

# SOCIO-CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND CULTURAL POLICY OF UKRAINE: EXPERIENCE OF FORMATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

Nataliia Zlenko<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract.** The paper is devoted to the analysis of the state cultural policy in the context of development of socio-cultural space. Scientific research is based on understanding of the basic values, the place and role of culture in the modern world, its true significance for the state, which claims the title of civilized, and therefore understanding of culture as a priority of the state policy. Therefore, *the aim of the paper* is the generalization of the Ukrainian experience of state cultural policy and identification of the significant achievements in this area. *Methodology.* The methodology of science of interdisciplinary level is applied in the research. The integration of interdisciplinary knowledge and the unification of disparate characteristics into the system allowed to obtain the new scientific knowledge in part of cultural policy characteristics on different sides and of view of the Ukrainian cultural policy in its entirety. The paper analyzes the main milestones of the Ukrainian cultural policy formation from independence to the present. The main achievements and imperfection of the state cultural policy in the political, cultural, institutional and financial aspects are summarized. *Results.* It is concluded that despite the failure of systemic cultural reforms in the past, a number of important changes have taken place in the cultural policy of Ukraine. The state cultural policy acquires signs of integrity and system. An organic entry into the context of the European system of values with the preservation and development of the own cultural heritage takes place. *Value/originality.* Analysis and systematization of the reformist projects and institutional decisions of the cultural policy of Ukraine in 1990–2020 can be used as the theoretical addition to research of the field of state cultural policy of Ukraine. *Practical implications.* From our point of view, the practical implications of the cultural policy research will help to get closer to understanding the reasons of the many reforms failures, to find the new effective practical solutions and to develop optimal approaches for the future state cultural policy of Ukraine.

**Key words:** culture, cultural policy, state cultural policy.

**JEL Classification:** F15, L62, L90, N70, Q53

## 1. Introduction

“The authority of a strong state is determined not only by its military and political influence on the world arena, but also by the possessed cultural potential” (Zhyvohliadova, 2019). Today, culture should be considered as one of the powerful drivers of the state social and economic development. “Cultural policy cannot and should not be a “residual sphere” of the state policy, as its potential can contribute to many tasks” (Shevchenko, 2019). We cannot disagree with the view of S. Zdioruk, published in the analytical study “Cultural policy of Ukraine: the national model in the European context”, that “modern, inherent in European society understanding of cultural functions, its role in public life goes far beyond vision as a sphere of pure art, aesthetic and spiritual

pursuits, preservation and nurturing of folk traditions”, although these branches, of course, do not lose their significance” (Zdioruk, 2012). The need of cultural policy research as an independent branch of theoretical knowledge has become relevant in the recent years due to the necessity of the search of new effective practical solutions in this area.

**The research degree.** The state cultural policy is defined as a set of principles and norms that are guided by the state for the preservation, development and dissemination of the culture. Cultural policy is understood as a purposeful activity in the field of culture and a sphere of social activity related to the state, its administration, power, i.e. that part of political activity (politics) which concerns the cultural sphere.

*Corresponding author:*

<sup>1</sup> Educational and Scientific Institute of Culture and Arts,  
Sumy State Pedagogical University named after A.S. Makarenko, Ukraine.

E-mail: [tokarenkonat@gmail.com](mailto:tokarenkonat@gmail.com)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2598-4336>

Various aspects of the cultural policy's formative factors have been studied by both foreign researchers (C. Landry, S. Mandy, E. Toffler, etc.) and Ukrainian scholars (V. Andrushchenko, Y. Bohutskyi, T. Wozniak, O. Hrytsenko, L. Huberskyi, S. Zdioruk, I. Kostyria, M. Mykhalchenko, M. Khudolii, etc.). However, the cultural policy of Ukraine has not been the subject of a special study of Ukrainian philosophers, culturologists, political scientists, economists, and legislators. Therefore, the purpose of scientific research is to generalize the Ukrainian experience of cultural policy and identify significant achievements in this sphere, which, from our point of view, will be addition for the theoretical basis in this area and will help to understand the causes of many reforms failures and will contribute to optimal approaches to future state cultural policy.

The methods of interdisciplinary **methodology** have been applied in order to achieve the goal. As interdisciplinarity shows what is inaccessible within a single science with its specific, narrowly oriented object, subject and research methods. Additionally, the modern science is in transformational processes. Interdisciplinarity is not only a simple borrowing of methods, tools from other sciences (disciplines), but also the integration of the last at the level of construction of interdisciplinary objects, subjects, processing of which allows to obtain new scientific knowledge. It also allows to get an explanation, a new reading, if not all, then most of economic, political and cultural processes and phenomena, to reveal previously unnoticed patterns.

To analyze and summarize the state cultural policy experience we have applied the methods of the empirical level, namely inductive generalization. The formation of the empirical basis of the theory requires the theoretical interpretation of the basic empirical dependencies and facts, the further development of the original scientific abstractions. Theoretical activity organizes the empirical one, predicts and draws new facts into the circle of research.

The theoretical knowledge reflects the object at the level of its internal connections, patterns of formation, development and existence. At the theoretical level, cognition generalizes empirical data, establishes the significance and practical value of certain research methods, reveals the true relationship between empirical data and existing theories, formulates new generalizations and conclusions within theories that previously existed. It reproduces the phenomena or processes mechanism, which provides an opportunity to explain the established facts, as was done in this research.

The basis on the interaction and unity of the empirical and theoretical, the availability of forward and backward linkages between them allowed to explore the cultural policy as an integrated system.

## **2. The review of the reform projects and practical measures in the field of cultural policy of the first decades of independent Ukraine**

At the time of gaining state independence, the Ukrainian culture was, in fact, postcolonial in nature: "the cultural space was still dominated by the public spheres of the former metropolis with their non-Ukrainian content and identities, and many citizens of the newly formed state had a nominal Ukrainian identity, preserving Soviet or Russian identity" (Hrytsenko, 2019). Such situation was considered by the political and cultural elite as a serious problem that had to be solved by means of state policy. There were also other problems in the transition period in the Ukrainian culture due to the fact that "most of then existing cultural and media centers were formed in a state-planned economy and could not cope with a market economy, especially during an economic crisis and hyperinflation" (Hrytsenko, 2019). So, the matter of the sphere of culture and state humanitarian policy reforming became obvious. However, for almost twenty-five years, there has been only a declaration of the state cultural policy course change. The guidelines and goals that were set by the "reformers" for themselves and for culture were not entirely effective for a number of reasons. The researcher O. Hrytsenko in his monographic study "Cultural Space and National Culture: Theoretical Understanding and Practical Formation" highlights among such reasons "the focus on ready-made recipes for solving the problems that were often uncritically borrowed from the Soviet past or from the experience of "real" European countries, <...> worldview contradictions between the bearers of different ideas about the nation, national culture and identity, different value systems and ideological guidelines <...> (Hrytsenko, 2019). It is needless to mention that there are different interpretations of the concepts of "national cultural space" and "national cultural product". Moreover, there were also a number of economic and administrative problems. Utilities, numerous state institutions and cultural enterprises, as well as hundreds of thousands of their employees, could no longer be maintained in a planned economy as before. The format of their activities has lost its ideological justification and economic basis. It is also worth to mention the unequal competition of the national cultural product with the globalized world market, which after the declaration of independence of Ukraine gained free access to our mass consumer. However, despite the difficulties and contradictions, the process of Ukrainian cultural space formation has been taken place. It was a complex and painful process of implementing state policy in the field of culture, which marked several conditional stages.

The first stage of the cultural policy of independent Ukraine took place in the conditions of the planned

economy dismantling, privatization process in the various cultural branches (film production, book publishing, etc.) in combination with hyperinflation and a sharp decline in the purchasing power of the population. In addition, there was a real prospect (for many, it was the threat) of its returning to the periphery of Western or Russian cultural space” (Hrytsenko, 2019). On the other hand, the introduction of “Ukrainian-oriented” state policy was hindered by the now (mostly) privatized cultural industries of Russia, which took on the role of the cultural mediator between the world and the former Soviet republics. Music, movies, literature, etc. existed mainly in the Russian translation or duplication. Russified influence acquired a market (and political!) format. “Accordingly, at the beginning of the 21st century, the Ukrainian culture has not gained the ability to effectively fulfill its role in social development, has not become a decisive force in the national identity formation of the majority of citizens, nor in building of the creative potential of society. It has not even become a leader in meeting the cultural needs of the population of Ukraine” (Hrytsenko, 2019).

The first legislative act of independent Ukraine in the sphere of culture was the “Fundamentals of Ukrainian Legislation on Culture”, adopted in February 1992. However, most of the principles proclaimed in the law were declarative and post-Soviet in nature. The problem or task of the cultural space reforming was not proclaimed in this legislative act. The main attention was paid to the development of cultural ties with the Ukrainian diaspora. Unfortunately, almost none of the promised, except of the establishment of several cultural centers at the embassies of Ukraine, with minimum funding and opportunities, were implemented. The declared provisions were not supported by legal actions during the next few years. The state policy on the Ukrainian culture development was mostly inertial.

In 1997, a Resolution was issued approving the “Conceptual directions of the executive bodies’ activity on the development of culture”. It was important to state the need of the cultural sphere comprehensive reforming. Patriotic rhetoric is rising; however, the document shows a tendency of reducing of the government specific commitments. “Strictly speaking, at least some of these regulations can be considered as reformist, as they were aimed to regulate the various cultural institutions activities in the new market economy and to ensure the continued existence of numerous mini-public spheres formed around theaters, houses of culture and libraries in Soviet times. “Revenues from paid services have not become a significant source of income for cultural institutions – they continue to depend on state or local budgets” (Hrytsenko, 2019).

The next stage of cultural policy is linked with the cultural reform project. In March 2005, the Verkhovna

Rada of Ukraine adopted the Law of Ukraine “On the Concept of State Policy in the Field of Culture for 2005–2007” (On the Concept..., 2005). It was adopted in a second attempt (the first was stopped by veto of the President Leonid Kuchma). The project was declared to be serious, however, the principles of state policy declared in the Law contained only general principles of “transparency and publicity”, “democracy”, “deideologization and tolerance”, “system and efficiency”, “innovation”, in which, in fact, there is no cultural specificity.

Attempts to update the state cultural policy and to provide more favorable conditions for the national culture development were intensified after the “Orange Revolution”. The first strategic document of the new government in the field of cultural policy is the Decree of President Yushchenko No. 1647 dated November 24, 2005 “On the priority tasks of enrichment and development of culture and spirituality of Ukrainian society”. It was established the National Council of Culture and Spirituality under the President of Ukraine with the aim of developing a “national action program for the enrichment and development of culture and spirituality of Ukrainian society”. The aim of the document was to change the priorities in the state cultural policy. In fact, “Roadmap for the Program of Enrichment and Development of Culture and Spirituality of Ukrainian Society” was proposed. But the document was never approved, as Viktor Yanukovich had different vision of public policy in the field of culture after the 2006 re-election. General approaches to state support of culture have not changed significantly. However, this does not mean that during those years there was no development of national culture.

During 2010-2013 years the cultural multi-vector was returned. The Law of Ukraine “On Culture” (On Culture..., 2010) was finally adopted in 2010 and entered into force on January 1, 2011. The main legal acts of the Law demonstrated both positive changes and a number of threats to the Ukrainian culture. The Law has contributed to the legal interpretation of concepts such as the national cultural space and its integrity. The law recognized the lack of unity of the cultural space of Ukraine. The matter of ensuring the protection of cultural values and cultural heritage objects that are the property of Ukraine and are located in other countries was also raised.

This period of time was marked by several essential features. On the one hand, this is the last peak before the rapid fall of Yanukovich. On the other hand, the team had certain ambitions, including the desire to reform cultural policy in Ukraine. The Art Arsenal (Kyiv), “Isolation” (Donetsk) was opened, the Rinat Akhmetov Foundation launched the country’s first and only grant program of cultural support – “Culture for the Eastern Partnership”, PinchukArtCentre and a network of

small cultural organizations were created. The cultural critic K. Botanova accurately noted in her paper “Not crossing this line was a matter of honor and the players on both sides despised and did not notice each other” (Botanova, 2019).

In addition to these positive decisions, the authorities were “systematically” solving the language problems in Ukraine by adopting the law “On the Principles of State Language Policy”, which strengthened the position of the Russian language in Ukraine’s cultural space. In this sense, the Maidan, which undoubtedly divides not only the last decade but also the entire history of Ukraine since 1991 into two unequal parts, was a great revolution in people’s attitudes toward their state and, accordingly, a revolution in cultural policy. The Maidan as an action and as a symbolic gesture of citizens regaining control over their own state lifted the taboo on the concept of state power, governance, politics (Botanova, 2019).

In 2014, the new people were involved to the public administration, making it more open, negotiable and simply human. Also the opportunities were opened for the whole layer of activists and NGOs for more directly and transparently influence and advocate for cultural policy changing. It turned out that the experience of the non-governmental sector in previous years, networking, self-organization, international cooperation – this was also the creation of cultural policies, effective steps to support, protect, develop various forms of cultural activities. Since 2014, this experience has been implemented in various attempts to create long-term cultural strategies, the most important of which were the Assembly of Cultural Figures and the Culture 2025 initiative.

There are at least three important points in unsuccessful history of cultural strategizing. First, it is the experience of consensus-seeking and advocacy in the public cultural sector. A standard democratic practice to negotiate and put pressure on the government was not easy for the Ukrainian cultural sector. However, the constant public activity since 2014 has made it possible to introduce transparent tender procedures, expert councils to make key decisions and allocate budget funds, and to create new institutions (the list can and should be continued).

Secondly, the concepts of “strategy”, “cultural policies”, “long-term planning”, “public-private partnership”, “open access” and many others have not only become an integral part of the vocabulary of all state institutions (we still remember that even five years before it was beyond imaginary), but also began to be applied.

At the same time, after Euromaidan, the criticism of the state’s cultural policy was intensified. In the spring of 2014, with the efforts of public “agents of change” and the new “revolutionary” leadership of the Ministry of Culture, with the support of the EU Eastern Partnership, the development of a “new cultural strategy” of Ukraine

was began. The significant result of the two years of “negotiations, discussions, quarrels and accusations of incompetence, unwillingness to dialogue, and even nationalism” (Hrytsenko, 2019) was the strategy of cultural development formation, which was finally adopted on February 1, 2016. № 119-r “On Approval of the Long-Term Strategy of the Development of Ukrainian Culture – Reform Strategy” (On Approval..., 2016) – (these and other normative documents in the sphere of culture in Ukraine until 2017 are provided in Table 1).

Despite the mostly declarative and internally contradictory nature and weak connection with the real situation of the cultural sphere in Ukraine, it cannot be denied that some of the priorities identified in this document have brought real changes in the cultural space of Ukraine.

### **3. The main achievements of the cultural policy formation at the present stage**

The next important stage of cultural policy in our country was the period of 2015-2019. Priority for the authorities was “the state support providing for the national cultural product” and “the integrated information and cultural space formation”. The decision to reform the budget system and finance cultural expenditures was also important. The formation of the state institution – Ukrainian Cultural Fund – with considerable funding affected the interests of some figures in the field of culture. The most noticeable was the conflict between supporters of different approaches to the status, functions and sources of funding of the new institution. The main tasks of the “Ukrainian Cultural Fund” were “to promote the implementation of state policy in the fields of culture and arts, the development of modern cultural, artistic activities and competitive on the world market domestic (national) cultural product; expert selection, financing and monitoring of projects, implementation of which is provided with the support of the Ukrainian Cultural Fund (About the Ukrainian Cultural Foundation, 2017).

The support of the national cultural industries as a key direction of the public cultural policy reforming has been actively strengthened. Among the important innovations were the creation of the Institute of Ukrainian Book, the Ukrainian Institute and so on. Significant changes have also taken place in the system of the Ukrainian cinema state support. Today, not only all key state institutions have strategies. To the important changes and achievements during last four years belong: decentralization, the law on the competitive appointment of the cultural institutions heads; the creation of the new cultural institutions mentioned above, the grants introduction for the non-governmental sector from the state budget;

Table 1

**Legislative regulation of cultural policy in 1990-2017: basic laws and reform projects**

"Fundamentals of Ukrainian legislation on culture"	1992
"Basic provisions of the Concept of the state cultural policy of Ukraine"	1994
"On measures to mark the 100th anniversary of the birth of O. Dovzhenko"	1994
"State program of the national book publishing and the press development for the period up to 2000"	1995
Resolution "On restructuring in the field of cinema"	1997
Law of Ukraine "On Cinematography"	1998
Resolution "Conceptual directions of the executive bodies activity concerning the culture development"	1997
"On measures to reform the cultural sector" ("On Cinematography" and "On the cultural heritage protection", "On minimum social standards for public libraries", "On the contractual form of employment contract with managers and creative staff of state theaters and concert and entertainment institutions", "On approval of the list of paid services that may be provided by cultural and artistic institutions based on state and communal property" and "On structural adjustment in the field of cinematography"	1997
"On approval of the Regulations on state support of national films in the production system"	1998
"On the Main Directions of the National Cinematography Development for the Period up to 2005"	2000
"On approval of the National Program of the National Film Industry Development for 2003-2007"	2002
"On the state support of book publishing in Ukraine"	2003
Law of Ukraine "On the Concept of State Policy in the Field of Culture for 2005-2007"	2005
"On the priority tasks of enrichment and development of culture and spirituality of Ukrainian society"	2005
Program of the enrichment and development of culture and spirituality of Ukrainian society "(Road Map Draft)"	2007
"On Amendments to the Law of Ukraine "On Cinematography"	2010
Law of Ukraine "On Culture"	2011
"On Approval of the Long-Term Strategy of the Ukrainian Culture Development - Reform Strategy"	2016
Law of Ukraine "On Amendments to Certain Laws of Ukraine on Improving of the Public Administration System in the Publishing Sphere"	2016
"On the establishment of the Ukrainian Book Institute"	2017
Law of Ukraine "On the Ukrainian Cultural Foundation"	2017
"Order on the establishment of the state institution "Ukrainian Institute"	2017

the attempts to create transparent procedures and decision-making mechanisms (for example, for the Ukrainian pavilion at the Venice Biennale), the numerous expert councils organization, this is, in fact, a participatory model. "The choice of the national cultural policy model should be based not only on the attractiveness of a foreign experience, but primarily on the own social, political and cultural traditions, the state of the economy, culture in general and its individual spheres, international challenges facing the country" (Zdioruk, 2019).

Significant changes in cultural policy are also evidenced by changes in the financing of culture. If five or ten years ago there was a problem of inadequate financial support of the cultural sector and there was a gap between the so-called official culture, which is financed from the budget, and one that is focused on the current needs of cultural activities. Thus, culture was on the periphery of the state interests, and although there were a number of laws and regulations that were designed to regulate the issues of cultural development, most of them "did not work", remaining in fact the "declarations of intent".

The positive changes in the field of cultural financing are also evidenced by the fact that the 2021 state budget has increased the funding for the Ministry of Culture and Information Policy by 52% compared to 2020. According to the Minister of Culture O. Tkachenko, this is the fact of "the clear demonstration of a gradual change

in the perception of the culture role for the state" (Mori, 2020). According to the approved budget, it is possible to start the implementation of the planned programs in 2021, in particular, the Great Restoration project, creation of cultural services centers, programs for the folk arts and crafts and reading promotion, systematic development and promotion of domestic tourism, construction of the National Memorial Complex of Heroes of the Celestial Hundred – Museum of the Revolution of Dignity, the Museum of the Holodomor, the Museum of Babyn Yar and the branch state archive, information security and media literacy programs, etc.

This year it is important to increase the state's financial support of the cultural projects, mainly through the Ukrainian Cultural Fund. It is proposed to increase its funding to 695 million UAH in 2021 – on 73% more than in the 2020 budget. The cinematography support will be also increased by 36.5%. In total, the state will spend 621 million UAH to create Ukrainian cinema in 2021.

From our point of view, finally there are achievement of certain results. Ukraine confidently follows the path of professional and motivated advocacy in the field of cultural and creative industries. Innovative business and creative management models are used. A positive development is the approval by the Government of the list of economic activities that belong to the creative industries. Also, the Ukrainian Fund of Startups with

a budget of 390 million UAH was recently announced which should increase the investment attractiveness of Ukraine and stimulate the growth of domestic creative capital. The scheme “producer of national cultural product” – the world community – is being developed. A system of powerful institutions with the ability to develop policy in the field of culture is being built. The documentary base is being formed, which will allow to define the main priorities of activity clearly. Significant changes are taking place in the field of financing. It is important to ensure the coordinated plan realization in accordance with the state strategy of cultural policy.

It may sound paradoxically, just now the current Ukrainian situation in the field of culture is reminiscent of that in Italy after its unification more than a hundred years ago. Then one of the political leaders declared: “We have created Italy, now we need to create Italians”. Accordingly, Ukrainian politicians have created Ukraine, and now they have to create Ukrainians. And in this sense, today’s state policy in the field of culture, in our opinion, has chances to achieve this aim.

#### 4. Conclusions

The process of formation and implementation of the cultural policy of independent Ukraine is long and contradictory. The cultural reforms and events in different years are determined by the political context. Their aim was to solve the specific problems (legislative, financial, institutional means) and to attempt to reform the entire cultural policy, and even the entire Ukrainian culture as well. Such long-term cultural and

political activities had different consequences: while most attempts to carry out serious systemic reforms failed, the measures to solve certain problems finally yielded results, which together with the development of cultural goods markets and self-organization processes in the cultural and artistic environment changed the national culture as a system.

The reform projects failures can be explained by the focus of most reformers on the idealized vision of the culture future, neither on solving of its real problems, that usually makes public policy inefficient. To the failure causes we can also include the weak interest of governments and political elites in the real state cultural policy reforming, mutual misunderstanding, interest and values conflicts, weak funding, and insufficient legislative regulation in this area. Most of the declared provisions were not supported by legal actions. The state policy of the Ukrainian culture development was mostly inertial.

Despite the low efficiency of systemic cultural reforms, a number of important changes have been taken place in Ukraine’s cultural policy. Today, the positive reforms and development strategies have already begun to be implemented. There are real opportunities for the free development of national culture, artist’s creativity freedom, achievement and preservation of the integrity of the Ukrainian national culture, its integration into the European and world cultural space. We are witnessing how the state systemic cultural policy began to be built, resulting in the culture formation that is capable to function as a part of the world cultural process in the modern conditions.

#### References:

- Botanova, K. (2019). Cultural policy of the last decade: how to live with a constantly open window of opportunity. Available at: [https://lb.ua/culture/2019/12/23/445542\\_kulturna\\_politika\\_ostanno.html](https://lb.ua/culture/2019/12/23/445542_kulturna_politika_ostanno.html)
- Zhyvohliadova, D. (2020). Actual: about cultural policy. Available at: <https://uaculture.org/texts/aktualno-pro-kulturnu-polityku/>
- Zdioruk, S. I., Litvinenko O. M., & Rozumna, O. P. (2012). Cultural policy of Ukraine: national model in the European context: analyst. ext. Kyiv: NISS.
- Hrytsenko, O. (2019). Cultural space and national culture: theoretical understanding and practical formation. Kyiv: Institute of Cultural Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine.
- Mori, Ye. (2020). Social media. Available at: <https://suspilne.media/88875-u-budzeti-2021-na-kulturu-vidilili-na-52-bilse-niz-minulogo-roku-tkacenko/>
- Law of Ukraine dated 03.03.2005. On the Concept of the state policy in the field of culture for 2005–2007. No. 2460-IV. Information of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, 2005. No. 16. Art. 264. 1. Available at: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2460-15#Text>
- Law of Ukraine On Culture No. 2778-VI dated 14.12.2010. Information of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, 2011. No. 24. Art. 168. Available at: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2778-17#Text>
- On Approval of the Long-Term Strategy for the Development of Ukrainian Culture – the Strategy of Reforms. Order of the Cabinet of Ministers dated 01.02.2016 No. 119-p. Available at: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/119-2016-%D1%80#Text>
- About the Ukrainian Cultural Foundation. Law of Ukraine dated 23.03.2017 No. 1976-VIII. Information of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, 2017. No. 19. Art. 238. Available at: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1976-19#Text>
- Shevchenko, M. I. (2019). Cultural policy of Ukraine in the context of European integration: dilemmas and challenges. *International relations: theoretical and practical aspects*, vol. 3, pp. 215–224.