

The Avant-garde as a Prototype of Totalitarian Art (Sketches of the History of Russian Musical and Non-Musical Avant-garde)

In the history of Soviet art of the first half of the 20th century it seems that there are no manifestations as contrasting, opposing each other phenomena than the avant-garde and the totalitarian art of the Stalin era. Indeed, it is hard to find any points of connection of these antitheses which are presented on one pole by the experimental, revolutionary artistic search and on the other pole – by the dogma of socialist realism. Here the revolutionary character of the first entity is contrasted with the post-revolutionary, preservationist tendency of the second entity; dynamism is contrasted to stagnation, the spirit of liberty – to a conservative limitation, a pluralist worldview – to an ideological hermetic closeness, a veneration of experimentation – to the canon, the aesthetical domination of the category of form – to the category of content. These contrasts could be enumerated infinitely, especially since it is particularly avant-garde which is the first to be placed into the sphere of ideological ostracism during the era of the grand style, while the struggle with class enemies on the political front in art turns into a struggle against *formalism* (in essence, with the avant-garde).

Incidentally, just as in relation to the so-called proletarian aesthetics, the mutual repulsion of the avant-garde and the socialist realist art demonstrates the universal character of the law of dialectics concerning unity and the struggle of polar opposites. In other words, it is impossible to characterize fully the process of the formation of totalitarian art without considering the role played by the avant-garde of the 1920s and early 1930s. At that the aesthetic necessity of the avant-garde for the formation of the grand style turned out to be more essential than, as one would initially suppose, the proletarian culture or the academic tradition. After all, neither academicism nor proletarian art were able to form in the 1920s the style of the epoch, nor do they reflect in such a multifaceted and diverse way the spirit of the revolutionary transition, striving and breakthrough. Both (to use the expression of Prokofiev) the “Karamzin language” of the academic composers and, even more so, the language of proletarian art, who during the 1920s was merely at a formative level (in the range from the pseudo-folk to the extremist avant-garde) represented, undoubtedly, a very limited panorama of the time. The scale of the avant-garde as the aesthetic symbol of the era of the 1920s and as a form of art, not unjustifiably claiming the role of the art of the future, undoubtedly could be correlated with the imperial ambitions of the official art. “If the primary indication of totalitarianism could be considered the proclamation of its ideological doctrine (whichever one it may be), the solely true and the solely mandatory one, then the artistic avant-garde of the 1910–1920s could make a claim toward a priority on the establishment of a similar ideology in the domain of art,” as Golomstock notes (2, 31). This way, the acuteness of the conflict between the world-view positions of the avant-gardists and the ideologues of the grand style was determined, first of all, by the necessity of leadership on the cultural front. The struggle which took place was one between two eras. For the totalitarian ideology the victory in this struggle meant the ultimate establishment of the party dictatorship in the country and the fall of the last bastion of the past: the spirit of independent art. In this light, the dissolution of the avant-garde should be recognized as one of the most crucial concerns of the official aesthetics.

The struggle with the left-wing art was begun even prior to the establishment of the conception of socialist realism and was carried on intensively, using all the possible levers and resources. The avant-garde was subjected to merciless criticism by Trotsky and Bukharin, who saw in the utopian conceptions of the avant-gardists a danger for the party conception of art. For the proletarian currents the avant-garde personified by itself “the face of the class enemy” (as the artistic image of Alexander Moslov had been defined), since left-wing art had placed the world-view priorities in a dependant position towards aestheticism. The cold negation of academic circles was determined, in its turn, by an antagonism of the aesthetics, since in the avant-garde art the traditional picture of the world underwent destruction.

At that, in order to guess the veritable essence of all the attacks and to understand why the art works of the avant-gardists, many of them outwardly loyal in terms of politics and even revolutionary in spirit, were mercilessly denigrated, it is necessary to examine and reveal the very definitions of avant-garde and avant-gardism in art, as well as the characteristic features of the aesthetics of the avant-garde.

Basing my assumptions on the experience of numerous researchers (Krusanov, Nakov, Vlasov and others) as well as on my own positions, stated in my books “The Russian Avant-garde and the Works of Alexander Mosolov of the 1920–1930s” and “The Composers of the Russian Avant-Garde” I shall dwell first of all on the conclusions, made as a result of researching the avant-garde art of the first third of the 20th century.

1. Avant-gardism and the avant-garde should be examined as an independent phenomenon of the artistic culture of the 20th century; the genetic connection with the art of modernism, asserted by a number of art critics (including Sarabyanov, Jacquard, etc.) do not allow it to be brought out in the guise of a style-defining component. Modernism and avant-gardism present themselves as a world-viewing, aesthetical and stylistic opposition, in which modernism presents itself as a conglomeration of trends and directions, which develop and transform the late romantic conception of art (hence the dominant role of the subjective, hypertrophic, emotional beginnings, the evolutionary path of transformation of language, the dominating sense of the classical perceptions that a particular content should correspond with a particular form). Avant-gardism, on the other hand, comes out under the banner of the aesthetics of negation (hence: anti-romanticism, the striving towards objective qualities, anti-emotionalism, the revolutionary character of innovations of language and the basis of the thesis of the primacy of form which creates its own content).
2. Avant-gardism, the avant-garde, modernism and the modern style are born in periods of social-political, economical and cultural crises. However in the socio-cultural context these phenomena carry out different functions, presenting themselves as various types of reflection of reality. The modern style and modernism express a world-view of crisis, and in their framework the means of artistic generalization are subservient to the goal of constructing a myth about the apocalypse of European civilization and culture, the destruction of religious and ethical values of classical eras. Avant-gardism and the avant-garde are connected with the formation of an anti-crisis world-view, a definition of a futurological utopia. It is not accidental that the modernist aesthetics is for the most part retrospective, aimed towards a “golden” past age of culture, permeated with a sense of pessimism and nostalgia. In contrast to this the avant-gardist aesthetics opens up the perspectives of progress (social, scientific, etc.). its spiritual meaning is the awakening of a historical optimism and hedonism.
3. The avant-garde in a conjunction of similar philosophical and aesthetic positions presents an epoch in artistic culture, which expresses itself by means of a complex of similar stylistic features (such are the avant-garde of the 1910–1920s and that of the 1950–1960s). the avant-garde of the 1910–1920s in this regard is characterized by a) an aesthetics of negation, b) anti-romanticism, c) a futurological aim d) a social-political slant and e) a festive world perception.

Let us examine more closely the aforementioned traits, in order to determine the level of their correlation with the art of Stalin’s time.

The aesthetics of negation or the artistic nihilism of the avant-garde present themselves as its chief attributive feature. It is particularly the full-fledged negation of the classical heritage, the severance with tradition are what distinguish the avant-garde into a self-sufficient era in the art of the 20th century. It is particularly the crisis of classical culture at the beginning of the century which caused the conditions for creating a principally new anticlassical model of culture and art, which were meant to serve the cause of overcoming the apocalypse of world-view.

The process of crystallization of the anticlassical anti-traditionalist aesthetics, called for to find new paths in the arts, was connected with a radical juxtaposition of a new, left-modernist (which is how the avant-garde was called at that time) style with the manner of the previous eras, as well as a search of artistic media and methods, which would be principally different from the customary ones. Experimentation with the artistic language and form, their constant renewal presented themselves in this regard as the primary of all aesthetic trends, which is perfectly illustrated by the famous motto of V. Shklovsky “One must not create in already found forms”.

Simultaneously the most important criteria for artistic success of musical compositions was their programmatic-philosophical aspect, declaratively destroying within the consciousness of the listener perceptions of classical norms. At that, naturally, the avant-garde aesthetics had enhanced the functions of theory to a much greater degree in comparison with romanticism or modernism. The ideological, world-view and methodological sides of the musical compositions replaced to a great degree the traditionally understood artistic content. As a result the theoretical foundation of the primacy of form or, in essence,

the basis of the primacy of construction became the aim of the creative process; the intellectual, rational attitude towards the material of art determined the essence of art.

The broadening of the functions of theory in its turn conditioned the phenomenal quality of journalist-type art, the provoking aggressiveness, the scandal, the discursive quality and, as a result, its anti-aesthetic quality (in the classical sense) of the art works pertaining to the avant-garde. What becomes their personification and at the same time is the symbol of the nihilism of the era is the literary manifesto as a quintessence of the aesthetic and theoretic constructions of thought. The manifesto turns out to be the most important instrument for propaganda and of the assertion of the historical inevitability of the new art, whatever its artistic results may be. At the same time it is necessary to emphasize that in the programmatic assertions of these different art trends, for instance, the Russian futurists, ego-futurists, suprematists, etc., the future of the artistic culture was interpreted from mono-polar positions. The young avant-garde art saw itself in the role of the *dominating* aesthetics, without any concessions, in an a priori manner excluding the possibility of the development in the future of differing trends and directions. This crucial feature of the manifestos, expressing a rather aggressive striving towards exclusivity in its turn affected virtually all the art works of the avant-garde, especially its dramaturgy, the principles of composition, content, subject matter, etc. (such as, for instance, in the opera “The Victory over the Sun” by Matyushin, Malevich and Kruchyonykh, the “Anti-religious Symphony” by Mosolov, the Symphony for Factory Whistles by Avraamov).

Along with the journalistic sharpness and a discursive belligerence the aesthetics of negation attacks tradition with the aid of a particular kind of *quasi-religiosity*. It is commonly well-known that the tone of many art works pertaining to the avant-garde, similarly to the manifestos and declarations, are marked with particularly a prophetic pathos (which is perfectly illustrated by the messianic approach of Khlebnikov). The quasi-religiosity relied to a great degree on the myth of a religious, social and cultural universality, which was so popular at the time of the creation of the new artistic epoch, due to the new religious philosophy (Soloviev and Bulgakov), as well as the aesthetics of symbolism. However in the context of the avant-garde this myth was considerably modernized, since the accents in it were moved from the sphere of a solely spiritual experience into an aesthetic one. The universal qualities of the language of art totally replaced the strivings of the spiritual and ethic kinds, since the language of art was entrusted with transfiguring and reforming functions. It suffices to remember that it was particularly language and not the subject matter served as a basis of the first futurist opera and particularly the word presented the weapon which “killed” the Sun in this opera.

This is why the quasi-religious pathos revealed itself with the greatest apparentness not in the formation of the spiritual foundations of art (such attempts had been made but as a rule they modulated into the sphere of aesthetics, such as, for instance, in the work of Kandinsky “Concerning the Spiritual in Art”) but, on the contrary, into aesthetic dogmas and canons of language, which were called upon to play the role of the cornerstones of a single style of the era, an artistic universe (such as, for instance, in the suprematist doctrine of Malevich, the constructivist speculations of Rodchenko, the conceptions of the innovative language of Zdanevich and Kruchyonykh, the pre-dodecaphony of Roslavetz, the microtonality of Matyushin and Wyschegradsky, etc.). On the other hand, in the context of the aesthetic utopia the artistic style the *artistic style* is perceived as a *means for transforming reality*. Art in particular was called upon to change the world, to form it according to its image and likeness. The “aesthetic amorality” which the priest Zenkovsky wrote about manifested itself to the fullest degree. The aesthetic inclinations replaced the problems of morality and took the place of the ethical imperative.

The aesthetics of negation, undoubtedly, reflects the social-political vector of history as well. The *revolutionary qualities* of the content of avant-garde art, directed at overthrowing of the existing aesthetical norms, is conditioned by the spirit of the revolutionary times, which attacks the aged positions of the old world, autocracy in the first place. The avant-garde, as it seemed, entered into a race with the revolutionary political parties in its formation of a negative perception of a degrading system of governmental and social relations, on the culture that was falling apart. “I place a *nihil* over everything that was established”. These striking words are by Mayakovsky, and they demonstrate an artistic nihilism in both the aesthetical and the social-political aspects!

*This way, the aesthetics of negation expressed the **historical purpose** of the new art, its actuality and inevitability. I marked the creation of a historical and cultural opposition to the aesthetics, culture, morals and norms of the social and political relations of the previous century, which by that time had already been exhausted. At that the realization of the nihilistic world perception became to an established degree dependent on the dogmatic, mono-polar and extremely aggressive means of influence on*

the social conscience, having undergone a great amount of circulation during the revolutionary era (it suffices to compare the language of the avant-garde manifestos with the language of political discussions, the declarations and programs of political parties).

The *anti-romantic* features of the avant-garde manifests itself in the form of a style-determining component. It was particularly anti-romanticism which becomes an original type of strategy of revolutionary art, uniting into itself numerous trends and directions, each of which in its turn tried to obtain a personal type of tactics, to define its own line of behavior within the artistic world. Let us bring our own quotation from the aforementioned book about the Russian avant-garde. “The anti-romanticism of the avant-garde <...> points at that inner substance of movement, since notwithstanding all the anti-traditionalism of the aesthetics the object of negation and reevaluation of in the avant-garde was not all “old art”, but primarily romantic art and its transformations, i.e. the art of the historically interconnected period, which possessed a polar world perception and world view. On the contrary, in the art of the pre-romantic periods, the pagan and non-European cultures the avant-gardists sought for the foundation for the anti-romantic conception of artistic creativity. For instance, the turning of Kharms and Mosolov to the traditions of Russian critical realism, Goncharova’s interest in ancient Russian art or Khlebnikov’s interest in the poetics of 18th century Russian classicism presented itself not as a recreation of traditions, but a means of expression of a new world-view, some of the characteristic features of which were a rationalistic perception of the world and an overcoming of subjectivism and emotionalism... In the artistic systems of the avant-garde there was no place for romantic sensuousness and romantic exaltation. <...> Thus, the avant-garde strove for a creation of a certain universal artistic model, a universal image of the world, in which the aspects of super-subjectivity and total humanity played the most crucial role. In this connection the norms of language within the avant-garde presupposed a constructive attitude in its approach towards the creative process and a development of such universal means, which would exclude a prevalence of the emotional element.” (I, 21–22).

This was the way for the formation of the **utopia** about form as a concentration of the meaning of art in general as well as of a work of art in particular. Basic importance in this utopia was attached to the primal elements of the language of art (color, dimension, sound, rhythm and phoneme), which would play the role of the undoubted constants, personifying this or that form of art in general. It is not by accident that compositional principles, the formation of subject matter, the creation of form, as they were presented by the romantic aesthetics were rejected from opposing positions. Depiction was replaced by abstract forms, semantic coherence – by a regular destruction of all levels of communication and the traditional, tonal harmonic system – by new tonality, serialism, microtonality, etc.

In terms of general aesthetic analogies, one must emphasize the fact that in its anti-romantic direction the avant-garde of the 1910–1920s was aligned with various trends and directions of art, which strove for obtaining artistically universal qualities, based on an objective, unemotional depiction of reality. As a result the *spectrum of artistic compromises* of the avant-garde (especially in the 20s) turned to be exceptionally wide: neoclassicism (through the prism of the works of Stravinsky, Prokofiev, Popov and Lourie), neofolklorism (Stravinsky), the revolutionary and proletarian art (the mass festive actions of the first post-revolutionary years in Russia, Schillinger, Mosolov, Deshevov, Shostakovich). Naturally, the aesthetical compromises presumed a more supple attitude towards the dogmas of form or experiment. The move beyond the boundaries of the aesthetics’ hermeticism allowed a broadening of the system of genres and even to find points of connection with tradition.

The possibilities of stylistic compromises on the basis of the already formed dictionary of contemporary art was demonstrated by the avant-garde in full measure in the late 20s and early 30s. It was particularly then that the anti-romantic pathos found its expression not only in the non-romantic interpretation of artistic forms but in a new content which fully reflected the dramatic substance of the epoch (Shostakovich, Scherbachov, Popov, Mosolov, Lourie, Roslavetz, Mayakovsky, Zabolotsky, Zamyatin, Platonov, Kharms, late Malevich, Deineka, Petrov-Vodkin, etc.).

The futurological direction presents itself on one hand as an essential feature of the avant-garde and on the other hand as a methodological element. The very circumstance that futurology is associated by us with the essence of the phenomenon could be explained by the fact that from the moment of its inception the avant-garde has identified itself with the art of the future. The great majority of avant-garde directions form their conception of art as a utopia, as a world-view which projects the image of the future into contemporary reality, which does not correspond to the ideals. The style and methods of the avant-garde was examined by its followers in terms of the necessities of tomorrow. The new style and the new aesthetics,

according to the train of thought of Mayakovsky and Meierhold, Malevich and Roslavetz, should be a replacement for the out-of-date art of the past which had lost its relevance and is no longer capable of any self-development. Of course, the revolutionary crisis which the culture of that time was undergoing was not helpful towards the construction of argumentative schemes for the new. Moreover the language systems of the trends and directions of the avant-garde were distinct for their experimental slant and also, frequently, a polarity of aesthetic positions. Their lack of sturdiness along with the swift changes of conceptions did not have the ability, as it seemed, to create a counterbalance for tradition. However during the revolutionary era in a particular sense tradition itself demonstrated itself as being on the side of the avant-garde. After all, the romanticism which had discredited itself as well as the academicism of the *conservatism of academic art in the guise of decadence turned out to be the most serious arguments in favor of the art of the future*, which at that time had existed only in theory, only as a perceived necessity.

This is why at the first stage (in the 1910s) futurology asserted itself so conspicuously and so declaratively in the sphere of the pragmatics of avant-garde, as well as in the aspiration to become a recognizable feature at any cost, marking the boundaries of the unknown. This is why it could be found in works by avant-gardists in unusual, daring aspects. Firstly, futurology manifests itself here as a consistent violation of the canons and classical norms of the language. The experimental perspective of the creative work of the avant-gardists creates the precedent of the anti-communicativeness of the aesthetics, its elite and hermetic quality. The reasons for this are all too apparent: the language of the art of the future, being in a stage of formation, cannot be accessible and accepted by everybody. Secondly, futurology manifests itself on a level of a lack of social communication of art. Nihilism presumes the usage of provoking, scandalous means and forms of effect on society; it consistently establishes the boundaries between the present day and the future norms and conventions of behavior. As a result the scandalous and sensational aspects of the avant-garde become its symbols, since the art of the future is unthinkable without the struggle of both aesthetical perceptions and ethical canons.

Nonetheless, one of the strongest points of the avant-garde is in its capability of adapting itself in difficult times of crisis. It is not by chance that the etymology of the concept (“going ahead” or “at the vanguard”) reflects the most important vector of the aesthetics. During concrete historical conditions this vector not only indicates at the capability of art in being ahead of the current events in the sphere of artistic culture itself (i.e. continuously to discover something new, to create the future forms for art) as well as in the social sphere (i.e. to personify by itself specific social and political tendencies). In this respect during a revolutionary era the avant-garde expresses primarily a social utopia (which had not yet formed itself into a concrete ideological scheme in the 1910s). the idea of the liquidation of the old regime’s state organization, the ideas of large-scale reforms were, of course, were exceptionally close to the world-view of the radically inclined artistic intellectual milieu. Moreover, the utopia of a just society corresponded to the utmost degree with the utopia of new art. Thus, gradually in the pre-revolutionary era the conception was being formed of the identity of the new world and of its art (which would subsequently become the basis of the world-view of the new Soviet avant-garde), as well as the utopia of the possibility of the rejuvenation of the world by means of art (bringing to mind the mystical-philosophical concepts of Malevich, the Russian futurists, the musical-philosophical conceptions of Scriabin, Lourie and Wyschnegradsky). Here futurology came out on a level of reflection and a global generalization of the most profound historical processes.

It is not an accidental occurrence that in the dimension of the method of the avant-garde futurology establishes such schemes of language and dramaturgy which fixate the basic moods of the world-view of the society contemporary to it. Among its most important components which should be especially noted are *mono-polarity and a tri-temporal domain of language and dramaturgy*.

The *mono-polarity* as an artistic principle and as a means for selection of the expressive means and at the same time their organization, is based on the nihilistic basis of the avant-garde aesthetics. From the perception of the futurological utopia this nihilistic perspective marks the boundary between the art of the past and that of the future in the most precise manner. Nevertheless, the aesthetics of negation emphasizes not as much the polarity as particularly the mono-polarity of the perception of art. After all, the past as viewed in the framework of the orthodox avant-garde approach is evaluated from the point of view of its absolute irrelevance. “To throw the great old masters form the steamboat of modernity” was the slogan that determined the artistic and historical inapplicability of tradition for the future times. Hence the language of the art of the future, which was recognized de facto as the solely permissible and historically justified, is formed under the sign, as had already been emphasized, of the absolute opposition to tradition: depiction was countered by figurative representation, syntactic coherence – by intellectual absurdity, tonality – by

atonality, etc. Classical harmony in music, the canons of depiction and the classical canons of poetry do not find any applicability in the dictionary of new art. Their aesthetic value is denigrated from the point of view of the artificially created mono-polar system.

In its turn, the discrediting of classical canonic norms takes place on the level of form and dramaturgy. Firstly, classical principles of form building are consistently avoided by means of the usage of antitheses of structure and genre, as well as various original “language innovations” (“Symphony of Factory Whistles” by Avraamov, “Mysterium buffa” by Mayakovsky, “Svadebka” (the title of “Les Noces” used in the diminutive form in Russian) by Stravinsky, “The Iron-Concrete Poem” by Kamensky, as well as the abstract art of Kandinsky and Malevich), in which direct allusions to classical art are deliberately avoided. Secondly, if the classical primary images do occasionally appear in the art works of the avant-garde, as a rule they undergo a merciless type of revision or destruction (for instance, the grotesque parody presentation in the works of Mosolov, Kharms, Mayakovsky, Shostakovich, etc.). in any case the classical heritage appears not as an object worthy of imitation, not as a “Golden Age” of culture (which is the most characteristic perception of historical retrospective for the art of the 17th–19th centuries), but as an object of aesthetic aggression for the sake of asserting the new aesthetics.

The “*tri-temporal domain*” (here we base our definitions on the point of view offered by A. Kamensky in regards to the compositional systems of revolutionary art of the turn of the decades of the 1910–1920s) in a certain sense elucidates the priorities of mono-polarity in terms of language and dramaturgy. The tri-temporal scheme presented itself as a characteristic product of the revolutionary era. Moreover, it was particularly the avant-garde aesthetics which formed this scheme for the sake of the philosophical and artistic foundation for the revolutionary transformations. This scheme reveals the necessity of changes in the life of culture of society by means of a vindication of the future, representing a free world, filled with happiness and creative artistic impulses. However, in order to create the artistic symbol of the future, it did not suffice merely to counter the established norms of language and dramaturgy. It was necessary to build a system of their interaction. In a certain sense the “tri-temporal” principle solved this problem.

Thus, in the aspect of the dramaturgy in works of art the following chain of interaction is laid out. The primary time frame of this system is the past, the secondary time frame is the present and the third one is the future. The *first* of these is connected with the grotesque negative rendition of images (such as, for instance, in the “Mysterium-buffa” by Mayakovsky and Meierhold). At that the objects of the past are brought out of the proper condition of norms of communication (since everything which is connected with the repellent perception of the world, even features of everyday mundane life, undergoes a destructive type of deformation, – for instance, if the luxury of wealth is depicted, then from the perspective of left-wing artists this presents an ugly, repellent luxury). In their turn, just like in folk theater, the characters depicting the past are as a rule bereft of psychological depiction or demonstration of their individuality. Being classified a priori into the category of evil, they are reduced to the sole function of masks (such are the characters of the works of Mayakovsky, Eisenstein, Kozintsev, Filonov, Meierhold, Zoschenko, Mosolov and others). The *present* as a rule is presented in two aspects. On one hand, these are images taken from the past, but relevant for the present day (historical figures, revolutionaries, etc.). On the other hand, it presents the thicket of contemporary events, including the revolutionary and social changes. Nevertheless, this sphere of images is presented at a no less distance from everyday mundane reality. The positive imagery is also interpreted at a maximally generalized manner, where the most essential elements from the point of view of revolutionary futurology are emphasized: heroism, bravery, self-sacrifice, nobleness, etc. the individual, peculiar, personal elements do not find a place in the characteristics of these characters. Such are the images of the revolutionary, rebellious character (folk heroes, heroes of myths and legends, such as, for instance, Prometheus, the heroes of the French Revolution and, of course, the creators of the art of the future themselves – such is the Aviator in the opera “Victory over the Sun,” the image of the poet in Mayakovsky’s poetry, the Chairman of the Earth Globe in Khlebnikov’s works). At the same time, despite all of their generalized characteristics, the positive images in avant-garde art acquire details that are very recognizable to their contemporaries. An important feature of this bringing in these numerous details is in the documentation, the likeness to historical factuality (which is typical for Mayakovsky, the masters of LEF, the constructivists and even in music the revolutionary contemporaneity is frequently connected with quoted material, namely revolutionary song; such are the quotes from the famous song containing the nickname “Apple”, the “Marseillaise” of the Russian revolution in Deshevov’s ballet “The Red Whirlwind” and in Lourie’s String Quartet, the “International” in Mosolov’s opera “The Dam”, as well as the numerous song quotations in Schillinger’s symphonic rhapsody “October”, etc.).

The collision arising upon the juxtaposition of the past of the present is projected onto the future. The outward collision of the polar image spheres (upon the lack of a real conflict, since the functions of the spheres are indicated from the beginning and the outcome of their struggle is predetermined) leads toward the creation of the third time, which fulfills the role of the dramaturgical constant (the philosophical symbol around which the conflict between the past and the present takes place). In the avant-garde art this third time was interpreted differently at various periods. However, in the 1910s as well as in the 1920s the meaning of the third time extended beyond the domain of a one-dimensional ideological projection. The third name, which was the future, was conceived of in terms of an expression of ethical and aesthetical imperatives of the era, as the revolution itself was perceived by the radically leaning intellectuals under the sign of primarily a spiritual and aesthetical transfiguration. Only in its secondary aspect it was perceived of as a means of social reform.

In this connection, images which predict and vindicate in advance the revolutionary catastrophe: such are Scriabin's "Prometheus" as well as Malevich's famous "Black Square" which appeared for the first time as a result of polarizations of the past and the present in the opera "Victory over the Sun"; such is the aesthetical result of Mayakovsky's "Mysterium-buffa". In the 1920s the futurological picture of the gleaming world, inheriting the utopian views of More and Campanella, Chernyshevsky and Marx, was replaced by more concrete symbols, determined by the changed image of the world. Firstly, the expected revolution became the reality, and secondly the future obtained features of reality and accessibility, because it started to be associated with the program of its creation. The future in the eyes of Mayakovsky and Meierhold, Deineka and Selvinsky is perceived as a symbol of the highest level of the scientific-technical and industrial progress, as a symbol of the communist justice, order and cessation of all conflict. The present scheme, which appeared in the art of the 1920s in the guise of a produced utopia, created an independent sphere of imagery. It was represented first of all by mask-images (including those of the familiar heroes and leaders, including Lenin), which symbolized not merely a new world-view but particularly that of the future; secondly, the fantastic pictures of collective labor and happiness (such as the painting by Juon "The Conquered Planet", Mayakovsky's Finale to the comedy "The Bedbug", Mosolov's final act of the ballet "Four Moscows", Deshevov's "The Red Whirlwind", Shostakovich's "The Golden Age"); thirdly, the images of production themselves, the labor on machines (Mosolov's "Iron Factory", Shostakovich's "The Screwdriver", Prokofiev's "Steel Prancer", Polovinkin's "Elektrifikat", subject matter dealing with production in works by Deineka and Filonov, as well as the poetic lauding of machine labor by the production workers and constructivists).

Of course, laying out a tri-temporal dramaturgy found correspondence in new principles of organization of language. For the first time the *possibility of stylistic compromise*, the simultaneous usage of the language of the art of the past in conjunction with contemporary tried-out means and techniques of an experimental type was perceived of as a stylistic inevitability. Finally, the dropping of stylistic barriers, the intermixing of "high" and "low" was regarded as a basis of a new vocabulary for art and of its aesthetics. The artistic range of stylistic compromises was explored in the 1920s (thus, for instance, in the music of Mosolov and Shostakovich the past appeared in the form of romantic clichés in the harmony, melody and texture, the present was embodied into sound-images which were developed by the aesthetics of modernism and of the avant-garde and the future acquired features of an advancing, robust sound-depicting motor quality).

Thus, in conclusion one can assert that the futurology of the avant-garde complements and discloses the characteristic features of artistic nihilism and anti-romanticism, forming a developed and varied system of interactions of language and dramaturgy. At the same time futurology created a central image sphere of the avant-garde aesthetics, connected with a vindication of the art and culture of the future. Within its framework the ethical and aesthetical priorities of the avant-garde is asserted, personified by means of a mono-polar and tri-temporal schemes of language and dramaturgy. Moreover, the interconnection between these schemes turns out to be exceptionally important within the context of the avant-garde as a whole as well as in the context of separate works in particular. The mono-polarity carries out the function of separation and limitation. The tri-temporal domain discovers a reverse connection, projecting the collision of the past with the present to form the ideal future. *In this utopian picture the meaning of the semantic constant becomes firmly attached to the time of the future. This becomes the aim of art and the aim of world history.*

The social-political slant of left-wing art points at the significance of the ideological aspect in the aesthetics of the avant-garde. It is not an accidental occurrence that the outward hermetic and elite qualities

of the aesthetical conceptions were compensated in the artistic context of the era by a bright social and political resonance of the avant-garde. The aesthetical utopia sought and found common features with various world-view and political utopias of the time. The radical character of the avant-gardists' views sought for support in radical political and ideological programs. A brilliant expression of the spirit of the times in the 1910s turns out to be in the *national-patriotic* moods of the leftists. This is conditioned in general by a wave of patriotism during the pre-war era, manifesting itself in the peculiar renaissance of the folk and ancient Russian art in the works of artists who were close to the avant-garde (such as Khlebnikov, Stravinsky, Roerich, Larionov, Goncharova, Prokofiev and Mayakovsky). Incidentally, attention should be paid to the similarity of the national-patriotic tendencies of the Russian and the Italian futurists (the sympathies of the latter toward fascism are well-known). Marinetti, Russolo, De Chirico and others also attempt to lay out a futurological concept on the basis of a patriotic utopia which was supposed to recreate the spirit of the great historical past.

No less apparently the ideological vector of the era is reflected by the pro-revolutionary, pro-proletarian world-view. The sympathies towards the left-wing parties would subsequently turn many of the representatives of the avant-garde into large-scale social and governmental activists during the first years of the Soviet regime (such as Mayakovsky, Lourie, Roslavetz and Meierhold). At this point the artistic world-view already merges directly with the *revolutionary utopia*, the art works turn into creating art in life, art and politics are interpreted as organically unified entities.

During the 1920s the political directedness of the avant-garde acquired new features. The aesthetics of the avant-garde gradually transcends the poly-ideological stage. The national-patriotic and revolutionary world-view is modified by the mono-polar, single-party system of the emerging Soviet state. Thus, the development of the new phenomenon of artistic culture, particularly of the Soviet avant-garde was already taking place under the sign of adherence to the party, becomes tinged more and more with the red color. The avant-garde movements which end up being in opposition to the new influences gradually get evicted from the scene of the artistic life. The proletarian and communist models of ideology take one of the central positions in the aesthetics of the avant-garde and in the theme of the compositions. The search for a compromise with the Proletkult (as expressed by the participation of the futurists in it), the revolutionary, pro-communist phraseology of the manifestos (for instance the OBERIU or the masters of analytical art), development in art works of the subject matter of the proletarian revolution, the revolutionary history and socialist construction – all of this indicates an extremely important trait for the self-realization and self-development of the avant-garde: to present in itself not only the combination of numerous artistic trends, not only an era in art and, finally, not only a style, but, in essence, *a large-scale social union which influenced the formation of Soviet culture, on the ideological program of the government*. Of course, the ambition connected with the winning of dictatorial powers in cultural politics was in reality just as utopian and hardly achievable as the artistic utopia. It was even more the cases as it met with a decisive resistance from the proletarian groups, academic circles and, finally, the Bolshevik politicians themselves. The leaders of the avant-garde were not in a condition to realize these kinds of ambitions, among other reasons, due to their extreme dispersion, in contrast to the well-organized proletarian unions, which frequently fulfilled their aims not in the sphere of artistic creativity but in the crafty takings over of key positions in the mass media and propaganda, as well as in the committees for repertoire and censorship. Nevertheless, the social-political acuity, the modern quality of sound remained the significant features of the avant-garde up to the early 1930s, which found its manifestation in a whole set of masterpieces, permeated with the spirit of the revolutionary era. Among them are Mayakovsky's poes "Vladimir Ilyich Lenin" and "Good", Selvinsky's "Ulyalyayevschina", Shostakovich's Second Symphony – "Tribute to October" and Third Symphony – "May First", Mosolov's opera "The Dam", Deshevov's ballet "The Red Whirlwind" and opera "Ice and Steel", schillinger's "October", Roslavetz's "Komsomolia", Tatlin's "Memorial to the Third International" and the depictive panorama of the revolution in the works of Malevich, Rodchenko, Filonov, Deineka and others.

The revolutionary spirit of the aesthetics of the avant-garde, the desire to overthrow all types of norms and conventions, the very nihilistic, anti-romantic, futurological, social and political doctrines themselves gave birth to a special tone of the art, the characteristic feature of the emotional condition of which was the mood of *festivity*. Festivity, a joyful and young acceptance of everything new, the directedness "towards the new shores" (as one of the music journals which glorified revolutionary art in the 1920s was called) was conditioned by the victorious procession of the revolution, both the artistic and the social. The state of festivity was born as an emotional climax of the tri-temporal optimistic tragedy of the revolution, in

which victory was achieved by the idea of the future. The festivity of world perception created the necessary emotional opposition to the art of the past. The revolution was perceived here through the prism of *historical optimism* in counterbalance to the academic and modernist traditions, in which contemporaneity appeared in an apocalyptic view. At the same time the festive mood compensated (taking into account the constructive, universal and supra-individual traits of the artistic systems of the avant-garde) the dearth of emotional background and the limitation of the specter of the direct artistic impact.

Equally important was the artistic gear of the festive aspect. Let us quote the astute observations of A. Kamensky in regards to the festive spirit of revolutionary art. "Each carried out social revolution throughout the entire course of its development breathes with a pathos of historical justice, its victory over the unrighteous, the inhumane, the outdated and hence contains an element of victory (and, in this sense, of festivity), which is the most important element for its historical dynamism". At the same time, "The October Revolution presented itself not only as the outcome but also the beginning of a new era. The conviction that we are witnessing in front of our eyes an overall renewal of social structures and – broader than that – of all of life – veritably determined during the first post-revolutionary years the world perception of contemporaries, which in this sense acquired a traditionally festive direction" (4, 9). "Peace and brotherhood of peoples – this is the sign under which the Russian revolution is taking place"; "Sooner or later everything will run in a new manner, since life is wonderful", declared A. Blok. Kamensky comments the poet's words in the following manner: "Of course this interpretation has an emotional, romantic character – in front of us is a classical festive utopia. It is profoundly humanistic, but presents the post-revolutionary world as good, kind, light "generally", as a symbolic image, only indirectly connected with the historical and national concreteness" (ibid., 10).

The utopia as an ideal, mythological model of society and of its culture appealed in essence to the archetypal religious consciousness. The future, which was perceived as a joyful and magic antithesis to the past, was something that it was necessary to *believe* in. its foundation was connected first of all in the rejection of the overturned world, with the fallen autocracy and capitalism, and not in a definite program of a just organization of the presently achieved world. Hence the inevitability of the forthcoming of the future world was imprinted into the consciousness as a *creed*, while the festive atmosphere of the brilliant and little understood art served as a background for this new faith, just like in the Christian tradition the rhythm of the church festivities and liturgies by means of its joyful exit from everyday life spoke about faith, about the past and the future. In essence, all the representatives of the avant-garde without exceptions became participants, to one degree or another, in the creation of the new ideologically charged creed, tinted with a positive festive color.

Such is the design of the avant-garde aesthetics as described in general terms. Let us now turn to the parallels with the grand style of totalitarian art, in order to present the argument for the proposed thesis of that significant role that the avant-garde played in its formation.

1. The *aesthetics of negation* in the avant-garde found its reflection in the creation of a common aesthetical program of totalitarian art, connected with the aggressive opposition of its own method and style to other trends and directions. The authoritarianism of the aesthetics, to which the avant-garde aspired, was realized in full measure by totalitarian art. The destruction of the preceding artistic traditions under the supposedly sole right point of view was successfully carried out within the framework of the new cultural politics. This destruction had, just like the case of the avant-garde, a selective directedness (everything which corresponded to the aesthetic criteria of the new art was acquired for usage). In other words, not all tradition was rejected. Naturally, direct rejection and ostracism was imposed on the avant-garde and modernism, which ended up being placed under the common definition of "bourgeois art", as well as the greater part of Western art, which was evaluated from analogous positions. Harsh criticism was exerted on proletarian art as well as a manifestation of ultra-left-wing ideology. At the same time, among the models and canons of the method and style, as is well-known, folk art, realism and the Russian natural school were accepted. Nevertheless it would be far from correct to assume that selection from the classical heritage as a model of a stylistic basis presented itself as a symbol of revival of tradition. The past in both the avant-garde and in the context of the grand style was viewed as a peculiar type of allusion, demonstrating not the old qualities of the artistic traditions but the new aesthetic approach. Indeed, at the basis of the aesthetics of totalitarianism a core feature was brought in, which was in a certain sense the *nihilistic imperative*, dividing the art of the era of Stalin and the Russian art of the new times, namely *the rejection of the freedom of individual artistic creativity, the assertion of the priority of collective*

attitudes towards an art work, which was expressed primarily in the concept of the party-line in art. The fixation on the stereotype of world perception in its turn dictated a strict regulation of themes, genres, artistic means, techniques, etc.

2. The *anti-romanticism* of the avant-garde likewise finds its reflection in the grand style. Firstly, the anti-romantic directedness of the grand style, even in its least amount of manifestation, presents itself in the *cardinal lack of interest of totalitarian art in the discovery of the complex, self-contradictory world of the human being, of revealing the tragic conflict of the individual and society or, on the other hand, of the inner conflict of the personality.* At a dominating position is the tendency of lack of conflict, which is capable of emphasizing in the most pronounced manner the ideological and world-view imperatives. It is not by chance that the perception of the human being as a function in the context of history, the state, culture, etc., brings closer together the conceptions of the avant-garde and the grand style, notwithstanding the fact that the difference in the concrete artistic reflection of this function brings a specific difference between them (the avant-garde destroys the anthropocentric picture of the world, while totalitarianism restores it). Secondly, the search for similarities in the history of culture brings the avant-garde and the grand style first of all to the restatement of those aesthetical focal points from the past, which demonstrate a universality, aspiration towards a stylistic unity (even at the expense of the artistically individual or author's personal elements), finally, the objective traits of the language of art (from hence comes imitation of the archetypical features of religious, canonical art, the folk tradition, the art of the pre-romantic epochs and non-European cultures, etc.). At the same time such features demonstrated by the grand style as: the demand for an active emotional tone, affected rhetoric, romantic pathos, the outward aspiration towards expressivity and simplicity of artistic means, – though they place totalitarian art in a position of outward opposition to the avant-garde, still they do not bring in the contradiction into the thesis about the anti-romantic tendency. Thirdly, the drive towards universality and objectivity of language in the ideological domain of avant-garde art formed a specific anti-romantic *artistic symbolism, which served as the means for the expression of certain world-view canons.* The spiral-shaped construction of the Monument to the Third International by Tatlin in this sense presented in itself a dialectic ladder, turned towards a utopian future. The Black Square symbolized the myth of the victory of the creative, futurist element over the outdated principles of copying reality, the victory of the new over the old. Shostakovich's Second Symphony unfolded a depictive sound diptych, a "poster", recounting of the movement of revolutionary masses to the center of the insurrection and the very apotheosis of the revolution. *The supra-individual, supra-emotional (in terms of expression of the collective emotional surge), the poster-like and, thus, the non-conflict interpretation of the most important categories of ideology and aesthetics accepted by the avant-garde as a type of dramaturgical canvas and artistic technique, undoubtedly, obtained further development in the grand style.* It is remarkable that even at the level of a system of images many features were taken over by socialist realism from the avant-garde. Such is, for example, the unity of the *hyperbolic (mythological) and factually veritable space*, the features of which are superbly demonstrated in the poems of the Russian avant-garde poets Kruchyonikh and Kamensky about Lenin, set to music by the well-known proletarian composers Davidenko and Schechter.

3. *The futurological utopia* is also inherited by totalitarian art. It is possible that particularly this feature is the one that indicates towards the essential likeness of these two conceptions. After all, in the center of the aesthetics of the avant-garde as well as that of totalitarian art happens to be the myth about the society and human being of the future. "The avant-gardist concept of creating the new human being became later an esoteric mission of totalitarian culture" as I. Golomstock notes. Hence the creation of the new art, its theoretical foundation, relies in many ways on the world-view, philosophical and political myths. In its turn, the revolutionary character, as well as the well-known artificiality of the new types of aesthetics, rejects the direct dependence on the speculative foundation of ideological dogmas and on the artificiality of political utopias.

Especially striking is the reflection of the dominant features of the dramaturgy and language of the avant-garde in the grand style, which is in the mono-polarity and the tri-temporal domain. It is not difficult to notice that the mono-polar aspect of the futurology of the avant-garde presents a mirror duplication of the social and political zombie aspects of the time period, moreover, of the 20th century in general – namely, the aspirations of the social groups and unions, the political parties and social stratum, finally, the governments, to create mono-polar, single-party, social, state and world systems, in which this given mono-polarity would be interpreted from the point of view of the highest stage of civilization, the model of perfection and the world of the future. At the same time, the dominating features in any totalitarian

or imperial model, of any mono-polar doctrine, was particularly the discrediting of the experience of the past and the consistent destruction of tradition. In the aspect of dramaturgy and language, the grand style, likewise to the avant-garde, consistently expressed this mono-polar ideology. Any hostile phenomenon in the domain of world-views (which, in its turn, was associated with the past, such as, for instance, the contemporary West in the eyes of the Soviet ideologues was the embodiment of conservatism and agedness of social relations) unfolded in the art works of the grand style through the prism of the grotesque, comical and unreal perception, presuming its rejection on moral grounds. The images of political adversaries, the enemies of the new government, underwent merciless denigration, in them the lowest human qualities, as well as the physical and moral handicaps were emphasized. Just as in the avant-garde style the negative characters were turned into a metaphor of evil, imitating the typical perceptions in folk art of the polar uniformity of good and evil, as well as the absolute necessity of the victory of good over evil. It is remarkable that this type of archetypal cognition of the aims of art was demonstrated not only by Soviet ideologues. Let us bring forth a quotation from Adolf Hitler: "Of course, art had also continuously demonstrated the tragic contradictions of life, and it had always shown, utilizing them in its creations, the struggle between good and evil, that is between the useful and the harmful. However, this was not done to accept the victory of the harmful, but in order to prove the necessity of the useful" (3, 8).

Of course in regards to the stereotypes of language the mono-polar domain in the grand style was filled not by means of juxtaposing the vocabulary of experimental art with that of the classical tradition. Moreover, the creation of utopian reality in totalitarian art was connection not of a hyper-new language but, following Lenin's and Stalin's directions, in the reevaluation of the artistic experience of civilization, with the restoration of the classical systems in literature, the visual arts and music. In this regard, a mono-stylistic model was being formed. Correspondingly, beyond the scope of the language of totalitarian art was a type of art the language norms of which contradicted the classical ones. This category included modernism, the avant-garde, certain trends in proletarian art, as well as any experimental trends (for instance, electronic music). Parallel to this, keeping in mind the ideological engagement of the grand style, outside of the scope of its language domain was all the art with religious and spiritual content, as well as subcultures, associated with the concept of bourgeois art (practically all the trends in Western art, in which the vindication of revolution and communism was absent, as well as mass culture, including jazz and the light music of cabarets and music halls). In light of what was stated earlier it becomes apparent that the inclination towards the revival of the classical tradition in this case was followed in the grand style by its virtual canonization, the transformation of the models of form and language into a comfortable media for a reevaluation of world perception. As a result the artistic method of totalitarian art became even more hermetic than any of the most orthodox artistic method of the art of the left (for instance, orthodox serialism). Likewise to the avant-garde, the deviation from the norms was regarded as a compromise with a hostile aesthetics, which contradicted the meaning of new art (for the avant-garde the aesthetic value of a work of art disappeared as a result of repetition of artistic means, whereas in the grand style the same effect was achieved as a result of any deviation from the already established means). Similarly to this, as becomes apparent, is the demonstration of the same tint of mono-polar negation, albeit in a mirror reflection to the similar phenomenon in the avant-garde style.

The tri-temporal conception of dramaturgy in the grand style enhanced the ideological mono-polar aspect and, undoubtedly, served the cause of asserting the futurological conception. Albeit the futurological utopia acquired in totalitarian art a principally different tint than that of the avant-garde art, nonetheless, the scheme of correlation of images and language forms, symbolizing the temporal triad, was preserved in its general features. However the accents within the scheme were shifted. Of course, totalitarian art, which expressed the dogmas of the totalitarian regime, was called upon to reject the past, and with it the hostile present. Undoubtedly, totalitarian art asserted the future in the form of the aesthetic and spiritual symbol of the epoch. However, the future in the totalitarian conception, which was initially devoid of the dynamism of self-development, was in effect identical to the present. The victory of the revolution and socialism substituted with itself the great victory of communism, toward which revolutionary art aspired. Hence, the language of the future, the futurist, intellectually paradoxical, the OBERIU language, etc., all the languages of the avant-garde epoch turned out to be meaningless sound effects of a tradition that was not relevant within the new, historical context and, hence, an alien one. During the Stalin era the present-future was already geared towards the documental, democratic, historically conditioned language, devoid of the boldness of experimentation, though a universal one, which formulated a united system of image and style.

4. *The social and political slant, as well as the festive mood of totalitarian art* has no need for additional argumentation. Strictly speaking, these present the same features, without which it becomes impossible to recognize the grand style of totalitarian art. The grand style relies upon the ideological and social-political dogma, recreating its focal positions in the form of artistic symbols, tinted in positive festive tones. The distinction from the avant-garde art could be determined here, once again, on the level of interpretation of the tri-temporal utopia. The festive mood as a foretaste and the victory of the revolution in the grand style is turned into an imitation of the final victory of the *present-future* over the past. The apotheosis of the present-future becomes the central theme in art. Here the contemporary leaders are brought out onto an supra-temporal, supra-historical pedestal, the party becomes the symbol of eternal state power, the international model is personified with the sought-after brotherhood of peoples, formed by an ethnically undifferentiated mass of people. Of course, for the revolutionary avant-garde such an outcome of events could hardly present itself as an acceptable one. *In the tri-temporal festive conception of totalitarian art there was no place for the future, since the mythologized reality substituted for the image of the latter.*

As could be observed, most of the features of the aesthetics of the avant-garde are able to find their modification and development within the framework of the totalitarian model. The avant-garde, as a form of art born from the necessity for social and artistic revolution, prepares the aesthetic and ideological ground for the grand style, along with the Marxist-Leninist aesthetics, pro-totalitarian philosophy, communist ideology, a proletarian world perception, etc. Similarly to totalitarian art the avant-garde in its historical scale demonstrates itself as a form of reaction to social and political crisis (hence the revolutionary and futurological qualities), as a reaction towards the decentralization of the state and of culture (hence the aspiration towards a universality, stylistic unity, a mono-polarity of world perception), as a reaction to the decadence of culture (hence the festive mood and the historical optimism). The conclusion could be made that the aspiration itself toward a world-view mono-polarity, a stylistic universality, the ability to play the functional role of a mirror, which reflects the extreme political intensity of the epoch, **endow the avant-garde with the features of being one of the forms of pro-totalitarian art** and in a certain sense one of its **prototypes**. Nevertheless, these same features are able to turn the avant-garde into a victim of totalitarianism. The power over the human consciousness and soul in the mono-polar ideological dimension can pertain to one sole form of aesthetics, one world-viewing system, which excludes the possibility of contradictions, conflicts and, correspondingly, pluralism.

Literature

1. I. Vorobyev, "The Russian Avant-garde and the Works of Alexander Mosolov from the 1920-1930s". St. Petersburg, 2006.
2. I. Golomstock, "Totalitarian art". Moscow, 1994.
3. Internet website: www.krugosvet.ru/articles/ Totalitarian art (with a reference to L. Richard Le, Nazisme et la Culture. Paris, 1978).
4. A. Kamensky, The Festive World of Revolution / A. Kamensky, Romantic Installment. Moscow, 1989.

Santrauka

Avangardas kaip totalitarinio meno prototipas. Muzikinio ir nemuzikinio avangardo istorijos eskizai

Sąvoką „totalitarinis menas“ reikia suprasti kaip normatyvinės estetikos rūšį, atspindinčią ideologinius totalitarinės sistemos pagrindus (XX a. ketvirtojo–šeštojo dešimtmečių sovietinis menas, Trečiojo reicho menas, trečiojo–penktojo dešimtmečių Italijos menas ir pan.).

Sąvoką „avangardas“ reikia suprasti kaip meninės kultūros epochą, įgaunančią išraišką per panašių stiliaus požymių kompleksą (XX a. antrojo–trečiojo, šeštojo–septintojo dešimtmečių avangardas). Šiame kontekste antrasis–trečiasis dešimtmečiai charakterizuojami šiais bruožais: a) neigimo estetika; b) antiromantizmu; c) futurologiniu kryptingumu; d) socialiniu-politiniu atspalviu; e) šventiška pasaulėjauta.

Neigimo estetika – tai atributinis avangardo bruožas, suteikiantis pagrindą antiklasikinio meno modelio sukūrimui. Pagrindiniai šio modelio bruožai: nihilistinis požiūris į praeities meną, revoliucingas kalbos traktavimas, siekis besąlygiškai dominuoti savos epochos meninės kultūros kontekste ir, tam tikra prasme, antiestetškumas (Michailo Matiušino, Kazimiro Malevičiaus ir Aleksejaus Kručionych opera „Pergalė prieš saulę“, Arsenijaus Avraamovo „Fabriko sirenų simfonija“ ir kt.).

Antiromantizmas – tai pagrindinis ir stilių nusakantis avangardo estetikos komponentas. Neigimo objektu tampa ne visas senasis menas, bet būtent romantiškasis menas su jo subjektyviu ir hipertrofuotai emocionaliu pasaulio suvokimu (Arturo Lourie „Formos ore“, Nikolajaus Roslaveco trečiojo dešimtmečio kūrybos stilius ir technika, Vladimiro Ščerbačiovo ir Gavriilo Popovo trečiojo dešimtmečio kūriniai ir kt.).

Futurologinis kryptingumas – esminis avangardo aspektas. Avangardas tapatinamas su ateities menu kuriant „laimingos ateities“ ir jos kultūros utopiją. Iš čia išplaukia ryškūs dramaturginiai akcentai: „vienpoliškumo“ principo naudojimas, vadinamosios „trilaukės erdvės“ formavimas kompozicinės sistemos lygmeniu (Josepho Schillingerio „Spalis“, Aleksandro Mosolovo opera „Užtvanka“ ir simfoninis paveikslas „Gamykla“, Vladimiro Deševovo baletas „Raudonasis uraganas“ ir kt.).

Socialinis-politinis atspalvis išryškina ideologinio aspekto reikšmingumą avangardo estetikoje (Dmitrijaus Šostakovičiaus Antroji ir Trečioji simfonijos, Nikolajaus Roslaveco „Komsomolija“, Vladimiro Deševovo „Ledas ir plienas“).

Šventiškumas – tai revoliucinės-utopinės ir socialinės-politinės avangardo doktrinų išraiška. Šventiška nuotaika sukuria emocinę opoziciją romantizmo ir modernizmo menui *istorinio optimizmo* požiūriu (instrumentinė ir orkestrinė Dmitrijaus Šostakovičiaus kūryba, trečiojo–ketvirtojo dešimtmečių Leonido Polovinkino, Aleksandro Mosolovo, Vladimiro Deševovo ir Josepho Schillingerio kūriniai).

Esant visų išvardytų aspektų kompleksui, avangardas tampa totalitarinio meno prototipu. *Neigimo estetika* atsispindi bendroje estetinėje totalitarinio meno programoje (agresyvi priešprieša kitokiems metodams ir stiliams, universalumas, kanoniškumas). *Antiromantizmas* pasireiškia visišku totalitarinio meno nesuinteresuotumu atskleisti sudėtingą vidinį žmogaus pasaulį, siekti nekonfliktiškumo (pvz., muzikoje tai paryškkinama epinio bei dainingojo tipo intonacijų vyravimu). *Futurologinė utopija* atsispindi mito apie ateities žmogų ir visuomenę kūrime, o *socialinis-politinis atspalvis ir šventiškumas* – ideologinio mito apie alternatyvos neturintį socialinį-ekonominį modelį kristalizavimesi. Nors ir nerasdamas tiesioginių analogijų su avangardo kultūra kalbos ir formos dimensijose, ketvirtojo–šeštojo dešimtmečių totalitarinis menas, neišskiriant ir muzikos, turi stebėtinų panašumų su avangardo estetika (puikių šio estetinio giminingumo pavyzdžių yra Šostakovičiaus, Popovo, Ščerbačiovo, Mosolovo, Miaskovskio, Chačaturiano ir kitų kompozitorių kūryboje).