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Abstract

The article reveals the important role of culture as the basis of national security. The key components of cultural policy that form the basis of national security are identified, the main vectors of cultural policy that should be developed and implemented in the national security system are analyzed as a priority.

The directions of improvement of cultural policy of Ukraine in the conditions of global transformations and challenges at this stage are offered. It is determined that the key indicators of the effectiveness of cultural policy and measures in the national security system should be the level of protection of citizens.
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Introduction

The global pandemic in 2020 has led to significant transformations in the activities of individual states both domestically and internationally. A large number of problems in the field of public policy, economy, ecology, and culture have worsened. To a large extent, these consequences are due not only to the direct economic recession caused by the pandemic, but also to the shortcomings of sectoral policies of the states. And it was the pandemic that clearly showed the ineffectiveness of the so-called “bunker” approach to shaping the state's domestic policy. At this stage, public administration and the formed vision of the development of many states, excluding a large number of aspects of human life, do not take into account the biological, cultural component of social development.

Culture is one of the foundations of sustainable development. And cultural policy as an important area of state activity determines not only the effective management of cultural resources, but also the formation of a common basis for the development of the people.

However, we can observe that most cultural policies, including European countries, focus on four aspects of the development of cultural policy:

- satisfying the cultural needs of people (emotional satisfaction);
- developing art education;
- developing economic potential of culture (priority – development of creative industries);
- developing cultural tourism.

In fact, the role of culture as a socially creative, nation-building basis of the state often remains marginal among the priorities of the vision of state development and the principles of cultural policy. As a result, we already see a large number of cultural conflicts at both domestic and international levels, the manifestation of social and economic problems, which are the result of extremely ineffective cultural policy in the context of misunderstanding or disregard for the important role of cultural factors in national security.

1. **Cultural basis of national security**

At the United Nations level, culture is recognized as a cornerstone of sustainable development, and in many United Nations’ development strategy papers, the role of culture in national security is increasingly emerging as one of its key factors.

In 2013, the United Nations Secretary-General’s Report “Science, Technology and Innovation and the Potential of Culture for Sustainable Development and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals” emphasized: “Culture is the starting point, the engine and the brake on virtually all areas of sustainable development, encompassing the social dimension, economic development, environmental sustainability, and peace and security… Priority (O.D. - on investment to achieve the Millennium Development Goals) is given to initiatives aimed at improving the regulatory framework, infrastructure, capitalization of capacity, development of education and training in the field of creativity and culture, as well as protection of freedom of speech and involvement of citizens. A stronger emphasis on the cultural context of development policies and programs provides a more efficient, inclusive, human-centered approach to development. Governments should use cultural and public service delivery approaches at all levels, taking into account cultural specificities, especially in the field of education and health care” (Declaration, 2013, p. 14).

In May 2013, Hangzhou (PRC) hosted the International Congress “Culture: The Key to Sustainable Development”, which adopted a Declaration on Ensuring the Crucial Role of Culture in Sustainable Development Policy. It outlines the need to (1) include culture into all policies and programs in the sphere of development; (2) mobilize culture and mutual understanding to strengthen peace and reconciliation; (3) ensure cultural rights for all in order to promote inclusive social development; (4) use the potential of culture to reduce poverty and have inclusive economic development; (5) involve culture for ecological sustainability; (6) strengthen resilience to natural disasters and combating climate change using the potential of culture; (7) evaluate, preserve and transmit cultural heritage to future generations; (8) use culture as a resource to achieve sustainable urban development and governance; (9) use culture as a basis for strengthening innovative and sustainable models of cooperation (Report, 2013, p. 4-6). The Declaration confirms the importance of the influence of certain determinants.
of culture on the development of the individual, social processes, the state and the world as a whole. The cultural component is beginning to play a special role in the formation of national security. In particular, the studies of R. Inglehart and K. Welzel determine a clear relationship between a number of cultural factors and the level of socio-economic development of the state (Inglehart, Welzel, 2007). Researchers note that democracy is not achieved through simple institutional change or elite maneuvering, but depends on the values and beliefs of ordinary citizens, which determines the role of social culture as one of the main factors influencing the possibility of development (Inglehart-Welzel, 2020). Accordingly, the consideration of cultural determinants is necessary in the formation of the national security system.

M. Grondona outlined twenty contrasting cultural factors that can both promote and inhibit social progress, the main of which are: religion, belief in the individual, moral imperatives, concepts of wealth, views on competition, the concept of justice, the value of work, the perception of unconventional thinking, the importance of usefulness, education, virtues in everyday life, direction of cultural development, rationality, power, worldview, fatalism, concepts of resistivity of goals (me for the world or the world for me), ideal, "utopia" to which the population aspires, vision of democracy (Grondona, 2008). Most of these factors are determined by the ethno-mental specificity of the population. Therefore, the role of ethnic culture and cultural identity today are defined by many researchers as important components of national security.

The importance of the role of cultural identity as a component of national security has been repeatedly emphasized by Ukrainian scholars, including O. Vlasyuk, who notes that "The humanitarian dimension of national security is that Ukrainian society is so extremely unconsolidated, as never before, there is a lack of a common political and cultural project, which is analogous to the 'national idea' " (Vlasiuk, 2016).

Speaking about the need to create the concept of "national idea", it is not only about the need to preserve cultural traditions, to establish internal consolidation in society, but also about the possibility of preserving the state national identity.

In the 21st century, many countries are in danger of losing their national identity as a result of imperfect migration policies, the negative effects of globalization, and, above all, uncontrolled migration flows. Thus, already today there are significant cultural problems that threaten the national security of France, Belgium, Serbia and others. In recent years, it has already been possible to observe the negative consequences of ethnic conflicts in the EU, which pose a threat to the national security of states in general. For example, the "Arab pogroms" that caused riots in many French cities in 2009, as a result of which a curfew was imposed in the country (TSN, 2010), or the "cartoon scandal" in Denmark, 2005-2006, which exacerbated the global political crisis, exposed a number of diplomatic conflicts and managed to announce the economic and political boycott of Denmark by many African and Asian countries (Kommersant, 2006).
That is why more and more researchers are focusing on the formation of a culture of security, which embodies the actual cultural basis of national security inside the state.

Among the studies worth noting in this context is the work of Canadian researcher Alan J. Stephenson, Canadian National Security Culture: Explaining Post 9/11 Canadian National Security Policy Outcomes, who reflected the paramount importance of culture in the structure of national security as it is impossible to form a system of national security without cultural component.

Researchers have introduced the term "safety culture" for more than a decade, used by Alan J. Stephenson and P.J. Katzenstein (1996), indicated the strategic meaning of the security culture for state security. J. Czaja (2008), identified the cultural factors of national security, also showed internal and external cultural threats to state, determined the very big importance of cultural determinants in the state's security system.

Developing the vision of security culture formation, we note the scientific work of Mary Kaldor 'Working Paper Global Security Cultures: A Theoretical Framework for Security Analysis in Transition', which formalized the components of cultural security (table 1).

Table 1. Key elements of security-culture system analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narratives</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Rules</th>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Tactic</th>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geopoliti cs</td>
<td>Deter major war</td>
<td>Level of Armament and defense spending</td>
<td>Self-defense and IHL</td>
<td>Regular military forces, advanced weapons system</td>
<td>Deterrence</td>
<td>Arms industry, military based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New War</td>
<td>Establish identity based political authority</td>
<td>Discrimination against particular identity based groups</td>
<td>None, occasionally warped version of Shari'a</td>
<td>Network of state non-state actor, Improvised Explosive Devices, suicide bomber, small arms</td>
<td>Violence against civilians</td>
<td>Outside sponsors or war-related and / or criminal activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal place</td>
<td>Global Stability</td>
<td>Numbers of conflicts</td>
<td>Emergence of postbellum law, peace agreement</td>
<td>International agencies, peace-keeping forces, NGOs, private security contractors</td>
<td>Peace agreements, peace - keeping, state building</td>
<td>International public funding plus voluntary contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War or terror</td>
<td>Defeat terrorist military</td>
<td>Terrorist incidents</td>
<td>Stretching of International humanitarian law and notion of self-defense</td>
<td>Intelligence agencies, private security contractors, drones</td>
<td>Extensive surveillance and targeted killing</td>
<td>United State government public borrowing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Kaldor, 2016)

Also important in this context are our previous studies of the role of culture in the formation of national identity and the culture of state security (Datsko, 2013; Shchurko, Datsko, Dudas, 2016). We agree with Edward Lock, who points to the need to refine the concept of 'strategic culture' and the importance of culture for the national security system (Lock, 2010). Thus, speaking about the role of cultural policy in the formation of the national security system, we single out its main directions, which are important to pay attention to in the formation of
security-oriented cultural policy:
- Cultural resources as a source of state development – and a strategic vision of their use to preserve and increase;
- The system of citizens’ values, which form the ground for socialization, integration of citizens into the activities of the state and determine the prerequisites for institutional development, community formation, the principles of joint governance.
- National idea for the formation of the ideological basis of the state, cultural factors of identification of citizens with the state (language, culture, customs, traditions, religion, customary law, etc.);
- Values of the population to stimulate welfare growth - cultural incentives / disincentives for economic development.

2. Analysis of the impact of cultural policy on the national security of the states

In the 21st century, the so-called "cultural wars" have intensified, when some peoples actually occupy the territory of another state without war, due solely to migration, cultural influences, and ineffective domestic cultural policies of separate states.

For example, in 2014 there was an annexation of part of the territory of Ukraine by Russia (the Crimea and the occupied territories of Donetsk and Luhansk regions). The reasons for such annexation are primarily ineffective cultural policies.

In our opinion, the main reasons that made possible this annexation and the outbreak of the war are:
1) The population of the occupied territories of Ukraine mostly spoke Russian, consumed Russian media cultural product, so due to the influence of cultural factors, this population did not clearly identify their belonging to the Ukrainian people. At the time of the annexation of this territory, Donetsk had only one Ukrainian-language school, and teaching in the rest of the schools was in Russian. In addition, the market for Ukrainian cultural products developed slowly, while the Russian cultural product filled many areas of cultural development and leisure: music, cinema, radio, television in Ukraine.
2) At the state level, threats to national security caused by imperfect cultural policy were not identified in time.
3) At the level of the state and local communities, sufficient opportunities were not provided for cultural practices that would have state-building significance and would stimulate the implementation of joint social projects in the context of the development of emotional attachment to the state.
4) The state almost did not stimulate and properly develop domestic creative industries, which led to the fact that the market for cultural products in many segments was flooded with foreign cultural products.
5) Imperfect cultural and economic policy has led to significant degradation of a large part of the population of Ukraine, the spread of antisocial behavior, increasing level of alcohol and drug addicts. And the growth of their number is due primarily to the promotion of destructive life practices through cultural products, the promotion of hedonistic lifestyles, leveling the role of religion.

Emphasizing the example of the annexed territories of the Crimea and Donbas, we note that, in our opinion, the cultural intervention of Russia at these areas during the last decades was also not accidental.

The Kremlin's official policy might partially started from the problem of de-Russification of Russia. However, the prospects for accelerated "Chineseization" of Russia are obvious. E. Gilbo predicts that if the current migration regime is maintained until 2040, the Chinese population in this country will reach 100 million people, which may exceed the size of the Russian population, the number of which is constantly declining due to demographic problems (Gilbo, 2016). Director of the Russian Institute of Demographic Problems I. Beloborodov argues that depopulation is not a mythical term, but a real threat to the existence of the country, which excludes claims to Russia's influential status in the global context (Filatov, 2009).

Researchers point out that the increase in migration flows to Russia is part of China's informal development programs. In particular, S. Kez notes that such programs include "the organization of the Chinese development of the Far Eastern and Siberian border areas, the creation of complex settlements with the subsequent formation of administrative-territorial autonomies. And then we should expect a "struggle for reunification", as was the case in other parts of the world." (Kez, 2002). Experts, including A. Khramchikhin, emphasize that during the "quiet occupation" Russia's military potential is, in fact, ineffective. And such expansion "is the use of the complex power of the state, by linking the eastern regions of Russia to the Chinese economy and changing the demographic situation through migration." (Khramchikhin, 2010).

Thus, the threat to Russia's national security due to China's "cultural expansion" is quite obvious. If the Russian authorities deny these prospects, a significant number of researchers warn that such prospects are quite real.

To ensure geo-national security, Russia's policy in recent years has been actively aimed at identifying the potential resource of the Russian-speaking population of the state. Measures aimed at its implementation include the State Program to Facilitate the Voluntary Resettlement of Compatriots (Russians) Living Abroad to Russia, adopted in 2006, under which migrants are reimbursed for the cost of moving to a new place of residence, issued "lifting" funds from calculation of 40-60 thousand rubles for the settler, as well as 15-20 thousand rubles for each family member and assistance in the amount of 50% of the subsistence level in the region until employment. 4.6 billion rubles were allocated for the implementation of the program in 2007, 5.7 billion rubles – in 2008, and 6.5 billion rubles – in
2009. (Filatov, 2009). Also, in order to identify promising Russian citizens of Russian nationality, a bill on the "Russian Card" has been developed, which is planned to be issued to all citizens of other states who consider themselves ethnic Russians. The presence of such a card provides a number of benefits for education, employment in the Russian Federation and obtaining Russian citizenship. While the bill is under consideration, a number of political and public organizations ('Russians' Foundation, 'Fair Russia', 'Union of Left Forces', etc.) have already initiated the issuance of such a document. (SLS, 2008).

Projecting these tendencies on Ukraine-Russia relations, we can say that Russia's official policy today is aimed at the occupation of Ukraine not only as an economic, but primarily as a "cultural buffer." Given that a significant number of Ukrainians, after centuries of Russia's expansive policy, speak Russian, which is one of the basic signs of ethnicity, Ukrainian citizens can become a reserve that will help the Russian Federation resist its "Chinesization." Some officials do not hide the real intentions of the modern expansive policy of de-Ukrainization of Ukraine. Pro-Russian policy is being implemented in Ukraine by actively involving Ukrainian students to study in Russian universities, opening branches of Russian universities during the pre-occupation period. Russia's leadership has officially stated that "Russia plans to use this to ensure that the new Ukrainian elite speaks Russian and is educated in the spirit of Russian science," thus making no secret of its real intentions toward russification and Russia's ethnic orientation of Ukraine. (Datsko, 2010). The objective reason for such a policy is to form a "cultural reserve" for the preservation of own nation-state. This may explain the appraisal of separatist tendencies in the political space of Ukraine, which resulted in the real annexation of the territories of Ukraine in 2014. If the Far East and part of Siberia can raise the issue of autonomy and unification with China in the future, the East and South of Ukraine are a source for Russia to preserve the ethnic identity of the Russian Federation. This is due to the ongoing decades of modern "cultural expansion" of Russian national culture in the information, cultural, educational space of Ukraine in order to form a "reserve/stock" of Russia's national identity.

Analyzing the existing domestic approaches to the formation of geo-cultural security systems, it can be stated that there is almost no strategic vision of the need to preserve, reform and develop the national identity of Ukraine as part of national security systems. In this context, in fact, the policy of national security in Ukraine does not consider the denationalization of the state as a threat to its national security. Appealing to the priorities of cultural tolerance and intercultural dialogue, the strategic vector and position of the state on its cultural national interests are not outlined at the state level, even with the tendency of aggravation of "geo-cultural wars". Moreover, the position of some Ukrainian government officials who actively support pro-Russian cultural policy, thus increasing threats to the country's national security, is surprising. Which together led to hostilities and the annexation of territories in Ukraine.
There are many vivid examples of cultural wars in the modern world. For example, the ongoing conflict over the territory of Nagorno-Karabakh between Azerbaijan and Armenia broke into a full-scale declared war. (Broers, 2020) This conflict is inspired by cultural factors, which have grown into confrontation in all spheres of life and the ongoing armed conflict.

Also in recent years, assessing the potential impact of migrants on the internal stability of Italy, the Government of this country has tightened migration policy. And one of the important factors in this decision is the change of the religious "map" of the country, when along with traditional Catholicism, the children of the state were very strongly influenced by Islamic communities, changing the cultural landscape and value system of the state (Ricucci, 2010).

Large-scale pogroms and uprisings, demonstrations of "yellow vests" in France in 2019, scientists and journalists are also associated with cultural wars, proving the influence of Russian special services on the intensification of mass social movements in this country. The initiation of these protests was based on the development of cultural institutions, common practices in various fields. And even the identification of the corresponding movement in the use of colors – also proves that the emotional impact on society is much stronger than the rational. And it is much easier to manage social groups on the basis of emotions than on the basis of rational factors.

The highlighted facts clearly confirm that the role of cultural determinants for the welfare and progress of states in the XXI century is becoming increasingly decisive. The lack of a unified balanced policy of Ukraine to form a system of national identity and take into account the need to implement the idea of "Ukrainian nation" within domestic and foreign policy poses a direct threat to national security. Therefore, the study of the interaction of cultural factors and socio-economic, political, environmental processes is one of the relevant areas of research, which in Ukraine are fragmented and require active application of interdisciplinary approaches. Determining the important role of national identity at different levels of government hierarchies allows creating a unified vision of the national idea and its implementation, including the context of ensuring the national security of the state.

Speaking of the formation of national identity as a mandatory component of an independent state, many pro-Russian politicians and scholars are beginning to raise the issue of national chauvinism. But such allegations are unfounded, given the results of surveys conducted by the Razumkov Center in 2006-2007, according to which the majority of the population of Ukraine perceives the Ukrainian nation as all citizens, regardless of their ethnicity, language they speak, national traditions that are followed and according to which they raise their children (National Security, 2007). Exacerbation of issues of national chauvinism in Ukraine is one of the methods of political influence, because there are no questions about national chauvinism in the use of concepts and formation of state policy on the "American nation", "Russian nation" and so on.
The above studies confirm that the citizens of Ukraine are ready to form a unified national idea concerning the ethnic specifics of the state, indicating a shift in emphasis in understanding the Ukrainian nation – from civil to ethnic, both in Western and Eastern Ukraine. So, the formation of a unified national identity of the Ukrainian citizens as the national basis for the development of the state has good prospects.

But the constant educational emigration is one of the biggest problems for national security of Ukraine. The latest systematic research of Ukrainian youths’ educational migration (CEDOS, Stadny 2019) showed that in 2016/2017 Academic year appr.8% of all Ukrainian students have been studying abroad. And these students studied mainly in Poland, Russia, Germany, other European countries (Fig.1).

![Figure 1. The number of Ukrainian students studying abroad in the 2016/2017 academic year. Source: (CEDOS, Stadny 2019)](image)

83 thousands of Ukrainian students - is 8% of total numbers of Ukrainians students. Thus such young intellectuals drain from the country, and in the future it will decrease the human capital of Ukraine.

Also emigration of young creative Ukrainians from Ukraine and increasing number of students from Asian and African countries in Ukraine change national and mental landscape. Thus it becomes more difficult to build unique cultural basis for the state development.

### 3. Priorities of the state's cultural policy to strengthen national security

In order to form an effective strategic vision of the state, it is necessary to conduct a comprehensive study of the peoples’ values, their expectations and priorities. Having clarified the most problematic "issues", the state should clearly specify the cultural policy in the following spheres of culture at the level of legislation and government (as showed in Fig. 2).
Figure 2 Priority directions of development of cultural policy of the state in the XXI century in the conditions of global challenges
Source: own elaboration
Conclusions

Cultural policy is an important component of the national security system of modern states. Failure to consider cultural factors in the national security system has exacerbated not only the internal problems of countries, but also highlighted threats to the existence of individual states as national entities, caused an erosion of national identity of some European states. For some states, their state sovereignty and territorial integrity are threatened.

Therefore, the revision, analysis and long-term planning of the state’s cultural policy should be carried out in the national security system, taking into account the vision of the state’s development, existing problems and established development priorities.

One of the most important priorities of the state’s cultural policy in the 21st century is the formation of a common value base of development, national identity, creation of strong emotional ties to the state to reduce emigration.

It is also obvious that migration policy, which changes the cultural landscape of countries, creates many new challenges that need to be addressed immediately, primarily through the development and integration of migrants and the national cultural space of states, the development of new cultural practices and values common both to local peoples and migrants.

A balanced cultural policy as a component of the national security system should contain the formation of a strategic vision of the following components of the cultural sphere of the state: communication and socialization, education, psycho-emotional, security, value-oriented and economic.
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