

REVOLUTION AS ART:
LVIV INTELLECTUALS AND THE ALTERNATIVE FESTIVAL “VYVYKH-1990”

by
Kateryna Ruban

Submitted to
Central European University
History department

In partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Supervisor: Professor Yaroslav Hrytsak

Second reader: Professor Vlad Naumescu

Budapest, Hungary

2008

Abstract

This thesis analyzes the intellectual life in Lviv in the late 80s focusing on the group of young intellectuals who presented their cultural products as alternative to the Soviet ideology and at the same time to the traditional nationalism of the political opposition which was coming to power. The public activities of the young intellectuals demonstrate attempts to change the whole field of cultural production and its system of consecration by means of change of the concept of art and orientation of their works towards the broad public. The festival of alternative culture “*Vyvykh-90*” which took place in Lviv in 1990 is one of the examples of the struggle for consecration that had political and social demands for changes as its core.

Abstract	2
Introduction	4
Chapter 1. Theoretical Framework	10
Chapter 2. The Competition of Intellectuals during the Revolution.....	23
Chapter 3. “Vyvykh-90” as the Last Soviet Performance in Lviv	46
Conclusions	62
Bibliography	67
Appendixes	75

Introduction

My thesis presents the version of the late 80s in the Soviet Lviv which is focused on the milieu of young intellectuals, mostly artists and writers, but not only, who transformed the collapse of the USSR into the brightest performance. Its name is festival of alternative culture “Vyvykh-90” which can be translated as twist of mind, dislocation of the society or individual kink. The young intellectuals organized this festival as an immense entertainment and invited everybody to take part in it during three day in late May of 1990. To give an idea of what happened during those days I would refer to the common Eastern European character soldier Švejk, since one at that time already noticed that “when the Empire is ruined Švejk is of current importance”¹. Thus “Vyvykh-90” can be considered as a gathering of the fanciers of Švejk in the situation when the USSR became an object of jokes. But it is only the starting point for exploring the long chain of issues which make “Vyvykh-90” happen, who were the people who organized it and took part in it and what they wanted to declare by this festival. Therefore, “Vyvykh-90” can be considered as a mode and prospective of analyzing and presenting the processes of transformation in the field of cultural production² of Lviv in the late 80s and beginning of the 90s.

Many versions of the perestroika time that describe the general situation in the USSR partially do not work in case of Lviv. Located less than 100 km from the Polish border, Lviv was considered a “Western” opposition city even after forty years of Sovietization. The case of Lviv in 1989 – 1991 seems to be close to Central Europe, and Padraic Kenney includes events in Lviv in his book “A Carnival of Revolution: Central Europe 1989”³, thus drawing a certain map that divides different modes of struggle against

¹ “Kheto z yiv ‘Saltsezon’?” (Who ate ‘Saltsezon’). In: *Postup* [Progress] #5, 2001.

² Here I refer to Pierre Bourdieu’s notion that will be explored in the theoretical chapter.

³ Padraic Kenney. *A Carnival of Revolution*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002. In fact, the only book in Western scholarship which examines the events of the late 80s in Lviv.

the USSR. On this map Lviv, but not Kyiv which was the other center of revolutionary events and transformations in Ukraine, is a part of Kenny's bright and enthusiastic picture, but at the same time very schematic, simplified and superficial vision of the European carnival that symbolizes the victory of freedom and human values over the totalitarian regime. The Bakhtin's concept of carnival used by Kenny is hardly relevant to the processes of the late twentieth century with complex of political, economic and cultural issues, thus, in my analysis of the festival "Vyvykh-90" that is exactly the carnival in Kenny's sense, I do not rely on this concept and consider it as a constructed pattern to present the events of that time.

Proceeding with the particular features of Lviv's situation, one should make a short "genealogy" of opposition. The resistance to Soviet mode of life was a common feature of the private discussions, but only in the late 80s it became public. Perestroika time was a splash of various public activities in Lviv organized by intellectuals with different projects and concepts of changes. One more particular feature of Lviv is that the city is an intellectual center of the Western Ukraine with many universities and developed field of cultural production. Therefore, students and young intellectuals were the driving force of the 'revolution' (or a transformation as some argue) of 1989-91 in Lviv. Besides the political oppositional movement, their main aim was promoting alternative Ukrainian culture as a basis of the further social and political changes.

Starting from such a broad prospective, I narrow my analysis to the certain milieu of the young intellectuals who promoted particular ideas and cultural products, and one of them is "Vyvykh-90". The festival presents broad public new concepts of aesthetics and arts, modification of the forms and genres in literature, music, and arts, introducing new themes and many other changes in the field of cultural production. My aim is to analyze the interconnection between politics and cultural production which appears in the ideas,

projects and strategies of the particular group of young intellectuals. It is not a history of arts and styles, but my focus is on the social context of these transformations that are clearly visible by the example of the works of writers, poets and artist created from the mid-80s and later.

The final defining of my sphere of research relies on the theoretical approach to the field of cultural production by Pierre Bourdieu that considers the changes of cultural products as a result of the struggle for consecration within the field. This theoretic premise allows analyzing both public promotion and private creative work, the reaction of the public and political and social aims of the producer altogether. In my research the production of culture and its consumption are tightly interconnected with the certain historical context of political and social transformations of the late 80s. The festival “Vyvykh-90” is one of the examples of the struggle for consecration with political and social demands in its basis.

Generally, the sphere of my research belongs to both anthropology and history, particularly to the cultural history, and since my primary sources are interviews with the people, my analytic work turns into “field work” of the reporter who creates “thick descriptions” (in terms of Clifford Geertz) relying on the skills of attentive listening and comparing the information with the other sources. This situation wipes the exact border between the present and the past in the interviews and raises the task to trace the continuity of the processes and find the ruptures and differences that took place in the extended “post” of the events of the late 80s. The oral history which is interconnection of private and collective memory as well as the relationship between the narrator and interviewer-historian, poses an additional task of analyzing the historical trustworthiness of such evidences. The interpretative work turns into a kind of psychoanalytic attentive listening and exposure of the variances, omissions and reservations, individual features and

collective identification. The work of memory presents the events in the reconsidered mode, thus I do not exclude or ignore this issue, but include analysis of discursive formations and concepts used by interviewees as integral part of my analysis.

The group of intellectuals who belong to the milieu of “Vyvykh-90” disagreed with the fundamental principles of traditional nationalism⁴ and aimed to deconstruct both Soviet and nationalist ideology⁵ and release the field of cultural production for a free intellectual and artistic work. My aim is to present the collective portrait of this group of people, balancing between the individual details of biography and sweeping generalizations, with the main emphasis on the struggle for consecration as the context of their creative work and its presenting.

The first chapter of my thesis forms a set of theoretical premises that would make a basis for the further analysis, starting from the general issues of the interpretative work and following with reflections on the concepts of intellectual and generation that lead to Bourdieu’s theory of the field of cultural production and struggle for consecration as its main feature. The second chapter analyzes the activities of the young intellectuals in Lviv in the late 80s focusing on the differences between the groups of intellectuals that create the situation of competition. The third chapter examines the festival of alternative culture “Vyvykh-90” as a particular example of the public struggle of consecration. The aim of the conclusions is to outline the peculiarities of the group of young intellectuals in the late 80s.

This group is much broader than the list of interviewed people, but the 13 interviews with the key figure allow me to make certain conclusions about this milieu including all its members. Since the interviewed people are the characters who will often appear in my plot, I will introduce them briefly by the time of “Vyvykh-90” : Vlodko

⁴ See later manifesto by Oleksandr Kryvenko: Oleksandr Kryvenko. “Ukrayina Moja Marginalna” [My marginal Ukraine]. In: *Dzerkalo Tyzhnia* [Weekly Mirror], 17.05.2003.

⁵ “Past: thesis: Communist Party of the Soviet Union; antithesis: Narodnyi Rukh Ukrainy [the leading oppositional political party]; synthesis: “Vyvykh -90”. Future: thesis: Narodnyi Rukh Ukrainy; antithesis: Communist Party of the Soviet Union; synthesis: “Vyvykh -91”. In: *Postup* [Progress] #5, 2001.

Kostyrko, artist who just came from the army; Krystyna Duda (Mavra), student of Lviv conservatoire, her brother Yurko Duda (13 years old), participants of milieu and festival; Yurko Kokh, artist, already a well-known bohème figure; Markiyan Ivashchyn, leader of Student Union that organized festival, the chief manager of it; Lyubko Petrenko, young intellectual, one of organizers and jury; Viktor Neborak, already quite well-known poet; Vlodko Kaufman, well-known artist; Yurko Prokhasko, student, participant and part of milieu; Serhiy Proskurnya, director, the main creative manager; Volodymyr Tsybulko, already quite well-known poet from Kyiv; Ostap Patyk, young artist; Yurko Pozayak, poet (Kyiv). To work with them was a pleasure of research and intellectual conversations since these people had a lot to say that prompted me to new findings.

Theoretical framework of my research implies concentration on the particular issues, and it might replace the other aspects that shaped the life of these people. Unfortunately, it is unavoidable here, and I realize that my picture is rather one-sided. Besides the struggle for consecration for their ideas, I see the young people of the late 80s who are full of creative potential and ideas, optimistic about their future and they want to realize their projects, and at the same time their recollection is about the times of their youth when they wanted to listen to music, to gather with their friends, to simply have a good time. My aim was to show real young people, not only competitors and public figures, and a little of imagination of the reader must help him or her to see these people in my work.

This thesis has its own story which includes night talks in the galleries of Lviv, meetings in the cafes, walking around the Administration of the President during a lunch break, kitchen talks, etc as well reading newspapers and magazines, watching films of that time and many other ways to plunge into the past. But this story begins when I just started

to go to school, and used to sing my favorite song by Andriy Mykolaychuk, very popular bald singer, participant of “*Vyvykh-90*”.

Chapter 1. Theoretical Framework

The late 80s in Ukraine, perestroika times, brought to life many social and cultural transformations that change the role in society, the form of activities and self-identity of the group of people which can be considered as intellectuals. The change, which was a result of various factors, has the rupture, conflict and struggle for consecration and recognition of generations of intellectuals and artists in its core, and these shifts and changes are the focus of my research. In this chapter my aim is first to define the most general theoretical premises of my research and thesis and later passing to the certain basis of my analysis of the intellectual milieu in Lviv of late 80s.

The analysis in many ways touches the current situation in Ukraine and the results of changes which took place eighteen years ago. It is hard to avoid not making conclusions from the current prospective, listening to the people who recollect their expectations. I consider the process of transformation and the change of cultural elite and the field of cultural production as still being in progress that does mean ignoring its current outcome and the new situation that it has brought. But my aim is to avoid delimitation and separation of the material of my research and my view of the current situation. and at the same time not to substitute the context of late 80s and exactly of 1990 with contemporary visions of that time presented by interviewee and by the present consequences of the processes which started or were already in progress in the 90s. This position of a scholar and interpreter reveals many general theoretical aspects of the explored topic.

The idea of continuity corresponds to Fernand Braudel's concept of *longue durée*, the long lasting movements where the events of radical change still fall into one process, and historians should pay more attention to the whole 'extent', and not to its brightest events. The present is only a next slight step on the same way which pretends to be a novelty by its bursts, i.e. revolutions, crises, inventions, but "each 'current event' brings together

movements of different origins, of a different rhythm: today's time dates from yesterday, the day before yesterday, and all former times"⁶. In a similar way Reinhart Koselleck's notion of *Zeitgeschichte* permanently discovers "structures that are features of not our times only"⁷. Koselleck presents history as stratification of layers that form the past and the present. These layers change irregularly, some of them stay stable for very long periods, and the others need a very slight touch to be transformed, therefore, the history of each period of the past does not look like a unity, but a simultaneous superimposing of layers..

At the time Braudel's concept of history should be in some sense contradicted with Foucault's notion of rupture and discontinuity, "on divisions ...limits ...transformations ... the rebuilding of foundations"⁸. Foucault's position opposes the "immobility" of structures" as they deny "the living openness of history" with the "whole interplay of differences"⁹. Foucault's archeology and genealogy¹⁰ as historical methodology are not aimed to discover the past itself, but to write "history of the present"¹¹. Here the historian's objective is to uncover the process of establishing the current status of things and to show that the past is the field of struggle and change of the concepts and ideas that form the present-day discourse and practices.

The idea of simultaneity and layers of time correspond to the general trend of definitions of time in 'postmodern' terms of variety and parallelism, multi-, poli-, etc. In my paper the aim of these philosophic constructions is to demonstrate that I refer to an unfinished process of past/present, but not to a unity that can be called '1990'. On the contrary, it is a complex coexistence of various practices and processes, and each of them has its own temporality, often described by banal formulae as "anticipation for the future"

⁶ Fernand Braudel. *On History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. p. 34.

⁷ *Ibid.* – c. 292.

⁸ Michel Foucault. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. New York: Pantheon, 1972. p. 5.

⁹ *Ibid.* p. 13.

¹⁰ Here I simplify the difference between his archeological and genealogical 'theories' and 'periods'.

¹¹ Michel Foucault. *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of Prison*. London: Penguin Books, 1991. p. 31. "Why? Simply because I am interested in the past? No, if one means writing history of the past in terms of the present. Yes, if one means writing the history of the present".

and “remnants of the past” that finally leads to “relevancy and “backwardness”. One has to be sensitive to this ‘splitting’ and the presence of the outdated that do not fit into the frames of calendar and remarkable events.

The above reflections lead directly to the issue of the interpretative work of the historian in the situation of his personal involvement into the past and the present. Referring to the classic text of Hans-Georg Gadamer, the interpretation is based on the relationship between the object and interpreter, and the task of an interpreter is “to view the object as the counterpart of itself and hence understand both”¹². The interpreter-historian should be conscious of his own historicity and consider the work of interpretation as ‘historically effected event’¹³, and it is an integral part of the historical event – object of his analysis. Gadamer’s notion of *Wirkungsgeschichte* (history of effect)¹⁴ returns us to the issue of the past and present which are now focused on the historian’s consciousness formed by historical processes itself. Therefore, a personal attitude and even memories seems to be not an obstacle, but a part of the research, as well as the mode of personal communication with the people who are the ‘objects’ of the study – they are themselves and also their stories are a still lasting ‘open’ history with its continuities and ruptures.

My interpretive work as anthropologist and historian appears is based on Clifford Geertz’s concept of culture and his idea that “anthropological writings are themselves interpretations”¹⁵, therefore, every anthropological or other scholarly writing is considered to be a “fiction” in Geertz’s terms¹⁶. But it does not mean that he breaks with the ‘objects’, i.e. interviews, observations, etc, but Geertz’s argument is that the process of interpretation (which is actually writing a text) itself is the only mode in which the object of research

¹² Hans-Georg Gadamer. *Truth and Method*. London, 1993. p. 299.

¹³ Ibid. – p. 300

¹⁴ The other translation can be ‘history that works’

¹⁵ Clifford Geertz. *Interpretation of Cultures*. Basic Books, New York, 1973. p. 15.

¹⁶ Ibid. -- p. 15. This statement inspired a lot of discussions among historians, and some of them (New Historicists, Postmodernist historiography) argued for wiping the line between historical writing and fiction.

exists as such, since the interpreter is creating its objects through interpretation. A scholar has to deal not with isolated concrete deeds, words and things, but with the culture as an “interworked system of construable signs”¹⁷, which “consists of socially established structures of meaning”¹⁸. Following these directions, my task in this work is to make “interpretations of what our informants are up to, or think they are up to” and “thick’ descriptions”¹⁹.

Proceeding to the certain theory of the social changes that includes both individual positions and the collective projects and ideas, my aim is to examine the individual and the group struggle for authority and consecration of Lviv’s intellectuals and artists in late the 80s by using some theoretical reflections that reveal the historical and sociological issues of the concepts of “generation” and “intellectuals” regarding the Ukrainian context. Applying the different concepts of generation and “intellectual” to certain group or milieu of people my aim is to “deconstruct” these concepts and to demonstrate in what way they are used as constructed “imagined communities” in the competition for consecration. The last part of the theoretical framework is devoted to Bourdieu’s theory of the cultural field and struggle for consecration that is the basis for further analytical work.

The opposition between individual and culture, individual biography together with analysis of his or her works and general features of the epoch is an obstruction for contemporary humanities, and the concept of generation might be an easy way to step over these difficult questions. There are a few classical definitions of generations and its changes that shape the widespread notion of the term. The generation seems to be a convenient notion that does not depend on the social, territorial, national and age groups, power and institutional hierarchy, but does not negate them, and most generally, gives a bridge between the abstract mass and concrete individual. The definition by Jose Ortega y

¹⁷ Ibid. – p. 14.

¹⁸ Ibid. – p. 12.

¹⁹ Ibid. – p. 15.

Gasset begins with the latter and turns to the role of the generation in history: “The changes of vital sensibility which are decisive in history appear under the form of generation. ... The generation is a dynamic compromise between mass and individual, and the most important conception in history”²⁰. Karl Mannheim, the founder of sociology of knowledge, defined generation as a “location phenomenon”²¹, which means that one has to be born within the same region that gives a possibility to be a part of generation. Common ideological basis and active participation in the intellectual life of the society make a group of people a generation-unit that presents itself as antagonistic to the values and ideas of the other group when they both belong to the same actual generation. Not every generation provides a social transformation, but only “when adaptation and modification of traditional patterns of experience, thought and expression” is not possible any more. Generation has a common “identity of responses, a certain affinity in the way in which all move with and are formed by their common experiences”²².

Pierre Nora analysing the ‘1968 generation’ as a starting point of talking about generations and worldwide generation gap is very sceptical about the possibility to use it in general²³. Competing the idea of indissoluble connection between the revolution and clash of generations, and what he calls “biological determinism”, Nora argues that this new historical and popular concept was the result of 1968: “suddenly the youth erupted into the public consciousness as a world unto itself, with its own laws, clothing, vocabulary, recognition signs, idols”²⁴. The concept of generation implies the struggle for significance, comparison to show the positive difference and an attempt of one generation to be a model and pattern for others. The conclusion of Nora is quite explicit: “the generation concept

²⁰ Jose Ortega y Gasset. “The Importance of Generationhood”. In *The Youth Revolution: The Conflict of Generations in Modern History*. Ed. by Esler, Anthony. Lexington, Mass., 1974. p 3.

²¹ Karl Mannheim. “What is a Social Generation”. In *The Youth Revolution: The Conflict of Generations in Modern History*. Ed. by Esler, Anthony. Lexington, Mass., 1974. p. 7

²² Ibid. – p. 11

²³ Pierre Nora. “Generation”. In: Nora, Pierre, ed. *Realms of Memory*. Vol. 1. New York, 1996. p. 499.

²⁴ Ibid. – p. 511

would make a wonderfully precise instrument if only its precision didn't make it impossible to apply to the unclassifiable disorder of the reality",²⁵.

There are some general issues that arise from Mannheim's, Gasset's and Nora's texts corresponding to the case of Lviv opposition intellectuals: what were the dividing criteria for the different generations; and if there is antagonism, what form did it take? But the main question is whether the concept of change of generations correlates with the situation in Lviv's artistic and intellectual circles and its broad social context. My aim is not to establish the relevance of the concept in general, but to find out how it works in case my research. In my further analysis I begin with a traditional division of old and young generations (I conditionally use the term young and old generation due to the constructed representations of each group and later I will examine them) to look in what way these concepts are used and what kind of division they construct. This generational division also supposes the reconsideration of a definition, role and mission of the intellectuals and artists in the state and society.

As my focus is not on generations in general, the next step is the definition of the intellectual and his or her role in the society. I will start from a kind of Foucauldian genealogy to explore what formed the concept of the intellectual in Soviet times and its revision by the intellectuals in late 80s. There is one general idea that shapes the notion of intellectual of modern times in Western tradition, and it comes from the Enlightenment paradigm of public poet-thinker-intellectual, who brings knowledge to the masses and who is a creative and a driving force of progress and changes of society. There are two opposing popular definitions of intellectuals, one made by Marxist Antonio Gramsci – his "organic" intellectual "articulated the world view, interests, intentions and historically determined potential of a particular class; ... legitimized the historical role of a given class, its claim to

²⁵ Ibid. – p. 506.

power and to the management of social process in terms of those values”²⁶. The opposite definition is Karl Mannheim’s “free-floating” intellectual “detached from the concerns of all interest-dominated groups”²⁷. These opposite notions are still a basis of Western representations of intellectuals even after the perspective has been changed due to shift which involves the private life in terms of ethical appraisal into the sphere of public activity of intellectual. In the totalitarian state human behavior becomes an essential feature of the intellectual.

There are two “ideal types” which push to reflections on the relationship between intellectual and power and an exploration of the role of the intellectual in modern society in terms of contemporary thinkers. Zygmunt Bauman gives the notion of an intellectual as a public interpreter of the ideas and values that are not a part of discourse and practices of the mass culture. Michel Foucault presents the role and the aims of the intellectual in his terms of struggle for power and truth and defining the contemporary specific intellectual in contrast to the former universal intellectual. I will combine these theoretical premises to explore the particular features of the intellectual in Soviet times and the conflicts and contradictions of the different groups of them.

Bauman considers intellectuals as legislators in the pre-modern period who later transformed into interpreters in modern times. Philosophers and artists who created culture were legislators, while culture was an official ideology of the state, and the main aim of the state to reproduce social order was achieved by total social commitment to the ‘ruling values’, in other words, culture was legitimizing the mechanisms of state power and intellectuals were legislative power of the state²⁸. But by the twentieth century the situation

²⁶ Antonio Gramsci. Cited in Bauman, Zygmunt. *Intimations of Postmodernity*. London: Routledge, 1994. p. 1.

²⁷ Lewis A. Coser. “The Social Role of Eastern European Intellectuals Reconsidered” in *Culture, Modernity and Revolution :Essays in Honour of Zygmunt Bauman*. Edited by Richard Kilminster and Ian Varcoe. London : Routledge, 1996. p. 166.

²⁸ Zygmunt.Bauman. *Intimations of Postmodernity*. London, 1994. p. 22

changes and intellectuals lost their special position within the state structure of power and had to turn to the field of market relations. As the artists and philosophers became free traders of their products it gave them unprecedented freedom of speech and self-expression which they could not have as legislators, and also the state, instead of legislative role, provided them with financial comfort and privileged status. In the situation of “a lack of overall structure of domination, which makes the questions of objective standards impracticable and hence theoretically futile”²⁹ intellectuals play the role of interpreters of one system of communication and knowledge into another one for those who are not ‘inside’. In case of the Soviet Union the status of intellectual who belonged to cultural elite can be compared to legislative function, and its crisis and confrontation with the opposition intellectuals in the situation of late 80s shows that in this scheme can be a transition to a new type of intellectual-‘interpreter’.

To show one more feature of the intellectual sphere of the USSR, I use the one more distinguishing principle. Foucault argues that “universal intellectual comes from a respectable legislator and finally gets its full embodiment in the figure of a writer as a bearer of meanings and values that every man can take as his or her own. On the contrary, the specific intellectual is born from absolutely different figure, no longer the “respectable legislator”, but “erudite expert”³⁰. The first example of such a specific intellectual is Robert Oppenheimer, the prominent physicist, “the father of the atomic bomb”, who spoke in public about the use of the bombs and its consequences for humankind. Specific intellectuals are not a part of system of power, because they provide a “local and concrete struggle” for “truth”³¹, at least, about “truth” as a specific kind of knowledge in sphere where they are experts and set of rules to distinguish true and false, rules invested with

²⁹ Ibid. – p. 24

³⁰ Michel Foucault. “Politicheskaia funktsia intelektual” [The Political Function of an Intellectual]. In: Foucault, Michel. *Intellectualy i vlast’* [Intellectuals and Power]. Moscow, 2002. p. 208

³¹ Ibid. – p. 207

power to affect the sphere where these rules are working. Specific intellectuals do not use the rhetoric of “general human values and issues” and does not present “general philosophy” or “world view” unlike universal intellectuals.

The words of anti-Soviet oppositional intellectual Vaclav Havel are a kind of definition of himself and a purely moral precept for intellectual: “to bear witness to the misery of the world ... rebel against all hidden and open pressure and manipulations, be the chief doubter of systems, of power and its incantations”³². This moralist tradition sets the framework for Soviet intellectuals both loyal and oppositional. The intellectual as individual and at the same time as an imagined community of the people who reached this high level of moral superiority present themselves as a power which can oppose and change the whole ‘system’, the machine of state power. Following the Havel’s view as an example of such moral position, some intellectuals present themselves as those who have the right and ability to form the opinion of the masses.

The competing notions of intellectual and his or her mission is an integral feature of the struggle for consecration within the field of cultural production which comes from the works by Pierre Bourdieu. The latter correspond to Geertz’s works in the sense that they establish the connection between the individual and structure and culture. In case of Bourdieu this connection is made by “habitus” that correlates with culture as the one of the plurality in terms of Geertz. Bourdieu considers the field of human discourses and practices as field of game, and habitus makes each agent a player in this game. He or she is not determined or formed by some structure, since the player’s choices and opportunities are created by the mixture of his unique abilities, skills, talent, etc as well as historical circumstances. At the same choices and “tastes” (Bourdieu’s term for a system of symbolic

³² Vaclav Havel. *Disturbing the Peace*. Cited in: Jerome Karabel. “Towards a Theory of Intellectuals and Politics” In: *Theory and Society*, 2 (1996).

domination, a particular system of judgments and distinctions) are dependent on the social context and formed historically due to social class, family, religion, traditions, etc.

One more term in this theory is “field” which is a space of the game with its rules. Each individual with certain habitus enters a particular field with the intention of becoming a winner i.e. to get a high position. There are a few types of fields: economic, political, literary/artistic (which has a more general term as ‘cultural’) that have their own laws and relationship between those who occupy the field, but all the fields are not isolated, on the contrary, they are interconnected and sensitive to the influences of other fields. Each field is a space of a competition for capital which can be economic or symbolic depending on a field. The completion does not imply a developed strategy and consciousness of idea of the competition, but it is a ‘feeling of a game’. Bourdieu demonstrates that in every field of human activity symbolic power (which does not have an economic dimension) plays a very significant role, and it cannot be reduced and converted to struggle for economic and political domination.

The aspiration for gaining symbolic capital in the field of cultural production appears in a form for struggle for consecration, recognition and authority from the broad public, the other producers and the whole system of mediators who influence and shape a field of cultural production (cultural institutions, critics, etc). At the same time symbolic capital displays itself as a certain form of knowledge and competence, a taste, which is the criteria of organizing the cultural field and particularly, the literary, intellectual and artistic milieu. Bourdieu emphasizes that each agent, i.e. each artist and writer, exists as occupying some position and position-taking shapes the existence of the field:

The structure of the literary field, i.e. of the space of positions, is nothing other than the structure of the distribution of the capital of specific properties which governs success in the field and the winning of the external or specific profits (such as literary prestige) which are at stake in the field. The space of literary or artistic position-takings, i.e. the structured set of the manifestations of the social agents involved in the field – literary or artistic works, of course, *but also political acts or pronouncement, manifestos or polemics, etc.* – is

inseparable from the space of literary or artistic positions (italics mine – KR) defined by possession of determinate quantity of specific capital (recognition) and, at the same time, by occupation of a determinate position in the structure of the distribution of this specific capital.³³

This long citation shows the exact connection between the field of cultural production and political field in which symbolic capital (gained as an artist or writer) can play a significant role and vice versa – the political activity can play a role (as a positive and negative factor) for recognition and popularity.

The struggle for recognition and consecration is held by all the agents at the same time, but not it is a struggle of everybody against everybody. The field itself is not homogeneous in the sense that it is one common space of positions, and Bourdieu defines two regulating principles of competition:

The structure of the field of cultural production is based on two fundamental and quite different oppositions: first, the opposition between the sub-fields of restricted production and the sub-field of large-scale production, i.e. between two economies, two time-scales, two audiences ... ; and secondly, the opposition between, within the sub-field of restricted production of restricted production, between the consecrated avant-garde and the avant-garde, the established figures and newcomers, i.e. between the artistic generations, ... between the 'young' and 'old' ...³⁴

In this way the outline of the theoretical reflections of Bourdieu give a schematic guideline for the further analysis of transformations which took place in the cultural field of Lviv in the late 80s. The following words are both a conclusion and an opening for the next chapter, but also these words should be questioned as the general statement which can be sometimes simplifying in a particular context:

“Structurally ‘young’ writers, i.e. those less advanced in the process of consecration ... will refuse everything their ‘elders’ (in terms of legitimacy) are and do, and in particular all the indices of social ageing, starting from the signs of consecration ...

The history of the field arises from the struggle between the established figures and the young challengers.³⁵

³³ Pierre Bourdieu. *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. Cambridge, 1993. p. 30

³⁴ Ibid. – p. 53

³⁵ Ibid. – p. 59 -60.

Turning to the certain topic of my research, the opposition intellectuals in Lviv in 1990 can be divided into many groups which represent various ideas and programs of change. The level of support for the ruling elites and conversely, the economic and symbolic support by the state is also a very important factor in this differentiation. The main divide is ideological and is often represented as the conflict of generations. The generational divide is used to represent the different faces of opposition to the regime in Lviv and the different ideologies and values of each group. These ideologies represent the visions of the future of Ukraine (later I will analyze each of them).

The discourse of moral intellectual, who has an advantage over the more powerful authorities, a moral right to give the judgment in all spheres of life gradually gains one more feature significant feature in the case of Ukrainian oppositional intellectual of the 60-80s. The young generation of the 80s rejected this moral aspect as a core of intellectual activity and opposed to the Soviet as well as to anti-Soviet concept of “intelligentsia” that had much in common with Havel’s one and considered themselves rather in terms of universal intellectuals..

The competition of ideas and programs of changes was not an abstract (as for example, diffusion or propaganda), but it was the concrete figures of intellectuals and artists who promoted their ideas by concrete activities. Only the certain figures, whose voices and opinions were authoritative for the broader public or for the circle of the cultural elite, had possibilities to implement their projects, visions and ideas. My main thesis supposes the struggle or competition for the consecration and authority between specific kinds of groups, who shared different or rather opposing ideas and views. This means not competition for some political power, but for a symbolic capital, a competition as a set of strategies and practices of young intellectuals and artists to make their ideas popular and supported by the broad public and the state. The success means the

replacement of the former cultural elites and taking their positions to realize new projects with support of the other elites (political or economic; in the case of the USSR it was mostly the support of the state).

The representatives of the both generations produce a set of ‘discursive formations’ in terms of Foucault (the ‘groups of statements’ that include different or inconsistent concepts, statements, etc in certain historical time and concern particular topic, i.e. sexuality, but on the contrary to the unified discourse, they present different point of view and still form a certain comprehensible unity)³⁶. These projects and ideas concern the social and political transformations and, first of all, the changes in the cultural field that leads to reconsideration of the role of intellectuals and artists with in the new social context. My main objective is to analyze the strategies and practices as well as the collective portrait of these young people as generation of young intellectuals, and how this “imagined community” was constructed, first of all, by them.

³⁶ See Michel Foucault. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. New York, 1972. p. 115

Chapter 2. The Competition of Intellectuals during the Revolution

*“Once we all had a crazy luck.
Since that time we do not fulfill a social demand”
Andriy Mykolaychuk³⁷*

In the following chapter my aim is to explore the particular features of the field of cultural production in Lviv in late 80s and the competition between young and old generation of intellectuals. Here my focus is on the certain groups and figures, their milieu, discursive formations, activities and ideas, projects and strategies in the context of the late 80s – early 90s, trying to catch the continuity and rupture of these processes of transformation.

First I will outline the group of people who can be generally considered as intellectuals in the late 80s. A short genealogy in Foucauldian terms shows that there are two ways or modes of being considered as an intellectual at that time: to belong to official state institutions of ‘brain workers’ or to the opposition and unofficial boheme. But in fact the local institutions engaged many oppositional intellectual to the work for the state³⁸. Starting with perestroika the division is wiped by the policy of the state which gave access to the public for alternative artists and writers and it reinforce the conflict of ideologies and struggle of symbolic capital and positions in the field of cultural production as they became public and not restricted by the regime.

Intellectuals in the Soviet Union mostly consisted of scholars of different fields (humanities and sciences) that had tight dependence upon their academic institutions, and artists, who belonged to some official institutions (Writers Union, Cinematographers Union, etc). Those who were in between, like journalists, literary critics, etc were also

³⁷ Andriy Mykolaychuk. “Pidpilnyi Kindrat?”(The Underground Kindrat?). In: *Moloda Halychyna* [Young Galicia], 21.04.1990

³⁸ The cases of Yevhen Sverstyuk, Ihor Kalynest, Mykola Ryabchuk and other who worked in journals, scientific institutions.

considered only due to their positions, i.e. as appointed on the certain job. As there were no market and the access to the broad public was only through the state institutions, the symbolic capital was gained through belonging to those organizations and depended on the its internal praise. The artists and writers had to fulfill the mission of propaganda of the values of communist ideology. They can be considered as the universal intellectuals in terms of Foucault and legislative in terms of Bauman. Their work was aimed to bring the universal human values in the interpretation of the communist party to masses.

Among the Ukrainian opposition intellectuals who belonged to the sixties generation one can find both universal and specific intellectuals. The most prominent figures who became political dissidents were writing letters, essays and articles to promote their ideas, and circulating the prohibited literature (*samvydav*). Therefore, the majority of them were related to the literature, but also a lot of them belonged to specific intellectuals³⁹. They were not numerous movement, and most of them were Party or Komsomol (Communist Youth Organization) members and, by their own words, supported the Communist ideology, and were opposing to the Russification and other defects in building communism⁴⁰. Gathering on the kitchens, criticizing the regime, singing Ukrainian songs, and reading prohibited old books and their own *samvydav* issues were the only secret activities of these people. But it was enough for some of them to get the court sentences that made their lives tragic symbols of struggling and suffering from totalitarian state.

In case of Lviv the hidden ‘home’ resistance was widespread among not only public the opposition activists, but also among the rest of Lvivians and even the people with rather high social status (artist, scientists, etc) who were in disagreement with norm and values of Soviet system. William Risch show that in Lviv after Stalin’s death it was not only students and young people formed alternative subcultures (like hippie) and were

³⁹ Like Myroslav Marynovych, Ihor Yukhnovskiy, etc.

⁴⁰ Bohymila Berdykhovska and Olya Hnatyuk, eds. *Bunt Pokolinnia* [Rebellion of the Generation]. Kyiv, 2004. p.28-29.

oriented toward Western values, but also those who belonged to official field of cultural production⁴¹.

Risch also demonstrates that Western music and fashion were very popular among the students in late 60s-70s, and at the same time the folk traditions were a part of everyday life of the city dwellers as many of them came from villages of Lviv district. Folklore and the Western music and literature (in the 60s many translations of the Western modern literature appeared in the USSR) were the modes of resistance to the Soviet canon for many intellectuals of the time. They both did not make one a dissident, since in 60s-70s the state used mostly propaganda against such people but not more strict measures⁴².

Ukrainian language and culture was the core of the opposition demands proclaimed by the sixties intellectuals. The equal rights and support of Ukrainian language and culture instead of spreading Russian were the main demands of the most important dissident text by Ivan Dzyuba "Internationalism or Russification". The opposition of the Ukrainian sixtiers⁴³ was based on the rational and moral intelligentsia disagreement with the policy of the state. Therefore, the phenomenon of the Western people of 60s and their protest is quite different from the national projects of Ukrainian ones. Also latter were different from Russian dissident of the 60s since they did not raised the national issue. Their concepts of nation and its culture and language were based on the visions and works of Romantic nationalism of the nineteenth century together with national-communist views of the beginning of the twentieth century⁴⁴. In both cases literature and arts were subordinated to the means of ideology that rejected many philosophic issues (irrationalism, sensitivity, etc) that shaped the literature of twentieth century.

⁴¹ William Jay Risch. *Ukraine's Window to the West: Identity and Cultural Nonconformity in L'viv, 1953-1975*. Unpublished dissertation. Ohio State University, 2001.p. iii.

⁴² Ibid. – p. iii.

⁴³ I use this term after the article by Lucky: George S. N Luckyj. "The Ukrainian Literary Scene Today". In: *Slavic Review*, Vol. 31, 4, (1972). pp. 863-869

⁴⁴ Ivan Lysiak-Rudnytskyi. *Istorychni Ese* [Historical Essays]. Kyiv, 1994. p. 478-79.

The publicist works of Ukrainian dissidents look like “they were written by “intellectual Robinson Crusoes”, i.e. by people, cut off the outside world and without any information about it”⁴⁵. And “for them sex was an astonishment”⁴⁶, jokes Vlodko Kostyrko. In the times when the Soviet state permitted to publish the translations of the some masterpieces of the twentieth century world literature, the essays of Ukrainian dissidents in samvydav or prohibited books⁴⁷ may be hardly very popular among the students and young intellectuals. But it was, first of all, the poetry of such outstanding poets of 60s as Lina Kostenko and Vasyl Stus which attracted the broad public to the activities of promoting Ukrainian culture (the readings of poetry, concerts, etc).

The sixties intellectuals were the first who began to compete with the official recognition of state by gaining public popularity by their activities. Their speeches made them popular public figures. They were the first ‘next generation’ of the Ukrainian cultural producers after Stalin’s purges of late 30s that annihilated the so-called “Shooteed Renaissance” and establishing the Soviet artists Unions with the strict ideological control. The Unions were managing the whole mechanisms in the field of official cultural production: all the financial matters, giving orders to the artists, publishing and literary critique were at the disposal of the Unions. Therefore, the 60s was a beginning of the creative period in the times when after the Stalin’s death the ideological control was loosen, and they got a possibility to struggle for their right to write and publish the works that did not follow the canon. The influential Soviet writers and artists, the symbols of the Soviet Socrealism, were still creative and powerful on their positions in the Unions, and the struggle for consecration by gaining public popularity was the only way to be a part of the field of cultural production for other part. At 60s they were young, and their aim was to

⁴⁵ Hrytsak, Yaroslav „Sashkove pokolinnya” [Sashko’s Generation] –<<http://www.zaxid.net/article/16745/>>. Last visited at 28.05.2008.

⁴⁶ Vlodko Kostyrko, interview by the author, digital recording, 7 April 2008

⁴⁷ Like the “History of Ukrainian literature” or “The Case of Pogruzhal’sky” (who committed arson of the Ukrainian collection of old prints) which were the most wanted by KGB.

show that the new language of literature and arts is popular among the young people and should be supported by the state.

Ukrainian sixtiers followed the ideal type of the moral intellectual described by Havel. Their public activity is the result of their objective to improve the situation in the sphere of 'spiritual values' by replacing the former ones by the values of humanism, democracy and traditional Ukrainian culture (folklore). This feature is common for all prominent intellectuals of 60s, even for those who seems to reject the ideological basis of their poetry (like Stus, Kostenko, Vingranovsky, etc), but all of them to a greater or lesser extent were the public activists.

Only the public competition for consecration let the certain group of intellectuals enter the field of cultural production. In the 70s one can find artists and writers who created in quite different styles⁴⁸, some of them belonged to hippie communities, but their works were not published and exhibited, therefore, they were competing for a consecration inside a narrow circle of informal boheme. The boheme circles, as well as the public figures of the 60s created a new phenomenon of private gatherings, certain milieu of common ideas, tastes and interests and discussions. It was the result of their both public activity that gave them popularity and informal communication that resulted in gathering such communities. It was the phenomenon of such figures as Ivan Svitlychnyi, Hryhorij Chubay and others who made their apartments and studios the places of gathering. Most of the intellectuals emphasized the importance of the group, milieu, tusovka (informal milieus of young people, comes from the word 'shuffle'). In the 60s those gathering have broken the professional separation. Only as a group which can organize the activities, events, etc they could struggle for consecration as a group, an imagined community for which belonging to the group is a symbolic capital itself.

⁴⁸ Alla Rosenfeld and Norton T. Dodge, eds. *From Gulag to Glasnost: Nonconformist Art from the Soviet Union*. New York, 1995.

In case of Lviv, where the intellectual life was concentrated in a few places and milieus (on the contrary to Leningrad or Moscow), the milieus of the oppositional public figures of 60s and the circles of the official intellectual elite were interconnected and also included the bohème intellectuals, who did not participate in the field of the official cultural production⁴⁹. Yurchak demonstrates by pieces of interviews that in the 70s the intellectuals and artists were quite ironic towards the ideological work that they were doing⁵⁰. Even the komsomol activists were reluctant to so-called ‘pro forma duties’, such as ideological propaganda. His main thesis is it was “paradoxical coexistence of affinities and alienations, belongings and estrangement, meaningful work and pure formality”⁵¹, and that most of the people did not oppose the state even if they were listening to Western music and mocking the official Soviet ideology.

In the 70s many clubs (kluby) and circles (kryzhky) that were official organizations, and the informal circles formed by collective place of work created a sphere of free discussions, reading and exchanging samizdat and other literature and music which were claimed as harmful and anti-Soviet by the official propaganda⁵². Even the cafes which emerged in 60s and the public that was gathering there and speaking freely about everything did not consider themselves anti-Soviet and dissidents due to the version of Yurchak. On the contrary, he argues that the people who visited these cafes in 70s-80s, young rock-musicians and poets, and other representatives of the alternative culture “distanced themselves from dissident discourse and political protest”⁵³, and also were

⁴⁹ William Jay Risch. *Ukraine’s Window to the West: Identity and Cultural Nonconformity in L’viv, 1953-1975*. Unpublished dissertation. Ohio State University, 2001. p. 4.

⁵⁰ Alexei Yurchak. *Everything was Forever, until It was no More: the Last Soviet Generation*. Princeton: 2006. p.56

⁵¹ Ibid. – p. 98.

⁵² Ibid. – p. 135-140

⁵³ Ibid. – p. 145

ironic to dissidents and kept distance from them as “the pro-system and anti-system types – they were all just the Soviet people”⁵⁴.

The research by Risch that involves the 60s - 70s and my own one dispute the above conclusions of Yurchak which he makes about the whole Soviet Union, while they does not correspond with the situation in Lviv where political issues were always in the focus of intellectuals. In late 60s and early 70s Lviv artistic and intellectual circle was formed as an underground community around such poets as Ihor and his wife Iryna Kalynets, and Hryhoriy Chubay⁵⁵, the poet whose verses were published only in samvydav together with Oleh Lyshega who might be the most significant Lviv poet of that period. Igor Kalynets belonged to the sixtiers (born in 1939), Chubay was 10 years younger, and Mykola Riabchuk, literary critic and essayist, “the eye-witness and personage of the Lviv underground in 70s”⁵⁶ who emphasized the role of Chubay in creating the intellectual milieu in Lviv (till his death in 1982) was the youngest (born 1953) of this milieu who later became the ‘Guru’ (by the words of Yuri Andrukhovych⁵⁷) for a young generation of Lviv intellectuals in their student years in 80s. That is a chain or outline of the Lviv intellectual life in the 60s-80s which can be found in books. First I will explore particular issues of their activities and later I will proceed to the late 80s which changed the whole picture.

The political aspects were very important for the oppositional intellectuals in Lviv. Their struggle for authority aimed to change the whole system, the society and the state. This does not imply that they proclaimed public political declarations or organized underground political activity. The private political talks were a part of everyday life of the majority Lviv families, but that did not make them oppositional political activists. Even it

⁵⁴ Ibid. – p. 129

⁵⁵ He is the father of Taras Chubay, the leader of the popular music band “Plach Yeremiya” that made its first performance on “Vyykh-90”.

⁵⁶ Pleroma. *Mala Entsyklopedia Aktualnoyi Ukrainskoi Literatury* [Pleroma. The Small Encyclopedia of the Relevant Ukrainian Literature]. No. 3. Ivano-Frankivsk, 2000. p. 98.

⁵⁷ Yuri Andrukhovych. *Tayemnytsja*. [The Secret]. Kharkiv, 2006. p. 112.

was rather not family “talks” (“The father every time pointed on the tv screen and just said “Gang”, Vlodko Kostyrko) since the negative attitude towards the regime was needless to explain. Also it seems that older people were much more afraid of the KGB and punishment, and even in the late 80s Khrystyna Duda (Mavra) had to read the “Ukrayinskyi Visnyk” (Ukrainian Herald), the samvydav newspaper of Lviv dissidents, hiding it from her parents because they were afraid of such things at their house⁵⁸.

‘The Great Coffee Revolution’⁵⁹ had begun in Lviv in the 70s and the first cafe “Nektar” (“Nectar”), the most popular one, and the others (which attracted the boheme young people also because they were decorated by the Lviv non-Socrealist artists⁶⁰) were the centers of public discussions and gatherings of different generations of intellectuals and artists (as well as other public). Unlike the private home parties, the space of the café implies much more open access and diversity of the people, and what is even more important, the continuity, everyday character of the intellectual talks. It was an open milieu, but the strangers who were very active in establishing friendly relations could be often considered as KGB agents⁶¹. Cafes made the milieu of Lviv intellectuals broader and connected many people which were interesting in communicating with each other. The main purpose of such public places as well home gatherings were the discussions and talks that in some ways substituted the lack of the information and literature, and also they were inevitable part of the student and boheme style of life in late Socialism (I will return to it later considering the late 80s and the milieus of the interviewees).

But the main reason of such gatherings seems to be the striving to be in a milieu of the ‘svoyi’ (Us) which is the only way for consecration for an intellectual, especially young one, outside the official structures of consecration. The gatherings included reading poetry,

⁵⁸ Khrystyna Duda, interview by the author, digital recording, 19 April 2008

⁵⁹ Expression by Viktor Krivulin. In: Alexei Yurchak. *Everything was Forever, until It was no More: the Last Soviet Generation*. Princeton: 2006. p 141

⁶⁰ Vlodko Kostyrko, interview by the author, digital recording, 7 April 2008

⁶¹ Yurko Kokh. interview by the author, digital recording, 8 April 2008

playing music and singing songs, and exhibiting paintings, or some other creative activities (all the interviewees mention them). The ideas of the artistic projects were born on such parties and café talks. The first artistic groups, like “Shlyah” in 1985 and literary groups, like LuHoSad, Bu-Ba-Bu and others also originate from such informal meetings. Also the already mentioned the lack of literature which was worth reading later resulted in the lack or very broad gaps of knowledge of the key works in humanities.

Yurchak argues that “svoyi” (Us) was ‘paradox’ attitude towards the people who understood the irony of everyday Soviet rituals and rhetoric, but did not opposed the regime, as the current status of things was his or her ‘normal’ mode of existence⁶². The people who did not belong to this ‘imagined community’ were ‘true’ communists and dissidents. But in case of Lviv this statement seems to be false. The intellectuals in Lviv were not isolated in their milieus as the latter were quite broad, and starting with perestroika, it was the prospective of the oppositional milieu the formed ‘Us’ against ‘Them’.

Either the different generations were not a dividing line for ‘svoyi’ and ‘vony’ (Them). The lack of radical deeds and projects, as well as different levels of cooperation with regime (membership in Unions, Party, Komsomol) seems to be not so important since these compromises were unavoidable for everyone who wanted to study and work, and not only struggle with the regime. There were different individual experiences of the co-existence of people that belonged to different generations within one milieu. They were surely not divided, but many factors influenced on the relations within the certain milieu. For Mykola Ryabchuk ironically describes the style of behavior of Iryna Kaly nec’s as one of a ‘teacher’⁶³, but Volodymyr Tsybulko nostalgically recalls (he speaks about his student

⁶² Alexei Yurchak. *Everything was Forever, until It was no More: the Last Soviet Generation*. Princeton: 2006. p. 93 -118.

⁶³ Bohymila Berdykhovska and Olia Hnatyuk, eds. *Bunt Pokolinnia* [Rebellion of the Generation]. Kyiv, 2004. p. 247

years in Kyiv) drinking spirits with Mykola Vingranovskyi who also belonged to the sixtiers⁶⁴.

Only in the perestroika times the splash of activities, organizations, groups made the diversification more apparent. Also it is the result of different experiences: among the people who were around thirty in late 80s there were already writers who were the members of the Union (poets Yuri Andrukhovych, Viktor Neborak, Oleksandr Irvanets (Bu-Ba-Bu group) and the young people who were twenty, like Vlodko Kostyrko, Ljubko Petrenko and others, and only started their career and were happy to get into (by some common friends) the milieus of the consecrated intellectuals.

Starting from 1987 Lviv has become a seed-plot of numerous non-official organizations which had a lot of similar in their programs, first of all, Ukrainian issues that demanded political determination. These organizations totally changed the landscape of oppositional activities in Lviv. The milieus of intellectuals continued their existence and at the same time its members were organizing or taking part in the activities of institutionalized groups and broad public which had certain program and demands. The organizations acted in support of Ukrainian language (Taras Shevchenko Native Language Society), legalization of Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church, and ecological demands. The most influential was Tovarystvo Leva (the Lion Society), one of the organizations formed mostly by young people, engaging also older dissidents and former Komsomol activists. Their activities were not directly political in the beginning, they performed the Ukrainian traditional folklore – vertepy (theatrical Christmas story), and hayivky (Easter festival with songs, plays, etc) that gathered a lot of people.

The other youth societies were the “Spilka Nezalezhnoyi Ukrayinskoyi Molodi” (SNUM, “Society of Independent Ukrainian Youth”) and “Studenstke Bratstvo” (SB

⁶⁴ Volodymyr Tsybulko, interview by the author, digital recording, 24 April 2008

“Student Union”). The first one used the rhetoric of the traditional ‘cave’ nationalism (definition by Vlodko Kostyrko) confronting with the Student Union which was the most influential student organization. The Student Union with Markiyan Ivashchysyn had quite radical political positions and is mostly known for student strikes and cultural events. One of them was “*Vyvykh-90*” to which the next chapter is devoted. This splash of creation of the societies, organizations, unions, etc and their activities to present them and their programs demonstrates that not only intellectuals, but also broad public felt its belonging to the changes. The support of the broad public was very important as the activities of these organizations were related to the first democratic elections which were held in March 1990. Lion Society, Student Union and others nominated a lot of their activists for the local councils and the opposition candidates got the majority of the places in all of them.

The youth organizations in late 80s took very active part in the struggle for political power. They published newspapers, gathered meetings, organized concerts and traditional folk festivals. And at the same time they criticized each other very often. The young intellectuals, who are in the focus of my research, belonged or supported, first of all, Student Union and Lion Society and took part in their meetings and cultural projects.

All the Ukrainian oppositional activists in Lviv in the late 80s had the common basis – Ukrainian language and culture. Without ignoring much more difference which one can find in their ideologies, strategies and projects, but they most of them emphasize that they followed the political program of Vyacheslav Chornovil and his Party “Rukh” (Narodnyi Rukh za Perebudovu - National Movement for Rebuilding [Perestroika])⁶⁵ which was formed on a basis of dissident groups in late 1989. The political program can be generally described as obtaining self-government of Ukraine (in different forms). The majority of the sixties dissidents became Rukh members and began their political career.

⁶⁵ The words ‘for Rebuilding’ were excluded from its name in late 1990 after the Party proclaimed its direction towards independence.

The obsession with politics was, undoubtedly, a feature of that time that clearly appears in the newspapers of the time. The newspapers which are considered to be oriented towards the youth public is not an exception, there is almost everything is a kind of political statement. But one should be careful in concluding whether it was a strong interest to the political issues or the objective of the organizations to attract youth to the political activities and gain the support of it. The examples of each newspaper are quite different, but there is one similarity – the political issues displace all the other themes.

The Komsomol newspaper “Leninska Molod” (“The Lenin’s Youth”) (later renamed to “Molod Halychyny” (“The Youth of Halychyna”) was the only one which instead of political issues published articles about sports, morality, cultural events and life stories, thus looked like a regular Soviet newspaper for youth in perestrioka times. The absence of politics is a displacement of it that is another form of presenting political issues by means of ideology of the Soviet life. But gradually side by side with an article about milkmaids appeared detailed interviews with rock-musicians, and it was “Molod Halychyny” that published most of articles about “Vyvykh-90” in 1990 which can be in the press of 1990.

The newspaper of the SB “Bratstvo” (“Brotherhood”) proclaims serious demands for democratization and uses traditional rhetoric of nationalists like “Ukraine ...that passed the mortal gloom of the 1936, through Stalin’s torture chambers”⁶⁶. There is nothing except political proclamations and pieces of poetry and history that are also devoted to politics (the first issue contains the congratulation of Ivan Svitlychnyi and a lot of his verses that also shows the continuity with the intellectuals of the 60s). The newspaper of the Lion Society “Postup” is almost in the same way devoted to politics, but their program is more elaborated and the content is more diverse, but the articles about history and literature lead to the national idea and political actions. The most traditional rhetoric can be found on the

⁶⁶ Zayava Redaktsiyi (Proclamation of Editorial Staff). In: *Moloda Ukraina* [Young Ukraine], 04.03.1990

pages of “Moloda Ukrayina” (“Young Ukraine”) published by SNUM. The history of the heroic struggle of UPA occupies nearly half of each issue and their idyll image of Ukraine is church and “house [khata] where icon and portrait of Shevchenko is always together”.

One more specific thing is that all the mentioned newspapers flung each other and often demonstrated a serious antagonism. Traditional rhetoric of nationalist struggle of the first half of the twentieth century was not very attractive for youth, especially young intellectuals, but it would be false to reject the influence of those unions. The festival “Vyvykh-90” gives an answer on this question: to attract youth the organizations needed to change their strategy and cultural policy.

My first thesis is that the alternative intellectuals took active part in the oppositional movement and political struggle, and it is very important feature of these intellectuals as they were not ‘behinds the politics’, but just on the contrary. In that time nothing was out of the political sphere from history to sexuality. The political position of young intellectuals can be described as “against sovok [Soviet]”, i.e. not only against regime, but for them it was mostly the struggle against the Soviet ideology and culture. They were supporting Rukh (nearly all mentioned interviewees mentioned it) and the organizations (like Lion Society and Student Union), but it is not so easy to describe their position and ideas in general.

The ideological basis for this party and of the Ukrainian nationalism movement in general can be described through the distinction by Alexandra Hrycak in her article about the second “Vyvykh-90” in 1992. Hrycak argues that there are two types of Ukrainian nationalism: “traditional (sometimes extreme) ethno-nationalism” and “cosmopolitan or civic form of national ideology”⁶⁷, and the latter is considered to involve liberal

⁶⁷ Alexandra Hrycak. “The Coming of ‘Chrysler Imperial’: Ukrainian Youth and Rituals of Resistance”. In: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 1-2 (1997). p.63

intellectuals and cultural producers, the driving force and target group of the “*Vyvykh* – 92”.

Operating mostly with contemporary evidences it is very hard to say what position and kind of nationalism supported each of the intellectuals and their group in general. Many people seem to have changed their preferences during the independence years. Vlodko Kostyrko speaks about ‘cave nationalism’ that seems to be a good metaphoric definition for traditional nationalist ideology by which he was also “infected” at that time⁶⁸. Yurko Kokh does not see any difference what can divide nationalists; there are different people, one part – artists, creative people – can represent nationalism more “freely, anarchically”⁶⁹ and the other more dependant on the pattern.

The one thing which can be undoubtedly defined as common ground for all oppositional intellectuals is Ukrainian language and culture that were the most important objectives of their activity. The language for all the whole opposition movement meant the same – usage of Ukrainian instead of Russian in all the spheres, but the culture has different definitions and interpretations. The notion of culture was different. But still it was the folklore which united the sixties people and the young people who were listening punk and rock, thus following the style of life which one can hardly find compatible with the traditional culture.

The traditional portrait of the young people of that time includes rock-music as the symbol of protest and opposition to ideology. But the rock-music of the Leningrad and Lviv was rather different – besides Western ‘classic’ (Pink Floyd, Led Zeppelin, etc), among the Lvivians the Polish and Hungarian rock bands were very popular, and these bands often gave concerts in Lviv and Uzhhorod⁷⁰. The Polish bands attracted because of the comprehensive language, but the case of popularity of Magyar bands shows the

⁶⁸ Vlodko Kostyrko, interview by the author, digital recording, 7 April 2008

⁶⁹ Yurko Kokh, interview by the author, digital recording, 7 April 2008

⁷⁰ Ibid.

importance of the live performance on the concerts. These live concerts in Lviv and in Poland and Hungary (which were easily accessible in Lviv on TV) had an atmosphere of an incredible performance unknown before, both on the stage and around it. Eccentrically dressed up bands who are doing shocking things on the stage and emancipated masses served as an example for the alternative festivals like “*Vyvykh-90*”.

Reformative and mass character of the folklore was also one of the main reasons of its attractiveness for young intellectuals. To find the connection between them one should distinguish the difference between the concept of folklore of the ethno-nationalists and of the young intellectuals in that time. The *verteps* (theatrical Christmas stories) performed by young groups in Lviv in 1988-90 did not follow the traditional text and songs⁷¹. Directors of the *verteps* used original texts written at that time with the clear references to current issues. The *verteps* were a kind of political declarations with many useful for this task non-canonic figures (Kozak, Knight Monomach, etc). It was a performance which attracted many people as the folklore is popular among a very broad group of people. Ostap Patyk recalls the story when his text of *vertep* with its main idea about ‘Russian occupants’ (*moskali-okupanty*), was not allowed to perform in Kyiv in 1989⁷² as it was too radical and the *vertep* itself was organized by the Lion Society⁷³. Patyk, an young artist at that time, had a strong interest to folklore and was among the organizers of other folk festivals of that time as well as an active participant of the milieu of “*Vyvykh-90*”.

Interest to the folklore was a common tendency of the youth. Markiyan Ivashchyshyn, the leader of the Student Union, tells that at that time “we all were keen on ethnography and it was new at that time”⁷⁴. The folklore was attractive for artists in its revised notion –

⁷¹ In fact, there was not widespread tradition of *verteps* in Lviv before late 80s, and it is an example of ‘invented tradition’ (Hobsbaum).

⁷² The *vertep* was presented on the stage of the Central Palace of Arts “Ukraine”, and the such text would surely caused great troubles for its organizers. Still later it was performed in Ivano-Frankivsk.

⁷³ Ostap Patyk, interview by the author, digital recording, 20 April 2008

⁷⁴ Markiyan Ivashchyshyn, interview by the author, digital recording, 21 April 2008

it was not Soviet amateur choirs and varenyky, which got a name of “sharovarshchyna” (baggy trousers, national Cossacks costume), but irrationalism and beauty of hutsul’s (people who live in Carpathian mountains) life like in the “The Shadows of Forgotten Ancesters”, film by Serhiy Paradzhanov. But for broad public folk songs, performances and festivals was the special event which was not organized by officials and thus oppositional, and at the same time not a political demonstration, but fun. Still folklore in its different interpretations was not considered as something alien to the alternative youth culture and modern literature, arts, music which were oriented towards the Western ones.

Vlodko Kostyrko recalls his frequent family trips to Carpathian region (hutsul’s lands) to collect the things of everyday life, first of all, plates, costumes⁷⁵. Collecting artifacts in hutsul’s villages is a kind of aristocratic collecting antiquities. It corresponds to the boheme style of life, and it was one of many ways to be ‘other’ in the Soviet times. Kostyrko clearly states that they liked namely hutsul’s, but not Ukrainian peasants. Together with his friends in their student years he also had trips “around Lviv, we were visiting palaces, castles”, but one can scarcely imagine that they would go traveling to the Eastern Ukraine.

Young intellectuals, who were students or young artists, writers, musicians, etc usually were not very overloaded with their work, had a lot of free time and quite good scholarships from the state. The late perestroika times were quite unique in a sense that “it was an unbelievable chaos in the state, it was considered that everything is possible”⁷⁶. The state did not obliged artists to follow the Socrealist canon, and that let many young one to be admitted to the Unions. Many of them used this possibility because of the material benefits it gave. Ostap Patyk describes his material status in late 80s as very comfortable: he was young, he was a member of the Union that gave him a studio and very good sum of

⁷⁵ Vlodko Kostyrko, interview by the author, digital recording, 7 April 2008

⁷⁶ Vlodko Kaufman, interview by the author, digital recording, 20 April 2008

money for quite a small pieces of work, and his life was full of creative ideas for which he had time and resources, and parties with his friends⁷⁷.

Parties and private events and creative leisure were forming the intellectual milieu and the atmosphere there gave birth to many projects. The parties and collective leisure were both a creative process and the public presentation of the works. On the one hand, they seem to be a common feature of the student life, but my aim is to focus on the peculiarities. The young intellectuals were forming their activities which can be considered as private, but still the main purpose was connected with its public character. Friendship, common interests and, consequently, having a good time on parties can be considered as the most important factors which created such milieus and shaped the mode of their private collective leisure which was not only entertainment, but a kind of public representation of “otherness” to the “sovok”. Fulfilling the tasks on their work, like painting placards for factories⁷⁸ that Yurko Kokh had to do, they could fulfill their ideas and projects only inside their small groups. Kokh describes their home gatherings (and many others recalled the parties organized by him and his wife as one the centers of alternative culture at the time) as high-quality prepared performances and one would call it even festivals with music and songs (first of all, by Viktor Morozov), reading poetry and exhibitions of his paintings. On the New Year party the artists arranged the competition of placards, and this work seems to be considered much more seriously than official job, since Kokh had to spent a month painting it (which can be compared to the interviews of artists in Yurchak’s book when they told about their work as production-line⁷⁹).

⁷⁷ Ostap Patyk, interview by the author, digital recording, 20 April 2008

⁷⁸ Yurko Kokh, interview by the author, digital recording, 8 April 2008

⁷⁹ Alexei Yurchak. *Everything was Forever, until It was no More: the Last Soviet Generation*. Princeton: 2006. p.56

The performances that Kokh arranged sometimes look shocking in the context of Soviet times. “We had such *gluk*⁸⁰, we were dressing up as women. ... My father was an actor, so we had costumes. I shaved clean, put a wig, and we were walking on the streets to shock a bit Soviet people. But we had to be very careful, because if I had come upon the policeman, ... they would put me in a madhouse”⁸¹. But neither Kokh nor Viktor Neborak who also recalls such performances rejects that *epatage* was the main purpose of it, and they say that it was the ‘normal’ for artists and a problem of the rest who did not understand it as a joke.

The younger milieu of students in late 80s, like the one of Vlodko Vostyrko, Lyubko Petrenko and others, had quite similar boheme style of life. It does not coincide with the alternative milieu of young intellectuals in Leningrad and Moscow described by Yurchak as being inside and at the same time ignoring the regime and its ideology. The language and cultural issues implied antagonism with the regime. For Vlodko Kostyrko “to look defiant” and to be ‘other’ meant to be interested in history of the city, to walk like a *flaneur* looking for traces of the past, and to use Galician dialect instead of official Ukrainian language (“I associated it with Soviet even more than Russian”)⁸². They also tried to find old-fashioned pre-Soviet clothes and wore them. The aim was to be ‘genuine Lvivian’: “Each Lvivian has to foster something strange, unique, e.i. habits, words, enunciation, etc”⁸³. Kostyrko tells that nearly all people of his milieu were native Lvivians, but it might be related only to his close friends, while a lot of the young intellectuals who studied in Lviv and became Lvivians came from the whole Galicia and other parts of Ukraine.

The everyday student life of late 80s described in the “Encyclopedia of Our Ukrainian Studies” which ironically depicts that epoch using the youth bravada style, present a young

⁸⁰ There is special word “*bzdyura*” for such things, and this word is used only in Lviv

⁸¹ Yurko Kokh, interview by the author, digital recording, 8 April 2008

⁸² Vlodko Kostyrko. “Nostalgiya, abo EX ORIENTE TENEBRIS” [Nostalgia or ex oriente tenebris] – <http://www.zaxid.net/article/12706/>. Last visited at 15.05.2008.

⁸³ Vlodko Kostyrko, interview by the author, digital recording, 7 April 2008

intellectual whose “the main item of budget expenses – liqueur “Vanna Tallinn”, innumerable coffees and beers, book (H. Hesse, T. Mann, F. Dostoevsky, poetry)”; the main occupation – rock-concerts, discussions about literature and philosophy on the flats and in cafes ...; the main leisure activity – visiting classes in the institute and examinations”⁸⁴. Yurko Prokhasko describes the ‘café’ style of life of that time as permanent process: coming there during the day between classes, instead of them and in the evening (the cafes worked only till 8 p.m.) and on weekends afternoon⁸⁵. The late 80s was the next stage of opening cafes in Lviv and the milieu becomes more differentiated, thus “Nectar”, the first place of public gatherings, was already considered by 20-years old people as the one for older consecrated boheme circle.

Kostyrko distinguishes himself and his friends as young and unknown comparing to the “generation of Andrukhovych, Irvanets” who were already 30 years old at that time, as well as Vlodko Kaufman and Yurko Kokh with whom he compares himself as an artist. The third member of this Bu-Ba-Bu group Viktor Neborak also tells that “we were older” comparing to the other organizers and participants of “Vyvykh-90” in 1990. The jury of the festival included people of from Ihor Kalynets to very young people just after their studentship, and nearly half of the jury were already well-known public intellectuals (like Sergiy Proskurnya, Sashko Kryvenko, Bohdan Zholdak, etc). But they all give the same names of the music bands which they were listening at that time, the similar comprehension of the processes in the field of cultural production, i.e. nothing seems to divide them except their status of already acknowledged poets.

The young intellectuals defined their place in the field of cultural production as opposing to the Soviet mass culture (“sovok”) that was convertible to uneducated and

⁸⁴ Oleksandr Kryvenko and Volodymyr Pavliv. *Entsyklopediia Nashogo Ukrainoznavstva*. [Encyclopedia of Our Ukrainian Studies]. Kyiv, 1997. p. 35.

⁸⁵ Yurko Prokhasko, interview by the author, digital recording, 23 April 2008

tasteless masscult. That was the mass called “rahuli” (bulls, hicks)⁸⁶ who determine the situation in that time and now. The intellectuals in their interviews (Kostyrko, Kokh) often touch the issue of the uneducated mass which still makes their art marginal. They presented themselves as avant-guard on the contrary to narrow-minded ideological mass art in late 80s and till now they emphasize this status: “The culture in Lviv, since I remember, had two poles – in sovok times and in independence times there were underground and ideological art”⁸⁷. They speak about hope and illusion of changes which did not fulfil: “We had an illusion at that time that this kink [Vyvykhovj] splash will be not an exception, but a new quality of Ukrainian culture”⁸⁸.

This establishes a scale of aesthetic evaluation of the cultural production and their own later definitions as the postmodern on the contrary to the “testamentary – rustical discourse”⁸⁹, and this opposition is the main thesis of “Mala Entsyklopedia Aktualnoyi Ukrainiskoi Literature” (“The Small Encyclopedia of the Relevant Ukrainian Literature”). by “Pleroma”-journal which was edited by Yuri Andrukhovych and Volodymyr Yeshkilyev. The intellectuals who belong to the latter (consequently, non-relevant literature) is characterized by orientation on “eternal classics of Ukrainian literature”, “cyclical rustic mentality, ... with symbols and rituals related to the annual agrarian household, which does not conceive truly new and other”⁹⁰. This encyclopaedia (as well as already mentioned “Encyclopedia of Our Ukrainian Studies”) is based on the defining “us” and “them” with quite clear idea that ‘they’ are backward and non-relevant to the present.

⁸⁶ Vlodko Kotyrko, interview by the author, digital recording, 7 April 2008

⁸⁷ Vlodko Kaufman. “Lviv mystetskyi” [Artists’ Lviv] – <<http://www.zaxid.net/article/11911/>>. Last visited at 18.05.2008.

⁸⁸ Viktor Neborak, interview by the author, digital recording, 22 April 2008

⁸⁹ Pleroma. *Mala Entsyklopedia Aktualnoyi Ukrainiskoi Literature* [Pleroma. *The Small Encyclopedia of the Topical Ukrainian Literature*] Issue #3. Ivano-Frankivsk, 2000. <<http://www.ji.lviv.ua/ji-library/pleroma/gk-tya.htm>>

⁹⁰ Ibid.

The critique of the previous generation(s) of the Soviet and later Ukrainian intellectuals is also one of the discursive formations and the mode of being different from them and thus the most important argument and symbolic capital in the struggle of consecration and removing the established canon of contemporary authors. Volodymyr Tsybulko talking about the intellectuals-symbols of the 60s in Ukrainian politics argues that “at the end of 80s they exhausted their creativity. ... They remind me of overdue canned fish. It is uneatable and just about to explode. But if you put it under the ice, it will last a bit. But there will be no demand on it. Just as there is no demand on Drach and Yavorivskyi”⁹¹. But not all of the alternative intellectuals draw the line between them an elder. Viktor Neborak emphasizes that Bu-Ba-Bu was not a “rejections of tradition. ... For us namely continuation and its modernization was important”⁹². Sixties poets helped him and Andrukhovych in the beginning of their career, but at the same time for Neborak now they represent a “pseudo-hierarchy” which already became a part of the past. It again reveals the idea of competition as not a personal struggle or aesthetic judgment of their poetry, but the non-relevance of the system of consecration, its procedure and mechanism, and those who embody it to the present.

Another factor is very important in defining the young intellectuals as a group. They were Lviv poets, writers, artist, etc, and their works have a strong connection to Lviv as a cultural centre of Ukraine since it has preserved its connection with Western culture. Thus it is also a competition with Kyiv as a capital with all the institutions which controlled the field of cultural production. One more example of making a regional group is “Stanislav phenomenon”, the name of the group of writers which come from Ivano-Frankivsk (Stanislav). The Small Encyclopaedia (which is written and composed by these “Stanislav”

⁹¹ Tsybulko, Volodymyr. “Taki yak Drach nagaduyut meni prostrochenu konservu” [Those like Drach reminds me of a spoiled canned fish] – <<http://www.tsybulko.com.ua/article.php?articleID=3778>>. Last visited at 15.05.2008.

⁹² Neborak, Viktor. “Ia vykliuchav nashyh divchat z komsomolu” [I expelled our girls from the komsomol] – <<http://vsiknygy.net.ua/index.php?module=interview&id=280>>. Last visited at 15.05.2008.

authors) creates an image of these authors as belonging to the Western culture and presents affiliation with the “phenomenon” as very important.

The term “generation” is the most often used to define belonging to some kind of unity which is based on common ideas, values, projects, etc. This ‘spiritual’ unity that generally coincides with biological and sociological parameters is the way to present a collective portrait, a transition between biography and an epoch or era and its mentality. The ‘term’ generation is used towards the sixties intellectuals as an established notion that they use referring to ‘us’ as a group, a unity, and which is used to define them, like in case of the book “The Rebellion of the Generation” by Olya Hnatiuk and Bohumila Berdykhovska is a bright example of it⁹³. Yurchak also defines the group of people between 15 and 34 in mid-80s as the last Soviet generation⁹⁴. The cases of Yurchak and Gnatiuk are different while Gnatiuk considers a rather small group of people as generation, and it implies that they were only the top of the iceberg and represented ideas of broader range of people.

To be a part of a group in the situation of the late 80s when there is still a threat of retributive measures of the regime gives a releases from the fear of individual deed. That was the answer of Vlodko Kostyrko: “Everybody was doing it, that is why I had no fear. ... It is like a train, you go in it and do not pay attention...”⁹⁵. This small milieu of young intellectuals and their public activities were not taken seriously by most of elders, but mostly as a part of their dissipated or even cynical leisure. On the other hand, young intellectuals positioned their works as a novelty, oriented towards West, and freedom from prohibition implied by the regime and canon, and this attracted mostly young people who

⁹³ Berdykhovska, Bohymila and Olia Hnatiuk, eds. *Bunt Pokolinnia* [Rebellion of the Generation]. Kyiv, 2004.

⁹⁴ Alexei Yurchak. *Everything was Forever, until It was no More: the Last Soviet Generation*. Princeton: 2006. p. 31

⁹⁵ Vlodko Kostyrko, interview by the author, digital recording, 7 April 2008

considered themselves as a part of the same generation, but not only them, like in case of “*Vyvykh-90*”.

In case of the alternative intellectuals of late 80s (and here they are in a similar position with one of the sixtiers at their time) creating a kind of “imagined community” is the only way not to be a single marginal, but to belong to a group with certain ideas. They also present themselves as a generation which means that it is not only their small milieu, but all the other people of approximately their age who, consequently share their values and expectations. The ‘generation’ is a symbolic capital which is used in competition for consecration and which does not coincide with biological age and even with different ideologies. The words by Markiyan Ivashchyshyn is the exact formulation the above reflections: “On my mind, the generation is created as a consequence of common experience of certain historical events which have people of the similar age. ... I think we are lucky: we have got an experience that formed us as personalities. .. we have got the understanding of our mission in the society”⁹⁶.

⁹⁶ Markiyan Ivashchyshyn. “My otrymaly rozuminnya nashoyi misiyyi v suspilstvi...” [We obtained understanding from the society]. In: *Lvivska Gazeta* [Lviv’s Newspaper], 19.06.2007.

Chapter 3. “Vyvykh-90” as the Last Soviet Performance in Lviv

Before we have entered the epoch of the Great Fracture, we had been living friendly, unanimously and solid, and not badly at all, in the time of developed Twist [Vyvykh]
*Oleksandr Irvanets*⁹⁷

One could hardly imagine what festival “Vyvykh-90” was, since it was quite a novelty for Ukrainian field of cultural production. Each of the interviewees confirmed my suggestion that in contemporary Ukraine such festival is impossible, because of the effect it had both on the participants (artists) and the audience. In this chapter I will try to describe this festival and to analyze what was its purpose and intention implied by young intellectuals as organizers, and how it is correlated with the whole field of cultural production in Ukraine and its changes, particularly in Lviv of the late 80s. My aims is to show that “Vyvykh-90” is not an exception, but a part of the process of transformations and at the same time the unique historical event in which the individual creative projects and intentions combined with unique situation of collapse of the totalitarian state. At first I will outline a picture of the festival in chronological order basing on the interviews with its coordinators and participants.

Considering a substantial scale of the festival (at least when you hear the list of events from organizers and participants) it seems to be oriented towards the broad public. But the festival’s full name was “The First Youth Festival “Vyvykh-90” and its newspaper as well as articles in the press clearly claim it as the student or generally youth festival. Due to its objective – to get the young people to take part in it – the director and coordinators elaborated the program and the mode of the festival which was quite a novelty for broad public in Ukraine and the USSR. The main unexpectedness was that the alternative literature, art, music and other genres which did not fit into the concept of arts

⁹⁷ Vyvykh, Spetsvypusk “Profspilkovogo Visnyka” (Twist. Special Issue of the Trade-union’s Herald)

in the USSR and also in the traditional nationalist concept of art. These arts were previously considered as underground and something *Unheimlich* (strange) and displaced (in terms of psychoanalysis) from the Soviet reality, and now they became a public event.

Festival “*Vyvykh-90*” took place in Lviv during 3 days on May 25 – 27 1990. It was organized by Studentske Bratstvo with its head Markiyan Ivashchyshyn and young intellectuals which were ‘around’ it. At that time Lviv already had a local council with majority of Ukrainian nationalists oppositional to the Soviet regime and Vyacheslav Chornovil as a head of the council. Serhiy Proskurnya, the director of “*Vyvykh-90*” and by that time he had already been a director of the first festival of Ukrainian alternative music “*Chervona Ruta*” (Chernivtsi, 1989) which was very popular in the whole Ukraine. Proskurnya was in good relationships with Chornovil and this might have also played an important role for starting to work on the idea of the festival. Vlodko Kostyrko tells about his personal talent and at the same time the status of the well-known director at that time that allowed Proskurnya “to go the cabinets and to make arrangements”⁹⁸. Many artists also mention that it was the cooperation of the Komsomol and alternative artists since one of them had resources and the other had ideas and could make young people come on the festival⁹⁹.

The “legend” of the festival (which was a starting point in nearly all interviews) tells that Proskurnya was inspired by the “game” or rather permanent performance of the milieu of young people (Ivashchyshyn, Kostyrko, Petrenko, Patyk, etc) invented by two student girls. It was a kind of tale about the girls who were Moors (Mavry), the Green and Black ones, and their king (Ivashchyshyn) and they ruled each who made a special gesture

⁹⁸ Vlodko Kostyrko, interview by the author, digital recording, 7 April 2008

⁹⁹ Ibid.

that meant that you are becoming “barmatsutsa”, their subject¹⁰⁰. Barmatsutsa as a twisted lion was a symbol of a festival. Their roles was a basis for the private performances with reading poetry (court poets), singing songs (court musician), etc. The festival which needed a lot of money and organization efforts could hardly originate from this funny entertainment. But at the same time the idea of the festival might have been born during informal communication and parties at which they discussed various crazy ideas and only some of them were realized¹⁰¹. The other part of the story about the origins of “Vyvykh-90” is told by Proskurnya, and it took place in a train Kyiv-Lviv in which he was traveling together with poets and they were having fun. There for the first time somebody (“it does not matter who”¹⁰²) told the word “Vyvykh-90” was where in one The main thing which emphasize the organizers of the festival is that it was a collective idea, something like a *Zeitgeist*, it was a product of all the milieu, of the “imagined community” of the young generation of intellectuals.

The core of the initiative group made informal arrangements with the artists and participants. The artists (Kostyrko, Kokh, Kaufman) decorated the stage and made a lot of the placards which hang out on the streets of the city. Their work was not a kind of order and they were not restricted about the form and content. The placards were an extreme parody and mocking the Soviet propaganda (see illustrations), also named as *stiob* which can be considered as a Soviet (post-Soviet) phenomenon of “performative shift”¹⁰³ similar to mocking or rather to pastiche¹⁰⁴. Conglomeration of Soviet slogans and visual elements that are mixed with new elements of the elements of the mass culture (Soviet star with horrifying Cossak face, man and woman who looked like punks whose pose is copying the statue of a worker and a peasant woman, etc), slang, etc were quite clear political

¹⁰⁰ It seems that the name ‘barmatsuts’ comes from a Soviet cartoon of the late 70s.

¹⁰¹ Markiyan Ivashchyshyn, interview by the author, digital recording, 21 April 2008

¹⁰² Serhiy Proskurnya, interview by the author, digital recording, 27 April 2008

¹⁰³ Yurchak 249-250

¹⁰⁴ The term of Frederic Jameson that means “blank parody” that does not have a humor of parody.

proclamation and the deconstruction of the Soviet ideology (“we wanted people to loose piety to Lenin”¹⁰⁵) and at the same time the aim was not to be political and ideological, but to present the new language and concept of arts using a striking images which could not be misinterpreted. Not an obsession with Soviet visual images made artists use them (“I would not paint Lenin for my self, I had other things to paint”¹⁰⁶), but at that time painting in a way that was prohibited before was the straightest path to popularity.

Advertisements of the festival in the local newspapers and placards called for young talents to be participants. Most of the activities were presented as competitions, in which could take part “agitational brigades, choirs, symphonic orchestras, capellas of accordionists, academic opera and ballet theatres, choreographic groups, amateur collectives of ore mining and processing enterprises, punk bands of Suvorov military schools, ...”¹⁰⁷, but in the most popular part, the concerts, only groups which passed the selection of the committee could participate. The data is quite different in numbers, but still all the participants say that all the events were crowded, especially the music concerts where popular bands took part.

The press-conference of the organizers was an integral part of the festival. It was the only event which the main sponsor, the head of the “Plastyk” (“Plastic”) factory Volodymyr Mykhalchenko visited¹⁰⁸. During the press-conference people asked the questions, for example, about the production of condoms, and the following theatrical sketches by the actors with enormous attached genitals (the names of the scenes were “The Results of the Perestroika”, “The Blowing Kisses”, etc) was a bit shocking for the people outside the milieu of the festival. In fact, “*Vyvykh-90*” is related to the first Lviv alternative theaters “*Ne zhurys*” (“Don’t Worry”) and “*Kryva Lyufa*” (“Curved Barrel”)

¹⁰⁵ Vlodko Kostyrko, interview by the author, digital recording, 7 April 2008

¹⁰⁶ Ibid

¹⁰⁷ Placard of *Vyvykh*.

¹⁰⁸ It was a funny story told by Markiyan Ivashchyshyn about his job at “Plastyk” (which lasted only two months), during which he convinced the head to give money for the festival, but just after it he was fired.

which performed musical and parody shows with prevailing elements of ideological mocking and sexuality. and Regardless the words of Proskurnya that it was in the course of traditions (in this certain case of antique theatre) and his general statement that they did not intended to make any epatage, the effect of using visual and verbal erotic material in the Soviet times is reached only when there are people who consider it a scandal. That was one of the ways for the young intellectuals to declare the freedom.

During the next three days the festival took place in Bohdan Khmelnytskyi park. On one of alleys there was held a contest for the best drawing. The artists of “Vyvykh-90” could not recall any significant works, except the winner of this competition. It was a 12-years old boy Yurko Duda who was a brother of one of Mavras, and Kostyrko found out that he had some funny pictures of Lenin and arranged his exhibition¹⁰⁹. Now Yurko tells that “at 12 years there could be no ideology ... I was just making some funny things about Lenin”¹¹⁰. He was the ‘author’ of the placard, changing only the slogan on the well-known Soviet propaganda placard from the time of civil war, which originally asked “Did you enroll to volunteer?” As a symbol of “Vyvykh-90” it got a new interpretation: “Are you moskal’[Russian]”¹¹¹. “For us it always meant namely this”, jokes Kostyrko.

Broad public also took part in the contest for the best anecdote¹¹². The stage was designed as a cage or rather prison cell, and participants had to go inside and stay locked there with a jury. After the jury (called ‘troika’) listened the anecdote, they made a verdict – to keep a competitioner in the cell or to release, and the policeman in uniform was bringing out the participants one by one. Freedom was a punishment in this case that reflected a reversed and twisted reality. There was a contest for the best sketch and beauty

¹⁰⁹ The next Vyvykh in 1992 the prize got also a boy, who drew on asphalt the composition which consisted of tryzub (Ukrainian national coat of arms), vodka-glass and heart.

¹¹⁰ Yurko Duda, interview by the author, digital recording, 19 April 2008

¹¹¹ Moskal is Ukrainian derogatory word for Russians.

¹¹² The competition was named after Volobuyev, but I do not see any clear connection between the Soviet Ukrainian economist who dared to challenge Kremlin in 1920s and the competition.

contest named “KDB”, Koroleva De-Biliv (The Queen of Morons) that refers to Ukrainian translation of the acronym “KGB”. The contest has got name after the verse by Viktor Neborak. The contest was not regular one – the girls had to make something shocking and extraordinary with their appearance. Some people say that the winner was a man, and he was very good in his woman role and appearance that one could hardly find out that he was a man, but the others say that he did not get a prize since it would be against the rules (it is hard to believe that it would be against the rules of “*Vyvykh-90*”).

The concerts were performed on the stadium “Yunist” (“Youth”) in the park. The singers and bands which took part in the opening and closing of the festival were already well-known for the youth auditory, since they had a few concerts on stadiums in Lviv during the last years. In Lviv in 1989 - 90 alternative bands and singers began to perform an alternative music (from rock and punk to bards) on large-scale concerts, sometimes with Polish bands¹¹³. But it was mostly Lviv groups and the idea of the organizers was to gather the bands from the other parts of Ukraine to make “*Vyvykh-90*” not a regional festival, but an event for the whole country.

The most interesting part of the festival is “The Awakening of Poetry” which was held on the last day of the festival in Lviv Opera House at 8 am in the morning. One should remember that at that time it was Ivan Franko State Academic Theatre of Opera and Ballet, the symbol of the ‘high’ Soviet culture and its producers and intellectuals. On the placard, made by Kostyrko, the Opera House is upturned and put in a breaker, and the inscription tells that “poezoaction” will include “besides awakening ... also taking off, pelting, throwing over and eating a poetry”¹¹⁴ (in Ukrainian it makes a word play)¹¹⁵. This

¹¹³ Like the concert on October 14, 1989, at which performed “Braty Gadyukiny”, Vika, Taras Chubay, etc and Polish Lady-Punk, Kombi, Papa Dance.

¹¹⁴ “Крім прокидання, ... також скидання, закидання, перекидання і з’їдання поезії”

¹¹⁵ Writing about that “awakening” Yuri Andrukhovych, one of the poets who was reading poetry at that morning shows one more ironic linguistic aspect: “In today’s slang it [the word ‘прокидатися’] means

performance is an interesting example of mix of creativity of the young intellectuals and the particular situation in the USSR at that time, therefore, I will describe it in details trying to include all the voices and different vision of it.

The “Awakening” was a creation of Serhiy Proskurnya who already made a few productions in travesty genre and he emphasizes that it was always his ‘organic culture’ which comes from Rabelais and other traditions of European and Ukrainian burlesque and travesty¹¹⁶. It was a part of the whole “*Vyvykh-90*” as “carnival mystery”, and “Awakening” can be considered as its catharsis. The intrigue is about practical aspect which seems incredible from the current point of view – how could the alternative director rent the Opera House for festival “*Vyvykh-90*” and to make a shocking performance there at 8 a.m. in the Soviet times, even if it was 1990? Nobody gives an exact answer, but the general explanation is that it was a period when the power was passing to the opposition, and in such situation everything depended on a certain person of an official. Markiyan Ivashchyshyn jokes (or not) that Proskurnya bribed someone who was in charge of the Opera with a bottle of hard liqueur that was a regular form of bribe under Soviet time, and mentions that people at that time supported the activities of the opposition in Lviv and helped with many practical issues¹¹⁷. It seems to be only a part of the story, and the next one is political context and purpose of “*Vyvykh-90*” to which I will turn later.

Proskurnya does not tell what he remembers, but he creates a verbal representation of that performance. The cast is the poetic groups “Bu-Ba-Bu” (Yuri Andrukhovych, Oleksandr Irvanets, Viktor Neborak), LuHoSad (Ivan Luchuk, Nazar Honchar, Roman Sadlovskiy), and Propala Hramota (The Lost Charter) of Yurko Pozayak, Viktor Nedostup and Semen Lybon, and one ‘single’ Volodymyr Tsubulko. All of them at that time were

something else, that is why now one can interpret this action as we really shafted [прокинули] the poetry” (Andrukhovych, Yuri. *Tajemnyca*. [The Secret] – Kharkiv, 2006. p. 122.

¹¹⁶ Serhiy Proskurnya, interview by the author, digital recording, 27 April 2008

¹¹⁷ Markiyan Ivashchyshyn, interview by the author, digital recording, 21 April 2008

well-known (among the Ukrainian speaking auditory) and consecrated authors, but the Writes Union did not influence on creating their own style during the late 80s. The first scene of action is the hotel near the Opera House where poets celebrate the birthday of Tsybulko drinking vodka during the whole night. At the same time Proskurnya and Yevhen Lysyk, prominent scene-painter who worked in many operas in the USSR¹¹⁸, created decorations which aim was to impress the audience. They took all the beds which were in the theatre – “starting from sham sofa a la rococo from La traviata to a two-layered prison bunk”¹¹⁹ and installed decorations from the Romantic Ukrainian operas. “It must be a soft dawn. .. Ukrainian village, painted Ukrainian houses, paradise, pink light, idyll”¹²⁰. But it is not enough, and they took all the artificial flowers and fasten them to beds – “and now everything is blossoming... crashing kitsch is on the stage”.

Proskurnya took away the drunken poets to the Opera House, they lay down on beds and fall asleep. “We tried to sleep, because we were sure that nobody would come”¹²¹. “Beautiful morning, the poets are sleeping and my assistant takes a box of beer on the stage. And I say: “Guys wake up, now you will be reading verses”¹²². The next part is described in Andrukhovych’s novel:

At eight in the morning the public was allowed to come inside. A few minutes past eight the curtain was raised – and we were waking up one by one of the footlights. The hall is full! 8 am, Sunday and the hall is full! Everybody saw how the sleep of poets produced monsters. And these monsters gradually stood up, pushed the other monsters on the nearby beds.¹²³

¹¹⁸ Evgen Lysyk was already 60 years old and fatally ill at that time, and it was his last project in the Opera.

¹¹⁹ Serhiy Proskurnya, interview by the author, digital recording, 27 April 2008

¹²⁰ Ibid.

¹²¹ Viktor Neborak, interview by the author, digital recording, 22 April 2008

¹²² Serhiy Proskurnya, interview by the author, digital recording, 27 April 2008

¹²³ Yuri Andrukhovych, *Tajemnycja*. [The Secret] – Kharkiv, 2006. p. 122

Yurko Pozayak opens his beer and utters “the first political phrase which sounded on the stage of Academic Theatre of Opera and Ballet” which was a kind of obscene popular proverb. The audience was in ecstasy”¹²⁴. Again Andrukhovych:

One of the monsters jumped off the upper tier of the soldier metal bed, greeting the present ladies and gentlemen with a hint on his nude bum, and began to read with a parched mouth. It took nearly an hour – we absolutely did not arrange anything in advance and we really had a hangover, and it is not a game, but at the same time it is a game... At 9 sleepy people begun lazily to fill the orchestral pit. We found out who they are and what they do only after Pozayak read his verse till the end: ... “Life is a good shit, They will play you Beethoven yet”. Conductor's baton flaps in the pit. The orchestra rumbles the first part of the Fifth. ... We had time to pass the last round and to read one verse each, it sounds absolutely blasphemous to Beethoven, but luckily, everything has its end. The public applauds and happy with the idea that early bird catches a good poetry¹²⁵

All the poets admit that they did not arrange the sequence and it seems that this was an improvisation. It had the idea of improvisation and shock of the audience as its core, since “Awakening of Poetry” opposed the high-culture ‘literary soiree’ organized by Writers Union with concrete scenario. Here the young intellectuals aimed to manifest themselves as contenders which are to remove the old Soviet elite and to take up the field of cultural production. To make this performance in the Opera House was a challenge itself. “It was staged for success, resonance. ... This action impressed by its impudence. It was a shock, shocking therapy”¹²⁶. Pozayak says that the theatre was packed not with the young people, but with “Lviv intelligentsia”¹²⁷, but it is hardly possible that they constitute a thousand people, even if the interest to alternative Ukrainian culture (which meant simply anti-Soviet for a broad public that did not know their works) was quite strong and people might have come without knowing exactly what to expect, but their reaction was enthusiastic.

¹²⁴ Serhiy Proskurnya, interview by the author, digital recording, 27 April 2008

¹²⁵ Yuri Andrukhovych, *Tajemnyca*. [The Secret] – Kharkiv, 2006. p. 122

¹²⁶ Serhiy Proskurnya, interview by the author, digital recording, 27 April 2008

¹²⁷ Pozayak. Proskurnya tells about Ihor Kalynets who came earlier to take a good seat since he expected that the hall would be overcrowded.

There are many examples of different perceptions of the festival. Kaufman and Neborak mention such anonymous people who criticized festival for its dissoluteness and also for irony and mocking the Ukrainian traditional nationalism and its ideology and symbols. But the next turn of irony is misinterpretation of such ironic and kitsch, like in case of the performance “UKRAINE - RUIN” (this is a play of words build on a crucial concept of Ukrainian traditional historiography) which was a break-dance and in its final each dancer turned their backs with the letters on them and formed this phrase, and the people seems to be taking it too seriously or without ironic effect¹²⁸. The other example is the song of the girl which came on a stage with a lot of Soviet orders and began to sing a song in traditional folk style, and people joined in this song¹²⁹. There were a few more ironic performances like putting together sickle and hammer and Ukrainian flag or Kostyrko’s idea of making a badge with Lenin’s bust on Ukrainian flag. Lyubko Petrenko states that they already were making strob on the nationalist ideology which was coming to power¹³⁰.

Despite this emphatic irony on the concepts of traditional nationalism, there is nothing so astonishing in the fact that “Vyvykh-90” was supported by the sixties intellectuals of and political leaders which were coming to power. The absolute absence of obstructions (comparing to the “Chervona Ruta” festivals in late 1989 when police beat a few dozens of people¹³¹) demonstrates that the situation had been dramatically changed. The first surprise is the speech of the major of Lviv Bohdan Kotyk on the opening of the festival in the park¹³². Regardless to the content of the festival, the authorities supported it, because the festival was to develop Ukrainian language and culture, and that seems to be

¹²⁸ Serhiy Proskurnya, interview by the author, digital recording, 27 April 2008

¹²⁹ Vlodko Kostyrko, interview by the author, digital recording, 7 April 2008

¹³⁰ It seems to be rather overinterpretation from the current prospective. At least most of the interviewees deny disillusionment and criticism of the Ukrainian political oppositional movement.

¹³¹ Serhiy Arkhynchuk. Monolog (Monologue). In: *Postup* [Progress], 2.10. 1989.

¹³² Nobody recalled this fact, but the major is on the one of the private photos from the festival.

enough for its support. The Ukrainian nationalist opposition which came to power in Lviv was using their power due to the old schemes of personal arrangements to help young intellectuals to realize their projects (organization and other practical issues). As Ivashchyshyn states, Studentske Bratstvo did not have any rupture with older dissidents and political leaders at that time¹³³, and it would be a year later when Oleksandr Kryvenko wrote his editor's column full of sad disappointment with the policy of Chornovil.

Proskurnya defines the main idea of the festival as following: "Media were not so active at that time, it was necessary to bring certain ideas to young people. So, besides the pathetic actions, demonstrations, etc which took place every day, we suggested the other form for the youth, .. to speak about freedom in the language of the youth culture"¹³⁴. Within these broad political and cultural purposes, the festival had a more specific one which again reveals the ambiguity of conflict and common activities and projects of the young intellectuals and elder ones: "They [people of 60s in politics] needed us as stimuli, because they promoted their political business, and they needed youth crowds"¹³⁵. Tsybulko has the similar vision: "The idea of "Vyvykh-90" was to bring together "kontryky"¹³⁶ [counter-culture artists] and to form a few fronts". The other one was "Chervona Ruta" which combined both alternative rock bands and pop singers, but at that time there was a slight difference between these festivals.

"The mass genres are very important in the period of mass psychosises", points Volodymyr Tsybulko. Assigned for students and youth, "Vyvykh-90" is considered to be a "mass" festival, and the position of the organizers is quite clearly stated in one of the newspapers: "From the very beginning we would like to ask you bear in mind that our festival in any case is not a opposition to such festivals as "Chervona Ruta", "Oberig",

¹³³ Markiyan Ivashchyshyn, interview by the author, digital recording, 21 April 2008

¹³⁴ Serhiy Proskurnya, interview by the author, digital recording, 27 April 2008

¹³⁵ Ibid. But in fact the political opposition gathered many times larger crowds than Vyvykh.

¹³⁶ This term was used by the Soviet propaganda concerning counterrevolutionaries and later dissidents.

“Zoloty Lev”¹³⁷. On the contrary, we think that our “Vyvykh-90” should be continuing this row. Of course, .. “Vyvykh” is opposing .. to official culture... which was very effective in unification of nations and transforming them into a “new historical unity”¹³⁸. Ukrainian language was obligatory for “Vyvykh-90”, and it was the only condition of participation, but in fact it was not a big problem since a lot of the bands were actually not using words in their songs¹³⁹. To oppose and contrast to the Soviet pop culture was the prior aim of the festival.

The young intellectuals who were trying to get the positions on the field of cultural production reckoned mostly on the youth auditory as they wanted to be a new avant-guard which comes as a power of youth to wipe ‘sovok’ and at the same time they could hardly expect that the other groups would accept their aesthetics. The whole special issue of the “Vyvykh-90” leaflet is directed to the students and youth as well all the articles and advertisements of the festival. In one of the articles alternative culture seems to be oriented towards the intellectuals with definitions like “young creative Ukrainian” or “independent thinking and without complexes”¹⁴⁰. Therefore, the mass character of the festival at the same time means that was the festival was assigned towards the young intellectuals which were not consumers of the Soviet pop [popsa]. This ambiguity is one of the main characteristics of the cultural products by the young intellectual of “Vyvykh-90”.

The key word which defines the ‘supply’, i.e. the cultural product, of the young intellectuals is freedom in its all possible modes. All the interviewees define the festival as freedom, and in a sense of victory in their words. The word “anarchy” is also often used as its feature. The freedom was a new exciting experience both for artists and public. The first

¹³⁷ These last two festivals were rather folk traditional ones.

¹³⁸ Zaproshennya na Festyval. (Invitation to the Festival). In: *Moloda Halychyna* [Young Galicia], 20.05.1990.

¹³⁹ Vlodko Kostyrko, interview by the author, digital recording, 7 April 2008. He says that metal and punk bands were singing “like a fish”.

¹⁴⁰ “Chetver – Zhurnal dlya Modernistiv” (“Chetver – Journal For Modernists”). In: *Moloda Halychyna* [Young Galicia], 10.05.1990.

could create without any rules and it was their freedom which was considered to be novelty on the contrary to the previous cultural products which were created according to some rules and ideology. Freedom as a creative principle was the main symbolic capital of young intellectuals. The large audience of the “Vyvykh-90” converts the freedom of marginal group which creates for its narrow milieu into the freedom as a mode of life of young people which expressed it by their behavior and appearance which fitted the festival.

The young intellectuals presented epatage obscenities, sexuality, alcohol abuse, reversed ideological symbols and concepts, as well as the Western masscult as an alternative to the previous ideological and moral values that determine the field of cultural production¹⁴¹. It means the turn to the ‘demand’ of the broad public and refers to the general definition of postmodern that wipes the distinction between the ‘high’ and ‘low’ culture and transforming it into a masscult. It was an obsession with kitsch as a reaction of the former ideological pressure. Parallel existence of ideology made their difference very clear and sharp. The “carnival” which was a key word for “Vyvykh-90” (for those who already read Bakhtin¹⁴² at that time) is a masscult that uses namely sexuality and obscenity and all kinds of abuse and perversions as its anti-ideological (anti-clerical in Bakhtin’s work) means for emancipation of the individual. The carnival as a splash of mass genres implies also the reconsideration of the role, objective and position of the intellectual in the ‘carnival’ society.

“The rupture of the swelling” – that is one more definition of “Vyvykh-90” by Vlodko Kaufman which considers it rather in terms of “anarchy of consciousness” (and I would add also unconsciousness here) than arts¹⁴³. For many people freedom means “to

¹⁴¹ For details see: Tamara.Hundorova. *Pislyachornobylska Biblioteka*. [Library after Chornobyl] Kyiv, 2005. p. 71-82.

¹⁴² Proskurnya and Neborak state that Bakhtin was already well-known in their circle, but it seems that most of Lviv artist did not know about his works.

¹⁴³ Vlodko Kaufman, interview by the author, digital recording, 8 April 2008

draw a dunghill and genitals, to write obscene words”¹⁴⁴. He refers to the people who were participants in “*Vyvykh-90*” drawing contest and also to those who write and draw such things on walls, but one can easily find that it is also concerns the field of cultural production. In the situation when everything is permitted and at the same time there are no resources (support of the state and sponsors) for the projects that need time and money, the easiest way to gain fame is to make epatage actions and themes of sexuality and obscenity.

Looking through Lviv Soviet newspapers of 1990-91 there is an evident shift from the moral and medical descriptions of some aspects of family relations to the clear interest (“of our readers”) to both the erotica and sexuality. During that time one after another the exhibitions of nude women began to work with a huge attendance. My interviewees recalled a few other stories which illustrate the interest to such products. In case of “*Vyvykh-90*” sexuality was one of the main themes, but it is always ironic ‘deconstruction’ of sexuality of a ‘natural’ and putting it into the field of relations between power and ideology. From the beauty contest “KDB” to erotic sketches “The Results of Perestrioka” and later to the articles in *Post-Postup* like “Putsch and Sex”, and rubrics “Intimate Advices of Mr. Lyzunchak” and “The School of Love”¹⁴⁵ the sexuality becomes a mode of ironic speaking about the politics as the two obsessions of the late perestroika and first independent years.

In fact, the contest and its criteria follow the ideas of avant-garde of the first half of the twentieth century (Marcel Duchamp, Russian constructivists, pop-art, etc) which were already not a novelty and at all for Western artists. Isolated from the Western art and humanities, the young intellectuals were making a belated art revolution. In one of the newspapers Ivashchyshyn was asked such a question “After the first “*Vyvykh*” my opinion was that it is a defloration of our complexes. – Yes. In the West it would not be considered

¹⁴⁴ Vlodko Kaufman, interview by the author, digital recording, 8 April 2008

¹⁴⁵ See: *Post-Postup* [Post-Progress], #12-14, 1991

as something extraordinary. But in our society it was excelled among the other events...”¹⁴⁶. The concept of backwardness (in psychological terms of ‘complexes’) of the Ukrainian field of cultural production is one more discursive formation that is in the focus of the young intellectuals. The backwardness include the ethical and ideological judgment of the work of art and other features of both Soviet and traditional nationalists ideologies.

Thus, the mission of the young intellectuals was to make the whole society free from these remains of the totalitarian ideological system. As there were a lot of people who considered their actions and works as “cynicism of the youth and cultural hooliganism”¹⁴⁷ and publicly criticized them¹⁴⁸, this made the dividing line between ‘old’ and ‘young’ generations gradually more clear. Later the young intellectuals adopted the term ‘postmodernism’ which envelop all their previous activities and boheme style of life opposing it to the ‘rustical’ and ‘farmer’ [khutoryanstvo] of the traditional cultural producers¹⁴⁹.

At the time of “Vyvykh-90” the artists like Kokh and Kostyrko did not any idea about postmodernism, and only poets and Proskurnya have already read Bakhtin about carnival¹⁵⁰. The young intellectuals turned to mass genres not because of the theory, but in the situation of the mass movements and mass actions they had a chance to become popular without relaying on the Unions which were reluctant to publishing, exhibiting and promoting them. Mark Andryczyk analyses the case of Bu-Ba-Bu group as a transformation of a poet into a rock star¹⁵¹. Literature performance (which appears in the

¹⁴⁶ “Vyvykh Zhyvyi, Vyvykh Bude Zhyty” (Vyvykh is Alive, Vyvykh will be Alive). In: *Post-Postup* [Post-Progress], #4, 1991

¹⁴⁷ Viktor Neborak, interview by the author, digital recording, 22 April 2008

¹⁴⁸ For exact names and examples see; Tamara Hundorova. *Pislyachornobylska Biblioteka*. [Library after Chernobyl] Kyiv, 2005. p. 68-68

¹⁴⁹ *Pleroma. Mala Entsyklopedia Aktualnoyi Ukraïnskoïi Literatury* [Pleroma. The Small Encyclopedia of the Relevant Ukrainian Literature]. No. 3. Ivano-Frankivsk, 2000. p. 117.

¹⁵⁰ That is why it seems to be non-relevant to use this term here and to analyze their ideas and practices due to postmodern theory.

¹⁵¹ Andryczyk, Mark. “Bu-Ba-Bu: Poetry and Performance”. In: *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, 1-2 (2002). p. 262.

late 80s) adopted of the rock'n'roll forms and imagery and also it often included performing the poetry by rock musicians. Young poets arrange public performances which were contrasting to the 'evenings of poetry' organized by the Union, and their aim is to gain popularity using new strategies and modes in their struggle for consecration.

All the cultural products (placards, performances, music, poetry, etc) on "*Vyvykh-90*" demonstrate their objective to be art for masses. "Our revolutionary character lay in a fact that we wanted to jump from hermetic poetry to the genres for much broader public"¹⁵². In the situation of the absence of market of the cultural production, the intellectuals who did not belong and aimed to destroy the non-market system of consecration in the field of cultural production and fulfilling the ideological demand of the state as the only way to this consecration were faced with an issue of reconsideration of the role and mission of intellectual in the post-Soviet society. The young intellectuals had to find new ways of gaining symbolic capital and competing in market economy and also determine their relations with politics and state. "*Vyvykh-90*" illustrates these reconsiderations and competition for consecration of their ideas and projects.

¹⁵² Viktor Neborak, interview by the author, digital recording, 22 April 2008

Conclusions

The aim of this thesis has been very ambitious: to analyze the intellectual life in Lviv in the late 80s and to explore the discourses and practices which shaped the transformations of that time. This aim is apparent in the whole thesis, but the mode to present these processes of transformation is the prospective of the festival of alternative culture “*Vyvykh-90*”, even if it was very difficult to establish frames and sometimes impossible not to step out of them. Analyzing “*Vyvykh-90*” and peculiarities of the field of cultural production eighteen years ago in Lviv I have been always bearing in mind the continuity of these processes, since one should always combine the prospective of the present and details that reveal the things which are wiped from our present vision of that time.

The starting point of my analysis was to explore the preconditions of the general situation of the late 80s in the interconnection of the cultural, social and political issues using the theoretical framework by Bourdieu. This approach outlines the picture of the Soviet Ukrainian field of cultural production, and highlights the groups of intellectuals that would play an important role in my further analysis of the late 80s. The intellectuals of the 60s presented the concept of Ukrainian language and culture as the historical and spiritual unity of the nation that becomes an ideology of the Ukrainian opposition movement in perestroika times. Consequently, this purpose of language and culture shapes the field of cultural production in the late 80s when the opposition was gradually coming to power.

The next group of young intellectuals which begun to appear in the field of cultural production from the mid-80s had quite different concepts and projects comparing with people of the 60s. They were oriented towards Western culture, especially rock music and literature (the latter appeared in translations at that time) and their concept of Ukrainian culture was not based on the definitions of the culture from the nationalism paradigm of the

beginning of the twentieth century. This group of intellectuals consider the difference between the sixties intellectuals and themselves as a rupture of generation. They represent an “imagined community” which is opposing to the Soviet cultural elite and at the same time also opposing to the sixties generation. Belonging to ‘generation’ converts the marginal artist or writer into a part of the powerful unity that presents itself as a peak of the iceberg of the people who are young, creative and want changes.

Promoting their ideas of change in all the spheres, especially, in the field of cultural production, the young intellectuals aimed to change this field through removing the previous system of consecration and ideological criteria of the works of art. Consequently, this meant to take the positions of the non-relevant cultural producers in the situation of ‘revolutionary’ changes which also demonstrated the substantial cultural ‘demand’ of the broad public for Ukrainian cultural products.

The informal milieu of this group was very creative and had a clear aim to promote their cultural products that resulted in many actions. As active participants of the political opposition, they supported the dissidents of the nationalist movement and the latter assisted with material and organizational issues for the concerts, festivals, etc, i.e. for the promotion of the young intellectuals. These actions correlate with political struggle between opposition and the regime, therefore, their general aim can be described by the one word “freedom” which is the key concept of that time. Another key objective was promotion of the Ukrainian language which was a common ground for united efforts and cooperation between traditional nationalist and young intellectuals. The latter did not break with folklore which was considered as a core for Ukrainian national identity for traditional nationalists (and in general culture itself was equate with folklore), but they gave a new interpretation of the folklore for contemporary Ukrainian culture.

The festival “*Vyvykh-90*” was one of the examples of the activities of the young intellectuals which illustrate all the above issues and reveals the further ones. “We were teasing the Soviet state”, tells the director of the festival Serhiy Proskurnya. It was assigned as a festival of alternative youth culture to promote the ideas of the young intellectuals and at the same it was in the course of political opposition headed by traditional nationalists. The festival was directed not only against Soviet ideology, but it was a ‘deconstruction’ of any ideology for the sake of new arts without ideological rules. “Anarchy” and “freedom”, but not “art” are the key word which is used to describe the festival. “Complexes” and “freedom” were other concepts to define the difference between generations, and the latter one was the main aesthetic value and symbolic capital of the young intellectuals in their struggle for consecration.

Opposing to the Soviet system of consecration, the young intellectuals resorted to the popularity as the new ruling principle of the field of cultural production. This turn is reflected in the works of the young intellectuals. Reverse Soviet ideology, slang and obscenities, sexuality, kitsch, etc – that is the striking features of the works of participants of “*Vyvykh-90*” who were mostly the milieu of young intellectuals already consecrated in boheme circles and even in broad public. To present their works which seems to be already turned to the broad public, particularly youth, the artists invented new genres of performances and other mass action, like “*Vyvykh-90*”, to gain popularity. To speak about the serious issues in the language of irony, deliberate simplification and at the same time complicated ambivalence – that are the main principles of their works.

The transformation of the field of cultural production that was an aim of the young intellectuals also meant the reconsideration of the role and mission of the intellectual in the post-totalitarian society. The intellectual as a professional writer, artist, musician, director, etc, but not a politician, demagogue, or ideological worker – that was the main difference

that distinguish them from both sixties intellectuals and Soviet producers of ideological works. The idea of this young people was that new Ukrainian field of cultural production would free of ideological demands of the state in exchange for its material and symbolic support. In other words, they had a hope that free arts, like “*Vyvykh-90*” would replace the concept of culture as ideological tool of state policy.

Looking from the prospective of its reasonable critics, obsession with kitsch, sexuality and obscenities in ironic mode seems to displace the serious issues of the transitional post-totalitarian society. The social aspect of the festival, i.e. the change of the mass consciousness is manifested by its organizers, but “*Vyvykh-90*” could not rework it at once by means of demonstrating the unlimited freedom. The festival seems to be the desired threshold to be easily crossed, but the deliverance from the Soviet past in all the spheres of life could not be so easily wiped by rather simple “shocking therapy” (by words of Serhiy Proskyrnya) .

The above conclusions refer mostly not to the secondary literature about the intellectuals in the Soviet Union in general (on the contrary, the case Lviv contradicts some version of the intellectual life in late 80s in USSR), but to my interviews with the people who were coordinators and participants of “*Vyvykh-90*”. It was their contemporary interpretations and conclusions that prompted me many suggestions and ideas about that processes. They still consider themselves as alternative cultural elite, but not a consecrated one. The late 80s and its threshold are permanent topoi of their narrative (especially in public interviews and works) which is a starting point and at the same time the symbolic significance of their alternative position in the field of cultural production. They associate themselves with the alternative and freedom, alternative to the state which supports ideological production, to ‘popsa’ [low-quality masscult], to the sixties intellectuals and their adepts, in other words, they still consider themselves as a part of “*Vyvykh-90*”, i.e.

creative irregularity and search for new and alternative to mainstream. At the same time all of them already belong to cultural elite or at least professional and successive artist which cannot be considered as marginal, even if their auditory is many times less than the masscult one.

Rather small and even marginal group of the young intellectuals with its Lviv core had a project of large-scale and total changes, but their voice was not very strong and it has been almost shaded with the wide-spread picture of political struggle of dissidents with regime by means of declarations, meetings, etc. My aim was not to explore the final result of their competition for consecration of their ideas and works, but to present the one more collective portrait of the people who are not victims of the Soviet times, neither obsessed with the Soviet ideology nor with antagonism to it, and they had very bright plans for future. These people demonstrated significant intellectual skills and flexibility of mind to adapt to the new conditions after collapse of the USSR.

Still working on this thesis revealed many other relevant paths which should be taken into account when one tries to grasp and write the history of particular event and its context. The case of “*Vyvykh-90*” is not a sum of components, and even after analyzing and decomposing, following assembling them altogether, there is always something more which is not included. That reminds me about overdetermination in terms of Freud as an inherent part and result of every interpretation, thus festival “*Vyvykh-90*” is something more than its precondition, context, projects and results. Also this research as an interpretation of words, images, hints, silence, distortions, rhetoric, obscurity, discoveries reminds me a bit about “*The Interpretations of Dreams*”.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Periodicals

Bratstvo [Brotherhood], 1-4 (1989), 1-4 (1990) – Lviv

Lvovskaia Pravda [Lviv Truth] (1990) – Lviv

Leninska Molod [Lenin's Youth] (1990) – Lviv

Moloda Halychyna [Young Galicia] (1990) – Lviv

Moloda Ukrainina [Young Ukraine], 1-4 (1989), 5-11 (1990) – Lviv

Molod Ukrayiny [Youth of Ukraine] 01.04–26.06 (1990) – Kyiv

Nova Doba [Our Times] 1 (1989), 2 (1990) – Lviv

Postup [Progress] 1-14 (1989), 1-7 (1991) – Lviv

Post-Postup [Post-Progress] 1-14 (1991) – Lviv

Ratusha [City Hall] 02.10–28.12 (1990) – Lviv

Spadshchyna [Legacy] 1-2 (1989), 1-9 (1990) – Lviv

Vilna Ukryina [Free Ukraine] 1990-1991 – Lviv

Viche [Popular Assembly] 1-3 (1989), 3-16 (1990) – Lviv

Vyvykh, Spetsvypusk "Profspilkovogo Visnyka" [Twist. Special Issue of the Trade-union's Herald] 20 (25.05.1990) – Lviv

Za Vilnu Ukrayinu [For Free Ukraine] 1.07-28.12 (1990) – Lviv

Oral interviews by author

Krystyna Duda, Lviv, digital recording, 19 April 2008

Yurko Duda, Lviv, digital recording, 19 April 2008

Markiyan Ivashchyshyn, Lviv, digital recording, 21 April 2008

Vlodko Kaufman, Lviv, digital recording, 20 April 2008

Yurko Kokh, Lviv, digital recording, 8 April 2008

Vlodko Kostyrko, Lviv, digital recording, 7 April 2008

Viktor Neborak, Lviv, digital recording, 22 April 2008

Ostap Patyk, Lviv, digital recording, 20 April 2008

Lyubko Petrenko, Lviv, digital recording, 17 April 2008

Yurko Prokhasko, Lviv, digital recording, 23 April 2008

Yurko Pozayak, Kyiv, digital recording, 24 April 2008

Serhiy Proskurnya, Kyiv, digital recording, 27 April 2008

Volodymyr Tsybulko, Kyiv, digital recording, 24 April 2008

Published primary sources

Anthologies

Andrukhovych, Yurii. *Taiemnytsya*. [The Secret]. Kharkiv, 2006.

Bu-Ba-Bu. Antolohiia [An Anthology]. Lviv, 2007.

Pleroma. Mala Entsyklopedia Aktualnoi Ukrainiskoi Literatury [Pleroma. The Small

Encyclopedia of the Relevant Ukrainian Literature]. No. 3. Ivano-Frankivsk, 2000.

Bu-Ba-Bu. T.v.o./../ry [Bu-Ba-Bu. Works]. Lviv, 1995.

Kryvenko, Oleksandr, and Volodymyr Pavliv. *Entsyklopediia Nashogo Ukrainoznavstva*.

[Encyclopedia of Our Ukrainian Studies]. Kyiv, 1997.

Berdykhovska, Bohymila and Olia Hnatyuk, eds. *Bunt Pokolinnia* [Rebellion of the Generation]. Kyiv, 2004.

Interviews

Interview with Vlodko Kaufman –

<<http://prokultura.com.ua/gallery/10.html?page=1&sym=K>>. Last visited at 18.05.2008.

Pozayak, Yurko “Inteligentnyi huligan Yurko Pozayak” [Intellectual Hooligan Yurko Pozayak]. In: *Ratusha* (07.10.2004) –

<<http://portal.lviv.ua/digest/2004/10/07/133117.html>>. Last visited at 15.05.2008.

Hrytsak, Yaroslav „Sashkove pokolinnya” [Sashko’s Generation] –

<<http://www.zaxid.net/article/16745/>>. Last visited at 28.05.2008.

Ivashchysyn, Markiyan. “My buly dostatnyo tsynichni...” [We’ve been cynical enough]. In: *Postup* [Progress], 5.10.2000.

Ivashchysyn, Markiyan. “My otrymaly rozuminnia nashoyi misiyyi v suspilstvi...” [We obtained understanding from the society]. In: *Lvivska Gazeta* [Lviv’s Newspaper], 19.06.2007.

Kaufman, Vlodko. “Lviv mystetskyi” [Artists’ Lviv] –

<<http://www.zaxid.net/article/11911/>>. Last visited at 18.05.2008.

Kaufman, Vlodko. “Shanuyu talanovytykh trudoholikiv...” [I Respect artists obsessed with work..]. In: *Vysoky Zamok* [High Castle], 12.06.2007 –
<http://vlodkaufman.com.ua/press/04.html>. Last visited at 18.05.2008.

Kaufman, Vlodko. “Vyvykhnutyi dzugar” [Twisted clock]. In: *Ukrayina Moloda* [Young Ukraine], 30.03.2007.

- Kokh, Yurko. “Shchob vydobuty z knyzhky tsymus..” [To get the essence of a book...]. In: Ratusha [City Hall], 20.05.2004 – <http://portal.lviv.ua/digest/2004/05/20/134038.html>. Last visited at 15.05.2008.
- Kostyrko, Vlodko. “Chukhrayinstvo” [Ukrainians]. In: *Postup* [Progress], 25.09.2001 – <http://www.ji.lviv.ua/n23texts/kostyrko-146.htm>. Last visited at 14.05.2008.
- Kostyrko, Vlodko “Nostalgija, abo EX ORIENTE TENEBRIS” [Nostalgie or ex oriente tenebris] – <http://www.zaxid.net/article/12706/>. Last visited at 15.05.2008.
- Kryvenko, Oleksandr. “Ukrayina Moja Marginalna” [My marginal Ukraine]. In: *Dzerkalo Tyzhnia* [Weekly Mirror], 17.05.2003.
- Moskalets, Kost. “Miy Son – Lviv” [Lviv, my dream] – <http://www.zaxid.net/article/15348/>. Last visited at 14.05.2008.
- Neborak, Viktor. “Bubabistskyi khronos Viktora Neboraka” [Bu-Ba-Bu Chronos of Viktor Neborak]. In: *Literatura plus* [Literature Plus], 9-10 (2001) – <http://www.aup.iatp.org.ua/litplus/lit34-35.php>. Last visited at 15.05.2008.
- Neborak, Viktor. “Ja vykliuchav nashyh divchat z komsomolu” [I expelled our girls from the komsomol] – <http://vsiknygy.net.ua/index.php?module=interview&id=280>. Last visited at 15.05.2008.
- Proskurnya, Serhy. “Lviv buv centrom dukhovnosti, rozvag ta spokusy” [Lviv was a centre of spirituality, fun and temptation] – <http://www.zaxid.net/article/3208/>. Last visited at 14.05.2008.
- Tsybulko, Volodymyr. “Taki yak Drach nagaduyut meni prostrochenu konservu” [Those like Drach reminds me of a spoiled canned fish] – <http://www.tsybulko.com.ua/article.php?articleID=3778>. Last visited at 15.05.2008.
- Zhezhera, Vitaly “Vyvykh, abo duzhe slushne dopovnennya” [Twist, or One Very Handy Addition]. In: *Perets* [Pepper], 01.06.1990.

“Zhyttja u Postupi” [Life in Postup]. (Interview with Sashko Kryvenko) –

<<http://www.kipiani.org/samizdat/index.cgi?245>>. Last visited at 12.01.2008.

Secondary sources:

Andryczyk, Mark. “Bu-Ba-Bu: Poetry and Performance”. In: *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, 1-2 (2002). p. 257-272.

Bahry, Romana. “Rock Culture and Rock Music in Ukraine”. In: Ramet, Sabrina ed. *Rocking the State: Rock Music and Politics in Eastern Europe and Russia*. Boulder, 1994.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Intimations of Postmodernity*. London, 1994.

Beissinger, Mark. “Event Analysis in Transitional Societies. Protest Mobilization in the Former Soviet Union”. In: Rucht, Dieter, Koopmans, Ruud, and Friedhelm Neidhardt, eds. *Acts of dissent: new developments in the study of protest*. Berlin, 1998.

Berdahl, Daphne, Matti Bunzl, and Martha Lampland, eds. *Altering states: ethnographies of transition in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union*. Ann Arbor, 2000.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Practical Reason*. Cambridge, 1998.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. Cambridge, 1993.

Braudel, Fernand. *On History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Coser, Lewis. “The Social Role of Eastern European Intellectuals Reconsidered”. In: Kilminster, Richard and Ian Varcoe, eds. *Culture, Modernity and Revolution: Essays in Honour of Zygmunt Bauman*. London, 1996.

Czaplicka, John, ed. *Lviv: a City in the Crosscurrents of Culture*. Cambridge, 2005.

- Daniel, Alexander. "Istoki i korni dissidentskoi aktivnosti v SSSR" [Roots and Origins of the Dissident Activity in USSR]. In: *Neprikosnovennyi zapas* [Untouched Supply], 1 (2002).
- Durnovo, Grigorii. "Orientatsiia v plastilinovoi vselennoi: (ne)sovetskii rok 1990 goda" [Orientation in the plasticine universe: (not)Soviet rock in 1990]. In: *NLO*, 83 (2007).
- Esler, Anthony, ed. *The Youth Revolution: The Conflict of Generations in Modern History*. Lexington, 1974.
- Fink, Carole, Gassert, Philipp, and Detlef Junker, eds. *1968: the World Transformed*. Cambridge, 1998.
- Forrester, Sibelan, Magdalena J. Zaborowska, and Elena Gapova, eds. *Over the wall / After the Fall: Postcommunist Cultures Through an East-West Gaze*. Bloomington, 2004.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. New York, 1972.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of Prison*. London, 1991.
- Foucault, Michel. "Politicheskaia funktsia intelektual" [The Political Function of an Intellectual]. In: Foucault, Michel. *Intellectualy i vlast' [Intellectuals and Power]*. Moscow, 2002.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Truth and Method*. London, 1993
- Geertz, Clifford. *Interpretation of Cultures*. New York, 1973.
- Hrycak, Alexandra. "The Coming of 'Chrysler Imperial': Ukrainian Youth and Rituals of Resistance". In: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 1-2 (1997).
- Hundorova, Tamara. "Bu-Ba-Bu", Karnaval i Kich [Bu-Ba-Bu, Carnival and Kitsch]. In: *Krytyka* [Critique], 7-8 (2000).
- Hundorova, Tamara. *Pislyachornobylska Biblioteka*. [Library after Chornobyl] Kyiv, 2005.
- Hunt, Lynn. *The New Cultural History*. Berkeley, 1989.

- Jameson, Fredric. *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. London, 1996.
- Karabel, Jerome. "Towards a Theory of Intellectuals and Politics" In: *Theory and Society*, 2 (1996).
- Kasianov, Georgiy. *Nezgodni: Ukrayinaska Intelligensia v Rusi Oporu 1960-80x rokiv*. [Dissidents: the Ukrainian Intelligentsia in the Opposition Movement, 1960-80s]. Kyiv, 1995.
- Kenney, Padraic. *A Carnival of Revolution*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.
- Kertzer, David. "Generation as a Sociological Problem". In: *Annual Review of Sociology*, 9 (1983).
- Koselleck, Reinhart. *Chasovi Plasty* [Time-Layers]. Kyiv, 2006.
- Kumar, Krishan. "The Revolutions of 1989 in East-Central Europe and the Idea of Revolution". In: Richard Kilminster and Ian Varcoe, eds. *Culture, Modernity and Revolution: Essays in Honour of Zygmunt Bauman*. London, 1996.
- Levada, Yurii and Theodore Shanin, eds. *Otsy i Deti: Pokolencheskii Analiz Sovremennoi Rossii* [Fathers and Sons: generational analysis of the Contemporary Russia]. Moscow, 2005.
- Luckyj George S. N. "The Ukrainian Literary Scene Today". In: *Slavic Review*, Vol. 31, 4, (1972). pp. 863-869
- Lysiak-Rudnytskyi, Ivan. *Istorychni Ese* [Historical Essays]. Kyiv, 1994.
- Maiofis, Mariia, and Ilia Kukulin. "Svoboda kak neosoznannyi element: zametki o transformatsii mediinogo polia v 1990 godu" [Freedom as unconscious element: notes on the transformation of the media field in 1990]. In: *NLO*, 83 (2007).
- Nora, Pierre. "Generation". In: Nora, Pierre, ed. *Realms of Memory*. Vol. 1. New York, 1996.

- Pavlyshyn, Marko. "Ukrainian Literature and the Erotics of Postcolonialism: Some Modest Propositions". In: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 1-2 (1993).
- Ries, Nancy *Russian Talk: Culture and Conversation during Perestroika*. Ithaca, 1997.
- Risch, William Jay. *Ukraine's Window to the West: Identity and Cultural Nonconformity in L'viv, 1953-1975*. Unpublished dissertation. Ohio State University, 2001.
- Romanov, Pavel, and Elena Iarskaia-Smirnova. "Sotsial'noe kak irratsionalnoe (Diagnozy 1990 goda)" [Social as Irrational (Diagnosis' of the 1990)]. In: *NLO*, 83 (2007).
- Rosenfeld, Alla and Norton T. Dodge, eds. *From Gulag to Glasnost: Nonconformist Art from the Soviet Union*. New York, 1995.
- Schuman, Howard, and Amy Corning. "Collective Knowledge of Public Events: The Soviet Era from the Great Purge to Glasnost". In: *The American Journal of Sociology*, 4 (2000).
- Uliura, Anna. "Mit'ki ne seksual'ny, ili Erotizatsiia 'pogranich'ia' obraztsa 1990 goda" [Mit'ki are not sexual, or erotization of the "borderland" of 1990]. In: *NLO*, 83 (2007).
- Yurchak, Alexei. *Everything was Forever, until It was no More: the Last Soviet Generation*. Princeton: 2006.
- Zayarnyuk, Andriy. "Povsyakdenna radyanskist postradyanskogo syogodennya" [Everyday Soviet motives of the post-Soviet nowadays]. In: *Krytyka*, 3 (2006).
- Zayarnyuk, Andriy. "Lviv iak ray dlia intelektualiv" [Lviv as a paradise for intellectuals]. In: *Krytyka*, 1-2 (2008).
- Zvereva, Vera. "Poetika sotsial'nogo na TV. 1990 god" [Poetics of social on TV. 1990]. In: *NLO*, 83 (2007).

Appendixes

Appendix 1.

Vlodko Kostyrko, “Vyvykh-90”, *Prokydannya Poezii* [Awakening of Poetry]



Appendix 2.

Yurko Kokh, "Vyvykh-90" poster, "Vidkrytyi Vyvykh" ["The Closing Concert of Vyvykh"]



Appendix 3.
Yurko Kokh, "Vyvykh-90" poster, Welcome



Appendix 4.

Yurko Kokh, "Vyvykh-90" poster, "Vyvykhy na Mistsyah" [Vyvykhs at Spots]



Appendix 5.

Yurko Kokh, "Vyvykh-90" poster, "Masshtabnyi Vyvykh" ["Large-Scale Vyvykh"]



Appendix 6.

Vlodko KOstyrko, "Vyvykh-90" poster, "Malyaskyi" ["Art Competition"]



Appendix 7.

Yurko Kokh, "Vyvykh-90" poster, *Koroleva Debiliv* [Queen of Morons]

