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Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to analyze the efficacy of the state policy of Ukraine in the sphere of protection of tangible and intangible cultural heritage, measures of safeguarding cultural property in the event of armed conflict and to assess how and why the state funding of culture has changed.

Design/methodology/approach – The proposal is to investigate this by discussing the national and international policy frameworks through case study by using quantitative and qualitative methods to disclose if state cultural policy initiatives promote public interest in cultural issues and how the political events in the country affect the distribution of the state funding of culture.

Findings – Ukrainian state cultural policy initiatives appear to be effective in protecting cultural heritage at both central and local levels despite redistribution in the state funding of this sphere. In cooperation with international agencies, Ukraine effectively promotes its intangible cultural heritage properties. Interest of the public in the state cultural policy issues has grown considerably. Problems exist with the protection of Ukrainian cultural sites located in war zones and disputed territories.

Originality/value – These findings demonstrate how the state policies aimed at protecting Ukrainian cultural heritage may be effectively implemented at different levels in cooperation with international agencies; how the political landscape in the country promotes the public interest in cultural policy issues. This case forms an example of steps aimed at protecting cultural properties on disputed territories in cooperation with intermediaries, such as UNESCO.

Keywords State policy, Cultural policy, Safeguarding, Cultural heritage, Cultural property

Paper type Research paper

Introduction

Cultural policy is a purposeful government activity in the sphere of culture, aimed at planning, coordinating and providing opportunities, as well as structuring approaches to the development of culture in the country.

Key issues regarding the cultural policy in the European space include setting clear objectives of the cultural policy, cultural education and heritage, language policy, cultural and creative industry, strategic planning to facilitate cultural development, further civic engagement.

Title 1 of the Constitution of Ukraine provides for the key principles of state functioning, human rights and freedoms, state order, functions, state symbols, state language, state culture etc. Article 11 (A11CU) emphasizes that “the State shall promote the consolidation and development of the Ukrainian nation, its historical consciousness, traditions, and culture, as well as development of ethnic, cultural, linguistic and religious identity of all indigenous peoples and national minorities of Ukraine.” Article 12 (A12CU) states that “Ukraine shall provide for meeting the national, cultural, and linguistic needs of Ukrainians residing beyond the borders of the State.” Article 54 (A54CU) of the Constitution of Ukraine declares, “Cultural heritage shall be protected by law.”
The national legal framework for the cultural heritage policy implementation and cultural heritage safeguarding, among others, includes the basic Law “On the Protection of Cultural Heritage” (2000, updated in 2020), which regulates the legal, organizational, social and economic relations in this sphere, the Law “On Protection of the Archeological Heritage” and the Law “On Exportation, Importation and Restitution of Cultural Values”, which regulates cross border transportation of cultural values.

Literature review
Scientific research into the mechanisms of formation and implementation of cultural policy is centered on the issues of cultural industries and their structure, legal framework for the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict, development of cultural tourism, the creative economy and creative industries, digitalization of inventories and archives. Oliveira (2018) recognizes four relevant spheres of policymaking, which relate to the cultural and creative industries and sectors: conceptualization of the cultural and creative industries; government structure and governance reforms to accommodate a collaborative mode; funding system and opportunities. Defining tactical and strategic objectives of the cultural policy as a complex and dynamic system, Di Angelo and Vesperini in their work “Cultural Policies in Europe: Method and Practice of Evaluation” (1999) single out five major features of the cultural policy: governmental objectives must be supported by the interests of regional and local authorities; state objectives must correlate with a real opportunity to choose the subjects engaged in the processes of cultural policy; implementation of policy always includes actions aimed at securing the functioning of culture; cultural policy includes distribution of different types of resources; cultural policy certainly includes planning. Adams and Goldbard (2006) focus their attention on the following three compulsory elements of cultural policy: defining cultural property, objectives and priorities; programs of legislative initiatives and their implementation spendings and monitoring and policy evaluation. The researchers identify six key directions of the cultural policy: education, heritage preservation, promotion of a cultural product and its distribution network, creative work of artists, attraction of financing, research into the conformity of the implemented cultural policy to the goals and tasks, training of artists and managers. Castillo-Palacio et al. (2017) study the relationship between culture and entrepreneurship. McKeague and Thomas (2016) analyze the evolution of historical environment inventories and their digitalization. Weiss and Connelly (2018) investigate legal framework, the responsibility of countries for the unlawful destruction of cultural heritage and looting of cultural property due to armed conflicts. The authors stress that their publications focus international attention on the deliberate destruction of the cultural heritage in Syria and Iraq, as well as war crimes related to the attacks on historical and cultural sites in Timbuktu, Mali. Destruction of infrastructure and cultural heritage has always been an inevitable part of a war. However, today it has become even more devastating due to the more ruinous force of weapons. Organized looting and trafficking of cultural property on the territories rich in archaeological sites pose threat as criminal gangs use the proceeds from the cultural property sale to sponsor armed conflicts. Lenzerini (2016) also points out to the fact that recently intentional destruction of cultural heritage in the event of armed conflict has exacerbated.

European-Ukrainian cultural partnership programs and projects
According to Kern (2018), considering the threats facing the European ideal it is not possible to build Europe without consideration for the following cultural policy priorities: engage with organizations that invest in culture: notably cities, the culture and creative sectors; take measures to protect and promote the expression of Europe’s diverse languages, dialects, traditions and stories to safeguard the continent’s immaterial heritage and valuable
identities; acknowledge the importance of cultural workers and support their endeavors in shaping a Europe that is attractive to investment and mobilized to promote sustainability; share European expertise in managing cultural exchanges and in supporting the emergence of creativity with other countries; empower artists and cultural workers in addressing innovation and technology issues in a multidisciplinary approach; make European citizens aware of Europe’s shared cultural heritage; encourage the mobility of cultural workers; mobilize the EU diplomatic network and EU’s cultural expertise to support the EU’s foreign policy strategy and a development agenda that enable the expressions of cultural diversity worldwide by building local capacity.

The European Parliament’s Committee on Culture and Education (CULT, 2019) has outlined the two key priorities for the development of culture in Europe: the need for further digitalization and, hence, the need for reinforcing inclusiveness and networks. A Commission expert group on cultural heritage (Cultural Heritage Forum) met for the first time on October 15, 2019. Various programs, that can provide effective support to the sector, are an important component of the promotion of culture in EU: Creative Europe; Erasmus + intercultural exchanges among students; cultural heritage-related volunteering and educational projects; the education and cultural learning component of DiscoverEU. At the CULT meeting, growing concern about the impact of new technologies on cultural diversity was voiced (Ubeda, 2019).

The Culture and Creativity website (CCA, 2015) was created in 2015 within the framework of the EU program (2015–2018) aimed at supporting the cultural contribution to the social and economic development of the six Eastern partnership countries: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine. Since then, the website has become a popular and useful resource for professionals of the cultural and creative industries. After the end of the program, the website continues to operate with funding from the British Council (2018).

According to Culture Partnership (CP, 2015), “Creative Europe” (CE, 2015) is the leading EU program in terms of grants for the Eastern Partnership countries, funding projects in cultural and audiovisual sectors. A single project funding may vary between €200 000 and €2 million.

The “Creative Europe” sub-program “Culture” (CEC, 2015) aims to promote the creative and cultural sectors. About 31% of the “Creative Europe” budget has been allocated for the “Culture” sub-programme, which exists to protect and support the European cultural heritage, to promote cultural and creative industries, such as theater, literature, music, arts etc.

The 2015–2017 COMUS (“Community-Led Urban Strategies in Historic Towns”) project, part of the 2nd Eastern partnership culture program, was commenced to stimulate social and economic development by applying new revitalization strategies in nine historic towns in the Eastern partnership countries. Three COMUS Pilot towns in Ukraine were Pryluky, Lutsk and Zhovkla. The outputs included reference plans, preliminary technical assessments and feasibility study. In 2016 Heritage Assessment Report Ukraine (HARU) was elaborated within the framework of COMUS in Ukraine with the list of recommended activities to improve the system of cultural heritage safeguarding.

The 2015–2017 CHOICE: Cultural Heritage: Opportunity for Improving Civic Engagement – the project was developed and later implemented in the four Eastern Partnership countries: Armenia, Belarus, Moldova and Ukraine. The EU allocated an 873,000-euro grant for the implementation of the CHOICE project, with Ukrainian cities receiving 160,000 euro. According to Ihor Savchak, head of the CHOICE project in Ukraine, “The project considered cultural heritage as a resource for the cities’ development. Eleven NGOs from Uzhhorod, Boryslav, Brody, Lviv, Kremenets, Rivne, Starokostiantyniv, Kherson, Dnipro, Chuhuiv and Poltava Region were given the opportunity to implement ideas for the protection and preservation of cultural heritage. . . . The CHOICE project helped turn all our dreams into
reality.” In most towns, the initiatives continued after the project ended. Within the CHOICE project, the Insights into the programs of Ukraine’s Cultural Heritage Conservation under the authorship of Oleh Rybchynskyy were published.

In 2017, Kern and other experts for the Council of Europe published “Ukraine Cultural Policy Peer Review”. As a result of the review the following cultural policy priorities to guide the decentralization process were outlined: efficient allocation of responsibilities in the cultural sphere between different levels of authorities (national, regional and local – the vertical links) and cross-sectoral interactions (horizontal links); development of state-private partnership in the cultural heritage field; optimization of local cultural infrastructures in the context of decentralization (Kern et al., 2017).

**Cooperation of Ukraine with international agencies**

Ukraine has been a UNESCO member-state since May 12, 1954. The Permanent Delegation of Ukraine to UNESCO has been functioning in Paris since 1962. According to the website, “The objective of cooperation between Ukraine and UNESCO is to strengthen the country’s intellectual potential and engage it into general educational processes in the humanitarian sphere, as well as the use of UNESCO’s resources and its international experience in the areas of competence, such as education, science, culture, information and communication (U-U, 2019).

Russia’s annexation of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and its occupation of some parts of Donetsk and Luhansk regions of Ukraine raised an urgent issue of cultural heritage protection. Since the occupation of the peninsula, the Executive Board of UNESCO has adopted ten decisions on the “Follow-up of the Situation in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea (Ukraine)” (Follow-up 2019).

The European Cultural Convention (ECC) in force since 1954 encourages the study by each contracting party of the languages, history and culture in their territory and the territory of other European states. The Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, adopted almost ten years after the end of Second World War, emphasizes the significant harm inflicted to the cultural heritage, with many landmarks having been destroyed and cultural property having been trafficked. The world cultural heritage suffers extensive, sometimes, irreversible damage. The convention appeals to the countries involved in armed conflicts to preserve and protect the world cultural heritage.

The Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expression (CPDCE) signed by Ukraine in 2005 came into force in 2010. Article 1 of the Convention defines the objectives and guiding principles, in particular: protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expression, creation of conditions for cultural cooperation, promotion of dialog among cultures, promotion of respect for the diversity of cultural expression, confirmation of the importance of the connection between culture and development for all states, acknowledgment of the special status of cultural activities, cultural goods and services as carriers of identity, strengthening of international cooperation for the developing countries’ advancement.

Article 2 of the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (CSICH) that Ukraine joined in 2008 defines the key notions “intangible cultural heritage” and “safeguarding cultural heritage”. The “intangible cultural heritage” means the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artifacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage. This intangible cultural heritage, transmitted from generation to generation, is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history
provides them with a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity (CSICH, 2003).

Accordingly, the intangible cultural heritage includes the following five domains (Figure 1):

The notion “safeguarding” means measures aimed at ensuring the viability of the intangible cultural heritage, including the identification, documentation, research, preservation, protection, promotion, enhancement, transmission, particularly through formal and non-formal education, as well as the revitalization of the various aspects of such heritage (CSICH, 2003).

The Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage (CCPWCNH) underscores the role of the States Parties to this Convention in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, identifying and delineating the different properties of the intangible cultural heritage on their territory. Ukraine as a State Party to this Convention regularly submits an updated inventory of property forming part of the cultural and natural heritage, situated in its territory (Article 11), secures protection, development and enhancement of the role of intangible cultural heritage, promotes the training of staff and specialists in this field (Article 22) (CCPWCNH, 1972).

The Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society of 2005 (Faro Convention) came into force in 2011, with Ukraine ratifying it in 2013. It underscores both individual and collective responsibility toward European cultural heritage and calls on the Parties to “take the necessary steps to apply the provisions of this Convention concerning: the role of cultural heritage in the construction of a peaceful and democratic society, and in the processes of sustainable development and the promotion of cultural diversity” (FC, 2005).

The Convention agrees that the common heritage of Europe consists of “all forms of cultural heritage in Europe which together constitute a shared source of remembrance, understanding, identity, cohesion and creativity, and the ideals, principles and values, derived from the experience gained through progress and past conflicts, which foster the development of a peaceful and stable society, founded on respect for human rights, democracy and the rule of law” (FC, 2005). The Faro Convention defines shared responsibility for cultural heritage and public participation in the sphere of the cultural heritage (Articles 11, 12).

Figure 1. Domains of intangible cultural heritage according to UNESCO convention

**Protection of Ukrainian cultural heritage**

Ukraine is actively working with the UNESCO World Heritage Centre within the framework of the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage of 1972.

According to the website of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, seven Ukrainian cultural and natural properties are inscribed on the World Heritage List (Figure 2).

The international ensemble of memorable sites of scientific-cultural heritage is a transboundary “Struve Geodetic Arc” which stretches through ten countries, including Ukraine with its six points. The natural world heritage property “Ancient and Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and Other Regions of Europe” is a shared Ukrainian-Polish transboundary nomination (2007). In 2011, the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee supported by Ukraine and Slovakia approved “The Ancient Beech Forests of Germany” as an extension of “The Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians”. Today the “Residence of Bukovinian and Dalmatian Metropolitans” property (2011) is a building of Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University.

The World Heritage List includes three types of heritage sites representing cultural, natural and mixed heritage. Ukrainian Tentative List of UNESCO (UTLU, 2019) consists of seventeen properties (Table 1). The cultural property is represented, among others, by Derzhprom (the State Industry Building) (2017). Among the natural properties on the

**Figure 2.** Cultural and natural sites of Ukraine on UNESCO World Heritage List

- Kyiv: Saint-Sofia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kyiv-Pecherska Lavra (1990)
- Lviv - the Ensemble of the Historic Centre (1998)
- Struve Geodetic Arc (10 countries) (2005)
- Residence of Bukovinian and Dalmatian Metropolitans (2011)
- Wooden Tserkvas (Churches) of the Carpathian Region in Poland and Ukraine (2013)
- Ancient City of Tauric Chersonese and its Chora (2013)
Tentative List is National Steppe Biosphere Reserve “Askaniya Nowa” (1989); the mixed properties include Taras Shevchenko Tomb and State Historical and Natural Museum-Reserve (1989), Dendrological Park “Sofijivka” (2000).

On January 15, 2016, Ukraine joined the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM). Considering the importance of the intangible cultural heritage as a mainspring of cultural diversity and a guarantee of sustainable development, UNESCO adopted a number of important documents. In particular, the Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore in 1989, Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity in 2001 and the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2003.

Ukraine was among those countries, which supported this UNESCO initiative and ratified the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2003. It became a State Party to the 2003 Convention in 2008 following an extensive process that included discussions and adoption of the law.

Intangible cultural heritage is one of the priority tasks of the Ministry of Culture of Ukraine. Since 2013, the Expert Council of the Intangible Cultural Heritage has been in operation. In 2015 to implement the Convention, the Ukrainian Centre for Cultural Studies (UCCS) was given the authority for providing scientific and methodological support for implementing the 2003 Convention in Ukraine.

In 2017, an annual Award for Preserving and Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage was introduced. In 2017, the Procedure on Inventoring the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Ukraine was developed and approved (Procedure, 2017). As of August 1, 2019, the National Inventory of Intangible Cultural Heritage (NIICH, 2019) included 17 elements (Table 2).

In the last two years, the Ukrainian Cultural Foundation (UCF, 2017) has made a significant contribution to the development of the cultural heritage of Ukraine with the aim “to facilitate the development of culture and arts in Ukraine, to provide favourable environment for the development of the intellectual and spiritual potential of individuals and society, wide access for the citizens to natural heritage, to support cultural diversity and integration of the Ukrainian culture into the world cultural space” (Ukrainian Cultural Foundation UCF, 2017).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic Centre of Tchernigov, 9th – 13th centuries</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Landscape of Canyon in Kamenets-Podilsk</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taras Shevchenko Tomb and State Historical and Natural Museum-Reserve</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Steppe Biosphere Reserve “Askaniya Nowa”</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dendrological Park “Sofijivka”</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagcesaray Palace of the Crimean Khans</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Site “Stone Tomb”</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mykolayiv Astronomical Observatory</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex of the Sudak Fortress Monuments of the 6th - 16th c</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronomical Observatories of Ukraine</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Centre of the Port City of Odessa</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyiv: Saint Sophia Cathedral with Related Monastic Buildings, St. Cyril's and St. Andrew's Churches, Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra (extension of Kyiv: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra)</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading Posts and Fortifications on Genoese Trade Routes. From the Mediterranean to the Black Sea</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Landscape of “Cave Towns” of the Crimean Gothia</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The historical surroundings of Crimean Khans' capital in Bakhchysarai</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derzhprom (the State Industry Building)</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyras–Bilhorod (Akkerman), on the way from the Black Sea to the Baltic Sea</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Ukrainian properties on the tentative list.
The Foundation introduces new mechanisms of providing state funding for projects in the field of culture and creative industries through a competitive selection process, contributes to the preservation of cultural heritage and development of Ukrainian culture in the world.

Certain advancement in the sphere of cultural heritage safeguarding at the central level has been observed since March 2020 when two reformed central executive bodies started their work in Ukraine. The State Service on protection of the National Cultural Heritage has been reformed to administer a network of museums, libraries, archives, national cultural heritage sites etc. The Service’s priority is the maintenance of the State Register of cultural heritage sites. The state inspection of cultural heritage of Ukraine has been established to strengthen control over the preservation of cultural heritage, with the authority to issue fines (NCEB).

**Protection of cultural heritage in the event of armed conflict**

The Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (HC) was adopted in The Hague in April–May 1954 by 56 states, including the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

The Convention was the first international treaty, which defined the legal framework for the protection of cultural property of every nation and country. According to this document, the Member States of the Convention make a commitment to respect the cultural property

### Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tradition of Kosiv painted ceramics</td>
<td>Ivano-Frankivsk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krovlevs handpicked weaving</td>
<td>Sumy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pottery and ceramics from the village of Opishnia</td>
<td>Poltava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrykivka decorative painting as a phenomenon of the Ukrainian ornamental folk art</td>
<td>Dnipropetrovsk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cossack’s songs of Dnipropetrovsk Region</td>
<td>Dnipropetrovsk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singing tradition of the village of Luka (Kyiv-Sviatoslyyn District of Kyiv region)</td>
<td>Kyiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The “White on white” technique of embroidery of the Reshetlyivka community of Poltava region</td>
<td>Poltava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition of floral ornamental carpet weaving from the village of Reshetlyivka, Poltava region</td>
<td>Poltava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornek, a Crimean Tatar ornament and knowledge about it</td>
<td>Autonomous Republic of Crimea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditions of ornamental painting of Bubnic ceramics (from the village of Bubnivka)</td>
<td>Vinnytsia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apiculture</td>
<td>Zhytomyr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition of Hutsul pysanka</td>
<td>Rivne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditions of preparation of et aiaklak (Karaita patty with meat). Experience of Karaites of Melitopol</td>
<td>Ivano-Frankivsk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditions of the ceremony of “Bush leading” in the village of Svartseyvychi, Dubroytsky district of Rivne region</td>
<td>Chernivtsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition of decorative painting of the village of Samchyky</td>
<td>Zakarpattia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oleshnia pottery of Chernihiv region</td>
<td>Zaporizhzhya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorative wood carving of Chernihiv region</td>
<td>Rivne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition of the ceremony of “Bush leading” in the village of Svartseyvychi, Dubroytsky district of Rivne region</td>
<td>Khmelnytskyi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition of decorative painting of the village of Samchyky</td>
<td>Chernihiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorative wood carving of Chernihiv region</td>
<td>Chernihiv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The state inspection of cultural heritage of Ukraine has been established to strengthen control over the preservation of cultural heritage, with the authority to issue fines (NCEB).
protected by the Convention within their territory and in the territory of other countries. In the event of armed conflict, any use of this property is banned if it could lead to its destruction or damage. Second Protocol was opened for signature on March 26, 1999 and came into force on March 9, 2004. The Convention foresees measures to protect movable and immovable cultural objects (monuments of architecture, art or history, whether religious or secular, archaeological sites, manuscripts, books, museums, large libraries, archives etc.), which are located both on the enemy territory and on their own territory.

In June 2016, the Monitoring mission determined the key legal instruments to protect the cultural property of UNESCO during the territories of Russia-occupied Donbas and Crimea in compliance with the Hague Convention. “Lessons from the occupation of Donbas and Crimea must form the basis for designing a clear algorithm of proceeding for museum workers in the event of war or social unrest. It should include developing adequate communication between museums and the relevant authorities at all levels, necessary training of museum workers and the military, the inventory of cultural property and organization of registers. The current priority is to implement the international mechanisms of protecting the cultural property in the occupied territories.” (UACrisis, 2016).

It was agreed that Ukraine would appeal to UNESCO to include the outstanding sites of Crimea to the World Heritage in Danger List to launch the mechanism of the international monitoring mission. According to the registers of the Ministry of Culture of Ukraine, the cultural property objects in the temporarily occupied territories include 82 museums in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and 17 museums in Sevastopol, 24 and 23 museums in the occupied territories of Donetsk and Luhansk regions respectively. The site threatened by destruction is the ensemble of the Khan Palace National Monument in Bakhchysarai in Russia-occupied Crimea (ICOMOS, 2016). On March 24, 2017, the United Nations Security Council adopted a historic resolution 2347 on the protection of cultural heritage in the event of armed conflict. Initiated by France and Italy the resolution condemned illegal destruction of cultural heritage, as well as looting and illicit trafficking of antiquities from the territory of the armed conflict, primarily by terrorist groups.

At the 39th session of the General Conference of UNESCO (RGC39) which was held from 30 October to 14 November 2017 in Paris, the head of the Ukrainian delegation welcomed the decisions of the Executive Board of UNESCO “The Monitoring of the Situation in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea (Ukraine)” and called on the Organization to be more actively involved in the international efforts aimed at countering Russia’s violations of international law and human rights in occupied Crimea.

Permanent Mission of Ukraine to UNESCO (PMUU, 1962) regularly informs the Director General of UNESCO and all the Member-States of unabated deterioration of the situation with human rights on the peninsula which is confirmed by the conclusions of the monitoring (field) missions of OSCE, OHCHR, UN, the European Council etc. Of special concern are the rights of Crimean Tatars; the safety of journalists; work of educational, scientific and cultural institutions; preservation and protection of national cultural, natural and scientific heritage. On March 6, 2018, at the Embassy of Ukraine in France Elmira Abyalimova, the former head of the Bakhchysarai Historical, Cultural and Archeological Museum-Reserve, presented the photos, which proved the Khan’s Palace, the symbol of the Crimean Tatar People, was in danger of destruction due to the barbaric restoration conducted by the occupation authorities.

At the 3rd Global Conference on Tourism and Culture (GCTC, 2018), held in December, in Istanbul, Turkey the Minister of Culture of Ukraine called on the participants to pay more attention to the risks of losing cultural heritage in armed conflicts. To illustrate the issue, the Minister of Culture reminded of the fate of the national site “The Khan’s Palace”, part of the Bakhchysarai Historical, Cultural and Archeological Museum-Reserve, which had been submitted to the Tentative List of UNESCO in 2013.
Materials and methods

The research employs both quantitative and qualitative methods, in particular, comparative analysis to compare the findings of the research in different time-frames in Google Forms; statistical methods to define the expenditure trends in the State budget of Ukraine allocated for support of culture in different years, the share of this expenditure in the total spendings of the Ministry of Culture of Ukraine.

Since production in the cultural sector relies on information, advances in digital technologies and globalization of information exchange networks have made this sector one of the most dynamic in the world.

In 2003, the “Cultural and Creative Sector” had a turnover of more than €654bn, contributing to 2.6% of EU GDP. The overall growth of the sector’s GVA was 19.7% in 1999–2003, which was 12.3% higher than the overall growth of the economy. In 2004, 5.8 million people worked in the sector: 3.1% of total employment (Fleming, 2007).

The “Culture” section of the State Statistics Service of Ukraine (SSSU), based on the information of the Ministry of Culture of Ukraine, contains data on the number of theaters, museums and libraries and the corresponding number of their visitors, as well as the number of concert organizations and artistic groups in 1990–2017 (Table 3). Since 2014, the data exclude the temporarily Russia-occupied territories of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea, the city of Sevastopol, Donetsk and Luhansk regions.

The percentage in the search shows which term was the most popular during the chosen period. The percentage varies on a relative scale of 0–100. The comparative analysis of the terms “state policy”, “cultural policy” and “cultural heritage” as search terms (Google Trends, 2019) in 2004–2019 or the last 16 years from January 1, 2004, till December 31, 2019 averages 10, 2 and 2% respectively, in the last 6 years January 1, 2014, till December 31, 2019 averages 32, 4 and 14% respectively (Table 4). We note that the interest of the Ukrainian audience in the state policy has grown considerably in the last 6 years.

Following the occupation of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea, the city of Sevastopol and some parts of Donetsk and Luhansk regions and albeit the ongoing Russia–Ukraine War in eastern Ukraine, if compared by years (2006–2019), then the average for the search terms “state policy”, “cultural policy” and “cultural heritage” demonstrate a surge in the interest in the state policy term (50%) in 2017–the year when the Russia–Ukraine War was at its height, “cultural policy” (14%), “cultural heritage” (33%) (Figure 3).

The largest contribution to the development of the cultural sphere of a new independent state which had freed itself from the Soviet throes was made by the Presidents of Ukraine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Cultural institutions/ organizations/groups</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Theaters</td>
<td>Total theaters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of spectators at performances, mln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Concert organizations, professional artistic groups</td>
<td>Total concert organizations, professional artistic groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of listeners at concerts, mln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Museums</td>
<td>Total museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>Total libraries, thsd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cinemas</td>
<td>Library stocks, mln. copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Club-houses</td>
<td>Total cinemas, thsd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Indicators in “culture” section of state statistics service of Ukraine
Viktor Yushchenko (2005–2010) and Petro Poroshenko (2014–2019). They facilitated restoring and preserving the national remembrance, opening new museums and monuments, building cultural sites of national importance, supporting international projects, cinematography, book publishing and popularizing Ukrainian books worldwide as attested to by the State Budget expenditure on culture.

Let us test the hypothesis by applying the statistical method of correlation to the search terms (Table 5). To define the strength and the direction of the relationship between the arrays of the search terms we have used Pearson’s correlation coefficient – a measure of the linear correlation between two variables, whose value ranges between −1 (strong negative relationship and +1 (strong positive relationship), within which we further distinguish 0.1–0.3 – weak positive, 0.3–0.7 – moderate positive, 0.7–0.99 – strong positive).

The results demonstrate the strong positive relationship between the researched variables within the given period which supports our hypothesis about the correlation between the terms “state policy”, “cultural policy” and “cultural heritage”. The relationship between the arrays of search terms “cultural policy” and “cultural heritage” is the strongest positive 0.914.

Having hypothesized that the growing interest in cultural heritage issues might correlate with the national legal framework, we have calculated the number of approved legal documents between 1991–2019, which mentioned the term “cultural heritage” (Figure 4).

The results show that the interest in cultural heritage issue since Ukraine’s independence has fluctuated, demonstrating certain correlations. During the formative period between 1991 and 2004, an average of 50 such documents per year were approved. Under the presidency of Viktor Yushchenko (2005–2010), a promoter of Ukrainian history and cultural heritage, the number of such documents increased considerably—on average 92 documents per year. When in 2010 the Pro-Russian forces with their disrespectful attitude toward Ukrainian culture came to power the number of the documents decreased to an average of 81 per year, dropping...
Since 2014, after the occupation of some parts of Ukraine and annexation of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea, the legal framework addressed the defense and economic issues, as a consequence, the documents relating to the cultural heritage issue decreased to an average of 55 documents per year.

Let us study the expenditure allocation from the State Budget of Ukraine on culture in 2014–2019 based on the official information of the Ministry of Finance of Ukraine available on its website in 2019.

The state budget expenditure allocation on the Ministry of Culture in 2014–2019 tended to grow from 2.4bn hryvnias (UAH) to 7.0bn hryvnias (UAH). In 2019 compared to 2014, the expenditure almost tripled (Table 6).

If we take a closer look at the expenditure allocation on the Ministry of Culture from the State Budget in 2014–2019 (Figure 5), then in 2015 and 2016 it decreased (0.42 and 0.39% respectively), the fact, reflecting the increase in expenditure allocation on defense, law

**Source(s):** “Laws of Ukraine” Database. Official web-portal of the Parliament of Ukraine
enforcement and security due to Russia’s annexation of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and its occupation of some parts of Donetsk and Luhansk regions of Ukraine. In 2017 and 2018 the expenditure allocation on culture grew (0.51 and 0.65% respectively) owing to the country’s economic growth despite the ongoing Russia–Ukraine War in eastern Ukraine.

Analysis of the line-item expenditure on the Ministry of Culture in 2014–2019 demonstrates a decrease in expenditure on national theaters, national and public artistic groups and concert and circus organizations (Figure 6).

In 2014–2019, there was a decrease in the expenditure on the preservation of historical, cultural and architectural heritage in national and state reserves, implementation of measures on protection of cultural heritage, certification, inventory and restoration of monuments of architecture, culture and UNESCO world heritage (Figure 7).

Contrary, in 2014–2019 there was an increase in the expenditure on cinematography and the State Film Agency of Ukraine (Figure 8). In 2019 compared to 2014, the percentage of the expenditure exceeded that of 2014 three-fold. In 2017 compared to 2014, the share of the expenditure on culture grew five times (11.71, 12.58% and 2.58, 2.85% respectively).

The year 2015 saw new budget expenditures on culture, namely, the financial support for the activities of the Ukrainian Institute of National Remembrance and the public enterprise “Crimean House” (CH, 2015), whose opening in 2015 was prompted by the annexation of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea by the Russian Federation to ensure human rights and freedoms of Ukrainian citizens, including those of national minorities and indigenous peoples.
on the temporarily occupied territory of Ukraine. The funding of the Ukrainian Institute of National Remembrance increased fivefold in 2014–2019, whereas that of Crimean House decreased two-fold (Figure 9).

Overall, the 2014–2019 period witnessed a positive trend in the budget expenditures on culture in Ukraine with certain redistributions.

Conclusions and discussion
As appears from the analysis, between 2014 and 2019 Ukrainian state cultural policy initiatives including setting Expert Council of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, the Ukrainian Centre for Cultural Studies and the state-owned institution “The Ukrainian Cultural Foundation”, developing the Procedure on Inventorying the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Ukraine, initiating awards for preserving and safeguarding intangible cultural heritage have
proved effective at both central and local levels, encouraging further decentralization in the sphere of culture.

The obtained results indicate the overall growth in the share of the total state budget expenditure on the Ministry of Culture in 2014–2019 as well as a decrease in the expenditure in 2015 and 2016 owing to higher defense, law enforcement and security spendings due to the annexation of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea by the Russian Federation and its occupation of some parts of Donetsk and Luhansk regions of Ukraine.

The analysis of the interest of Ukrainians in the terms “state policy”, “cultural policy” and “cultural heritage” in Google Trends and the comparative method applied to the search queries have revealed considerable overall interest growth in the state policy among Ukrainians in 2014–2019.

However, the protection of cultural heritage after the annexation of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and occupation of some parts of Donetsk and Luhansk regions by the Russian Federation remains a crucial issue. Continuous deterioration of the situation with the preservation and protection of the national cultural heritage on the Crimean Peninsula is being reported by various OSCE, UN and Council of Europe monitoring missions.
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