

## **CULTURAL POLICY OF UNDEMOCRATIC COUNTRIES NOWADAYS: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STATE AND PRIVATE SECTORS**

*Mg.hist., Mg.art.* **Ojārs Stepens**

### **Abstract**

The purpose of the article is tackling the hallmarks of the undemocratic regimes in Europe nowadays, mainly focusing on the interaction between state and private sectors in cultural sphere. Although in today's Europe most countries are regarded as democratic, in some of them still exist political regimes not meeting requirements of democracy – they are the so-called managed democracy regimes. According to the typology of cultural policy provided in 1989 by Hillman-Chartand and MacCaughey, managed democracy regimes integrate elements characteristic to Architect and Engineer cultural policy models. According to these models, state institutions predominate in administration of the cultural sphere. Resources provided by cultural sphere are systematically used for achieving ideological, propaganda and political goals of managed democracy regimes. This process involves not only state institutions but also private actors and NGOs in cultural sphere. In order to gain control over private sector as well the regimes apply diverse strategies of merging state and private sectors (public and professional organisations controlled by the government, financial assignments controlled by the government such as foundations, state budget assignments etc.). As a result, the ideological control and censorship by the state affect both state and private sectors, both actively contributing to achieving political goals and propaganda activities of the regime.

**Keywords:** *state, culture, cultural policy, managed democracy.*

### **Discussion**

The purpose of the article is tackling the hallmarks of the undemocratic regimes in Europe nowadays, mainly focusing on the interaction between state and private sectors in cultural sphere.

Although nowadays in Europe most countries are regarded as democratic, in some of them still exist political regimes not meeting requirements of democracy. One of the most common approaches to identifying such regimes is the so-called managed democracy theory. It suggests that it is difficult to establish strong totalitarian regimes (such as, for instance, is the totalitarian regime of the North Korea) in today's Europe, but there are countries where the development of democratic institutions is restricted in favour of authoritarian tendencies. Such regimes shall be characterized by use of pseudo-democratic institutions (election, parliament, multi-party system etc.) for legitimating the supremacy of the regime [Wolin 2008, 131–159]. These regimes also create and apply diverse mechanisms for controlling the society (ideology, propaganda and censorship). Regimes of this type can be observed in the following European countries: Yugoslavia (1989–2000), Slovakia (1993–1998), Belarus (since 1994) and Russia (since 1999).

Relevant tendencies of development can be observed also in the field of cultural policy of countries with managed democracy regimes, and they particularly affect the relationship between state and private sectors in cultural sphere.

Research on the above-mentioned issues as well as the development of theoretical and methodological approaches has been launched already in the 1920s–1930s as sociologists and cultural theorists attempted to analyse the emerging totalitarian regimes, incoherent with the model of Western democracies. Referring to recent research practices, I would like to mention the analysis of the Nazi cultural policy provided by the American sociologist George Mosse [Mosse 2003] and studies by the Russian scholar Igor Golomshtok (Голомшток) analysing the cultural policy of the Soviet regime [Голомшток 1994]. Maria Davydchuk from Robert Bosch Research Center has elaborated a comparative analysis of the impact of the state to the cultural policies of today's Ukraine, Russia and Poland. Linking historical experience with actual developments, Davydchuk concludes that cultural policies in these countries are still affected by the tendencies of Soviet mechanisms for regulating cultural sphere [Davydchuk 2010, 45–48]. In relation with the today's cultural policy in Russia as one of referential studies shall be mentioned the report on the political development of today's Russia elaborated by Alfred Evans from the Pittsburgh University, representing the cultural policy of Russia as characteristic to an authoritarian regime [Evans 2008 18–23]. Among others, the report on the development of the political culture in today's Eastern Europe composed by Hans Dietrich Klingermann, Dieter Fuchs and Jan Zielonka shall be mentioned [Klingermann, Fuchs, Zielonka 2006], as well as the recent study by Klaus von Beyme, the professor of political science emeritus at the Heidelberg University, covering aspects of cultural policies and political culture [Beyme 2014].

Referring to the methodological framework of the study, I would like to note that the submitted article has been based on a more comprehensive research project contributing to the analysis of the cultural policy in today's Russia involving a multidisciplinary scope grounded in political science, history and cultural studies. Consequently, among the applied methods comparative analysis, institutional analysis and cultural analysis shall be noted, characteristic to political science but also attributed to cultural studies based analysis. The comparative analysis provides comparing alike phenomena occurring in diverse backgrounds (countries, communities etc.) in order to determine their similarities and differences [Collier 1993, 105–118]. The institutional analysis method concerns societal organisations such as state apparatus, political movements and other institutions regulating social processes [Peters 2000, 1–18]. Cultural analysis is applied in order to analyse correlations between societies and relevant social processes [Ross 2009]. Taking into account that the study concerns Latvia's foreign relations, approaches based on studies of international relations have been tackled, such as the insight into relationship building through the development of ideas, collective values, culture, social structures and identities as provided by the constructivist theory according to the works by Nicolas Onuf [Onuf 1997] and Emanuel Adler [Adler 1997, 321–338].

The main focus in further analysis is set on two European countries of most typical managed democracy regimes – Russia and Belarus. It is also important to mention that these countries are neighbouring with Latvia and cultural relations between Latvia and these countries are always a topical issue for Latvia. Furthermore, just after the collapse of the Soviet Union these countries and Latvia were similarly positioned. Nevertheless, in the future political, economic and cultural development Latvia chose a development scenario, different from the managed democracy countries. Therefore, it is necessary to analyse the cultural policy type of these countries as well as the state and private sector relationship model in their cultural sphere in order to develop successful culture cooperation with them.

### **State cultural policy models and their relationship with political regimes**

Since the 1980s cultural theorists and cultural management researchers have developed several typologies of state cultural policy models. One of the criteria significant for their distinction is relationship between cultural sphere and state institutions. In this context as a typical example can be mentioned the typology offered in 1987 by cultural management researchers Milton Cummings and Richard Katz, which divides state cultural policies into the following models: pure panel, bureaucrat with advice, pure bureaucratic. The same authors offered another approach to division of state cultural policies in 1989 by suggesting the following

models: the government as patron, the government as market manipulator, the government as a regulator of cultural sphere, or the government acting as impresario. Another typology taking into account the state influence on the cultural sphere was provided by Kevin Mulcahy in 1998: the government as designer, the government as benefactor, the government as manager, the government as enabler. In 2003 Margaret Wyszomirski from the University of Ohio offered another typology: the government can serve as an entrepreneur, advocate or a think-tank provider [IFACCA D'Art Report No. 9, 31].

As a relevant source for the study I would also like to mention the theory of four models of cultural economics provided in 2008 by Steward Cunningham and Jason Potts. The theory focuses on the integration of the creative industries into the overall economic development [Cunningham, Potts 2008]. However, as the theory does not offer an analysis of the political regime of the state and cultural sector, this source has been of secondary importance for the actual research paper.

One of the most elaborated and applied typologies belong to American cultural management researchers Harry Hillman-Chartrand and Claire MacCaughey who have offered the following state cultural policy models: facilitator, patron, architect and engineer [Hillman-Chartrand, MacCaughey 1989]. Therefore, I have focused on the theory suggested by Harry Hillman-Chartrand and Claire MacCaughey elaborated by taking into account the differences between Western democracies and Soviet totalitarianism and its cultural policy, still actual whilst the theory was stated. These differences smoothed out later, however, in such countries as Russia and Belarus totalitarian past continued haunting state and cultural policies. Consequently, this model has served as a basis for the development of the submitted research paper.

Following the facilitator model, the government strives to provide conditions (laws, regulations etc.) that support the development of culture. Still the government avoids direct interfering with the field either by establishing state institutions or by assigning financial resources. This model is characteristic, for example, to the USA and to other countries following the example of the USA. Following the patron model, the government interfere with the organisations in cultural sphere to far larger extent. The state supports outstanding cultural workers, provides some financial support, can create organisations (often shared between the state and public sector) for cultural activities management. This model is characteristic to the UK, Australia and other countries under British influence. The architect model respectively maintains even more pronounced role of the government at the management of cultural sphere. The state establishes special cultural administration institutions (ministries etc.) and sustains a complex structure of regional institutions. The cultural sphere gets financing directly from the state

budget, and the state provides also different additional financial assignments. There exist certain guidelines for development of cultural sphere that can include also ideological directions, this model is characteristic to modern France, Germany, Scandinavian countries etc. [Hillman-Chartrand, MacCaughey 1989].

The above-mentioned models are characteristic to democratic countries. The last one, engineer model characterizes undemocratic regimes. Therefore, it is most relevant to serve as a theoretical background for explaining characteristic features of so-called managed democracy in today's Europe. Following the engineer model, the government directly controls cultural sphere by active and total interfering with the most part of cultural activities. This model also provides that the government drafts explicit and mandatory cultural policy guidelines with particular attention to ideological, propaganda and political motives. Consequently, cultural sphere in this case serves as a medium for state ideology and propaganda. The cultural policy includes clear political tasks addressed towards achieving domestic and foreign policy objectives of the state regime. The cultural policy includes not only supporting diverse mechanisms of state control and finance assignment control, but also repressive mechanisms developed for suppressing oppositional ways of expressing critique towards the regime through cultural sphere. Censorship is also actively applied. According to Hillman-Chartrand and MacCaughey, this cultural policy model has been characteristic to the totalitarian regimes of the 20<sup>th</sup> century in North Korea, China, Cuba and the USSR [Hillman-Chartrand, MacCaughey 1989].

To a certain extent this approach was influenced by the time it was dated back to – the second part of the 1980s brought radical changes on a global level caused by dismantling of the totalitarian Soviet regime under the General Secretary of the Communist Party Mikhail Gorbachev (Горбачев, 1985–1991). These events lead to the decomposition of the Soviet influence in Eastern Europe, giving place to renewal of democratic regimes in the Eastern Block. Therefore, it was necessary both to describe the differences between cultural policies in undemocratic and democratic states and to identify the cultural policy type of the dissolving totalitarianism. However, it shall be noted that the countries mentioned by the authors were not the only samples of the engineer type cultural policy. According to similar principles cultural policies were established also in other totalitarian and authoritarian regimes in Europe of the 1920s–1970s. Characteristic examples are Fascist Italy (1922–1943/45), Nazi Germany (1933–1945) and also the so-called Iberian dictatorships: Spain (1936/39–1975) and Portugal (1932–1974), as well as dictatorship regime in Greece in the 1960s. In this context the authoritarian dictatorship regime in Latvia (1934–1940) also has to be mentioned.

### **Cultural policies of managed democracies: relations between state and private sector in cultural sphere**

The managed democracy regimes of today's Europe carry many features of the engineer model. At the same time, they also represent certain qualities of the architect cultural policy model. The reason for this peculiarity is mostly caused by the presence of private sector in economics and respectively also in cultural sphere. This factor affects the tendency for the regimes to apply cultural policy of a mixed type instead of following one model. This quality marks a similarity with the historical undemocratic regimes such as Nazi Germany and fascist Italy. In these countries during the period of the 1920s–1940s the governing regimes aimed to gain total control over all the areas of social life and developed specific tactical approaches that allowed to control both state and private sectors.

The above-mentioned referred also to the organisation of cultural sphere. The main control mechanism was creating professional cultural institutions ruling the corresponding field and thus responsible for all the representatives of private sector. Another characteristic approach was massive state-assigned financial investments into cultural sphere, leading to the situation where the most part of the actors in the field were dependent on these assignments. Similar control mechanisms are applied also by the managed democracy regimes in Europe nowadays. An important feature in their cultural policy strategies is a tendency to apply the resources provided by cultural sphere for purposes of advocating the regime ideology and propaganda, hence turning the actors of cultural sphere into instrumentalized agents of state policy.

This shall be referred also to the relationship between state and private sectors in cultural sphere. One of the objectives of undemocratic regimes is total control over the field – that can be addressed both to state and private sectors. For this purpose, diverse control and impact mechanisms are developed. In this respect similarities with the historical European totalitarian regimes can be observed. For controlling private sector public institutions and money assignments managed by the regime are applied. Developing close relationship between political and economic elites shall be mentioned as a specific method. That presumes maintaining corruptive political-economic environment where successful entrepreneurship is impossible without political support by the regime. Thus, the so-called oligarchic state capitalism is created where entrepreneurs provide supporting regime ideology and propaganda as service to the state. It also refers to cultural sphere accenting the fact that cultural activities create a fertile environment for ideological and propaganda events.

The aforementioned tendencies in cultural policy are particularly characteristic to such managed democracy regimes as today's Russia and Belarus. Therefore, these

two cases require more detailed analysis. In both cases as a specific characteristic feature in cultural sphere shall be mentioned the – of course preserved to a certain extent only and partially modified – remnants of the cultural administration system created under the Soviet totalitarian regime. The system facilitates state control over the field and serves also as a background for building relationship between state and private actors in the field. Tendency of merging state and private sectors in cultural sphere can be observed in both countries, and the mechanisms are similar as well. Consequently, the main objective of the merger is involving the resources of the field into advocating the regime ideology and propaganda. However, there are also essential differences between both cases.

In the actual cultural policy of Russia several stages of development shall be distinguished. The first lasted from 1991–1999. The period shall be characterized as sustaining a relatively democratic cultural policy, development of private sector within the field as well as self-managed development, at least to some extent. The second stage lasted from 1999–2013, when the managed democracy regime was established in Russia. The period is characterized by gradual consolidation of the state and including the private sector into ideological and political tendencies of the regime. The beginning of the third stage can be dated back with 2014, and it has not ended yet. The period is characterized by strong tendency towards developing an undemocratic regime, manifesting itself also as aggressive foreign policy. In cultural sphere merger of state and private sectors has been nearly completed, therefore private actors of the field are also significantly participating in advocating the regime ideology and propaganda acting under strong political control. As the most essential mechanism serving to merge state and private sectors the government-controlled financial assignments shall be mentioned. This policy is strongly advanced due to such an essential income source as oil and gas export industry controlled by the state and supporting the government at diverse manipulative activities. Oil and gas export industry is administrated under the supervision of such institutions as the National Charity Foundation founded by the President of Russia Vladimir Putin (Путин) in 1999, as well as the Cultural Foundation of Russia supervised by the President, and such institutions as Rossotrudnichestvo aiming to broadcast ideology of Russia state abroad. Moreover, as an example of how private sector is involved in controlling cultural sphere the case of the investment company Interros shall be mentioned. The company was created in 1991 by the oligarch Vladimir Potanin (Потанин). Nowadays its main income sources are oil industry and nickel mining industry Norilsknikel where entrepreneurship is nearly only possible by governmental accept. Simultaneously, the charity institute of the foundation is a significant actor in cultural sphere, as it invests a lot in diverse cultural projects, not accidentally mostly supportive to the ideology and propaganda of the regime

[Интепрес]. This way a chain of influences is created – the government enables private entrepreneurship initiatives in a profitable field and receives the possibility to apply private financial assets for ideological securing. Respective tendencies are observable also in the normative acts referring to the cultural policy of Russia. Guidelines for law drafting in cultural sphere of the Russian federation, which came into force in 1992, provided development of a relatively democratic cultural administration [Основы законодательства Российской Федерации о культуре 1992]. However, the end of this development is marked by the guidelines for cultural policy of Russia approved by the President Vladimir Putin in 2014 that provide for ideologization of cultural sphere according to the interests of the regime [Основы государственной культурной политики 2014].

The situation is different in Belarus. It was one of the first Eastern European countries to create an undemocratic regime in 1994. Compared to, for example, the Baltic States and even the regime in Russia in the 1990s, Belarus had far more explicit tendency to preserve the Soviet totalitarian legacy regarding political, economic and cultural spheres. It provided also preserving former Soviet institutions for cultural administration. It must be mentioned that normative acts of the state and cultural policies of Belarus acknowledge and accentuate positive aspects of this legacy regarding the development of Belarus nowadays [Главные принципы государственной политики Республики Беларусь]. Regarding the organisation of cultural sphere, it means a strong emphasis on the state sector and attempts to restrict private initiatives in the cultural market sphere. In this aspect the regime in Belarus is less democratic than the regime in Russia. Despite that, compared to the Soviet totalitarian period, a functioning private sector has been created in Belarus. So, in order to gain ideological and political control over the private actors, the government of Belarus apply strategies similar to those of the Russian government, in order to support merger of state and private sectors in cultural sphere – such as state controlled administrative institutions, investments etc. As one of the most influential instruments can be mentioned, for example, the Foundation of the President of Belarus. Many cultural projects depend on the financial assets gained from the Foundation. An essential difference from the case of Russia is the tendency not only to control but also lessen private initiatives in cultural sphere. Next, there is present also the tendency that the government not only controls the involvement of the private actors into advocating the state ideology and propaganda, but also interferes directly with market relations. Different methods (for instance, mandatory attendance of cultural events for employees in state sector) are applied to manipulate with the product demand in the field – hence the profit options of private actors do not depend on the quality of their provided cultural product, but on loyalty to the regime instead. In this respect as a significant contribution



can be mentioned the characterization of the cultural policy of Belarus provided by Belarussian cultural theorist Vladimir Mozheiko (*Можейко*): “The specialty of the cultural policy of Belarus is that everything that characterizes an artist: his income level and sources, sociocultural context, artistic theme and social activity, depends on one factor – on his attitude towards the regime. In one or another sense activities of an artist are determined by policy that defines their status and audience. Certainly, it distorts the market, it starts functioning according to its own rules where popularity is not related to talent, but income – with popularity” [*Можейко* 2012].

In general, Russia and Belarus represent a typical managed democracy model. Therefore, the experience of these countries can be used for characterizing the overall tendency. Another factor shall be taken into account. Cultural sphere is one of the most advantageous methods for implementing the so-called public diplomacy or soft power in foreign policies. Certainly, to some extent it is characteristic to many countries, such as the USA, France, Germany etc. However, in the case of managed democracy according to the aggressiveness of the relevant foreign policy, cultural sphere turns into a tool for influencing others. The private sector plays an important role here, as traditionally it is not associated with direct governmental supervision. However, in case of Russia, for example, the tendency is actually the opposite – the government controls the private sector both ideologically and politically in respect to the domestic policy, whereas regarding foreign policy the private sector is used as a propaganda tool. It shall be taken into account by developing cultural relations of Latvia with the countries representing managed democracy regimes.

### Conclusions

According to the typology of cultural policy provided in 1989 by Hillman-Chartand and MacCaughey, managed democracy regimes integrate elements characteristic to architect and engineer cultural policy models. According to these models, state institutions predominate in administration of the cultural sphere. Resources provided by cultural sphere are systematically used for achieving ideological, propaganda and political goals of the managed democracy regimes. This process involves not only state institutions but also private actors and NGOs in cultural sphere. In order to gain control over the private sector as well, the regimes apply diverse strategies of merging state and private sectors (public and professional organisations controlled by the government, financial assignments controlled by the government such as foundations, state budget assignments etc.). As a result, the ideological control and censorship by the state affect both state and private sectors, both actively contributing to achieve political goals and propaganda activities of the regime.

As most significant representatives of managed democracy regimes in Europe nowadays Russia and Belarus shall be mentioned. Both states have developed an undemocratic cultural policy already starting from 1990s. It is characteristic for both of them to apply the resources of cultural sphere for advocating the regime ideology and propaganda. In case of Russia the foreign policy representation of this process is of great importance. Regarding the relationship between the state and private sectors, these countries represent a tendency of maximum governmental control over the private sector. Therefore, strategies of merging both sectors are actively forwarded. As a result, now in both countries successful existence of the private sector is directly dependent on claiming political loyalty to the regime and active cooperation by propagating the regime. It can be referred also to the foreign policy of these states and the component of cultural relations in their foreign policies. Therefore, this tendency of development shall be taken into account while developing cultural relations of Latvia with these states.

### **Sources**

- Adler, E. (1997). Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics. *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 3. Available: <http://www.rochelleterman.com/ir/sites/default/files/adler%201997.pdf> (viewed 11.08.2016.)
- Beyme, K. (2014). *On Political Culture, Cultural Policy, Art and Politics*. Heidelberg: Institut für Politische Wissenschaft Universität Heidelberg.
- Collier, D. (1993). The Comparative Method. In: Finifter, Ada W. (ed.). *Political Science: The State of the Discipline II*. Washington, D.C.: American Political Science Association.
- Cunningham, S., Potts, J. (2008). Four Models of the Creative Industries. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*. Volume 14, Issue 3.
- Davydchik, M. (2010). Kulturpolitik als staatliches und gesellschaftliches Handeln. Eine Vergleichungsanalyse in Russland, Polen und der Ukraine. Staat oder Privat? Akteure und Prozesse zwischen Staaten und Gesellschaften in Osteuropa. *Beiträge für die 18. Tagung Junger Osteuropas-Experten*. Bremen. Forschungsstelle Osteuropa, 2010. Available: <https://www.forschungsstelle.uni-bremen.de/UserFiles/file/06-Publikationen/Arbeitspapiere/fsoap109.pdf> (viewed 30.06.2016.)
- Dubois, V. (2013). Cultural Policy Regimes in Western Europe. Available: <https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-00836422> (viewed 10.10.2016.)
- Evans, A. B. Jr. (2008). Power and Ideology: Vladimir Putin and the Russian Political System. The Center for Russian and East European Studies, a program of the

- University Center for International Studies, University of Pittsburgh. *The Carl Beck Papers*, No. 1902.
- Hillman-Chartrand, H., McCaughey, C. (1989). The arm's length principle and the arts: an international perspective – past, present and future. In: Cummings, M. C., Shuster Davidson, M. (eds.). *Who's to Pay? for the Arts: The International Search for Models of Support*. American Council for the Arts, N.Y.C, 1989. Available: <http://www.compilerpress.ca/Cultural%20Economics/Works/Arm%201%201989.htm> (viewed 24.10.2016.)
- IFACCA D'Art Report No. 9. (2009). *The Independence of Government Arts Funding. A Review*. July 2009. Prepared by C. Madden. D'Art Topics in Art Policy No. 9. Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies. Sydney.
- Klingermann, H. D., Fuchs, D., Zielonka, J. (2006). *Democracy and Political Culture in Eastern Europe*. New York: Routledge.
- Mosse, G. (2003). *Nazi Culture: Intellectual, Cultural and Social Life in the Third Reich*. [Madison]. University of Wisconsin Press.
- Onuf, N. (1997). A Constructivist Manifesto. In: Burch, K.; Denmark, R. A. (ed.). *Constituting International Political Economy*. London.
- Peters, G. B. (2000). Institutional Theory: Problems and Prospects. In: Biegelbauer, P. (ed.). *Reihe Politikwissenschaft / Political Science Series 69*. Vienna: Department of Political Science, Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Rizq, H. *Russia's state cultural policy: Ministry of Truth?* Available: <http://harryrizq.com/> (viewed 29.10.2016.)
- Ross, M. H. (2009). Culture in Comparative Political Analysis. In: *Culture and Structure*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Shlapentokh, V., Arutunyan, A. (2013). *Freedom, Repression, and Private Property in Russia*. Cambridge University Press.
- White, S. (2008). *Media, Culture and Society in Putin's Russia*. New York.
- Wolin, S. S. (2008). *Democracy Incorporated: Managed Democracy and the Specter of Inverted Totalitarianism*. Princeton University Press.
- Главные принципы государственной политики Республики Беларусь. Available: <ps://www.google.lv/search?dcr=0&biw=1024&bih=662&q=Главные+принципы+государственной+политики+Республики+Беларусь&oq=Главные+принципы+государственной+политики+Республики+Беларусь&gs> (viewed 30.10.2016.)
- Голомшток, И. (1994). *Тоталитарное искусство*. Москва. Галарат.
- Интеррос. <http://www.interros.ru>. (viewed 01.11.2016.)

Культура Беларуси. *Беларусь. Факты*. Available: <http://belarusfacts.by/ru/> (viewed 25.20.2016.)

Можейко, В. (2012). Культурная политика Беларуси: на бумаге и в жизни. *Наше Мнение*. 2012. Available: <http://nmnby.eu/news/analytics/4841.html> (viewed 30.10.2016.)

*Основы государственной культурной политики* (Russia, 2014). Available: <http://kremlin.ru/events/administration/21027> (viewed 30.10.2016.)

*Основы законодательства Российской Федерации о культуре (9 октября 1992 года)*. Available: [http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons\\_doc\\_LAW\\_1870/](http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_1870/) (viewed 01.11.2016.)