

UDC 930.85(474.5+477)“19/20”
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.29.292934

Lesia KOTSUR

PhD (History), Associate Professor of Department of Political Sciences, Hryhorii Skovoroda University in Pereiaslav, 30 Sukhomlynskooho Street, Pereiaslav, Kyiv region, Ukraine, postal code 08401 (dombrovska_ne@ukr.net)

ORCID: 0000-0001-8996-1606

Леся КОЦУР

кандидатка історичних наук, доцентка кафедри політології Університету Григорія Сковороди в Переяславі, вул. Сухомлинського, 30, м. Переяслав, Київська обл., Україна, індекс 08401 (dombrovska_ne@ukr.net)

Bibliographic Description of the Article: Kotsur, L. (2023). Comparative Analysis of the Cultural Policy of Lithuania and Ukraine at the end of the 20th – beginning of the 21st century. *Skhidnoievropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 29, 212–222. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.29.292934

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE CULTURAL POLICY OF LITHUANIA
AND UKRAINE AT THE END OF THE 20th – BEGINNING OF THE 21st CENTURY**

Abstract. *The purpose of the study is to compare the cultural policy strategies of Lithuania and Ukraine after the restoration of their independence at the beginning of the 1990s and to borrow useful experience for the further state building of Ukraine and enrichment of a cultural space of Europe; consideration of the influence of the Soviet past on the culture of both countries and identification of ways to return cultural memory after the restoration of independence by Lithuania and Ukraine; carrying out a comparative analysis of modern strategies of a cultural policy in the countries under analysis. The research methodology is based on general scientific and special historical methods. In particular, on the retrospective and historical genetic method, which made it possible to reveal the influence of the cultural policy of the previous historical period on the formation of new factors that significantly affected the cultural policy of Lithuania and Ukraine after they regained independence. In turn, the comparative analysis made it possible not only to compare the strategies of both countries in the field of a cultural development, but also to trace a number of similar and different policies in this area. The methodological basis of the article is complemented by the principles of historicism, consistency, scientific pluralism, objectivity, systematicity, and comprehensiveness. The Conclusion. In the research it has been elucidated that both Lithuania and Ukraine have a powerful cultural layering, which for a long time was not only hidden under the ideological layering of the Soviet Union, but also underwent a systematic distortion over many years. After the restoration of independence, first of all, prerequisites were created in Lithuania for the revival of traditional (ethnic) culture on general democratic principles, while in Ukraine, in the first decades of independence, there was almost no focus on the restoration of ethnic culture at the national level. Although the experience of Lithuania shows that these steps were extremely necessary for the country, in particular, in order to strengthen the national identity of citizens. No less important for Lithuania and Ukraine is the implementation of a regional cultural policy, especially if we look at this sphere from the point of view of centrifugal tendencies and politicization of regions that occasionally take place in both countries. The approaches to a cultural policy implementation through leading state institutions – the Council of Culture of Lithuania and the Ukrainian Cultural Fund, which place special emphasis on the development of cultural and creative industries, are the most similar in Lithuania and in Ukraine. Analytical data of these institutions testify*

to the strong, albeit somewhat different, potential of both countries in this field. This especially applies to Ukraine, which is one of the largest countries in Europe, both territorially and in terms of a human and intellectual capital. The layer of its culture cannot only significantly enrich the European cultural heritage, but also shows the historical durability and interpenetration of cultures on the European continent over many centuries.

Key words: Ukraine, the Republic of Lithuania, Lithuania, strategy, culture, traditions, memory.

КОМПАРАТИВНИЙ АНАЛІЗ КУЛЬТУРНОЇ ПОЛІТИКИ ЛИТВИ ТА УКРАЇНИ НАПРИКІНЦІ ХХ – ПОЧАТКУ ХХІ ст.

Анотація. Мета дослідження полягає у порівнянні стратегій культурної політики Литви та України після відновлення їхньої незалежності на початку 1990-х рр. та запозиченні корисного досвіду для подальшого державного будівництва України й збагачення культурного простору Європи; розгляді впливу радянського минулого на культуру обох країн та виявлення шляхів повернення культурної пам'яті після відновлення Литвою і Україною незалежності; здійсненні компаративного аналізу сучасних стратегій культурної політики в досліджуваних країнах. **Методологія дослідження** спирається на загальнонаукові та спеціальні історичні методи. Зокрема на ретроспективний та історико-генетичний метод, які уможливили виявити вплив культурної політики попереднього історичного періоду на формування нових чинників, які суттєво позначилися на культурній політиці Литви та України після відновлення ними незалежності. Своєю чергою, компаративний аналіз дав змогу не тільки порівняти стратегії обох країн у сфері культурного розвитку, а й відстежити низку схожих та відмінних політик у цій площині. **Методологічну основу статті** доповнюють принципи історизму, послідовності, наукового плюралізму, об'єктивності, системності та всебічності. **Висновки.** Запропоноване дослідження свідчить, що і Литва, і Україна мають потужне культурне нашіарування, яке упродовж тривалого часу було не тільки сховане під ідеологічним нашіаруванням Радянського Союзу, а й зазнавало системного спотворення упродовж багатьох років. Після відновлення незалежності насамперед у Литві були створені передумови для відродження традиційної (етнічної) культури на загальнодемократичних принципах, натомість в Україні, в перші десятиліття незалежності, відновленню етнічної культури на загальнодержавному рівні майже не надавалася увага. Хоча досвід Литви показує, що ці кроки для країни були вкрай необхідні зокрема, для того, щоб зміцнити загальнонаціональну ідентичність громадян. Не менш важливою для Литви та України є реалізація регіональної культурної політики, особливо якщо поглянути на цю сферу під кутом зору відцентрових тенденцій і політизації регіонів, які час від часу мають місце в обох країнах. Найбільш подібними в Литві, і в Україні є підходи до реалізації культурної політики через провідні державні інституції – Раду культури Литви та Український культурний фонд, які особливий акцент роблять на розвиток культурних і креативних індустрій. Аналітичні дані цих установ свідчать про потужний, хоч і децю відмінний потенціал обох країн в цій галузі. Особливо це стосується України, яка є однією з найбільших країн Європи як територіально, так і за показниками людського й інтелектуального капіталу. Пласт її культури може не тільки суттєво збагатити європейську культурну спадщину, а й показати історичну тяглість та взаємопроникнення культур на європейському континенті упродовж багатьох століть.

Ключові слова: Україна, Литовська Республіка, Литва, стратегія, культура, традиції, пам'ять.

The Problem Statement. Ukraine and the Republic of Lithuania (*hereinafter* – LR or Lithuania) are European countries that are closely connected not only by a rich historical past, but also by the tragic experience of being part of the Soviet totalitarian machine, one of the main tasks of which was to fuse, mix and absorb national cultures. However, despite all their efforts, the Bolsheviks did not manage to achieve final success, because in 1991 the collapse of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (*hereinafter* – the USSR) testified that even a

distorted ethnic culture is capable of a gradual reviving and creating a nurturing environment for further state building. Evidence of this is, in particular, the thirty-year experience of a cultural formation in the Republic of Lithuania and Ukraine, because despite the fact that after 1991 the states chose excellent strategies for a cultural development, over time the cultural policies of the states acquired a number of common features, which allow us to show the world that these cultures have a rich potential, which was previously securely hidden behind the ideological superstructure and distorted by the Soviet policy, and nowadays can enrich the European cultural space significantly.

The Analysis of Sources and Researches. Despite the fact that many analytical reports are used in the study, it must be said that in both Lithuania and Ukraine, the study of state cultural policy is a chief focus of many scholars who study this phenomenon at the national, regional, and local levels. First of all, certain aspects of the Ukrainian cultural policy were elucidated by Ivan Dziuba (Dziuba, 2009), Yaroslava Muzychenko (Muzychenko, 2020), Yaroslav Kalakura (Kalakura, 2013), Yulia Nikishenko (Nikishenko, 2004), Illia Levchenko (Levchenko, 2022), Mykhailo Tyvodar (Tyvodar, 2004), Hlib Vysheslavskiy (Vysheslavskiy, 2020), Maria Parakhina (Parakhina, 2018), Roman Kharkovenko (Kharkovenko, 2023), Oleh Rishniak (Rishniak, 2022), Inna Paholok, Natalia Hrynokh (Paholok & Hrynokh, 2020) and the others. Among Lithuanian and other foreign researchers, the issue of cultural policy is studied by Petras Kalnius (Kalnius, 2011; Kalnius, 2019), Vladas Sirutavičius (Sirutavičius, 2017), Sumitra Dutta, Bruno Lanvin, Lorena Rivera León and Sasha Wunsch-Vincent (Dutta, Lanvin, Rivera León, Wunsch-Vincent, 2021), Radvilė Maskuliūnaitė, Christina Mažeikaitė (Maskuliūnaitė & Mažeikaitė, 2022). At the same time, none of these researchers attempted to compare the cultural policies of both countries, with the aim of identifying and borrowing useful experience for improving their own cultural strategies.

The purpose of the study is to compare the cultural policy strategies of Lithuania and Ukraine after the restoration of their independence at the end of the 20th century, with the aim of using a positive experience for further state building of Ukraine and enrichment of the cultural space of Europe. First of all, it is about considering the influence of the Soviet past on the culture of both countries and identifying ways to restore the cultural memory of both peoples after the restoration of independence; to compare modern strategies of cultural policy in Ukraine and Lithuania, to distinguish their strengths and weaknesses.

The Results of the Research. It should be mentioned that Ukraine was part of the USSR for much longer period, so the Ukrainian ethnic culture was under much more destructive influence than the culture of any other country. The Ukrainian traditions, customs and self-expression, which have always been a fertile ground for the growth of national self-awareness of the Ukrainians, constituted a special “danger” for the Soviet totalitarian leadership, to whom the priority was to control the Ukrainian national and cultural sphere (Yefimenko, 2003). As a result, under the conditions of the hybrid policy of planting and establishing the Bolshevik regime in the 20th century, Ukraine experienced a spiritual genocide (Dziuba, 2009), as a result of which the entire layer of cultural heritage suffered irreversible losses – from the looting of unique values, historical monuments, destruction of museums, libraries, ethnic culture, etc. (Kalakura, 2013; Rishniak, 2022; Parakhina, 2018). At the same time, a total russification of the Ukrainian population led to the distortion of the cultural and informational space (Yarmolenko, 2013); marginalization of the sphere of art, with the aim of its unification and stamping mainly propaganda works in the spirit of socialist realism (Levchenko, 2022). In particular, the Bolshevik regime succeeded in denigrating,

pushing out of the mass consciousness and conserving *traditional (ethnic) Ukrainian culture* in the villages: the Bolsheviks skillfully forced people to work on religious holidays, and the ritual ceremonial holidays were held in the Russian manner (for example, Masliana instead of Kolodiy); to abandon the national clothing; through censorship and substitution of meanings, folklore was distorted – songs, fairy tales, visual arts, proverbs, sayings, customs, superstitions, rites, crafts, etc. (Muzychenko, 2020).

Regarding Lithuania, Moscow pursued almost an identical cultural policy. However, in this case, it is worth considering the period and a territorial factor, since Lithuania is a much smaller country in terms of territory and was under the occupation of the USSR for much less period than Ukraine. As a result of these factors, the scale of repression of cultural figures, capable of participating in the struggle for independence, also differed in both countries (Sovietų, 2016).

Since Lithuania was the first to declare independence on March 11, 1990, we suggest that we should consider the experience of cultural policy in Lithuania first. Thus, immediately after the restoration of independence, the revival and strengthening of the ethnic (traditional) culture of the Lithuanians became a criterion of the national identity strengthening. That is why, from the first days of the independence restoration in the Republic of Lithuania, a chief focus was on the restoration and protection of “ethnic culture”. Initially, the reflection of this policy found a place in scientific publications (Kalnius, 2019), and later it was recorded in Law “On Basics of State Protection of Ethnic Culture of the Republic of Lithuania” dated September 29, 1999. In particular, in Law it is stated that “*ethnic culture is a set of cultural values created by the entire people (ethnos), which are passed down from generation to generation and constantly updated, which contributes to the maintenance of national self-awareness and self-awareness, the identity of ethnographic regions*”. Several other important concepts are also recorded in this document: 1) *a living tradition of ethnic culture*, i.e. transmission of the inherited culture of the people, its creation and renewal; 2) *ethnic cultural heritage* – ethnic cultural values created by the nation in the past and preserved to this day. The main goal of this Law is not just to gain knowledge about ethnic culture, but to promote its manifestation in an everyday life of the Lithuanians and to protect against the influence and absorption of mass culture (Lietuvos, 1999). Since 2004, the Council for the Protection of Ethnic Culture has been providing institutional support for this Law under the Seimas (Etninės kultūros globos taryba) (Dėl, 2004) and the Council of Culture of Lithuania (CCL). In addition, the protection of ethnic culture is enshrined in the Law “On the Basics of National Security of the Republic of Lithuania”, which runs that among the objects of national security are the environment and cultural heritage, and “*the duty of the state is to preserve and nurture the identity of national culture, ensure the protection and continuity of the Lithuanian language, patronage of an ethnic culture and local traditions, protection of cultural heritage ...*” (Lietuvos, 1996). In fact, it was the protection of ethnic culture of the Lithuanians that formed the basis of the state cultural policy of the Republic of Lithuania over the past thirty years. Also important is the cultural policy of Lithuania at the regional level and regarding the development of cultural and creative industries (*hereinafter* – CCI). However, these cases require a comparative analysis and will be analysed below.

On August 24, 1991 Ukraine embarked on the path of independence, and it seemed that it also had to get rid of the Soviet vestiges in culture and go the way of restoring ethnic culture. However, as the analysis of the cultural policy of independent Ukraine during the period of 1991 – 2005 showed, due to a negligent attitude towards the cultural sphere on the part of the

state, it found itself in a critical situation (Kotsur, 2023): mass culture, as well as the works of many artists, often resorted to simplification, primitiveness, entertainment, as a result, mainstream and margins developed in Ukraine; in the field of art, the ideological liberalism of the new times combined with cynicism and egoism contrasted with the typical Soviet orientation towards success in Moscow artistic environment and indifference to the Ukrainian culture discourse (Vysheslavskiy, 2020, pp. 116–117); the folk arts were in an even worse situation, which practically fell into decline (Pro skhvalennia, 2021). In fact, at the beginning of the 2000s the state of culture was not so much in the state of decline as it was halfway to dissolution in the newly created Russian cultural product. In 2005 – 2010, the third President of Ukraine, V. Yushchenko, tried to convert the Ukrainians to the national and European origins of the Ukrainian culture by means of relevant decrees. However, the steps initiated by him (policy of memory, restoration of cultural monuments, etc.) ran into the galloping pace of russification of the Ukrainian culture and could not cause a prevailing effect. Although it would be fair to note that in 2005 – 2010 the cultural policy of Ukraine was able to sow the seeds for the revival of cultural authenticity, which could not be completely destroyed by the subsequent unrestrained russification of the cultural space, which culminated in 2010 – 2013.

After the victory of the Revolution of Dignity in 2013 – 2014, positive trends related to the ethno-national motive and European cultural meanings emerged in the formation and development of the Ukrainian cultural policy. This was primarily facilitated by the initiation of the policy of a large-scale decommunization and reforms implementation in the field of culture, which initiated the creation of two powerful institutions such as the Ukrainian Book Institute (2016) and the Ukrainian Cultural Fund (*hereinafter* – UKF) in 2017, the significance of which will be considered below.

Thus, it is evident that the cultural policy of both countries has significant differences. However, if we look deeper into the realm of culture, we will see many similarities. First of all, this concerns the concept of “ethnic culture”. In particular, as in Lithuania, in Ukraine the concept of “ethnic culture” is also represented in a number of scientific and theoretical researches (Nikishenko, 2004; Hurova, 2022). After all, as it was noted by the Ukrainian ethnologist M. Tyvodar, “*ethnic culture is a complex of economic and social life, material and spiritual culture inherited from ancestors, which determine the lifestyle, perform an ethno-identifying role, provide an opportunity to distinguish and contrast oneself with other ethnic groups*” (Tyvodar, 2004, p. 168). However, unlike Lithuania, in Ukraine there is no special legislation aimed at protecting the Ukrainian ethnic culture, since the ethno-cultural policy is regulated by a number of special national and international legal acts and is mainly aimed at protecting the culture of national minorities and indigenous peoples (the Crimean Tatars, the Crimean Karaites, the Krymchaky), whose cultural heritage is more protected than the culture of the Ukrainians (Pro korinni, 2021; Kalakura, 2012; Kontseptsiiia, 2023). At the same time, concepts that are as close as possible to the Lithuanian definitions are contained in the Constitution of Ukraine, the Law of Ukraine “On Folk Art Crafts” (Pro narodni, 2001), Conventions on the Protection of Intangible Cultural Heritage (Konventsiiia, 2008), Law of Ukraine “On Culture” of 2010 (Pro kulturu, 2010), etc. Thus, we see that even in the absence of special legislation, the Ukrainians can also protect their own ethnic cultural heritage, but on the condition that the central body accepts the relevant national and cultural state target programme “Concepts of the State targeted national and cultural programme to ensure the comprehensive development and functioning of the Ukrainian language as the state language in all spheres of public life for the period until 2030” dated May 19, 2021 (Kontseptsiiia,

2021) or “Concept of the State targeted national and cultural programme for the development of folk arts and crafts in 2024 – 2027” dated December 15, 2021, which was updated for the first time since 2007 (Pro skhvalennia, 2021; Pro zatverdzhennia, 2007). However, these steps are not enough, even though there is a strong public demand for the revival of ethnic culture in Ukraine (Tykhonenko, 2020, pp. 405–407).

Summarizing this case, it is worth noting that the state policy regarding ethnic culture in Lithuania is a separate issue, while in Ukraine it is fragmented and apparently even secondary. This is particularly evidenced by the fact that in Lithuania this topic is given much more attention. For example, the analysis of the activities of key and quite similar in their activities institutions, that implement this cultural policy (RKL and UKF) indicates that, despite its modernity, RKL pays much more attention to the development of national and ethnic culture, instead, UKF often prefers projects of cultural innovation and cultural diffusion, which are considered universal cultural mechanisms of co-creation (Proekt, 2023), which can be a serious miscalculation of the state’s internal policy. This is evidenced in particular by the analysis of the work of the UKF in 2018 – 2021, (Richnyi zvit, 2018; Richnyi zvit, 2019; Richnyi zvit, 2020; Richnyi zvit, 2021, p. 20).

Another important direction of the state cultural policy in Lithuania and Ukraine is *the development of culture in the regions*, which at the same time are the largest melting pot and diversity of ethnic culture (Savivaldybių, 2021; Lietuvos, 2006; Kultūros, 2020). In this case, it is rather difficult to make comparisons regarding the ethno-cultural features of the regions, since the area of Ukraine is almost ten times larger than the area of Lithuania, and the conclusions may not be entirely correct. However, in the context of a regional cultural policy there are a number of similar factors that are important for both states.

Firstly, the factor of a decentralized regional cultural policy is inherent in both countries. After all, as is known, in both countries the general policy of decentralization positively changed the policy of financing the cultural sphere. And if these processes are already relatively established in Lithuania, then Ukraine is just beginning the path of a cultural policy decentralization. Therefore, it is natural that a number of obstacles related to the transition process arise in this area (funding procedure, optimization of cultural institutions, provision and access to cultural services, lack of personnel in the OTH, etc.) (Nazarenko, 2021; Yak rozvyvaty, 2020).

Secondly, the Lithuanians systematically monitor the situation and development of a regional culture, with the aim of improving the current cultural policy as a tool for strengthening national identity. This necessity arose due to the difficulties associated with the formation of national identity, both at the level of historical and ethnographic regions, where the issue of ethnic culture is quite politicized (close to the issue of ethnic passports to the Zhemaitians), and in particular in the eastern regions of Lithuania, where a large part of national minorities lives (Kalnius, 2011). After all, it is worth recalling that in 1991 attempts were made to create the Polish political autonomy with the aim of its subsequent exit from the Lithuanian state and joining the Soviet Union. In addition, the Russian and Belarusian national minorities were actively used by Moscow in 1990 with the aim of disrupting independence, because the forceful intervention of the Soviet troops took place precisely under the pretext of protecting the Soviet citizens of non-Lithuanian nationality (Sirutavičius, 2017; Deputato, 1991). Taking into consideration the fact that similar negative manifestations of regionalism and separatism took place and, unfortunately, will occur in Ukraine, the Lithuanian experience is very useful, because the revival of *the Ukrainian* ethnic culture in the regions of Ukraine will help dispel

a number of entrenched myths about the so-called civilizational split of Ukraine. Of course, both Lithuania and Ukraine focus on the development of a cultural diversity and support of the national minorities culture. However, the protection of the Ukrainians' ethnic culture (and indigenous peoples) should be the main priority of the state. As a matter of fact, the first steps towards its implementation have already been taken within the framework of the UKF in this direction of the state cultural policy, in particular, the "Culture. Regions", the most priority task of which is "*promoting preservation, restoration, protection and popularization of the cultural heritage, cultural values and national memory of the Ukrainian people in order to strengthen the modern Ukrainian identity and the formation of common values of a civil society*". The competition "LOT 1. Local Culture" is responsible for the implementation of this priority, the purpose of which is to support regional initiatives and develop culture in small settlements by preserving and promoting local culture, folk crafts. "LOT 2. Culture of indigenous peoples and unique ethnic cultures of the Azov and Black Sea Regions" is responsible for other area. (Ukrainskyi kulturnyi fond, 2023a, 2023b, 2023c). However, currently a serious obstacle is disproportion of participation of regions of Ukraine in competitive programmes aimed at restoring traditional Ukrainian cultural memory. Regionally, Kyiv and the region, Lviv, Kharkiv, Odesa, and Dnipropetrovsk regions are the most actively involved in the submission of cultural support projects (Richnyi zvit, 2018; Richnyi zvit, 2021). Other regions are less active, as a result, these serious disparities negatively affect the revival of ethnic culture in the regions, which can significantly affect the strengthening of the Ukrainian people national identity and enrich the cultural diversity of Europe.

The sphere of *cultural and creative industries* (CCI), which are at the crossroads of art, business and technology, is also important for Lithuania and Ukraine. It is worth paying attention to the fact that in both countries this area of a cultural development is one of the key priorities of state policy relatively recently, or rather after 2015. However, even during this short period of time, CCI established itself as one of the most promising in the field of a cultural policy. The experience of both countries shows that in this area they develop approximately equally. If, for example, we take into account the Global Innovation Index for 2021, we will see that Lithuania ranks the 39th there, and Ukraine – the 49th. Despite the fact that, according to the income rating, Ukraine is included in the group of countries with income below the average, at the same time, it took the third place among the most innovative economies. While Lithuania, which is considered a country with a high income, was ranked at the bottom of the list and did not make it into the top 25 innovative economies (Dutta, Lanvin, Rivera León, Wunsch-Vincent, 2021). However, this does not mean that the potential of CCI in Lithuania is weak, it is just a bit different. In particular, among the main differences in the development of CCI, it is possible to single out the fact that in Lithuania in this field there prevails the development of sites (platforms), computer games, board games, creation of laboratories, exhibition space, creation of advertising services. Film production is less developed (Maskuliūnaitė & Mažeikaitė, 2021). In Ukraine (in 2019), almost half of the added value of CI was created by computer programming (43% of the total VAT of CI), advertising agencies (12%), consulting on informatization (10%), activities in the field of television broadcasting (9%), as well as production of films and video films, television programmes (4%) and mediation in the placement of advertisements in mass media (4%). In addition, exports of cultural and creative industries grew (Nikolaieva, etc., 2020, p. 5). At the same time, it is worth noting that this industry became one of the most vulnerable areas of the Ukrainian economy during the quarantine of 2019 – 2020. For the creative and cultural

industries, 2020 turned out to be a real test of viability and sustainability. The economic crisis caused by the pandemic and quarantine inflicted a severe blow to this sector of the economy, since the majority of the CCI areas are related to social contacts and interaction (Lopukh & Makukha, 2021).

Thus, we can see that, in addition to the revival of ethnic culture, cultural policy regarding regions and cultural creative industries is relevant in both countries. Also, the leading state institutions implementing cultural policy – the Council of Culture of Lithuania and the Ukrainian Cultural Fund – have many similar features, which will continue to be an important object of research.

The Conclusion. In the research it has been shown that both Lithuania and Ukraine have a powerful cultural layering, which for a long time was not only hidden under the ideological layering of the Soviet Union, but also underwent systematic distortion over many years. After the restoration of independence, the prerequisites for the revival of traditional (ethnic) culture on general democratic principles were created in Lithuania. While in Ukraine, in the first decades of independence, there was almost no focus on the restoration of ethnic culture at the national level. Although the experience of Lithuania shows that these steps were extremely necessary for the country, in particular, in order to strengthen the national identity of citizens. Equally important for both countries is the implementation of a regional cultural policy, especially if we look at this sphere from the point of view of centrifugal tendencies and politicization of regions that occasionally take place in both countries. The most similar in Lithuania and Ukraine are the approaches to a cultural policy implementation through the leading state institutions – the Council of Culture of Lithuania and the Ukrainian Cultural Fund, which place special emphasis on the development of cultural and creative industries. Analytical data of these institutions testify to the strong, albeit somewhat different, potential of both countries in this field. This especially applies to Ukraine, which is one of the largest countries in Europe both territorially and in terms of a human and intellectual capital. The layer of its culture cannot only significantly enrich the European cultural heritage, but also show the historical durability and interpenetration of cultures on the European continent over many centuries.

Acknowledgement. We express sincere gratitude to all members of the editorial board for consultations provided during the preparation of the article for publishing.

Funding. The authors did not receive any financial support for the research, authorship and / or publication of this article.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dėl. (2004). Dėl Etninės kultūros globos tarybos nuostatų patvirtinimo [Regarding the approval of the provisions of the Council for the Protection of Ethnic Culture]. *Lietuvos Respublikos Seimas, 2004 m. lapkričio 2 d. Nr. IX-2532, Vilnius*. URL: <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAD/TAIS.244947>. [in Lithuanian]

Deputato. (1991). Deputato E. Petrovo kreipimasis į rusakalbius Lietuvos gyventojus [Deputy E. Petrov's Address to the Russian-Speaking Residents of Lithuania]. *Lietuvos Respublikos Aukščiausioji Taryba – Atkuriamasis Seimas. Stenograma, 1991-01-12*. URL: <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAK/TAIS.251248>. [in Lithuanian]

Dutta, S., Lanvin, B., Rivera León, L. & Wunsch-Vincent, S. (2021). Global Innovation Index 2021. Tracking Innovation through the COVID-19 Crisis. *World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)*. URL: https://www.wipo.int/edocs/pubdocs/en/wipo_pub_gii_2021.pdf [in English]

Dziuba, I. (2009). Problemy i perspektyvy ukrainської kultury [Problems and prospects of Ukrainian culture]. *Radio Svoboda, 18 liutoho*. URL: <https://www.radiosvoboda.org/a/1495357.html> [in Ukrainian]

Hromliuk, I. & Struk, A. (2021). Velykyi potentsial. Yak perenesty kulturne y mystetske zhyttia z Kyieva do mistechok i sil [Great potential. How to Transfer Cultural and Artistic Life from Kyiv to Towns and Villages]. *The Ukrainians*, 28 chervnia. URL: <https://theukrainians.org/velykyi-potentsial/> [in Ukrainian]

Hurova, I. (2022). Svitova, natsionalna, etnichna kulturny v suchasnomu kulturnomu prostori: strukturno-funktsionalnyi pidkhid [World, national, ethnic cultures in the modern cultural space: a structural-functional approach]. *Kulturolohichniy almanakh – Cultural Almanac*, (3), 209–217. [in Ukrainian]

Kalakura, O. (2012). Osoblyvosti suchasnoho etnokulturnoho rozvytku Ukrainy [Peculiarities of modern ethno-cultural development of Ukraine]. *Naukovi zapysky Instytutu politychnykh i etnonatsionalnykh doslidzhen im. I.F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy. Spetsialnyi vypusk – Scientific Notes of the I.F. Kuras Institute of Political and Ethnonational Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Special Issue*, 77–98. [in Ukrainian]

Kalakura, Ya. (2013). Dzhherelni svidchennia nyshchennia ukrainskoi kulturny [Source Evidence of the Destruction of Ukrainian Culture]. *Kraieznavstvo – Local History*, 4, 285–288. [in Ukrainian]

Kalnius, P. (2011). Challenges Faced by the Lithuanian State from Regional Identities. *Journal of Ethnology and Folkloristics*, 1(1–2), 101–113. [in Lithuanian]

Kalnius, P. (2019). Etninės kultūros sąvok a etnologijos ir jos vartojimo variacijos Lietuvoje [The Concept of Ethnic Culture in Ethnology and its Usage Variations in Lithuania]. *Res Humanitariae*, XXVI, 70–91. [in Lithuanian]

Kharkovenko, R. (2023). The state system formation historiography of the cultural heritage monuments protection in Ukraine. *Skhidnoevropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk – East European Historical Bulletin*, 28, 200–210. [in English]

Kontsepsiia. (2021). Kontsepsiia Derzhavnoi tsilovoi natsionalno-kulturnoi prohramy zabezpechennia vsebichnoho rozvytku i funktsionuvannia ukrainskoi movy yak derzhavnoi v usikh sferakh suspilnoho zhyttia na period do 2030 roku [The concept of the State targeted national and cultural program to ensure the comprehensive development and functioning of the Ukrainian language as the state language in all spheres of public life for the period up to 2030]. *Kabinet Ministriv Ukrainy. Rozporiadzhennia vid 19 travnia 2021. № 474-p.* URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/474-2021-%D1%80#Text>. [in Ukrainian]

Kontsepsiia. (2023). Kontsepsiia Derzhavnoi tsilovoi natsionalno-kulturnoi prohramy “Iednist u rozmaitti” na period do 2034 roku [Concept of the State target national and cultural program “Unity in diversity” for the period until 2034]. *Kabinet Ministriv Ukrainy. Rozporiadzhennia vid 12 travnia 2023. № 429-p.* URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/429-2023-%D1%80#Text>. [in Ukrainian]

Konventsiiia. (2008). Konventsiiia pro okhoronu nematerialnoi kulturnoi spadshchyny [Convention on the Protection of Intangible Cultural Heritage]. *Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy. Data nabrannia chynnosti dlia Ukrainy: 27 serpnia 2008.* URL: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/995_d69#Text. [in Ukrainian]

Kotsur, L. (2023). Transformatsii v kulturnomu prostori nezaleznoi Ūkrainy: uroky pershykh trokh desiatylyt [Transformations in the cultural space of independent Ukraine: lessons from the first three decades]. *Aktualni pyttannia humanitarnykh nauk – Current Issues of Humanitarian Sciences*, 62(1), 26–33. [in Ukrainian]

Kultūros. (2020). Kultūros paslaugų prieinamumas regionuose: erdvinė kultūros paslaugų tinklo analizė [Access to Cultural Services in Regions: Spatial Analysis of the Network of Cultural Services]. “Kurk Lietuvai” projektų vadovė Vėjūna Žalalytė, *Vidaus reikalų ministerija, Kultūros ministerija*, 2020. URL: <https://www.kulturostyrimai.lt/visos-temos/kulturos-politika/kulturos-paslaugu-prieinamumas-regionuose-erdvine-kulturos-paslaugu-tinklo-analize/>. [in Lithuanian]

Levchenko, I. (2022). Svoi chuzhi. Mystetstvo yak m'iaka syla rosiiskoho/radianskoho kolonializmu [His Own Strangers. Art as the Soft Power of Russian/Soviet Colonialism]. *Heinrich-böll-stiftung*, 14 chervnia. URL: <https://ua.boell.org/uk/2022/06/14/svoyi-chuzhi-mystetstvo-yak-myaka-syla-rosiyskohoradyanskoho-kolonializmu>. [in Ukrainian]

Lietuvos. (1991). Lietuvos Respublikos etninės kultūros valstybinės globos pagrindų įstatymas [The Law on the Basics of State Protection of Ethnic Culture of the Republic of Lithuania]. *Lietuvos Respublikos Seimas, VIII-1328, Vilnius.* URL: <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAD/TAIS.86929>. [in Lithuanian]

Lietuvos. (1996). Lietuvos Respublikos nacionalinio saugumo pagrindų įstatymas [Law on the National Security Basics of the Republic of Lithuania]. *Lietuvos Respublikos Seimas, VIII-49.* URL: <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAD/TAIS.34169/CrUreToEZW>. [in Lithuanian]

Lietuvos. (2006). Lietuvos regioninių kultūros centrų situacijos analizė [Analysis of the Situation of Lithuanian Regional Cultural Centers]. *Lietuvos nacionalinis kultūros centras. Socialinių tyrimų institutas*. URL: <https://www.kulturostyrimai.lt/visos-temos/kulturos-politika/regionai/lietuvos-regioniniu-kulturos-centru-situacijos-analize/>. [in Lithuanian]

Lopukh, K. & Makukha, K. (2021). Ukraine's Creative Industries during the COVID-19 Crisis. *Efektivna ekonomika, 11*. URL: <http://www.economy.nayka.com.ua/?op=1&z=9582>. [in English]

Maskuliūnaitė, R. & Mažeikaitė, K. (2022). Programos “Kultūros ir kūrybinės industrijos” vertinimas [Evaluation of the “Culture and Creative Industries” Program]. *Lietuvos kultūros taryba, 51*. URL: https://www.kulturostyrimai.lt/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/LKT_Programos-kulturos-ir-kurybines-industrijos-vertinimas_2022.pdf. [in Lithuanian]

Muzychenko, Ya. (2020). Spovoreno v SSSR [Distorted in the USSR]. *Zbruch, 31 sichnia*. URL: <https://zbruc.eu/node/95252>. [in Ukrainian]

Nazarenko, Yu. (2021). Detsentralizatsiia kultyry: problemy ta vyklyky reformy [Decentralization of culture: problems and challenges of reform]. *Mistosite is a Ukrainian urbanist platform*. URL: <https://mistosite.org.ua/articles/detsentralizatsiia-kultyry-problemy-ta-vyklyky-reformy?locale=en>. [in Ukrainian]

Nikishenko, Yu. (2004). Poniattia “etnichna kultura” i “tradytsiina kultura” v etnokulturolohii [Concepts of “ethnic culture” and “traditional culture” in ethnocultural studies]. *Naukovi zapysky NaUKMA: Teoriia ta istoriia kultyry – NUKMA Scientific Notes: Theory and History of Culture, 24, 4–13*. [in Ukrainian]

Nikolaieva, O., Onopriienko, A., Taran, S., Sholomytskyi, Yu. & Yavorskyi, P. (2020). *Kreatyvni industrii: vplyv na rozvytok ekonomiky Ukrainy* [Creative Industries: Influence on the Development of the Economy of Ukraine]. URL: <https://kse.ua/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/KSE-Trade-Kreativni-industriyi-Zvit.pdf>. [in Ukrainian]

Parakhina, M. (2018). The Problem of Retrieval of Ukraine's Cultural Property in the Ukrainian-Russian Mutual Relations: on the problems history. *Skhidnoievropeyskyi istorychnyi visnyk – East European Historical Bulletin, 6, 8–14*. [in English]

Pro korinni. (2021). *Pro korinni narody Ukrainy. Zakon Ukrainy, 1 lypnia 2021. № 1616-IX*. [About indigenous peoples of Ukraine. Law of Ukraine, July 1, 2021. N 1616-IX]. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1616-20#Text>. [in Ukrainian]

Pro kulturu. (2010). *Zakon Ukrainy, 14 hrudnia 2010. № 2778-VI*. [About Culture. Law of Ukraine, December 14, 2010, N 2778-VI]. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2778-17#Text>. [in Ukrainian]

Pro narodni khudozhni promysly [About folk art crafts]. *Zakon Ukrainy, 21 chervnia 2001. № 2547-III*. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2547-14#Text>. [in Ukrainian]

Pro skhvalennia. (2021). *Pro skhvalennia Kontseptsii Derzhavnoi tsilovoi natsionalno-kulturnoi prohramy rozvytku narodnykh khudozhnykh promysliv na 2024 – 2027 roky* [On the approval of the Concept of the State targeted national and cultural program for the development of folk arts and crafts for 2024 – 2027]. *Kabinet Ministriv Ukrainy. Rozporiadzhennia, vid 15 hrudnia 2021. № 1677-p*. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1677-2021-%D1%80#Text>. [in Ukrainian]

Pro zatverdzhennia. (2007). *Pro zatverdzhennia Derzhavnoi prohramy zberezhennta, vidrodzhennia i rozvytku narodnykh khudozhnykh promysliv na period do 2010 roku* [On the approval of the State Program for the Preservation, Revival and Development of Folk Art Crafts for the Period Until 2010]. *Kabinet Ministriv Ukrainy. Postanova, vid 23 travnia 2007. № 768*. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/768-2007-%D0%BF#Text>. [in Ukrainian]

Proiekt. (2023). *Proiekt “Kulturni mekhanizmy spilnototvorennta”* [The project “Cultural mechanisms of community formation”]. *Ukrainskyi Katolytskyi Universytet. Data zvernennia, 27.06.2023*. URL: <https://culture.ucu.edu.ua/proyekty/kulturni-mekhanizmy-spilnototvorennta/>. [in Ukrainian]

Richnyi zvit. (2018). *Richnyi zvit* [Annual report]. *Ukrainskyi kulturnyi fond*. URL: <https://ucf.in.ua/storage/docs/21012019/202018.pdf>. [in Ukrainian]

Richnyi zvit. (2019). *Richnyi zvit* [Annual report]. *Ukrainskyi kulturnyi fond*. URL: <https://ucf.in.ua/storage/docs/14022020/202019.pdf>. [in Ukrainian]

Richnyi zvit. (2020). *Richnyi zvit* [Annual report]. *Ukrainskyi kulturnyi fond*. URL: https://ucf.in.ua/storage/docs/07092021/USF%20Print%20A5_c796812a8e272a6f7d8f1a8124ce6dbdfead0c60.pdf. [in Ukrainian]

Richnyi zvit. (2021). Richnyi zvit [Annual report]. *Ukrainskyi kulturnyi fond*. URL: <https://ucf.in.ua/storage/docs/24042023/%2020218f558e2ac17.pdf>. [in Ukrainian]

Rishniak, O. (2022). Kulturna spadshchyna u voiennomu konflikti: mizhnarodnyi dosvid druhoi polovyny XX – pochatku XXI st. ta ukrainska diisnist [Cultural Heritage in a Military Conflict: International Experience of the Second Half of the Twentieth – the Beginning of the Twenty-First Centuries and the Ukrainian Present Time]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal – Ukrainian Historical Journal*, 4, 159–173. [in Ukrainian]

Savivaldybių. (2021). Savivaldybių veiklos kultūros paveldo apsaugos srityje 2020 m. Analizė [Activities of municipalities in the field of cultural heritage protection in 2020. Analysis]. *Valstybinė kultūros paveldo komisija*. URL: <https://www.kulturostyrimai.lt/uncategorized/savivaldybiu-veiklos-kulturos-paveldo-apsaugos-srityje-2020-m-analize/>. [in Lithuanian]

Sirutavičius, V. (2017). On the Polish National and Territorial Autonomy in Lithuania (the Spring–Summer of 1991). *Studia z Dziejów Rosji i Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, LII-SI (1)*, 163–195. [in English]

Sovietų. (2016). Sovietų Lietuvos švietimas: kaip buvo kuriama komunistinė sąmonė [Education in Soviet Lithuania: how communist consciousness was created]. *Lrytas.Lt*, 2016-08-08. URL: <https://www.lrytas.lt/kultura/istorija/2016/08/08/news/sovietu-lietuvos-svietimas-kaip-buvo-kuriama-komunistine-samone-1196295>. [in Lithuanian]

Tykhonenko, Yu. (2020). Rozvytok ukrainskoho etnoturyzmu: problemy ta perspektyvy [Development of Ukrainian ethnotourism: problems and prospects]. *Materials of the XI International scientific and practical conference “Tourist and hotel and restaurant business in Ukraine: problems of development and regulation” (March 19–20, 2020, Kyiv)*, (in 2 vols., vol. 2, pp. 405–407). Cherkasy: ChDTU. [in Ukrainian]

Tyvodar, M. (2004). *Etnolohiia: Navchalnyi posibnyk* [Ethnology: Study guide]. Lviv: Svit. [in Ukrainian]

Ukrainskyi kulturnyi fond. (2023a). *Ukrainskyi kulturnyi fond. Kultura. Rehiony. LOT 1. Lokalna kultura* [Ukrainian Cultural Fund. Culture. Regions. LOT 1. Local culture]. URL: https://ucf.in.ua/m_lots/63c95ee3e541706d0c482724. [in Ukrainian]

Ukrainskyi kulturnyi fond. (2023b). *Ukrainskyi kulturnyi fond. Kultura. Rehiony. LOT 2. Kultura korinnykh narodiv ta unikalni etnichni kultury Pryazov'ia i Prychornomor'ia* [Ukrainian Cultural Fund. Culture. Regions. LOT 2. Culture of indigenous peoples and unique ethnic cultures of the Azov and Black Sea regions]. URL: https://ucf.in.ua/m_lots/63c960c814e97c554774b2d5. [in Ukrainian]

Ukrainskyi kulturnyi fond. (2023c). *Ukrainskyi kulturnyi fond. Kultura. Rehiony* [Ukrainian Cultural Fund. Culture. Regions]. URL: https://ucf.in.ua/m_programs/63c95a6bde873529294ebbea. [in Ukrainian]

Vysheslavskiy, H. (2020). *Contemporary art Ukrainy – vid andehrandu do meinstrimu* [Contemporary Art of Ukraine – From the Underground to the Mainstream]. Kyiv: IPSM NAM Ukrainy. [in Ukrainian]

Yak rozvyvaty. (2020). *Yak rozvyvaty kulturu v hromadakh: mozhlyvosti, resursy, vyklyky* [How to develop culture in communities: opportunities, resources, challenges]. URL: <https://decentralization.gov.ua/news/12801>. [in Ukrainian]

Yarmolenko, M. (2013). Movna polityka v URSS u 40–80-kh rokakh XX stolittia [Language policy in the Ukrainian SSR in the 40s – 80s of the 20th century]. *Naukovi zapysky Instytutu politychnykh i etnonatsionalnykh doslidzhen im. I.F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy. Spetsialnyi vypusk – Scientific Notes of the I.F. Kurasa Institute of Political and Ethnonational Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine*, 3, 365–377. [in Ukrainian]

Yefimenko, H. (2003). Natsionalno-kulturna polityka yak ody z osnovnykh zasobiv modernizatsii radianskoho suspilstva u 1920 – 1930-ti roky [National and Cultural Policy as One of the Main Means of Modernization of Soviet Society in the 1920s and 1930s.]. *Problemy istorii Ukrainy: fakty, sudzhennia, poshuky – Problems of the History of Ukraine: facts, judgments, searches*, 9, 251–278. [in Ukrainian]

The article was received April 25, 2023.
Article recommended for publishing 14/11/2023.