

DOI: 10.31866/2410-1915.22.2021.235891

UDC 130.2:321.64"713"

THE SIMULACRUM NARRATIVE OF HISTORY INTERPRETATION IN POST-TOTALITARIAN CULTURE

Tetiana Humeniuk^{1a}, Yurii Lehenkyi^{2a}¹*DSc in Philosophy, Professor,*

ORCID: 0000-0001-9210-6424, t_gumenyuk@ukr.net,

²*DSc in Philosophy, Professor,*

ORCID: 0000-0002-6567-4730, y.legenkiy1949@i.ua,

^a*Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts,*

36, Ye. Konovaltsia St., Kyiv, 01133, Ukraine

For citations:

Humeniuk, T., & Lehenkyi, Y. (2021). The Simulacrum Narrative of History Interpretation in Post-Totalitarian Culture. *Culture and Arts in the Modern World*, 22, 45-58. <https://doi.org/10.31866/2410-1915.22.2021.235891>.

The purpose of the article is to highlight the features of contemporary national culture as a special artistic meaning of the Gesamtkunstwerk, which is formed by a reflection of a predominantly historical pattern. The research methodology consists of a set of scientific methods of general and special nature. Methods of analysis and synthesis, as well as historical, cultural and systemic approaches, were used to reveal the essence of virtual reality of super narratives in the information space, which are the impetus for the formation of ethical, aesthetic and artistic consensus. The relevance of the research is determined by the need to study the postmodern paradigm, which gives the rise to the new discourses that replace the narratives of the communist era in the interpretation of the history of the post-totalitarian space. The scientific novelty of the study is that it shows post-Soviet culture as an inertial phase of post-totalitarianism, which has an image simulative tottalogy of reality. Conclusions. The article demonstrated that the artistic meaning of the Gesamtkunstwerk of the post-Soviet space is a desirable reality, but it has stopped at the level of the fairy-tale narrative, which is formed by a reflection of a predominantly historical pattern. The time and space of culture in the dimension of the simulacrum world appear as another kind of aesthetics virtus. It has been noted that the cultural reality of post-totalitarianism is at a stage when it is necessary to realise that the invented reality of the fairy-tale type is not art. So, the hybridity of creative efforts, post-coloniality, hypercriticism as a way of being, vital energy represent a set of motives that adds little to the understanding of the situation of postmodern creativity in Ukraine. Conversely, national slogans indicate the need for a national identity, because time is waiting for the manifestation of creative initiatives of artistic synthesis.

Keywords: art; culture; history; interpretation; Gesamtkunstwerk; modelling principle; post-Soviet space; post-totalitarian

© Tetiana Humeniuk, 2021

© Yurii Lehenkyi, 2021

The article was received by the editorial office: 22.04.2021

Introduction

Gesamtkunstwerk as a universal work of art in the contemporary world is a dimension of the interpretation of the state of culture forming, where art plays a leading role as a modelling principle for cultural development. The artisation of cultural practices defines another dimension of the understanding of this space. Along with the political culture and culture of everyday life, there is a new extremely powerful cultural movement associated with art, which has the potential to harmonise the reality of the development of national cultures in the era of globalisation.

The post-Soviet space becomes an all-encompassing art, because Stalin's Gesamtkunstwerk, according to B. Groys (1993), is a totality of culture, created by great suffering, by groans of millions of martyrs, by "cultural" means of destroying everything human in a man. Therefore, post-Soviet culture as an inertial phase of post-totalitarianism falls into a different context of the unity of the visual and verbal worlds of information presentation. Its virtual space looks like a work of art with a new totality of reality, an image simulative one. We can speak of artisation as virtualisation, the application of artistic art configurations in other cultural dimensions of human existence.

Purpose of the article

The purpose of the article is to highlight the features of national culture in the post-Soviet space as a special artistic meaning of the Gesamtkunstwerk, which is formed by a reflection of a predominantly historical pattern.

The research methodology consists of a set of scientific methods of general and special nature. The systemic approach made it possible to identify the post-Soviet state of culture, where the leading place is occupied by art as the principle of shaping the development of culture. The methods of analysis and synthesis were aimed at studying virtual constructions of historians in the information space and their definition as phantasmagoria of interpretative simulacrum. The historical and cultural approach is determined by a comprehensive study of the use of artistic art configurations in other cultural dimensions of human existence.

The scientific novelty of the study is that it shows post-Soviet culture as an inertial phase of post-totalitarianism, which has an image simulative totality of reality.

Recent research and publications analysis. The development of post-Soviet culture is one of the important issues in research on post-totalitarianism. Thus, Ye. Bystrytskyi (1995), studying the culture forming direction of national cultures in the era of globalisation, notes that "post-communist freedom is freedom in the specific concept of liberation from the old without having sufficiently defined social ideals and regulative ideas" (p. 30). While previously creative artists with independent thinking perceived the intrinsic value of art and the value of the author's position, using the principle of "lying with the truth", according to H. Skliarenko (2006), then with the collapse of the total-

itarian system, postmodernism became a consolidating factor for some time. Moreover, “as a legacy from previous times, there is a complete destruction of the language for describing reality in social realism, the spread of false autonomous objects of pseudo-reality” (p. 377). In particular, V. Chernetskyi (2013) notes that social and cultural transformations have led to the emergence of the “second world”, social art, magical realism, carnival and heterotopia, corporeality and sexuality, the national, queer aesthetics, etc. in post-Soviet literature. Also, V. Propp (1986) notes that the emergence of fairy-tale images and attempts to “find a historical basis has brought the fairy tale to life” (p. 113) or new historical myths, such as Ya. Tudorovskii (2017) about the execution of the Tsar’s family.

At the same time, the issues of alternative concepts of post-modernity, which are formed by reflection of a predominantly historical pattern, have been insufficiently covered.

Main research material

Postmodernism combines the culture of the post-Soviet space in the art dimension of the creator’s self-actualization. The art reality of culture formation becomes the environment for the emergence of the newest systems of identity of the creative subject, an authentic dimension of the artistic activity of a person, close to Western traditions. However, the postmodernist paradigm is an extremely aggressive attractor (the search for harmony in a modern, chaotic environment), which gives rise to new discourses that replace the narratives of the communist era. Still, these narrations return in the form of a dreamlike, virtual world, taking shape as artistic transformations of the time and space of history. The post-modern man finds himself in a series of alternative conceptions, systems of evidence, and stage interpretations, where the reflexion of interpretation becomes art.

A phantasmagoria of interpretative simulacrums can also be called “historians’ competitions” in the information space as virtual constructions, which are easily transformed into a fairy-tale narrative after the execution of the Tsar’s family. Thus, a version is produced that no one shot the family of Tsar Nicholas II, but that front men were shot. This is justified by collusion between representatives of the West and the virtual liquidators. According to this version, the Tsar’s family was rescued in order to gain access to the Tsar’s financial resources in Western banks. The most interesting thing about the proposed story is that Tsarevich Alexei was “scenically” transformed, underwent a rite of communist initiation, got a new biography, and became none other than Alexei Kosygin (Tudorovskii, 2017).

Such a fairy tale is no longer a fairy tale, since the rather energetic structure of the fairy-tale narrative leads one to believe in a miracle, in the extraordinary. We see the emergence of “historians” who assure others that these things are well-known facts. Thus, the recipient of the informational discourse finds himself in a situation of possible worlds. The fairy-tale narrative becomes a visual pattern, a picture, a virtual reality. There are also surprises with other historical

figures. For example, A. Hitler escaped and lived in Africa, just like Brezhnev, who did not die, but went on to live in the same Africa with his young mistress.

The dominant popular image of the “life after death” verification or death’s postponement, its transformation. Notably, the Russian Orthodox Church has not agreed that the found remains of the family of Nicholas II are real. The action of opening Alexander III’s crypt to take a DNA test was also unethical. But the pursuit of the “truth” is so compelling that it cannot be found. Contemporary culture is in an artistic space where history is constructed as an adventure discourse or western. Parallel versions and “newer” facts emerge.

However, problems also arise. In fact, culture as *Gesamtkunstwerk* is reflected in the artistic artefacts of the post-Soviet space. It turns out that Ukrainian culture in its artistic realities, particularly literary ones, is better known by Western theorists than by domestic art historians. Of course, interpretations of the post-Soviet space, emerging from the West, have a postmodernist paradigm as their horizon. And innovativeness of Ukrainian post-communist culture is linked to the destruction of socialist realism and Soviet reality.

Let us define the stages of the domestic postmodern transition through a destructive interpretative and modelling period: The first is the emergence of social art. Stalin becomes a game character in visual installations. Reality lends itself to a kitschy interpretation in the form of a stylisation of Stalinist discourse in glamour culture, which is carried out in the context of an adaptation to thrash culture. In the 90s of the 20th century, interest in Soviet reality was so high that a certain hypercriticism, a discourse of negation for the sake of negation emerged. For example, G. Bruskin paints *The Fundamental Lexicon* as a montage narrative of pictures-events depicting slices of life in the USSR, showing the puppetry of “socialist reality”, and this piece was sold for a record sum of £200,000.

Then the niche of the art reality deconstruction was filled, and other impressions, styles, and directions of construction of the “Soviet world” emerge, but they all fit into the fabulous narrative of diffuse consciousness, which is formed as a virtue quasi-reality. The Ukrainian fiction writer B. Shtern (2005) creates a quasi-biography of A. Chekhov, in which he reports that Chekhov did not die. His post-death life is described as follows: Chekhov was dying on a boat while crossing a river. Anton Pavlovich felt ill and asked for champagne, but there was no champagne; instead, pure alcohol was found. Chekhov got a glass of pure alcohol, drank it and suddenly recovered. After his recovery, he set up a foundation in his name, and the money he asked for in the West was used to bribe the Bolsheviks to dissuade them from the revolution. The revolution did not happen.

So we see a new story, a reflection on history, a fairy-tale narrative. We are invited to believe this fairy tale, just as, incidentally, to believe the fairy tale of Tsarevich Alexei Kosygin. It is worth recalling the model of fairy-tale space by B. Propp (1986), where the characters are as follows: the one who sends out the protagonist, the one who challenges him, the helper who helps him carry out his plans, the enemy who creates obstacles, the princess who agrees to marry the conquering protagonist. So the fairy-tale plot literally becomes the

prescription for creating the latest interpretations of history. So we find ourselves in another test of post-Soviet culture, namely, the test of the fairy-tale narrative, from the anecdote genre, where peculiar oxymorons reign, to quasi-historical studies.

N. Man'kovskaya (2008) notes that a variety of problems without political or national borders have been conceptualised in the 20th century as global problems of modernity. The concept of "globalisation" is being introduced to reflect this, meaning a new kind of internationalisation of fundamental planetary trends, in which barriers to the exchange of information, movement of capital, agents of material production, etc., disappear. (p. 25). This approach contributes to the characterisation of a non-classical type of consciousness. That is, the avant-garde or post-avant-garde, postmodernist worldview indicates that artistic language is being transformed, and the type of information transmission is changing itself. It is being transformed, moreover, the descriptive temporality or the chronology of the sequence of events is being changed.

The inverted type of presentation of the cultural-historical narrative becomes one of the most important, which begins with the creation of a new paradigm of worldview. It has the appearance of a variation, of a possible reality. In general, the symptomatology of the reconstruction of possible worlds brings to the fore such globalising signs of industry in artistic space, which are easily associated with the postmodern type of communication. N. Man'kovskaya (2008) writes that contemporary theatre directing is influenced by destructive transformations that are most defined in literature. Fantasy interpretations of history have little to do with real history, but they take it as "degree zero" of writing and on its scaffolding create a certain theatrical exercise. The post-modern typology of history is formed as a symbiosis of thrash, glamour, and kitsch vocabulary. Thus B. Zholdak, who directed Solzhenitsyn's *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* and Chekhov's *The Seagull*, subsequently transforms the ancient drama *Phaedra* in avant-garde interpretations. The stage postmodern *Phaedra* is a fantasy world of Stalinist madness in a madhouse. *Phaedra* turns into the wife of a big party official, Vira Pavlovna.

A synthesis emerges, a combination of various historical, cultural, mental and even virtual realities of ancient Stalinist existence as an eclectic stage reality. A certain insular ontology is formed, according to E. Morin, the drama is realised as a theatre of the absurd, a kind of reconstruction of Bolshevik ideology and mentality. *Phaedra* shows that a new type of vision, or a kind of suprematism of the optics of seeing through Chekhov's "lens", is taking shape. However, this technique is not new. For example, as part of his documentary film *Ordinary Fascism*, M. Romm makes cuts from photos of people taken by a concentration camp photographer. These people were then executed. Romm used the portraits in striped pyjamas as a kind of super-reality that correlates with Malevich's suprematism and surrealism. The virtual optics of supervision, or surrealism "without the unconscious", as F. Jameson aptly described, reproduces a kind of imaginative installation space which can be defined as a globalist text, an image of the contemporary theatre and cinematographic scene.

V. Chernetskyi (2013), an American researcher of Ukrainian origin, creates a certain mapping of post-communist culture, provides a rather detailed description of literary works, mainly by Russian and Ukrainian authors, and systematises them. The reasoning behind his focus on the cultures of these countries is that these are the two most populous Slavic and post-Soviet nations, which offer advantages to various “post”-discourses in their national context (post-modernism in Russia and post-colonialism in Ukraine). The events of the Orange Revolution of November-December 2004 put Ukraine in the international spotlight and “raised all doubts about the fundamental negation of the ways in which these national cultures have moved in recent years and established them as two paradigmatic cases in the post-Soviet space” (p. 15). The researcher also notes that the globalisation of culture does not necessarily lead to a certain type of colonisation life as American or otherwise, which suggests certain constructions of everyday life, etc. An approach to interpreting culture, defined as “mapping”, is now taking shape. That is, certain post-Soviet cultural development maps are being formed, such as mental, ideological, aesthetic, which are virtual enclaves of the postmodern *Gesamtkunstwerk*, where the worldview exists in a certain space that can be called a modelled and volumetric reconstruction. A certain scanning of the cultural landscape is taking place. The terms of computer technology are appropriate here, where visual realities form a landscape not in a plane, but on a certain imaginary volume of four-dimensional space, where time becomes one of the virtual dimensions.

This visualisation and certain map chart of actions, events, cultural developments becomes a relevant and interesting way of cognitive mapping, which makes it possible to model the artistic space of culture in general. The researcher enters the space of dual modelling-artification and self-reflection, becoming a kind of art phenomenon. However, if the image represents only the image and the object is the pleonasm of imagery or the intention of mapping, then there is a decalcomania, which, according to G. Deleuze and F. Guattari (1990), interprets everything as a map.

Such a model approach is not new; it simplifies the cultural landscape and brings it to certain systems, which can be called a regeneration of technocentrism in cultural reconstruction. The mechanism of mapping as a horizon of four-dimensional space is purely avant-garde, since it is reshaped in postmodern reflection. Postmodernity forms a schizophrenic world of a thousand plateaus, a thousand definite points that form the space of quasi-reality.

An analysis of the interpretation of post-Soviet culture reveals a system of visions of Ukrainian literature by the dominant of works by Yu. Andrukhovych and V. Yeshkiliev. “For Yeshkiliev, postmodernism is mainly a “situation” in contemporary art that needs to be “dealt with”; he offers his own vision of a new “demiurgic” art, which is paradoxically based on the mass-cult fantasy genre. ... Andrukhovych offers not so much a refutation as a summary of some descriptive points, ... which lead to a reassessment, based on cognitive mapping as the underlying philosophy, in the authors’ individual research projects and studies. This productive tension between the visions and approaches of the two co-editors made the encyclopaedia project, which ideologically is ... also a work

that has made a strong intervention in national cultural policy” (Chernetskyi, 2013).

That is, we have a moderate analysis of Ukrainian postmodern discourse, a reflection on postmodern culture in literary work. “Andrukhovych creates a parodic alphabet of negative epithets with which postmodernism has been awarded, and which are based on the belief that postmodernism is merely a manifestation of literary narcissism. According to Yu. Andrukhovych, this flow of stereotypes can only be dealt with through personal, subjective attributes and definitions, through the question “where am I?” In other words, he strongly defends the philosophical paradigm of cognitive mapping,” says V. Chernetskyi (2013, p. 79). Consequently, a kind of boundary opens up where, on the one hand, an apophatic thesaurus is reproduced which is not strictly postmodern and, on the other, there is an unshakable postmodern horizon based on which our own reflections are built and many other interpretations arise.

V. Chernetskyi (2013) introduces the term “postcolonialism”, which he adopts in parallel with “postmodernism”. Such parallels are quite applicable. Thus, Ye. Bystrytskyi (1995) writes that the culture of post-communism is basically an enclave of postmodernism. But apart from the prefix “post”, it did not go beyond phenomenological comparisons. That is, postmodernism is broader than the 1000 plateaus, according to G. Deleuze, since its shape-forming potencies are not limitless. Post-Soviet consciousness is not “post-colonial”, but rather post-imperial, which is difficult to dissect into its components as elements of the post-modern game. I And no matter how much we project the realities of postmodernity onto this consciousness, the destructive alphabet studied by Yu. Andrukhovych remains monolithic.

Thus, post-communist “colonialism” is described in the context of allegorical prose or metaphor, which produces certain national myth-making potencies or a national way of interpreting reality. But allegorality itself is demonstrative. Allegory as a mechanism of rhetoric or imagery is more of a persistent social code, where the object thesaurus (sphere of the denotative) is replaced by symbolic (verbal) connotations. There is, however, a clear system for interpreting the replacement of an object with an image-sign. Unfortunately, or fortunately, in postmodern discourse we cannot see such a substitution. The cognitive mapping method is a kind of numbering of images based on the implementation of certain map charts or *gestalts* of the cultural landscape. That is, there is a visualisation of the literary language, the text, by means of certain routes or peculiar maps of the object that is being mapped.

V. Chernetskyi (2013) analyses the works of such Russian post-conceptualists as D. Prigov, L. Rubinstein, who have created an interesting poetic system in which the world becomes assembled from debris, combining fragments of different spheres of human experience of Soviet reality. The texts appeal to the folkloric depths of the 20th century urban environment. Anyway, in contrast to V. Pelevin’s philosophical poetics, and the explicitly stylised discourse of V. Sorokin, their works are of an endless deconstruction nature. Deconstruction for the sake of deconstruction, which looks like a virtual space, shaped without the involvement of a computer, without the involvement of any screen.

Yeshkiliev, one of the interesting poetic deconstructionists, in his poem *Art is the property of the masses* models in a humorous form the peculiar realities of modernity as an ironic unexpected context of clashing images, and the need to have a quality poetic product. The absurdity in such social art discourse looks like a kind of flamboyant picture that quickly became boring to everyone. It is therefore difficult to consider that there is an era of change or literature transformation behind this.

V. Sorokin is certainly more relevant with his close stylisation of discourse. But he is surpassed by A. Platonov, who is literally a chronicler of Soviet space. However, he has nothing in common with postmodernism. Platonov's work was the antipode of totalitarianism within a totalitarian system, and now it is the horizon of all deconstructions. No one can reach the philosophical depth of *The Foundation Pit*, the mighty mythology of "the nature of existence". Even if post-modernist literary figures were NOT to twist the discursive space, they would still remain captive to thrash culture.

V. Chernetskyi (2013) introduces the category of literary "heterotopia", which characterises other spaces of human civilisation (p. 149). The typology of heterotopic dimensions within the space that exists here and now is relevant. The extreme virtual proximity to the human virtue as anti-virtue, anti-masculinity, anti-reality is manifested. These are mad asylums, self-publishing libraries, anti-image fairs, anything that can be anti-world. However, the possibility of realisation of the anti-world in the world is not an anti-system but another location of the cultural landscape in word, painting. We can recall the formation of the vertical of empty drawers that the surrealist Salvador Dali once drew. The most important thing is that all the drawers are open but empty. We put what we want in there and close them. We put things in and close them. This is actually what modern surrealists and those who create literary heterotopias do.

Mikhail Kuraev, a Russian screenwriter who worked in the routine space of socialist film scripts, made an anti-scenario in late 1989, which was his first novel, *Captain Dickstein*, where there is actually a deconstruction of the Soviet and post-Soviet space as a shared image of fictional characters. The novel's characters make references to Dostoyevsky, the story takes on the appearance of an inverted discourse as voyeuristic adventurous scenery, spied through a keyhole, or reflected in a mirror that stands in a dumpster. The novel is a classic technique for defining reality, a dialogue of Dostoyevsky described by Bakhtin, or a dialogue of dead souls by Gogol. The fictitious non-existent reality takes on more significance, more figurative significance, than reality itself. V. Chernetskyi (2013) focuses on Kuraev's style and emphasises the focus on the little man as a victim of history, drawing parallels with the Gogol tradition and the St. Petersburg works of Dostoyevsky and Andrei Bely (p. 156).

In the end a little man's philosophy emerges. It is a good philosophy that suddenly ends with the death of the philosopher. We can say that man's existence in the world of heterotopia and his exit from it happens suddenly, once, and we cannot go back to "our" world any more. That is, what Pelevin defines as fantasy, imaginative adventure, here looks like a kind of stroll within the text, like a stopover at the crossroads of different streets, different dead ends of

the mind, which cannot be crossed. You will surely do something when you get run over by a history machine, or pass out. Such radical catastrophism is much needed to assess, to make sense of the post-Soviet space. Here everyday life becomes a realm of victory over spirit, over culture. Every day and every night becomes an open space. And, if so, the real world does not exist.

Therefore, we have a definite syndrome of total search for the cemetery of the Tsar' family. There was no place in the Kremlin wall for Tsarevich Alexei, because he was a low-ranking Central Committee bureaucrat. The Tsar himself is buried in the cemetery in Nizhny Novgorod. His wife, who died in a monastery in the Donbas, was also buried here. The girls died in different villages, also buried under different surnames. One of them was the most "lucky" and married Stalin's security guard. What can be said about such facts? It is the decadence of post-Soviet space, which is tragic, virtual and at the same time does not have the deep, powerful reality that Dostoevsky and Gogol had.

This is not the steppe, described by Gogol in *Taras Bulba*, with its smells, with the swaying of the stalks. It is not the goodbye when a mother embraces her sons for the last time. This is not Taras Bulba's cry: "Do you hear me, son? Such a world no longer exists in the post-Soviet space. The father cannot ask the son, and the son will not hear the father. It is an ironic, deconstructed reality, praised in the West as travellers of literary heterotopias actually break with the past, fit into a postmodern discourse. Deconstruction is radical criticism, hypercritical discourse leads to an unfortunate interpretation where all verbal nominations look like an ironic oxymoron, which can hardly even be called irony. The extremes that combine due to the pressure of Western globalisation cannot be called integration, synthesis of arts, figurative unity, as they lose their figurativeness, imagery, and are maps — flat elements of the cultural decalomania. All tracing is removed and immediately discarded.

Let us ask, what is the loss of the reality of culture? What is deconstruction inflicted from the outside? How are the globalising intentions of another will, another soil and another civilisation changing the reality of traditional Slavic cultures? However, these are rhetorical questions. Let us rather say that cultural colonisation and the critical logic of hyper discourse are capable of destroying any culture, any civilisation. After all, we can determine that the processes of cultural globalisation are not a simple destruction, a suggestion, an opportunity to catch up, with our cultures enthusiastically playing with postmodern aesthetics. No, they are creating, like Yeshkiliev, a negative alphabet. The temptation to deconstruct, to mentally fracture the space that existed before, is very great. Speech is breaking down, discourse is breaking down, and space is losing its fourth dimension which is time. However, by losing time, post-Soviet space becomes an abstract, overly modelled construct, which can be called flat and trivially interpreted as a map.

Trying to map postmodern and postcolonial Ukrainian literature, V. Chernetskyi (2013) identified three main paradigms: carnivalisation, heterotopia, and irony, although in discussing Ukrainian contemporary literature it is worth dealing with its distribution according to the generation of imaginative national settings or regional principles. Deconstruction, irony and heterotopia are

the paradigms of the universal globalisation map of modern history, in which Ukraine has a special role to play. However, these are more the means of poetics, behind which something else is hiding. There is a hidden destruction as a principle of deconstruction of proven self-sufficient subjectivity. However, if we are to define national culture, art in aesthetic terms, we must point to the self-sufficiency of the destructive, dense quasi-reality that is created in the postmodern alliteration of the artistic worldview.

The contemporary symbiosis of visual and verbal arts in Ukraine is characterised by a baroque approach centred on the idea of the new baroque of the post-Soviet space. After all, the new baroque is problematic, however attractive it may be. Even Yurii Illienko's film *Mazepa*, with its baroque embellishments, the infrastructure of its poetics and spectacular baroque paradoxicality, proves that this approach is "laboratory", if we use the terminology of L. Kurbas. The shots of the film look like a puppet, a strange game where a living hand sticks out of the sarcophagus and pulls in not only the viewer, not just the director, but the whole country. That is, baroque allusions remain theatrical, cinematographic and literary super-realities of that imaginative toolkit, which cannot become an Image in any way. There are enough Images, no new Absolute of baroque aesthetics emerges.

As in painting, there are groupings in the literary space of modern Ukraine, a kind of foundations that have a purely theatrical, synthetic, burlesque nature. These include the *Bu-Ba-Bu* group, comprising Yurii Andrukhovych, Oleksandr Irvanets, Viktor Neborak. The attraction of collaborative writing in Ukrainian literature was evident in the poems of the *Lu-Ho-Sad* group (Ivan Luchak, Nazar Honchar, Roman Sadlovskyyi), as well as of the *Propala Hramota* (The Lost Letter) group (Yurko Pozaiak, Viktor Nedostup, Semen Lybon). All this, shall we say, bacchanalia is reminiscent of the 20s of the 20th century with their permanent artistic totality.

Thus, hybridity of creative effort, post coloniality, hypercriticism as a way of being, and vital energy represent a set of motives that adds little to the understanding of the situation of postmodern creativity in Ukraine. The post-colonial syndrome imposed on us does not represent colonisation. Colonisation is the external arrival of the colonisers and the creation of the space that the Spanish colonisers created in the West. In Latin America, with Quetzalcoatl and the other gods left in the dungeon, the gods of Catholicism come in, imposing a new religion. The country is left without an authentic religion. If we consider that Ukraine was colonised, then by whom? By Russia? Yet the religion is the same. By the Bolsheviks? The Bolsheviks did not colonise other countries, they turned society into an experimental space where religion was completely destroyed, the latest quasi-religion of atheism was formed. That is, the message of colonisation is not genuine, is purely Western.

Post-Soviet countries are being offered Western-style modernisation, which is colonisation. That is, we find ourselves in a situation of global simulations, a fairy-tale narrative from which it is impossible to escape. Postmodernist discourse is not natural for the post-Soviet space, but is an absolutely external colonizing deconstructionism. If the post-Soviet space is virtual, it may not

become a work of art. Art artefacts define dead ends, roads, paths, crossroads of spiritual ascent. The artisation of cultural practices becomes a transfer of the poetics of art into everyday life, artistic translations of images into other practices appear as a superficial assimilation of visual and verbal territory or the dynamics of interaction between visual, verbal artefacts in a reality that has nothing to do with art.

The cultural reality of the post-Soviet space is at a stage where we need to realise that the invented reality of the fairy-tale type is not art. It is a modern post-totalitarian fairy tale, where there are witnesses to the story of the shooting of innocent people, which supposedly did not happen, but the shooting took place. M. Bulgakov asks in the finale of *The Master and Margarita*: “Was there an execution?” Yes, it was. Was Ukrainian culture, Ukrainian nation executed in the space of postmodern globalisation transformations? No, it has not been executed. It has remained, and the national culture has remained alive forever. No system, no matter how it colonises, no matter how it shows up with all sorts of slogans, can execute a culture where there is a nation that is the bearer of national identity. Why? Because it belongs to traditional Christian cultures.

By analysing visual art, including scenography, theatrical costumes and partly fashion, and architecture, we can say that the underground, the whole “post” reality that existed in Soviet space, is coming out of the underground. Many groups emerged, which formed over several years and then disappeared. H. Skliarenko characterises the last decades of the 20th century as the beginning of a great new period in the development of Ukrainian art, characterised by a diversity of creative directions, a reinterpretation of the artistic values of the Soviet era, and the expansion of the boundaries of types of art. “The mid-1980s went down in history as the time of Perestroika, the collapse of the USSR, and Ukraine’s gaining independence in 1991. This period was the time when art was liberated from ideological oppression, new principles of cultural creation were formed, and Ukraine was searching for its place in the world space” (Skliarenko, 2006, p. 353).

Consequently, postmodernism does not have the premise of a group, but is symptomatic of an inherently anti-group. Therefore, the postmodern mode of artification of culture appears as a kind of colonial project. *Bu-Ba-Bu* group is the final postmodern cultural aesthetic of the post-Soviet space. It cannot be compared to the groups that emerged during the Executed Renaissance during the 1920s and 1930s. So we can say that the avant-garde space of literature, the visual arts of the avant-garde was close to the Ukrainian baroque, an excessive space of transgressions of all real and imaginary boundaries of culture. Baroque redundancy, brightness, expression, the intimacy of worlds to the touch in the realities of the Ukrainian steppe, the roads are an endless blue sky, white clouds, angels in the sky.

The Ukrainian Virgin Mary walks in the field by “paths, borders” near the village, as she was described by P. Tychyna in *The Mourning Mother*. The dramatic figure of the Ukrainian Virgin Mary shows that art is not a game. The worldview range of poetry reveals the boundaries of the human world, good and evil, the sublime and the inferior.

Conclusions

The study demonstrates that the artistic meaning of the Gesamtkunstwerk is a desirable reality, but it has stopped at the level of the fairy-tale narrative, which is formed by a reflection of a predominantly historical pattern. After all, this reflection has not become an interpretation of time. The time and space of culture in the dimension of the simulacrum world appear as another kind of aesthetics virtus. And if researchers try to show the avant-garde, postmodern nature of Russian, Ukrainian culture as a horizon, an achievement of the fate of the “post-Soviet” period, then this is only a banal and inadequate statement. Ukrainian culture at the turn of globalist intentions is more voluminous and universal. Homogenisation, modernisation, adaptability as the leading mechanisms of cultural globalisation in the system of the national culture of Ukraine have the appearance of a pale tracing of the cultural landscape mapping. The globalisation of culture is not self-sufficient and comprehensive. Postmodernism becomes a consolidating factor that unites artists from independent countries, but for a while. However, the culture of the post-Soviet space with its indefinite mentality as a virtual fairy-tale reality of super narratives has not formed into an artistic space, and is only a stimulus for the formation of a moral, aesthetic and artistic consensus.

Consequently, we can argue that national culture is a special work of art. If art degrades, it negates the very meaning of national culture. There are national slogans that indicate some need for a national identity because time is waiting for the manifestation of creative initiatives of artistic synthesis.

References

- Bystrytskyi, Ye. (1995). Politychna filosofii postkomunistychnoi doby [Political Philosophy of the Post-Communist Era]. In V. Polokhalo (Ed.), *Politolohiia postkomunizmu: Politychnyi analiz postkomunistychnykh suspilstv* [The Political Science of Post-Communism: A Political Analysis of Post-Communist Societies] (pp. 13–67). Politychna dumka [in Ukrainian].
- Chernetskyi, V. (2013). *Kartohrafuiuchy postkomunistychni kultury* [Mapping Post-Communist Cultures]. Krytyka [in Ukrainian].
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1990). *Kapitalizm i shizofreniya. Anti-Edip* [Capitalism and Schizophrenia. Anti-Oedipus]. INION [in Russian].
- Groys, B. (1993). *Utopiya i obmen* [Utopia and Exchange]. Znak [in Russian].
- Man'kovskaya, N. B. (2008). Globalizatsiya a la russe: khudozhestvenno-esteticheskii rakurs [Globalization a la russe: Artistic and Aesthetic Perspective]. In *Estetika: Vchera. Segodnya. Vsegda* [Aesthetics: Yesterday. Today. Always] (Issue 3, pp. 24–57). Institute of Philosophy Russian Academy of Sciences [in Russian].
- Propp, V. Ya. (1986). *Istoricheskie korni volshebnoi skazki* [The Historical Roots of the Fairy Tale]. LGU Publishing House [in Russian].
- Shtern, B. (2005). *Vtoroe iyulya chetvertogo goda* [The Second of July of the Fourth Year]. Svin'in i synov'ya [in Russian].
- Skliarenko, H. (2006). Ukrainske mystetstvo druhoi polovyny 1980–2000-kh rokiv: podii, yavyshcha, spriamuvannia [Ukrainian Art of the Second Half of the

1980-2000s: Events, Phenomena, Directions]. In V. Sydorenko (Ed.), *Narysy z istorii obrazotvorchoho mystetstva Ukrainy XX stolittia* [Essays on the History of Fine Arts of Ukraine of the XX Century] (Vol. 2, pp. 353–392). Intertekhnolohiia [in Ukrainian]. Tudorovskii, Ya. (2017, August 7). *Nikolai II umer v 1958 godu. Rasstrela tsarskoi sem'i v real'nosti ne bylo?* [Nicholas II Died in 1958. Wasn't the Shooting of the Royal Family in Reality?]. Versia. <https://versia.ru/rasstrela-carskoj-semi-v-realnosti-ne-bylo> [in Russian].

СИМУЛЯКРОВИЙ НАРАТИВ ІНТЕРПРЕТАЦІЇ ІСТОРІЇ В КУЛЬТУРІ ПОСТТОТАЛІТАРНОГО ПРОСТОРУ

Гуменюк Тетяна Костянтинівна^{1а}, Легенький Юрій Григорович^{2а}

¹Доктор філософських наук, професор,
ORCID: 0000-0001-9210-6424, t_gumenyuk@ukr.net,

²Доктор філософських наук, професор,
ORCID: 0000-0002-6567-4730, y.legenkiy1949@i.ua,

^аКиївський національний університет культури і мистецтв,
Київ, Україна

Мета статті — показати специфіку сучасної національної культури як особливий мистецький сенс *Gesamtkunstwerk*, що формується рефлексією переважно історичного зразка. Методологію становить сукупність методів наукового дослідження загального та спеціального характеру. Методи аналізу і синтезу, а також історико-культурологічний та системний підходи використовувалися для розкриття сутності віртуальної реальності супернарративів в інформаційному просторі, які є спонукою до утворення етичного, естетичного та художнього консенсусу. Актуальність зумовлена необхідністю дослідження постмодерної парадигми, під впливом якої народжуються новітні дискурси, що замінюють наративи комуністичної доби в інтерпретації історії посттоталітарного простору. Наукова новизна розвідки полягає у тому, що показана пострадянська культура як інерційна фаза посттоталітаризму, що має симулятивно-іміджеву тоталогію реальності. Висновки. Доведено, що мистецький сенс *Gesamtkunstwerk* пострадянського простору є бажаною реальністю, але вона зупинилась на рівні казкового нарративу, що формується рефлексією переважно історичного зразка. Час і простір культури у вимірі симулякрового світу виглядає ще одним різновидом естетики *virtus*. Зауважено, що культурна реальність посттоталітаризму перебуває у стадії, коли треба зрозуміти, що наміряна дійсність казкового типу не є мистецтвом. Отже, гібридність творчих зусиль, постколоніальність, гіперкритика як спосіб буття, життєва енергія — це той набір спонук, що мало додає розуміння ситуації постмодерної творчості в Україні. І навпаки, національні гасла свідчать про потребу в національній ідентичності, адже час чекає на виявлення креативних ініціатив художнього синтезу.

Ключові слова: мистецтво; культура; історія; інтерпретація; *Gesamtkunstwerk*; моделюючий принцип; пострадянський простір; посттоталітаризм

СИМУЛЯКРОВЫЙ НАРРАТИВ ИНТЕРПРЕТАЦИИ ИСТОРИИ В КУЛЬТУРЕ ПОСТТОТАЛИТАРНОГО ПРОСТРАНСТВА

Гуменюк Татьяна Константиновна^{1а}, Легенький Юрий Григорьевич^{2а}

¹Доктор философских наук, профессор,
ORCID: 0000-0001-9210-6424, t.gumenyuk@ukr.net,

²Доктор философских наук, профессор,
ORCID: 0000-0002-6567-4730, y.legenkiy1949@i.ua,

^аКиевский национальный университет культуры и искусств,
Киев, Україна

Цель статьи — показать специфику современной национальной культуры в качестве особенного художественного смысла *Gesamtkunstwerk*, который формируется рефлексией преимущественно исторического образца. Методологию составляет совокупность методов научного исследования общего и специального характера. Методы анализа и синтеза, а также историко-культурологический и системный подходы использовались для раскрытия сути виртуальной реальности супернарративов в информационном пространстве, которые склоняют к созданию этического, эстетического и художественного консенсуса. Актуальность обусловлена необходимостью исследования постмодерной парадигмы, под влиянием которой рождаются новейшие дискурсы, заменяющие нарративы коммунистической эпохи в интерпретации истории посттоталитарного пространства. Научная новизна исследования состоит в том, что показана постсоветская культура как иннерционная фаза тоталитаризма, имеющая симулятивно-имиджевую тоталологию реальности. Выводы. Доказано, то художественный смысл *Gesamtkunstwerk* постсоветского пространства является желаемой действительностью, но она остановилась на уровне сказочного нарратива, формирующегося рефлексией преимущественно исторического образца. Время и пространство культуры в измерении симулякового мира выглядит еще одной разновидностью эстетики *virtus*. Замечено, что культурная реальность посттоталитаризма находится в стадии, когда нужно понять, что воображаемая действительность сказочного типа не является искусством. То есть гибридность творческих усилий, постколониальность, гиперкритика как способ бытия, жизненная энергия — это тот набор побуждений, который мало что добавляет в понимание ситуации постмодерного творчества в Украине. И напротив, национальные лозунги свидетельствуют о потребности в национальной идентичности, ведь время ждет проявления креативных инициатив художественного синтеза.

Ключевые слова: искусство; культура; история; интерпретация; *Gesamtkunstwerk*; моделирующий принцип; постсоветское пространство; посттоталитаризм