhanov, Borys Plakisy, Mykola Tregub, Vudon Baklytskyi, Muzyka Yaroslav, Eduard Gudzenko, Halyna Zakhariasevych-Lypa, Andriy Chebykin, Anatoliy Lymarev, Pavlo Bedzir, Yelyzaveta Kremnytska, Ferentz Seman and many more.

Initiative group within the Union of Artists of Ukraine, that included Kyiv-based artists Yuriy Lutskevych, Oleksandr Dubovyk, Yakim Levich, organized an exhibition of modern art in the October Palace, gathering by pieces the works of artists, who did not obey official directions. Later, in the 1970s, the "quiet painting" trend (Yevhen Volobuev, Zoya Lerman, Halyna Hryhorieva, Irina Makarova-Vysheslavskya, Valeriy Laskarzhevsky, Hryhorii Havrylenko, Victor Ryzhykh, Galina Neledva) concentrated on painting-plastic solutions and on lyricism. Other trends, differing in style, developed: Victor Zaretsky experimented with "neo-Secession", Oleksandr Dubovyk with "geometric abstraction". Local modifications of hippie movement generated special creative environment, called "attic romanticism" or "Latin quarter". Words "happening" and "performance" became more and more frequent in artists' speech.

Free creativity has been restricted in asphyxiating atmosphere of officialism and almost equaled a heroic deed. Functioning of art in general and of artist as a creative individual in any known totalitarian systems of the 20th century supposed basically identical changes. Researchers of these processes point on the fact, that imperial art always revealed strict subordination of art variations and genres according to their "importance", offered classical guidelines and provoked typical format multiplication.

As it was mentioned, the feature of new totalitarian art was its return to the artistic forms and ideals of the past. It would seem to be nothing unusual in that, as these processes (return to the

past experience and different interpretation of it on the new time level) periodically happen in art history. However, some difference should be considered. Realism in the past was a part of the massive Enlightenment movement, an active method of cognizing and studying the natural laws. Totalitarian regimes of the 20th century followed the principles of recreating the world, though not the true one, but artificial, rather typical for academism, totally mythologized and allegoric. However, society was content with such pseudorealization of idea and interpreting of an artwork from some kind of neo-Classical point of view. As a result, ease and color as autonomous painting and aesthetic categories disappeared from artworks.

In the Soviet society, as in any other totalitarian system, creating artistic forms, close to reality, was not an artist's desire, creative path, chosen by him, a way of creative interpretation, but was tightly linked to established ideologems, to presumably desired by general public. Therefore, Soviet artist's objective was to be simple and understandable, to thrill and lead crowds. That was the understanding of the "national spirit", conceived and established within the system. The main idea was art's necessity to the masses. And incomprehensible have been proclaimed anti-national.

Unlike academicism, socialist realism destroyed the very essence of art, when artist's opinion could be neglected, as well as the point of view of renowned scholars, including art historians. The guidelines have been published in central party press. That produced another phantom, well-known to any member of the Soviet art life of the last half a century — so called "ordinary people's thoughts". What people in fact thought, particularly of art, was not authorities' matter of interest.

In such contradictory and paradoxical atmosphere consciousness of the artists, who had a chance to experience freedom and try the new ways of the free art development in the early 20th century, deformed. The ones, trying to preserve their Self somehow, were forced to "build" their own inner world, isolated from the outside one and open only to the narrow circle of like-minded peers. All of this conflicted with the logic of art processes development, therefore disarming artists, not leaving them an opportunity to express any counterarguments. According to the Stalin's variant of historical materialism, the new trends of the first quarter of 20th century were proclaimed outdated, produced by bourgeois society. Instead traditional, classical was constantly presented as the newest. Such position was reasoned by the idea, that sticking to tradition is a basis of socialist realism and ensures great achievements. According to socialist realism, every person in the world, and an artist in particular, is fiercely fighting the Formalism adherents in art, who are class enemies.

Artists were imposed with certain myths, that produced some fantastical allusions and beliefs in their consciousness. Even ordinary criminal was treated from the ideological point of view. Professor of the Painting Department once told us, young students, a story about how he had been persecuted, almost executed, by Formalists. Allegedly, he barely managed to escape, locking himself in the university studio, continuing to paint in the realistic manner. Thus dissenters turned into ideological opponents. This story of the artist who, by the way, was quite interesting in his early period, full of exactly formalistic tendencies, now sounds humorous. However, back in the day society had been so much electrified, that everything was interpreted from the class struggle point of view.

In totalitarian environment an artist as a representative of intellectual sphere, turned out to be unnecessary and became an ordinary worker. He was forced to prove the need in his own existence every day of his life by performing artworks, featuring the history of revolution or heroic war deeds, depicting an image of a hero, ready to give his life for the sake of revolutionary ideals of the Soviet nation. Such tough heroic personality was perfectly fit for totalitarian synthesis of arts. This personality was always ready to overcome any obstacles or subdue the elements. The most valuable characteristic was ability to strain every physical and spiritual nerve.

The mentioned parallels to the art development in totalitarian states of the rest of Europe could be observed only prior to the World War Two. After its ending situation changed dramatically. In the European states, freed from fascism, democratic changes soon started. Meanwhile in the Soviet Union Stalin's regime was in its full, that, besides the control within the state, spread its influence on the Eastern Bloc countries. After the dictator's death and during the short-lived "thaw"

ideological pressure on the art sphere slightly lessened, though generally the same ideals, guidelines and scale of values continued to exist, the same stimulation and control methods for artists (ranking system and well-paid ideologically “right” commissions) were still there.

Soviet power did all possible to keep artists secured from the diversity of post-modernist trends, started by pop art and conceptual art. The reason for that was simple: their creative work had been judged from the position of political opposing of two systems, established long ago, and according to the needs of one of these systems.

However, outside the socialist realism influence zone mutual blending of different creative activities occur: installation, performance, video art and environment art spread. By virtue of Non-conformism, a bridge of life remains there, not letting Ukrainian art to be bogged in ultimate isolation, as if accumulating hidden potential energy, aspiration for creative freedom.

Translated by Svitlana Kulinsky

Література

1. *Бурлака В.* Актуальне мистецтво на зламі століть: спостереження ситуації [Текст] / Вікторія Бурлака // Пластичне мистецтво. — 2002. — № 1. — С. 10–13.
2. *Петрова О.* Трете око : мистецькі студії : монографічна збірка статей [Текст] / Ольга Петрова ; ІПСМ НАМ України. — К. : Фенікс, 2015. — 480 с. : іл.
3. *Сидоренко В.* Візуальне мистецтво від авангардних зрушень до новітніх спрямувань : розвиток візуального мистецтва України ХХ–ХХІ століть / ІПСМ АМУ. — К.: ВХ[студіо], 2008. — 188 с. : іл.
4. *Скляренко Г.* Сучасне мистецтво України : Портрети художників [Текст] / Галина Скляренко ; ІПСМ НАМ України. — К. : Huss, 2016. — 376 с. : іл.
5. *Смирная Л.* Украинский художественный нонконформизм 1960-х : истоки возникновения и тенденции развития [Текст] / Леся Смирная // Сучасні проблеми дослідження, реставрації та збереження культурної спадщини : зб. наук. праць / ІПСМ НАМ України. — К. : Фенікс, 2015. — Вип. 11. — С. 298–316.
6. *Смирная Л.* Художественный нонконформизм Украины 1970-х — начала 1980-х : «Стиль с половиной» [Текст] / Леся Смирная // МІСТ : мистецтво, історія, сучасність, теорія : зб. наук. праць / ІПСМ НАМ України. — К. : Фенікс, 2015. — Вип. 11. — С. 217–235.

Сидоренко Віктор. Український нонконформізм у політичному контексті

Розглядається нонконформізм як помітне явище в історії українського мистецтва другої половини ХХ ст. Показано, що характерними ознаками українського нонконформізму є романтичність, шукання правди, опір, національне відродження і бажання вийти на світові обрії. Художники, яких об'єднувало прагнення віддзеркалити нові віяння в рамках тієї стилістики, що, здавалося б, якнайкраще відповідала розумінню свободи мистецької творчості, були, наприклад, Галина Недева, Валерій Ласкарецький, Віктор Рижих, Зоя Лерман, Валентин Реунов, Іван Марчук, Роман і Магріт Сельські, Карл Звіринський, Олег Соколов, Валентин Хрущ, Володимир Макаренко, Володимир Стрельников, Олександр Ануфрієв, Вагрич Бахчанян, Алла Горська, Людмила Семикіна, Ірина Макарова-Вишеславська, Олександр Павлов, Борис Лобановський, Анатолій Сумар, Валерій Ламах, Федір Тетянич та багато інших. Зазначено, що у радянському суспільстві, як і в будь-якій тоталітарній системі, створення близьких до реальності мистецьких форм не було потребою митця, обраним ним творчим шляхом і способом художнього осмислення, а тісно і нерозривно пов'язувалося із загальноприйнятими ідеологемами, з тим, чого нібито бажає народ. Звідси й завдання радянського художника: бути простим і зрозумілим, аби захоплювати і вести за собою маси. Саме в цьому містилася сутність розуміння народності, сутність, що зароджувалася і утверджувалася в надрах системи.

Ключові слова: український нонконформізм, мистецтво України другої половини ХХ ст., ідеологія, опір.

Сидоренко Виктор. Украинский нонконформизм в политическом контексте

Рассматривается нонконформизм как заметное явление в истории украинского искусства второй половины XX века. Показано, что характерными признаками украинского нонконформизма является романтичность, искание правды, сопротивление, национальное возрождение и желание выйти на мировые горизонты. Художники, которых объединяло стремление отразить новые веяния в рамках той стилистики, что, казалось бы, лучше всего отвечала пониманию свободы художественного творчества, были, например, Галина Неледва, Валерий Ласкаржевский, Виктор Рыжих, Зоя Лерман, Валентин Реунов, Иван Марчук, Роман и Магрит Сельские, Карл Звиринский, Олег Соколов, Валентин Хрущ, Владимир Макаренко, Владимир Стрельников, Александр Ануфриев, Вагрич Бахчанян, Алла Горская, Людмила Семькина, Ирина Макарова-Вышеславская, Александр Павлов, Борис Лобановский, Анатолий Сумар, Валерий Ламах, Федор Тетянич и многие другие. Отмечено, что в советском обществе, как и в любой тоталитарной системе, создание близких к реальности художественных форм не было для художника необходимым, не было избранным им творческим путём и способом художественного осмысления, но тесно и неразрывно связывалось с общепринятыми идеологемами, с тем, чего якобы «желает народ». Отсюда и задачи советского художника: быть простым и понятным, чтобы захватывать и вести за собой массы. Именно в этом содержалась сущность понимания народности, сущность, что зарождалась и утверждалась в недрах системы.

Ключевые слова: украинский нонконформизм, искусство Украины второй половины XX в., идеология, сопротивление.

Sydorenko Victor. Ukrainian Nonconformism in Political Context

Nonconformity is considered as a significant phenomenon in the history of Ukrainian art of the second half of the twentieth century. It is shown that the characteristic features of Ukrainian Nonconformism is romantic, the search for truth, the resistance, the national revival and the desire to enter the world horizons. Artists, who are united by the desire to reflect new trends within that style, that would seem to best meet the notion of freedom of artistic creativity, were, for example, Galina Neledva, Valeriy Laskarzhevsky, Victor Ryzhykh, Zoya Lerman, Valentin Reunov, Ivan Marchuk, Roman and Margit Selsky, Karlo Zvirynsky, Oleg Sokolov, Valentin Khrushch, Volodymyr Makarenko, Vladimir Strelnikov, Alexander Anufriev, Vagrigh Bakhchanyan, Alla Horska, Liudmyla Semykina, Irina Makarova-Vysheslavska, Oleksandr Pavlov, Boris Lobanovskyi, Anatoliy Summar, Valeriy Lamakh, Fedir Tetianych, and a lot others. It is noted that in Soviet society, as in any totalitarian system, the creation of close to reality art forms was not an artist need not have been elected them a creative way and manner of artistic interpretation, but are closely and inextricably linked with the generally accepted ideologemes, with what allegedly «wants the people». Hence the problem of the Soviet artist: to be simple and straightforward to capture and lead the masses. This is the essence of understanding contained a nationality, an entity that originated and affirmed at depth.

Keywords: Ukrainian Nonconformism, Art of Ukraine of the second half of the XX cent., ideology, resistance.