

3D animators and published to convince masses in something important for a stakeholder.

Freedom of speech is becoming difficult to define. The question can be reformulated «is framing becoming a part of free social problems expressions?». If we assume that public opinion is not framed then comes an antagonism between public opinion and social media companies. In the other case if we consider public opinion biased there is no checks and balances between civil society and state, just the masses depending on the last one.

Concluding, framing nowadays is an important part of information consuming by Post-Soviet citizens. Stakeholders, framing discourse are shaping masses' identity, dividing them, forming official restrictions to make civil society dependant on the state. Framing discourse they are trying to achieve their own interest realisation. Such an order causes destabilisation thus making a threat to the national security system.

At the same time framing is becoming the capacity of everyone today. The mechanisms of information presentation are becoming more

well-known and used not only by elites, but also by public activists and bloggers. Although «framing» is considered a new, non-researched concept, it influences both social sphere of Post-Soviet Space and national security policymaking.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Бурдьє П. Политическое представление. Элементы теории политического поля [Электронный ресурс] / П. Бурдьє. - Режим доступа: <http://bourdieu.name/content/politicheskoe-predstavlenie-elementy-teorii-politicheskogo-polja>.
2. Baker R. J. Mind over matter: why intellectual capital is the chief source of wealth / R.J. Baker. – New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Inc., 2007. – 340 p.
3. Gameson W.A., Modigliani A., The changing culture of affirmative action / W.A. Gameson, A. Modigliani // Research in Political Sociology. – 1987. – Vol.3. – P.137-177.
4. Habermas J. Between Facts and Norms Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy / J. Habermas. – Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1996. – 631 p.
5. Lyotard J.-F. The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge / J.-F. Lyotard. – Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984. – 110 p.

УДК УДК 321

Osadcha Y.

V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University

CULTURAL APPROACH TO ANALYZING STATE BUILDING IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The article examines the characteristics of the cultural approach to describing Middle East politics and the process of state building. Both – advantages and disadvantages of this approach are analyzed. The author states that religion itself cannot be a major factor, which determines the development and internal structure of political institutions as well as the probability of democratization of the Middle Eastern regimes.

Keywords: Middle East, Islam, political culture, democratization, state building.

Осадча Я.Д.

ПОЛІТИКО-КУЛЬТУРНИЙ ПІДХІД ДО АНАЛІЗУ ДЕРЖАВОТВОРЕННЯ НА БЛИЗЬКОМУ СХОДІ

Проаналізовано риси політико-культурного підходу до описання політичного життя та процесу державотворення на Близькому Сході. Описано переваги та недоліки цього аналітичного напрямку. Обґрунтовано неможливість використання релігії як головного аналітичного інструмента під час вивчення розвитку та структури політичних інститутів держав цього регіону. Висловлено сумнів у тому, що іслам є головною перешкодою до демократизації режимів на Близькому Сході.

Ключові слова: Близький Схід, іслам, політична культура, демократизація, державотворення.

Осадчая Я.Д.

ПОЛИТИКО-КУЛЬТУРНЫЙ ПОДХОД К АНАЛИЗУ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОГО СТРОИТЕЛЬСТВА НА БЛИЖНЕМ ВОСТОКЕ

Проанализированы черты политико-культурного подхода к описанию политической жизни и процессу государственного строительства на Ближнем Востоке. Описано преимущества и недостатки этого аналитического направления. Обоснована невозможность использования религии как главного аналитического инструмента в процессе изучения развития и внутреннего строения политических институтов государств данного региона. Выражено сомнение в том, что ислам является главным препятствием для демократизации режимов на Ближнем Востоке.

Ключевые слова: Ближний Восток, ислам, политическая культура, демократизация, государственное строительство.

Analyzing political processes in the Middle East almost inevitably will lead us to include a cultural variable, which is usually reduced to the religion and the role of Islam in the state formation and political life in the region. This is a common approach among the specialists who study this area. However, we argue that it does not take into account the variety of factors that affect the process of state building and state modernization in the Middle East.

The cultural approach in political science was developed in the 1960s by two American political scientists – Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba. Thus, they provided a classical definition of political culture. In their book «The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations» they define political culture as «attitudes toward the political system and its various parts, and attitudes toward the role of the self in the system» [1, p. 13]; «particular distribution of patterns of orientation towards political objects among the members of the nation» [1, p. 14]. Later the dependence of politics on cultural elements (such as rituals, stereotypes, beliefs, attitudes, values, traditions, etc.), was explored by other prominent scientists – Lucian Pye, Walter A. Rosenbaum, Ronald F. Inglehart, Samuel P. Huntington, Lawrence Harrison and others. Cultural approach is widely used to explain political processes in developing countries and the failure of economic modernization and political democratization in these cultural settings.

The political culture of the Arab countries is of interest to such researchers as Gabriel Ben-Dor, Benjamin MacQueen, Mark Tessler, Rex Brynen, David Bukay, David Govrin, Elie Kedourie, Raphael Patai, Philip Salzman, Lawrence Rosen, Bernard Lewis, Steven Fish, Daniela Donno. Bruce Russett, Alfred Stepan, Graeme Robertson, Michael Hudson, Hisham

Sharabi, Brigitte Weiffen, Dale Eickelman, James Piscatori and many others.

When it comes to the Middle East, many scholars tend to emphasize the role of Islam as the primary value system that explains political life in the region. Thus, the majority of researches is directed towards examining the characteristics of religion without taking into account the features of the state as an institution. The attractiveness of this concept can also be explained by the fact that it excludes from consideration the differences between history and economic systems of the Arab countries, conveniently reducing them to one factor. Moreover, it allows separating the Middle East from other developing countries [2, p. 2].

All the existing literature on this issue, Rex Brynen offers to divide into three paradigms - essentialism, contextualism, and criticism. The first perceives culture as an almost primordial characteristic that is intrinsic to the political system and inseparable from it. Thus, culture unites the Middle East into a single cultural complex. It is stronger than any other characteristics, so it determines them. The second approach considers the interdependence between culture and other social subsystems. It argues that culture does not influence politics directly, but rather it acts indirectly through a variety of means. Moreover, there could not be a single culture, but there are different subcultures that have a different impact on politics. To sum up, this approach combines attitudes and political consciousness with physical factors. Alternatively, critics pay attention to institutions and the economy in contrast to the maximization of cultural influence [2, pp. 3-4].

Regarding the analysis of the Arab state, we can distinguish three main statements that accompany it. First, the assumption that Islam is resistant to Western models of political institutions. That means denial of secularism,

democracy, human rights and civil society in general as these institutions do not seem to be compatible with the Muslim religion. Secondly, it is argued that Islam does not accept the Western understanding of statehood. Consequently, modern political institutions cannot take root in these states. Thirdly, attention is drawn to the clannish and tribal social system, which is just incompatible with the modern state [3, p. 27]. This assumption takes us to the theories of state building. Generally, the state was only one of the possible alternatives to different forms of political organization. Thus, its survival depended on the ability to gather social forces around the idea of a state, so clans and tribe contradict this logic and oppose the very idea of a state.

Consequently, Islam is seen as the main obstacle to the political development of the Middle East. Bassam Tibi wrote that the cultural system of Islam is the primary barrier for social change as it is a rigid and reactive system that resists any attempts of Western domination [4]. In this perspective, eastern despotism can be explained through the religious requirement to obey the authority and the Muslim perception of earthly life as a temporary comparing to life after the death. All that leads to the so-called 'political quietism.' Pluralism, human rights, the separation of powers and the rule of law are ideas that are incompatible with absolute divine sovereignty. Moreover, the underdevelopment of civil society and low participation do not allow formulating a clear request for change [5].

Considering the institutional aspect of statehood, it should be noted that the state in the Middle East has always been stronger than civil society. This corresponds to the religious requirement of humility before the authorities and explains the absence of any representative bodies that would conduct a dialogue between government and society [6]. The lack of civil society led to a severe backlog in modernization and democratization of these states [7].

However, the concept of «ummah» that is an interethnic unity of Muslims represents some supra-state civil society. Consequently, hardly is it compatible with the idea of a national state. At the same time, secularism, nationalism, and democracy are being rejected. The state in the Middle East was never determined by nationality or ethnicity. Besides, the tribal forms of political life have been preserved and did not lose their influence. Furthermore, Islam did not manage to develop the concept of sovereignty as it favors «ummah» and religious identity more than other forms of unity [8, pp. 319-321].

At the same time, one cannot say that Muslims share a common view of the state. James P. Piscatori indicates the existence of political conformists and political nonconformists among Muslims [9, p. 40]. He also notes that Islamic political and legal theory does not adequately reflect religious discourse as numerous sources influenced it. Also, these states fully accept territorial pluralism. Moreover, many Islam theorists refer to the state as a natural and primordial institution. The political practice of Arab empires also proves the acceptance of pluralism within the Muslim state.

Indeed, many Muslim theorists abandoned the idea of the state in favor of the umma as another way of unity and integration outside of the state. Consequently, the notion of a modern national state from the very beginning was in conflict with the supranational Islamic community.

When we compare the concept of the Western state with its original incarnation in the Middle East, it is necessary to take into account the blurriness of the very concept of the state. Due to the absence of clear conceptual limitations of this term, the criticism of the Islamic state as backward and rigid seems to be scientifically inaccurate. In addition, when we talk about Islam, we need to take into account the concepts of the imamate and the caliphate as unique ideas, which have no analog in Western political discourse. Caliphate embodies the religious unity of Dar al-Islam, builds on the sharia law and embraces the whole world. The concept if imamate incarnates the idea of the combination of religious and secular power, which is embodied in one person. And this person stands above both – society and the state. However, even within Islam, there appeared various types of nationalism – Egyptian with the idea of the Pharaoh's state, Mediterranean nationalism, Syrian nationalism, Arabic, Lebanese, etc.

Another weakness of the Middle Eastern states can be explained by the fact that the process of state building was mixed with the process of liberalization of political power. Therefore, the compatibility of Islam with the democratic regime was questioned. Moreover, it was a cause for extensive discussions about the reasons of failed democratization.

In addition, the debates about the interaction of state institutions with tribal forms of political life were actualized. Houry and Kostiner define three approaches to the examination of these relationships. First, they can be viewed evolutionarily (tribe becomes a state). Secondly,

one can consider the cohabitation of the state and the tribal system. Thirdly, it is possible to study the mutual influence and interdependence of the state and the tribal system, as well as their identities [10].

However, this approach does not tell us anything about the real dynamics of statehood in the Middle East. Within the framework of the cultural approach, the interactions of social forces that lead to the formation of a particular type of political regime are not analyzed either. In addition, it is purely descriptive and cannot be used to analyze institutions.

One of the possible explanations of the resistance of the Middle East to democracy states its unique geographic location. In particular, authoritarian neighbors significantly affect the likelihood of a democratic transition.

Islam itself contains both – elements hindering political modernization and elements that stimulate it [11, p. 17]. The mere assertion that religion is a determining factor of the political system does not indicate the existence of certain political and economic players and the kind of interactions among them. In this case, Islam is the worst example of such an assertion since its direct interpretation is much more important than the original postulates. And the real political results depend on these interpretations. Consequently, this system is not static, but dynamic. The perception of religion as an independent and determinative factor of politics is unscientific since it can be used to explain anything. In addition, this approach is highly influenced by orientalism.

Empirical evidence (for example, the existence of a variety of political systems in Muslim countries) also proves that Islam is not a determining factor of politics. Bromley writes that the same religion leads to three different results in the real world: Islamic modernism, secular nationalism, and social conflicts.

The cultural approach does not take into account the difference in the political orientations of people of different generations, socio-economic status and different countries although it certainly exists [2]. Otherwise, there would be no inner impulse towards democratic transformations in the Middle East.

The lack of a unified view of the Middle East is easily explained by the nature of this

territory, its diversity, complexity of conducting quantitative and qualitative research here, and the rapid nature of changes in the political life of the region. That is why cultural approach cannot be enough to understand and explain politics in such diverse conditions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Almond G., Verba S. *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations* / G. Almond, S. Verba. – Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015. – 576 p.
2. Brynen R. *Political Culture and the Puzzle of Persistent Authoritarianism in the Middle East* [Електронний ресурс] / R. Brynen. – Режим доступу: <https://www.mcgill.ca/icames/files/icames/IPSA.pdf>
3. Saouli A. *Dilemmas of late formation: international system and state survival in the Middle East: case studies: Saudi Arabia and Iraq* [online] [Електронний ресурс] / A. Saouli. – Режим доступу : <https://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/handle/10023/752>
4. Tibi B. *Islam and the cultural accommodation of social change* / B. Tibi. – Boulder: Westview Press, 1990. – 272 p.
5. Govrin D. *The Quest for Democratic Political Reforms in the Middle East and the Prevailing Arab Political Culture* [online] [Електронний ресурс] / D. Govrin. – Режим доступу: <http://www.jcpra.org/jl/vp528.htm>
6. Kedourie E. *Politics in the Middle East* / E. Kedourie. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992. – 366 p.
7. Sadowski Y. *The New Orientalism and the Democracy Debate* / Y. Sadowski // *Middle East Report*. – №183. – 1993. – P. 14-21.
8. Kelidar A. *States without Foundations: The Political Evolution of State and Society in the Arab East* / A. Kelidar // *Journal of Contemporary History*. – Vol. 28, №2. – 1993. – P. 315-339.
9. Piscatori J. *Islam in a World of Nation-States* / J. Piscatori. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1986. – 204 p.
10. Khoury P., Kostiner J. *Tribes and State Formation in the Middle East* [Електронний ресурс] / P. Khoury, J. Kostiner. – Режим доступу: <http://intersci.ss.uci.edu/wiki/eBooks/MidEast/BOOKS/Tribes%20and%20State%20Formation%20in%20the%20Middle%20East%20Khoury.pdf>
11. Tessler M. *Islam and Democracy in the Middle East: The Impact of Religious Orientations on Attitudes toward Democracy in Four Arab Countries* / M. Tessler // *Comparative Politics*. – Vol. 34. – №3. – 2002. – P. 337-354.