



Journal  
of Danubian  
Studies  
and Research

## **A Cultural Approach to the Interaction of Culture and War and its Impact on Socio- Cultural Processes in Ukraine**

**Bukhnieva Olena<sup>1</sup>**

**Abstract:** The article analyzes the content of state cultural policy, outlines its goals and objectives, which are determined by socio-economic, political, historical and other features of the development of Ukrainian society. The article examines the relevance of modern problems in the parameters of the interaction of culture and war. In the conditions of the introduction of innovative technologies in all spheres of human life, including the military, this problem has become especially important for the fate of all people of the earth. It has been proven that along with the philosophical and sociological approach, cultural analysis plays a significant role in revealing the actual issues of the essence, causes, nature and role of wars, the regularities of their course and outcome. Cultural studies, acting as the methodological basis of research, allows for a deeper understanding of social life and the phenomena that occur in it.

**Keywords:** cultural policy; culture; war; interaction paradigm; the cultural approach

### **Introduction**

Any armed conflict, and even more so war, causes enormous damage to the cultural environment. Historical monuments, museums, libraries, theaters, universities and scientific centers are being destroyed. In the topic “Culture and war” it is possible to single out a fundamental aspect related to the question of the cultural environment and cultural context in which violent conflict arises and takes place. Every conflict is generated by at least two parties in the case of interstate and intergroup conflicts, including wars. If the conflict is structured along the lines of “group versus state”, which is the nature of almost all internal conflicts, especially separatist wars, then two socio-cultural environments are involved in the conflict. One is the culture of

---

<sup>1</sup> PhD, Associate Professor, Izmail State University of Humanities, Ukraine, Address: Repina St, 12, Izmail, Odessa Region, 68601, Ukraine, Tel.: +38 0633445977, Corresponding author: bukhniewaolena@gmail.com.

the local community, on whose behalf and in which the initiators of armed separatism act and where the drama of the conflict usually unfolds. The second is the environment of the dominant society, i.e. the socio-cultural environment of the entire state on whose behalf conscription is carried out, including the use of armed force against supporters of clear secession.

In the case of an intra-state conflict of a separatist nature, the culture of the rebellious region, although distinct, is nevertheless a part of the general cultural environment of the state. For example, the culture of Catalonia, with all its uniqueness, is part of the general Spanish culture, and these two environments will never be able to divide the artist Pablo Picasso - a native of Barcelona, because he simultaneously belongs to both cultural environments and is part of both Catalan and, more broadly, Spanish culture (And France can also put forward its share of claims to his work). Violence is present in all past cultures, as is the experience of peaceful interaction. Depending on the desire and political attitude, one can extract from this experience and use as a modern argument either the fact that real Japanese (Swiss, etc.) cannot live without a weapon - a samurai sword (gun or pistol), or the fact that the Japanese profess the most peaceful religion and ethics of life, and the Swiss have not been at war with anyone for the last two hundred years (Kovach, 2008).

Another fundamental problem of the theme “Culture and war” is the role of culture in the process of restoring peaceful life. No power, economic and social measures will be sufficient to solve this task, unless efforts are made to restore the cultural sphere. Artistic creativity and other forms of cultural activity have one of the most important properties that cannot replace any political or other measures. It is about healing the trauma of war through the world of imaginary life, through stage creativity and theatrical play, through picturesque canvases and musical works of art, which are able to bridge the gap between the realities of war with its cruelty and the realities of peaceful existence with its peace.

Works of art (paintings, literature, music, etc.) are important for a comprehensive consideration of issues of war and peace. Artistic culture greatly influences the education of people with high moral, patriotic, political and other qualities.

The question of the role of wars has always been in the center of attention of many thinkers of the past. Thus, the progressive Chinese philosopher Mo-Tzu believed that “wars bring social evil, because they destroy the most valuable thing in society - people” (Kovach, 2008).

Some scientists confirm the leading role of war in the development of science. Thus, the American economist Lionel Edis talks about “scientific discoveries that war gives birth to...” Within two or three years, he believes, “you will achieve the same scientific progress in the country that can be achieved usually in 40-50 years”.

Others see war as the main source of spiritual wealth for mankind. Thus, according to Butul, war is the “mother of literature”, because only war inspired the first epic poems and folk songs that reflect organized power. War is the source of any lyricism. As for the world, it “appears in the clothes of a poor relative”, which does not give us glory (Kravchenro, 2014).

Metaphysically thinking authors regard war as the cause of high moral qualities of people. The Austrian sociologist V. Kraus writes that the absence of wars “leads to the accumulation of reserves of aggressiveness in young people”, to the loss of moral values, to the growth of negative phenomena, to the birth of selfishness, private interest, to the forgetting of public debt.

Thus, the cultural approach to the interaction of war and culture, their impact on all socio-cultural processes, makes it possible to objectively assess the role of each subject of social development in strengthening the world. In addition, these provisions contribute to the development of the strategy and tactics of states in important issues of war and peace for all mankind, and are a powerful factor in unifying broad peace-loving forces.

The institution of culture and its subjects change in reality, and not within the framework of theoretical approaches and models. During the transformational transition, the sphere of culture was not considered a strategic development priority. And only relatively recently, state authorities have come to realize the role of culture in the development of society. Today, culture is elevated to the rank of national priorities and is recognized as the most important factor in the growth of the quality of life and the harmonization of social relations, the guarantor of the preservation of a single cultural space and territorial integrity of Ukraine, and cultural and humanitarian development is considered an important direction of state cultural policy.

The development of the “war-culture” dichotomy originated a long time ago and existed together with the development of humanity. Humanity has always been either in a state of war, or in preparation for it, or before the restoration of its economy after it. That is, war as an aspect firmly inscribed in culture has never been discharged

from people's consciousness. The very fact of the war was a fact of the worldview, for which they were preparing and for which they were always waiting.

If we look at war in historical retrospect, then it appears as an extremely multipolar phenomenon, often fatalistic, originating from higher forces, and man has participated in it in different ways, most often losing it before entering it. That is, at first people were not considered as a real military force that could contribute something significant to it (Lyapina, 2018).

If we translate these axioms into mythology, then we can clearly see that the causes of wars in mythology appear as a situation created by the gods, in which people do not appear to be something worthy of attention.

In ancient mythology, only two wars are described - the Trojan war and the war "Seven against Thebes". The Trojan War is celebrated in an extremely large number of poems, its phraseology has become rhetorical, the expression "Trojan horse" is a well-known symbol of betrayal and treachery, etc. how mankind all the time waged wars, whose merits were very bright, military experience was gained, soldiers participated not only in battles, but also in endless training for them, which led to the need to rethink the essence of war and remove it only from under the divine right hand, people began to understand that it is their experience, knowledge and efforts that have their own value. This moment can be considered as somewhat revolutionary, which created cultural and anthropological views about war.

Nevertheless, the divine origin of wars was so firmly established in the minds of people that it was extremely difficult to transfer its vector to other positions. This was explained by the fact that each religion had its god of war, monotheistic religions had angels of war who constantly fought against the angels of darkness, involving people in these processes.

Therefore, at first, philosophical and anthropological theories were, of course, full of references to heavenly forces (Khryashchevska, 2016).

However, the development of military practice required the systematization and analysis of military experience, understanding the essence and uniqueness of military campaigns and, accordingly, the actions that would be most appropriate in them, which naturally covered the boundaries of mythologies and religions.

Moreover, people began to understand what exactly they were fighting for, and the first understanding of the war for the Motherland became very acute. Symbolization, as a purely cultural component, overlapped many divine positions, which in any case

were very abstract, and Motherland - Fatherland - extremely concrete. Enemies are specific entities from which you need to fight back your land - the Motherland. And very often this was achieved by the skill of the commander and the personal bravery and courage of the soldiers.

Thus, the cultural and anthropological component became more and more close to man and became the central focus of the entire war or a specific battle.

Human experience showed its own value in the process of warfare. Therefore, first in philosophy, the search for the meaningful features of war began, the so-called "limit of things" was sought here, which could help people evaluate war comprehensively and, at the same time, solve the main task: whether a person can do without it or not. As a result, hypothetical constructions were built based on the main philosophical ideas - dialectics, the unity of the world, knowledge as the essence of things, and others.

At the same time, people began to understand the integrity of their lives and many parameters that depended on the decision of the target positions of the war. Theoretical views of the war constantly multiplied and entered into rivalry with each other. Moreover, the understanding of war became more and more complicated, leading to a new paradigm of complication that was carried out faster than allowed.

This resulted from several positions: the anthropology of war had to first reflect the anthropological status of war and separate it from the mythological and religious one. Although it is still very difficult to do this. There are a number of professions in which it is rather difficult to clearly assume the finale (doctors, military, representatives of extreme professions, etc.), all of whom make a prayer before their actions, putting themselves in the hands of the Most High and calling to themselves greater forces, weeks those who they really have. It is obvious that this fact of surrendering oneself to God's hands will be in demand by humanity for a long time to come.

Therefore, in this case, philosophy turned to positions, the first of which was based on the derivation of the meaning of war from knowledge obtained through experience, the second was built on the basis of understanding and development of hypotheses that absolutized the meaning of war, built on the awareness of war as the factual basis of the world structure, which included himself and a number of irrational moments.

In this case, the very fact of understanding the “limits of things”, on the one hand, based on real experience, and on the other hand, going far beyond it, initially disturbed the balance of these two positions.

Philosophical content as a result emphasized experience and hypothesis, which viewed the war itself differently.

Research interpretation considered the war as a phenomenon related to and dependent on various social aspects of politics, economy, ethnic, religious reasons, etc.

The hypothetical interpretation was aimed at researching the fact of the purpose of the war, how exactly it will arise, how it will be formed, how it will develop, etc.

The ambivalence of these positions increasingly deepened the differences between the semantic reality and virtuality, which were constantly changing on the basis of the hypothetical philosophical consideration of futurology of the world.

Simultaneously with these positions, philosophy reached an understanding of the connection in the war of personal and social experiences, which were supposed to be coordinated, but it was not always possible to build precisely. Moreover, moments of inconsistency during the wars were evident.

Therefore, philosophical axiology was quite naturally connected to philosophical epistemology, which studied the meaning of war, which is studied to study the experience of wars, to reveal its significance for social ontology, virtuality revealed the significance of war from a futurological perspective, revealed its purpose.

Therefore, the correlation of war with other phenomena follows from the fact that the value of war far exceeds its intrinsic value: war is not valuable in itself, and therefore there is no point in looking for meaning in itself. Semantic origins are important in the refraction of war and other significant (for humanity, society, nature) phenomena. Therefore, in order to build philosophical interpretations, it is necessary to build a hierarchy of significant relations with the surrounding phenomena, which can become a platform for their interpretations (Reznikova, 2011).

These aspects create three approaches to the relationship between war and culture, within which the phenomena of socio-natural positions are embedded: ontological, axiological and praxeological.

The ontological interactions of war and culture are expressed in the fact that war is perceived as part of culture and is perceived as a given outside of value categories. In this case, it is a certain part of being, for which everyone needs to be prepared morally, and for soldiers, professionally. Actually, the very dimension of military activity and the phenomenon of war consists in the fact that the presented analysis appears in an ambivalent (at least) form: 1) “the fact of war is a fact of culture” (in a more radical version - the content of culture) and 2) war is a phenomenon of cultural historical, the change of which is most expedient to study by studying the patterns of cultural and historical development in combination with ethnic and social features. The dominant relations of the “war-culture” dichotomy is usually viewed from a negative point of view, represented by one-sided views, since, as noted earlier, war, in particular, affects culture as a trigger for development.

The axiology of the relationship “war - culture” is considered from the standpoint of what war brings to society and culture, being transformed, including through the feelings of a specific person. Here the opinion was established that war can have a positive effect on culture, if its consequences have become significant in a positive way for society in general. States, social and ethnic strata gained freedom, integrity of being and the right to self-determination. In this view, there is a discrepancy between the social and the personal, where the latter is recognized as secondary, since society establishes its hierarchies. The European tradition since the time of Aristotle notes: “Even if the good for one person is the same as for the state, the good of the state, its achievement and preservation, is still more important and more complete. It is desirable to understand, and (the good) of one person, but even more beautiful is the divine good of the people and the state.” Therefore, personal views on the relationship “war - culture” become irrelevant (Reznikova, 2011).

The praxeology of “war-culture” interaction appears, as a rule, in the establishment of “good work” during the conduct of war (military tactics and strategy, organization and orderliness of work in the rear, etc.), and after its end, when society and culture must effectively and quickly enough to repair the damage caused, create new values, fill the gaps caused by the war. Usually, in this case, all social institutions of culture come into play - politics, economy, art, science, religion mainly as practically transforming structures.

Politics develops diplomacy, which must solve the question of the inadmissibility of the next war for as long as possible, economics transforms the flows less affected by the war and directs them to the more affected. Science uses numerous military experiences as a basis for the development of multiple scientific technologies. It can

be said that the militarization of science gave society many discoveries and objects of use.

Art implements military themes extremely actively. For her, the military orientation is an opportunity to glorify heroes, to educate the younger generation in these high standards, and to create patriotic attitudes in society.

Religion teaches people to strengthen their spirit by enduring suffering, to live on, not complaining about fate, but accepting what happened.

The change in interactions of the “war - culture” paradigm emphasizes the fact that new cultural forms of these parameters have appeared in modern times. The paradigm of interactions has changed qualitatively, becoming the culture of war and the culture of peace. The basis of the war was the confrontation and dissimilarity of cultures.

World culture acquires deep meanings as a long-term (eternal) cultural strategy of society. Its main task is to identify the possibilities of culture in maintaining a lasting world. This is connected with multiple problems, including the fact that the outbreak of war (especially a world war) can lead not only to the death of humanity, but also to the death of the Earth as the Planetary Logos. It is these fears that shape the concept of a cultural transition from war to peace, and humanity has a real opportunity to realize this by replacing the traditional form of culture of war with a new form of culture of peace.

The new form of “world culture” is based on multiple approaches to the study of society itself, its ethnic, cultural, military, political, economic, and other forms of existence, carried out by various social institutions, and, at the same time, an in-depth study of the traditional form of “war culture”, since a straightforward her objection (“there should be no war!”), without an analysis of cause-and-effect relationships, cannot solve the problem fundamentally.

The very fact of denying war in principle, which was characteristic of positivist pacifism, took other forms. If at first pacifism, denying war, did not offer any methods and strategies for ensuring and maintaining peace, now it has overcome these one-sidedness. The world itself sets itself other tasks. Major world organizations advocate the support and development of the world, a society “without violence” (Lyapina, 2018).

Within the culture of the world, a consistent practice of war prevention is carried out by involving in this process all possible means: the creation and distribution of peace



communiqués, negotiations, the formation of a positive worldview, peaceful ideology, globalization of culture, inculturation of social processes, multiple tourist, professional and educational migrations, allows to some extent remove internal conflicts of ethnocultures. This leads to the formation of a more global task: “a world without violence”, which in principle transforms (or sets such a task) the development of society and culture in the vector of linear removal of war from the life of culture. In this case, the cyclicity (in a more radical version - constancy in various forms) of wars should leave the world arena, and its place in culture should be taken by other peaceful forms of individual self-realization. Culture currently offers many options that can replace the need for the existence of war-aggression in the individual (Khryashchevska, 2016).

Strength and extreme sports, extreme travel and much more can be considered as such, which allows a person with similar needs to experience the entire fireworks of emotional upheavals that allow maximum self-expression.

At the same time, the culture of war is improving. It acquires powerful branched, in-depth and analytical forms. Moreover, the connections between these forms have not yet weakened, the culture of war has not lost its vitality.

The culture of war for an extremely long time “fed” the culture of the world, it is firmly inscribed in the culture itself, rooted in it and became an integral part of it. As already noted earlier, society is permeated with a culture of presence, which has become the vitality of war itself and its consideration as a necessity.

As a result, the culture of war formed is a complex cultural education, closely related to all peaceful constructions of culture. Moreover, war is perceived as a state-supported structure, where the latter in the form of war is considered to reshape the existing order. “Those who disturb the world in which they are,” said Aurelius Augustine, “do not hate the world, but wish to change it according to their will. They do not want that there should be no peace, but that it be as he wants it to be” (Khryashchevska, 2016).

Recognizing the state nature of war, the philosophy of war does not have a clearly defined center, but asserts a completely rigid orientation of its practice. Moreover, it unequivocally emphasizes that man himself is genetically oriented to war and, if he falls into the elements of war, then all the efforts of culture simply fall apart.

The ideology of war culture is realism. He expresses the nature of contradictions in the relations of states to the fact of wars. Moreover, it blocks those of them that can destroy humanity. At the same time, it stimulates the development of various tactical

military practices (development of new weapons, application of new strategies, application of psychological forms, etc.)

The culture of war constantly adapts to the new realities of the life of society and culture, where the latter with its own development stimulates the development of the culture of wars, at least its constant transformation. Wars do not repeat themselves.

Cultural and psychological forms of military suppression of the enemy are gaining prominence today. One of the clear indicators of this is the Cold War. This type of war has symbolic violence aimed at symbolizing the power of another state, undermining the ethnic and spiritual foundations, cultural values of the opposing state, etc. which strike the enemy with a carefully formed fear of him.

The second difference between new types of war is their localization. Acting as a consequence of the prohibition of world wars - their local forms occur quickly, punctually, but in terms of percentage, the number of people killed in them over the past decades can be compared with the figures of losses in the Second World War. E. Toffler gives the following figures: in the second half of the 20th century, there were about 160 local wars and armed conflicts with the death of 7 million 200 thousand soldiers, which can be compared with the losses in the First World War, when approximately 8 million 400 thousand soldiers were killed. Adding to them the number of victims of the civilian population, we increase the indicators by orders of magnitude - from 33 to 44 million (according to various calculations).

The next form of war is terrorist war. This is a kind of ancient archaism, considered as modern barbarism. A military professional today is trained in the skills of a terrorist fighter who can effectively affect enemy forces. Terrorist acts can extremely effectively and quickly solve the complex tasks of suppressing the enemy and creating fear in the opposing party.

Street or social wars are adjacent to these positions. The rioting citizens draw a gap in them and the streets becomes battlefields. This kind of war also blurs the lines between the state of war and the state of the world, as the situation matures into a war of all against all, building upon the archaic forms of interactions genetically embedded in humans (Reznikova, 2011).

These are “urban” forms of violence that have become a substitute for traditional war, which strengthen the ties between the cultures of the world and war. As a result, the influence of culture on wars and the performance of its functions is clearly outlined, but it is obvious that it will take a long time for the world to completely replace war.

The Government of Ukraine should develop and implement a system of measures to restructure the operation of the country's cultural and educational institutions on a military basis, detailed recommendations should be submitted to local authorities regarding the organization of patriotic activities of schools, libraries and museums in new conditions. Difficult military conditions dictate the need for libraries to transition to new forms of working with readers.

The main directions and forms of work of library institutions are informational and campaigning work (reports, exhibitions, posters); organization of mobile traveling exhibitions in hospitals, at conscription points, at enterprises; compiling a recommended bibliography; reference work with the reader; scientific and bibliographic work; work on providing assistance to the city and region.

The ideological work of cultural institutions, the main task of which was to explain to citizens the nature and goals of the war, is put forward. The topic of war should become a key theme in the work of theaters, museums, and libraries. At the same time, the theater repertoire must include productions dedicated to the current moment. Institutions of culture are one of the most effective tools of ideological influence on people's minds, thereby providing invaluable assistance in solving wartime tasks. The activities of public cultural institutions during the war period are distinguished by patriotism, citizenship and a powerful ideological context aimed at exposing the Nazi aggressor, strengthening the spirit of the Ukrainian people and their belief in victory.

Creative collectives of culture houses and clubs should create agitation brigades, conduct agitation events and concert programs directly at production sites, in hospitals and places of military unit reformation. The coverage of the population by propaganda and educational work by institutions of mass culture will increase many times compared to the peace period.

Adaptation to work in new conditions should become a necessity for theaters, which need to change the mode of operation, structure, approaches to financial support of activities, adjust the content of creative plans in view of the state of war in our country.

The main and most important task of all creative workers of culture, all enterprises and art institutions of our country is to give all their strength to the defense of our homeland, to help the cause of mobilizing the entire people for the war against the occupiers, to contribute to increasing labor productivity, strengthening the discipline and organization of the population of our country.

The great goal - victory over the enemy - influenced the content of all political decisions, in particular in the sphere of state cultural policy. During the war, the importance of specific people, their talent, and uniqueness are relegated to the background. People are used as a resource to solve wartime tasks.

## References

*Khryashchevska L. (2016). National-cultural associations as a manifestation of national revival and development of ethnic minorities in the 90s of the 20th century/ Національно-культурні об'єднання як прояв національного відродження та розвитку етнічних меншин в 90-х роках ХХ століття. Миколаїв: Молодий вчений, № 1 (28), ч. 2, pp. 16–20.*

*Kovach L. (2008). National and cultural societies of Ukraine: current state and problems of development/ Національно-культурні товариства України: сучасний стан та проблеми розвитку. Київ: Наукові записки Інституту політичних і етнонаціональних досліджень ім. І.Ф. Кураса НАН України, No. 40, pp. 97-107.*

*Kravchenro O. (2014). Conceptual models of identification of the national and cultural space of Ukraine in modern public intellectual discourse/ Концептуальні моделі ідентифікації національно-культурного простору України в сучасному публічному інтелектуальному дискурсі. Київ: Культура України: збірник наукових праць, Вип. 47, pp. 13-23.*

*Lyapina L. (2018). Multiculturalism as a strategy of intercultural interaction: modern socio-humanitarian discourse/ Мультикультуралізм як стратегія міжкультурної взаємодії: сучасний соціогуманітарний дискурс. Соціальні технології: актуальні проблеми теорії та практики. Вип. 79. Опубліковано. <http://soctech-journal.kpu.zp.ua/archive/2018/79/23.pdf>.*

*Reznikova Ya. (2011). The activity of national and cultural associations of Odesa as a factor of good neighborliness. Historical traditions of good neighborliness of Odesa / Діяльність національно-культурних товариств Одещини як чинник добросусідства. Одеса: Історичні традиції добросусідства Одещини, pp. 136–159.*