

Postmodern Openings

ISSN: 2068-0236 | e-ISSN: 2069-9387

Covered in: Web of Science (WOS); EBSCO; ERIH+; Google Scholar; Index Copernicus; Ideas RePeC; Econpapers; Socionet; CEEOL; Ulrich ProQuest; Cabell, Journalseek; Scipio; Philpapers; SHERPA/RoMEO repositories; KVK; WorldCat; CrossRef; CrossCheck

2022, Volume 13, Issue 3, pages: 323-345 | <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/13.3/492>

Submitted: January 27th, 2022 | Accepted for publication: May 2nd, 2022

Socialist Realism: An Instrument of Class Struggle in Ukrainian Fine Arts and Architecture

Oleksii ROHOTCHENKO¹,
Tetiana ZUZIYAK²,
Andrii MARKOVSKIY³,
Olga LAGUTENKO⁴,
Oksana MARUSHCHAK⁵

¹ Modern Art Research Institute of the National Academy of Arts of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine, rogotchenko2007@ukr.net, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4631-8260>

² Vinnytsia Mykhaylo Kotsiubynskyi State Pedagogical University, city, country, Vinnytsia, Ukraine, zuziyak@ukr.net, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5437-0272>

³ National Academy of Arts of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine, andrii_markovskiyi@ukr.net, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9499-4434>

⁴ National Academy of Fine Arts and Architecture, Kyiv, Ukraine, Olga_lagutenko@ukr.net, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5934-2943>

⁵ Vinnytsia Mykhailo Kotsiubynskyi State Pedagogical University, Vinnytsia, Ukraine, ksanamar77@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0754-6367>

Abstract: The article contains the conceptual vision of socialist realism as one of the key characteristics of art, transformed in the postmodern cultural era. Socialist realism is a cultural manifestation of the historical development of Soviet republics, including the Ukrainian SSR. The essence of socialist realism is seen as a manifestation of ideology in the Soviet conditions. Besides, the article considers the phenomenon in the context of postmodernism, relying on the findings of various scholars, and describes the interaction between postmodernism and socialist realism. Despite the general view that postmodernism (literally “coming after modernism”) emerged in the United States and Western Europe in the 1960s-1970s, there could be another way this movement evolved in fine art and architecture. The fact that the artists from the post-Soviet space managed to adapt to the global cultural field of postmodernism so swiftly proves that the totalitarian system failed to eliminate the plurality of opinions. A post-Soviet variant of postmodernism was largely defined by the influence of socialist realism. The recently proclaimed era of post-truth that allegedly started after the new millennium produced fascinating political and artistic experiments in the post-Soviet space. Hence, it would be logical to assume that some previously developed mechanisms were activated there. Post-truth as an instrument of politics in that sense resonates with the socialist realism used as an instrument of class struggle. Research methods include description, synthesis and analysis.

Keywords: *totalitarianism, socialist realism, Soviet art, painting, architecture.*

How to cite: Rohotchenko, O., Zuziyak, T., Markovskiy, A., Lagutenko, O., & Marushchak, O. (2022). Socialist Realism: An Instrument of Class Struggle in Ukrainian Fine Arts and Architecture. *Postmodern Openings*, 13(3), 323-345. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/13.3/492>

Introduction

The cultural field of the USSR and the Ukrainian SSR was based on a logical and clear artistic tradition brutally distorted and crushed by the triumph of the method which entered the history of art under the name of socialist realism. There are dozens of interpretations of how socialist realism emerged, developed and was implemented. Nevertheless, one can argue, based on the cited facts, that socialist realism was more of an instrument of class struggle than a classical method of academic realistic recreation of surrounding reality in painting, graphic art and sculpture. The moral dependence of the state's cultural field on the existing political system is a proven fact.

There is an established opinion that the transformation of fine arts in Russia and Ukraine during the specified period was almost identical to that carried out through the forceful intervention in the cultural field of literature, theatre, music, cinema and architecture.

The cultural community of the United States and Western Europe did not experience ideological pressure, equal to the one that dominated the USSR and the Ukrainian SSR between 1920 and 1960 (after the Khrushchev Thaw, it reduced significantly and underwent overall transformation). Undoubtedly, the artists from the Eastern Bloc states, such as German Democratic Republic, Poland, Hungary, Romania, Czechoslovakia, did suffer from the suppressing influence of the totalitarian regimes, too. However, the timespan of it was shorter (starting in the second half of the 1940s, during and after the Second World War). Also, the artists were pressured by the respective states significantly less than in the USSR. If in most countries the emergence of postmodernism was caused by the feelings of disillusionment regarding modernism and its fundamental principles, in all the Soviet republics, including the Ukrainian SSR, sporadic manifestations of postmodernism during the 1960s-1980s which may be also named a Soviet variant of postmodernism, may be explained by the dissent of a certain part of the artists with the doctrine of socialist realism (a leading method of state formation). The fear that prevailed among the artists of the totalitarian USSR significantly limited their creative potential. Fearing to lose state commissions, an average Soviet artist did not dare to confront the official canon. From such a perspective, the boundary between Western postmodernism and the art of the Soviet dissenters (nonconformism) is almost indistinguishable (Sternberg, 1996). Therefore, it is essential to determine the main factors in forming social realism as a political consequence of ideology in the context of postmodernism.

The points of convergence between Western postmodernism and Soviet nonconformity were as follows: the elimination of cultural values and fundamental truths of the leading method of state formation (be it modernism or socialist realism); the repudiation of authoritative figures in the field; an ironic attitude towards official culture; the origination of genres and trends in painting and applied arts. What was undeniably in common was a certain distrust towards the dominating movement or method and irony. What was different between Western postmodernism and Soviet nonconformity was the fact that the irony in the USSR could trigger devastating results for an individual: because of the caricature of the factory or research institute administration, one could be left without financial bonuses, summer vacation or promotion.

Despite a great amount of factual material published by Ukrainian and foreign art historians and researchers, many facts still have not been publicized. Every new attempt to analyze the events of this period is topical today. Even though not many participants in the cultural and artistic life of the era are still alive, several issues remain open and continue to pressure the present-day reality.

The article aims to present the author's interpretation of the development and forcible implementation of socialist realism in the cultural field of the USSR and define the role of penal establishments as a mandatory part of the Ukrainian totalitarian regime between 1930 and 1980 in the context of socialist realism.

Research **methods** include the socio-cultural approach, interviewing, as well as the analysis of original sources.

In the context of modernism, research into socialist realism is important for the long-term identification of the main trends in art. Lagutenko (2006) studied the influence of socialist realism on graphics as a postmodern form of art in Ukraine. Rohotchenko (2007) defined socialist realism as an ideological art that can change one's perception of art as a whole. Smyrna (2017) analyzed new societal trends manifested in art which contradict universal values and reflect on the problems of humankind in the information society, as well as in the context of artistic interpretation.

It must be noted that Rohotchenko et al. (2021), Nerubasska & Maksymchuk (2020), Nerubasska, Palshkov, & Maksymchuk (2020) identified cultural manifestations changing one's worldview in the context of postmodern values. Their findings have served as the basis for further research on postmodern culture based on the trends of socialist realism.

The Socio-Cultural Component of Art History

Even though socialist realism has been extensively studied as a method by foreign art researchers, the works of their Ukrainian peers are equally relevant. Considering socialist realism in its Ukrainian variant from the inside, one can see exciting perspectives and dimensions for research not available to the scholars who are geographically, chronologically and personally more distanced from the phenomenon.

Foreign historians and art historians initiated an unbiased study of the specified period (Imel, 1998). The most significant theoretical work on the roots of socialist realism was *The Socialist Realism Canon*, authored by a team of top experts in the field. An introduction to this milestone publication that encompasses half a century of socialist realism dominance is a point of reference for all the researchers in the field. The authors of this article consider this project to be a starting point for systemic research on socialist realism as a method of formation. The fact that not only scholars from the countries directly affected by socialist realism but also from the ones where this method did not exist (France, the UK, Switzerland, the USA) chose it as a research topic has proved it to be a complex and tricky phenomenon.

One should agree with Lachusen (2000) in his point: “Paradoxically, socialist realism got its final official definition of “historically open aesthetic system of a true depiction of life” right before the fall of the very Soviet state” (p. 523).

Weiss (2000) studied the role of Soviet propaganda in the context of socialist realism: “The language of Soviet propaganda has already been a subject of numerous research works. They vary in their time frame and scientific approaches” (p. 359). In the 1990s, Bown (1998) conducted a prolific study on socialist realist fine arts, summarized in his book *Socialist Realist Painting*. Given the rapid flow of information and advancing technological development, social realism should be analyzed in the context of postmodern society. As noted by Tidd (2006), postmodernism manifests itself in the development of new technologies. Indeed, the adults born between 1960 and 1990 did not have the opportunity to use digital technologies in their youth.

The postmodern worldview originated as a challenge to the events of the 20th century. In particular, both world wars led to dissatisfaction in society and denial of the values established during the evolutionary development of humankind. Some scholars claim that postmodernism is a manifestation of political ideologies promoted in an innovative digital

environment as a favourable position for personal development. Saunders (1995) views postmodern art as an unsatisfactory result of human activity which urges one to come up with new interpretations of one's thoughts in artistic reflection. Kolkmann (2018) analyzes today's world as a reflection of political perception in artistic motives. Cosmopolitanism is another important manifestation of Soviet culture. It vividly shows socialist realism in combination with the Soviet ideology, which, having no particular cultural features, promotes socialist ideology in "fake" works of art. In his research, Buchowski (2018) describes such a manifestation of socialist-realist postmodern cultural ideology.

The leading scholars have studied thousands of previously unknown paintings and graphic artworks, collecting them at the territories of the former Soviet Union.

As for the researchers from the post-Soviet Ukraine, one of the first who attempted to study the reluctance of national cultures to be dissolved in the ruling method of socialist realism was Rustem Dzhanguzhin (1981). In the foreword to his book *Innovation as a Tradition*, he states, "Traditions and innovation in the development of artistic culture, reaching the core of spiritual life of various peoples, highlight the specific features in different national regions" (Dzhanguzhin, 1981, p. 10). The translation of this almost 40-year old phrase formulated in the Aesopian language of Soviet reality would be the following: nations and peoples of the Soviet Empire do not want to be assimilated into the general socialist culture. During the era, no Ukrainian researcher would dare to publish such liberty.

Soviet art history promoted the method of socialist realism as the one and the only right one for over half a century starting in the mid-1930s. The first attempts of Ukrainian scholars to deal with the difficult issues of socialist realism were initiated during the early 1990s. Andriy Puchkov (1993), a Kyiv-based researcher, was one of the first theoretical thinkers in the field of fine arts and architecture who proposed to observe the art life of this period in detail without the involvement of politics. In his foreword to Aleksandr Gabrichevsky's (1993) monographic work *Theory and History of Architecture*, Puchkov (1993) writes, "Giving predictions is a frustrating undertaking, yet one should look around nevertheless. Certainly, brutal attacks of the so-called common sense armed with the recycled citations start to annoy and one wishes the usual art research 'lenses' to be a bit further from the pupil of the eye and not so right for a moment" (p. 7). Puchkov (1993) delicately offers artists and art historians to cast aside the official Soviet doctrine and explore the role of the artist in society in architecture and fine arts.

Albina Arefieva (1997) in her book *The Aesthetics of Socialist Realism (a word in the public dimension)* notes, “The recent past of our society that is being characterized as ‘communist,’ ‘socialist’ past, only now becomes a subject to professional unbiased study” (p. 3).

Yevhen Volobuyev (2011), a famous Ukrainian socialist realist painter who participated in all the events of the era himself, in his book *“Realism is such a mighty, huge, constantly hungry beast...”* suddenly remarks (referring to his non-classical approach to socialist realism), “I always painted only the things that moved me. Probably, I lost something in terms of material benefits, almost certainly I did, nevertheless, I think I have won in something bigger. I could not work the other way” (p. 3). Such rather unexpected revelation of one of the leading artists of the era proves the resistance to the dominant method; it also confirms the fact that not all of the artists yielded to the state-imposed guidelines.

The 1998 album *Realism and Socialist Realism in Ukrainian Soviet Painting. History. Collection. Experiments* edited by Yuriy Maniychuk (1998) came as a bombshell. In the introductory article to the album “Ukrainian fine arts in the grip of transformations (from the origins of socialist realism up to the 1980s)”, Borys Lobanovskiy (1998) dared to formulate his insights the following way, “Socialist realism ceased its existence. Long live socialist realism as a curious museum artefact” (p. 13). Both the compiler of the album and his fellow art historian asserted the totalitarian era in fine arts to be over. Instead, they offered to treat the remnants of the bygone period as artefacts suitable for creative research.

Olga Lagutenko (2006), Doctor of Art Studies, head of the Department of Art History of the National Academy of Fine Arts and Architecture, in her book *Ukrainian Graphics in the First Third of the 20th Century* offers her unique vision of the problem: “The urgent need of the present day is to formulate our place in culture, to understand the contemporary situation in art history, art studies, to evaluate their achievements and failures” (p. 5). Lagutenko (2006) expresses quite a reasonable opinion that total negation of the artistic practice of totalitarian art between 1930 and 1990 is not expedient. Instead, it could be more effective to study the origins of many situations that occurred in this period, obviously taking into account the realities of the Soviet era.

In 2007, a monograph by Rohotchenko (2007), *Socialist Realism and Totalitarianism*, covering the triumph of socialist realism in Ukraine between 1930 and 1950, was published. The author outlines the socio-political and socio-psychological background, describes the one-way development of culture artificially shaped by the Soviet ideologists, and explains the

inevitable strict dependency of the artist on these circumstances (Rohotchenko, 2007).

Borys Yerofalov-Pylypchak (2010) conducts a detailed study on the fine arts and architecture of the capital of Soviet Ukraine. The author demonstrates his attitude to the “hard” times of Ukrainian history and architecture and fine arts in particular. The evolution of his convictions was simple and complex at the same time. Yerofalov-Pylypchak (2010) offers the reader to make his conclusion after studying the material: “Little-known and often unique illustrations demonstrate the highest level of academic mastery of our architects, revealing the immense architectural and plastic potential of Kyiv, as well as its fulfilled and missed opportunities” (p. 4).

The Century of Nonconformism in Ukrainian Visual Art by Lesya Smyrna (2017) is one of the most profound monographs on the Ukrainian culture of the previous century. In the foreword, Smyrna (2017) presents her work of many years in the following way, “This monograph covers the phenomenon of Ukrainian nonconformism in the visual art that emerged in the 1920s as a resistance to the totalitarian system and its main method in culture – the socialist realism” (p. 478). The book is useful for further research, since, besides the theoretical conclusions about the important stages of art life in the country of the last century, it contains a detailed gallery of illustrations.

Another recent monograph, *Art studies: Reflections and Life* by Rohotchenko (2018), summarizes over fifty years of research and includes previously unpublished archival material from his doctoral dissertation. This is the most detailed research that specifically addresses the development of Ukrainian fine arts and architecture in the totalitarian era. In the author’s own words, “The main focus of attention is on the sociocultural component of art processes that took place in the 20th century in Ukraine” (Rohotchenko, 2018, p. 7). Well- and little-known works of architecture, painting, graphic art, theatre and decorative and applied arts are analyzed in Rohotchenko’s book (2018). In the publication, previously classified archival sources are quoted that shed light on the events of the era and explain certain historical facts presented to the readers for the first time.

The Political Component in the Development of New Culture and Ideology in the USSR and Ukraine during the Pre-War Period (1939-1945)

Recently granted public access to the archives of the communist era enables one to look at many facts from a different perspective. Culturologists, historians and art historians of the present-day free society who study the art of the Soviet era make fundamentally novel judgments

regarding the actions of the party leaders, as well as the actions of the artists, writers, composers, cinematographers, who worked during the specified period (Giddens, 1991). Thus, research and comparison of different views and explanation of artistic processes and acts committed by people, who lived and worked between 1930 and 1980, allows one to better understand the era, see the true situation and explain the actions of artists, subdued to the authorities.

Most documents of the era that study the new method of state formation (socialist realism) contain the official definition of it. Often quite verbose, in its core, it was always the same, formulated as a clear objective. The formula of “national in form, socialist in content” would become the cultural motto of the USSR and the Ukrainian SSR. The newly created method, after receiving official approval during the second half of the 1930s, eventually came to dominate almost all spheres of culture. Support from the governing bodies is a factor that could not be ignored. The artist became a hostage to the new rules, since rejecting the mainstream line in the art could end up tragically. That is exactly what happened to many writers, theatre professionals and artists. This fact was concealed in the studies of art history and culture of the former USSR up to the end of the 20th century, despite being a key to understanding the real picture of the distorted development of culture in the Soviet empire. For many foreign researchers, except for those who specialized in the field, the course of events happening in Moscow, Leningrad, Kharkiv or Kyiv in the pre-war and post-war eras was just not comprehensible.

The governing authorities paid much attention to the management of artistic processes. Top officials visited art exhibitions, theatrical performances, congresses of creative unions (Gordon et al., 2009). It was during the 1920s and 1930s when a class of cultural figures emerged. They were artists, composers and theatrical figures who actively collaborated with the authorities and supported the leading state line for the development of art, thus earning themselves a living.

The level of involvement of party leaders in the management of arts and choice of artistic methods could be well illustrated by the following example describing Stalin’s visit to the art exhibition. Fyodor Bogorodsky (1955), a corresponding member of the Academy of Arts of the USSR, in the 1955 edition of *the Issues of Fine Arts* gave testimony to the event, “...they came on foot from the Red Square. While viewing the exhibition, Joseph Stalin held himself with casual ease. In response to my question, which work Stalin especially likes, he answered upon some thinking, ‘I like the picture *Reply of the Zaporozhian Cossacks* by Repin. Thus, if the Soviet artists could

express in their works the strength and power of the working class or peasantry, as Repin did in his *Zaporozhians*, it would be very good” (pp. 134–138).

Favoured artists received all the benefits from the leaders of the state. Besides the moral support, they had obvious material advantages, in the first place regarding their high earnings (Sternberg, 2009).

Recollections of Yevheny Katsman (1955), an artist, a corresponding member of the Academy of Arts of the USSR, can serve as an example: “In 1933, Joseph Stalin invited a group of artists to visit the city. Isaak Brodsky, Aleksandr Gerasimov, Fyodor Modorov, Vasily Svarog and I were going. The upcoming meeting somehow changed Brodsky, his eyes shining and smiling. Gerasimov’s reaction was more dramatic, and I was totally bursting with joy. Voroshilov said that he was just as excited when he first approached the apartment of Vladimir Lenin. Joseph Vissarionovich made everything clear, simple and straight right from the start. When we were playing *gorodki*, I noticed that Brodsky was as if arranging Stalin’s figure against the background of the landscape in his mind. We talked a lot about the ways of developing Soviet art, the organization of art management” (pp. 112–117).

The keywords in this quote are “the organization of art management”. The leadership of the state did not leave the development of artistic processes to chance. This explains the particular cruelty towards the creative intelligentsia that started in the 1930s. Hundreds of writers, artists and other cultural figures ended up in prisons and concentration camps. Many artists were physically eliminated. Even after the death of Stalin and de-Stalinization, there were very few changes in the state policy regarding culture. However, many of the previously convicted cultural figures were released from the prison camps.

Social realism shows reality through illusion and political ideology that express it only figuratively. In turn, people do not perceive realistic events through the prism of their thinking and, instead, recreate ideological information presented to them. This trend is rather dangerous since it contributes to spreading false information. It can lead to *infodemic*, i.e., mass dissemination of false information that is threatening to destroy humanity. However, socialist realism emerged as a manifestation of monumentalism in the context of cultural development and defined certain stylistic features of Soviet society. It led to the ideology of heroism represented by the corresponding ideologized images. Postmodernism has proved itself as a disagreement with the scientific and technological progress after modernism (Tidd, 2009). In the context of postmodernism, social realism is one of the

factors in forming boundless interpretations of art, namely, the perception of genres and styles without any clear definitions.

The focus should be placed on how people of non-free society comprehended and perceived artistic problems in general and why realistic art was understandable and appealing to them in particular.

Fine Arts: An Academic Depiction of the Ideal Image

Obviously, during the long period of the existence of socialist realism, the boundaries of what was permitted varied.

Borys Lobanovskyi (1998) in his article for the *Realism and Socialist Realism in Ukrainian Soviet Painting. History. Collection. Experiment* describes the period of the late 1940s and the early 1950s: “In the last years of Stalin’s regime, the boundaries set for ‘the most progressive’ method steadily narrowed in all spheres of literature, music, fine arts and cinema. The artist was only allowed to praise the ardour for work and the beauty of nature, avoiding the temptations of impressionism and refraining from the simplification of the image of the Soviet citizen” (p. 41).

The artworks (especially paintings and graphic works) created in the later periods of the 1940s-1980s show practically photographic depiction of the image. This trait was used as a method in the art of the USSR long before hyperrealism established itself in the 1970s.

However, during all stages of socialist realism, its defining characteristic in the visual arts (fine arts, sculpture, book illustration) was not just an academic depiction of an image but *that of the ideal image* (that only partially resembled the real-life one). The creative legacy of Tetiana Yablonskaya (1950), Yevhen Volobuyev (2011) and many others is a vivid illustration of that. Photographic depiction of the image became to dominate art academies and institutes since it seemed apprehensible to the ordinary viewer at the numerous republican and all-Union art exhibitions. After the Second World War, the method of socialist realism, to a lesser extent and yet quite tangibly, spread across the states of the Eastern Bloc.

Academic, painted-from-life depiction of the character in plastic arts and literature was, and probably still is, the most comprehensible for the most tiers of society throughout the world.

Academically painted images (and to a lesser extent sculpture and mosaics) allowed one to make virtual images apprehensible to the “workers and peasants”. Without the prior expertise in art, such readily understandable images as if made it possible to establish a symbolic connection between the party-guided artists and the common folk.

Tetiana Yablonskaya (1950), one of the most acclaimed painters of the era, a standard-bearer of socialist realism, in her article “Socialist Realism in Painting” published in the leading *Kultura i Zhizn* [Culture and Life] magazine wrote, “The vast scope of work performed by the united, happy workers at the collective farm astonished me. Being there made me realize what a big debt our art still owed to our great people, how little it had done to reveal all the greatness and dignity of the Soviet people, and the vastness of the socialist reconstruction that our country was going through... The way I saw art changed entirely after I visited the collective farm. Formalism and naturalism both find foundation in the artist’s estrangement from our Socialist reality” (Yablonskaya, 1950), as cited by Polyanskaya (2014).

This, perhaps, is the best illustration of why naturalism (a true-to-life depiction of reality), though also being an academically precise realistic method, did not fit within the cultural system of the Soviet state. What was needed was not a reality as such but a myth.

Social realism relies on the images that reflect political orders, rather than the artist’s imagination. There is virtually no reflection of an artistic style. It follows that postmodern art is a mere combination of existing styles, genres, themes and ideas. Particular trends erase the physical environment of objects so that fine arts can acquire abstract features. It means that a household object can acquire artistic significance when in another environment. Postmodernism is characterized by an assumptive semantic analysis of reality by transforming and reflecting works. Thus, it generates the idea of functionality, as well as new aesthetic interpretations contradicting the standards of the past.

In architecture, postmodernism is the integration of styles of the past eras in combination with scientific and technological advances. For instance, buildings were decorated with such materials that provided insulation or protection, without any traditional canons. In the postmodern context, fine arts highlight both aesthetics reflected in the lines and abstractions of figurativeness and functionality of new objects that can be considered as decorations. Postmodernism lacks uniformity and may contradict artistic reflection. Consequently, one can observe certain ideologization of the post-industrial society, which is similar to socialist-realist culture.

Thus, complying with the party guidelines provided the artists not only with the material gain in the form of the received commissions and other benefits. It granted them popularity among the general public as well. This popularity was only partially induced by the party and, in some cases, was genuine. There were many reasons for that, including, first of all, people’s hopes for some changes for the better in their lives (hence, the ideal

image of reality would nourish these expectations and enthusiasm), admiration for the level of artistic mastery (which often was extremely high), and the images being readily understandable for the public.

Forcible Subdual of Culture to the Doctrine of Socialist Realism

The proclamation of socialist realism as a main artistic method on August 30, 1934, at the First All-Union Congress of Soviet writers started the count of a new totalitarian culture, which will become one of the constituent parts of Stalin's personality cult (that turned full-scale after 1929, his 50th birthday). During the course of the next year, 1935, the artistic ideology was shaped; state mass media became the mouthpiece for proclaiming socialist realism the main artistic method of Soviet art. All creative groups and associations in the USSR had been eliminated by then.

There is one aspect of socialist realism implementation in Ukraine that may be disclosed only now, long after the collapse of the Soviet Union. The new method was used, first of all, as a tool of class struggle. This is the trait that distinguishes this artistic method from any other.

In 1973, the interpretation of "the creative method" was already different compared to the 1950s, even though the pressure of censorship may be sensed in every word (Afanasiev & Shpakov, 1966).

"The creative method of Soviet art (socialist realism), which is steadily used as a guidance by Ukrainian artists, provides them with inextricable ties with the common people, with their lives and struggles, obliges to intensify the internationalist tone in the artworks, increases interest in the traditions of folk art, promotes social activism and overall intellectual growth, broad and forward-thinking artistic vision. At the same time, the method of socialist realism, constantly evolving and being enriched with the experience of socialist society, requires a deeper, more insightful and refined recreation of the lively movements of the human soul, deep and intense feelings of a contemporary person and, above all, the embodiment of the positive changes in the worldview, perception of the world, in the morals of the Soviet citizen, which have been enabled by and established in the process of building communism" (Afanasiev & Shpakov, 1966, p. 6.)

Such definition of the role of art in society has nothing "wrong" in it. Moreover, if the words "socialist" and "communism" were taken out of the text, this definition would do for contemporary art, because internationalism, folk traditions, social activism and intellectual growth of the artist remain the leading criteria of the Ukrainian national fine art school even today.

Art historians of the past periods left out one important aspect: since its emergence, the creative method of socialist realism transformed into a powerful instrument of class struggle. The global idea of socialist realism in the USSR sought some reinforcement in international experience. For instance, according to political course, the International was successfully used as the theme for artworks. It was therefore desirable to refer to the work of (non-Soviet) predecessor artists and cultural figures. The elimination of free artistic groups and associations, not controlled by the state, and the emergence of socialist realism, which was declared not only a method but a mode of existence in the artistic community, were prerequisites for the cultural revolution and its main achievements.

The works depicting heroics of revolutionary struggle (especially its leaders), and, additionally, the life of broad masses of people, improved by the revolutionary movement, are typical of early socialist realism.

Later on, in the late 1920s, if such a “classical” approach was applied, it would only partially fulfil the goal of socialist realism at the time. Since the 1930s, in the USSR in general and in the Ukrainian SSR in particular, they launched the campaign against the museums, former private country estates and private art collections stored there. As the previous owners of these mansions, estates and collections either fled the country during war and revolution, died or were executed by the communist regime, the Soviet state inherited such museum collections.

The museum as a temple of arts became a counteragent to the communist rule. The vast majority of museum collections told the story of the country’s past. It was proclaimed that the “new” viewers did not need such history. Their ideal had to be different from the ideals of the past. “There is a fundamental difference between the ideology of the group or the party expressing discontent with something and seemingly similar ideology but with the status of state doctrine. The concentration of power in one hand (in the hands of the Bolshevik Party) radically changed the essence of not only rationalism but also of empiricism and utilitarianism” (Gabrichevsky, 1993).

Postmodernism is an artistic-cultural trend that ideologically advocates questionable attitudes towards human values. Social realism, as a manifestation of ideology, formally justifies the value of human life, human needs and social equality and, at the same time, strengthens authoritarianism. Thus, socialist realism ignores human values: human life is insignificant; education, art, values-based attitude towards oneself and others are not a priority.

Postmodernism expresses a human protest against ideologies. In particular, wars have demonstrated the ultimate futility of human life.

Architecture: Creating a Void to Be Filled

Vladimir Paperny (2000), who studied the Soviet architecture of the 1930s-1960s, repeatedly mentioned the magical power of socialist realism: “Socialist realism as if assumes that when the city goes to rest at night, all these marble, bronze, and concrete Workers, Kolkhoz Women, and Party Leaders come to life, cast off the fetters and come out of the dark Plato’s cave of mundane existence” (p. 133). Thus, for the Soviet power it was equally unacceptable to have both the “former people” and “former buildings” around. That was the true underlying reason for the twofold process launched almost simultaneously with the establishment of Soviet power. One aspect of this process was the demolition of the “former buildings” and elimination of the objects of cultural and historical value from the physical and symbolical space of the republic. The second aspect lay in inventing a recognizable architectural style for the new communist rule that would symbolically dominate the city space.

The main ideological task in reshaping culture was its shift down to the level of public practice. This was the way to break links between generations in the cultural field that logically contradicted integration into the culture of the past and annihilated the achievements of the predecessors. The demolition of the old culture was supported by virtually the entire ruling elite of the country since the art and culture of the landowners and imperialists became a counterpoise to the Marxist-Leninist theory. Under such a theory, the demolition of religious buildings was justified. Also, all the artworks were considered as always belonging to the general public (previously oppressed by tsarism). Therefore, it was proclaimed that the ruling class (previous owners) used these artworks illegally. In this way, the state culture became people’s culture and, certainly, belonged to the people. Such interpretation meant that the people, as the cultural objects’ ultimate owners, had the primary right to use culture. First of all, any items of the cultural property could be sold abroad. That was exactly what was done.

The next task of the leaders of the state was to justify the demolition of sacred buildings that was the literal implementation of Stalin-standard socialist realism. This contradicted Lenin’s interpretation of the old culture as just a bourgeois one and also meant that there is no need to build a new proletarian culture on the wreckage of the old capitalist one. The new culture was to be built from scratch. The political argumentation was skillful: taking over the religious buildings, estates, mansions and art collections of

previous owners was considered to be implementing historical justice (Gouthro, 2002).

The previous cultural life of the Russian Empire was depicted as a logical precondition for the newest, super-scale culture of socialist realism that included literature, fine arts, cinema, music, theatre and architecture.

The construction of the Proletarian Park and the Government Quarter in Kyiv could serve as a perfect example of such rhetoric and illustrates the mentioned twofold process.

The theorists of Soviet architecture faced the necessity to produce a radically new concept of creation of a form, to provide a new style response to the profound change in society caused by the revolution and civil war. In the circumstances of uncertainty and ongoing creative experiments, state-wide architectural competitions become of crucial importance as they opened some possibilities for dialogue in art circles.

During that period, such contests went beyond only choosing a certain project for construction. It was a place for synthesis, formation of the new style doctrine and adoption of the coordinated direction for the development of architecture.

The contest for the construction of the Government Quarter in Kyiv, carried out between 1934 and 1935, was undoubtedly the most significant event in the architecture of the Ukrainian SSR of the interwar period. After Kyiv was made capital of the Ukrainian SSR again in 1934 (and thus all government authorities had to relocate there from Kharkiv), there emerged the urgent need to create a new centre to host the governing apparatus of the republic. The new transportation routes were set to be built, the zoning of the territory was to be changed, and, unfortunately, numerous religious buildings were also to be demolished. In light of these events, the architectural contest turned out to be not just an architectural task. It was presented as a programmatic, symbolic, almost sacred possibility to transform the former city of churches and monasteries into the architecturally complete, truly socialist centre of Soviet Ukraine.

After preliminary project work, the Kyiv Architecture and Planning Administration offered six fundamentally different city-planning proposals (Killeso, 1981), however, some sources mention that only five of them were considered (Molokin, 1935, p. 12). The contest committee had chosen the site: between St. Michael's Golden-Domed Cathedral, Vasylykivska Church (The Church of Three Baptists), the Square of Red Heroes of Perekop (present-day Sophia Square) and the Government Administration Building. Five other variants were rejected under quite dubious wording.

St. Michael's Golden-Domed Cathedral was named after Michael the Archangel, saint patron of Kyiv. It was founded in 1108 by Sviatopolk Iziaslavich (ruler of Kyivan Rus), grandson of Yaroslav the Wise, and was completed until 1113. This was a unique cross-in-square temple with six pillars, three apses and one gilded dome. The walls of the cathedral were decorated with mosaics and frescoes. In the subsequent centuries, the cathedral became a pilgrimage site and received rich donations from both powerful benefactors and common folk.

The selected site triggered considerable debates over the proposal to demolish St. Michael's Golden-Domed Cathedral. Most historians agree on the fact that the person to play the crucial role in the process of decision-making was Pavel Postyshev, the second secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party (bolsheviks) of Ukraine and later on the first secretary of the Kyiv Oblast Party Committee. He, ignoring the opinion of the professionals, influenced the final decision of the commission (Gevryk, 1987). The press, including the paper *Sotsialistychnyi Kyiv* [Socialist Kyiv], supported the extensive propaganda campaign that argued that the cathedral holds no historical value. The campaign was supplemented with the publication of research works, commissioned by the regime.

Eventually, for several reasons, the project was never completed: in 1938, only the building of the Council of People's Commissars was erected and the site for the symmetrical building was cleared. After Petrushansky's death, the construction of the Government Quarter was put on hold and never resumed. There were many reasons for the halt, mostly political and economic: obvious miscalculations in the plan produced by the government commission. Still, criticism of the contemporaries also played its part.

A detached, out-of-the-context building of the Council of People's Commissars neighbored a void space for a long time, causing further criticism among the architectural community for the poor city-planning decision to build the projected Government Quarter (Killeso, 1981). The Quarter was meant to become a centrepiece of "The General Plan of Kyiv Restoration" of 1934–1935 by the Soviet architect Pavel Khaustov. Nevertheless, neither the Quarter nor the general plan was adequately implemented.

According to the plan, two operating parks on the slopes of the Dnipro River in Kyiv were to be transformed into a new recreation area. In April 1932, a meeting of party public organizations was held. Labour unions, workers of museums and clubs were involved in the work. According to the standard scenario of those years, architects, artists and film directors were engaged as well, including well-known architect Valerian Rykov, renowned

painter and architect Vasyl Krychevsky and world-famous film director Oleksandr Dovzhenko.

The statement of Oleksandr Dovzhenko, which was later published in the city newspaper, goes as follows: “I think that in solving the problem of building a cultural park, St. Michael’s monastery will be asked to “leave”, it had become outdated. It is unacceptable that these walls were somebody’s need. I think that when we demolish St. Michael’s Monastery, the construction of the park will produce a proper effect” (Kovalynskyi, 2003, p. 290).

St. Michael’s Golden-Domed Cathedral, one of the most significant objects of religious art of Kyivan Rus, its bell tower and other structures of the ensemble were demolished between 1934 and 1936. The desperate attempts by some art historians (in particular by Mykola Makarenko and Dmitry Aynalov, both purged later on) to save the cathedral (at least its pre-Mongolian part) were ignored by the authorities. The only compromise was to remove the old mosaics and frescoes from the walls of the building before the demolition. The latter are now stored at the Tretyakov Gallery in Moscow.

Architecture was destroyed as an art. It is because socialist realism was developing the anti-religious policy and, accordingly, destroying religious architectural monuments. It led to people’s open dissatisfaction and realization of their devaluation by the authorities. At the same time, the idea remains that human activity is important. The described tendencies are reflected in the artistic arsenal of postmodernism.

Postmodern architecture expressed new ideas: decorations lost the semantic essence of previous styles and, instead, promoted innovation, unattainability and asymmetry characterizing one’s artistic search for perfectionism. The curvature of the lines highlighted abstract views on reality, as well as the search for the ideal.

Thus, postmodernism lies in searching for something new, unattainable and, at the same time, useful.

Conclusions

The demolition of religious buildings would become a new normal for the Soviet ideology and would be justified as a general component of the workers’ struggle against the remnants of the past. Aside from politics, there was another element of a crime. Golden, silver, platinum, jewel-framed icons and iconostases, jewels, crosses, and garments worn by the clergy were a powerful source of income for the reserves of foreign exchange and gold of the newly formed state. Thus, the policy of “struggle against the past” was a

convenient excuse for the further crimes of the Soviet authorities against their people. The exact number of the victims of Stalin's concentration camps is still unknown. In reality, probably there were millions of citizens whose thoughts and actions did not coincide with the ones of the Party. Yet, the totalitarian system not only justified the crimes but also created a new class of Soviet bourgeoisie that lived a far better life than the rest of the population. Besides, by implementing socialist realism, the culture was directed into the convenient, manageable corridor. Only Soviet themes dominated literature, fine arts, theatre and even music; with their patriotism defined by the Party. As the spirituality, religion and culture of the past were destroyed, the new, artificial Soviet culture turned from the invented guideline into the real one for the next eighty years, eventually influencing the cultures of the states of the Eastern Bloc.

The new art, according to the new "humanistic" principles, could reflect only two sides: love or hate. Love for the people, the Party, Stalin and hate for the enemies. This resulted in the principle of class assessment of phenomena of political life, which subsequently was used to justify the purges among scientists, cultural figures, writers, architects, artists, clergy, wealthy farmers; repression of certain artistic styles, clashing with the mainstream socialist realism, also started. Since its emergence, socialist realism was used as a powerful instrument of class struggle and, eventually, an argumentation for purges.

However, despite all the repressions and purges, dissidents were still there. Quiet resistance was summering underneath the surface. Foreign literature was practically unavailable. Samizdat opened some possibilities, though also carried high risk, up to imprisonment. The names of the foreign scholars, even such globally renowned as Nietzsche, who significantly influenced postmodernism, were unfamiliar to the Soviet artists. To reject the dominance of rationalism, the relativity of knowledge and morals could hardly ever be the question for discussion in the studios of Ukrainian artists. Pre-war and post-war eras, as well the years since the Khrushchev Thaw and up till the 1990s, were marked for the Soviet artists with clear guidelines to glorify the worker in the socialist society.

If postmodernism in the West emerged as a certain opposition to modernism, in the Soviet Union there also was an opposition (both ideological and artistic) to the ruling regime and its creative method.

Soviet-style postmodernism, undoubtedly, was a response to the decades of totalitarian arbitrariness in art. The reason why this art seems rather obscure to the outside world up till now lies in the causes which are not relevant for the free cultural society. Despair and fear that ruled Soviet

artists were most distant from the foundations of the free creativity of modernism and Western postmodernism as its successor.

Acknowledgement

Author 1 research scientific publications and the importance of intelligence on the theoretical and methodological foundations of research.

Author 2 defined the conceptual provisions and the main context of socialist realism as a concept and presented his research in the article.

Author 3 on the basis of scientific achievements defined the essence of the basic concepts of research, presented the definition of the concept and terms of this research problem.

Author 4 researcher and compiled a list of references on this issue.

Author 5 systematized and compiled a list of literature of domestic researchers

Author 6 systematized and compiled a list of literature of world researchers.

References

Afanasiev, V. A., & Shpakov, A. V. (1966). *Ukrainske radianske mystetstvo 1956-1965 rokiv* [Ukrainian Soviet art between 1956 and 1965]. Art.

<https://opac.lviv.ua/bib/125668>

Arefieva, A. A. (1997). *Estetika sotsrealizma (slovo v izmerenii publichnosti)* [The aesthetics of social realism (a word in the public dimension)]. GALPU.

http://91.217.179.134:9100/libr/DocDescription?doc_id=741300

Bogorodsky, F. (1955). Zametki pedagogy [Teacher's notes]. In F. P. Reshetnikov, F. S. Bogorodskiy, & Ye. A. Kibrik (Eds.), *Voprosy izobrazitel'nogo iskusstva* [The issues of fine arts: A collection of articles] (pp. 134–138). Sovetskiy Hudozhnik.

http://irbis.usaaa.ru/Isapi/irbis64r_15/cgiirbis_64.exe?LNG=&C21COM=S&I21DBN=BOOK&P21DBN=BOOK&S21FMT=fullwebr&S21ALL=%28%3C%2E%3E%3D%0%98%0%B7%0%BE%0%B1%D1%80%0%B0%0%B7%0%B8%D1%82%0%B5%0%BB%D1%8C%0%BD%0%BE%0%B5%20%0%B8%D1%81%0%BA%D1%83%D1%81%D1%82%0%B2%0%BE%20%2D%2D%20%0%A2%0%B5%0%BE%D1%80%0%B8%D1%8F%20%0%B8%0%B7%0%BE%0%B1%D1%80%0%B0%0%B7%0%B8%D1%82%0%B5%0%BB%D1%8C%0%BD%0%BE%0%B3%20%0%BE%20%0%B8%D1%81%0%BA%D1%83%D1%81%D1%81%D1%82%0%B2%0%B0%3C%2E%3E%29&Z21ID=&S21SRW=GO&S21SRD=&S21STN=1&S21REF=10&S21CNR=20

- Bown, M. C. (1998). *Socialist realist painting*. Yale University Press.
<https://www.amazon.com/Socialist-Realist-Painting-Matthew-Cullerne/dp/0300068441>
- Buchowski, M. (2018). Cosmopolitanism with a human rights face. *Przegląd Kulturoznawczy* [Cultural Studies Review], 1(35), 140–145.
<https://www.ejournals.eu/Przegląd-Kulturoznawczy/2018/Numer-1-35-2018/art/11425/>
- Dzhanguzhin, R. (1981). *Novatorstvo kak traditsiya. Problemy preemstvennosti v razvitií budozhestvennoy kultury* [Innovation as a tradition. The issues of continuity in artistic culture development]. Kazakhstan.
http://lib.nkzu.kz/CGI/irbis64r_01/cgiirbis_64.exe?Z21ID=&I21DBN=KNIGI_PRINT&P21DBN=KNIGI&S21STN=1&S21REF=&S21FMT=fullw_print&C21COM=S&S21CNR=&S21P01=0&S21P02=1&S21P03=A&S21STR=%D0%94%D0%B6%D0%B0%D0%BD%D0%B3%D1%83%D0%B6%D0%B8%D0%BD%20%D0%A0.%D0%9D
- Gabrichevsky, A. (1993). *Teoriya i istoriya arhitektury: Izbrannyye sochineniya* [Theory and history of architecture: Selected works]. Samvatas.
<https://www.livelib.ru/author/482874-aleksandr-gabrichevskij>
- Gevryk, T. (1987). *Vtracheni arkhitekturni pamiatky Kyieva* [Lost architectural monuments of Kyiv] (2nd ed.). Ukrainskyi Muzei.
<https://diasporiana.org.ua/ukrainica/18872-gevrik-t-vtracheni-arhitekturni-pam-yatki-kiyeva/>
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*. Stanford University Press. https://s3.amazonaws.com/arena-attachments/50002/Giddens_ModernityandSelf-Identity.pdf
- Gordon, J., Halasz, G., Krawczyk, M., Leney, T., Michel, A., Pepper, D., Putkiewicz, E., & Wiśniewski, J. (2009). *Key competences in Europe: Opening doors for lifelong learner across the school curriculum and teacher education*. CASE-Center for Social and Economic Research.
<https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/87621/1/613705459.pdf>
- Gouthro, P. A. (2002). Habermasian theory and the development of critical theoretical discourses in adult education. In *Adult Education Research Conference (AERC)* (pp. 1–7). North Carolina State University.
<https://newprairiepress.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=2375&context=aerc>
- Imel, S. (1998). *Transformative learning in adulthood*. ERIC Digest No. 200. Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
https://www.academia.edu/25166095/Transformative_Learning_in_Adulthood
- Katsman, E. (1955). U novosibirskikh khudozhnikov [At Novosibirsk artists']. In F. P. Reshetnikov, F. S. Bogorodskiy, & Ye. A. Kibrik (Eds.), *Voprosy*

- izobrazitel'nogo iskusstva* [The issues of fine arts: a collection of articles] (pp. 112–117). Sovetskiy Hudozhnik. http://irbis.usaaa.ru/Isapi/irbis64r_15/cgiirbis_64.exe?LNG=&C21COM=S&I21DBN=BOOK&P21DBN=BOOK&S21FMT=fullw_ebr&S21ALL=%28%3C%2E%3E%3D%D0%98%D0%B7%D0%BE%D0%B1%D1%80%D0%B0%D0%B7%D0%B8%D1%82%D0%B5%D0%BB%D1%8C%D0%BD%D0%BE%D0%B5%20%D0%B8%D1%81%D0%BA%D1%83%D1%81%D1%81%D1%82%D0%B2%D0%BE%20%2D%2D%20%D0%A2%D0%B5%D0%BE%D1%80%D0%B8%D1%8F%20%D0%B8%D0%B7%D0%BE%D0%B1%D1%80%D0%B0%D0%B7%D0%B8%D1%82%D0%B5%D0%BB%D1%8C%D0%BD%D0%BE%D0%B3%D0%BE%20%D0%B8%D1%81%D0%BA%D1%83%D1%81%D1%81%D1%82%D0%B2%D0%B0%3C%2E%3E%29&Z21ID=&S21SRW=GOD&S21SRD=&S21STN=1&S21REF=10&S21CNR=20
- Kileso, S. (1981). Arkhitektura Kyieva radianskoi doby [Kyiv Architecture of the Soviet era]. *Narodna tvorcbist ta etnografii* [Folk Creativity and Ethnography], 5, 11–22. http://history.org.ua/LiberUA/Book/ist_K5/2.pdf
- Kolkmann, M. (2018, September 25). Kongress der Deutschen Vereinigung für Politikwissenschaft [Congress of the German Association for Political Science]. *Politik. Wissenschaft*. <https://blogs.urz.uni-halle.de/politikwissenschaft/2018/09/27-kongress-der-deutschen-vereinigung-fuer-politikwissenschaft/>
- Kovalynskiy, V. (2003). *Dovzhenko i Mykhailivskiy monastyr* [Dovzhenko and St. Michael's Golden-Domed Monastery]. Mist, VH-studio. <http://www.calendar.interestny.kiev.ua/KOVALINSKIY.pdf>
- Lachsen, T. (2000). Sotsrealizm v poiskah svoih beregov: neskolko istoricheskikh zamechaniy odnositelno “istoricheski otkryitoy esteticheskoy sistemy pravdivogo izobrazheniya zhizni” [Socialist realism in search of its boundaries: A few historical remarks regarding the “historically open aesthetic system of true depiction of life”]. In H. Günther, & Ye. Dobrenko (Eds.) *Sotsrealisticheskij kanon* [The socialist realism canon: A collection of articles] (pp. 523–536). Akademicheskii proekt. <https://www.twirpx.com/file/2590908/>
- Lagutenko, O. (2006). *Ukrayinska grafika pershoi tretyny XX stolittia* [Ukrainian graphics in the first third of the 20th century]. Hrani-T. <https://knygy.com.ua/index.php?productID=9789662923148>
- Lobanovskiy, B. (1998). Ukrainskyi zhyvopys u labetakh perebudov: vid dzhherela sotsrealizmu do 1980-kh rokiv [Ukrainian fine arts in the grip of transformations (from the origins of socialist realism up to the 1980s)]. In Yu. Maniychuk (Ed.) *Realizm ta sotsialistychnyi realizm v ukrainskomu zhyvopysi radianskoho chasu. Istorii. Kolektsiia. Eksperyment* [Realism and socialist realism in Ukrainian Soviet painting. History. Collection. Experiment] (pp.

- 484–486).
Poligrafknyga. http://ekmair.ukma.edu.ua/bitstream/handle/123456789/5558/Realizm_ta_sotsialistychnyy.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
- Maniychuk, Yu. (1998). *Realizm ta sotsialistychnyy realizm v ukrayinskomu zhyvopysi radyanskoho chasu. Istoriya. Kolektsiya. Eksperyment* [Realism and socialist realism in Ukrainian Soviet painting. History. Collection. Experiment]. Polihrafknyha. <http://uartlib.org/allbooks/istoriya-ukrayinskogo-mistetstva/realizm-ta-sotsialistychnyj-realizm-v-ukrayinskomu-zhyvopysu-radyanskogo-chasu-istoriya-kolektsiya-eksperyment/>
- Molokin, A. (1935). Proektirovanie Pravitelstvennogo Centra USSR v Kieve [Designing the Government Centre of the Ukrainian SSR in Kyiv]. *Arhitektura SSSR* [USSR Architecture], 9, 11–28.
http://www.dnabb.org/modules.php?name=FAQ&op=viewfaq&id_cat=2
- Nerubasska, A., & Maksymchuk, B. (2020). The Demarkation of Creativity, Talent and Genius in Humans: a Systemic Aspect. *Postmodern Openings*, 11(2), 240–255. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/11.2/172>
- Nerubasska, A., Palshkov, K., & Maksymchuk, B. (2020). A Systemic Philosophical Analysis of the Contemporary Society and the Human: New Potential. *Postmodern Openings*, 11(4), 275–292.
<https://doi.org/10.18662/po/11.4/235>
- Paperny, V. (2000). Sotsrealizm v sovetskoj arhitekture [Socialist realism in Soviet architecture]. In H. Günther, & Ye. Dobrenko, (Eds.) *Sotsrealisticheskiy kanon* [The socialist realism canon: A collection of articles] (pp. 129–133). Akademicheskij proekt. <https://www.twirpx.com/file/2590908/>
- Polyanskaya, O. (2014). Tatiana Yablonskaya. 1949. The artist’s “true heart.” *Tretyakov Gallery*, 45(4).
<https://www.tretyakovgallerymagazine.com/articles/4-2014-45/tatiana-yablonskaya-1949-artists-true-heart>
- Puchkov, A. (1993). Predislovie [Foreword]. In A. Gabrichevsky (Ed.), *Teoriya i istoriya arhitektury: Izbrannyye sochineniya* [Theory and history of architecture: Selected works] (pp. 3–7). Samvatas.
<https://www.livelib.ru/author/482874-aleksandr-gabrichevskij>
- Rohotchenko, O. (2018). *Mystetstvoznavstvo: rozhdumy ta zhyttya* [Art studies: Reflections and life]. Feniks. <https://odnb.odessa.ua/vnn/book/3119>
- Rohotchenko, O. O. (2007). *Sotsialistychnyy realizm i totalitaryzm* [Socialist realism and totalitarianism]. Feniks.
http://www.mari.kiev.ua/sites/default/files/inline-images/pdfs/Rogotchenko_Soc_Realism.pdf
- Rohotchenko, O., Zuziak, T., Kizim, S., Rohotchenko, S., & Shynin, O. (2021). Information and communications technology in the professional training

- of future professionals in the field of culture and art. *Postmodern Openings*, 12(3), 134–153. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/12.3/332>
- Saunders, F. (1995, October 22). Modern art was CIA “weapon”. *The Independent*. <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/modern-art-was-cia-weapon-1578808.html>
- Smyrna, L. (2017). *Stolittiya nonkonformizmu v ukrayinskomu vizualnomu mystetstvi* [The century of nonconformism in Ukrainian visual art]. Feniks. https://shron1.chtyvo.org.ua/Smyrna_Lesia/Stolittia_nonkonformizmu_v_ukrainskomu_vizualnomu_mystetstvi.pdf
- Sternberg, R. J. (1996). *Successful intelligence: How practical and creative intelligence determine success in life*. Simon & Schuster. <https://www.cs.tufts.edu/~nr/cs257/archive/robert-sternberg/Successful%20Intelligence.pdf>
- Tidd, J. (2006). *Series on technology management (Vol. 3). From strategic management to strategic competence: Measuring technological, market and organization innovation* (2nd ed.). Imperial College Press. <https://www.worldscientific.com/worldscibooks/10.1142/p439>
- Volobuyev, Ye. (2011). “Realizm – eto takoe silnoe, zhivuchee, ogromnoe, vechno golodnoe chudovische...” [“Realism is such a mighty, huge, constantly hungry beast...”]. Optima. <https://catalog.princeton.edu/catalog/SCSB-5683591>
- Weiss, D. (2000). “Novoyaz” kak istoricheskoe yavlenie [Novoyaz as a historical phenomenon]. In H. Günther, & Ye. Dobrenko (Eds.), *Sotsrealisticheskij kanon* [The socialist realism canon: A collection of articles] (pp. 539–555). Akademicheskij proekt. <https://www.twirpx.com/file/2590908/>
- Yablonskaya, T. (1950, February 11). Sotsialisticheskij realizm v zhivopisi [Socialist realism in painting]. *Kultura i zhizn* [Culture and Life], 4. <https://electro.nekrasovka.ru/books/6157858>
- Yerofalov-Pylypchak, B. (2010). *Arbitektura sovetского Kieva* [Architecture of Soviet Kyiv]. A+C. http://books.totalarch.com/architecture_of_soviet_kiev