

Nana SHARIKADZE

Georgian Unofficial Music as a Fact of Musical Resistance

Gruzijos neoficialioji muzika kaip muzikinio pasipriešinimo veiksnys

V. Sarajishvili Tbilisi State Conservatoire, Griboedov str 8-10, 0108, Tbilisi, Georgia
n_sharikadze@hotmail.com, rector@tsc.edu.ge

Abstract

Cultural resistance reveals itself in different forms; it represents the act of unmortification of art and often appears as a tool against power, and restrictions and censorship in art. In the Soviet Union, with its strong censorship practices, the act of ignoring the “rules defined for all forms of art” while making art music can be perceived as an act of resistance. Unofficial art music and censorship have always been interrelated throughout the history of Soviet music. Micheil Shugliashvili is an outstanding Georgian composer of the generation of the 1960s and a brilliant member of the so-called musical resistance in a country where attacking freedom formed the main attitude for life and culture. He represents a unique example of an individual who had never been in touch with Western music. While isolated in the Eastern political bloc, he managed to reveal and incorporate new music information and find his own ways of expression, which earned him the name of the most distinguished Georgian avant-garde artist. His works were interpreted as the “Georgian analogue of Xenakis.”

Keywords: Micheil Shugliashvili, unofficial music and Georgian avant-garde.

Anotacija

Kultūroje pasipriešinimas reiškiasi įvairiomis formomis: menas dažnai tampa įrankiu kovoje su valdžia prieš ribojimus ir cenzūrą. Sovietų Sąjungoje griežtai cenzūruojamas akademinės muzikos kūrimas, ignoruojant „taisykles, nustatytas visoms meno formoms“, gali būti suvokiamas kaip pasipriešinimo veiksmas. Per visą sovietinės muzikos istoriją neoficialioji akademinė muzika visuomet buvo susijusi su cenzūra. Micheilis Šugliašvilis (Shugliashvili) yra žymus septintojo dešimtmečio kartos gruzinų kompozitorius ir talentingas vadinamojo muzikinio pasipriešinimo atstovas šalyje, kurioje kova už laisvę visuomet formavo požiūrį į gyvenimą ir kultūrą. Ši unikali individualybė neturėjo ryšių su vakarietiškais muzikos procesais: uždarytas rytų politiniame bloke, jis sugebėjo aptikti ir panaudoti naujausią muzikos informaciją bei rasti savitus išraiškos būdus, pelniusius jam žymiausio gruzinų avangardisto vardą; jo kūryba interpretuojama kaip „gruziniškasis Xenakio analogas“.

Reikšminiai žodžiai: Micheilis Šugliašvilis, neoficialioji muzika, gruzinų avangardas.

Introduction

The relationship between the dominant, so-called official culture and unofficial culture lies in the deviance from the rules defined for all forms of art and contradicts what was agreed as being “normal” in the Soviet regime. The degree of deviance shaped the degree of resistance in artistic/musical work.

The present article will deliver a short overview of the meaning of resistance in culture associated with the different forms of Soviet art music: *unofficial*, *underground*, *nonconformist*, *other music*, and *underground art*. Attention will be drawn to the concept of unofficial art due to its ability to deviate from the norms of politically driven art. Furthermore, interrelations between unofficial art and censorship will be highlighted in the light of totalitarian regimes, since the act of ignoring the “rules defined for all forms of art” while making art music in the Soviet regime can be perceived as an act of resistance.

The Thaw epoch, with its liberalization, brought back a sense of accessibility to the “forbidden fruit” as well as a feeling of boundlessness. At the same time, the cultural policy introduced after WW2, which was based on confrontation and opposition between the Western and Eastern political blocs, created a dichotomy between modernism and social realism. Through the light of post-Stalinist times, the development of Georgian art music of the 1960s will be discussed. This was a time when representatives of both official and unofficial music had entered the musical scene and contributed to the fast and diverse development of art music in Soviet Georgia. These names included Sulkhan Nasidze, Sulkhan Tsintsadze, Giya Kancheli, Otar Taktakishvili, Nodar Gabunia, Bidzina Kvernadze, Natela Svanidze, and Micheil Shugliashvili. This was the time when unofficial music was born in Georgia—it was time full of experiments and new ideas that were not in line with the official concepts of the ruling party. How the Georgian music reflected all the above-mentioned issues will be discussed in the present

article. The history of Georgian unofficial music will be looked at from the perspective of its origins and development as well as through the relationships between the unofficial and official. Furthermore, the 1960s will be outlined as the turning point for the Georgian music scene, which served as a foundation for the Westernization of creative minds and therefore contributed to the firm development of the culture of resistance in art music. Shugliashvili's works written for three grand pianos will be examined as an example of unofficial art music. All three pieces were written in the 1970s and created on an original technological idea based on a progression of numbers.

Resistance in music: fact or myth?

Cultural resistance is generally a complex phenomenon, has been associated with various types of music, and has been described with different terms during the Soviet regime: unofficial, underground, nonconformist, other music, or underground art. All the above-mentioned terms serve as a synonym for describing the forms of expression the resistance in culture against totalitarian regimes took.

For the purpose of outlining the general definition of resistance in Soviet art music, I would refer to the common features in all abovementioned terms and underline them: it's an ability of culture to resist the rules defined for all forms of art by the official culture and contradict what has been agreed upon to be "normal" in an official sense. Thus, the term unofficial music comprehensively describes the act of resistance against politically driven art and best expresses the cultural reality of deviance from the standardization of culture. Therefore, the term unofficial music will be used throughout the article as a synonym for the act of willfully disobeying an order from a superior authority and not belonging to the dominant culture.

The history of resistance in music/unofficial music has been dealt with ambivalently: on one hand, art not belonging to the hegemonic culture was banned and was not known to a broader audience; on the other hand, it existed as a fact and was known to a small circle of specialists. For instance, Natela Svanidze and Micheil Shugliashvili, Georgian unofficial composers, were known to their contemporaries, but music lovers did not have any information about their works.

What is the main concept of unofficial art music?

The relationship between the dominant, so-called official culture and the unofficial one lies in deviance from the rules defined for all forms of art. The unofficial culture and art music, and the contradiction between the official

and unofficial concepts, have been thoroughly discussed by various researchers¹ and argued in the light of different issues related to deviance from the norms.

The importance of adherence to the rules or deviance from them in art music was well acknowledged by the fathers of Soviet ideology; they introduced the norms and dogmas on how music should be perceived by the "new working class" since the ideological fathers "considered literature and the arts as a weapon in the revolutionary armory...":

Lenin hesitated to dictate a single style for socialist culture, but he intervened whenever he saw something he disliked. He permitted what he considered harmless bourgeois culture to survive so long as he did not find it too expensive, too critical, or too independent. When the market in cultural goods vanished, all arts became public arts and all artists became de facto state employees (Brooks and Chernyavskiy 2007: 142)

We can assume that the act of maintaining a constant adherence towards what "they" disliked represented an act of unmortification of art music, where the degree of deviance shaped the degree of resistance in art and often appeared as a tool against the powers as well as restrictions and censorship in art. By paraphrasing Rebecca Raby's statement, deviance from accepted standards and approved rules defined resistance against politically driven art (Raby 2005: 153).

Even after Stalin's death, Kabalevsky's statement, made in 1959, was quite in line with Lenin's views. Kabalevsky argued that:

The Composer is First and Foremost a Citizen [...] young composers should more clearly and fully realize that huge responsibility that lies upon them... you are first and foremost a citizen of your society, who should help your people in their gigantic creative work directed toward the building of a new communist society, and that you should be in the front lines of that society—this realization should guide every one of us, independent of our age, our talent, or our stage of maturity (Schmelz 2005: 140)².

Is that the only reason why keeping to the rules was so important to the authorities of the totalitarian regime? Why was it so important for the Soviets to have a clear understanding about what was official or unofficial in art music?

The answer lies far beyond musical art and most likely not only in music, but rather in political concepts. Since art was considered as a weapon in the revolutionary armory that aimed to bring up the new working class, the weapon should have served political aims:

The bipolar, black-and-white world that was introduced after WW2 revealed not only the confrontation and opposition between the Western and Eastern political blocs, but the dichotomy between modernism and social realism as well.

Policies that supported the antimodernist movement in art music created lots of gaps in the music financed by the Soviets. It's well-known that social realism showed preference for traditional forms and approaches in terms of harmony, musical language, and style; it was ardently against Western modernism and the avant-garde. (Sharikadze 2019: 18)

The role and function of official art music was to create a status or position, and the privilege and esteem attached to it. So, what did art music look like in terms of gaining status, fitting the ideology, having the proper aesthetic background, and becoming part of the cultural space as permitted by the cultural center? What did those unmortified art music composers have to contradict?

Briefly going through all the above mentioned questions and outlining art music according to a black-and-white reality, the following might be said:

- Status: official vs unofficial
- Ideology: Soviet vs anti-Soviet
- Aesthetic basis: social realism vs modernism/avant-gardism
- Cultural space: Soviet Union vs the Western political bloc;
- Cultural center: Moscow vs the multicentered culture of the West

This black-and-white reality was introduced with the intention to preserve the party line in culture, and that literally meant using censorship as a tool for ensuring the "normal," "official" order in art, to strengthen the Soviet ideology through all cultural means.

What was opposite to the official status in Soviet Union? It's clear that unofficial art music was placed opposite to official music. The main reason for that was its strong leanings towards Westernization, in other words, the influence of modernism and avant-gardism on art music.

As long as the ideology sought to preserve the purity of its concepts, censorship held high importance. Thus, it is unimaginable to talk about unofficial music without discussing the concept of censorship because they have been interrelated throughout the history of Soviet culture³; moreover, censorship was literally a reply to those "unmortified ones" that the system was not able to gain victory over; everything that did not conform to the ideals of socialist realism became officially sanctioned by the police state. Although strict censorship was softened during the Thaw, not much had been changed in terms of cultural policy. On one hand, the rules were in place for those following socialist realism as the dominant culture. On another hand, even in the drastic '30s, Communist Party leaders "faced opposition from the intelligentsia, and the Bolsheviks accepted the support of some avant-garde artists and writers. Lenin initially tolerated them, perhaps because of the prestige they lent Bolshevik rule" (Brooks and Chernyavskiy 2007: 142) and offered "to extend the boundaries of official tolerance by adopting a line considered by authorities" (McDermott

and Stibbe 2006: 90, 91). "It was also a surviving formula, a modality for writers and artists to cheat Communist censorship without going the whole way into open political opposition" (Copoeru and Sepp 2007: 74).

The abovementioned arguments allow Ross Haenfler (Haenfler 2014) to argue that those cases enforced conformity. It is worth mentioning that, during the time of the Communist regime, as Joseph Bakshtein, the Russian curator, author, and museum director, wrote:

The duality of life in which the official perception of everyday reality is independent of the reality of the imagination leads to a situation where art plays a special role in society. In any culture, art is a special reality, but in the Soviet Union, art was doubly real precisely because it had no relation to reality. It was a higher reality... The goal of nonconformism in art was to challenge the status of official artistic reality, to question it, to treat it with irony. Yet that was the one unacceptable thing. All of Soviet society rested on orthodoxy, and nonconformism was its enemy. That is why even the conditional and partial legalization of nonconformism⁴ in the mid-1970s was the beginning of the end of the Soviet regime (Bakshtein 1995: 332).

According to the polarity of perception in culture, it is evident that the Soviet totalitarian regime created a challenging space for musical art where in addition to ideology dictating forms of expression in music, individuals were trying to shake the concept of politically driven art through music (Sharikadze 2020).

The Thaw and unofficial music

Discussion about unofficial music typically starts by describing the importance of the Thaw era with relation to its birth. The political context is crucial to having a comprehensive understanding about the real statement art makes, but it's also essential for interpreting the circumstance in an objective way. In that regard, I would draw attention to the following quotes by two famous individuals from the twentieth century—Nikita Khrushchev and Zygmunt Mycielski—the first a politician, the second a musician. Both had absolutely different mindsets and approaches to culture and the problems faced by art.

Although Khrushchev⁵ did not focus on art in his secret speech, the real intention of the "Thaw maker" might be found in the Declaration on Music in Soviet Society made by him on March 8, 1963:

Music in which there is no melody produces nothing but irritation. [...] A normal person finds it difficult to understand what is hidden behind the word dodecaphonic... We need music that inspires, that calls for heroic deeds and for constructive labor. Music for such bands can be written only by composers who adhere to positions of socialist realism.

[...] We want to stipulate our own attitude towards music, its tasks and its creative direction. To put it briefly, we are for melodic music, rich in content, which stirs the souls of men, generating strong feelings. We are against cacophonous music. [...] Music in which there is no melody produces nothing but irritation. They tell us that such opinions as mine reveal a lack of understanding. [...] A normal person finds it difficult to understand what is hidden behind the word dodecaphonic, but in all probability, it is the same as cacophonous. Well, this cacophonous music we totally reject. Our people cannot include such trash in our ideological armament. (Shouts in the audience: "Right!") We need music that inspires, that calls for heroic deeds and for constructive labor. When a soldier goes to war, he takes all that he needs with him, and the regiment band never leaves him. It inspires him during the army march. Music for such bands can be written only by composers who adhere to positions of socialist realism, who remain close to everyday life and to the problems of national struggle, those who are supported by the people. Our political stand in art is that of intransigent opposition to abstractionism, formalism and other bourgeois perversions of this type. It is Lenin's line, which we have unswervingly followed, and which we will continue to follow. (APPLAUSE). (Slonimski 1971: 1377–1378)

Another influential figure, the well-known Polish composer Zygmunt Mycielski, argued about the challenges of the modern artistic world and its further development in Poland:

Unfortunately, we live in a world that is closed—and practically speaking—isolated from the artistic life surrounding us. Even numerous official visits, congresses, or conventions, which only a few—usually the same—artists and virtuosos attend, do not help here. That is not true artistic contact. Artistic contact means concert life, and concert programs on which a person can define the best achievements of music from around the world; it means easy access to publications, an exchange of the finest soloists and conductors. [...] we are becoming a provincial land, in which we cannot imagine either how or what is being played or produced in other places. We do not know what the level of an orchestra or violinist, or oboist is, or how a conductor interprets a particular work. Here in Poland the majority of musicians are not acquainted with Prokofiev's symphony for cello and orchestra, and we do not know all of Shostakovich's symphonies, or even the compositions of Janacek or Bartok, or the current works of Honegger, Stravinsky, Britten or Messiaen. [...] Such is the state of things. Ignorance of what is happening in our held elsewhere increases every year this is more than dangerous. (Droba 2014: 336)

According to Khrushchev's speech, life in the Soviet Union, including cultural life, stood on the pillar of the bipolar world concept, which was based on the perception of a black-and-white reality with its clearly identified boundaries, where revelation of any symptoms of the

Westernization of culture was enough to be labeled anti-Soviet or anti-official. The only parts of the Thaw speech that might be seen as positive were both the declaration of liberalization and openness as well as the testing of the limits of censorship.

It's true that the Thaw epoch, with its liberalization, brought back the sense of accessibility to the "forbidden fruit" as well as a feeling of boundlessness. At the same time, the Thaw created expectations, revealed positive signs in terms of opening doors for information, offered a perspective for the future without a cult of personality, and softened censorship. However, Thaw politics did not have a universal expression in culture. Khrushchev speaks for it since in his speech no word was said about the new cultural policy of the Soviets. In other words, it is clearly shown by the leader of the police state that the evaluation of the appropriateness of art music was still under strict control and no deviance from the rules was to be considered even during the Thaw.

In contrast to the Soviet leader, Mycielski underlined the dramatic situation for the further development of cultural life in Poland, which recalls the Georgian Soviet reality. Akaki Bakradze, the Georgian publicist and writer, described the state in the literature as follows:

Any doctrine was an expression of Russia's interest, which considered the interests of Georgia only to the extent of being acceptable for Russia. What is good and admissible for Russia is good and admissible for Georgia (and for all non-Russians). We have become one of the Russia's provinces like the Tambov or Kaluga regions. (Bakradze 2018: 2)

Bakradze's statement applied to art music as well.

Furthermore, the cultural policy during the Thaw epoch was still full of contradictions. On the one hand, the Soviet government upheld the participation of Soviet musicians in such festivals as Warsaw Autumn in Poland, but on the other hand, the Soviets adhered and remained in the dichotomy of the modernism and avant-garde. It was especially aimed towards the so called "young composers" keen to adopt the various "avant-garde" techniques of the West and actively falling under the influence of Westernization.

As a result, these "young composers," or "molodye kompozitory," as the Soviet press pointedly labeled them in negative screeds until well after they had ceased to be young, eagerly adopted the various "avant-garde" techniques of the West. The very specific use to which I am putting "young composers" (aided by the English "the" absent from the Russian original) thus has its genesis in the negative criticism of the time. I am using it to refer to a specific group of composers, those composers who would only later, in the mid-1960s, become unofficial, after the power relations within Soviet musical life had solidified, and what can legitimately be called an unofficial musical subculture had developed... In Russian the phrase "young composer" is as generic as its literal English

translation, but in its Soviet usage during the Thaw it acquired more specific shades of meaning. While Sovetskaya muzika carried general rubrics called “The Creative Activity of the Youth” (Tvorchestvo molodyozh’), and published many articles detailing compositions by “young composers”; when it came to negative criticism, the term “young composer” was turned into an epithet with a very specific connotation (Schmelz 2005: 140).

The name “young composers” was given to the generation born in the 1930s. They came onto the musical scene after WW2, and among them were Sofia Gubaidulina, Alfred Schnittke, Edison Denisov in Russia, Arvo Pärt in Estonia, and Natela Svanidze and Micheil Shugliashvili in Georgia. Various means of censorship were used to punish creative expression by this group, from banning the creative works⁶ of the rule breakers to outright ignoring them.

That is, when the “young composers” were mentioned critically it was very clear who was being addressed, as was the case. The composers started out as “young”—immature, impressionable, and hence only misguided—but as the 1960s unfolded they gradually moved beyond the pale, either receiving more direct criticism or, more often, going entirely unmentioned in the Soviet press; they became unofficial (Schmelz 2005: 140).

In this clash between the system and the individual—where it was so hard for a person to gain victory over the system—the generation of unofficial composers (these so-called “young composers”) was born. Both Natela Svanidze, a Georgian composer of Soviet times whose work is often neglected, and Micheil Shugliashvili, one of the founders of Georgian unofficial (so-called repressed) music, were members of this group.

Its paradoxical that the official art music, with its strong ideological background, created a stimulus for the development of unofficial music in the Soviet Union before and even during the Thaw. It was strangely predicted by Georgi Plekhanov⁷ at the beginning of the last century:

There is no force on earth which could say to art: You must take this and not another direction (Sjeklocha and Mead 1967: V).

Towards unofficial music: the Georgian case

The history of Georgian unofficial art music started after the death of Stalin and lasted until *perestroika*. Thus, the 1960s turned out to be important for Soviet music due to the birth of unofficial art music. The 60s are crucial for Georgian music for the following reasons in addition to those already mentioned:

a) First, this is a time when such Georgian composers as Sulkhan Nasidze, Sulkhan Tsintsadze, Gyia Kancheli, Otar Taktakishvili, Nodar Gabunia, Bidzina

Kvernadze, Natela Svanidze, Micheil Shugliashvili and other representatives of the official as well as unofficial music entered the musical scene and contributed to the rapid and diverse development of art music in Soviet Georgia.

- b) The 1960s was a time when radical changes had taken place in Georgian music; the “generation of 60s” contributed to those changes to a large extent. These changes affected all aspects of musical thinking, including language, style, and genre.
- c) In the beginning of the 1960s, the Thaw allowed artists to discover new influences, such as the new Vienna school, John Cage, Béla Bartók, and the Polish avant-garde. The Georgian compositional school started to catch up to the information coming from the West and strived to find its way beyond the borders of the Soviet Union. But apart from that, composers had to be careful about producing abstract musical language and experiments.
- d) Composers tried to carve out a space for official and unofficial so-called “other music.” Nasidze, Gabunia, Kvernadze, Kancheli, and others worked within the context of the Thaw and post-Thaw musical reality, while Svanidze and Shugliashvili experienced problems in reaching out to their audiences.
- e) Soviet composers, Georgians among them, were allowed to attend the Warsaw Autumn Festival of contemporary music in Poland and to perform their works there. That of course was not the case for unofficial composers.
- f) An information boom accompanied sanctions and bans. The information boom was developed with a solid interest in pluralism, Neoromanticism, Prokofiev’s and Schostakovich’s music, Bartók’s works and all types of avant-garde techniques.

Generally, Georgian music strived to enrich musical language with new findings and saw a chance for development in linking tradition with modernity: Tsintsadze wrote his second symphony (1962), followed by Kancheli’s Concerto for orchestra (1962), *Largo and Allegro* (1963), and the First Symphony (1966), Kvernadze’s *Dance Phantasy* (1961); in 1968 Gabichvadze, Toradze, and Nasidze wrote their second symphonies, and that same year Svanidze created his first symphony; one year later, Nasidze wrote chamber symphony No 3.

Simultaneously, unofficial Georgian music was on the rise: Natela Svanidze drastically changed her style in 1963 after she visited the Warsaw Autumn Festival; Micheil Shugliashvili intended to blow out of the water all his works written in the 1960s. Although new ideas were not in line with the official concepts of the ruling party, unofficial art was flourishing while still being marginalized by the Soviets. The voices of unofficial Georgian composers—those of

Natela Svanidze and Micheil Shugliashvili—were either not heard loudly enough or at all.

Can we trace any tendencies from the past that could predict the birth of unofficial music in Georgia? The answer to this question is negative. But I think it's important to explain the reason thoroughly by looking back at history.

Let's start with the fact that Georgia as a country was occupied by the Red Army in 1921 and, as a result, became isolated from European artistic life, followed by full suppression in the 1930s. Generally speaking, the disadvantage of being one of the socialist republics of the Soviet empire was, in addition to occupation, the fact that the cultural paradigm was broken off and the newly established Georgian compositional school (just three years prior to occupation) found itself in another reality, that of social realism. The new Georgian professional school established in 1918 had had no time for experiments and independent development. Ideologically driven Georgian music of 1920–1950 might serve as the best example of this period. Let's list the objective reasons for the abovementioned:

- 1932 Stalin's government took control of the arts with the publication of *On the Reconstruction of Literary-Artistic Organizations*, a decree that placed artists' unions under the control of the Communist Party.
- Two years later, in the context of the promotion of socialist realism, four categories of unacceptable art were defined and labeled "formalistic" art; these categories included abstractionism, expressionism, and conceptual art.
- The worst part of this period in history was that the world was narrowed to the borders of the Soviet Union and the only cultural center for the peripheral republics was Moscow, the capital of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.
- In 1936, avant-garde artists who were unable or unwilling to adapt to the new policy were forced out of their positions and often either murdered or sent to the Gulag, as part of Stalin's Great Purge.

In the 1930s the music was "carrying out less threat" for ideological standard-bearers. Only a few musicians were executed in the 1930s if we compare music to other fields (e.g., writing, art, theater, or poetry) in Georgia. There is an explanation for this phenomenon: in the 1920 and 1930s, after the occupation the Georgian professional music school was balanced in terms of style, was not adherent to the experiments, and there was no threat of music influencing the working class. Maybe lack of experiments and new ideas was the advocacy for the survival of the Georgian composers.

If unofficial musical culture might be traced through the history of closed performances in Soviet Russia, that was not the case for Georgia before the period of Thaw for art music:

Unofficial musical subculture took root in rare performances in small, closed venues such as scientific institutes in Moscow like FIAN—the Physics Institute of the Academy of Science (Fizicheskiy Institut Akademiy Nauk)—or the Kurchatov Institute (Institut imeni Kurchatova). There were also concerts, as we have seen, in open, publicly accessible venues like the Small Hall of the Moscow Conservatory, the Small Hall of the Leningrad Philharmonic, and even the hall at the House of Composers in Leningrad. The performances at these venues were dictated more by chance than anything else (Schmelz 2005: 198).

The Westernization of creative minds, which was revealed through the adoption of "strange" language features before then unknown, began to occur from the 1960s. The Georgian compositional school had to catch up with the information that was accumulated in the West during the period the Iron Curtain divided Europe.

Inspirational "contact zone"

The Westernization of creative minds occurred through various channels, one of the most crucial being "contact zones" (Mary Louise Pratt's expression). Contact zones were where "cultural goods are exchanged" (Lisa Jakelski); the more Mary Louise Pratt stated that the term referred "to social spaces where cultures meet, clash and grapple with each other, often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relations of power, such as colonialism, slavery, or their aftermaths as they lived out in many parts of the world today" (Pratt, 1991 :34). Such zones in music consisted of various "cultural goods" in its origin, stylistic pluralism, musical language, compositional techniques, concept, and musical aesthetics as well. Meanwhile contact zones were an important stimulus, a source for influence often accompanied by an information boom that served as an inspiration for reviving musical language and traditions (e.g., dodecaphony, sonorism, and aleatorics). Georgian composers in the 1960s received cultural goods through either personal contact (between members of the Russian avant-garde such as Schnittke, Denisov, or Gubaidulina, or representatives of unofficial art music) or through attending the Warsaw Autumn Festival of contemporary music in Poland. This festival rendered a great service in spreading information about recent tendencies in art music throughout the world. While Svanidze found inspiration at the Warsaw Autumn Festival and prepared for a drastic style change,⁸ Shugliashvili's personal friendship with Andrei Volkonski (the founder of unofficial music in the Soviet Union) allowed him access to new information. Volkonski visited Tbilisi several times, and a few Georgian composers had the opportunity to meet him at Shugliashvili's place.

Although Shugliashvili had never been at the WAF, his close friendship with Volkonski played a crucial role in the composer's life. The composer's efforts to modernize his music started with the adoption and adaptation of "new" techniques such as dodecaphony and serial, sonoristic, aleatory, and electronic techniques, the adoption of different compositional techniques such as Structuralism and Rationalism, and the use of algorithmic organization of mathematical models.

Micheil Shugliashvili (1941–1996)⁹

Micheil Shugliashvili was an outstanding Georgian composer and teacher, the founder of a computer music studio in Tbilisi, and a brilliant member of the so-called musical resistance in a country where attacking freedom formed the main attitude for life and culture. He was a unique example of an individual who had never been outside of the Soviet Union and who experienced the full means of Soviet censorship. He never tried to negotiate about musical style with decision-makers in culture, and that's why he was forced to exit musical life and become a teacher. Nearly all his works were banned from the 1970s to 2015, and these banned musical pieces were not published until 2018. His works found their way to the audience only after his death. In 1996 his piano work was performed for the first time by Nana Khubutia, respected Georgian pianist, teacher, and conservatoire professor. Despite this Shugliashvili managed to reveal and incorporate new music information into his work and find his own ways of expression, which gained him recognition as one of the most distinguished Georgian avant-garde artists. His works were interpreted as a Georgian analogue of Xenakis.

I found personal consultations with Shugliashvili's son and the composer's close friends and conducting individual interviews with his former pupils the appropriate approach to help me examine Shugliashvili's legacy. Personal recollections serve as a good source of information in this situation; we lack evidence, since no written material (publicity or interviews) is available. Shugliashvili as a person was extremely modest and did not place himself at the center of attention. He also did not pay attention to his archive, which was actually lost after his death. The only material that remains accessible is a few of his writings about the features of his individual compositional technique.

Due to the fact that the archive of the composer has been lost, researchers have to base their research on oral stories told by his contemporaries as well as his former pupils and friends, such as Reso Kiknadze, Zurab Nadareishvili, and Teimuraz Bakuradze.¹⁰

According to Shugliashvili, his main creative works are as follows:¹¹

For orchestra:

- *Gradationi* (1979)
- *Progressions* (1976)
- *Polichronie* (1978)
- *Paraphrase* (1976)

For two pianos and string quartet:

- *Sextet* (1973)

For piano:

- *Ecercise* (1972)
- *Da capo* (1976–1979)

For three pianos:

- *Grand Chromatic Phantasy* (1974 / 1976–1978)
- *Largo e Presto* (1977)
- *Pastorale* (1977–1978)

For tape:

- *Multiplications* (1977–1979)
- *Reminiscence* (1976)
- *Inversus* (1976 / 1972–1979)

As we know from his former pupils, Shugliashvili prioritized pieces he composed at the beginning of the 1970s. Shugliashvili left no details about the reason for this choice, but we can assume that the starting point may have been the compositional technique based on progressions of numbers which he became interested in and started working with in the 1970s. Shugliashvili explains the technique of the progression in the following way:

I have been working on this system since 1973. This technology is close to computer music and maybe that is a reason why these pieces are not performed. I am working on how to express musical form adequately graphically. Apart from that, since my student years, I've been working on the relevant graphic realization of the musical form and theoretical issues. The final solution and realization of it is not possible with the computer technique. Finally, I've been working on an original method for musical education for last 10 years, which has its followers among musicians in Tbilisi. (Kavtaradze 2018)

Shugliashvili's *Da capo* for piano and the following three most important compositions for three pianos have been selected: *Grand Chromatic Phantasy*, *Largo e Presto*, and *Pastoral*. All were written in the 1970s and created using his original technological idea based on the progression of numbers. This technique was explored for the first time in *Da capo*, the piece written for solo piano in 1973.

It's based on 24 structural non-changeable elements. On one hand, the sequence of the elements is defined by repetition (*da capo*); on another hand the static elements create a dynamic process where the sequence shows the intensity and the relaxation of the emotional load. Compositionally, the piece consists of symmetric sections; the relation between them is strictly based on the principle of *inversus*. (Shugliashvili M 2005)

The technique of the progression achieves another level in the group of pieces written for three pianos. Shugliashvili builds both parts of *Largo e Presto* on the quotes taken from Chopin's piano works: *Largo* starts with the reminiscence of the quote from Chopin's Prelude No. 20, while *Presto* is built on a quotation from Chopin's 2nd Sonata's Finale.

It's an unusual choice for an unofficial artist to refer to Chopin's piano works. Prelude, Op. 28 No. 20 in C minor, commonly known as "Chord Prelude," probably attracted Shugliashvili's attention because of its slow progression of quarter note chords. But what about the second part of *Presto*, which is developed on the Finale theme from the 2nd Sonata by Chopin? The short finale, which is also marked as *Presto*, is a *perpetuum mobile* in "relatively simple" binary form (Rosen 1995: 294). The sonata's final part has been inspiring musicians for decades: Garrick Ohlsson¹² described it as "the weirdest movement he's (Chopin) ever written in his whole life. [...] the movement was truly looking into the 20th century and post-romanticism and atonality" (Ohlsson 2018), Leikin noted the Chopin's finale as "probably the most enigmatic piece Chopin ever wrote" (Leikin 1994: 191), and Anton Rubinstein is said to have remarked that the fourth movement is the "wind howling around the gravestones" (Thompson 2013). Supposedly all of the above inspired Shugliashvili when he composed *presto* part. Shugliashvili emphasized:

[*Largo e Presto*] is based on the principle of register and canonic multiplication and reprise progression, which results in a peculiar sound based on acoustic and stereophonic effects. As for the form, the work is a triptych, the parts of which are conformed in equal time proportion (4 + 4 + 4 = 12). The work expresses epitaphic feeling, "sinking" in its statics gradually evokes dynamic mood. (Shugliashvili 2005)

Pastorale for three pianos was written in 1977–1978 with the aim to play "one 'pastoral' texture in each part, constructed on the intonations of Ionic mode. [...] Each piano part is a line of "mechanical" sequences, which acquire peculiar sound only in ensemble polyphony" (Kavtaradze 2018).

Grand Chromatic Phantasy ("Symphony") is a large-scaled composition written for three grand pianos and lasts nearly an hour. Shugliashvili was inspired by Bach's Chromatic Fantasy in D minor. Shugliashvili's piece with its "amazingly strong emotional impact is based on accurately calculated constructivist ideas and mathematical progressions. The idea of this construction is born from the chromatic scale and is realized on every level and provides algorithmic organization of mathematical models, sound and rhythmic material" (Kavtaradze 2018: 3). This is how the dialogue with Bach is carried out. Progression is everywhere, via canonic multiplication and reprise progression.

Each piano part has the line of "mechanic" sequences firstly short, then constructed on complete chromatic movements, which acquire particular function in ensemble polyphony. A rich arsenal of modern pianist technique (including rhythmic imitation on the lids of all three grand pianos) creates the effect of orchestra sound. The flows of pulsating sounds stretched in time often overlap, compress the space and erupt like volcanic lava. (Kavtaradze 2018: 4)

Conclusions

Shugliashvili's creative works tell us a story about the development of unofficial music in Soviet Georgia, but this is also a story about the unmortified artist's legacy in Georgian professional compositional school. Although Shugliashvili was underrepresented during his life, it took about 20 years to bring his works back into the light. Shugliashvili's life shows the turbulence of the status of unofficial music in politically driven art music. His legacy has still to be examined, and I do hope that this work will eventually be done.

Endnotes

- ¹ Rebecca Raby, Ross Haenfler, Paul Sjeklocha, Igor Mead, Marina Frolova-Walker, Richard Taruskin, Alexander Glezer, Joseph Bakshtein, Peter J. Schmelz, Nicolas Slonimsky, etc.
- ² I use Peter Schmelz's translation (Schmelz 2005).
- ³ Such an approach has been practiced in the Soviet Union since the 1930s. The "terror of censorship" drastically entered into force and lasted until the end of 1940, and the rules applied to music, art, and film. The decree stated that the measures were considered to be temporary, although censorship lasted until the 1980s. The rules dealt with small details, from the labels of bottles to the titles of operas (viz: The title for Glinka's opera *Life for the King* was changed to *Ivan Susanin*) to whole opera works (for instance, Tchaikovsky's opera works were considered inappropriate for the new Soviet class until the end of WW2). Violation of censorship rules could be construed as "divulging state secrets." Soviet censors worked with a large volume of information that was not suitable for publication/performance in open sources, among them artworks, literature, and musical pieces from the West, especially those with abstract musical language, avant-garde music, etc. However, censorship was not able to control the ban on literature due to *samizdat* literature (self-published literature).
- ⁴ The term "Soviet Nonconformist Artist" was applied to art produced from 1953 to 1986.
- ⁵ Nikita Khrushchov was the most scandalous first secretary of the Communist Party of the USSR and the "author" of the political Thaw, the term used in his secret speech at the 20th Communist Party Congress of the Soviet Union, held on February 24–25, 1956, in Moscow.
- ⁶ For instance, the synopsis of so-called "accepted musical pieces" for the staging and performance for Soviet ideology in music was published in 1929. It was done by the *Glavrepertkom* (the main council for repertoire in the 1930s). The

synopsis started with the preface: “The presented collection should be considered as an official publication of the *Glav-repertkom*; with this issue the published synopsis previous to May 28, 1928 are annulled” (Vlasova 2010: 47).

- 7 Georgi Plekhanov (1856–1918) was a Russian revolutionary, philosopher, founder of the social-democratic movement in Russia, and one of the first Russians to identify himself as “Marxist.”
- 8 Incidentally, Shugliashvili was the only composer who had never been included in the delegation of Georgian composers to be sent to Warsaw Autumn Festival (WAF).
- 9 Micheil Shugliashvili, a Georgian composer, was born in Tbilisi in 1941 and graduated from the Tbilisi State Conservatoire in 1964. He taught the subject of music theory and was the only composer who was never a member of the Communist Party
- 10 I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to Teimuraz Bakuradze and Ketevan Bolashvili, who provided me with information about the composer’s rare writings with the edition made by Bakuradze and Zurab Nadareishvili.
- 11 Shugliashvili wrote the following pieces between the 1962–1969:
 - Variation für Klavier* (1960);
 - Miniaturen* for woodwind quartet (1961);
 - Sonata for clarinet and piano (1962);
 - String Quartet (1963);
 - Simphonietta Suite* for orchestra (1964);
 - Scenes from Shota Rustaveli’s *The Knight in the Panther’s Skin* for chamber choir, harp, piano, 12 strings and percussion (1965);
 - Trio for clarinet in Es, in B and bass clarinet (1966);
 - 12 piano pieces for children (1967).
- 12 Garrick Olof Ohlsson was an American classical pianist and first-prize winner at the International Frédéric Chopin Piano Competition, the Busoni Competition in Italy, and the Montreal Piano Competition in Canada. Ohlsson was nominated for three Grammy Awards; he is a 2008 Grammy winner.

Bibliography

- Bakradze Akaki 2018 mortification of the literature (*Mtserlobis motviniereba*) Tbilisi.
- Bakshtein Joseph, “A View from Moscow,” in: *Nonconformist Art: The Soviet Experience 1956–1986*, Alla Rosenfeld and Norton T. Dodge (eds.), London: Thames and Hudson, 1995, p. 86.
- Bek, Mikuláš - Chew, Geoffrey. ‘Introduction: The Dialectics of Socialist Realism’, in: *Socialist Realism and Music*, Musicological colloquium at the Brno International Music Festival, 1-3 October 2001, edited by Mikuláš Bek, Geoffrey Chew and Petr Macek, Prague, Koniasch Latin Press, 2004 (Colloquia musicologica Brunensia, 36), pp. 9-15
- Brooks Jeffrey, and Georgiy Chernyavskiy, *Lenin and the Making of the Soviet State: A Brief History with Documents*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Copoceru Ion, and Hans Rainer Sepp (eds.), *Selected Essays from the Euro-Mediterranean Area. Part I*, Series Phenomenology 2005, Bucharest: Zeta Books, 2007.
- Droba Krzysztof, “Spotkania z Giją Kancelim” [The Meetings with Gija Kanceli], in: *Duchowość Europy Środkowej i Wschodniej w muzyce końca XX wieku* [The Spirituality of Central and Eastern Europe in the Music of the End of the 20th Century], Krzysztof Droba, Teresa Malecka and Krzysztof Sz wajgier (eds.), Kraków: Akademia Muzyczna, 2004, p. 335
- Glezer Alexander, “Soviet ‘Unofficial’ Art,” in: *Index on Censorship*, Vol. 4(4), December 1975, p. 35–40.
- Haenfler Ross, *Subcultures: The Basics*, New York, 2014.
- Kavtaradze Marina, “Introduction,” in: Micheil Shugliashvili, *Three Works for Three Pianos*, Warszawa: PWN, 2018.
- [Kabalevskiy] Кабалевский Дмитрий, “Композитор – прежде всего гражданин” [The Composer is first of all a Citizen], in: *Советская музыка*, No. 2, 1959, p. 13–20.
- Leikin Anatole, “The Sonatas,” in: Jim Samson (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Chopin. Cambridge Companions to Music*. Cambridge University Press, 1992, p. pp 160-188
- McDermott Kevin, and Matthew Stibbe (eds.). *Revolution and Resistance in Eastern Europe: Challenges to Communist Rule*. Oxford, New York: Berg Publishers, 2006.
- Nadareishvili Marika, “Musical Identity in New Georgian Music: Natel Svanidze – Eka Chabashvili,” in: *GESJ: Musicology and Cultural Science*, No. 2(12), 2015, p.46–51.
- Ohlsson Garrick, *Radio Chopin. Episode 44: Chopin’s Unruly Children. Piano Sonata No. 2 in B-flat minor, Op. 35:iv*, radiochopin.org, <http://www.radiochopin.org/episodes/item/503-radio-chopin-episode-44-piano-sonata-no-2-in-b-flat-minor-op-35iv> [accessed 01 09 2020].
- Pratt, Mary Louise. “Arts of the Contact Zone.” *Profession*, 1991, pp. 33–40. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/25595469. Accessed 22 Nov. 2020.
- Raby Rebecca, “What is Resistance?” in: *Journal of Youth Studies*, No. 8(2), 2005, p. 151–172.
- Rosenfeld Alla, and Norton T. Dodge (eds.), *Nonconformist Art: The Soviet Experience, 1956–1986*, New York: Thames and Hudson, 1995.
- Rosen Charles, *The Romantic Generation*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Schmelz Peter J., “Andrey Volkonsky and the Beginnings of Unofficial Music in the Soviet Union,” in: *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, vol. 58, No. 1, 2005, p. 139–207.
- Schmelz Peter J., *Such Freedom, If only Musical: Unofficial Soviet Music During the Thaw*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Sharikadze Nana, “Global Music Processes: About the Influences and Analogies in the Georgian Music of the 60s in the Last Century,” in: *GESJ: Musicology and Cultural Science*, No. 2(20), 2019, p. 16–28, http://gesj.internet-academy.org/ge/en/list_artic_en.php?b_sec=muz [accessed 01 09 2020].
- Sharikadze Nana, “Warsaw Autumn Festival: New Music Perspective for the Countries under the Iron Curtain”, report at the International Conference *Music the Cultural Bridge – Essence, Contexts, References*, 6–8 April 2020, Wrocław, Poland.
- Sjeklocha Paul, and Igor Mead, *Unofficial Art in the Soviet Union*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1967.
- Slonimsky Nicolas, *Music since 1900*, New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1971.
- Shugliashvili Micheil, *Writings*, Teimuraz Bakuradze and Zurab Nadareishvili (eds.), manuscript, 2005.
- Thompson Damian, “Courage, Not Madness, is the Mark of Genius”, in: *The Daily Telegraph*, 7 December 2013, <https://www.webcitation.org/6Lgbv28s4?url=http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/culture/damianthompson/100050942/you-don%E2%80%99t-have-to-be-mad-to-be-a-genius/> [accessed 01 09 2020].
- [Vlasova]. Власова Екатерина, *1948 в советской музыке* [1948 in Soviet Music], Москва: Классика-XXI, 2010.

Santrauka

Straipsnyje analizuojamas kultūrinis pasipriešinimas kaip sudėtingas reiškinys, apibūdinamas jo santykis su neoficialiąja akademinė muzika. Siekdama apibrėžti pasipriešinimą akademinėje muzikoje, autorė akcentuoja kultūros gebėjimą atsispirti taisyklėms, oficialiosios kultūros nustatytoms visoms meno formoms, ir pasipriešinti tam, kas bendrai pripažįstama „oficialiąja norma“. Autorė teigia, kad politiškai kontroliuojamame mene akademinės muzikos kūrimas cenzūros sąlygomis, ignoruojant „visoms meno formoms nustatytas taisykles“, priylgsta pasipriešinimo aktui. Todėl ji mano, kad neoficialiosios muzikos terminas išsamiai apibrėžia pasipriešinimo politinei meno kontrolei aktą ir geriausiai išreiškia kultūrinę nukrypimo nuo kultūros standartizavimo tikrovę. Neoficialiosios muzikos terminas visame straipsnyje vartojamas kaip sąmoningo nepaklusimo viršenybės tvarkai kultūroje sinonimas.

Straipsnyje pateikiama neoficialiosios akademinės muzikos samprata, aptariant jos vietą tarp dominuojančios vadinamosios oficialiosios ir neoficialiosios kultūros, taisyklių laikymosi svarbą ar nukrypimą nuo jų. Autorė apibrėžia neoficialiosios akademinės muzikos sąvoką, akcentuoja cenzūros vaidmenį ir charakterizuoja politinį „atlydžio“ laikotarpio kontekstą. Micheilio Šugliašvilio (Shugliashvili), neoficialiosios (vadinamosios represuotos) muzikos atstovo ir vieno iš jos pirmųjų kūrėjų, veikla aptariama atsižvelgiant į įvairius kontekstus: politinę aplinką,

septintojo dešimtmečio gruzinų muzikos raidos tendencijas, vakarietiškos muzikos įtaką „atlydžio“ kompozitoriams ir vadinamosios „kontaktnės zonos“, įkvėpusios kompozitorius sekti vakarietiškoje muzikoje jau sukauptą informaciją, svarbą. Šiuo atžvilgiu minėtini asmeniniai Šugliašvilio ir Volkonskio kontaktai. Gruzijos neoficialiosios akademinės muzikos istorija prasidėjo po Stalino mirties ir truko iki *perestroikos*. Autorė pabrėžia septintojo dešimtmečio svarbą gruzinų muzikai ir parodo jos raidą link neoficialiosios akademinės muzikos kūrimo.

Kaip teigia buvę Šugliašvilio mokiniai, jis labiausiai vertino kūrinius, parašytus aštuntojo dešimtmečio pradžioje. Neliko išsamesnės informacijos, paaiškinančios priežastį, tačiau manytume, kad atspirties tašku galėjo būti jo praktikuota kompozicinė technika, grindžiama skaičių progresija, kuria jis susidomėjo ir pradėjo naudoti aštuntajame dešimtmetyje. Straipsnyje aptariami Šugliašvilio kūriniai: „Da capo“ fortepijonui ir trys svarbiausi jo kūriniai trims fortepijonams: „Grand Chromatic Phantasy“, „Largo e Presto“ ir „Pastoral“. Visi kūriniai parašyti aštuntajame dešimtmetyje originalia kompozicine technika, grindžiama skaičių progresija. Technikos ypatumas paaiškinamas remiantis negausiais Šugliašvilio rašytiniais dokumentais. Autorė parodo muzikinės idėjos ir kompozicinės technikos ryšį ir aptaria galimas sąsajas su jo darbuose cituojamais kūriniais. Kadangi archyvas dingęs, kompozitoriaus rašytiniai dokumentai tapo prieinami jo artimų draugų ir šeimos dėka.

Delivered / Straipsnis įteiktas 2020 10 20