

DOI: 10.31866/2410-1176.45.2021.247350

UDC 78:130.2

**ON MONOCULTURALISM
ISSUE IN MUSIC**

Andrii Bondarenko

*PhD in Art Studies,**Senior Lecturer,**ORCID: 0000-0002-6856-991X,**e-mail: bondareandre@gmail.com,**Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts,**36 Ye. Konvaltsia St., Kyiv, 01133, Ukraine*

The purpose of the article is to analyse the context of the use of the term monoculturalism in music, determine the features of the relation with the concept of multiculturalism, outline the prospects for their application. Research methodology. Analytical and comparative methods are to analyse the context of the application of the term monoculturalism in cultural and music literature and compare the meanings in the interpretation by different researchers. The scientific novelty of the study is the definition of criteria for applying the concepts of monoculture (monoculturalism) and multiculture (multiculturalism) in music background discourse. Conclusions. During the study, it has been revealed that in music art, the term monoculture is understood by the authors in different ways — in the sense of focusing on the traditions of certain national communities (with the restriction of interethnic influences) or on the conventions of individual social communities (with the restriction of national identity), the examples of which are the Soviet socialist realistic doctrine (CPSU officials introduced the restrictions) or contemporary mass art (the restrictions due to the laws of the market economy). The use of the term monoculture in works that are performed within the framework of the Kovchek Ukraina Art Project, in particular, folk songs in authentic-sounding and modern arrangements, symphonic works by D. Bortniansky, M. Lysenko, B. Liatoshynsky, M. Skoryk, etc. has been analysed in detail by critics of The Claquers publication. It has been proved that the term monoculture is used uncritically in a negative emotional colour by the authors, the sources of which come from certain areas of sociology and agronomy, which forms a basis for discrimination and stigmatisation of creative initiatives aimed at maintenance and development of original national art. It has been noted that the ambiguity and instability of the term monoculture in music art is a prerequisite for its uncritical, politically motivated use. At the same time, the opposite concept is multiculturalism, ambiguously assessed by culturologists, can be used in music art.

Keywords: monoculturalism; monoculture; multiculturalism; globalisation; contemporary music art

Introduction

In recent years, the terms *monoculture* or *monoculturalism* have been increasingly used in the national literature, both academic and journalistic. While in sociology, *monoculturalism* has already acquired an unquestionable terminological certainty, the use cases of the term so far seem somewhat sporadic in the art of music. Meanwhile, considering the special activity of the term-forming process due to globalisation and integration processes in the world, it seems important to analyse and outline the field for the application of certain concepts, the possibility of their borrowing from a foreign language or other industry semantic field, in particular, to outline the phenomena of musical culture in Ukraine.

Analysis of recent researches and publications. The dichotomy of *monoculturalism* and *multiculturalism* in European literature emerged at the end of the 20th century. Among the authors of the largest monographs devoted to the issues of *multiculturalism* of the last two decades are B. Brian, D. Bennett, R. R. Fillion, G. Paul, H. Barnor, B. Parekh, Ch. Taylor, A. Tremblay and others. *Multiculturalism* is contrasted with *monoculturalism* with a tendency to justify the advantages of the former in terms of the comfortable coexistence of persons of different nationalities within the same multiethnic community or state.

In music, the issue of certain national cultures became relevant in the 19th century during the emergence of national composition schools, including the Ukrainian one. Although there are few, Ukrainian studies in this direction are indicative in the context of changes in the geopolitical situation in Ukraine. Thus, S. Liudkevych (1999) and O. Kozarenko (2000) describe the national originality of art as a certain self-value and achievement

of Ukrainian culture, while I. Liashenko (1991) sees the value of the national only in the dialectical process of interaction of cultures of different nationalities and their development.

The scientific novelty of the study is the definition of criteria for applying the concepts of *monoculture* (*monoculturalism*) and *multiculture* (*multiculturalism*) in music background discourse.

Purpose of the article

The purpose of the article is to analyse the context of the use of the term *monoculturalism* in music, determine the features of the relation with the concept of *multiculturalism*, outline the prospects for their application.

Main research material

The term *monoculture* first appeared in agronomy to denote a method of crop production in which the same crop is grown on the same plot for many years (Zharinov & Dovhan, 2008, p. 183). In agronomy, this term has a negative connotation due to biological reasons — monoculture creates a constant unvaried load on soils, leading to their depletion, and therefore — negative environmental and economic consequences.

In sociology, the term has acquired a slightly different grammatical form — *monoculturalism* and has received the following definition: “the policy or process of supporting, advocating, or allowing the expression of the culture of a single social or ethnic group” (online Oxford dictionary). The opposite term is *multiculturalism*, initially introduced in the context of problems of racial discrimination in the USA in the 1950 and the 1960s, and is defined as “the principle of ethnonational, educational, cultural policy that recognises and supports the right of citizens to preserve, develop and protect their (ethno) cultural features by all legitimate methods, and the state is obliged to support such efforts of citizens” (Kolodii, 2008, p. 66).

The assessment of multiculturalism in sociology is ambiguous. The apologists of multiculturalism proceed from the priority of protecting the rights of national minorities in multinational communities (Ch. Taylor and V. Kymlichka, B. Parekh, etc.). Opponents, on the other hand, call multiculturalism a means of “the destruction of the national spirit” (Shils, 1997) and “the deprivation of the cultural core” (Huntington, 1996, p. 306).

In Ukrainian culturology, the terms *monoculturalism* and its opposite — multiculturalism- also find themselves in the field of opposite tendencies of their interpretation. For example, S. Drozhzhyna (2008, p. 104) considers that “multiculturalism based on universal values, on the principles of equal coexistence of various forms of cultural life, including subcultural forms, can become a unifying ideology”. O. Hrytsenko (2019) expresses scepticism about the *unifying prospects* of multiculturalism. According to the researcher, the policy of multiculturalism “does not bring much success in overcoming interethnic and intercultural conflicts, but provides a cheap platform for supporters of extreme ideologies, instigators of hostility and distributors of *fake*” (Hrytsenko, 2019, p. 229). T. Usatenko (2011) has a similar opinion, pointing to “the need to form an integral monocultural space capable of meeting Ukrainian citizens’ cultural and linguistic needs” (p. 146).

In direct musicology, the use of the term *monoculturalism* by Ukrainian musicologists is rare and different in context. Thus, I. Savchuk (2016) calls the Soviet doctrine of the interwar years a *monocultural component*, which limited the possibilities of cultural exchange between Soviet composers (in particular, B. Liatoshynsky) and European ones. O. Tsekhmistro (2012), considering the problems of Ukrainian vocal and symphonic music of the last third of the 20th century, emphasises the possible risks of “transformation of different world cultures into a single monoculture” (p. 124). It is significant that in both cases, monoculture is somewhat supranational, that levelling out certain national cultural features, facilitates their assimilation into a certain international space, and is negatively assessed. This understanding of “monoculture” differs from the one expressed in T. Usatenko’s article but does not contradict the above-mentioned sociological definition — after all, both culture under the Soviet totalitarian regime and modern mass culture are focused on certain social groups (in the USSR — on “workers and peasants”, in the conditions of mass culture — on the mass consumer), and, in addition, the rejection of these guidelines makes it impossible for an artist to build a successful career (in the USSR — due to the intervention of the CPSU leadership and employees of the relevant law enforcement agencies, in the conditions of mass culture — due to the market mechanisms).

A different understanding of the word *monoculture* is given by I. Rozumeiko and L. Sirenko (2021) in a critical review of the Kovchek *Ukraina* project. The reviewers accused the authors of the project of rejecting “cross-cultural or multinational ways of creating the new”, “focusing only on folk art”, and a lack of novelty. *Monoculture* in this article is interpreted as a concentration on the artefacts of a particular national culture (in this case Ukrainian

one), but, unlike T. Usatenko's article mentioned above, is perceived as something unacceptable, or at least devoid of innovation.

The use of the term *monoculture* by I. Rozumeiko and L. Sirenko negatively encourages us to analyse in which works this term has been used. The analysis of the programme of the Kovcheg *Ukraina* Art project indicates the presence of several types of works in it: authentic folklore (performed by 85-year-old folk singer Dominika Chekun and ethnoband Kurbasy), Ukrainian Christian music of the 16th–18th centuries, vocal and symphonic works of the 18th–20th centuries (D. Bortniansky, M. Lysenko, B. Liatoshynsky, M. Skoryk, etc.), modern arrangements of folk songs (I. Nebesnyi, Dakha Brakha, etc.).

In fact, *monocultural* in the sense of being completely in the Ukrainian national traditions should be considered only the songs performed by Domenika Chekun and Kurbasy (performed a capella) in this programme, which made up no more than 20% of the entire concert programme. The presented Christian songs go beyond purely national traditions because, as it is known, Christianity originated in the eastern provinces of the Roman Empire, and church musical practice came to the territory of Ukraine through Byzantium. The symphonic works of D. Bortniansky, M. Lysenko and his followers are even more *multicultural* — the article does not need to describe the European background of their opera and symphony opuses in detail, as well as the Lysenko composition school in general, because many musicologists outlined certain issues in the last century. Finally, the work of the Dakha-Brakha band, which has not yet received proper coverage in musicological discourse, should still be considered in the context of the exclusively Ukrainian tradition. At least, the use of oriental percussion instruments and cello, the presence of ostinato rhythms (first of all, the 3+3+2 structure), and, finally, self-attribution as an “ethno-chaos band” indicate the interaction of various national traditions, although with a predominance of Ukrainian ones, in the work of this band. In addition, the symphonic orchestrations by Serhii Vilka and Roman Hryhoriv, which were used in the Dakha-Brakha performance, added a European symphonic element to the *ethno-chaos*, expanding the *multicultural* basis.

Thus, we can state that the use of the term *monoculture* by I. Rozumeiko and L. Sirenko (2021) was uncritical and conditioned by a biased negative attitude either towards the project organisers or a politically motivated negative attitude towards Ukrainian culture in general.

The different context and different understanding put by certain authors into the concept of *monoculture* encourages us to single out the features of its use in musical culture.

First, in all cases, *monoculture* generally implies a certain self-isolation of the system, but this isolation relates to the national character in different ways. In some cases, *monoculture* means focusing on certain national traditions and, consequently, restrictions of the influence of cultures of other nationalities; in others, on the contrary: focusing on certain conventions that limit the inclusion of pronounced national elements. That is, if we return to the above-mentioned sociological definition, *monoculture* can be understood as either maintaining the culture of certain national communities (for example, Ukrainians) or the culture of certain social communities (for example, “workers and peasants” in the USSR or the average mass consumer in the modern globalised world).

Second, there is the question of criteria or quantitative indicators of *multiculture*. For example, comparing the operas of the above-mentioned D. Bortniansky and M. Lysenko, it is probably necessary to conclude that the former is more *multicultural* and the latter more *monocultural* since M. Lysenko's operas are mostly focused on the Ukrainian national intonation sphere (Kozarenko, 2000) and are written for Ukrainian-language librettos, unlike D. Bortniansky's operas. A similar problematic issue arises after the attempt to outline the Soviet “monoculture” — for example, in the work of the above-mentioned B. Liatoshynsky it is possible to find works focused on the conventions of socialist realism, and conversely, more stylistically individualised ones. In both cases, however, there is hardly a definite quantitative criterion for the unambiguous attribution of work as a *monocultural* or *multicultural* one.

In addition, the same artistic phenomena turn out to be both *multicultural* and *monocultural*, depending on the chosen criterion. Thus, if the criterion of *multiculturalism* is the interaction of multiethnic elements, then the socialist realistic works of Soviet times are quite *multicultural* since they form a certain fusion of multiethnic traditions. In this case, all types of mass culture are also positioned as *multicultural*, despite their limited focus on certain social groups of people.

It should be clarified that the terms *monoculture* and *multiculture* are used rather not for certain works of art, but for cultural and artistic policies that can be implemented by the state (represented by officials of relevant ministries and departments) or certain regions, municipalities (represented by officials), individual institutions (represented by their heads), and so on. However, this does not eliminate the problem of criteria for *multiculture* for separate works of art — after all, one way or another, the question arises which of them are acceptable or unacceptable for inclusion in concerts, festivals, training programmes, etc. in the context of *monocultural* vice versa *multicultural* policy.

Finally, the relation between the concepts of multiculturalism and innovativeness is a relevant issue. In the works of some authors, it is possible to trace the opinion that only multiculturalism implies innovativeness. In fact, this position was advocated by I. Liashenko (1991, p. 35), considering that “the development of national traditions... is impossible without their interethnic and international relations”. However, in most of the cases, we have analysed, *monoculture* does not mean the absence of interethnic ties. At least among the works of the monocultural Kovchek *Ukraina* Art project, the following series of relations can be clearly drawn: M. Lysenko is innovative in comparison with D. Bortniansky; B. Liatoshynsky — with M. Lysenko; M. Skoryk — with B. Liatoshynsky, etc.

Conclusions

The term *monoculture* has a certain potential for uncritical use and manipulation or deliberate discrediting and stigmatisation of the processes of national revival, which we see in the works of individual Ukrainian critics. This potential is due to the different content of the concept — in some cases, “monoculture” is understood as a focus on the traditions of certain national communities (with limited interethnic influences), in others — on the conventions of certain social communities (with limited national identity). The uncritical use of the term “monoculture” in Ukraine creates a semantic field that encourages cultural figures to stigmatise and discriminate against artists who create in the most nationally distinctive areas of music art and, therefore, serve the political purpose of the destruction of the foundations of original Ukrainian culture.

At the same time, the opposite term *multiculture*, due to ambiguous coverage in sociological and cultural literature, can cause ambiguous connotations and be used by music critics for political rather than art historical purposes.

The prospects for the use of the terms *monocultural*, *monoculture* and their antonyms — *multicultural*, *multiculture* in music art should be considered dubious, or such that will be used in an extra-musical and, above all, political context.

At the same time, the problems of the development of national art in the context of interethnic relations and the challenges of globalisation will remain relevant. Further profound research of determinants of national styles and the constancy of national cultural codes in the context of cross-national interaction should be considered a relevant task of future scientific research.

References

- Drozhzhyna, S. (2008). Multykulturalizm: Teoretychni i Praktychni Aspekty [Multiculturalism: Theoretical and Practical Aspects]. *Politychnyi Menedzhment [Political Management]*, 3(30), 96-106 [in Ukrainian].
- Hrytsenko, O. (2019). *Kulturnyi Prostir i Natsionalna Kultura: Teoretychne Osmyslennia ta Praktychne Formuvannia [Cultural Space and National Culture: Theoretical Understanding and Practical Formation]*. Institute for Cultural Research of the National Academy of Arts of Ukraine [in Ukrainian].
- Huntington, S. P. (1996). *The Clash of Civilisations and the Remaking of World Order*. Simon & Schuster.
- Kolodii, A. (2008). Amerykanska Doktryna Multykulturalizmu i Etnonatsionalnyi Rozvytok Ukrainy [American Doctrine of Multiculturalism and Ethno-National Development of Ukraine]. *Ahora*, 6, 5-14 [in Ukrainian].
- Kozarenko, O. (2000). *Fenomen Ukrainskoi Natsionalnoi Muzychnoi Movy [The Phenomenon of the Ukrainian National Musical Language]*. Shevchenko Scientific Society [in Ukrainian].
- Liashenko, I. F. (1991). *Natsionalne ta Internatsionalne v Muzytsi [National and International in Music]*. Naukova dumka [in Ukrainian].
- Liudkevych, S. (1999.). *Doslidzhennia, Statti, Retsenzii, Vystupy [Research, Articles, Reviews, Speeches]* (Vol. 1). I. Krypyakevych Institute of Ukrainian Studies of the NAS of Ukraine [in Ukrainian].
- Oxford University Press. (2021). Monoculturalism. In *Lexico.com*. Retrieved October 30, 2021, from <https://www.lexico.com/definition/monoculturalism>
- Rozumeiko, I., & Sirenko, L. (2021, September 1). *Kovchek "Ukraina" – Korabletoshcha Natsionalnoho Kulturnoho Kodu [Kovchek "Ukraine" – a Shipwreck of the National Cultural Code]*. The Claquers. <https://theclaquers.com/posts/7359> [in Ukrainian].
- Savchuk, I. (2016). Borys Liatoshynskyi i Polska Kultura: Typolohichni Osoblyvosti [Borys Liatoshynsky and Polish Culture: Typological Features]. *Naukovyi Visnyk Natsionalnoi Muzychnoi Akademii Ukrainy imeni P. I. Chaikovskoho [Scientific Herald of Tchaikovsky National Academy of Music of Ukraine]*, 114, 16-49 [in Ukrainian].

- Shils, E. (1997). *Natsiia, Natsionalnist, Natsionalizm i Hromadianske Suspilstvo* [Nation, Nationality, Nationalism and Civil Society] (V. Yeshkiliev, Trans.). In E. Shils, *The Virtue of Civility: Selected Essays on Liberalism, Tradition, and Civil Society* (pp. 188-224). Liberty Fund. <http://www.ji.lviv.ua/n21texts/shilz.htm> [in Ukrainian].
- Tsekhmistro, O. V. (2012). *Kulturno-Istorychni Peredumovy Rozvytku Ukrainskoi Vokalno-Symfonichnoi Muzyky Ostannoii Tretyny XX st.* [Cultural and Historical Preconditions for the Development of Ukrainian Vocal and Symphonic Music of the Last Third of the 20th Century]. *Kultura Ukrainy [Culture of Ukraine]*, 37, 224-232 [in Ukrainian].
- Usatenko, T. (2011). *Identychnist v Konteksti Mystetskoii Osvity* [An Identity in the Context of Artistic Education]. *Estetyka i Etyka Pedahohichnoi Dii [Aesthetics and Ethics of Pedagogical Action]*, 1, 137-148 [in Ukrainian].
- Zharinov, V. I., & Dovhan S. V. (2008). *Ahroekolohiia: Terminolohichni ta Dovidkovyi Material [Agroecology: Terminological and Reference Material]*. Nova knyha [in Ukrainian].

The editor office received the article on 30.10.2021

**ДО ПРОБЛЕМИ
«МОНОКУЛЬТУРНОСТІ»
В МУЗИЦІ**

Бондаренко Андрій Ігорьович
Кандидат мистецтвознавства,
старший викладач,
Київський національний університет
культури і мистецтва,
Київ, Україна

Мета статті — проаналізувати контекст вживання терміна «монокультурність» в музиці, визначити особливості співвідношення з поняттям «мультикультурність», окреслити перспективи їхнього застосування. Методологія дослідження. У роботі використано аналітичний та компаративний методи — аналізується контекст застосування терміна «монокультурність» у культурологічній та музикознавчій літературі, порівнюються значення в тлумаченні різних дослідників. Наукова новизна дослідження — окреслення критеріїв застосування понять «монокультурність» («монокультуралізм») і «мультикультурність» («мультикультуралізм») у музикознавчому дискурсі. Висновки. Під час дослідження виявлено, що в музичному мистецтві термін «монокультурність» автори розуміють по-різному — у значенні зосередження на традиціях певних національних спільнот (з обмеженням міжнародних впливів) або на конвенціях поодиноких соціальних спільнот (з обмеженням національної самобутності), прикладами яких є радянська соцреалістична доктрина (обмеження впроваджувалися чиновниками КППС) або сучасне масове мистецтво (обмеження, зумовлені законами ринкової економіки). Детально проаналізовано вживання терміна «монокультурність» критиками видання «The Claquers» у творах, які виконані в рамках мистецького проекту «Ковчег „Україна”», зокрема народних пісень в автентичному звучанні та сучасних обробках, симфонічних творів Д. Бортнянського, М. Лисенка, Б. Лятошинського, М. Скорика та ін. Доведено, що термін «монокультурність» автори вживають некритично у негативному емоційному забарвленні, джерела якого походять із певних напрямів соціології та агрономії, що створює підґрунтя для дискримінації та стигматизації творчих ініціатив, спрямованих на підтримання і розвиток самобутнього національного мистецтва. Зауважено, що невизначеність, неусталеність терміна «монокультурність» в музичному мистецтві є передумовою для некритичного, політично вмотивованого його застосування. Водночас і протилежне поняття — «мультикультуралізм», неоднозначно оцінене культурологами, можливе для застосування у музичному мистецтві.

Ключові слова: монокультуралізм; монокультурність; мультикультуралізм; глобалізація; сучасне музичне мистецтво

**К ПРОБЛЕМЕ
«МОНОКУЛЬТУРНОСТИ»
В МУЗЫКЕ**

Бондаренко Андрей Игоревич
Кандидат искусствоведения,
Старший преподаватель,
Киевский национальный университет
культуры и искусств,
Киев, Украина

Цель статьи — проанализировать контекст употребления термина «монокультурность» в музыке, определить особенности соотношения с понятием «мультикультурность», определить перспективы их применения. Методология

исследования. В работе использован аналитический и компаративный методы — анализируется контекст применения термина «монокультурность» в культурологической и музыковедческой литературе, сравниваются значения в толковании разных исследователей. Научная новизна исследования — определение критериев применения понятий «монокультурность» («монокультурализм») и «мультикультурность» («мультикультурализм») в музыковедческом дискурсе. Выводы. В ходе исследования выявлено, что в музыкальном искусстве термин «монокультурность» авторы понимают по-разному — в значении сосредоточения на традициях определенных национальных сообществ (с ограничением межнациональных влияний) или на конвенциях единичных социальных сообществ (с ограничением национальной самобытности), примерами которых является советская соцреалистическая доктрина (ограничения вводились чиновниками КПСС) или современное массовое искусство (ограничения, обусловленные законами рыночной экономики). Подробно проанализировано употребление термина «монокультурность» критиками издания «The Claquers» в произведениях, выполненных в рамках художественного проекта «Ковчег „Украина”», в частности народных песен в аутентичном звучании и современных обработках, симфонических произведений Д. Бортнянского, Н. Лысенко, Б. Лятошинского, М. Скорика и др. Доказано, что термин «монокультурность» авторы употребляют некритически с негативной эмоциональной окраской, источники которой исходят из определенных направлений социологии и агрономии, что создает основу для дискриминации и стигматизации творческих инициатив, направленных на поддержание и развитие самобытного национального искусства. Замечено, что неопределенность, неустойчивость термина монокультурность в музыкальном искусстве является предпосылкой для некритического, политически мотивированного его применения. В то же время и противоположное понятие — «мультикультурализм», неоднозначно оцененное культурологами, возможно для применения в музыкальном искусстве.

Ключевые слова: монокультурализм; монокультурность; мультикультурализм; глобализация; современное музыкальное искусство

