

Oleksii Rohotchenko

Doctor in Art Studies, senior researcher, leading researcher,  
Modern Art Research Institute of the National Academy  
of Arts of Ukraine

Олексій Роготченко

доктор мистецтвознавства, старший науковий співробіт-  
ник, головний науковий співробітник, Інститут проблем  
сучасного мистецтва НАМ України

тел. / tel: +380503583912 e-mail: rogotchenko@mari.kiev.ua orcid.org/0000-0003-4631-8260

## Civil Society as a Component Part of the Cultural Field of the State

### Громадянське суспільство як складова культурного поля держави

**Abstract.** The research focuses on the impact generated by civil society on the art processes taking place in totalitarian and post-totalitarian systems. The author states that social impact on creating or destructing of an artwork should be examined in detail. By the example of life story of the renowned Ukrainian monumental artists Ada Rybachuk and Volodymyr Melnychenko (ARVM—abbreviation for their initials) the author traces the development of state apparatus' intervention into the individual creative work of the artists. The proposed conclusions prove the fact that under the circumstances of totalitarian arbitrariness civil society does not play a leading role. The paper tells the tragic fate of the unique work of art—*The Wall of Memory*—constructed during 1968–1982 at the Baikove Cemetery in Kyiv. In 1982 the artwork was poured over with concrete. In 2018, following the intervention of civil society, 10 m2 of the artwork were uncovered.

**Keywords:** civil society, architecture, monumental art, Wall of Memory.

**Objectives of the study** are to research the processes of creation, demolishing and partial restoration of the unique piece of monumental art—*The Wall of Memory* (by Ada Rybachuk and Volodymyr Melnychenko) within the Park of Memory at the Baikove cemetery in Kyiv—and the role of civil society in the latter process.

**Analysis of recent research works and publications.** The list of academic publications since the 1980s through 2000s, where works of Ada Rybachuk and Volodymyr Melnychenko are the main or secondary theme, is rather scant. Their names are mentioned mainly in the research works on non-conformism. The scholars who did study ARVM were Galyna Sklyarenko, Glib Vysheslavskiy, Valeriy Sakharuk, Lesia Smyrna, Orest Holybets, Oleksiy Rohotchenko, and Eduard Dymshyts. Civil society as a cultural phenomenon in the context of artistic resistance was the subject of the research works by José Ortega y Gasset, Boris Groys, Vladimir Paperny. Specifically focused on the creative development of ARVM are the expert studies by Olga Petrova, Myroslav Popovych, and Lesia Smyrna. In 2017 Nataliya Gorova defended a Candidate's thesis “The Phenomenon of the Artistic Rebellion on the Ukrainian Cultural Scene of the second half of the 1950s—the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century (on the Example of Creative Work of Ada Rybatchouk and Vladimir Melnichenko)” at the Modern Art Research Institute. As of today, the latter is the most significant art

and culture study of the ARVM artistic career. The last (to date) publication on ARVM by Svitlana Rohotchenko—“The Wall. Revival”—was featured in *Fine Art* magazine in 2019 (No. 1).

**Presentation of the main research material.** Upon reflection on the interconnections between culture and society one inevitably comes to a conclusion that the dualism of relations between art and its consumer is awaiting its proper academic studying and defining. While omitting the whole universe of culture, starting with the cromlechs and menhirs, with the caves of Altamira and Font-de-Gaume and up to the latest to-date art project (which remained a project)—world's largest cargo aircraft, the Antonov An-225 Mriya, flying over Venice and casting a fleeting shadow over the Giardini della Biennale during the opening of its 58<sup>th</sup> installment—I choose to focus in studying the unstoppable pendulum of culture that swings from left to right, repeating the very same move for centuries. What directs the viewers' feelings in free and non-free societies? What criteria are set for an artist or for the group of artists in evaluating their meticulous work? How exactly should one paint, sculpt, write, dance, sing in order to win over the audience? There are more questions than answers. And not because there are no such answers or the experts do not know them. They do know the answers; however, to share the truth may be sometimes hard, dangerous, or thoughtless. So what constitutes

the society that serves as a panel of art experts while a viewer/listener is perceiving a work of art? What is this society like? To whom it accounts to? And whom does it challenge?

There is a set definition of the “civil society” [8]. It appears to be “the aggregate of non-governmental organizations and institutions that manifest interests and will of citizens; individuals and organizations in a society which are independent of the government. It is a ‘third sector’ of society, distinct from government and business, and including the family and the private sphere. The elements of civil society are various unions (professional, creative, sport, religious denominations, etc.) that cover all spheres of social life [10]. One thing leads to another: “From the point of view of securing and realizing individual and group interests, civil society is a system of voluntary public organizations, means of forming public opinion, of influence on the political sphere, as well as of other intergroup and interpersonal relations that provide grounds for realization of their interests to the members of society. The important point is ability of a person to consciously and voluntarily join forces with its peers, as was emphasized by Alexis de Tocqueville. From the point of view of a structure of a social system, civil society is a social space of a kind, where people interact as autonomous individuals, forming complex, multi-level network of civil relations and interdependences that constitute the very social life and society, which does not need compulsion from political structures in order to function properly” [10]. From this definition, it becomes clear that one of the main functions of civil society is being a leverage against authorities, therefore preventing the usurpation of power. Perhaps, in a century such definition would be the only one truly correct, nevertheless, as for the present day it seems absurd and non-academic. In fact, no civil society is capable of functioning in totalitarian states.

It is impossible to cover overall global art process, as well as to trace the development of the artist within his community, say, in Ukraine during the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Therefore, it is better to pick just a single fact: conceiving of the idea, erecting, and finally demolition of the landmark piece of monumental art—*The Wall of Memory* at the architectural complex the Park of Memory at the Baikove cemetery in Kyiv. The artwork was co-authored by the creative duo, former peer students Ada Rybachuk and Volodymyr Melnychenko in collaboration with the architect Avraam Miletsky. The underlying reason for turning to this work of art and to the fate of its authors is the desire to shed light on the mysterious and legendary piece, poured over with superhard concrete that served as a retaining wall between the two levels of Kyiv slopes within the area of old local Baikove cemetery. The combined major and minor axis length of the piece was 213 m; height of the piece varied from 4 to 14 m. The 1982 directive to demolish the monument was signed in person by Volodymyr Shcherbytsky, the first secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine. This unprecedented artwork had been created during previous 14 years and had no similar precedents in Ukraine, Europe or worldwide. A year ago, in the spring of 2018, after 36 years in concrete captivity, *The Wall of Memory* was partially uncovered (approximately 10 m<sup>2</sup> of it). The reinforcement grid and concrete layer were removed; the parts of the artwork that as of today were the monolithic concrete pour (due to the 1982 resolution) were altogether removed with a concrete breaker. For Ukraine, this was an unprecedented restoration program, as previously there were no such rescue operations for monumental works of art, poured over with concrete. In fact, all the artworks, inconsistent with the guidelines of totalitarian society, were physically destroyed. That was a grim fate of numerous religious build-



Left to right:  
Svitlana Rohotchenko,  
Volodymyr Melnychenko,  
Oleksii Rohotchenko next  
to *The Wall of Memory*.  
May 2018

ings (churches of all denominations, Karaite kenesas), burial vaults, tombstones and monuments to tsars; religious books were burnt, paintings and graphic pieces were destroyed. One of the most notorious examples is St. Michael's Golden-Domed Cathedral, founded by the prince Sviatopolk II Iziaslavych, a grandson of Yaroslav the Wise, in 1108. Unique cross-in-square church with three naves on six pillars with the dominating gold-plated dome (thus the name) was blown up in 1935, due to the "necessity" to build a governmental center at the spot.

In 1919, the group statue of Olga of Kyiv, Andrew the First-Called, saints Cyril and Methodius, enlighteners of the Slavs was destroyed. The monument was erected in the Kyiv center, at the Mykhailivska Ploscha, in 1911. The sculptors were Ivan Kavaleridze, Petro Snytkin, and Valerian Rykov. The final dismantling of the remains of the monument was concluded in 1935.

The works of avant-garde artists, as well as of Mykhailo Boychuk and his followers were dubbed ideologically deleterious. During the interwar period thousands of paintings and graphic artworks, depicting the members of the tsar family, Ukrainian hetmans, other wealthy individuals were physically destroyed (burnt) in the art museums of the country. Similar process went on in the art museums of the Western Ukrainian lands upon their incorporation into the Soviet Union. Church wall paintings were painted out or torn down, golden and silver revetments were taken off the icons, and the religiously themed oil on wood paintings were burnt in tens of thousands.

In the state of victorious socialism, the resistance to the official art doctrine had completely vanished since the 1918. The imposed method of socialist realism did not presuppose any other vision or perception of art problems, except for the ones set by the authorities.

Therefore, one simple question arises. Where was civil society back then? Could it challenge official apparatus at all? Demolition and burnings of the artworks of global significance was witnessed by millions, including the intellectuals, scientists, researchers, artists, writers. Was there intellectual resistance at all? Yet it was, but sporadic. Nearly all attempts of resistance ended up in criminal proceedings and eventually in concentration camps. Fear eliminated all the common sense and fostered another mode of behavior—conformism. Conformism as an element of behavioral model of a totalitarian society produced another mode of action—not interfering in the political, economic, social, cultural processes. Moreover, speculations about culture were scaled up to unprecedented level. Writers, sculptors, artists and musical performers—all became active participants of the process. As it is evident from the unclassified archives, the most sentences in the cases of artists and intelligentsia were based on the denunciations by their peers and neighbors (living next door in the so-called "artists' houses"), editorial and publishing staff, workers of film studios, theaters, and conservatories. Practically all accused artists were denounced on by their fellows. That means that there was no civil society in the state of rampant totalitarianism. Other states prove that truth as well. It is understandable when the processes, identical to Ukrainian one, went in the other republics of the former USSR; however, events took a similar course of action in countries outside the Soviet Union or Eastern Bloc: Italy, Spain, Germany. The Degenerate Art Exhibition in the interwar Germany illustrates that well. The concept of "degenerate art" was first introduced by Max Nordau in his 1892 book *Degeneration*. That was the way for the author to attack his personal rivals—avant-garde artists and writers. Obviously, he did not expect his terms to be actively used by German national socialists. In the Nazi Germany, as well



Recovered fragment  
of The Wall of Memory.  
May 2018

as in all USSR republics, avant-garde art and its creators underwent not only ideological discrimination and interdiction but physical extermination as well. The fight against the ones who did not follow the mainstream culture development guidelines was headed by Joseph Goebbels, the Reich minister of public enlightenment and propaganda. Adolf Ziegler, the president of the Reich Chamber for the Visual Arts, oversaw the destruction of the artworks, deemed “degenerate art.” Whole art movements and schools felt on to disgrace of the state. The Bauhaus, a major European art center of the time, operating in Germany, was shut down; Dadaism, cubism, impressionism, surrealism, and expressionism were prohibited and were subject to annihilation. Adolf Ziegler was a head of the special commission, which revised hundreds of German museums. The commission discovered 12 890 ideologically questionable artworks in museum collections and repositories. Works by Emil Nolde, Max Beckmann, Oskar Kokoschka, George Grosz, Pablo Picasso, Paul Cézanne, Vincent van Gogh. Some of the works were auctioned abroad, some made it to the Degenerate Art Exhibition that opened in Munich in summer of 1937. The propaganda apparatus of the Third Reich accomplished its task perfectly. Before the war with USSR started, the exhibition traveled to 12 cities. It was visited by over 3 million viewers. Later on the majority of works has been destroyed. Among others, the pieces by Max Ernst, Marc Chagall, Edvard Munch, Wassily Kandinsky, Paul Klee were set on fire.

In the USSR and in Ukrainian SSR similar campaigns were lower-scaled but with identical outcome. The artworks, confiscated from churches and museums, made it to art auctions of Paris and London. Precious golden and silver folding icons and revetments, silver church bells were sold abroad as a scrap, regardless of their immense artistic value.

Returning to the main point, that is, civil society and its role in the art processes happening within the state, one comes to a sad conclusion that is identical to the author’s hypothesis. Civil society is virtually extinct in totalitarian system. Its role and function of moderator of social thought are nullified. The role of civil society and its real significance grow up in proportion to the weakening of totalitarian system. Civil resistance did not play any significant role in the hate campaign against the acknowledged German artists in the 1930s. Similar processes took place in the USSR, including Ukrainian SSR, when all officially registered oppositional art associations of artists, writers, and theatre practitioners were eliminated. The attempts to maintain their artistic beliefs led to the purges, like the one Mykhailo Boychuk and his followers underwent.

The lifespan of Ada Rybachuk and Volodymyr Melnychenko—fellow students at the Kyiv State Art Institute—coincided with the post-war thaw in totalitarian course of the state. The social status of the duo differed significantly. Ada Rybachuk was a daughter of high-ranking military official. After the war the Rybachuk family resided in Vienna (Austria) for a period of time, where colonel Fedir Ivanovych Rybachuk was stationed. Consequently, Ada had a chance to observe Vienna museum collections, was famil-

iar with the Austrian press, read studies on art. She was fluent in German and had a deep knowledge in many areas of fine art that were prohibited at her homeland. Volodymyr Melnychenko had just an ordinary Kyiv background. He survived German occupation in his childhood, witnessed awful destructions inflicted on Ukrainian capital, all the fires, explosions, executions of civilians, the Babyn Yar massacre of Jews. Volodymyr studied at the art school and, obviously, was raised according to the communist ideology applied to the whole society. What united the fellow students was the desire to paint and study the history of art. Diverse demographics of the Kyiv students in the post-war times favored egalitarian relations between people of different ages. Fellow students could have more than ten years gap. Many male students completed their military service and received insignia and medals. Unlike the military circles, there was no hazing between the art students of the time (when newbies or lower-ranked experienced harassment). Social equality nourished professional competitiveness. Not the oldest or most experienced student became leaders but the most talented, whose professional traits prevailed those of others. Clearly, teachers did not stand aside. Some students received special treatment: those, who were members of the Communist Party or those, who voluntarily chose ideologically “right” themes for their works (it should be noted, however, that student’s inclination for some subject eventually had little impact on the final theme selection in any case).

ARVM (abbreviation for Ada Rybachuk and Volodymyr Melnychenko) stood out among the rest of the students of the Kyiv State Art Institute due to their avant-garde thinking and original creative experiments.

“Before their graduation in 1959 from the Kyiv State Art Institute as the monumental artists (supervised by Tetyana Yablonska), ARVM first visited Kolguyev island in 1954. The island, situated at a 200 km distance from the mainland, had a restricted access, as it served a testing ground for nuclear weapon, largest in the state. Their further development was also conflicting with the standards and guidelines of the Soviet Union of Artists, according to which the artist should have entered any of the sections—be it painting, graphics, monumental or decorative and applied art and, consequently, was ruled out of experiments in the other spheres of art. Meanwhile, ARVM did fine art, book illustrating, created etchings, woodcuts, linocuts, monumental pieces. Ada Rybachuk, in addition to her art practices, worked on research papers and literary documents that may be classified as literary creations” [8]. The duo’s achievements were strikingly different from that of their peers even during their student years. Highly skilled in academic drawing, ARVM depicted the episodes of the ordinary people everyday life that were kept out of the public eye, the ones that did not have much in common with the heroic images of the builders of communism; that, and depiction of nature, was later on praised by Rockwell Kent in his letters to Ukrainian artists. One could unconsciously sense that ARVM were no longer much alike the common worker of culture, a Soviet artist from the 1960s. Civil society start-

Left to right:  
 Victor Konoval (head of Kyiv  
 organization of the National  
 Union of Artists of Ukraine),  
 Volodymyr Melnychenko,  
 Oleksii Rohotchenko.  
 May 2018



ed its revival in the totalitarian USSR. In the early 1960s the dissident movement emerged, as well as the resistance to the official art doctrine that would later be labeled “non-conformism”. ARVM would be one of the first to experience the pressure of official art and the processes surrounding it. In 1959 came out the detailed article “Art stands no hullaballoo”, signed by then-coryphaei Vasyl Kasiyan and Mykhailo Deregus, the famous Soviet artists. In fact, the true author of the article was Georgiy Portnov, a professional art researcher. The article was a well-calculated move against the young artists; they were accused of detesting the bases of socialist realism and distorting the image of the Soviet working man. For other artists it would be a sentence. Nevertheless, ARVM not only did not give up but issued a public answer in Moscow and Kyiv press. This fact gives grounds to consider this act of resistance to be the first manifestation of the second-stage nonconformism. (The author considers the first stage of Ukrainian nonconformism to be the struggle of the Mikhail Boychuk fellow artists against the official doctrine and apparatus during the 1930s.) ARVM were not the classic dissidents. They signed the support letter for political prisoners, offered to them in their studio in the early 1960s by a professional instigator and attracted KGB attention since then. During the next years ARVM were under rigorous surveillance from the plain-clothed KGB agents and their fellows from the art circles recruited by the special services.

In the early 1960s, ARVM’s friend Valentin Seliber introduces them to the architect Avraam Miletsky, who would later become their longtime collaborator: at the newly-built Kyiv central bus station (1960), in styling for the Kyiv Place of the Pioneers (1963–1968), in developing the project of the Park of Memory at the Baikova hill and the monumental artwork *The Wall of Memory* (1968–1982). Emergence of the idea, the process of creating the sketches for it, development of the architectural part of the future monumental

artwork, struggle to preserve the almost completed piece, and observing the destruction of your own unique wall of 200 m, decorated with hundreds of images—all of this would happen during the next fourteen years. The echo of these events does not fade away in the outline of fine art and would remain a bloody page in the history of the artists who were not supported by the civil society in their fight with the totalitarian regime.

The grandiose work started in 1968 with the construction of retaining wall between the lowest and middle levels of the Park of Memory at the Baikove cemetery on Kyiv. The height of the future structure should be from 4 to 14 m. Economically, the project was perfect, as the retaining wall should be constructed in any case. ARVM proposed project that was both original and cost effective. The artists offered to turn the retaining wall into an artwork. It meant saving public funds and erecting an artwork of unprecedented scale at the same time. The function of the structure was clear, the sketches raised tensions but were eventually approved. According to the design of its creators, *The Wall of Memory* went along the pathway of the funeral procession to the crematorium gate. Along the whole length of the wall’s 213 m the members of the funeral procession could observe a course of human life since the moment of conception and till its end. It was a daring, creative, highly artistic and philosophical project that had, in addition to the engineering one, the social function as well. The artists proposed the new vision of the design. Tens of figures of different height were meant to illustrate the human lifespan. Children, adults, soldiers, younger and older people were depicted within real or fantasy world. The relief was first “woven” out of the reinforcement bars and then tied round with the special tie-wire. When construction was ready, it was poured with concrete, creating the solid retaining wall as a buttress. For the years of the wall construction 95 tons of reinforcing

steel bars of different diameters and tie-wire were used. As for the color palette, the piece should have been many-colored. According to the author's design, upon its completion the artwork should have been painted with encaustic paint and low-melting glaze, resistant to the temperature change, as well as to precipitation and sun. The project and its realization were avant-garde and audacious in their core. The images created strayed from the easy-to-understand scheme of socialist realism. According to Nataliya Gorova, Candidate in Art Studies, who did research on ARVM, "Within this context, the research of the theoretical and conceptual basis of artistic resistance as an overall phenomenon of totalitarian society and its manifestations becomes highly important; studying its historical, psychological and socio-cultural aspects shows significant influence on the artistic experiments. The latter were a trigger for implementing innovations within different kinds of art: monumental art, painting, graphic art, sculpture, ceramics, etc., introducing new principles and approaches towards creation of artworks. The artists, guided by various motives, who followed the path of non-conformity with the set art dogmas, constituted a special stratum of art community that at the time experienced the rise of processes of free artistic expression, experiments, discovering and testing a wide range of the newest media. Such creative activity nourished a strong interest in non-standard and "unconventional" solutions within the general context of Ukrainian art of the time" [1, p. 5–6].

As of the early 1980s, the artists had their first conflicts with Avraam Miletsky, the architect of the project. The construction site was repeatedly inspected by a panel of experts and eventually the controversy was abruptly stopped by an unexpected decision: "Recommended for liquidation." The appeal to the government to allow demolition of the almost completed artwork was prepared. As for engineering part of the task, it was impossible to dismantle *The Wall of Memory*, because it became a buttress and a retaining wall at the same time. Kyivproject, an institute that developed the draft of *The Wall of Memory*, had to come up with a project where the wall would be covered, yet the engineering structures would remain intact. Such project was eventually developed. The artwork was covered with the 6 mm expanded steel sheet from its bottom left point up to the top right point. Pouring with concrete lasted for six days with no breaks. It was used more superhard concrete—of the compressive strength up to 7 500 psi—on pouring over the piece than on its creation. The main directive ordering to destroy the monumental work was signed in person by the highest ranking official in the republic—First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Ukrainian SSR Volodymyr Shcherbytsky.

As these events unfolded, civil society, undoubtedly, have already existed in the Ukrainian SSR. The struggle between the freethinkers and art authorities acquired traits of resistance. At the same time, it was not fruitful at all during that period. Ukrainian and Russian painters, writers, public figures engaged into the struggle to save the wall. World-

renowned doctor Mykola Amosov, poet Jacek Kaczmarski, painter Anna Trojanowska, Moscow-based art researcher Karl Kantor, sculptor Zurab Tsereteli, Kyiv art researchers Dmytro Gorbachov and Zynoviy Fogel publicly supported ARVM and their creation. Official Union of Artists supported the proposal of the expert board to destroy the piece. Art community was on ARVM side, nevertheless not proceeding with any active actions. Thus, the power of the Art Foundation of the Ukrainian SSR overcame common sense and corporate solidarity. The Union of Artists, represented by the Art Foundation and all-republican exhibitions, remained almost sole source of artists' income. To lose an emolument was a grim prospect for the artist. Consequently, the resistance was low-scale.

During the next 36 years there were many changes in the former USSR and in Ukrainian SSR. Governments changed, elites changed, Chernobyl tragedy happened, tumults of maidans and revolutions died away, yet the problem of uncovering of *The Wall of Memory* still had no solution. With no punishment from the authorities threatening them, the artists, art researchers and campaigners from various parties and movements expressed their dissatisfaction with the delay and weakly demanded a revenge. The most active in the struggle to restore justice was the Kyiv organization of the National Union of Artists of Ukraine (KONSKHU). The sections of art criticism and of monumental art annually pleaded to the government, to the Kyiv City State Administration, to their leaders personally, dispatching wrathful letters. Still, the problem remained unresolved. The miracle happened in springtime of 2018. Another recurring appeal reached the Kyiv city mayor Vitaliy Klychko. All the previous appeals to each of the heads of Kyiv City State Administration had no effect. However, Vitaliy Klychko reacted instantly. All the formal permits, delayed for decades, were issued within a week. Restoration works funded by Kyiv City State Administration started in early May. 10 m<sup>2</sup> of the original artwork were "revived" from under the concrete captivity. Hundreds of Kyiv city dwellers rallied to commemorate this outstanding event.

**Conclusions.** On 18 May, 2018 at the Baikove Cemetery Ukrainian public celebrated an event, having no precedent in the history of our state. The builders, removing the superhard concrete, uncovered 10 m<sup>2</sup> of the monumental artwork relief—*The Wall of Memory* by Ada Fedorivna Rybachuk (1931–2010) and Volodymyr Volodymyrovych Melnychenko (born 1932). Uniqueness of this landmark moment was highlighted by the fact that *The Wall of Memory* was some kind of testing site for both technologies of demolition and of restoration that were applied upon this monumental piece in 1982 and 2018, respectively. The struggle by civil society to restore the unlawfully destroyed artwork lasted for 36 years. However, there is still no clear understanding, what actually caused the fragment of the wall to be uncovered. Was it the triumph of civil society or the one-man decision the city mayor, aimed to restore historical fairness—remains a rhetorical question.

## References

1. Horova N. V. Yavyshe mystetskoho suprotyvu v kulturnomu sere-dovyshchi Ukrainy druhoi polovyny 1950-kh — pochatku XX stolittia (na pryklady tvorchosti Ady Rybachuk i Volodymyra Melnychenka): dys. ... kand. mystetstvoznavstva: 26.00.01 / Instytut problem suchas-noho mystetstva. Kyiv, 2017. 180 s.
2. Sirenko V. F., Tymoshenko V. I., Kovalchuk T. I. Hromadianske suspilstvo v Ukraini: problemy stanovlennia. Kyiv: Lohos, 1997. 124 s.
3. «Degenerate Art»: The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany / Stephanie Barron, ed. New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1991. 423 p.
4. Zelenko H. I. Politychna «matrytsia» hromadianskoho suspilstva (dosvid krain Vyshehradskoi hrupy ta Ukrainy). Kyiv: Znannia Ukrainy, 2007. 335 s.
5. Zuschlag C. Entartete Kunst. Ausstellungsstrategien im Nazi-Deutschland. Werner, Worms 1995. 440 s.
6. Petrova O. Ne tolko o Stene, no i o nas // Zerkalo nedeli. 1999. 4 sent.
7. Rohotchenko S. Stina. Vidrozhennia // Obrazotvorche mystetstvo. 2019. # 1(106). S. 96–97.
8. Rohotchenko S. Vystup na konferentsii «Khudozhnii metal vizii maibutnoho», Ivano-Frankivsk, 2–5 travnia 2019.
9. Shaihorodskiy Yu. Hromadianske suspilstvo v Ukraini: chynnyky u osoblyvosti formuvannia // Suchasna ukrainska polityka. Kyiv: Tsentr sotsialnykh komunikatsii, 2013. Vyp. 28. S. 323–334.
10. Hromadianske suspilstvo. URL: [https://uk.wikipedia.org/wiki/hromadianske\\_suspilstvo](https://uk.wikipedia.org/wiki/hromadianske_suspilstvo) (last accessed: 1.05.2019).

## Література

1. Горова Н. В. Явище мистецького супротиву в культурному середовищі України другої половини 1950-х — початку ХХ століття (на прикладі творчості Ади Рибачук і Володимира Мельниченка): дис. ... канд. мистецтвознавства: 26.00.01 / Інститут проблем сучасного мистецтва. Київ, 2017. 180 с.
2. Сіренко В. Ф., Тимошенко В. І., Ковальчук Т. І. Громадянське суспільство в Україні: проблеми становлення. Київ: Логос, 1997. 124 с.
3. «Degenerate Art»: The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany / Stephanie Barron, ed. New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1991. 423 p.
4. Зеленько Г. І. Політична «матриця» громадянського суспільства (досвід країн Вишеградської групи та України). Київ: Знання України, 2007. 335 с.
5. Zuschlag C. Entartete Kunst. Ausstellungsstrategien im Nazi-Deutschland. Werner, Worms 1995. 440 s.
6. Петрова О. Не только о Стене, но и о нас // Зеркало недели. 1999. 4 сент.
7. Роготченко С. Стіна. Відродження // Образотворче мистецтво. 2019. № 1(106). С. 96–97.
8. Роготченко С. Виступ на конференції «Художній метал: візії майбутнього», Івано-Франківськ, 2–5 травня 2019.
9. Шайгородський Ю. Громадянське суспільство в Україні: чинники й особливості формування // Сучасна українська політика. Київ: Центр соціальних комунікацій, 2013. Вип. 28. С. 323–334.
10. Громадянське суспільство. URL: [https://uk.wikipedia.org/wiki/громадянське\\_суспільство](https://uk.wikipedia.org/wiki/громадянське_суспільство) (дата звернення: 1.05.2019).

## Роготченко О. О.

## Громадянське суспільство як складова культурного поля держави

**Анотація.** Досліджено вплив громадянського суспільства на мистецькі процеси, що відбувалися у тоталітарних та посттоталітарних системах. Автор вважає, що вплив соціуму на створення чи знищення художнього твору був попередньо мало досліджений. На прикладі життя відомих українських митців-монументалістів Ади Рибачук та Володимира Мельниченка (АРВМ) простежено втручання державного апарату в індивідуальну творчість художників. Пропоновані автором висновки підтверджують, що в умовах тоталітарного свавілля громадянське суспільство не відіграє ключової ролі. У матеріалі йдеться про трагічну долю унікального твору мистецтва «Стіна пам'яті», що була споруджена протягом 1968–1982 років на Байковому цвинтарі у Києві. 1982 року твір було залито бетоном. У 2018 році, завдяки втручання громадянського суспільства, 10 м<sup>2</sup> твору було розкрито з-під шару бетону.

**Ключові слова:** громадянське суспільство, архітектура, монументальне мистецтво, «Стіна пам'яті».

## Роготченко А. А.

## Гражданское общество как составная часть культурного поля государства

**Аннотация.** Исследовано влияние гражданского общества на процессы, происходившие в искусстве тоталитарных и посттоталитарных стран. Автор полагает, что влияние социума на создание или уничтожение произведения искусства ранее было мало исследовано. На примере жизни известных украинских художников-монументалистов Ады Рыбачук и Владимира Мельниченко (АРВМ) прослеживается вмешательство государственного аппарата в индивидуальное творчество художников. Предложенные автором выводы подтверждают, что в условиях разгула тоталитаризма гражданское общество не играет ключевой роли. В материале описывается трагическая судьба уникального произведения искусства «Стена памяти», возведенного в 1968–1982 годах на Байковом кладбище в Киеве. В 1982 году произведение было залито бетоном. В 2018 году, благодаря вмешательству гражданского общества, 10 м<sup>2</sup> произведения были освобождены из-под слоя бетона.

**Ключевые слова:** гражданское общество, архитектура, монументальное искусство, «Стена памяти».