

Bulletin of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv.
 Philosophy, 2(7), 56-60.
 UDC 1(09):14(510)
<https://doi.org/10.17721/2523-4064.2022/7-10/11>

Vitalii Turenko, PhD of Philosophical Sciences, Researcher,
 Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0572-9119>
 e-mail: vitali_turenko@ukr.net

SPECIFICS OF DEVELOPMENT OF AESTHETICS STUDIES: BETWEEN SOVIET AND CHINESE MARXISM

The article reveals the features of the formation and functioning of aesthetic research in such two areas of Marxism as Soviet and Chinese. The study identified three key stages in the development of aesthetics in Soviet Marxism – the pre-war (the 1920s and 1930s), late Stalinism and the Khrushchev thaw, and the late period (1970-1980s). It should be noted that in the context of Soviet Marxism, the key tasks were that aesthetics becomes influential and in-demand science, included in the program of "technical progress" and "education of the builder of communism", important ideological, aesthetic, and applied field of philosophy. Therefore, in addition to the fact that purely ideological works were developed within the framework of aesthetic discourse, aesthetics itself in Soviet Marxism was able to develop thanks to contacts with semiotics, psychology, anthropology, cultural history, and sociology. Relying on a selective stream of translations of Western philosophies of art, Soviet aesthetics is beginning to resonate with global trends, which is facilitated by the unspoken consensus of the idea of aesthetics as a part of philosophical and humanitarian knowledge that has its own autonomy. Proved that in China culture and the cultural revolution are inextricably linked with the Marxist projects of critiquing capitalist modernity and building alternative modernity. Aesthetics and culture also were at the center of attention in Chinese Marxist circles. In this respect, the diverse practices and designs of Chinese Marxism are similar to those of Western Marxism or an equally distinct variety of Euro-American Marxist intellectual enterprises. Aesthetic Marxism in China had a dual mission – to criticize the internal contradictions of revolutionary hegemony and to offer a constructive vision of culture in a post-revolutionary society. This is the value of Chinese aesthetic Marxism, the implications of which go beyond China proper in the world of global cultural criticism. Moreover, being non-Western, Chinese aesthetic Marxism deliberately questioned the inherent Eurocentrism of Marxism. If this Eurocentrism is to be challenged and problematized, the questions posed by Chinese aesthetic Marxists cannot be ignored.

Keywords: aesthetics, Marxism, Chinese Marxism, Soviet Marxism, culture, cultural revolutions.

Introduction. At first glance, it seems that Marxism put purely economic, political, and socio-philosophical tasks at the center of its attention. Whereas such an area of philosophical knowledge as aesthetics, most likely, should have been "in the shadow" of thinkers who worked in line with Marxist philosophy. However, both Soviet and Chinese Marxism shows and proves just the opposite – aesthetics has served and continues to serve as a powerful factor for the implementation of certain ideas and principles that come from the works and concepts proposed by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.

Scientific research by Chinese and Western historians of philosophy became the basis of our research. However, we cannot see in their comparative analysis the functioning of aesthetics in Soviet and Chinese Marxism. Therefore, the purpose of this article is to analyze the peculiarities of formation and development of aesthetics studies in such areas of Marxism as Chinese and Soviet.

Development of Aesthetics in Soviet Marxism: key stage. Under the conditions of Soviet dogmatism, there were social spaces located on the periphery of the party dictate, where there was some freedom of creativity, which made it possible to feel more confident. One of these oases of freedom of spirit and creativity was aesthetics. Of course, this was a Marxist-Leninist aesthetic, but in the post-war ideological paradigm with the beginning of the Cold War and the movement of dissidents of the party power was not up to aesthetics.

At the same time, it must be said that four stages in the development of aesthetics in the Soviet era can be distinguished into three stages, which we will consider in more detail.

The first stage – the 1920s – 1930s – received, following *Katerina Clark*, the title "return of aesthetics" (Clark 2018, 155), which was associated with the general conservative turn of Stalin's cultural policy, the creation of a socialist realist canon, the program the construction of socialism, the denial of the functionalism of the previous –

avant-garde – stage. The "Return of Aesthetics" not only had a political and pragmatic content but also contributed to the saturation of Soviet culture with fragments of the classical heritage, primarily philosophical. In cultural politics, there was a turn away from the functionalist paradigm, orienting artists and intellectuals to the connection of art with vital praxis, with production and technical progress, which was expressed in the dominant method of formalism in theory and constructivism in practice. In the early 1930s, the rhetoric of the leading documents of power and journalism: avant-garde art (first of all, architecture) is criticized as "dry" and "soulless", innovative art projects are negatively evaluated for "aestheticization of technology" and "cult of the machine". There began, as Clarke writes, a turn to "beauty" that "involved a return to conventional taste norms, but the emphasis on beauty also involved overcoming discursive boundaries. He meant aestheticization of politics or, more precisely, metapolitics – a model that served as the basis and justification for real political practices". (Clark 2018, 156)

Aesthetics during this period was in demand more than ever. At the same time, the Marxist theorists of the 1920s did not use the word "aesthetics" at all, and the circle of avant-garde practitioners and their ideologists rejected the mention of "beautiful" "as an empty and unscientific fetish". (Clark, 2018: 158) During the pre-war decade, huge anthologies were published, including the works of aesthetic philosophers from Plato to Hegel, the Classics of Aesthetic Thought series was regularly updated, aesthetics acquired an academic status and place of discipline in higher educational institutions.

The turn to aesthetics played an important role in the new stage of building socialism. The regime needed not just beautiful and exemplary objects (buildings, cities, people, things), it "needed a narrative that brings order to them, clarity and above all meaning". (Clark 2018, 168) At this time, a unified aesthetic system is being formed, which provides a fundamental theoretical (historical-philosophical

and historical-cultural) basis for the method of socialist realism. The result of all academic and educational discourses around the aesthetics of the new world was to be the idea "beautiful is our life".

To the greatest extent, this paradox is characteristic of two key figures in the aesthetics of that time: *György Lukács* and *Mikhail Lifshitz*, whose aesthetic views were quite original. Lukács defended the idea of the integrity of human nature, access to which is provided precisely by aesthetics as a philosophical and historical worldview. Moreover, the occupation of aesthetics at that time was a zone of relative freedom from direct ideological dictate, the space of the Great Time and world culture, which is good can be seen in the example of the organization of the education and science system at IFLI (Institute of Philosophy, Literature, and History), which enjoyed certain independence. Until the end of the decade (the 1930s) the installation of cultural the politics of power and the vectors of development of the philosophy of art and culture were either parallel or intersecting within one main line. Before World War II, this whole situation with the "return" (Soviet renaissance) of aesthetics is winding down. IFLI is closed; the publication of many series that acquaint the reader with world aesthetic thought has almost been discontinued. (Kruglova 2018, 198)

At the **second stage** – late Stalinism and Khrushchev Thaw – there was a rollback of aesthetics towards the extreme political instrumentalization. After the war, aesthetics shares the fate of extreme ideologization and instrumentalization, common with all humanitarian disciplines, although the discipline itself does not disappear from the agenda of dissertation councils and conferences. and educational programs. In confirmation of this, one can look at the example of the development of aesthetic research among Ukrainian Soviet thinkers.

"First of all, it must be said that after the Second World War, in the late 40s and early 50s of the XXth century the critic *Anatoliy Trypolskyi* was engaged in the development of certain problems of aesthetics in Soviet Ukraine. Thus, in his book "Bolshevik Party's – the Basis of Socialist Aesthetics" (1948) it is noted: "The development of the problems of the new socialist aesthetics requires serious work of philosophers, literary critics, and art critics. However, reality shows that in our republic this issue is not in the center of attention of scientific and creative workers". Ivan Ivanyo emphasizes: "In the mid-1950s, after the 20th Congress of the CPSU (Communist Party of the Soviet Union – V.T.), science, culture, and art were further developed in all Soviet republics, including the Ukrainian SSR. The flourishing of artistic culture, the introduction of the broad masses of the working people to it, the growing role of the aesthetic principle in all areas of society's life required the solution of new creative problems. Under these conditions, the unity of science and culture is even stronger. In the activation of aesthetic research in the USSR as a whole, an important role was played by the speeches of the magazine "Problems of Philosophy" (rus. "Voprosy filosofii") on the tasks and subject of Marxist-Leninist aesthetics (1956), as well as discussions on the topic Aesthetics and Life conducted by the "Problems of Philosophy" magazine in 61-62 years. Therefore, scientists and teachers of the Kyiv Order of Lenin, Order of the October Revolution State University, the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, and other scientific and educational institutions on the territory of Soviet Ukraine began to actively develop ideas and concepts that would

substantiate and approve a new vision of aesthetics in line with Marxist-Leninist ideology. So, in particular, one can mention such works as: "On the question of the growing role of art in the formation of the communist worldview", "Communism and aesthetic education", "Building communism and aesthetic education", "Questions of Marxist-Leninist aesthetics in the resolutions of the Central Committee of the CPSU on literature and art", "For Marxist principles in aesthetics", "Aesthetics Leninism and questions of literature". Based on the texts of these works, one can see those aesthetics, as in fact, and any philosophical discipline inevitably had to become an "instrument" and a way of implanting the party line and worldview. So, for example, in the context of aesthetic research, Ukrainian scientists considered this or that problem, concept, idea not so much to increase scientific knowledge, but to make it necessary and useful for educating people in the spirit of Marxist ideology. Separately, it is necessary to mention that during the period under study, such a concept as "socialist realism" began to be actively developed. The foundation of this concept was laid by *Anatoliy Lunacharskyi* in his work "Foundations of Positive Aesthetics" (1904), where the key aspects of Bolshevik (socialist realist) aesthetics were first systematically outlined. A rigid attitude towards the evaluative-normative nature of aesthetics, the cult of the superman, and at the same time the apologetics of extreme collectivism, inhumanity – everything in Lunacharsky's positive aesthetics is directed towards the spirit and letter of the coming socialist realism. Therefore, in the period under study, works were published on both the concept directly given by *Vyacheslav Kudin* (1959, 1961) and separately taken issues in this context, for example, *Borys Minchin* analyzed satire in the context of socialist realism (1967), and *Ivan Stebun* tried to consider it in the context of the legacy of Ivan Franko (1958). At the same time, in the spirit of the dominant ideology, it was important to substantiate and show that the very phenomenon of art is close precisely to the people. Art itself has the right to be called if it is directed to the people and has such a characteristic as nationality. This attribute was contrasted with the mass of world (more precisely, Western) art. In this context, it would be appropriate to recall the works of *Mykola Goncharenko* "The problem of the nationality of literature in the Marxist-Leninist aesthetics" (1968) and "The nationality of art" (1959), in which the author considered nationality as an obligatory attribute of genuine art and everything that should have an aesthetic taste. In parallel with this, criticism of Western aesthetics was actively developed during this period, which was expressed in the writing of the corresponding ideological works by Ukrainian Soviet aesthetics, in particular *Mykola Goncharenko* "Reactionary bourgeois aesthetics – the enemy of art" (1960), "Against revisionism in aesthetics" (1959)". (Turenko and Yarmolitska 2021, 25)

Thus, aesthetics began to lag behind public liberal discourse, giving way to journalism and art criticism. During the period of liberalization of the 1960s, aesthetics, in our opinion, goes into the shadow of other rapidly developing humanities, occupying the forefront. The intensity of the debate in art criticism and literary criticism, addressing previously unknown or forbidden artistic phenomena in the history of art and art history – these are the territories where interesting events take place. Aesthetics has not kept up with these rapidly erupting, but also quickly disappearing discussions that instantly react to "modernity".

During the *third stage* – 70s-80s of XX century aesthetics becomes influential and in-demand science, included in the program of "technical progress" and "education of the builder of communism", important ideological, aesthetic, and applied tasks are assigned to aesthetics, it is expected to influence all spheres of life.

At the turn of the 60s, during the 70s and early 80s of the last century, Soviet aesthetics began to gain philosophical weight and depth, although the connection of this process with what is happening outside the walls of the academic environment is not at all obvious. During this period, aesthetics again becomes an independent philosophical discipline, influential and even in many respects ahead of other socio-philosophical areas. One after another, voluminous and fundamental "Aesthetics" is published, written by the authors of a new generation: *Moses Kagan, Arkadiy Yeremeev, Yuriy Borev*. Around these scholars, scientific schools arise, developing different concepts of the aesthetic attitude and essence of art, arguing with each other. Despite the discussions, there is something in common in the relationship between aesthetics and the environment, the world, and other sciences. On the one hand, aesthetics is open to new scientific directions, including those that come to the Soviet humanitarian environment from the West thanks to an ever-increasing number of translations: semiotics, psychology, structural anthropology, psychoanalysis, systems theory, archeology, even cybernetics, and mathematical methods of studying art.

On the other hand, aestheticians are very worried about the loss of artistic specificity in new theoretical solutions, the danger of dissolving in interdisciplinary theories and methodologies. The situation in aesthetics in the late Soviet period recalls the state of intellectual quest in the Hellenistic era: eclecticism of scientific theories, many borrowings from authoritative and newly discovered Western philosophical concepts (*Theodor W. Adorno, Hans-Georg Gadamer, Walter Benjamin, Jean-Paul Sartre, Claude Lévi-Strauss, Julia Kristeva*, etc.) and the rediscovery of their heritage (*Mikhail Bakhtin, Gustav Shpet*, Russian formalists), but also depth, immersion in the subtleties of analytics, a variety of ontological, socio-philosophical, epistemological and cultural arguments in favor of the autonomy of aesthetic and artistic values and worlds, created by them. The social tilt inherent in the main Marxist-Leninist line in aesthetics, gave certain results, although it remained on the surface of official discourse, in reality, was already beginning to retreat before other approaches, primarily ontological and cultural ones. (Kruglova 2018, 201)

Aesthetics as a philosophy and science develops in response to contacts with semiotics, psychology, anthropology, cultural history, and sociology. Relying on a selective stream of translations of Western philosophies of art, Soviet aesthetics is beginning to resonate with global trends, which is facilitated by the unspoken consensus of the idea of aesthetics as a part of philosophical and humanitarian knowledge that has its own autonomy.

Features of aesthetic studies in the Chinese Marxism. Concerning aesthetics in Chinese Marxism, however, one often hears the objection that China never had a discipline that could be compared to occidental philosophical aesthetics. Seen from a methodological point of view, such objections may carry a certain weight, but because of a similarity to art-philosophical aspects of Western aesthetics, the Chinese, in general, understood and still understand their own rich tradition of poetic rather

than systematic reflections on the essence of literature and art as "aesthetics". The "aesthetic fever", *meixue re*, that broke out in China during the eighties of the 20th century can be understood from this eminent role those aesthetics played and still plays in the history of Chinese ideas. Hence, first of all, if we want to avoid getting further tangled up in the snares of euro-centrism, we would be well advised to say about the specifics of understanding aesthetics and beauty in China in general.

If we want to translate the Chinese term *meixue* (美学) into English is the Western term "aesthetics" – "beautology". This translation is for China somewhat misleading, if not unfortunate, as the category of the "beautiful" – neither in the form of natural nor as artistic beauty – played a significant role in traditional China. In early Confucian scriptures, the character *mei* (beautiful) was used almost synonymously with "moral goodness" (*shan*) without further differentiation or emphasis on a category of beauty. Apart from this connotation, Confucian discourse on literature and art seems to have slighted formal beauty, deeming it, as an outward ornament, less valuable than the substantial ethical or moral content. For Daoist writers, the recognition of beauty only led to the notion of ugliness, like Laozi, chapter 2, succinctly states: "When everyone in the world knows the beautiful as beautiful, ugliness comes into being." In Chinese literary theory and art philosophy "beauty", thus, used to carry more a negative, if not a vulgar (*cu su* 粗俗) connotation. More important in terms of aesthetic "categories" attributed such as "harmonious/balanced" (*he* 和), or "natural/spontaneous" (*zi ran* 自然). Thus, a work of art should not imitate reality or nature, but should convey a sense of natural creativity; apart from this, it should have a poetic or self-transcending suggestive effect on the viewer or reader.

However, coming back to the modern realities, aesthetics assumes a special place in China's grappling with Western thought: First, aesthetics, particularly in its early modern phase, constituted a realm relatively free of politics. For this reason, it attracted the Chinese to explore freely and without political restraint, occidental thought. Second, the philosophy of art as part and parcel of aesthetics offered, as already mentioned, many ways of linking up with China's own tradition. This was important because – other than the mainstream of Chinese traditional social and political thought, particularly Confucianism – this part of the Chinese tradition had not been discredited by the reception of Western ideas and the radical anti-traditionalism of the May Fourth period. Quite on the contrary, when the Chinese at the beginning of the 20th century began to define their place in relation to the West, they understood their own culture as an essentially aesthetic one. In their monumental *History of Chinese Aesthetics* (*Zhongguo meixue shi* 中国美学十五讲), *Li Zehou* and *Liu Gangji* marked as the last and most important characteristic of traditional Chinese aesthetics the idea that an aesthetic consciousness was regarded as the highest and noblest consciousness to be attained in life. (Pohl 2018, 337)

The encounter with Western thought offered the Chinese, on the one hand, a range of fascinatingly new ideas (such as the category of the tragic or Hegel's grand system) and, on the other, to look for familiar concepts which could be aligned with their own tradition. Particularly *Cai Yuanpei* (1868-1940), the president of the Peking University during the May Fourth period, felt motivated to this twofold endeavor. He was instrumental in formulating

the idea of the mentioned cultural-aesthetic self-understanding of the Chinese. Through his studies in Germany, he was familiar with occidental philosophy, particularly with *Immanuel Kant*. He regarded Western man largely shaped by religion, whereas for China he held aesthetics (a combination of ritual, art, and ethics) to be the functional equivalent to religion in the West.

For this reason, he demanded modern China "aesthetic education in the place of religion". As China is in the process of re-install aesthetic education in schools, one can see that his ideas are still reverberating there (though he failed with his attempts in his own time). Therefore, in the planning for the various disciplines in China, philosophy stands at the first level, and it is comprised of 8 second-level disciplines, namely: Marxist philosophy, Chinese philosophy, foreign philosophy, logic, ethics, aesthetics, religious studies, and philosophy of science and technology. Generally speaking, Marxist philosophy is one of the strongest second-level disciplines among all philosophical disciplines in Chinese colleges or universities. (Wang & Peters 2021)

Hence, Modern Chinese aesthetics forms an essential part of this historical struggle with Western thought, although at the same time it absorbed elements of Western aesthetic thought and not only Marxist thought. For example, in the article, "The Spreading and Influence of German Aesthetics in China", Liu Gangji showed that modern Chinese aesthetics has been largely formed by dealing with the German tradition of aesthetics. Because of the enormous problems of translation, this tradition of aesthetics – from German idealism to *Karl Marx* and *Martin Heidegger* – was received in China with a phase shift of about 100 to 150 years. Due to this background, it is not surprising that the discourse of Chinese aesthetics of the 20th century was largely shaped by the categories and questions of German philosophy of the 18th and 19th centuries. The rather rigid reception of Marxism only reinforced this tendency. (Pohl 2018, 338)

Based on this, culture and the cultural revolution are inextricably linked with the Marxist projects of critiquing capitalist modernity and building alternative modernity. Aesthetics and culture were at the center of attention in Chinese Marxist circles. In this respect, the diverse practices and designs of Chinese Marxism are similar to those of Western Marxism or an equally distinct variety of Euro-American Marxist intellectual enterprises. But apart from a partial understanding of Maoism, Western Marxists knew little about what their Chinese counterparts were doing in a different context. Thus, while it is generally believed that Maoism changed the way Europeans thought about Marxism, by comparing Chinese aesthetic Marxism and Western Marxism, we can get an idea of the historical development of modern Marxism. Chinese aesthetics and Western Marxism create a theoretical space for critical intervention, reinforcing cultural politics. European and North American cultural politics contributed to the formation of an oppositional vision, focused mainly on the problems of domination and resistance, manipulation and self-government, consent and coercion in modern capitalist society. By contrast, aesthetic Marxism in China had a dual mission:

- to criticize the internal contradictions of revolutionary hegemony;
- to offer a constructive vision of culture in a post-revolutionary society.

This is the value of Chinese aesthetic Marxism, the implications of which go beyond China proper in the world of global cultural criticism. Moreover, being non-Western, Chinese aesthetic Marxism deliberately questioned the inherent Eurocentrism of Marxism. If this Eurocentrism is to be challenged and problematized, the questions posed by Chinese aesthetic Marxists cannot be ignored. Its originality, as well as its historical and structural limitations, allowed Chinese aesthetic Marxism to make a decisive contribution to the struggles of the real world. (Kang 2000, X)

The modern Chinese aesthetician's frantic search for beauty in their own tradition thus appears in many ways like a voyage into the wrong direction which, however, as is not unusual with such voyages, also let them discover the unknown and interesting territory, such as a few parallels between Chinese and Western aesthetics, some of which having been mentioned before. Also worth noting is the creative appropriation of Marxist aesthetics in China, an accomplishment that could be stimulating in Marx's own cultural hemisphere if anyone would only take note of it. What would be needed is simply to get a dialogue started on these issues. A dialogue will not, however, take place if one side simply lectures, and the other, as in a teacher-student relationship, listens attentively. Dialogue first happens, when both sides can express their views and are being taken seriously. It is about time to begin such dialogues between the West and other cultural areas on the globe. An essential condition for a successful dialogue, however, would be that each side is able to get to know the other through translations. In terms of English translations of Chinese aesthetics, has already *Li Zehou's* *The Path of Beauty* (in English and in German) and the volume edited by *Gene Blocker* and *Zhu Liyuan*, *Contemporary Chinese Aesthetics* (New York 1995), but this is far not enough, compared to the numerous translations of Western works, from *Immanuel Kant* to *Benedetto Croce*. Leveling out this asymmetry will be of paramount importance for a fruitful dialogue, not only on aesthetics, in the future. In fact, the discovery of the cultural other could have a broadening and vitalizing effect on our humanities in general; for it is very likely, paraphrasing *Hans-Georg Gadamer*, that the other, in this case, the other culture with its different answers to existential questions, also has something to tell us. (Pohl 2018, 339)

However, it must be said that Chinese Marxism, is presented not only as Maoism, but other Marxist positions have always existed in it. Therefore, the tragic consequences of Mao's Cultural Revolution and revolutionary hegemony made Chinese aesthetic Marxists think of Mao's privileged culture, firstly, as a betrayal of the Marxist principle of economic primacy and, secondly, as an obstacle to constructive and systematic social transformation. Chinese aesthetic Marxism, especially *Li Zehou's* "philosophy of practical subjectivity", reaffirms historical-materialistic concepts, as well as the categories of material "practice" and "mode of production" in relation to the language of modern science. cultural criticism. This does not mean that Chinese aesthetic Marxists followed the Western Marxist agenda; the Chinese deliberately criticized Western Marxism and its Maoist connections. It is noteworthy that the Chinese Marxist experience in post-revolutionary society and the vision that emerged from it has drawn a different cognitive map, an alternative "cultural topology" for contemporary cultural studies. They offer us an epistemological alternative for understanding the genealogy of the critical concepts and conceptual schemes by which the history of contemporary Chinese culture is interpreted. Aesthetics and Marxism examine these

"topological cultural spaces" from a critical perspective based on Chinese theories themselves, and also juxtapose these theories with Western Marxist ones so that their assumptions can be mutually challenged. Of course, this is only a preliminary experiment, and therefore it is subject to the most ruthless study of history. (Kang 2000, XI-XII)

Conclusions. Thus, after analyzing the features and specifics of understanding the role and significance of ancient philosophy in Soviet and Chinese Marxism, we can draw the following conclusions:

1. In Soviet Marxism, we can identify three key stages in the development of aesthetics – the pre-war (the 1920s and 1930s), late Stalinism and the Khrushchev thaw, and the late period (1970-1980s). The key tasks of aesthetics in Soviet Marxism were that she becomes influential and in-demand science, included in the program of "technical progress" and "education of the builder of communism", important ideological, aesthetic, and applied field of philosophy. However, in addition to the fact that purely ideological works were developed within the framework of aesthetic discourse, aesthetics itself in Soviet Marxism was able to develop thanks to contacts with semiotics, psychology, anthropology, cultural history, and sociology.

2. In China culture and the cultural revolution are inextricably linked with the Marxist projects of critiquing capitalist modernity and building alternative modernity. Aesthetics and culture also were at the center of attention in Chinese Marxist circles. In this respect, the diverse practices and designs of Chinese Marxism are similar to those of

Western Marxism or an equally distinct variety of Euro-American Marxist intellectual enterprises. Aesthetic Marxism in China had a dual mission – to criticize the internal contradictions of revolutionary hegemony and to offer a constructive vision of culture in a post-revolutionary society.

Acknowledgements. This research is done in the framework of the project "Chinese Marxism and its socio-cultural implications" (scientific supervisor – Prof. Dr. Sergii Rudenko, reference number 0122U001967).

References

- Clark, Katherine. (2018). Moscow, the Fourth Rome: Stalinism, Cosmopolitanism, and the Evolution of Soviet Culture (1931–1941). Moscow: New Literary Review.
- Kang, Liu (2000). Aesthetics and Marxism. Chinese Aesthetic Marxists and Their Western Contemporaries. Duke University Press
- Kruglova, Tatiana. (2021). Intellectual Map of Russian Aesthetics: Toward the Results of the Second Russian Aesthetic Congress, *Koinon*, vol. 2, no. 3: 194–212.
- Pohl, Karl-Heinz. (2018). An Intercultural Perspective on Chinese Aesthetics, *Social Theory and Asian Dialogues*, Springer Singapore; Palgrave Macmillan: 329-342.
- Turenko, Vitalii & Yarmolitska Natalia. (2021). Specificity and features of the development of aesthetics in the Ukrainian soviet philosophy in the 50–60s of the XX century, *Ukrainian cultural studies*, №8, pp. 24-28, [https://doi.org/10.17721/UCS.2021.1\(8\)](https://doi.org/10.17721/UCS.2021.1(8))
- Wang, Chengbing & Peters, M. A. (2021): Contemporary Chinese Marxism: disciplines, teaching platforms and status quo of basic academic research, *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2021.1929171>

Received: November 24, 2022

Accepted for publication: December 19, 2022

Published: December 30, 2022

Вісник Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка.
Філософія, 2(7), 56-60.
УДК 1(09):14(510)
<https://doi.org/10.17721/2523-4064.2022/7-10/11>

Віталій Туренко, канд. філос. наук, наук. співроб.,
Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, Київ, Україна
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0572-9119>
e-mail: vitali_turenko@ukr.net

ОСОБЛИВОСТІ РОЗВИТКУ ЕСТЕТИЧНИХ ДОСЛІДЖЕНЬ: МІЖ РАДЯНСЬКИМ І КИТАЙСЬКИМ МАРКСИЗМОМ

Розкрито особливості становлення та розвитку естетичних досліджень у таких двох напрямках марксизму, як радянський та китайський. Було визначено три ключові етапи розвитку естетики в радянському марксизмі – довоєнний (1920–1930-ті роки), пізній сталінізм і хрущовська відлига та пізній період (1970–1980-ті роки). Зазначено, що в умовах радянського марксизму ключовими завданнями було те, щоб естетика стала впливовою і затребуваною галуззю філософського знання, включеною в програму "технічного прогресу" та "виховання будівника комунізму". Утім, окрім того, що розвивалися суто ідеологічні праці в межах естетичного дискурсу, сама естетика в радянському марксизмі змогла розвиватися завдяки співпраці з фахівцями з семіотики, психології, антропології, історії культури, соціології. Спираючись на вибірково переклад західної філософської думки, радянська естетика починає перегукуватися зі світовими тенденціями, чому сприяє негласний консенсус ідеї естетики як частини філософсько-гуманітарного знання, що має власну автономію. Водночас доведено, що в Китаї культура і культурна революція нерозривно пов'язані з марксистськими проєктами критики капіталістичної сучасності і побудови альтернативної сучасності. Естетика і культура також були в центрі уваги в китайських марксистських колах. У цьому плані різноманітні практики та задуми китайського марксизму подібні до західного марксизму або не менш відмінного різновиду євро-американських марксистських інтелектуальних підприємств. Естетичний марксизм у Китаї має подвійну місію – критикувати внутрішні суперечності революційної гегемонії та запропонувати конструктивне бачення культури в післяреволюційному суспільстві. Це цінність китайського естетичного марксизму, наслідки якого виходять за межі власне Китаю у світі глобальної культурної критики. Крім того, будучи незахідним, китайський естетичний марксизм свідомо ставив під сумнів приетатанний марксизм європоцентризму.

Ключові слова: естетика, марксизм, китайський марксизм, радянський марксизм, культура, культурні революції.