



The Project is funded  
by the European Union

EUROEAST CULTURE  
RMCB Unit

***Non-official Translation***

**Eastern Partnership Culture Programme  
Regional Monitoring and Capacity Building Unit  
(RMCBU)**

**EuropeAid Contract No 2010/255-219**

**ADDENDUM**

**to the ANALYTICAL BASE-LINE REPORT ON THE CULTURE SECTOR  
AND CULTURAL POLICY OF  
UKRAINE**

**Studies and Diagnostics on Cultural Policies  
of the Eastern Partnership Countries**

The document is prepared by the Regional Monitoring and Capacity Building Unit of the Eastern Partnership Culture Programme

March 2015

This document has been produced with assistance of the European Union. Its content is the sole responsibility of the Regional Monitoring and Capacity Building Unit of the Eastern Partnership Culture Programme. It reflects the opinion of contributing experts and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Commission.

The RMCBU Project is implemented by a Consortium led by [Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit](#) (GIZ) GmbH in partnership with [HYDEA S.p.A.](#) (Italy) and [RWTH Aachen University](#) (Germany).

## **PREFACE**

This document complements the Analytical Base-line Report on the Culture Sector and Cultural Policy of Ukraine prepared by the Regional Monitoring and Capacity Building Unit of the Eastern Partnership Culture Programme (RMCBU) in August 2012 and revised in January 2013. The report was published at the Programme's web-site (<http://www.euroeastculture.eu/en/database-of-materials/view-ukraine-analytical-base-line-report-on-the-culture-sector-and-cultural-policy.html>).

The Addendum reflects the major changes that occurred in the country's cultural policy context since 2012. The content of this document is the sole responsibility of the RMCBU and reflects the opinion of contributing experts. It can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Commission. The document was prepared by Mr. Mykola Skyba, RMCBU Expert and Ms. Tetiana Biletska, RMCBU Capacity Building Expert, with contributions from Mr. Luciano Gloor, RMCBU Team Leader and editing by Ms. Oksana Muzychuk, RMCBU Project Monitoring Manager.

In 2013 the RMCBU published the Regional Research Report on Cultural Policies and Trends of the Eastern Partnership Countries and six Analytical Base-line Reports on the Culture Sector and Cultural Policy of the EaP countries. The reports were intended for a broad range of audiences that includes all culture stakeholders in the countries of the Eastern Partnership and the European Union. The documents summarised results of the *Studies and Diagnostics on Cultural Policies of the Eastern Partnership Countries* carried out by the RMCBU from October 2011 to March 2012 in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine. The studies were focused on the national cultural policies of these countries and practically orientated to provide strategic guidance to the entire Eastern Partnership Culture Programme and to all activities of the RMCBU Project. A tailor-made system to analyse the current situation in the culture sector of the EaP countries was elaborated by the RMCBU. It was primarily based on conceptual comparative analysis of the countries' specific policies with applicable international standards exercised by the RMCBU in cooperation with six local experts and guided by an international expert. Preparation, publication and further promotion of the reports stimulated comments and contributions from the Programme's stakeholders and other interested parties, leading to debate on cultural policy matters for the EaP countries and beyond. No doubt, in the course of implementation of the Programme, the dialogue on cultural policy matters contributed to promoting better integration of culture into national, regional and local development policies of the Eastern Partnership countries.

## **Introduction**

The social and political context of the Ukraine's culture sector has changed dramatically over the recent two years. The major events and drivers which have led to such contextual changes include: Ukraine's accession to the European Union through the European Neighbourhood Instrument, preparation to signing the Ukraine-EU Association Agreement and Russian interference in this process; large-scale public protest movement in response to President Yanukovich's last-minute refusal to sign the Association Agreement (known as Euromaidan Movement escalated from protests against President Viktor Yanukovich's regimen to large public protest movement – the Revolution of Dignity). As a result of public protests, the ousting of President Viktor Yanukovich was followed by early presidential and parliamentary elections, formation of the new Cabinet of Ministers and Ukraine's eventual signing of the Association Agreement. These steps provoked military aggression of Russia attempting to restore its control over Ukraine lost with the fall of Viktor Yanukovich's regime. Military and terrorist actions in the Eastern Ukraine have strengthened wider volunteer movement initiated at Maidan<sup>1</sup> in support of the Ukrainian Armed Forces as well as public initiatives promoting reforms appeared to be very urgent and essential given the institutionally weakness of government authorities. Volunteering has become a unique cultural phenomenon in Ukraine and requires a special study as a part of the overall analysis of cultural trends in 2013 to 2015.

The major events and trends that occurred or developed over these two years and had impact on Ukraine's culture sector may be divided into three periods.

### **Period I: Preparation to signing the Ukraine-EU Association Agreement (before 21 November 2013)**

The Ukraine-EU Association Agreement was to be signed on 27 November 2013 at the EU Eastern Partnership Summit in Vilnius. Students, many culture actors and thought leaders put high hopes on this instrument. Implementation of the Association Agreement was expected to relax visa requirements, boost cooperation with EU institutions, open EU labour markets and bring other positive developments. Moreover, the Association Agreement was seen as a cornerstone of relatively free and fair presidential elections scheduled for 2015.

The period of preparation to signing the Association Agreement featured slow and mainly formal policy changes. The policy, as such, was 'double-level'. At the first level, the level of official policy, a number of laws were adopted exactly as required by the Association Agreement and supported by numerous speeches claiming reforms and similar steps however no legal development was supported by an implementing mechanism. At the other level, the 'shadow' policy continued to strengthen the President's and his inner circle's power and enhanced his control over civil society organisations including those working in the culture sector. The culture activities faced many evident and hidden restrictions.

As a part of EU accession political processes, though merely formal, the National Institute for Strategic Studies (NISS, the main research organisation providing analytical and prognostic support for the President of Ukraine) was involved in the elaboration of the Ukraine's culture development strategy. NISS was then led by Mr. Andriy Yermolayev and the strategy development was coordinated by Mrs. Oksana Melnychuk. Near-term priorities of the national culture development policy were then defined as follows:

1. Formation of the new sociocultural infrastructure at the local level to promote pro-active public space

---

<sup>1</sup> For the purposes of this paper, the terms 'Euromaidan' and 'Maidan' have the following definitions:

Euromaidan is a period of non-violent protests from 21 to 30 November 2013 (or through 16 January 2014 according to some experts). The leaders and participants of this movement followed liberal values; their meetings were based on tolerance and respect to cultural diversity. Metaphorically speaking, it was the Decembrist uprising supported by other social groups and subsequently succeeded.

Maidan means active and large-scale anti-government protests eventually resorted to force. In wider sense, this protest is seen as a form of political movement characterized by bottom-up self-organization and lack of clear political programme. This term also refers to events in 2004 known as the Orange Revolution.

2. Re-actualisation of the cultural heritage to make the modern cultural product and promote the cultural image of cities
3. Clustering of creative economy to identify and promote development of the nation's creative potential

Policymakers relied on the idea of sociocultural modernisation and studies of cultural practices completed in 2012. However they lacked cooperation with independent expert communities and public initiatives which could support and ensure better implementation of the strategy.

The recommendations presented by NISS experts brought no changes to the practice of governance at the level of the Ministry of Culture or cultural institutions. Governance was still built on the principle of personal loyalty rather than on professional approaches.

Some positive experience in management of cultural resources and processes was accumulated at some regional centres and cities of Ukraine such as Vinnytsia and Lviv. However due to poor communication and lack of nationwide platforms for representatives of local communities, local self-governance bodies and central authorities, the awareness of the best practice was low. Round table discussions, conferences and workshops held as a part of the Eastern Partnership Culture Programme seem to be the only platform where representatives of municipal authorities, civil society organisations and the Ministry of Culture could meet, discuss and cooperate with each other. In particular, in December 2011, at the beginning of the Programme, representatives of central and local authorities, public and independent cultural institutions discussed the most urgent issues of the culture sector at the round table held by RMCBU in Kyiv as a part of diagnostic visits to EaP countries. Regional and urban development based on cultural resources and cultural diversity of local communities was subsequently discussed as a part of the cultural policy exchange workshop held by RMCBU in 30 October through 2 November 2013 in Alushta (Autonomous Republic of Crimea<sup>2</sup>, Ukraine). The workshop brought together culture professionals from six EaP countries. The conceptual principles of Ukraine's cultural policy, Lviv development strategy and many other interesting examples of modernised life of local communities in Ukraine were presented to and discussed by more than 40 guests from Crimean cities – Alushta, Bilogirsk and Yevpatoriya and other Ukrainian cities and towns. Nevertheless, these events were not large enough to institutionalise and disseminate such positive practice at the national level.

At the same time, there have been some positive changes in the management practice at some cultural institutions such as development of project management skills, more efficient work with target audience, fundraising and other initiatives due to participation in the training programmes offered by foreign cultural institutions such as the British Council, Polish Institute, Goethe-Institute, French Institute and cultural departments of foreign missions. Moreover, some projects granted as a part of the Eastern Partnership Culture Programme contributed to these capacity building initiatives. However these changes have been non-systemic and took place contrary to the government cultural policy rather than promoted by it.

## **Period II: Euromaidan and Revolution of Dignity (21 November 2013 – 22 February 2014)**

President's last-minute refusal to sign the Ukraine-EU Association Agreement led to public unrest. On the 21<sup>st</sup> of November, the protest meeting was called through social media by Mustafa Nayyem, a well-known Ukrainian journalist (currently an MP). The meeting gathered more than thousand people and was followed by a larger demonstration variously estimated at 50 to 200 thousands two days later, on the 24<sup>th</sup> of November. All the time Maidan Nezalezhnosti (The Independence Square) was crowded with the young people calling the President of Ukraine to cancel his decision to suspend the Ukraine's accession process and sign the Association Agreement at Vilnius EaP Summit. The movement is known as Euromaidan where Ukrainian students and creative people manifested their values and beliefs. Yaroslav Hrytsak, a well-known Ukrainian historian, considers that the new Maidan movement should be compared with New York's "Occupy The Wall Street" movement in 2009 rather than with Ukraine's Orange Revolution 2004 since this sociocultural phenomenon was a 'revolution of values'.

---

<sup>2</sup> At present, the territory of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea was temporary annexed by the Russian Federation.

Notably, after Euromaidan events escalated to more radical forms and thousands of people started coming to the centre of Kyiv from small towns and villages all over Ukraine, the majority of activists (63%, source: Kyiv Institute of Sociology) had higher education, students accounted for 10% to 13%, and businessmen from 9% to 12%. Euromaidan, grown into Maidan after protesters had changed their claims (Yanukovich's resignation), was supported by culture actors, thought leaders and representatives of the IT sector.

Maidan was not just a protest movement but rather **a new culture space**<sup>3</sup>.

- The protest movement was accompanied by concerts, shows, performances, open-air exhibitions, poetry readings and other cultural events.
- In cooperation with thought leaders and organisers of TEDxKyiv Conference, students and lecturers of Kyiv School of Economics launched Maidan Open University Initiative to give lectures at the Maidan main stage so the protesting students could continue their learning process. The leading Ukrainian teachers and experts spoke out from the small stage at Maidan Nezalezhnosti (near Liadski Gate). The Maidan Open University moved to the Ukrainian House for some period of time. This initiative was still active in the post-Maidan period.
- Well-known photographers and filmmakers such as Igor Haidai, Olexandr Gliadielov, and Olexandr Chekmeniov documented events taking place at Maidan. Sergiy Loznytsia, the film director, shot his film on the barricades.
- Live recordings made by a new documentary filmmakers' association Babylon'13 have written a new page in the history of Ukraine's documentary filmmaking.

In terms of **the sociocultural process** of that time, horizontal interaction and self-organisation (volunteering and networking) of people representing various social groups from self-reliant businessmen to the poorest farmers from all regions of Ukraine seem to be the most outstanding Maidan's phenomenon. Wide use of the Internet, social media and 3G contributed to this phenomenon greatly. More than a dozen of different initiatives have been launched to address the major functions of the social organisation, i.e. the government:

- Self-defence groups (in the capital and regional centres) to provide security
- Information & coordination centres
- Legal support centres
- Medical aid centres
- Catering and accommodation service centre for those who came to Kyiv
- Information and promotion centres
- Maidan's Family Centre raised more than UAH 50 million to support families whose relatives were killed or wounded and required medical care
- AutoMaidan Group, car owners who quickly responded to Maidan's needs from products delivery to transportation of the wounded

The Blue Shield National Committee was established in Kyiv as a result of prompt self-organisation of monument protectors. They actively cooperated with Euromaidan Self-Defence Group to preserve museum collections, natural parks and monuments from vandalism and provocations.

Today, private funds donated by Ukrainian people to Maidan during those days could hardly be estimated with accuracy but reached hundreds of millions hryvnias.

Hromadske.tv, a public Internet TV channel, was launched in the first days of Maidan movement to provide unbiased information. It has set up the world record of hits in YouTube and raised more than UAH 1 million through crowdfunding initiatives for the first ten days only (people's donation has been the single source of financing). This is a public organisation founded by a group of journalists and supported by the wider society through social media. The success of hromadske.tv was repeated by Hromadske Radio however to lesser extent. Both projects apply a fundamentally new approach to their content: live recordings and panel discussions prevail over entertainments and ads.

---

<sup>3</sup> See: #Euromaidan – History in the Making. Kyiv, 2014: <http://euromaidanbook.com/>

Therefore, **cultural practices have changed dramatically**: public actions have stepped forwards and the content of social media has changed significantly. Thousands of people use their private accounts to track and assess political events and developments. Volunteers' organisations are now mobilised in social media and coordinate their efforts to help those in need. Ukrainian writer Oksana Zabuzhko's new book 'Eyewitnesses' Chronicle' compiles social media users' posts of that time and is very indicative of how the content has been changed.

### **Period III: Post-Maidan period (from February 22, 2014 onwards)**

This is a period of 'rebooting' the government after the former President Viktor Yanukovich, former Prime Minister Mykola Azarov and many other criminal politicians escaped from Ukraine. Since then, the country has held early presidential and parliamentary elections and has formed new Cabinet of Ministers twice. This period is accentuated by the military aggression of the Russian Federation which annexed the Autonomous Republic of Crimea, incited and backed separatist movements in Donetsk and Lugansk regions leading to military actions in eastern Ukraine. Signing of the Ukraine-EU Association Agreement was one of the most significant political developments.

Annexation of Crimea by the Russian Federation forced many thousands of Crimean Tatars leave their historical homeland and move to other locations throughout Ukraine. Culture actors and activists who preferred to stay in Crimea are persecuted now. Ukrainian film director Oleg Sentsov was arrested by the Russia's Security Service and accused in terrorism. Although the case caused a massive public outcry and many Ukrainians and representatives of the global filmmaking community came out to voice their support and call to free Oleg Sentsov, he is still imprisoned by Russia's FSB (Federal Security Service).

With the beginning of Russian military aggression against Ukraine and spread of separatist movements orchestrated by Russia in eastern Ukraine, the volunteer movement grew rapidly. **Dozens of new public initiatives were launched in the culture and art sector.**

Volunteer organisations have become reliable partners for the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Ministry of Defence. Cultural activists are also much involved in this process. Many charitable concerts and events are held to raise funds for wounded. Groups of artists, such as People's Philharmonic Initiative<sup>4</sup>, visit Donetsk and Lugansk regions to play concerts before those on the frontline. When several towns, such as Slovyansk and Severodonetsk, Donetsk region, were freed from separatists, local residents required psychological support and should be integrated into Ukrainian humanitarian space. In this context, New Donbas Initiative<sup>5</sup> is a unique one – culture actors focused their efforts on teenagers, one of the most vulnerable groups. New Donbas offers unique and creative programmes combining drama, pantomime and filmmaking to relieve the psychological pain in children and rebuild their trust in 'mainland' Ukraine through human relations. The newly established Charity Foundation The Depths of Art<sup>6</sup> is going to hold interdisciplinary art forums in Kyiv and other cities. The forums will be devoted to certain regions of Ukraine. Today, DonCult is the most remarkable. STAN Art Group<sup>7</sup>, a civil society organisation from Lutsk, should also be noted in this context. The Art Group attempts to strengthen the social dialogue and understanding in different Ukraine's regions by studying stereotypes towards internally displaced persons from eastern Ukraine in cities such as Dnipropetrovsk, Lutsk, Kremenchuk, Melitopol, Kharkiv, Ivano-Frankivsk, Lviv and Kyiv. They give recommendations on how to address such stereotypes. Partner relations of cultural institutions involved in this project and representing different Ukrainian cities were established at RMCBU Cultural Policy Exchange Workshops Cycles 2013 and 2014 held for professionals from six EaP countries.

The Ukrainian Assembly of Cultural Actors<sup>8</sup> Initiative has taken the responsibility for 'people's oversight' over what the Ministry of Culture does. When the provisional government chaired by Prime Minister Arseniy Yatsenyuk was formed and Yevhen Nischuk was appointed as the Minister of Culture in February 2014, the representatives of this Initiative and the government official signed a memorandum promoting,

---

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.facebook.com/NarodnaFilarmoniya?fref=ts>

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.facebook.com/NewDonbas>

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.facebook.com/doncultforum?fref=ts>

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.facebook.com/lqstan>

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.facebook.com/cultureassemblyua?fref=ts>

inter alia, the principles of transparency and accountability of the Ministry. Although the Memorandum was followed by several meetings bringing together representatives of the Assembly, the Minister and other newly appointed ministerial officials, the parties failed to find common language. One of the reason was different views due to the different scope of their responsibility: government officials are tied down by dozens of regulations and follow the principle 'do what is allowed by the law or rule' and may be subject to administrative or criminal sanctions for decisions taken while culture activists are free from any bureaucratic hurdle and bear no responsibility for their decisions or sayings and are guided by the principle 'everything is permitted unless prohibited by the law'.

In this context, the Congress of Cultural Activists<sup>9</sup> should also be mentioned. Established in spring 2014 by a few members of the Assembly of Cultural Actors, the Congress launches and implements interdisciplinary projects throughout Ukraine in support of efficient cultural initiatives for the benefit of the society and promotes enabling environment for partnership. It is a volunteer movement to support activists' communities in large and small cities where local governance bodies have political will to boost reforms. The Congress activists are open to international experience in reforming the society and culture and art sector and intensively cooperate with foreign partners.

**Self-organisation in the expert community takes the form of different initiatives focused on strategic outlook over Ukraine's further development.** Among the initiatives with a special focus on cultural policy, some are especially interesting:

- Vision Project 'New Country Civic Platform' is a non-political civil group. The Platform focuses on integration of nation's intellectual resources and promotes the national dialogue and mutual understanding to develop and implement efficient reforms in Ukraine with a special emphasis on development of human capital in the society as whole and addressing cultural issues in particular.<sup>10</sup>
- Nestor Group founded as an informal association of thought leaders and civil activists, experts and practitioners to develop the strategic vision for Ukraine based on studies of values of the Ukrainian society. In late February 2015, the Group presented its framework document 'Vision of Ukraine 2015: Agreement of Dignity for Sustainable Development'.<sup>11</sup>
- Humanitarian Security Committee, an open civil discussion platform, was established by well-known and influential culture actors including Vlad Troitsky, Olexandr Roytburd and Viktor Zotov. This initiative attempts to go beyond specific highly specialised areas and look at the situation in the culture sector at a wider perspective.<sup>12</sup>
- New Ukraine Institute for Strategic Research, an expert and analytical group, sees its mission in developing a platform for modernisation and strengthening dialogue for new Ukraine's future. Development of the new cultural policy and concept of development of creative economy are among its key directions.<sup>13</sup>

The large number of such initiatives and their pro-active approach is a very positive development; however their activity lack coordination both among partner projects and with legislative and executive bodies. Their activities sometimes are not backed by fundamental academic studies such as studies of Ukrainian cultural practices completed by NISS in 2012 as described above. Poor coordination and lack of institutional memory affects the efficacy of reform initiatives as a whole.

The independent sector continues to demonstrate its ability to generate new initiatives and self-organisation processes. Some of them have been mentioned here. At the same time, the emotional tension caused by military actions in eastern Ukraine and the crisis affecting activity in the culture sector remains high in the society.

---

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.facebook.com/congress.of.cultural.activists?fref=ts>

<sup>10</sup> <http://novakraina.org/>

<sup>11</sup> <http://nestorgroup.org/documents/>

<sup>12</sup> Vlad Troitsky is a theatre director, producer, play writer and actor, founder of DAKH Contemporary Art Centre and GOGOLFEST interdisciplinary festival. Olexandr Roytburd is an artist, representative of South Ukrainian art school, and one of founders of Ukrainian postmodernism. Viktor Zotov is an architect, founder and organiser of CANactions International Festival for Young Architects.

<http://platfor.ma/society/vidkritii-diskusii-klub-na-temu--gumanitarna-politika-ukrayini-kqb-komitet-qumanitarnoyi-bezpeki-/>

<sup>13</sup> <http://newukraineinstitute.org/about>



Similar to other government agencies, **the Ministry of Culture focused on reforms in the culture sector in spring 2014**. The entire structure of the former Ministry as well as the national culture strategy requires changes - said New Culture Minister Yevhen Nischuk.

First off, **the Ministry improved its day-to-day operation**. Cooperation with international and intergovernmental organisations such as the Council of Europe and the European Commission are now more active. The Ministry expressed their interest in studying best European practice in cultural policies, in particular, the experience of Baltic States. In cooperation with Goethe-Institut and Polish Institute, the exchange programme was launched for civil servants to share good management practice. The programme comprised study visits to partner countries and Kyiv-based workshops. In order to start financing projects to be implemented by independent cultural institutions on a competitive basis, the Ministry of Culture launched the grant programme 'Common Ground' to encourage dialogue among different regions of Ukraine through cultural events and seek better support from civil organisations.

Moreover, **the Ministry of Culture is committed to implement strategic and systemic changes**.

In March 2014, a working group<sup>14</sup> was established by experts and practitioners, independent cultural professionals. In cooperation with representatives of the Ministry of Culture, this working group proposed priority activities for the Ministry until 2015. This document was published on the Ministry's website<sup>15</sup> in late July 2014 following public discussions. The document offers the Ministry of Culture to change its focus from control over institutions under its supervision to encouraging and building enabling environment for comprehensive intercultural and interregional social dialogue, promoting partnership and strengthening understanding among citizens based on European values and democracy such as the right to self-determination, welfare, free creative development and access to cultural values, openness, transparency and governmental accountability to the people. According to this document, the Ministry of Culture has undertaken to implement the brief anti-crisis programme until late 2015 based on the priorities described below:

1. To encourage social dialogue to strengthen country's integrity
2. To preserve and develop cultural heritage as a resource of today's and future generations
3. To develop creative industries as a driving force for social and economic innovations
4. To introduce European standards such as openness, transparency and governmental accountability to the people within the competence of the Ministry of Culture of Ukraine

Development of the long-term strategy has become a further step. In autumn 2014, the Eastern Partnership Culture Programme provided technical assistance to this activity, including, in particular, development of the Road Map for 'Culture 2025 Long-term National Cultural Strategy' Project<sup>16</sup>. The Road Map was developed in consultation with the Ministry of Culture of Ukraine, Ukrainian Centre for Cultural Studies, Ukrainian independent expert community and Ragnar Siil, RMCBU expert from Estonia.

In November 2014, members of the Working Group, which developed priorities for the Ministry of Culture, established Culture 2025 Platform of Strategic Initiatives in cooperation with representatives of cultural communities representing many regions of Ukraine. As many other similar initiatives, Culture 2025 is based on the principles of self-organisation. According to representatives of this organisation, they moderate the process of elaboration of Ukraine's culture development strategy until 2025 and hope the contents of the strategy will be defined through joint efforts of representatives of central government, local self-governance bodies, civil society, producers and users of the cultural product.

So called 'regional strategic sessions' were held in Vinnytsia, Dnipropetrovsk, Zaporizhia, Lviv, Odesa and Kharkiv in November 2014. As an interim result of these meetings, Culture 2025 Platform of Strategic Initiatives was presented at the Third Capacity Development Forum held on 3 – 4 December 2014 in Kyiv bringing together more than 800 participants representing all regions of Ukraine including the Autonomous Republic of Crimea. Some Ukrainian cities joined the process of identifying challenges for the culture sector by their own initiative in early 2015. In February 2015, the sector discussion cycle for

---

<sup>14</sup> The group included Katerina Botanova, Mykola Skyba, Olexandr Butsenko, Olena Pravylo, Yuriy Rybachuk and Katerina Chuyeva.

<sup>15</sup> <http://mincult.kmu.gov.ua/mincult/doccatalog/document?id=367057>

<sup>16</sup> <http://culture2025.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/%D0%94%D0%BE%D1%80%D0%BE%D0%B6%D0%BD%D1%8F-%D0%BA%D0%B0%D1%80%D1%82%D0%B0-%D0%BE%D0%BD%D0%BE%D0%B2%D0%BB%D0%B5%D0%BD%D0%B0.pdf>



representatives of sector communities was launched. The developments and deliverables are published on a regular basis on the Platform's website<sup>17</sup>.

In assessing performance of the Ministry of Culture in March through December 2014, it should be noted that the Ministry became more transparent, more predictable and consistent in its activities and now adheres the priorities and principles declared although some functional, organisational and management difficulties remain. Some steps have been crucial in the context of implementation of the Association Agreement to serve as a good background for further reforms in the culture sector:

- Negotiations with the European Commission to define the terms and conditions of Ukraine's participation in Creative Europe Programme, development of the respective agreement and identification of mechanisms for functioning and funding the local structure – Creative Europe Desk Ukraine.
- Development of the Memorandum for Cooperation between the Ministry of Culture of Ukraine and the European Commission
- Support to Ukraine's joining ICCROM<sup>18</sup>
- Revision of the principles of operation of Ministry's expert councils based on best global practice, development and approval of the respective regulations: the key principles of accountability were introduced such as disclosure of conflicts of interests, minimal involvement of ministerial officials and management, selection of members from among well-known sector experts independent from the Ministry.
- Validation of the new model of appointing management staff for national cultural institutions subordinated to the Ministry of Culture through consultation with expert community and labour collectives (e.g. appointment of the art director for Odesa National Academic Opera and Ballet Theatre).

**Some changes in directions and coordination of efforts focused on reforms of Ukraine's cultural policy took place when a new management team joined the Ministry of Culture in December 2014 – January 2015.** The new management team is headed by Vice Prime Minister / Minister of Culture Vyacheslav Kyrylenko and was formed by the principle of political loyalty rather than professional competence.

- Culture 2025 Platform of Strategic Initiatives continued taking its efforts to identify the challenges of some culture subsectors. The Platform does not operate under the aegis of the Ministry of Culture; however an agreement has been reached to continue coordination and expert cooperation with the Committee for Culture and Spirituality at Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine (VRU).
- The VRU Committee for Culture and Spirituality took steps to develop the concept of reforms in the culture and art sector with a special focus on implementation of the most essential legislative reforms to promote favourable climate for cultural and art activities<sup>19</sup>. Committee Chairman Mr Mykola Kniazytsky and Mrs Iryna Podoliak, Deputy Chairman, play a very active role in this process.
- The Ministry of Culture of Ukraine, of the one side, concentrates efforts on implementation of the CoM Action Programme<sup>20</sup> with a special focus on three major directions in 'New Cultural Policy' Section: 1) development and implementation of the Strategy for Ukrainian Humanitarian Policy; 2) development and support to adoption of the Law of Ukraine 'On National Cultural Product'; 3) attraction of new sources of financial support to the culture sector. On the other hand, according to Mr Kyrylenko, the Ministry of Culture focuses on legislative reforms in cultural heritage protection, introduction of incentives to develop the film production sector, finance cultural and art events and introduce the contractual system in theatres and cultural institutions<sup>21</sup>. The professional community believes that in practice the majority of Ministry's financial resources support 'measures' within the territory of the Antiterrorist Operation in eastern Ukraine rather than reforms. As a result, strategic planning and culture reforms are financed on the leftover principle.

---

<sup>17</sup> <http://culture2025.org.ua/>

<sup>18</sup> (International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property

<sup>19</sup> [http://espresso.tv/news/2015/03/04/knyazhyckyvy\\_prezentuvav\\_novu\\_koncepciyu\\_reformuvannya\\_kultury\\_v\\_ukrayini](http://espresso.tv/news/2015/03/04/knyazhyckyvy_prezentuvav_novu_koncepciyu_reformuvannya_kultury_v_ukrayini)

<sup>20</sup> <http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/26-19>

<sup>21</sup> [http://www.kmu.gov.ua/control/uk/publish/article?art\\_id=248033265](http://www.kmu.gov.ua/control/uk/publish/article?art_id=248033265)

In terms of trends characterising 'Period III', **an intention to synchronise cultural policy and cultural practices** should be noted. However, to overcome discrepancies and coordinate efforts being taken by activists and wider professional community, on one hand, and representatives of government bodies, on the other, **systemic problems should be addressed first**.

- According to representatives of cultural institutions, imperfect laws conserve the existing state of affairs characterised as stagnation. This does not foster the development process.
- The powers of the Ministry of Culture match neither the Ministry's organisational and management structure nor today's realities. As a result, anti-crisis measures being undertaken by the Ministry and the Government at large cannot be as far-reaching and as prompt as required by the current situation in the country. Considering this situation, cultural policy goals such as social integrity and national cultural integrity become the major priorities. In fact, today the Ministry of Culture has to pay much attention to anti-crisis management and, in parallel, implement reforms in the culture sector and focus on long-term strategic planning.
- Access to resources and additional sources of financial support for the culture and art sector is limited.
- Government officials, large businessmen and vulnerable groups of the society do not understand the role of culture.
- Cultural activities are not enough covered or presented sometimes in a wrong way by media. Media tend to focus on an event itself or on the spectacular value of a cultural process leaving behind the aspects related to formation of socially important values or impact on the system of values.
- Representatives of different cultural subsectors and, sometimes, institutions within a subsector lack communication.
- The system of education is obsolete with poor focus on cultural management skills.

## **Conclusions**

The social and political confrontation in Ukraine escalated in November 2013 and led to fatal victims and violence brought up urgent questions for 'culture' as such. The gap between formal and informal culture became evident and may continue to deepen. Recent changes in Ukraine are associated with the context of culture and radical changes in the life of the country and society. Such changes demonstrate the switch to the new stage of sociopolitical and sociocultural transformations common for EaP countries and post-Soviet states at large. Such transformations may potentially indicate a step back to obsolete forms of governance and functioning of the society in some countries but may be a step forward to brand new models in the others. The new models of governance and functioning of the society would be most likely based on the strategic approach to reforms and changes and the new type of relations between the civil society and the government. This certainly requires redefining roles of various stakeholders in all spheres of the social life, including the culture sector. In fact, the recent social and political conflict put acute questions before 'culture' in terms of its values, role in the society, impact and place in the development of democracy.

The recent sociocultural process in Ukraine features the contrast between weak government structures and strong and well-organised society. Lack of trust in government institutions inherited by many social groups over the previous decades of Ukraine's history impacts today's processes of government modernisation. The willingness and readiness for quick changes faces inertness of the system. Furthermore, activists do not always understand the algorithm of changes and time required to achieve sustainable and high-quality changes. Therefore, the success of reforms and positive changes in the country will, to a large extent, depend on the quality of managerial decisions and on how quickly the consensus would be achieved by major culture actors including the civil society, government and local self-governance bodies.

The capacity of the private sector including creative and cultural industries in Ukraine, similar to other EaP countries, is underestimated by the public sector and, as a result, is not taken into account in planning. Private stakeholders' activities in the art sector are often called 'show business' and private initiatives in the culture sector raise suspicions.

The current situation in Ukraine and development of its national, regional and local cultural policy and strategy may become a 'testing lab' for other EaP countries. In this context, it would be interestingly to observe the results achieved by consolidating different efforts to be taken by culture actors in reforming the culture sector and overall modernisation of the country by Culture 2025 Platform of Strategic Initiatives launched in 2014 with the support of the Ministry of Culture of Ukraine and technical assistance provided during Phase I of the Eastern Partnership Culture Programme.