



KAPITEL 8 / CHAPTER 8⁸
NEO-ETHICS, LIBERALISM OR NEO-ROMANTISM OF THE DIRECTOR
DOI: 10.30890/2709-2313.2022-11-01-010

Introduction

The experience of European and Ukrainian methods of coexistence of creative intelligentsia with the dominant ideological factor, which a cultural figure at a certain time accepts or does not accept, seems interesting. The capricious 1960s in both post-fascist Europe and post-Stalin Ukraine were marked by broad tectonic shifts in both public consciousness and culture. Post-war society, partly overcoming material destruction, giving peoples the opportunity to stabilize economies, needed moral, spiritual, ethical rehabilitation. And if in the West the direction of this movement was obviously multi-vector, containing manifestations of anti-fascism, sexual revolution, and the hippie movement, and the development of popular music culture. In Ukraine, as in the entire Soviet territory, this period is marked by a certain "communist romanticism", and the ideology of the sixties as a manifestation of anti-Stalinism still does not become anti-communist. Some researchers single out the political, religious and cultural currents of the Sixties in Ukraine. Others confuse concepts. Many authors of materials on this topic identify the "sixties" with dissidents. This is the most persistent mistake. I want to emphasize once again: the "sixties" were in the circle of the Soviet worldview. Their enthusiasm was fueled by the belief that socialism could be deprived of (()) its "perversions" - totalitarianism and bureaucracy. That is why Soviet liberalism was born among the "sixties". Accordingly, they must be distinguished from dissidents - principled and uncompromising opponents of the System "[3, p.45-46].

At some point in time, indeed, the overall picture of the Ukrainian Sixties looks heterogeneous. And if the Sixties are too categorically included in the "subculture", as some scholars do, then at least alternatively thinking people of culture, including artists and researchers, sculptors, writers, poets, theatre figures and Ukrainian-born artists between 1925 and 1945 (as determined by the chronology of biographies), it seems legitimate to include them. Probably, over time, the picture of the Ukrainian sixties will become more accurate, will become more and more convincing.

⁸*Authors: Kovalenko (Kchursina) Olena Mykolaivna*



However, today we can try to single out several groups, directions, wings of this movement.

The first is cultural figures, intellectuals who suffered physically and were, in fact, executed by the Soviet system. Among them are members of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group - Oleksiy Tykhy (January 27, 1927 - May 5, 1984), Yuriy Lytvyn (November 26, 1934 - September 5, 1984), Valery Marchenko (September 16, 1947 - October 7, 1984), Vasyly Stus (January 6, 1938) —4.09.1985) and others.

It makes sense to include in the next group those who fought against the system with openly political methods. Among these cultural figures there are many who also suffered, but after a while still managed to continue the struggle in other ways. Among them are Levko Lukyanenko, Ivan Dziuba, Oles Berdnyk, Bohdan Rebryk, Danylo Shumuk and others. They received political sentences from the system and spent much of their lives in political camps, but during the years of independence, some of them gained the status of recognized and respected statesmen, cultural and public figures in the 1990s.

Another wing of the Sixties movement was those who, by means of civil means, created cultural organizations and spoke out against the dogmas of the current regime. The Creative Youth Clubs of Kyiv and Lviv - "Contemporary" and "Snowdrop" definitely belong to this direction. Among the KTM activists are L. Tanyuk, also I. Dziuba, E. Sverstiuk, I. Svitlychny, V. Symonenko, S. Telnyuk, A. Horska, V. Zaretsky, G. Sevruk, L. Semykina.

In particular, in our system there is a group of those who embodied the opposition's thought through their own work, by artistic means. This is the part of the generation of the sixties who managed to realize their creative potential without going to the service of the government, but also without giving up their own ideals. They are reliable and restrained, balanced and far-sighted. Can they be called "liberals"? Maybe neo-romantics? This group includes theatre directors who did not have the professional ability to write "on the table" or shoot "for the shelves." They had to find their own way, their own language, understandable to the audience and secretive from the point of view of the bureaucracy.

We can say at once that it is the least studied by researchers. But her contribution to the common cause is hard to deny. Despite the differences in



ideological constructs, the sixties of different countries and political systems had much in common. Both in relation to creativity and in the methods of creating an artistic product. Today we have Peter Brook, Peter Stein, Sergiy Danchenko.

8.1. Acting school.

German director Peter Stein until the 2000s, Ukrainian - Sergei Danchenko for 30 years - to zero, English - Peter Brook in the 70's, led large groups and created not only performances, but also acting schools, embodied his work and theatrical activities directing current. And obviously belonging to different ideological worlds, different approaches to creating their own place in history: Danchenko - moderate, but consistently intransigent, eternal seekers of history and free space - Brooke, Stein - these directors may still belong to the "great style" (which researchers are still debating [5]), although the methods were used and are used by the authors. It became possible to unite these different cultural figures thanks to a detailed comparative analysis of common features both in worldviews and in methodological heritage.

Serhiy Danchenko, who has been the artistic director of the National Theatre in Ukraine for 30 years, never took care of the de jure school, but the actors he worked with became the stars of leading Ukrainian bands: Bohdan Stupka, Natalia Sumska, Anatoliy Hostikoyev, Bohdan Beniuk , Alexey Bogdanovich, Larisa Kadyrova, Bogdan Kozak and others.

Peter Brook is the founder of an international theatre community whose ideas he still adheres to. He has worked with Paul Scofield, John Gilgood and Yoshi Oida in various years. "When you work with an international troupe, it is easier to get away from the stereotypes inherent in the actors of a culture, to release the inherent national origins. Conventions go, and previously hidden layers open. Collected grains create a holistic image "[11].

Peter Stein - as a director who values acting personality, director of both dramatic and opera performances and still does not like to work with several compositions of the troupe.

These directors have a lot in common, which can be found in meticulous research. The results of the comparative analysis, as well as the method of "key issues" - are amazing.



8.2. Artistic tradition.

Brooke believes that "every creative work must be based on tradition" and... invites Salvador Dali's directors of *Salome*, as he is the only artist I know whose style naturally combines what can be called Strauss's erotic decadence and imagery. Wilda "[1].

Stein believes that we need to focus on what is worth preserving. For example, cultural values. It is extremely dangerous to discard them. We must protect them from the speed with which the world is changing. "[7] That is why he does not like video projections on the stage, and even working at the Bolshoi Theatre, on the romantic opera *Berlioz*, whose score includes many effects, remains true to himself: "We try to create an illusion with the help of as many simple theatrical means at our disposal as possible, but partly with the help of video projections, which I cannot tolerate at all. But in this case they are necessary. After all, during the flight, Faust and Mephistopheles meet on the way some ghosts, monsters, fairies, black birds dancing skeletons, blood pouring in streams ... Somehow it must be illustrated. We can say: "It is unwise to illustrate all this! "Okay, then I keep doing my stupid job! I don't care. I try to realize the things that are in the score "[6]. We may marvel at the rhetoric. But Stein studies the scores meticulously and the texts of the plays very carefully. "Deciphering is my favorite pastime, I've always wanted to read in the original and get out of the original, and not listen to what a translator or a scientist who explains the meaning of the work tells me. I have to verify myself. For the same reason, I am especially interested in the musical score. These are very complex texts, much more complex than dramatic ones. This is extremely in line with my need to decipher.

- How much time do you need to get acquainted with the score and develop a production plan?

- Hard to tell. If you don't sit on the score every day ... Sometimes it lasts with breaks of two to three years. And then comes the *stretta*, the most important moment, when you meet the conductor, who explains how he sees the score, and he is a much more competent person. And, of course, you need to decide together with the set designer and costume designer what the production will look like. The process of



cognition is becoming more intense, and it can not be measured by the usual time measures "[6]. Few, at least among Ukrainian researchers of the theatre, will deny the already well-established and generally accepted fact that the director and artistic director of the National Theatre Ivan Franko S. Danchenko (from 1979 to 2000) was the "last" of the representatives of the classical "great style" on the Kyiv metropolitan stage. But few people interpreted his article "National Theatre - Theatre of Great Style", first published in 1997 in the magazine "Cinema Theatre" [4, p. 186-190] as in fact a manifesto of this kind of theatre. Let's turn to the original source. "The art of the Great Style is the accuracy and clarity of stylistic expressions, cleansed of everything non-essential and accidental. But it is also the absence of stylistic extremism, stylistic extremes, stylistic explosions "[4, p.186].

The "golden mean"? Is there a conscious separation, refining of emotions from the urgent social context? The formula "I and Eternity" - seems fundamental, worthy, and... automatically moves the work of art in zone outside criticism. But trying to solve global and eternal problems is an integral part of the sixties.

8.3. "Director-translator".

For Stein, the idea, as well as directing in general, is the realization of a dramatic idea, and above all - a classic one, which is why he says about himself: "I do not feel like an author. Imagine someone writing a play. What am I doing? I reach out to him, helping to bring this masterpiece to the stage. Do you understand? This is my job. I am a translator. I have no ideas of my own. I'm not even sure that I can be called an artist "[7]. I think it's worth stopping here to understand what it's all about when a director calls himself a "translator." We explain. Taking the classic texts, the director feels like a continuation of the author, empowering himself to preserve the author's style, to find a stage language that expands the possibilities of the text without splashing the child with water. Look for meaning in what is said (written), not outside it, look for meaning in hermeneutics, not in phraseology, in collected by deduction, not inductively, trying to understand sound, or movement, not confession or revelation. One blogger responded to a video of Brooke's play "Mahabharata":



"Current Mood: awake. Finally managed to download the first series of video recording by Peter Brook. The decision impressed me with its simplicity, sophistication and careful attitude to the material. The actors are gathered from all over the world, of all races, which makes the picture magically attractive.

Probably many Indian directors would like to shoot this story, but in the performance of a European, the essence of the material is intact, in any case, not contrary to my view. The selection of actors is unexpected, but watching the behavior of the characters, you see how accurately guessed the interior of each image, its spine. The director is thin, with a great sense of harmony and dignity to the ancient heritage "[12]. Stein sums it up: "The director, by the way, is also, in a sense, Faust. After all, he wants to redo, create, build something. And thus kills the very spirit of the theatre. And in our theatres we can see the result with our own eyes. When the director considers himself more important than what is happening on the stage, the theatre ceases to be a theatre in its purest form. He turns into a puppet - in the bad sense of the word. To a theatre where the actors are just puppets run by a demiurge director. This is the horror of conceptual theatre, which is so popular now and which I personally do not like at all "[10].

8.4. Concept format.

"Art is bigger than what's happening right now. Updating the topic destroys the work. At all times: in the 1800s, in the 1850s, in the 1900s, in the 2000s, and in the 2050s, "Faust" will be topical precisely because it tells the story of the universal. You can, of course, have something in mind, but in general, linking the production to a specific political situation narrows the idea of the work. And it should be relevant in ten years "[9]. The Sixties, however, are united by a belief in the eternity of artistic themes. They choose if not upbringing, then at least showing the way to the light at the end of the tunnel. "The whole meaning of human existence in the world is spiritual self-improvement. As much as it does not happen, it can be said that humanity has lost its existence "- said Danchenko [4]. And, probably, what unites the sixties is the clarity and simplicity of theatrical speech. Stein puts it this way:



“Theatre must be organic and alive. Raise the most difficult issues, but remain clear and transparent. The viewer must understand what he is being told, become part of what is happening. And if he constantly has a question about what all this means, you have already lost “[6]

If we try to understand what P. Brooke is trying to say when answering the question about the meaning of theatre, we understand that for him the fragile harmony that arises between many people working on the play is extremely important. "It's a disgusting thing when a director starts working on ideas. This is not part of his profession. Such a bad practice began in the early twentieth century, when in Russia and Germany, the director became the real master of the stage. (...) Then the director's dictation became commonplace. A dictatorial director is bad, but it's awful when he's writing plays. Then the most valuable thing in the theatre is destroyed. Instead of polyphony, a rich combination of different personalities, we get a truncated, flat view of the world. But someone put their idea into action. If you think you have ideas that other people should know about, write a book, write a poem, or make a movie. The film is really a one-man affair. The director here is the author. In the theatre, the director has a completely different task. His goal, as I said, is to give life to the invisible. To do this, he needs other people, a long period of contact with them, long Arthur rehearsals, during which the director does not depress the actors, but allows their personalities to manifest themselves most fully [10].

8.5. Duration of the play.

The considerable duration of the performances of the directors of the 60's is their special feature. Brooke "played" the Mahabharata for 9 real hours. Stein "Faust" at the exhibition in Hanover in 2000 - for 20 hours. "More precisely, twenty-two hours. With breaks. It started at 14:00 on Saturday, there was a lunch break in the evening, at 23:00 the performance ended, and the next day continued from 10:00, again with a break for lunch, with an evening intermission for dinner, and ended at 23:00 on Sunday "[9]. His "Oresteia" lasted 8 hours. Part of the protracted rhythm of time can be explained by the principle underlying such a performance - in fact, it is a



reconstruction of the worldview, not stylization - the reproduction of ways of presenting information by means of the era when these artifacts were created. Slow movements, almost meditative dialogues with significant pauses for the flow of thought, making the right decision, etc., the inclusion of sacred dances to express simple and deep emotions. This approach to the classical works of previous epochs corresponds to the aesthetics of the 60's, their leisurely, vain consideration of humanity and its problems is typical of Western culture, where, say, in music universities instrumentalists are taught to play their instruments from the Baroque to the present. The domestic audience is not ready to accept such marathons, so Soviet directors, in particular S. Danchenko, limited themselves to full-blooded theatrical epics during one evening.

In addition, the performances of the sixties were often and remain long-lived. One of the reasons for this phenomenon is, obviously, that the theme of the performances is designed for the long term, for the problems of people who have not disappeared since the "classics" - devotion, honesty, faith, compassion, conscience. Modern design and enterprise theatre are designed approximately or ten shows in a year or six months - then - new requests from society and new echoes on stage. It is interesting that D. Bogomazov expressed his opinion about performances that live for years: "One performance lasts two years, and another - twenty years. The first in a short time answers their own questions. And it is exhausted. Only what is an endless movement between "yes" and "no" can continue [8].

Danchenko's longevity included Ivan Franko's *Stolen Happiness*, Chekhov's *Uncle Vanya*, Kotlyarevsky's *Aeneid*, Sholem Aleichem's *Tevietel*, and Durenmatt's *Visit of the Old Lady*. Stein certainly has *Faust* in various variations. Brooke has the *Cherry Orchard* and the *Mahabharata*.

8.6. Methodology.

Brooke formulates his observations on the origin of the idea in the book "Threads of Time" as follows: "There are many different approaches to the problem of the relationship between stage and audience. (...) Grotowski's actor is a martyr



with whom the spectator cannot identify himself; he can only witness in pious fear the courage of the hero and the sacrifice given to him. Samuel Beckett once told me that for him the play is when a ship near the shore was defeated, which, standing on a rock, the audience helplessly watches, while waving their arms, the passengers are drowning. However, three years of travel have given us a different approach. We are used to meeting the spectator in his own territory, taking his hand and starting to explore something together. For this reason, the image of our theatre is a presentation of history, and a group of actors - a narrator with many heads "[2, C.11-12]. Danchenko came to the rehearsals with premonitions of the plan and ready decisions of only the key episodes. "I am convinced that you should not come to the rehearsal, having thought through every last detail. The main thing is to keep the general feeling of the play, the key scenes "[4]. "Earlier, when the right decision did not come immediately, I resorted to one rather brutal psychological exercise. Cruel, because it is more exhausting than any physical.... There is a transition between reality and dream, when the subconscious mind is more active than consciousness. At this point, you have the opportunity to direct your brain to solve a problem that is difficult to solve for some reason. In those moments, half-heartedly, I focused on the topic, forcing myself to remember all the details of the problem. So, I fell asleep. Therefore, sometimes I had to repeat this "exercise" several evenings. Finally, one night, around three o'clock, I woke up, because the right decision came... "[4, p.49].

Conclusions

Approaching the peculiarities of domestic and European directing of the sixties, we see how much these vain thinkers, dreamers, sincere admirers of cultural traditions, values, but always ready to defend social justice, to fight for the truth as they understand it. The theatrical sixties tend to the golden mean, avoiding explosive experiments, accidental associations, while trying to see the flow of life as broadly as possible, in all its manifestations, without turning a blind eye to contradictions, but without exacerbating them absurdly, without resorting to hypocrisy, posturing or mentoring. They still love the human in man and believe in the possibility of creating



a harmonious world. Utopia? Directors "do not break" the authors, but try to develop the author's opinion, in accordance with the respect for the original texts, rarely resorting to their radical changes. Whether it is worth rushing to include directors of this style and historical period among liberals or neo-romantics ... The question remains open. The only thing that seems obvious is that these directors profess certain common ethical norms not only in interpreting the content of selected material, formulating concepts of productions, but also in methods of working with authors, texts, actors, in relation to the audience in the auditorium.