

KULTUROZNAWSTWO

Marta Zambrzycka

DOI: 10.15290/sw.2025.25.14

University of Warsaw

e-mail: m.e.zambrzycka@uw.edu.pl

ORCID: 0000-0002-2123-8531

**Non-Conformism as a Precursor of the Artistic Revival
of the 1980s–1990s in Ukraine**

Keywords: independent Ukrainian art, “non-conformism”, political oppression, late-Soviet period

1. Introduction

The period of transition and the 1990s is a very important time for the artistic life of Ukraine, comparable to the beginning of the 20th century, when groundbreaking avant-garde movements developed along with the new statehood [Višeslavs'kij 2020, 13]. The 1980s and 1990s saw the emergence of a variety of currents and trends (neo- and post-modernism, social photography, action art, media art, performance, non-figurative painting, abstraction) and the development of an institutional structure for contemporary art, initially in the form of grassroots initiatives, informal associations, squats, private galleries, open-air galleries and festivals [Lugovs'ka 2022, 87–95], and later centred around the Soros Centre for Contemporary Art, with a strong financial and promotional base, as well as curatorial experience previously lacking in Ukraine. This development of art would not have been possible without non-conformist artists who created under the Soviet censorship. It was independent artists who maintained continuity with the tradition of native and European art during

the period of political oppression and bans in the sphere of culture. I understand non-conformism as a general term for the artistic phenomena that were not consistent with the socialist realism, aesthetically related to the tradition of modernism, and emerged under political constraints. Non-conformism is therefore a social and aesthetic category closely related to the activity under totalitarian conditions.

Mikhail Gorbachev's reforms, initiated in '85, were the beginning of changes that enabled the "grassroots mobilisation of society" [Plokhyy 2022, 393], but many Ukrainian humanists consider the Chernobyl disaster [Gundorova 2013, 45] to be the main stimulus that determined the emergence of new literary and artistic trends. The role of Chernobyl in art is mentioned, among others, by Olha Petrova, who emphasises that it was the explosion of the power plant that stimulated huge changes in the structure of cultural life and artistic practice [Petrova 2015, 30]. Hlib Višeslavs'kij also writes about the great importance of the Chernobyl disaster and the associated upheaval of the previous political system for changes in culture. The author emphasises that the change in ideology that followed the disaster led to a partial democratisation of culture and to the abolition of censorship in the arts. This led to the emergence of a young generation of artists for whom the canon of socialist realism and the traumatic experience of the bygone era remained the main antagonists, and to the possibility of the official existence for tendencies that had previously remained "underground".

2. Non-conformist independent art in the late Soviet period

Indeed, the artistic practices that emerged in Ukraine in the late 1980s and in the early 1990s were not born in a vacuum. Around the 1960s, unofficial art, often referred to as non-conformism, developed in the Soviet Union. Olha Petrova points out that without the tradition of "political thaw" art and non-conformism, the explosion of free art in the 1990s would not have been possible [Petrova 2015, 34], and that the generation that entered the art scene in the 1980s owes its freedom and creativity to its non-conformist predecessors [Petrova 2000, 171]. Hlib Višeslavs'kij also identifies the origins of the so-called "new wave" (which he under-

stands as the totality of the various currents at the turn of the 1980s and 1990s) in the tradition of non-conformism, emphasising that some of its representatives came from non-conformist circles, while others were part of the tradition of unofficial art, both in terms of their creative ethos and their attitudes to life [Višeslavs'kij 2020, 14].

The term “non-conformism” cannot be understood in terms of a specific direction or trend. It seems to be a rather ambiguous term that only makes sense in the atmosphere of political repression. Lesya Smirna notes that the term itself appeared in the context of art as a rather conventional name for various artistic trends which did not conform to the norm imposed by socialist realism, and existed unofficially. The author writes that: “Nonconformism – by definition and by the nature of the phenomenon – necessarily presupposes the presence of conformism as its binary opposite” [Smirna 2016, 129]. A similar idea is expressed by Ol'ha Kotova, who stresses that “unofficial art” is all that which the authorities prevented from entering the public domain and relegated to the “underground” [Kotova 2021, 17]. Dariya Zel's'ka-Darevič also notes that non-conformism in art can only be discussed in the context of the presence of a style imposed by state institutions, official, repressive and enforced by censorship [Zel's'ka-Darevič, 2006, 16–31]

Hlib Višeslavs'kij stresses the stylistic diversity of non-conformism which finds a common platform in broadly defined modernist trends and tendencies [Višeslavs'kij 2006, 172]. Non-conformism, then, would be all the currents and creative tendencies which developed in the post-war period, contradictory to the determinants of official art, and deriving from the tradition of modernism and the avant-garde of the early 20th century. The turn to the modernist tradition was largely determined by the political context in which the artists existed: censorship, the dominance of socialist realist aesthetics and a very limited knowledge of Western art determined the turn to the period in which domestic art was still developing in parallel with pan-European trends, i.e. towards the beginning of the 20th century. In the 1960s, under the influence of a temporary change in cultural policy known as “the thaw”, there was a partial revival of the memory of the Ukrainian avant-garde and modernism, which inspired artistic exploration of the time. The turn to the avant-garde was also part of a broader trend characteristic of the

post-war European and American art [Kluczyński 1997, 9], but with the reservation that while the Western European neo-avant-garde referred to incidental phenomena such as the Dada movement and Marcel Duchamp's "counter-art", Ukrainian artists referred primarily to abstract painting, Cubo-Futurism, expressionism and even impressionism or art nouveau. Generally speaking, Ukrainian non-conformism was therefore aesthetically moderate, praised individualism and an artistic expression of disagreement with the schematic nature of official art, but it did not seek to impress the public with innovative solutions and the breaking of taboos. According to Lesya Smirna, the individualism that characterised Ukrainian non-conformism did not mean absolute creative freedom and, furthermore, it was not synonymous with the notion of "art for art's sake", but it remained strongly attached to the idea of nationhood in the broadest sense [Smirna 2016, 129]. The researcher stresses that non-conformism was a reaction to strict censorship and a series of cultural bans [Smirna 2016, 130]. In her article *Українські художники-нонконформісти: естетичний протест*, the author describes the non-conformism of Odessa, Lviv and Kiev as art with a nationally involved message [Smirna 2013, 40]. And in her book *Століття нонконформізму в українському візуальному мистецтві* she claims that it was a phenomenon deeply rooted in the traditions of freedom and in the realisation of the idea of national aspirations of Ukrainians [Smirna 2017, 35–36]. Smirna links the concept of non-conformism with the idea of the struggle to preserve the national and linguistic identity: "Ukrainian artistic non-conformism – as a manifestation of a covert rebellion against the ideology of Socialist Realism – was a very complex and contradictory phenomenon. Unlike its opponent, the Socialist Realism, it reflected the mentality, worldview and spiritual orientation of Ukrainians, attempted to restore a coherent national image of the Ukrainian culture, and defended the priorities of the Ukrainian language and history". [Smirna 2017, 36]

This view seems controversial in relation to, for example, the Odessa Non-conformism, which was submerged in the Russian language and had close links with Moscow, but it must be remembered that the author has a very broad understanding of the phenomenon, setting its time frame from the late 1920s to 1991 [Smirna 2016, 130]. This long period determines the understanding of non-conformism in an inseparable connection with the

history of repression, exile and murder of the Ukrainian intelligentsia, the Stalinist terror, the Great Famine of the 1930s and the subsequent persecution. The wide time span is combined with a fairly significant geographical spread, covering the major cities of Ukraine from Uzhhorod and Lviv to Kharkiv and Dnipro. Using these criteria, the non-conformist artists could include Roman Selsky and Karl Zvirinskyi, the Kiev “Sixties” the Odessa painters and the Kharkiv photographers led by Boris Mykhaylov. These are very different artists, working under different conditions and with different views, including on the issue of nationality and language. Lesya Smirna identifies several phases of non-conformism and uses the term post-non-conformism to describe the creative search emerging from the underground during the transition period, again grouping various currents, groups and tendencies under this label [Smirna 2016, 134–135]. This broad approach allows the author to understand non-conformism as one of the manifestations of freedom and the national aspirations of Ukrainians [Smirna 2017, 26].

Other researchers focus more on the analysis of the “local” varieties of non-conformist art, defining its period as the post-war times – from the 1960s to the late 1980s. A significant number of studies focus on Odessa non-conformism, described by Tetyana Basanec or Ol’ha Kotova, among others [Kotova 2013, 55–60; Kotova 2015, 275–277; Basanec 2015, 62–67; Medvid’ 2002, 132–139]. Basanec, however, believes that the term “underground” better reflects the specificity of Odessa artists, since their activities were oriented towards the unofficial, in a sense “underground”, practice of home exhibitions, rather than fighting the authorities and engaging in the active resistance [Basanec 2015, 66–67]. Irrespective of the definition of the term itself, the time frame and the territorial scope assigned to it, it was in unofficial art that the currents developed which referred both to the avant-garde tradition and to the post-war art of Europe and of the USA. In this text, I intend to focus mainly on the currents and tendencies of unofficial art at the end of the Soviet period, i.e. around the 1970s and 1980s; I will only mention the earlier period, refraining from a detailed description of the “thaw” period, which was extremely important for Ukrainian art, and the associated “Sixtiers” movement, which in art is associated with such names as Alla Horska, Opanas Zalivaha, Viktor Zaretsky, Lyudmila Semykina and others. I have written about the art of the 1960s in another

article [Zambrzycka 2018, 397–417], and I do not want to reiterate what I said there. Suffice it to say that the painting of the sixties generation was largely a continuation of the avant-garde and modernist tendencies interrupted by the Stalinist repression, marking a clear line of continuity of creative tendencies.

Abstract painting, stimulated – at least in part – by the exhibitions of the Western abstractionism held in Moscow in 1959, was an important part of the late Soviet unofficial culture. These provided an opportunity for the general public to become familiar with the works by Mark Rothko and Jackson Pollock, among others. Despite the fact that the climate in the Ukrainian Soviet Republic was extremely unfavourable for the development of art, abstract, non-figurative or Informalist painting existed owing to the many artists from Odessa, Kiev, Lviv, Uzhhorod and other cities. The “underground” character of this art provided conditions for its great diversity, influenced individualisation which was the result of the individual search of such artists as Karl Zvirinskyi, Vilen Barskiy, Oleksandr Dubovyk, Elizaveta Kremnytska, Valery Lamah, Boris Plaskiy, Oleh Sokolov, Anatoliy Sumar, Valentyn Khrushche, Ludmyla Jastreba and many others [[IN]FORMAL 2018, 5]. It is also worth noting the different situations within the Ukrainian cities – while for the inhabitants of Kiev the Moscow exhibitions of the Western abstractionism indeed opened up the possibility of becoming partially acquainted with the earlier inaccessible trends, for the “non-conformists” of Lviv they were not a major discovery, as they were influenced by the admittedly informal but constant exchange of information on the current Western art [Pavelčuk 2009, 366–371]. The Lviv artists who survived the war and remained in the city, continued their explorations, although they necessarily presented it only to a small group of trusted individuals. In the context of abstract painting in Lviv, the name Karl Zvirinskyi is worth mentioning, a follower of the tradition of Roman Selsky, he is an exceptional figure both as a painter and as a teacher, introducing the younger generations to the arcana of independent art. Zvirinskyi’s work shows the inspiration of the avant-garde tradition – including the work of Henryk Stażewski and Władysław Strzemiński – as well as the influence of the contemporary Western trends [Pavelčuk 2009, 366–370]. He is the author of abstract compositions using both painting techniques and various types of wood and metal applications. In Odessa, on the other

hand, Oleh Sokolov was involved in abstract painting already in the 1950s. He held small exhibitions in his own apartment, where he presented his small graphic works, clearly inspired by the work of Vasily Kandinsky, in particular his synaesthesia of painting and music [Rottenberg 2009, 91], as postulated in his treatise *Concerning the Spiritual in Art*.

Abstract painting, which remained in unofficial circulation during the Soviet period, was associated with the only available space of freedom. In the period of the thaw, when the information blockade was weakened, Anatoly Summar, Hryhoriy Havrylenko, Valery Lamach and others worked within the abstract trend. Their work was known only to a small circle of trusted friends [Avramenko 2018, 14]. In the 1990s, the question of freedom was no longer crucial, as censorship was essentially non-existent, and artists turned to abstraction, referring both to folk art, the indigenous tradition, and to certain trends that had developed in abstract painting since the Great Avant-garde. What is important here is the question of the revival of innovative trends which emerged in Ukraine at the beginning of the 20th century and which were halted by the Stalinist repression. Ukrainian abstract painting of the 1990s also drew inspiration from the American post-war art, in particular Abstract Expressionism, geometric abstraction and the “colour field painting” [Rudik 1999, 74]. One of the most recognisable pages in the history of abstractionism in the first decade of independence today is the activity of the group “Zhivopysnyy Zapovidnyk” (the term meaning the “Painter’s Skansen”), which existed from 1991 to 1995. Among its members there were: Tiberyi Silvashi, Anatolyi Kryvolap, Oleksandr Babak, Oleksandr Zivotkov, Mykola Kryvenko, Marko Heiko, Serhiy Semernin, Pavlo Kerestey.

Abstractionism is only one of the strands of unofficial painting of the late Soviet era. In parallel, there was a tradition of more or less realistic figurative representation that often operated in a “grey zone” between the official and underground art. The general term “silent painting” refers to such work produced in the post-communist period under conditions of the renewed censorship. It was a counter-proposal to the official monumentalism and pathos; the common denominator of the various practices covered by the term is considered to be an individualised subject matter dealing with various shades of human privacy. “Silent painting” is a term used by Olha Petrova. This researcher links it to the strategy of escaping

into the private sphere (the “inner emigration”) and the silent resistance to the norms of the official art, which manifested itself, among other things, in the dominance of motifs of anxiety, the loneliness of human frailty [Petrova 2015, 23–24].

Like the term “non-conformism”, the concept of the “silent painting” is based not so much on an aesthetic community as on the artists’ attitude and way of life. Its geographical spread across many Ukrainian cities makes it even more difficult to unambiguously define. Of course, the artists’ existential and moral attitude created an aesthetic community in a general way. We can point to the turn towards privacy, personal themes and individualism mentioned above [Ložkina 2019, 209]. The absence of pathos and the exuberance of optimism, the motifs of human frailty and loneliness, and lyricism, are equally important. This last category even became the basis for another term to describe this work, namely the “new lyricism” [Kotova 2021, 57]. The Kiev “silent painting” circle includes Yakym Levykh, Zoya Lerman, Yuriy Lutskevych, Mykhailo Vaynstein, Halyna Hryhorieva, Oleksandr Dubovyk, Yevhen Petrenko or Serhiy Pustovoyt [Ložkina 2019, 209].

The work of Donetsk-Kyiv painter Anatoliy Lymarev can also be included in the “silent painting”, although, as Alisa Ložkina points out, his expressive, fervent paintings are far different from the subdued style of most of the mentioned artists [Ložkina 2019, 210]. Lymarev made eastern Ukraine his atelier. He depicted Donbas – his “little homeland” – not as an industrial centre and an optimistic workers’ “paradise”, but as a quiet, idyllic countryside, steppe and field [Petrova 2015, 247]. He painted mainly small etudes, landscapes dominated by silence and the hot sun shining through. Lymarev’s paintings are suffused with light and they depict simple scenes of the village life: daily chores, harvesting, quiet evening conversations. Although the subject matter of the paintings did not stray far from the requirements of the Socialist Realism and it was certainly not provocative, Lymarev’s painterly manner meant that his work was rarely exhibited and he himself was surrounded by an aura of unfriendliness in the official circles [Petrova 2015, 248]. Olha Petrova emphasises Lymarev’s immense colouristic talent and argues that we can now find in Anatoly Kryvolap’s work [Petrova 2015, 249] a continuation of the tradition of pure colour handling initiated by Lymarev. Professional

failures, ill health and – again in Petrova’s opinion – a fragile psyche marked Lymarev’s life with an aura of tragedy and, in 1985, the artist committed suicide.

The theme of privacy links the tendencies collectively referred to as the “silent painting” with a distinct current of late Soviet hyperrealism initiated in Ukraine by a group of young painters known as the “Kiev Railway Station Artists” [Ložkina 2019, 223] or the “Four Serhiys” [Petrova 2000, 174] (Yakutovych, Heta, Shestyuk and Bazylev). Hyperrealism or photo-realism was a novelty in the artistic awareness of the 1970s and 1980s, for the young artists it was a manifestation of modernity and a “wind from the West”, and, at the same time, it operated within the framework of legal art, challenging the clear division of the late Soviet artistic life into the official and unofficial art [Sklârenko 2021, 90]. Hyperrealism as a new phenomenon of Ukrainian art came to light in the 1980s, after the All-Union Youth Exhibition in Tashkent [Sklârenko 2021, 91]. The Ukrainian variant of the Soviet hyperrealism was distinguished primarily by its subject matter, which focused on the private lives of a circle of young artists living in the big city. The development of hyperrealism was inspired by the fragmentary information about Western art available through Polish magazines (“*Projekt*”, “*Sztuka*”), several exhibitions in Moscow (1974, 1975) and the album of paintings by Franz Gertsch, which was popular in Kiev circles. At the time, hyperrealism was a fashionable trend in the American art, which made it attractive to young artists. At the same time, according to Sklârenko, the popularity of this trend was deeply rooted in the domestic context, where both in the official art education and in the popular belief, the ability to reproduce reality realistically, was the measure of an artist’s professionalism [Sklârenko 2021, 90].

According to Lesya Smirna, the 1970s also witnessed the emergence of tendencies that would later develop under the name of postmodernism. The researcher draws attention to the works of Serhiy Paradjanov and Oleksandr Dubovyk, in particular, their characteristic use of the palimpsest technique. Smirna points out that Parajanov’s work is part of a Ukrainian tradition inspired by the sacred art and folklore as well as the Ukrainian modernism, especially the work of Fedor Krychevskiy. In the 1980s and 1990s, the author sees a continuation of this aesthetics in the large-scale, theatrical and multi-figurative compositions by Arsen Savadov [Smirna 2017, 269–270].

Odessa is a city that in the contemporary history of the Ukrainian art is primarily associated with the milieu of the non-conformist painters of the 1960s and 1970s. During the transition period, the city became a centre for conceptual art and actionism. Those behind unofficial art – the so-called the “Odessa Nonconformists” – remained in the circle of the aesthetic and philosophical concepts of modernism and the avant-garde until the 1980s [Višeslavs’kij 2006, 172]. Their work can be described as “moderate modernism” which does not aim to provoke and dazzle with novelty. The event referred to by most authors describing the Odessa independent artists’ circle is the so-called “Fence Exhibition”, organised by Stanislav Sychov and Valentin Khrusch in 1967. It was an accidental and spontaneous event that had nothing to do with a desire to provoke [Kotova 2013, 57]. The exhibition disappeared very quickly from the fence (surrounding the Opera House, which was being renovated), and the casualness and insignificance attached to it by its creators at the time is evidenced by the fact that today none of those involved can remember exactly when the event took place, how long it lasted, or even whether the works of art were taken down by the police or by the artists themselves [Filûk 2015, 69]. And yet, in later years, this very event has become an urban legend. In a brief description of the inspirations of the Odessa non-conformists, it is important to note the tradition of Impressionism and Post-Impressionism (Aleksandr Anufriyev, Vladimir Strelnikov), abstract painting (Viktor Marynyuk), the tradition of the avant-garde, including abstraction with elements referring to Baroque art (Ludmila Yastreb) [Basanec 2015, 63].

The generation of Odessa artists that appeared on the scene in the 1980s turned decisively against the modernist tradition cultivated by the artists mentioned before. According to Hlib Višeslavs’kij, the activity of the young Odessa artists is perhaps the earliest manifestation of post-modernism in the Ukrainian art, inspired by the Moscow Conceptualism, with the creators of which the Odessa artists maintained close contacts [Višeslavs’kij 2007, 93–146]. According to Oksana Baršinova, the young conceptualists felt that the modernist formula cultivated by the non-conformists had been exhausted, and she saw the need to create new meanings by combining object (drawing, installation), action and authorial commentary [Baršinova; www1]. The most common techniques were, therefore, conceptual objects that clearly “quoted” the tradition of world art, drawing

accompanied by a text, collage, assemblage, installation and artistic actions and performances in the artists' homes, and sometimes in urban space. This transgression of the limits of a particular technique or style, as well as the blurring of the boundaries between art and everyday life, the "casualness", "chance", "amateurism" and spontaneity of artistic actions, render the activities of apt-art (as the Odessa Conceptualism is called) similar to the practices of the Fluxus movement. There is also a heavy dose of irony and distance from both the assumptions of the avant-garde art and the ideologised work of the socialist realism. It is worth noting that individual examples of "action art" can be found in Ukraine as early as in the 1960s, for example in the activity of the Kiev-based artist Fedor Tetyanych (alias Frypulya), who would parade through urban space in eccentric costumes, carrying out his actions with an ecological message [Grîdâeva 2015, 901]. Alisa Ložkina describes him as a pioneer of the Ukrainian actionism, stressing that he combined the official life – in which he was known as a painter-monumentalist – with unofficial experiments in all forms of expression (painting, drawing, actionism, performance, objects, installations) [Ložkina 2019, 214].

Photography, which became one of the most important "voices of freedom" during the transformation, was also a very important artistic sphere. As Viktoria Mironenko notes, photography of this period refers above all to the subject matter that had previously been influenced by propaganda and subject to censorship. Photography takes on a social, critical dimension, while, at the same time, formal explorations and aesthetic experiments are evident [Mironenko, 2009, 381–382]. Among the artists who focus on documentary photography, the researcher mentions the Kiev-based artists Viktor Marushchenko and Yuri Nesterov, while those who seek primarily formal solutions and base their work on sophisticated metaphors include the Lviv photographer Mykhailo Frantsev and the Kiev photographer Yuri Kosin. By far, the most radical variety of the social photography is what emerged in Kharkov in the 1980s and 1990s. This phenomenon also stems from the tradition of the Soviet unofficial art and dates back to the late 1960s and early 1970s, when several people gathered in a Kharkiv photography club to form a group called *Vremya* [Время]. These were mainly Boris Mykhailov, Yevhen Pavlov, Oleh Malovanyi, Anatoly Makyenko, Yuri Rupin, Alexander Suprun and others. The themes in their works

included the de-ideologised representation of the Soviet reality – mainly urban space with a special focus on fringes of the society, images of greyness and ugliness and corporeality, the depiction of which stood in clear opposition to the socialist realist canon. The idea of photography as a “blow” against propaganda images of the “Soviet happiness” was a kind of program premise of the Vremya group as early as in the early 1970s. It called for an absolute depiction of the truth, which usually took the form of depressing, gloomy images of the real life in the Soviet republic. The artists exposed decay, squalor and the fringes of society. There were also motifs of nudity, which had little to do with eroticism, but were rather an expression of rebellion against the official ideological-aesthetic canon and which constituted a space for the search for intimacy and individuality. In this context, it is worth mentioning Yevhen Pavlov’s *Violin* series from the early 1970s, which perhaps for the first time in the Soviet photography featured male nudes. Pavlov’s photographs were published in the Polish magazine “Fotografia” in 1973 [no. 1] with a commentary by the art critic Jan Sunderland [Pavlova; ww1]. They were inspired by Yuri Rupin, who in 1972 made a series of photographs entitled *Sauna*, showing male nudity in the space of a bathhouse. Rupin is one of the representatives of Kharkiv photography, and in the 1970s, the male and female nude became the main motif of his work. At the turn of the 1980s and 1990s, Roman Piatkovka also worked in the area of erotic photography, reflecting in his works on the place of intimacy in the ideologised space of the official discourse on art and everyday life.

3. Conclusion

Ukrainian late-Soviet independent art, described in Ukrainian sources as non-conformist and, in some instances underground, was the inspiration from which new generations of artists emerged. In its first period, Ukrainian independent art drew inspiration from non-conformist trends, but also opposed the cultivated tradition of modernism and the avant-garde, opting for more radical means of expression. The period of political transformation and the first decade of independence is a very turbulent and diverse period in the Ukrainian art, still waiting to be fully understood and sys-

tematised. Despite the growing number of publications, it remains largely “apocryphal”, passed from mouth to mouth by artists, curators and eye-witnesses [Ložkina 2019, 271]. Hlib Višeslavs’kij describes the years 87–88 as the beginning of a period of transformation in the Ukrainian art. As Ukraine in the 1990s was essentially devoid of cultural policy in the visual arts [Botanowa, 2012, 110], the period of the late 1980s and early 1990s was characterised by the development of grassroots initiatives in the guise of art groups, private galleries and squats. Groups such as Lviv’s “Centr Europy” [1987], “КУМ” [1989], Kharkiv’s “Panorama”, Kiev’s “Soviart” and the open-air workshops in Sednevo in 88–89 [Meľnik 2009, 6–10] played the major role. By the end of 1993, most of the groups and centres established during the transition period had ceased to exist, and the influence of new organisations grew, especially the Soros CCA Foundation in Kiev, and later in Odessa. In Lviv, the Dzyga Art Centre was established in 1997, combining the functions of a gallery, organiser of open-air activities, festivals, concerts and other artistic events. Three open-air events held in the village of Sednevo in 87–91 played a very important role in shaping the artistic life of the transitional period. These events were initiated by Tiberiy Silvasi, who, at the time, was the head of the youth section of the Artists’ Union. In the words of Halyna Sklârenko, it was the trips to Sednevo that launched the “Ukrainian wave”, which became synonymous with the contemporary art in the 1990s, and which aroused the interest of critics, curators and collectors both in Ukraine and abroad [Sklârenko 2015, 27]. This new creativity would not have been possible without the continuity of the tradition of independent art that survived under the conditions of political and cultural repression.

Literature

- Avramenko O., 2018, *Krivolap. Metafizika čistogo kol’oru*, Kiïv. [Авраменко О., 2018, *Криволап. Метафізика чистого кольору*, Київ.]
- Baršinoва O., *Sučasne ukraïnske mistectvo: istorična pam’ât’ ta svitovij kontekst*. [Баршинова О., *Сучасне українське мистецтво: історична пам’ять та світовий контекст*], <http://www.korydor.in.ua/ua/stories/suchasne-ukrayinske-mystetstvo.html> [accessed: 20.03.2024].

- Basanec T., 2015, *K istorii neoficial'nogo iskusstva Odessy*, [v:] *Iskusstvo ukrainskikh šestidesâtnik*, red. O. Balašova, L. German, Kiev, s. 62–67. [Басанец Т., 2015, *К истории неофициального искусства Одессы*, [в:] *Искусство украинских шестидесятников*, ред. О. Балашова, Л. Герман, Киев, с. 62–67.]
- Botanowa K., 2012, *Biegając w kółko*, [in:] *Raport o stanie kultury i NGO w Ukrainie*, Lublin, pp. 107–120.
- Filúk E., 2015, *Mif o zabornoj vystavke*, [v:] *Iskusstvo ukrainskikh šestidesâtnikov*, red. O. Balashova, L. German, Kiev, s. 68–72. [Филюк Е., 2015, *Миф о заборной выставке* [в:] *Искусство украинских шестидесятников*, ред. О. Балашова, Л. Герман, Киев, с. 68–72.]
- Gridâeva T., 2015, *Performans ta prostorovi mistec'ki podii-akcii v Ukraïni 1960-h – perša pol. 1990-h – perša pol. 1990-h rokiv*, „Narodoznavčî zošiti”, no. 4(124), s. 899–907. [Гридяева Т., 2015, *Перформанс та просторові мистецькі події-акції в Україні 1960-х – перша пол. 1990-х років*, „Народознавчі зошити”, № 4(124), с. 899–907.]
- Gundorova T., 2013, *Pisláčornobil'ska biblioteka. Ukraïnskij literaturnij post-modernizm*, Kiiŭ. [Гундорова Т., 2013, *Післячорнобильська бібліотека. Український літературний постмодернізм*, Київ.]
- [IN]FORMAL. *Ukraïns'ke abstraktne mistectvo 1960–1980-h rr.*, *Katalog vistavki*, 2018, Kiiŭ. [IN]FORMAL. *Українське абстрактне мистецтво 1960–1980-х рр.*, *Каталог виставки*, 2018, Київ.]
- Kluczyński R.W., 1997, *Awangarda. Rozważania teoretyczne*, Łódź.
- Kotova O., 2013, *Mistec'kij nonkonformizm Odesi 1960–1980*, „Sčasne mistectvo”, no. 9, Kiiŭ, pp. 55–60. [Котова О., 2013, *Мистецький нонконформізм Одеси 1960–1980*, „Сучасне мистецтво”, № 9, Київ, с. 55–60.]
- Kotova O., 2015. *Hudožniki Odessy* [in:] *Iskusstvo ukrainskikh šestidesâtnikov*, Balašova O., German L.G. (red.), Kiev, s. 275–277. [Котова О., 2015, *Художники Одессы*, [в:] *Искусство украинских шестидесятников*, ред. О. Балашова, Л. Герман, Киев 2015, с. 275–277.]
- Kotova O., 2021, *Mistec'kij nonkonformizm Odesi v kontekstî svitovoï kul'turi 1960–80-h rokiv*, Odesa. [Котова О., 2021, *Мистецький нонконформізм Одеси в контексті світової культури 1960–80-х років*, Одеса.]
- Ložkina A., 2019, *Permanentna revolúciâ. Mistectvo Ukraïni XX – počatku XXI stolittâ*, Kiiŭ. [Ложкіна А., 2019, *Перманентна революція. Мистецтво України XX – початку XXI століття*, Київ.]
- Lugovs'ka A., 2022, *Dinamika stanovlennâ mistec'kih institucij L'vova periodu nezaležnosti*, „Hudožnâ kul'tura. Aktual'ni problemi”, no. 18(1), s. 87–95.

- [Луговська А., 2022, *Динаміка становлення мистецьких інституцій Львова періоду незалежності*, „Художня культура. Актуальні проблеми”, № 18(1), с. 87–95.]
- Medviď L. 2002, *Nonkonformizm ák áviše kul'turi 60-h rokiv*, „Sučasnist': literatura, nauka, mistectvo, suspil'ne žittâ”, no. 12, s. 132–139. [Медвідь Л., 2002, *Нонконформізм як явище культури 60-х років*, „Сучасність: література, наука, мистецтво, суспільне життя”, № 12, с. 132–139.]
- Mel'nik A., 2009, *Proekt „Ukraïns'ka nova hvilâ”*, [v:] *Ukraïns'ka nova hvilâ. Katalog vystavki*, Kiïv, s. 6–10. [Мельник А., 2009, *Проект „Українська нова хвиля”* [в:] *Українська нова хвиля. Каталог виставки*, Київ, с. 6–10.]
- Mironenko V., 2009, *Problemi analizu tvoriv fotografii v konteksti fotomistectva Kiïva ta L'vova kincâ 1980-h – počatku 1990-h*, „Sučasne mistectvo”, no. 6, s. 381–387. [Мироненко В., 2009, *Проблеми аналізу творів фотографії в контексті фотомистецтва Києва та Львова кінця 1980-х – початку 1990-х*, „Сучасне мистецтво”, № 6, с. 381–387.]
- Pavel'čuk Ĭ., 2009, *Vitoki abstraktnoi tvorčosti Karla Zvirinskogo*, „Sučasne mistectvo”, no. 6, s. 366–371. [Павельчук, І., 2009, *Витоки абстрактної творчості Карла Звіринського*, „Сучасне мистецтво”, № 6, с. 366–371.]
- Pavlova T., *Do istorii Harkivs'koï Školi Fotografii: grupa Vremâ*. [Павлова Т., *До історії Харківської Школи Фотографії: група Время*], <http://www.korydor.in.ua/ua/context/11657.html> [accessed: 10.02.2024].
- Petrova O., 2000, *Utopiâ hudožn'oï svobodi 60-h rokiv u proekcii na obrazotvorčii realii peredpočatku XXI st.*, „Naukovî zapiski Naukma”, t. 18, s. 171–175. [Петрова О., 2000, *Утопія художньої свободи 60-х років у проекції на образотворчі реалії передпочатку XXI ст.*, „Наукові записки НаУКМА”, т. 18, с. 171–175.]
- Petrova O., 2015, *Tretê oko. Mistec'ki studii*, Kiïv. [Петрова О., 2015, *Третє око. Мистецькі студії*, Київ.]
- Plochy S., 2022, *Wrota Europy. Zrozumieć Ukrainę*, tłum. F. Skrzepa, Kraków.
- Rottenberg A., 2000, *Kandinsky*, [in:] *Klasycy XX wieku*, Warszawa, s. 90–91.
- Rudik G., 1999, *Osnovni naprâmi rozvitku abstraktnogo živopisu: istoričnij oglâd*, „Naukovî zapiski. Teoriâ ta istoriâ kul'turi”, t. 13, s. 69–78. [Рудик Г., 1999, *Основні напрями розвитку абстрактного живопису: історичний огляд*, „Наукові записки. Теорія та історія культури”, т. 13, с. 69–78.]
- Sklârenko G., 2015, *Sovremennoe iskusstvo Ukrainy. Portrety hudožnikov*, Kiev. [Скляренко Г., 2015, *Современное искусство Украины. Портреты художников*, Киев.]

- Sklärenko G., 2021, *Ukraińskie mistectvo kincâ 1950 počatku 1980-h rokiv: evoluciâ oficijного hudožn'ogo prostoru*, „Mistectvoznavstvo”, no. 21, s. 85–94. [Склярєнко Г., 2021, *Українське мистецтво кінця 1950 початку 1980-х років: еволюція офіційного художнього простору*, „Мистецтвознавство”, № 21, с. 85–94.]
- Smirna L. 2013, *Ukraińs'kî hudožniki-nonkonformisti: estetičnij protest*, „Vіsник Книжкової палати”, no. 5, s. 40–43. [Смирна Л., 2013, *Українські художники-нонконформісти: естетичний протест*, „Вісник Книжкової палати”, № 5, с. 40–43.]
- Smirna L., 2016, *Dinamika ukraińskogo mistec'kogo nonkonformizmu*, „Mistectvoznavstvo Ukraїni”, no. 16, s. 128–137. [Смирна Л., 2016, *Динаміка українського мистецького нонконформізму*, „Мистецтвознавство України”, № 16, с. 128–137.]
- Smirna L., 2017, *Stolittâ nonkonformizmu v ukraińskomu vizual'nomu mistectvî*, Kіiv. [Смирна Л., 2017, *Століття нонконформізму в українському візуальному мистецтві*, Київ.]
- Višeslavs'kij G., 2006, *Nonkonformizm: Andeğraund ta «neoficijne mistectvo»*, „Hudožnâ kul'tura. Aktual'ni problemi”, no. 3, s. 171–198. [Вишеславський Г., 2006, *Нонконформізм: Андеґраунд та «неофіційне мистецтво»*, „Художня культура. Актуальні проблеми”, № 3, с. 171–198.]
- Višeslavs'kij G., 2007, *Postmodernists'kî tendenciï u sučasnomu vizual'nomu mistectvî Ukraїni kincâ 80–80-tih počatku 90 tih rr*, „Sučasne mistectvo”, no. 4, s. 93–146. [Вишеславський Г., 2007, *Постмодерністські тенденції у сучасному візуальному мистецтві України кінця 80-тих початку 90-тих рр.*, „Сучасне мистецтво”, № 4, с. 93–146.]
- Višeslavs'kij G., 2020, *Contemporary art. Ukraїni. Vid andergraundu do mejnstrimu*, Kіiv. [Вишеславський Г., *Contemporary art. України. Від андерґраунду до мейнстріму*, Київ 2020, № 4, с. 93–146.]
- Zambrzycka M., 2018, *Tradycja modernizmu i awangardy w ukraińskim malarstwie II połowy XX wieku*, „Studia Ucrainica Varsoviensia”, vol. VI, s. 397–417.
- Zel's'ka-Darevič D., 2006, *Ukraińs'kî kul'tura i mistectvo kriz viki*, [v:] *Ukraińskij modernizm 1910–1930*, Kіiv, s. 16–31. [Зельська-Даревич Д., 2006, *Українська культура і мистецтво кріз віки*, [в:] *Український модернізм 1910–1930*, Київ 2006, с. 16–31.]

NONKONFORMIZM JAKO PREKURSOR ODRODZENIA
ARTYSTYCZNEGO LAT 80. I 90. XX WIEKU W UKRAINIE

STRESZCZENIE

Słowa kluczowe: niezależna sztuka ukraińska, „nonkonformizm”, represje polityczne, okres późnoradziecki.

Artykuł dotyczy niezależnej, podziemnej sztuki ukraińskiej, nazywanej przez ukraińskich badaczy „nonkonformizmem”. W artykule omawiam twórczość późnoradziecką, zwłaszcza nurty artystyczne lat 70. XX wieku. Zwracam uwagę na te formy ekspresji artystycznej, dla których nie było miejsca w przestrzeni sztuki oficjalnej, zdominowanej przez realizm socjalistyczny. W artykule omówiono nurty malarstwa abstrakcyjnego, dzieła inspirowane modernizmem i awangardą z początku XX wieku, hiperrealizm i fotografię. Twórczość ukraińskich nonkonformistów miała ogromny wpływ na późniejsze odrodzenie artystyczne, które rozpoczęło się pod koniec lat 80. w kontekście przemian politycznych. Bez nonkonformistów sztuka ukraińskiej niepodległości nie mogłaby rozwijać się w tak wielokierunkowy sposób. To niezależni artyści zachowali ciągłość z tradycją sztuki rodzimej i europejskiej w okresie ucisku politycznego i zakazów w sferze kultury.